



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 151 No. 171
Wednesday, March 22, 2023

Speaker: The Honourable Anthony Rota



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, March 22, 2023

The House met at 1 p.m.

Prayer

• (1300)

[*English*]

The Speaker: It being Wednesday, we will now have the singing of the national anthem led by the hon. member for Peace River—Westlock.

[*Members sang the national anthem*]

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Friday, March 10, the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed from October 25, 2022, consideration of the motion that Bill C-283, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and the Corrections and Conditional Release Act (addiction treatment in penitentiaries), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to express some thoughts on Bill C-283 the last time it was up for debate, and I thought that maybe for the last couple of minutes I would talk about the impact of addictions on our communities.

I recall sitting in opposition when we talked about safe injection sites, particularly given what was taking place in Vancouver, and the positive impact they were having. This government has been working with other governments to deal with drug-related issues in communities across the country. I want to emphasize that there is so much more that can be done through co-operation with the different stakeholders out there. What we have seen over the last number of years from this government is a high sense of co-operation when working with stakeholders and different levels of government to deal with the very difficult issue of drug addiction and the impact it is having on our communities.

I would suggest that one of the best ways we can deal with crime is prevention. This is where things become very relevant. The more

we turn to groups such as the Bear Clan Patrol in the north end of Winnipeg, the many professional agencies and services out there and community-minded individuals, the more likely we will have a positive outcome. I believe that by having a positive outcome, we prevent crimes from taking place in the first place.

With those few words, I will conclude my remarks.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Before we continue, since today is the final allotted day for the supply period ending March 26, the House will go through the usual procedures to consider and dispose of the supply bills. In view of recent practices, do hon. members agree that the bills be distributed now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

• (1305)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Resuming debate. The hon. member for Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia.

Ms. Kristina Michaud (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to speak to Bill C-283. I have been my party's public safety critic for the past few years, and I have learned a great deal about the situation in federal penitentiaries. I have learned more about Correctional Service Canada and the work of the correctional investigator, who publishes highly relevant reports each year on the various issues in Canada's penitentiaries. I send him my regards, by the way.

In fact, last summer, I joined the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety for a tour of the Port-Cartier penitentiary, a maximum-security facility located in the North Shore region, in a constituency adjacent to mine. We were able to see how things are done on the ground. We observed that addiction is a massive scourge in penitentiaries, both in Quebec and Canada.

I am very pleased that the member for Kelowna—Lake Country contacted me a few months ago to tell me about the bill she is introducing to propose a solution. The bill would allow inmates to be sent to drug treatment facilities. It would also allow penitentiaries to be designated as drug treatment facilities. I will discuss this in more detail later.

Private Members' Business

When the member for Kelowna—Lake Country introduced her bill, she said its purpose was to end the revolving door of the criminal justice system. Those are the words she used. People entering prison get released almost immediately without getting adequate treatment for mental health issues, substance abuse or other problems. Federal penitentiaries, unlike provincial prisons, are reserved for people serving sentences of two years or more, although inmates may serve a much shorter sentence. That said, the meaning of my colleague's words are clear.

In a system that values rehabilitation, it is unacceptable for someone to be released from a penitentiary with the same problems they had when they entered. For there to be rehabilitation, a minimum effort must be made to try to improve or resolve offenders' problems.

As I said, substance abuse is a very real problem. Let us use the current situation in Quebec penitentiaries as an example. In 2014, 58% of inmates in federal penitentiaries had a substance abuse problem. This data comes from the Correctional Service of Canada, the CSC. According to the CSC, drug addiction is a major problem in the prison system.

According to experts, drug addiction is what drives most of the people who end up in prison to commit a crime in the first place, and that is what brings them back to prison, where drugs are very easy to get, despite what people might think. In 2021, Frédéric Lebeau, president of the Union of Canadian Correctional Officers for the Quebec region, said, "There's a major issue, a problem of delivery [of drugs and other prohibited items] inside the penitentiaries. It's too easy. It's got to get harder".

With the advent of drones, it is easier than ever to deliver drugs into prisons. By 2020, officers at Donnacona's 451-inmate maximum security penitentiary had detected 60 drones, but they estimated that was just the tip of the iceberg. To address this emerging issue, penitentiaries are working to implement new drone detection technology, but we must not kid ourselves. We know that drugs are still getting into prisons and will continue to do so, despite the efforts that are being made. This really is one of the biggest problems in the prison system in Quebec and Canada right now.

That is why people are right in saying that incarceration does not solve drug abuse problems, quite the opposite. If we want my colleague's solution to work, then we need to ensure that it is more difficult, if not impossible, for the program participants and all inmates to access drugs in prison.

● (1310)

Recidivism rates among drug addicts is very high. When they get out of prison, many immediately try to obtain drugs and often turn to crime to pay for their purchases.

There are many programs for addicts, such as the federal drug treatment court funding program. Drug treatment courts, known as DTCs, offer eligible offenders with a substance use disorder the opportunity to complete a court monitored drug treatment program as an alternative to incarceration. Provinces and territories are eligible for federal funding for the development and delivery of these drug treatment courts.

It is important to note that offenders serving sentences in provincial prisons have usually committed less serious crimes—they are therefore sentenced to a maximum of two years less a day—and that alternative sentences may be more appropriate for these offenders than for inmates in federal penitentiaries.

The DTC program has a few conditions, including that the inmate remain in the program for as long as it takes, usually 12 to 18 months, and that the inmate have no further criminal convictions.

DTCs have existed in Quebec since 2012 and have been so successful that they served as a model for a pilot project to address recidivism among drug addicts in France. According to a study by CIRANO published in 2019, Quebec is an example to the world when it comes to rehabilitating its inmates. I have cited this report in the House before because Quebec truly is a role model.

According to the study, Quebec's reintegration programs for inmates in Quebec-run prisons reduce the risk of recidivism and perform significantly better than elsewhere in the world. These reintegration programs, which are not only aimed at drug addicts, reduce the recidivism rate from 50% to 10% among participating inmates. Participation in the program is, of course, voluntary.

In comparison with Quebec programs, it bears mentioning that federal penitentiaries are doing a poor job in facilitating the rehabilitation of inmates. In the Correctional Investigator of Canada's 2020 annual report, and this is something that comes up nearly every year in the correctional investigator's reports, federal inmates do not get training or learn skills that are job relevant and they do not have access to adequate care. In short, they are very ill-equipped to reintegrate civil society.

It should also be noted that indigenous peoples are overrepresented in federal penitentiaries. They account for less than 5% of the Canadian population, but they account for over 32% of the prison population. Substance abuse and the lack of effective treatment programs partially explain this indigenous overrepresentation. That is where Bill C-283 may make a difference and have a fairly positive impact.

Private Members' Business

Let us take a closer look at the bill. It has three separate parts and would provide additional tools to help offenders overcome addiction. It adds the possibility for a convicted offender to ask the court to serve their sentence, or a part of it, in custody in a penitentiary designated as an addiction treatment facility if the following conditions are met: The offender was in trouble with the law because of their problematic substance use; the offender consents to participating in the program; the court is satisfied that the request has merit; the offender has not been sentenced to a term of imprisonment of 14 years or more; and the offender has not been sentenced to a term of imprisonment of 10 years or more for an offence that resulted in bodily harm, involved drug trafficking or involved the use of a weapon.

The court would then make a recommendation to the Correctional Service of Canada that the inmate be placed in an addiction treatment facility if the inmate meets the criteria mentioned earlier.

The bill would also amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act. It would provide for the designation of addiction treatment facilities in the act. I was going to talk about that a little more, but I see that I have little time left.

Therefore, I will say right now that the Bloc Québécois will vote in favour of the bill at second reading because it is a bill that would actually help rehabilitate inmates. I would remind members that federal penitentiaries have done a very poor job in the area of rehabilitation. I therefore commend my colleague and thank her for proposing this bill, which I hope will be a step in the right direction for offenders in Quebec and Canada.

• (1315)

[English]

Ms. Lisa Marie Barron (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Madam Speaker, I want to first thank the member for Kelowna—Lake Country for putting forward this bill.

In my riding of Nanaimo—Ladysmith and across Canada, we are losing loved ones at an alarming rate as a result of the toxic substance crisis. Since 2016, more than 30,000 people have died: 30,000 preventable losses. We know the toxic substance crisis does not discriminate or follow political lines. The toxic substance crisis impacts us all in a multitude of ways.

Canadians need all members of this House to unite and move forward with evidence-based solutions to begin addressing this crisis so no more lives are lost.

According to recent reports by Island Health, illicit drug toxicity deaths are in the top two leading causes of death in all age categories, from under 19 up to the age range of 40 to 59. These are people who should have had long lives ahead of them but had them cut short because of toxic substances.

In the last year alone, 80 people died of toxic substances in my riding of Nanaimo—Ladysmith, specifically in Nanaimo. These people were somebody's father, brother, daughter, friend or neighbour: 80 people gone and their loved ones left to mourn their tragic loss, all because of toxic substances. This is horrific and inexplicable.

Fortunately, there are good people doing good work. Last month, community members and organizations in my riding of Nanaimo—Ladysmith, including the Nanaimo community action team, Canadian Drug Policy Coalition, Nanaimo Area Network of Drug Users, Nanaimo Brain Injury Society and Naut'sa mawt Community Wellness Network, all came together to continue the work that needs to be done to start saving lives. They brought together community members, including frontline workers, health care professionals, substance users and their families, and even central Vancouver Island's own medical health officer. At one point in this meeting, a speaker stood at the front of the room and asked all those in attendance to say the names of those they lost from the toxic substance crisis. It brought tears to my eyes as the names of loved ones echoed through the room, loved ones taken too soon because help was out of reach.

I, too, shared the names of my loved ones lost, family and friends whose lives were tragically ripped away. This was a stark reminder of what we are talking about today: life-saving and long-overdue supports. It is essential that we take a moment to acknowledge that prevention is key to addressing the crisis.

People are struggling. We have seen significant increases in substance use over the last few years as people struggled with isolation as a result of the pandemic. I saw this first-hand as a former frontline worker in mental health and addictions when COVID-19 first hit our country, with increased barriers in accessing supports and our loved ones separated.

As our communities work to put back the pieces, the cost of living continues to increase. People are struggling to make ends meet. The basic necessities are no longer affordable, such as a place to call home, food on the table and heat to keep warm. Adding to this, health care has hit its breaking point. We see the impacts all around us. The severity and complexity of untreated mental illness being experienced by people in our communities are on the rise. The number of those using substances to get through their day is increasing. Crime in our neighbourhoods, as too many struggle to survive, is happening more and more often. This is all right in front of our eyes in the communities we care about.

People in my riding of Nanaimo—Ladysmith are seeing this all unfold in front of us, and it is heartbreaking. People are reaching out to me, unsure of how they are going to afford their next meal. Others are reaching out fearing for their safety. When I was knocking on doors in downtown Nanaimo last week, resident after resident expressed that they were worried about the increasing number of people struggling around us, living on the streets or on the verge of being without a home.

I made a promise that I would share these concerns and fight for better. Unfortunately, we are dealing with the aftermath of consecutive Liberal and Conservative governments' inaction that has left people behind. Housing is a basic human right. Why have the Liberals allowed loopholes that let housing be used as a stock market for the ultrarich?

Private Members' Business

Access to head-to-toe care, including mental health supports, is a basic human right. Why have the Liberals followed in the Conservative footsteps by underfunding health care transfers to provinces and territories? Why has not a single dollar of the promised mental health transfers been received to date? This funding would make a huge difference in the lives of many, yet the promised funds still sit unused.

We also know that access to an income that provides, at minimum, the basics that people need to get by is a human right. Why is this government not lifting those with disabilities, seniors left with limited fixed incomes, and families out of poverty with a guaranteed livable basic income?

It is important that we look at the root of the problem before we can effectively address the symptoms. The symptoms are that we have people struggling with substance misuse, increasing mental illness, and increasing crime and incarceration rates. When considering this bill, at a time when so many are struggling, we need to focus on people's access to their basic human rights, if we truly want to put an end to the cycle of crime around us. The barriers in accessing treatment for substance misuse need to be removed, including for those in our penitentiaries. I fully agree that the lack of supports is part of the recidivism that we see in our criminal justice system. This is why everyone should have access to the supports they need that are right for them.

When considering the bill in front of us today, we need to look at what is currently in place and working. Again, in my riding of Nanaimo—Ladysmith, Connective Nanaimo, formerly known as John Howard Society, is doing incredible work to provide restorative recovery supports to those in correctional facilities located in Nanaimo. Through the Guthrie program, those in corrections are offered in-house treatment, which is not only offered within the facility by those trained and qualified to do the work but also stretches into the community, ensuring that the supports continue on as they re-enter the community. Those interested are considered based on their willingness and motivation to do the work required, and the result is a lower incidence of recidivism of participants than their counterparts.

My friend Harry, who is now five years sober and currently working toward his Red Seal ticket in trades, spoke to me last night about his experience as someone who has been in and out of corrections since the age of 16. According to Harry, his entire life trajectory changed when he was offered, and made the decision to participate in, the Guthrie program while in jail, at the age of 38. Harry entered this program knowing only a life of substance use, unable to read and write. While participating in the program, he was provided with, among others, peer recovery programming, counselling to begin addressing the deep-rooted symptoms of trauma, and regular tutoring to learn how to read and write.

Harry said to me that if he had not participated in the Guthrie program, he would probably be in prison or dead. Instead, Harry is proudly sober, sharing his story and helping so many others as a result. Instead of continuing to cycle in and out of jail, Harry is contributing to and is a valued part of our community, showing others struggling with substance misuse that there are options available to them to live happy, healthy lives, if made available to them.

Harry's success is the result of his willingness and strength to fully participate in the programming made available and accessible when he needed it. This programming is evidence-based, delivered by qualified professionals in the field and those with lived experience, and is made available based on need and fit.

This bill, although with good intentions, includes components that are problematic. This bill excludes individuals who are convicted of certain offences, such as drug trafficking. With limited time, I will only say that I have yet to see evidence that would suggest that those who have been charged with trafficking substances would not be successful if willing and able to participate in a good-fit treatment program for substance misuse.

This bill unfortunately assumes a one-size-fits-all program. Again, while the program that Harry attended was successful for him and so many others, we cannot disregard the importance of culturally appropriate, accessible programming that meets people where they are at. Harm reduction and trauma-informed supports save lives.

● (1320)

Moving forward with evidence-based solutions to this toxic substance crisis is vital and life-saving. Unfortunately, this bill, although I am sure well-intentioned, misses the mark. My hope, however, is that this important debate helps to apply the pressure needed to finally light the fire under the Liberals to do what is needed with the investment required to save lives.

● (1325)

Ms. Raquel Dancho (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC): Madam Speaker, from January 2016 to June 2022, over 32,000 Canadians died of opioid overdoses. We have thousands of people federally incarcerated in Canada, and about 70% of them deal with substance use issues. We have a very serious threat to public safety and to the health of Canadians on our hands.

I know that all parties in this House want to see recidivism rates and addiction rates reduced, want to save lives and want to keep our communities safe. However, we have very different approaches for how we get that accomplished. I think the debate today has been very illuminating, and I appreciate the perspectives of all parties, but I do think the Conservative approach is a solid one and I applaud the members who brought it forward.

As I mentioned, there are over 30,000 people who have died just of opioid overdoses in the last number of years. We have many people in federal penitentiaries who are addicted to drugs. In fact, since the pandemic, we have about 20 people a day who die of opioid overdoses. It is getting far worse. Looking back to 2016, there were about eight people a day. That was already terrible, but now, just a few years later, it is 20 people a day.

I hear from my constituents all the time. I have visited communities across the country and tent cities. There is open, dangerous drug use on the streets, violent crime and petty crime, and deaths of loved ones from drug addiction. It is impacting every single neighbourhood in this country. It is a growing problem. We can see it with our own eyes. We see it when we look at the news every morning. There is headline after headline about theft, petty crime and violent, repeat offenders hurting innocent Canadians. I do believe these are all linked.

If we look at crime rings and gangs, the purpose of these, more often than not, in the gang culture is to sell drugs and protect their drug territory from other gangs. We have this criminal network in Canada that is highly incentivized to push very dangerous drugs on people and get them highly addicted so the gangs can make money. Then they violently protect their drug turf using illegally smuggled firearms and 3D-printed firearms. We see this cycle of violence and addiction impacting the vulnerable people in this country.

The direction of this has only gotten worse under the current government. Unfortunately, over 32,000 people have died of opioid overdoses alone in the last number of years. Of course, violent, repeat offenders are intimately tied to gangs, drug trafficking and taking advantage of vulnerable people with addictions. We have seen an increase in violent crime from those repeat, violent offenders, who are getting out on bail more easily than ever because of the regime brought forward by the Liberal government.

Today, we have the opportunity to do something real about this and end the revolving door of inmates in and out of prison. This is a huge issue. Part of what is happening is that we have highly addicted individuals who commit crimes, go to prison and do not receive the treatment they need to recover.

This bill is called the “ending the revolving door act”, and I think that is something we can all get on board with, if not for the benefit of compassion for those who are in our penitentiaries and addicted to substances, then for the taxpayer, because it costs a lot of money when an inmate is in and out of prison over and over again. It would also make our penitentiaries and the corrections staff who work in them safer. If we have individuals who are dealing with substance abuse, which can often manifest in violent ways, and if we can get them rehabilitated, it is even better for everyone.

This bill has lofty and high goals that I very much support. It goes about it in a very smart way. In particular, the legislation would allow for a part of the federal penitentiary to be turned into a rehabilitation facility. Let us turn part of our existing penitentiary infrastructure into a rehab, given the high number of inmates addicted to substances. I think that is a great idea. Inmates are there anyway. Let us have an intensive option where, if they choose to, they can get some rehab and perhaps recover from their addictions. When they are released from the penitentiary, they have a much better opportunity and much better chance of living a fulsome, law-abiding life if they receive the care, support and compassion they need.

Ultimately, the bill is designed very well, in the sense that it is the judge's discretion, which I think is important in this regard, and it is only for non-violent crimes. We are not talking about folks with life sentences. We are talking about low-level crimes for

Private Members' Business

which people are committed to federal penitentiaries. That is important, especially as a start for this. Let us see how it goes. If it works really well, great, we can talk about different expansions, if that is what is needed. I think this is a great place to start, and it is the safest place to start this very innovative idea.

• (1330)

It is up to the judge and then ultimately it is up to the individual. People are given a choice and then they can choose if they want to go to the rehab part of the facility. They still have to serve the same amount of time, but it is in a part of the facility that is built for that rehab. That is really great if we are of the opinion and the philosophy that we want people who have substance use issues to access recovery and fully recover and live fulsome lives, which is certainly the Conservative Party's perspective. Addiction is a mental health issue, and we can help a lot more people if there is a lot more access to mental health and rehabilitation supports.

To get right to the source, I have visited federal penitentiaries and they are very tough places to be. I recommend that every legislator in this place go to visit a federal penitentiary. The older penitentiaries, especially, are not places that were built for, or are conducive to, rehabilitation. It is a great idea that we could redesign those structures to support those who need extra compassion, mental health care and rehab supports. They are there anyway, so, if the judge decided it was safe, giving them some freedom to access rehabilitation and to get a real shot at recovering would be good for them and good for their loved ones, who want to see them survive. Ultimately, it is good for them when they are released from a federal penitentiary.

I mentioned at the beginning that I think all parties have the ultimate goal of reducing recidivism, which is very high, costly to the taxpayer, and very harmful to the individual who is in and out of jail over and over again. I think everyone agrees that it is not great, so let us fix it.

Everybody in the House talks repeatedly about addictions and how many people have died. What we do not have in common is how we all approach that. However, I think that the way the bill is structured, it offers an innovative solution to this that could be supported by all parties, if they want to give it a shot and say “why not?” This could be a real option to save lives and to support a reduction in recidivism rates.

One thing that the Liberals have done, which would be their solution to the issues that I and others outlined today regarding this bill and the goal it is trying to solve, is something that I cannot get behind: the prison needle exchange program. I visited penitentiaries where corrections officers are being told that this is coming to them from the federal government. There have been test runs in some penitentiaries as well.

Private Members' Business

The federal government is facilitating needle kits for federal inmates to inject drugs while in jail. They are not allowed to have drugs. The drugs are illegally smuggled into jails through criminal networks and then inmates inject them. The Liberal idea is to provide clean needle kits to reduce the spread of diseases, which is a good goal. However, in many cases, we are talking about providing the most dangerous people in Canada with, for all intents and purposes, tiny knives that they could put their own blood into, or a whole host of liquid substances, and they could use them to hurt themselves, corrections officers and other inmates.

Corrections officers have spoken to me about their fears with respect to this, and inmates themselves are very concerned. In fact, a women's federal penitentiary in Alberta has written a very strong petition to the federal government pleading and demanding that it does not introduce those needles into their prisons. The women inmates themselves are saying they would not feel safe and they do not want them, yet it is coming. I am very concerned about that and about the safety of our corrections officers.

I feel that this bill is designed in a way that is not supposed to be divisive. It is an innovative idea. I think we should all be able to get behind it. It is an approach that is safe and is focused on safety. It would turn part of a federal penitentiary into something very positive: a rehabilitation facility. I very much support that and the ultimate objective of reducing recidivism and improving recovery rates for inmates and the vulnerable populations there.

I would like to thank the members for Kelowna—Lake Country and Kootenay—Columbia for their hard work on this bill. It is a Conservative bill. I am very proud of my colleagues.

With my last 20 seconds, I would like to thank all of the corrections officers and parole officers in this country, who put their lives on the line to keep us safe and to do the hard work to help rehabilitate our inmates.

To conclude, I would like to acknowledge the two Edmonton police officers who were recently killed on the job: Constable Travis Jordan, who was 35 years old; and Constable Brett Ryan, who was 30 years old. We have incredibly hard-working men and women in our justice system, and it is always tragic when we have deaths. I want to acknowledge that we are thinking about their families.

• (1335)

Mr. Gary Anandasangaree (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Madam Speaker, let me begin by acknowledging that we are gathered here on the traditional unceded lands of the Algonquin Anishinabe people.

I am pleased to join in the debate today as we progress to the second reading of Bill C-283, regarding addiction treatment in penitentiaries. I thank the member for Kelowna—Lake Country for her advocacy on this important issue and for her hard work. As the member has noted, this bill aims to expand sentencing options to help address the root causes of criminal offending through treatment.

Our government is committed to protecting the health and safety of all Canadians, including those who are incarcerated and struggling with substance abuse issues. As my colleagues would agree, these issues cannot be addressed in isolation. Substance use is a so-

cial and health issue that intersects clearly with systemic racism and inequities. That is what I would like to focus on today.

The Minister of Public Safety's December 2021 mandate letter reaffirmed the requirement to continue to combat systemic racism and discrimination in the criminal justice system. This includes supporting work to address systemic racism and the overrepresentation of Black, indigenous and racialized Canadians within the criminal justice system.

The Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada introduced Bill C-5, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act, last December. It received royal assent, and we are hopeful that it will make a significant impact in our criminal justice system in addressing these issues. Bill C-5 aims to restore judicial discretion to impose fit sentences and to address overincarceration rates among indigenous and Black persons, and members of marginalized communities who are overrepresented among those convicted of certain drug- and firearm-related offences. Harms related to substance use would be treated as a health and social use rather a criminal one.

The Minister of Public Safety, in concert with the provincial and territorial colleagues, addressed many of these important matters head-on at recent meetings of ministers responsible for justice and public safety. Work is under way to implement the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act, across the country and within provincial and territorial jurisdictions. Excellent collaboration continues with the FPT working group on the development of the indigenous justice strategy and in addressing systemic discrimination and overrepresentation of indigenous persons within the criminal justice system.

The ministers also affirmed, in light of the James Smith Cree Nation tragedy last year, the need to work with indigenous leaders to ensure their communities are safe and supported. The ministers agreed to collaborate on the development and implement of the Canada's Black justice strategy to address anti-Black racism and discrimination within Canada's policing and criminal justice system.

Another key priority was the ongoing opioid crisis. Again, substance use is a public health issue that must be balanced with public safety. In practice, that means diverting individuals away from the criminal justice system at an early stage, through rehabilitative and treatment programs or increased use of conditional sentences.

Our government is very much seized with the work to both build safer communities and help break the cycle of substance-related harms by addressing the root causes of criminality. On its surface, Bill C-283 appears to have the same goals. It proposes to offer offenders the possibility of serving all or part of their sentences in a designated addiction treatment facility.

Let us examine some of the bill's unfortunate oversights and exceptions. Proposed section 743.11 would stipulate that those whose offences carry a maximum penalty of 14 years' imprisonment or life in prison, and those who have committed offences resulting in bodily harm, involving a weapon, or drug trafficking or production, would not be eligible to serve their sentences in a designated addiction treatment facility. This is a problem.

With respect to overrepresentation, Bill C-283 runs counter to our goals. We know that indigenous and Black persons are overrepresented in federal penitentiaries. According to the data, over 68% of indigenous women in custody are serving a federal sentence of more than 10 years. Black offenders represent the largest proportion, 42%, of offenders convicted of importing or exporting drugs.

• (1340)

Overall, Black and indigenous persons tend to be subject to longer sentences, and I invite members opposite to look at the Auditor General's report on corrections, released late last year, which talked about systemic racism. It is, therefore, clear that Bill C-283 would exclude some of the most vulnerable and overrepresented members of the custody population, those who, in fact, may be most directly in need of treatment and rehabilitation.

In addition, proposed paragraph 743.11(1)(a) of the bill would require the offender to show evidence of repeated good behaviour in order to indicate that substance use has contributed to their actions. Here is yet another barrier to accessing treatment for incarcerated people. Not everyone who needs support and services may have a history or a pattern of behaviour: for example, those who have only recently begun using opioids.

This could also represent a prohibitively expensive burden for offenders who do not have the means to provide submissions established in their history or repeated behaviour. Bill C-283 would therefore not only make those individuals ineligible for treatment, through no fault of their own, but also create significant issues of inequity, with BIPOC and socio-economically disadvantaged offenders being denied services at a disproportionate rate.

This bill flies in the face of the Minister of Public Safety's December 2021 mandate letter, which reaffirmed the need to continue to combat systemic racism and discrimination in the criminal justice system. It is also misaligned with Correctional Service Canada's commitment to addressing the overincarceration of indigenous peoples. Again, that is why our government introduced Bill C-5, to treat harms related to substance use as a health and social issue and not a criminal one. Ultimately, the measures in Bill C-5 will help address overincarceration rates among indigenous and racialized persons convicted of certain drug- and firearms-related offences. In contrast, Bill C-283 would undermine these goals.

Despite its veneer of concern for the health and safety of offenders who use substances, this bill is not designed to help those who

Private Members' Business

need it the most. I encourage all members to join me in voicing their concerns about this bill.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak to Bill C-283. This legislation would allow a federal inmate to be sent to an addiction treatment facility.

Under this legislation, the courts must assess these cases and ensure that certain eligibility requirements are met, including the following: Problematic substance use has contributed to the offender's involvement in the criminal justice system; the offender consents to participating in the treatment program; the court is satisfied that the application has merit; the offender has not been sentenced to a term of imprisonment of 14 years or more; the offender has not been sentenced to a term of imprisonment of 10 years or more for an offence that resulted in bodily harm, involved drug trafficking or involved the use of a weapon.

Bill C-283 also amends the Corrections and Conditional Release Act to provide for the designation of a penitentiary or any area within a penitentiary as an addiction treatment facility.

The purpose of an addiction treatment facility is to provide inmates with access to treatment programs in relation to their problematic substance use as well as to other related services that respond to their specific needs.

My Bloc Québécois colleagues and I will be voting in favour of Bill C-283 at second reading because we believe that it could help rehabilitate inmates struggling with addiction.

Rehabilitation is one of the key pillars of our justice system, and it is our duty to do everything we can to enable as many people as possible to reach that goal. Rehabilitation is also a way to give a second chance to citizens who have made mistakes in the past.

Experience has shown that shutting out an entire segment of the population from our society and our community indefinitely is not beneficial to anyone—not to them and not to us. On the contrary, it only replicates and reinforces the conditions that give rise to crime in the first place.

One thing is clear: A healthy, prosperous, and compassionate democracy requires rehabilitation and inclusion. Unfortunately, right now, federal penitentiaries have a dismal record of rehabilitating inmates struggling with addiction.

Private Members' Business

In Quebec, in 2014, 58% of prisoners in federal institutions were found to have a history of addiction. I will say it again: 58%. We are not talking about a marginal or minority phenomenon, but rather a widespread scourge that contributes to keeping inmates in a state of dependence, precariousness and vulnerability.

Many experts have in fact established that addiction is the catalyst that drives many Canadians to commit a first offence or to be repeatedly incarcerated.

One would think that imprisonment and the isolation that comes with it would help inmates struggling with addiction to go through proper withdrawal during their incarceration, but the reality is something else altogether.

According to correctional workers, it is shocking how easy it is to get drugs in prison. Those seeking psychoactive substances can use an underground network to find whatever they need to feed their drug habits.

Delivery of these substances and other prohibited items has become much more difficult to control since the advent of drones. Because they are small and make virtually no noise, they can deliver small items by air and are almost undetectable.

New drone detection technologies are now being implemented. However, Frédérick Lebeau, president of the Union of Canadian Correctional Officers is under no illusions.

• (1345)

Drugs will continue to find their way into prisons one way or another. Knowing that, it would be unrealistic to think that jail time will solve an inmate's substance abuse problems. Quite the opposite. It is the federal government's responsibility to provide resources for supervision and control, but more importantly for coaching and assistance so that detention facilities can help inmates make lasting lifestyle changes.

The federal government is already funding some initiatives in this respect, including the drug treatment court funding program, commonly referred to as DTCs, which offers offenders with addictions issues the opportunity to undergo drug treatment as an alternative to a prison sentence. Quebec, other provinces and the territories may receive funding under this program to implement DTCs.

An important distinction must be made, however. Inmates serving sentences in provincial prisons have typically committed less serious offences, given that they were sentenced to a maximum of two years less a day. It is therefore easier to justify alternative sentences for them than for inmates in federal penitentiaries.

Still, it cannot be denied that DTCs have had a very positive impact since they were implemented in 2012. Quebec's successful rollout got people talking, even across the Atlantic. France based its pilot project for countering recidivism among drug users directly on our DTCs.

More broadly, DTCs are part of Quebec's wider rehabilitation strategy, which is delivering impressive results. By combining all of these rehabilitation programs, Quebec has reduced the recidivism rate from 50% to 10% among inmates who choose to participate. I am sure my colleagues will all agree that that is quite a feat.

Hundreds of Quebecers decided to accept the Quebec government's help so they could get their lives back on track and live free.

That is why the Bloc Québécois will support Bill C-238, introduced by my Conservative colleague from Kelowna—Lake Country. We think this bill should be studied in committee to ensure that it is effective and to determine what improvements need to be made so that it has a lasting, positive impact on those it affects.

We believe in rehabilitation, we believe in inclusion, but above all, we believe in human justice.

• (1350)

[*English*]

Mrs. Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am proud to rise in the House to speak to the private member's bill of my colleague, the member for Kelowna—Lake Country, the end the revolving door act.

This legislation proposes critical amendments to the Corrections and Conditional Release Act and the Criminal Code of Canada that would expand access for substance use treatment in federal facilities across the country. I was really disappointed when hearing some of the speeches, particularly from members of the governing Liberal Party, stating that this is simply a veneer. I really think it highlights the fact that they do not truly understand the crippling impacts addiction has on our communities, in our neighbourhoods and across the country. Addiction is such a serious issue that affects individuals from all walks of life, and the harms and costs have only increased as years go by.

One of the flashpoints of our addiction crisis across this country is in Canada's correctional facilities. The Canadian Centre on Substance Use and Addiction found that over 75% of individuals arriving at Canadian federal institutions have a serious substance use problem. Within that alarming statistic, there is an overrepresentation of indigenous offenders. The Correctional Service of Canada found that 94% of incarcerated indigenous women present a substance use disorder compared to 71% of non-indigenous female offenders, and the figures are 86% of indigenous males compared to 68% of non-indigenous male offenders.

Given the interplay between addiction and criminal behaviour, intergenerational trauma and recidivism, it is urgent that we look at actually allowing these people to heal, to find a space for healing. Having recovery, rehabilitation and reintegration in a correctional facility is a very good step toward dealing with the root cause of this.

Conservatives firmly believe that addiction is a health condition and that recovery is possible. It has been exceptionally clear that the Liberal-NDP approach to addiction has failed. It has flooded our streets with more drugs, leading to more addictions, which lead to more death, more despair and, unfortunately, more crime. The sad reality is that, without meaningful change to the government's approach, people with severe mental health problems and addictions will continue re-entering our system without receiving the proper treatment.

The solution from the government has been, as one of my colleagues pointed out, the needle exchange program, which has created all kinds of fears from a variety of correctional institutions. It has not solved the problem. People in correctional facilities are not supposed to be using drugs, yet the government is facilitating the use of illegal substances while they are in our correctional facilities, rather than offering them treatment options. This is putting the cart before the horse and losing the plot on what the issue is.

It is so encouraging that we are finally seeing some evidence-based opioid agonist therapy being offered to some offenders in correctional facilities, but it is worth pointing out there are significant barriers within the system that create lengthy wait times, inconsistent procedures and difficulties obtaining entry that vary from facility to facility. We know, through evidence-based procedures, that opioid agonist therapies such as Suboxone, Sublocade and methadone can help someone find recovery, yet there are barriers in place in our correctional facilities to allowing people to access these forms of treatment. It is worth pointing out that they can do more when it comes to these kinds of things.

• (1355)

I wish I had more time to go through some of the statistics, facts and figures we have collected on how serious the addiction issue is in our criminal system, but if there is one thing I could leave every member of the House with, it is that we have an option right now. We have an ability to make a difference in people's lives. We have a captive audience and we can provide an option to people to be able to get the treatment and help they so desperately need and help them get their lives back, rather than keeping them in a revolving door.

I would urge everyone to vote in favour of this wonderful bill.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member for Kelowna—Lake Country has five minutes for her right of reply.

• (1400)

Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak to my private member's bill, Bill C-283, the "end the revolving door" act, once again.

I want to thank the member for Kootenay—Columbia for his initial work and research on this legislation during the previous Parliament, and my colleagues who have spoken to the bill. I also want to thank those who work in law enforcement and the criminal justice system. I hope we can move forward with this legislation to provide the Standing Committee on Public Safety the opportunity to study how this can improve our justice system and give people hope to recover from addiction.

Private Members' Business

Kelowna—Lake Country residents, the people of British Columbia, and Canadians from coast to coast to coast have seen first-hand the devastating impact the addiction crisis has had on families, communities and the individuals themselves. Residents in my community want people to be held accountable for their actions, while at the same time to have compassion and get addiction and recovery help to those who need it.

My "end the revolving door" act is an opportunity for parliamentarians of every political stripe to come together to move forward with a common sense approach to improving our justice system and helping those struggling with addiction. No one piece of legislation can serve as the panacea for those who are repeatedly re-entering the criminal justice system who have mental health and/or addiction challenges.

This legislation offers an additional tool to help reduce recidivism, address our mental health and addiction crisis, and improve the public safety of our communities. Expanding the sentencing options available in our justice system and assisting those whose lives have been ravaged by addiction is the right thing to do. No one is served when repeat reoffenders are in a revolving door system where it is reported that more than 70% of those sentenced to federal penitentiaries have addiction issues.

We must ensure that the effort of curative treatment is focused and provided for those who have found themselves incarcerated and who want help to turn their lives around. A dedicated addiction treatment facility operating inside an existing Correctional Service of Canada facility would help support this work. Many who work around the criminal justice system have told me that this would put a stop to the revolving door for many.

I want to thank those who have supported this legislation, from the national level to my backyard, who think we should not waste one moment to move forward. The City of Kelowna mayor and council passed a motion unanimously supporting this legislation.

Lissa Dawn Smith, president of Métis Nation British Columbia, said that Métis Nation BC strongly supports the implementation of more effective addiction and mental health services within the federal penitentiary system through Bill C-283. It knows that Métis people are over-represented in the correctional system and that Justice Canada needs more tools in its tool kit to address the root causes of incarceration.

Tom Smithwick, founder of Freedom's Door, which is a vital organization dedicated to hope and healing for those suffering from addiction, including those recently released from incarceration, expressed how it makes sense to start a recovery process while incarcerated. He said, "The whole system would save money. The human need would be met. There totally is hope".

Statements by Members

It is in that spirit that I hope Parliament moves to advance this common sense legislation to the Standing Committee of Public Safety for further study. I hope that we will not waste this crucial opportunity that we have as elected representatives to help reduce recidivism, give hope and healing to those struggling with addiction, and end the revolving door.

Therefore, I move:

That, notwithstanding any Standing Order, special order or usual practice of the House, if a recorded division is requested today in regard to the second reading of Bill C-283, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and the Corrections and Conditional Release Act (addiction treatment in penitentiaries), it shall be deferred to the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions later today.

[*Translation*]

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

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

(Motion agreed to)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The question is on the motion.

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

[*English*]

Mrs. Sherry Romanado: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded division.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Pursuant to the order made earlier today, the recorded division stands deferred until later today at the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

CANADA-U.S. RELATIONS

Mr. Irek Kusmierczyk (Windsor—Tecumseh, Lib.): Madam Speaker, on Friday we will welcome to Parliament U.S. President Joe Biden to strengthen the unbreakable bond between our two countries. Border communities like mine rely on that relationship more than any other. From 80% to 90% of what we manufacture and what we grow is exported to the Midwest and beyond.

There are 1,600 Windsorites who cross the border every day to care for Americans, and they kept crossing every day during the worst of the pandemic. We cross the border to visit family, go shopping and attend concerts, so we welcome President Biden and the First Lady to Canada.

We are celebrating the rise of a new auto industry in North America, a battery belt up and down the Mississippi River that connects new battery and electric vehicle plants in Windsor and St.

Thomas to factories in Michigan and Georgia. We say to our American friends that we are in fact stronger when we work together to lift American and Canadian workers and families on both sides of the border.

* * *

ALBERTA'S FILM AND TELEVISION INDUSTRY

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am imploring my constituents to run and get out while they can. Southern Alberta has been infested. Foothills has been overrun by clickers, bloaters, raiders and runners, and they are spreading like a fungus, decimating communities such as Fort Macleod, High River, Nanton, Waterton and Kananaskis.

The Last of Us is a global phenomenon that has toppled the Super Bowl, the Oscars and the Grammys, and more than 40 million people have watched the first episode. This has been an economic boom for Foothills because people from around the world are tuning in to see what is going to happen with Joel and Ellie in their harrowing adventures across Canada.

This world phenomenon is also successful because of an incredible group of talented people, many of whom call Foothills home. Not only has this HBO series highlighted and showcased our iconic landscapes, but it has also highlighted our incredible talent. I want to take this opportunity to thank the wonderfully creative people in all of our communities for making Alberta's film and television industry such a massive success. I invite all members to tune in to what is going on in the Foothills, if they dare.

* * *

● (1405)

WORLD TUBERCULOSIS DAY

Ms. Pam Damoff (Oakville North—Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this Friday, March 24, marks World Tuberculosis Day.

TB continues to infect people around the world and right here at home. In Canada, people affected by TB are mostly newcomers or indigenous peoples. Inuit communities are especially affected, with rates of tuberculosis over 280 times greater than non-indigenous peoples.

Today I want to let Canadians from coast to coast to coast know that ending tuberculosis is possible, but we must continue the fight against this debilitating disease. We have the ability to end TB in indigenous communities, ensure the health of newcomers to Canada and save millions of lives around the world.

I give a special shout-out to people such as those at Results Canada for doing grassroots work on this. I thank them. Their hard work does not go unnoticed. I would also like to invite all hon. members to a reception tomorrow morning at 8 a.m. to raise awareness on the domestic and global impacts of TB.

[Translation]

QUEBEC SOCIAL WORKERS' WEEK

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille (Salaberry—Suroît, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this week, we celebrate the expertise of nearly 16,000 professionals, my fellow social workers.

Social workers can be found in schools, in hospitals, in local community service centres, in shelters, at police stations, in prisons, at community organizations and right here in Parliament. Wherever they go, these agents of change are making things better. They care about every individual's aspirations.

Whether they are working with children, seniors, people with disabilities, or those with different life trajectories, social workers do what they do best, without passing judgment: They take the time to focus on the human in front of them, help them out of their difficulties and empower them. Social workers everywhere are doing good in our world, improving our communities every day and fighting for greater social justice.

I want to thank all these esteemed “SWs” and wish them a happy social workers' week.

* * *

TRAGIC EVENTS IN QUEBEC

Ms. Rachel Bendayan (Outremont, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, over the past few weeks, Quebec has been hit by one incomprehensible tragedy after another: the day care tragedy in Laval, the truck attack in Amqui, the carnage in Rosemont, the fire in Old Montreal. Furthermore, just a few days ago, an 18-year-old man was shot and killed while walking down the street in Anjou. So many places and communities in Quebec have witnessed tragic events.

I believe I speak for all of us in the House when I say to the grieving families, friends and loved ones that, while we cannot ease their pain, we share it, and our hearts go out to them.

We do not have all the answers, but together we will get through this and find solutions.

* * *

[English]

GOVERNMENT POLICIES

Mr. Tony Baldinelli (Niagara Falls, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after eight years of a Liberal government, groceries, gas and home heating are getting more and more expensive. If that were not bad enough, on April 1 taxes on gasoline are going up 14¢ a litre, while the escalator tax on wine, beer and spirits is also set to rise by 6.3%. That is no cruel April Fool's joke. In Niagara and across the country, these taxes will punish wineries, craft breweries, distilleries and anyone who enjoys consuming these wonderful Canadian-made products.

There are serious consequences to the government spending the cupboards bare while leaving Canadians with the expensive bills to pay. What will happen to the much-vaunted federal tourism growth strategy, and what of the wine sector support program? Our tourism operators, grape growers and wineries deserve so much better from the government.

Statements by Members

It is time for the tired Liberals to step aside so a Conservative government can lead and create the changes needed such that Canadians can finally get ahead.

* * *

● (1410)

RAMADAN

Ms. Iqra Khalid (Mississauga—Erin Mills, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this evening Muslims in my community of Mississauga—Erin Mills and across Canada will mark the beginning of the holy month of Ramadan. Many of our friends, family members and neighbours will gather at their local mosques to pray, hold Iftars, break their fast and emphasize Canadian and Muslim values such as charity and compassion. This is also a time to reinforce the cultural bonds of our communities that make our Canadian mosaic so great.

As we recently marked the first United Nations International Day to Combat Islamophobia, let us reinforce our commitment to rejecting hate in all its forms in Canada and across the world. I wish all Muslims observing Ramadan a peaceful and blessed celebration with family and friends as we really begin this important journey together.

Ramadan Mubarak.

* * *

RAMADAN

Mrs. Salma Zahid (Scarborough Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, every year Muslims across the world fast during the month of Ramadan. As we fast from dawn to sunset for the next month, we take the time to reflect on ourselves, our actions and our values. Ramadan is a time of patience, empathy and compassion, when we grow closer to our faith, families, friends and communities. We open our hearts and strive to give back to our communities through charity and volunteerism. We share these values as Muslims and Canadians who work every day to make our country a better place.

It is a challenging time for many in Canada and around the world. In the spirit of Ramadan, I encourage everyone to reach out and connect with one another and to offer help and support to those in need.

Ramadan Mubarak, Ramadan Kareem.

*Statements by Members***RAMADAN**

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today marks the beginning of Ramadan, and tomorrow Muslims in Canada and around the world will fast for one month from sun-up to sundown. Fasting is a practice in many faith traditions, where we give up food or other pleasures in order to draw our attention to higher things. Giving up all food and drink from sun-up to sundown is a particularly intense fast, and I salute the temperance, fortitude and commitment of all those observing it.

Muslim Canadians have contributed to our common national life in so many ways, and we honour their service and sacrifice.

[*Translation*]

There is a strong Muslim community in every province and territory in Canada that deserves to have its rights respected by all levels of government.

[*English*]

As Conservatives, we particularly recognize the contributions of Muslim Canadians to building our Conservative movement: MPs, senators, provincial elected officials, candidates, staff and volunteers continue to build and strengthen the connections between their faith community and our party.

We know that religious freedom is always fragile. It can be threatened by discriminatory state policy and acts of violence. Virtually every country in the world, including Canada, has seen instances of violence targeting the Muslim community. However, the Muslim community is resilient; it is a strong, accepted and critical part of our Canadian family. We stand with Muslims today and always.

Ramadan Kareem, Ramadan Mubarak.

DALJIT BAINS

Mr. Randeep Sarai (Surrey Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to remember somebody special to me. Daljit Bains was a husband, father and strong pillar in the Surrey community. He helped anyone who came to his door. Whether someone was marginalized or in need of a job, he would help them with a meal and some work and even get them a job. If someone was a new immigrant, he would help them settle in. If someone was a visitor, he would lend them his home. He was a neighbour who checked in, kept the neighbourhood neat and tidy and helped others when they needed help in the garden.

Daljit was an ideal citizen, a great Surreyite, my uncle and someone who will always remain in our hearts.

HOUSING

Mr. Marty Morantz (Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after eight years under the Prime Minister, the dream of home ownership has died. The average rent for a two-bedroom apartment has doubled since 2015. The average monthly mortgage payment has more than doubled, from \$1,400 to over \$3,200.

Canadians are finding it impossible to save for a down payment or afford a mortgage. All of their hard-earned money is going to skyrocketing rent and groceries thanks to the Prime Minister's inflationary spending and taxes.

Young people are doing everything we asked them to do: going to school, getting a job and working hard. However, they still cannot afford to own a home. They deserve better.

Conservatives will bring homes Canadians can afford, cut taxes so that we can bring home more pay, sell unused federal buildings to convert to housing and remove the gatekeepers to build more homes. We know that the Liberals do not believe in the dream of home ownership, but Conservatives do.

When it comes to home ownership, it is time for the Prime Minister to move out of his taxpayer-funded home so that Canadians can move into theirs.

• (1415)

CARBON TAX

Mr. Doug Shipley (Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after eight years of the Prime Minister, Canadians are struggling to pay rent, feed their families and heat their homes. Everything is more expensive. Instead of showing compassion for struggling Canadians, the Liberal government has decided to increase the carbon tax on April 1.

Canadians who are already struggling because of the Liberal government's inflationary spending cannot afford to be punished every time they drive to work or heat their homes.

The carbon tax is not an environmental plan. It is a costly tax plan that is damaging to Canadian families and small businesses. In my community, I have heard from residents whose home heating bills have doubled because of the Liberals' failed carbon tax. During these unprecedented times, the government should be focused on ways to put more money, not less, in Canadians' pockets.

Only a Conservative government will bring home lower prices by ending inflationary carbon tax hikes and deficit spending that drive up inflation and harm Canadians.

[*Translation*]

INNOVATIVE AGRI-FOOD BUSINESSES

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan (Châteauguay—Lacolle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, things are happening in the agri-food industry in Châteauguay—Lacolle, which will soon be called Châteauguay—Les Jardins-de-Napierville.

Statements by Members

Today, I want to talk about the success of two dynamic and innovative businesses. First, I want to talk about the Coallier family, who owns G.S.P.M Distribution in Napierville. Recently, the family showed us their vertical hydroponic farm system, which allows year-round market garden production. This clean technology, the only one in Canada, is highly promising for our food autonomy.

I also want to talk about Signé Caméline from Saint-Édouard. A few weeks ago, this company, headed by Chantal Van Winden, won first prize in the Bocuse d'Or SIRHA Innovation Awards, one of the most prestigious culinary competitions in France. This was a first for a Canadian product that stood out for both its quality and its uniqueness.

* * *

[English]

RED DRESS ALERT

Ms. Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, indigenous women, girls and two-spirit people continue to go missing and be murdered at alarming rates. That is why I join family, survivors and advocates in calling for the creation of a nationwide red dress alert program. A red dress alert would notify the public when an indigenous woman, girl or two-spirit person goes missing. This would significantly increase the likelihood that someone who goes missing will be found.

We know this because of how successful early alert programs like Amber Alerts have been. In Ontario, more than 90% of Amber Alerts lead to the safe recovery of children.

We are in the midst of an ongoing genocide of missing and murdered indigenous women, girls and two-spirit people, as the Prime Minister has acknowledged. We have a right to live in safety, with security and with dignity. If we should go missing, we deserve to be and must be found. That is why we must have a red dress alert system put in place immediately. A red dress alert will save lives.

It is time for the government to treat this crisis with the urgency it deserves and put in place a red dress alert system now.

* * *

[Translation]

MONTREAL ALOUETTES

Mr. Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Alouettes have finally found a new owner. Montreal's team has been purchased by none other than Pierre Karl Péladeau, making him the first francophone owner since Léo Dandurand, the man who founded the team in 1946.

This well-known sovereigntist said that buying the team was not a business transaction, but a matter of national pride. His words were deeply moving. I bet that some will even be converted. I am certain that this will be a great boon to our local talent. Our teams have already reaped many honours at the college and university level, and more and more players, coaches and managers from Quebec are joining the professional ranks.

In Pierre Karl Péladeau, the Alouettes have found a terrific quarterback. I am even convinced that he will not hesitate to go out onto the field himself to finally bring the Grey Cup back to Quebec. Af-

ter the highs of the 1970s and 2000s, we now feel that our Alouettes are ready to soar again.

It looks like the third down is the charm for Montreal's football team.

* * *

● (1420)

DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE LAND

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, for the past seven years, the Wendake community, which I have the honour of representing here in the House of Commons, has been working on an exciting project for first nations and the entire Quebec City area.

It involves developing the National Defence land in Sainte-Foy, which is located near Laurier Québec and the hospital. This project will create over 1,000 housing units, such as social and health-related housing, as well as indigenous commercial spaces, public, commemorative and historic spaces, with the help of veterans, and spaces for other first nations.

The Wendake project already has the support of the City of Quebec, veterans and Laval University. It is fair to say that everyone in Quebec City supports this project and wants to see it happen. All that it needs to go forward is the green light from the federal government.

Let us be proud. Let us move forward with this project, which promotes reconciliation with first nations and furthers their economic self-reliance.

* * *

COMMUNITY LITERACY WEEK

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Gatineau, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, community literacy week is coming up from April 3 to 7, and I want to acknowledge the remarkable work of Quebec organizations such as Le Vent dans les lettres in Gatineau, which is making literacy a community effort.

Even today, many people in the Outaouais region are still vulnerable because they are illiterate. That is why, in addition to running school programs, the incredible team at Le Vent dans les lettres hosts community workshops on various civics-related topics.

I recently had the pleasure of meeting the participants, and I want to commend them for their perseverance and their resilience. Community literacy week teaches us about the importance of making our communications more accessible and inclusive.

Happy seventh community literacy week.

*Oral Questions***ORAL QUESTIONS***[Translation]***HOUSING**

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, eight years ago, the Prime Minister promised, and I quote, that he was going to “make it easier for Canadians to find an affordable place to call home”. On the day he made that promise, the average mortgage payment was \$1,400.

How much is it today?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know that people across the country continue to face challenges in terms of finding affordable housing. That is why we launched the national housing strategy in 2017.

Last week, I was in Guelph, Ontario, to announce \$4 billion in investments for municipalities across the country so they can build more housing faster and make housing affordable for Canadians.

We know it takes investment to meet Canadians' expectations, and that is exactly what we are doing.

[English]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the question was about what he promised in 2015: “We will make it easier for Canadians to find an affordable place to call home.” When he made that promise, the average monthly payment for a mortgage in Canada was a modest \$1,400. What is it today?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, of course, situations vary across the country, but we have stepped up with housing programs in big cities like Vancouver, Toronto and Montreal. We have also stepped up in smaller municipalities and rural areas across the country that need supports in housing.

Unlike the previous Conservative government, which did not feel the federal government had any role to play in housing, we stepped up in tangible, concrete ways to deliver more housing, to deliver rapid housing and to deliver programs that fight homelessness and programs that increase rental stocks. We will continue investing to support people, alongside our partners in the provinces and municipalities.

• (1425)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, he wants to compare that with the Conservative record. I gave him a chance. I told him that when the Conservatives left office, the average monthly payment on a new house was \$1,400. I asked him to tell us what it is today, and either he does not know or he is too afraid to admit that it has gone up to over \$3,100. That is over a 100% increase.

When the Prime Minister took office, a two-bedroom apartment in Canada's 10 biggest cities, on average, was \$1,100. How much is it today?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, over the past eight years, we have seen significant growth in the economy. We have seen more Canadians getting jobs than ever before. We have seen more Canadians lifted out of poverty than ever

before because of the things we did, from the very first initiative, which was lowering taxes for the middle class and raising them on the wealthiest 1%, an initiative the Conservatives voted against, to delivering a Canada child benefit that puts more money in the pockets of families that need it. We also stopped sending child benefit cheques to millionaires.

We have continued to move forward in supporting communities, supporting home builders and supporting homeowners and homebuyers. We will continue to be there for Canadians.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, he would have us believe that Canadians have never had it so good. Let us ask the nine in 10 young people who believe they will never own a home, or the 35-year-olds living in their parents' basements because they cannot afford the new doubling of the average down payment, mortgage payment or rental cost.

Speaking of paycheques, when he took office, someone only needed 39% of the average paycheque to make monthly payments on the average house. That number has risen to 62%.

By every objective measurement, things are more expensive and Canadians are taking home less. How did he spend so much to achieve so little?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, across the country, we have seen record job growth. We have seen a record number of Canadians lifted out of poverty. We have seen investments to fight climate change that have put more money in people's pockets. We have continued to move forward in growing the economy.

However, it is only the Conservative leader trying to say Canadians have never had it so good. We know Canadians are struggling, and that is why we continue to step up with investments in dental care and investments in low-income rental supports, two initiatives the Conservatives voted against. We will continue to be there to deliver for Canadians while we deliver a better future for everyone.

Oral Questions

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is trying to talk about everything but the housing questions I asked. It is easy to understand why. When he took office, housing was affordable, and now it is impossibly expensive. In fact, it is much more expensive than around the rest of the world. Vancouver is now the third most overpriced housing market, and Toronto the 10th worst, in the world. They are worse than Manhattan, Singapore, London and countless other places with more people, more money and less land. In fact, the average house price last year in the United States was almost half less than it is here in Canada.

Why is housing so much more expensive here than elsewhere in the world?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have continually invested in programs and supports for Canadians, and have seen millions of families entering new homes and getting the supports they need. There are millions of refurbishments, with millions in supports right across the country.

It is interesting to contrast that with the Conservative record. In the last election campaign, the Conservative platform promise on housing was to give tax breaks to wealthy landlords. That was their approach on housing.

We contrasted with significant investments in delivering for first-time homebuyers, delivering for people facing homelessness and delivering for Canadian families to access better housing.

* * *

[Translation]

DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, although no one knows just how many there are, many Chinese nationals who are under the Prime Minister's solemn responsibility and whom Canada let in, are being forced under threat to return to China. We can imagine what is waiting for them upon their return.

Our main ally is coming to Ottawa tomorrow. Is that not just one more reason to establish that the Prime Minister cannot choose who will lead the inquiry or establish that the inquiry does not need to be public?

● (1430)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since the start, I have been very clear that it was not up to me to launch a public inquiry, because it may not be the best thing to do. That is why we decided to turn to an expert, someone who is absolutely unimpeachable, to make that determination and establish the best way forward.

That is why the former governor general will determine whether there will be a public inquiry or not, and what the parameters of that public inquiry would be. In the meantime, he is encouraging and assuring that the various committees are doing their job to set the record straight and restore the confidence of Canadians.

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, allow me to make a distinction between the Communist Chinese regime and the Chinese people, as well as the extraordi-

nary Chinese culture, which dates back five millennia. Electoral interference, illegal financing, industrial espionage and the forced repatriation of Chinese Canadians: Enough is enough.

Have we not come to the point where a self-serving appointment is not going to cut it?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think that Canadians understand full well that for issues as serious as this one, what we need is not more partisanship, but less. That is why we chose an eminent Canadian who will be able to look into all these issues. He will ensure that we keep using our tools and approaches for ensuring the integrity of our electoral system and protecting our communities with origins in other countries.

We are offering less partisanship, but the opposition parties want more.

* * *

[English]

GROCERY INDUSTRY

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we are seeing the cost of living continue to hit hard across the country. People are struggling with the cost of everything.

We know that some numbers have come down with inflation, but, really, where it counts, like groceries, inflation is still over 10%. That means people go into a grocery store, pick up items, realize they cannot afford them and put them back. At the same time, corporate CEOs for these grocery stores are making record profits.

When will the Prime Minister stop the excess profit being made by his CEO friends and stand up for Canadians so they can afford their groceries?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as inflation was hitting in the fall, we stepped up with support for 11 million Canadians through a GST rebate over six months. We moved forward on dental care supports so that over 200,000 kids could afford to go to the dentist. We moved forward with extra help for families that need help paying their rent.

These are the kinds of things we will continue to do to help Canadians. Child care costs are down, cut in half to \$10 a day for millions of families across this country. These are the kinds of things that have made a difference. We will continue to be there for Canadians, including with the budget coming out next week.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

HOUSING

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the cost of living is on the rise. It is getting harder and harder to make ends meet. Affordable housing is especially hard to come by. Since this Prime Minister was elected, rents have doubled because the rules established by the Conservatives and the Liberals favour the ultrarich.

When is this Prime Minister going to stop favouring his rich friends and build more affordable housing for the average person?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, over the past eight years, we have made historic investments in housing to give Canadians access to more affordable housing.

In fact, that is why I was so pleased to be in Guelph, Ontario, last week to announce \$4 billion in investments for municipalities across the country to build housing faster, particularly affordable housing.

We know there is still a lot of work to do, but with our housing accelerator fund, our rapid housing initiative, our homelessness strategy and our affordability plan, we will continue to be there for Canadians.

[English]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I asked the Prime Minister why mortgage payments have doubled under his eight years, why rent payments have doubled under his eight years and why Canadian house prices are about 72% more expensive than their American counterparts, even though it has 10 times the population on even less land. He could not answer any of these questions.

The answer, according to Scotiabank, is that “Canada has the lowest number of housing units per 1,000 residents of any G7 country. The number of housing units per 1,000 Canadians has been falling since 2016”, right when the Prime Minister took office.

Why has the Prime Minister continually given billions of dollars to municipal government gatekeepers but blocked the construction of Canadian homes?

● (1435)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this goes to the heart of the disagreement on housing between the Leader of the Opposition and I. I recognize, as this government recognizes, that we need to work with municipalities to help them change zoning laws, to help them accelerate their permitting processes and to create more opportunities to build affordable homes for Canadians across the country, whereas he sits back and attacks them and proposes absolutely nothing.

We are stepping up with \$4 billion to accelerate the supply of homes across this country. We will continue to invest and work with partners instead of picking fights with everyone and hoping that it all settles itself.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, no, actually the disagreement is that under our government

housing was affordable, but under this government it is eye-poppingly expensive. That is the disagreement.

Let us just look at the facts. Canada has the fewest houses per capita of any country in the G7, even though we have the most land to build on. Why? We rank 64th in the OECD in the time it takes to get a building permit. Government red tape adds as much as \$650,000 to each house in some cities, and the Prime Minister has made it worse by giving gatekeepers that block building more money. Why?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this goes to the heart of the announcement we made last week on the housing accelerator fund, which works directly with municipalities to accelerate the delivery and construction of affordable housing.

What the member opposite would have us believe is that doing nothing to address the housing crisis would have somehow made it better. He criticizes us for the investment of billions of dollars in housing over the past years. Just think, if things are expensive now, how much worse it would have been had we had a Conservative government that continued to cross its arms and cut services to Canadians for the past eight years.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we do not have to imagine what prices would have been were I making the decisions, because when I was the housing minister, the average mortgage payment and the average rent payment were half of what they are now. We do not have to imagine that; it is called history.

The Prime Minister's solution is to continue to spend billions of dollars. He spent \$89 billion on housing affordability to double mortgage payments, double rental costs and double the needed down payment. How did he spend so much to achieve so little?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the next thing the member opposite is going to complain about is that housing prices are higher today than they were in my father's time as prime minister.

We are going to continue to invest in Canadians and recognize that while we grow the economy, while we—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: I am going to have to interrupt the right hon. Prime Minister. I am having a hard time hearing the answer and I am sure other people are too.

The right hon. Prime Minister, please continue.

Oral Questions

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, every step of the way, we have contributed to a growing economy, to lifting Canadians out of poverty and to putting more money in the pockets of the middle class and people working hard to join it. That is why we are continuing to invest in building houses and in working with municipalities and the provinces on fighting homelessness, creating affordable homes and creating more opportunities for all Canadians.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when we look at his promise to make it easier for Canadians to get homes, since that time, the payments have actually doubled. We listen to him rattle off the billions he has spent to achieve that failure, and he kind of reminds me of that shady contractor who promises he will build a brand new home, but the cost just keeps going up and up, and the house never actually gets built. That is exactly where young people are today, stuck in their parents' basements, their dreams crushed because they cannot get themselves homes and start families.

Instead of siding with the gatekeepers and sending billions of dollars more to those bureaucracies, why will he not get them out of the way to bring the homes Canadians can afford?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative leader is actually arguing that fewer investments in Canadians, fewer investments alongside municipalities and provinces, and fewer programs to support Canadians would somehow have solved this problem. That is the problem with Conservatives. They think cuts can create growth. They think fewer investments in Canadians will get people to pull themselves up by their bootstraps and succeed.

We believe in investing in the middle class and people working hard to join it, and that is why Canadians are doing better than they were before.

• (1440)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): In other words, Mr. Speaker, we should forgive him for failing because he fails expensively.

What we propose is actually to incentivize home building. Why does the government not link the number of federal infrastructure dollars a big city gets to the number of houses that actually get completed? That would incentivize them to get the gatekeepers out of the way. We could bring in penalties for big-city bureaucrats who block construction and boost infrastructure dollars for those who get out of the way.

Why will he not pay for results instead of paying for failure?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians well remember that when the hon. member was in government, the character of the relationships between provinces, municipalities and the federal government was fights all the time. There were conflicts and fights with cities, conflicts and fights with rural mayors, conflicts and fights with provinces, and cuts to services that Canadians relied on. The member is demonstrating that eight years of investments in Canadians in growth, in lifting Canadians out of poverty, in creating jobs and in fighting climate change just makes him want to go back to the good old days of Stephen Harper, with cuts and fights with everyone.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister says that Canadians should not worry about the fact that our young people are living in homeless shelters while they go to school or that they are condemned to tent cities or their parents' basements, because all the politicians are getting along and that is what is important. As long as we go along, get along and have wonderful meetings and conversations, he believes we should not worry about the poverty the gatekeeping policies are causing.

Why will the Prime Minister not link federal infrastructure dollars for cities to the number of houses they allow to be built, fine those gatekeepers who block and give bonuses to those who build, so that we can have more affordable homes for our young people?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite wants to talk about poverty, so let us talk about poverty. The very first thing he did after we formed the government was to vote against a tax hike on the wealthiest so we could lower taxes for the middle class. He then voted against a Canada child benefit that has lifted hundreds of thousands of kids out of poverty. We created millions of jobs while lifting millions of Canadians out of poverty. Our focus on growing the middle class and supporting people working hard to join it has delivered, and is continuing to deliver, even as we stand with people going through difficult times right now. We cannot grow this economy through cuts, no matter how much he shouts that he—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Beloeil—Chambly.

* * *

[*Translation*]

DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister says we should not be partisan. That is rich, coming from him.

If that is how he feels, why do so many members in the House get the feeling that he is willing to do anything and everything to avoid an independent public inquiry? A public inquiry is urgently needed, and it should not be conducted by a family friend.

Oral Questions

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what Canadians expect is that issues as serious as foreign interference, particularly Chinese interference, will be dealt with in a serious and responsible manner. We know that is exactly what the former governor general is going to do. To question his commitment to Canadians and to Canada is unbecoming of the House.

We know that he is a man who will deliver for Canadians and restore public trust, in spite of all the partisan attacks being levelled at him.

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my point is that the work must be done for everyone in the House and for all of our constituents. I am not convinced that that is going to happen. All opposition parties in the House want an independent public inquiry.

At a time when all eyes in the U.S. are about to be on Ottawa, which tolerates interference and looks like it has something to hide, who is being partisan here?

• (1445)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we established an independent process to address the real problem of Chinese interference.

We did more than just appoint the special rapporteur. We also created a committee of parliamentarians that includes a Bloc Québécois member. These parliamentarians have the right security clearance to be able to delve into everything we are hearing, into all the work that our security agencies do. As they have always done, they will publish reports that all parliamentarians can access and read.

The work is being done in an independent, non-partisan manner. The opposition parties are the only ones still trying to politicize this situation.

* * *

[English]

HOUSING

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has failed to make housing affordable, even after \$89 billion, precious tax dollars, have been spent on that failure. I have suggested to him that we should link the number of dollars a big city gets to the number of houses it allows to be built, in order to incentivize more building. He does not like that idea. He does not like results.

Here is another idea: We build transit stations with federal money. In the most successful transit and housing jurisdictions on earth, there are apartments next to those stations.

Will the Prime Minister require that every federally funded transit station have high-density apartments so that our seniors and young people can live right next to the bus or train?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first I want to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition for actually talking about concrete ideas. For a long time, his only recommendation to help Canadians was to invest in Bitcoin, as that would

help them avoid inflation. Now he is talking about credible opportunities to help Canadians.

What is nice, though, is that the idea of density around transit hubs is something we are already moving forward on and have invested in over the past few years. We know how important that is, but I will remind the member opposite that, in order to invest in density around transit hubs, one has to invest in public transit, which his government never did and which we have continued to do to record levels.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the difference is that, like housing, we actually got it built. What I am proposing is not to dream about housing around transit, but to actually require every single federally funded transit station be pre-approved for high-density housing so our young people and our seniors can live right next to the bus and train.

He does not like that idea, but how about this one? He has 37,000 buildings, many of them largely empty, big, ugly buildings. Why does he not sell off 15% of them so we can convert those into affordable housing for our young people?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, part of question period and answer period needs to be taking “yes” for an answer. I said yes. Not only do we like the idea of density around public transit spaces, but we have been doing it for years. We have been putting it in our agreements with municipalities as we invest historic amounts in public transit.

The former Conservative government refused to invest in any infrastructure larger than a doorknob or an economic action plan sign. We are continuing to invest in significant public transit, including with a permanent public transit fund, something the Conservatives have again campaigned against.

We will continue to be there to invest in Canadians.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals' very first infrastructure project was to install a doorknob in the Prime Minister's Office when they took office.

Speaking of housing—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order. We want to hear the questions as much as we want to hear the answers, so I am going to ask everyone to take a deep breath and calm down.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, but sometimes I even crack myself up here.

The Prime Minister is presiding over a 37,000-building empire with these big, ugly, largely empty buildings. Why does he not sell off 15%, which is 6,000 buildings, so we can convert them into affordable housing for our young people so they can actually have a roof over their head and a place to call home?

Oral Questions

• (1450)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, this is an idea we are already moving forward with, looking at federal properties and how we can convert them either through the rapid housing process or by working with municipalities to deliver more affordable housing.

I am very pleased to see the member opposite moving off his recommendation on buying Bitcoin as a way of avoiding inflation, and actually putting forward concrete ideas. It is great to have a real debate over ideas. I wish he had paid attention to the ideas we have so he can maybe propose different ones or perhaps better ones.

* * *

CARBON PRICING

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the only ideas the Prime Minister has put forward on housing are to double the rent, double the mortgage costs and double the down payments on the backs of hard-working Canadians who are paying more tax than ever.

On April 1, he wants to raise the cost of housing even more by increasing the cost of home heating, a monthly expense that goes with owning a home. This is at a time when seniors are already choosing, making the heartbreaking decision, between eating and heating. He wants to triple the carbon tax.

Will he cancel his plan to raise taxes on our seniors, our workers and our farmers and get his hands out of their pockets?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as of April, the places across the country that have the carbon backstop in place will receive more money. We are delivering more money than what the price on pollution costs average families across this country, because we know that people want to see us both fighting climate change and preparing for the economy and challenges of the future while making things more affordable for Canadians. That is why our climate action incentive puts more money back into the pockets of people in his riding and people right across the country in backstop areas.

We will continue to fight climate change and support affordability for Canadians.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, President Biden's Inflation Reduction Act proposes a plan to create good jobs and protect the environment. Sadly, the Prime Minister has not shown the same leadership here in Canada. We need a plan that creates good jobs and good union jobs and also protects the environment. Sadly, if that plan is not here, we are going to lose jobs in Canada, and that is a serious threat.

Will the Prime Minister make a commitment today that the budget will include a plan to respond to the IRA, and, in addition, that any investments that go to corporations are tied, with guaranteed strings attached, to creating jobs in communities?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, allow me to say that, over the past eight years, it has been an

honour and a pleasure to work so closely with organized labour across this country.

We have been able to build opportunities for middle-class Canadians right across the country by standing up for unions, by ensuring that, first of all, we reverse the anti-union legislation the Conservatives had put forward under Stephen Harper, but more than that, that we build for a stronger future in partnership. We have invested in union training and better opportunities for apprenticeships. We have partnered with unions on infrastructure builds. We will continue to draw in investments from around the world, whether it is Volkswagen, Michelin, Dofasco, or any number of investments across the country—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Burnaby South.

* * *

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government is giving \$560 million to a company owned by Loblaws to deliver services for veterans, but the services are not adequate. They are not meeting the needs of veterans. It is clear that the contract is not doing what is necessary to provide veterans with the dignity and respect they need.

Will the government admit that this contract is botched and is failing veterans, and cancel it?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are not going to do what the NDP suggests, which is what the Conservatives did many years ago and cut services to veterans. We saw what happened when the Conservative government shuttered nine veterans services offices so they could nickel and dime those who had served this country. The NDP proposes that we cut services to veterans. We are not going to do that. We are going to continue to be there to invest in supports for our veterans, as we have since the very beginning, with over \$10 billion in fresh investments to support veterans.

There is lots more to do, but we owe duty of care to our veterans. That is why we will continue to step up despite the requests of the opposition to cut services for veterans.

*Oral Questions***AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY**

Ms. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, after a decade of neglect under the Harper Government, the Canadian auto sector is finally re-emerging as a global leader. When asked about the opposition leader's criticisms of the Volkswagen investment our government has attracted to Canada, the Ontario premier shrugged them off and characterized them as political comments. Even the Conservative premier of Ontario knows that this is a good outcome and that federal Liberals are bringing jobs home to Ontario.

Can the Prime Minister please elaborate on what this means for Canada and Canadian workers?

• (1455)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we join the member for London West and all Canadians in celebrating the fact that Volkswagen chose St. Thomas, Ontario, for their first-ever battery factory in North America.

This historic investment is a major vote of confidence in Canadian workers and in Canadians' battery ecosystem. It shows that our country is a green supplier of choice. That is why it was so puzzling to see the opposition leader criticize this announcement, even as members of his own caucus celebrated our landmark step forward for Canadian jobs and Canadian families.

* * *

CARBON PRICING

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's carbon tax costs families more than they get back in rebates in every single province it applies in, according to his own Parliamentary Budget Officer. Now we learn from the Canadian Federation of Independent Business that "Despite collecting billions in carbon tax revenues, the federal government has returned less than 1% of the promised proceeds to small businesses". This job-killing tax is driving up the costs on small local businesses that support communities right across the country.

Will the Prime Minister tell us how much an average corner store owned by a ma and pa would get back in rebates for all the carbon tax they are going to pay on their heat?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is increasingly clear that the Conservatives are struggling to continue with their anti-climate change arguments. They do not think that fighting climate change is a way of growing the economy.

We are seeing investments come in from around the world. We are seeing Canadians understand that innovation and clean solutions are part and parcel of not just a stronger future for our economy in general but their jobs, their careers and their kids' careers.

We are going to continue to show leadership around the world in drawing in green investments while we support small businesses with some of the lowest small business taxes in the world. These are things that we will continue to—

The Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, from corner stores to car mechanics, they have to pay this carbon tax. I asked the Prime Minister how much they get back. He would not answer because, of course, the answer is zero. It is a gigantic tax grab. It is also a tax on food. When one taxes the farmers who make the food and the truckers who transport it, one taxes the people who eat it at the end of the supply chain.

Carleton Mushroom Farms, just half an hour south of here, employs 100 people. Their carbon tax bill for the month of July was \$9,000. Does the government they expect them to put that on customer's food bills?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I guess the Leader of the Opposition truly thinks that the third time is the charm. Twice already they have tried to campaign against putting a price on pollution. They have campaigned against having a plan to fight climate change and grow the economy. They have failed the first two times. Maybe this time they will get it right, and Canadians will realize that climate change is a scam, according to the Conservative members.

The fact is Canadians know that fighting climate change and growing the economy, while supporting families and investing in small businesses, is the only path forward. The fact that they are continuing to stand against that is really a shame.

* * *

TAXATION

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is not a climate plan. It is a tax plan. He has not met a single emissions target since he became Prime Minister. All he has managed to do is suck more money out of the pockets of Canadians. It is enough to make a man drink, but he is taxing that too.

I have in my hands a letter from Canadian breweries workers. These are union workers who say Canada is experiencing the highest cost of living increases in a generation. This is squeezing family budgets and making workers in the brewery sector nervous about their jobs. They are calling on the Prime Minister to cancel his planned tax increase on beer and spirits. Will he listen to these union workers and cancel the tax hike?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have always recognized the important contributions that Canadian wine, beer and spirits producers make to the Canadian economy. It is why we cut taxes for small businesses and eliminated the excise duty on low-alcohol beer.

We will continue to be there for small businesses right across the country, even as we promote extraordinary Canadian products like Canadian wine, beer and spirits.

[Translation]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, he is raising taxes on gasoline, heating, electricity, food, family income, on all sorts of things, and now he is raising taxes again, this time on beer and alcohol.

The unions that represent the workers who produce these alcoholic beverages in Canada say that this will impact their jobs, their wages and the cost of living of all Canadians.

Will he finally listen to the unionized workers and announce that he will cancel this tax hike for Canadians?

• (1500)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we all recognize the important contribution that Canadian wine, beer and spirit producers make to the Canadian economy. That is why we lowered small business taxes and eliminated excise duty on low-alcohol beer.

We will always be there for our small businesses, and we will always promote the excellent quality of Canadian wine, beer and spirits.

* * *

DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION

Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, once again, we need to talk about Amira Elghawaby, whom the Prime Minister appointed despite opposition from Quebeckers and who began her first tour this week as special representative on combating Islamophobia.

Right away on her first stop in Ontario, she began attacking Quebec's Bill 21 on secularism. In her own words, her job is to attack legislation like that. This is how she chose to use her first official appearance.

I would ask the Prime Minister to clarify Ms. Elghawaby's mandate. Is it to build bridges between communities or is it to tour Canada to fight Quebec legislation?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, we will always stand up for minority rights.

As a Quebecker, I know how important it is to defend our beautiful French language, to defend our minority cultures, to defend our official languages and, yes, to defend religious freedom in this country.

That is why we are always going to be there to defend individual rights. That is why we oppose pre-emptive use of the notwithstanding clause, which suspends the fundamental rights of Canadians before they can even go to court to defend those rights.

Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this is exactly what the National Assembly feared when it unanimously criticized Ms. Elghawaby's appointment.

She is not using her position to build bridges, to foster understanding between Muslim and non-Muslim communities, or to fight racism. Ms. Elghawaby is using her position to rally Canada against

Oral Questions

Quebec's Bill 21 and to feed assumptions that a secular state is a discriminatory one.

Is she straying from her mandate, or was this exactly what the Prime Minister intended when he created the position?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it always amazes me that the Bloc Québécois seems to be willing to pick and choose which minorities it would like to defend.

The reality is that defending minority voices, defending official languages, defending culture, defending everything in a minority situation—including freedom of conscience—is important in a free society.

I hope his party does not continue to attack this idea of defending minority rights across the country.

* * *

[English]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it took the Harper government only three months to get the Americans to back down and pay back and stop collecting illegal tariffs on softwood. When the Prime Minister took office, the Americans smelled weakness and they slapped those tariffs right back on, and then what happened? He backed down.

The Harper government got an exemption to buy America laws. Within months of the Prime Minister taking office, the Americans slapped it right back on again, and he backed down again. He is now even saying that he cannot protect our borders against illegal border crossing without the permission of the United States president.

Will he announce resolutions to these problems tomorrow, or will he just back down again?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when Canadians faced one of the most significant threats to our jobs, growth and prosperity in the threat of cancellation of NAFTA, the recommendation from Mr. Harper and the Conservatives was, “Oh, we need to capitulate”.

That is not what Canadians or what this government did. We stood strongly. We got them to lift tariffs on steel and aluminum. We renegotiated NAFTA in our favour. We continue to stand up for Canadians and Canadian workers right across the country.

We will take no lessons in capitulation to the Americans from the Conservatives.

• (1505)

[Translation]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we knew that the Prime Minister would back down, and that is exactly what he did.

Oral Questions

He signed an agreement that allowed the Americans to maintain illegal tariffs on our softwood lumber, hurting our forestry workers. He capitulated again on buy America, which gives an exemption to Mexico but not to Canada.

He also said that we need the Americans' permission to protect our border. That is something that we never needed before.

Will he finally stand up for Canada, yes or no?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we all remember when Canadians and Canadian workers faced the greatest threat to our economy that we had ever seen: President Trump was going to cancel NAFTA. We stood firm and pushed back against the Americans, even though Mr. Harper and the Conservatives were urging us to capitulate, to avoid upsetting Trump and to accept what he was offering.

We stood up for Canadian workers, we revisited the tariffs on steel and aluminum, and we renegotiated NAFTA in our favour.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, he is the one who accepted all of Mr. Trump's demands.

Mr. Trump signed an agreement with the Mexicans. The Prime Minister accepted it as it was presented to him, without any changes, including tariffs on our forest products. When the Conservatives were in power, we were able to fix that problem in three months. He has had eight years to fix the problem, but so far, no luck.

After eight years, will he finally be able to do what the Conservatives managed to do in three months?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I understand how badly the Conservatives need to take partisan shots, but they do not have the right to rewrite history.

When we renegotiated NAFTA, we stood up for the Canadian cultural industry, Canadian workers, our dairy industry and supply management. We were there for Canadian workers, and we will continue to be there.

While the Conservatives urged us to capitulate, we stood up for Canadians. That is what we will continue to do, but we will do it in partnership with the Americans.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Brendan Hanley (Yukon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since 2021, the situation in Afghanistan has been very difficult, especially for women and girls, who face daily persecution. According to the United Nations, the number of Afghans who need humanitarian aid is unprecedented.

Can the Prime Minister tell us about Canada's efforts to support the Afghan people?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Yukon for his excellent question and his hard work. We introduced Bill C-41 to enable Canadian humanitarian organizations to provide vital aid to the Afghan people, while maintaining our strong anti-terrorism laws.

This is in addition to the \$156 million we have allocated to international organizations since August 2021. I hope that my colleagues across the way will support the quick passage of Bill C-41 and support quick aid for the Afghan people.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, a former Conservative government obtained an exemption to the buy America policy under the Obama administration.

The Americans slapped it right back on again when this Prime Minister took over. He then signed a deal that allowed the expansion of buy America from being just projects at the state level to projects at the federal level.

The Mexicans got an exemption. Will the Prime Minister finally do what the Mexicans and Prime Minister Harper did and try to get an exemption from buy America tomorrow?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we saw the extent to which Americans wanted to create an electric vehicle industry in the U.S. by excluding Canada, but in our work with our American partners, we stressed just how integrated the auto manufacturing sector is on both sides of the border.

We got a carve-in for electric vehicles and batteries in the U.S. inflation reduction act.

We will continue to work hand in hand with our American partners to offer good jobs to Canadians, economic growth and productive competition around the world.

● (1510)

[English]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is hard to really fathom how badly the Prime Minister has capitulated on buy America.

Let us get it straight: Harper got an exemption to buy America in the Obama era to protect our construction workers and their paycheques. This Prime Minister allowed Trump to slap buy America on, and then he signed a deal that would allow the expansion of buy America from being just at the state level to the federal level. Now, the Mexicans have an exemption from buy America, and we do not.

This is a catastrophic failure for our construction workers as a result of the Prime Minister's weakness. Will he get a deal to end buy America for Canadians tomorrow?

Oral Questions

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the issue of protecting Canadian jobs and ensuring growth for the future is a deeply serious issue that must be taken seriously, which is why people really should not be just making stuff up as the Leader of the Opposition is.

The fact of the matter is, we will continue to stand up for Canadian jobs and work closely with the Americans on making sure we are competitive with the world. This is the approach we have always taken with our partners to the south. We will continue to take this seriously, instead of looking for venal partisan advantage.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that buy America remains in place today on Canada and that it has been expanded under the Prime Minister to include the federal government, something that was specifically exempted from the earlier NAFTA. However, Trump demanded it and the Prime Minister was in the habit of backing down to everything Trump demanded.

We thought that when Trump was gone, the Prime Minister would have an easier time, but now Biden is pushing him around. Putting partisanship aside, I think we as Conservatives can all agree that we do not like any Prime Minister, including the Liberal Prime Minister, to be pushed around like this by an American president.

Will he end it tomorrow?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have consistently stood up for Canadians, whether it was Canadian auto workers and Canadian steelworkers, whether it was making sure we renegotiated NAFTA in strong ways, or whether we stood up for inclusion of Canadian electric vehicle production in the new IRA.

We will continue to work constructively with our partners to the south. We will continue to defend Canadian interests. We will continue to grow our economies together at a time when the world needs North America to be working together as allies to project our success and our values to the world. That is what we will do while the Leader of the Opposition plays partisan games.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Michael McLeod (Northwest Territories, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my constituents in the Northwest Territories are very troubled by the recent news that millions of litres of oil sands tailings in northern Alberta were leaked without notifying communities at risk for nine months. It is unacceptable that neither Imperial Oil nor the Alberta regulator bothered to let northerners know about this potential threat to our water quality.

Could the Prime Minister share what the Government of Canada is doing to address the concerns of my constituents on this matter?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as always, I thank the member for the Northwest Territories for his advocacy on behalf of his constituents in a very serious situation.

We are deeply concerned about the health and well-being of the affected communities. Ministers have been in regular contact with

the impacted communities, quickly providing supplies and conducting water testing.

We need to understand why the company and the regulator were so slow to notify. We expect to see a clear remediation plan from the company so that communities can get the answers they deserve and so that this never happens again.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Indian government has suspended cellphone service, Internet service and social media accounts, on top of blocking journalists from covering what is happening while a heavy military presence rolls into Punjab.

Why has the Prime Minister remained silent on this? Will he accept and commit to the NDP demands to boycott the G20 events in Chandigarh and Kashmir, to ban BJP officials from entering Canada who have uttered death threats against Canadians, and to do everything possible to ensure the safety of Canadians abroad?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, obviously Canada is monitoring the situation in Punjab closely. We are looking forward to a swift return to a more stable situation.

* * *

● (1515)

CLIMATE CHANGE

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, the IPCC report of this week is sobering reading. It requires of all of us that we be prepared to do more, be braver and be bolder, because nothing less than our children's future is at stake. It is a ticking time bomb, as it has been described. The report finds that deep emissions reductions are required in the near term, before 2025 at the latest. For Canada, that means banning fracking. It means reversing Bay du Nord and cancelling the \$30-billion boondoggle Trans Mountain pipeline now.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since 2015 we have taken concrete actions to address climate change. Our government has committed over \$120 billion and introduced over 100 measures, including a price on pollution, to support environmental action and climate mitigation. As the Minister of Environment and Climate Change said this week, we will be looking very closely at that report.

*Private Member's Business***PRIVATE MEMBER'S BUSINESS**

[Translation]

PANDEMIC DAY ACT

The House resumed from March 8 consideration of the motion that Bill S-209, An Act respecting Pandemic Observance Day, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Speaker: It being 3:16 p.m., pursuant to order made on Thursday, June 23, 2022, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill S-209, under Private Members' Business.

[English]

Call in the members.

● (1530)

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

*(Division No. 269)***YEAS**

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Barron
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bendayan	Bennett
Bergeron	Bérubé
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney	Blois
Boissonnault	Boulerice
Bradford	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Casey	Chabot
Chagger	Chahal
Champagne	Champoux
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Collins (Victoria)	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
DeBellefeuille	Desilets
Desjarlais	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Dong	Drouin
Dubourg	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Fergus
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Gaheer
Garrison	Gaudreau
Gazan	Gerretsen
Gould	Green
Guilbeault	Hajdu
Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Holland
Housefather	Hughes

Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Idlout
Ien	Jaczek
Johns	Joly
Jowhari	Julian
Kayabaga	Kelloway
Khalid	Khera
Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Kwan	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Larouche
Lattanzio	Lauzon
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Lemire	Lightbound
Long	Longfield
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Martinez Ferrada	Masse
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
May (Saarnich—Gulf Islands)	McDonald (Avalon)
McGuinty	McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod
McPherson	Mendès
Mendicino	Miao
Michaud	Miller
Morrice	Morrissey
Murray	Naqvi
Ng	Noormohamed
Normandin	O'Connell
Oliphant	O'Regan
Pauzé	Perron
Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon
Powlowski	Qualtrough
Rayes	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Sahota
Sajjan	Saks
Samson	Sarai
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
Sinclair-Desgagné	Singh
Sorbara	Sousa
Ste-Marie	St-Onge
Sudds	Tassi
Taylor Roy	Thériault
Therrien	Thompson
Trudeau	Trudel
Turnbull	Valdez
Van Bynen	van Koeverden
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vignola	Villemure
Virani	Vuong
Weiler	Wilkinson
Yip	Zahid
Zarrillo	Zuberi— 208

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Berthold	Block
Bragdon	Brassard
Brock	Calkins
Caputo	Carrie
Chambers	Chong
Cooper	Dalton

Private Member's Business

Dancho
Deltell
Doherty
Dreeshen
Ellis
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Findlay
Généreux
Gladu
Goodridge
Gray
Hoback
Kelly
Kmiec
Kramp-Neuman
Kusie
Lantsman
Lehoux
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lloyd
Maguire
Mazier
McLean
Moore
Morrison
Muys
O'Toole
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Reid
Richards
Rood
Scheer
Seeback
Shiplay
Soroka
Stewart
Stubbs
Tochor
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vis
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson

Davidson
d'Entremont
Dowdall
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
FERRERI
Gallant
Genuis
Godin
Gourde
Hallan
Jeneroux
Kitchen
Kram
Kurek
Lake
Lawrence
Lewis (Essex)
Liepert
Lobb
Martel
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Melillo
Morantz
Motz
Nater
Patzler
Perkins
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Roberts
Ruff
Schmale
Shields
Small
Steinley
Strahl
Thomas
Tolmie
Van Popta
Vidal
Viersen
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams
Zimmer— 114

recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-289 under Private Members' Business.

● (1545)

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

(Division No. 270)

YEAS

Members

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

PAIRED

Members

Bezan Desbiens
Duguid Lametti— 4

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[*Translation*]

Accordingly, the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Health.

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

* * *

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed from March 9 consideration of the motion that Bill C-289, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (identity verification), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Speaker: Pursuant to an order made on Thursday, June 23, 2022, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred

Private Member's Business

Ste-Marie
Strahl
Thériault
Thomas
Tolmie
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vignola
Vis
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams
Zimmer— 149

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

Masse
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McLeod
Mendès
Miao
Morrissey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
Oliphant
Petitpas Taylor
Qualtrough
Rodriguez
Romanado
Sajjan
Samson
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Singh
Sousa
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Trudeau
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vandenbeld
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 171

Mathysen
McDonald (Avalon)
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Mendicino
Miller
Murray
Ng
O'Connell
O'Regan
Powlowski
Robillard
Rogers
Sahota
Saks
Sari
Schiefke
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sorbara
St-Onge
Tassi
Thompson
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandal
Virani
Yip
Zarrillo

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Beech
Bennett
Bittle
Blair
Blois
Bradford
Cannings
Chagger
Champagne
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhaliwal
Diab
Drouin
Duclos
El-Khoury
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Gazan
Gould
Guilbeault
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)

Alghabra
Anand
Angus
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Battiste
Bendayan
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blaney
Boissonnault
Brière
Casey
Chahal
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Victoria)
Coteau
Damoff
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Dong
Dubourg
Dzerowicz
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser
Fry
Garrison
Gerretsen
Green
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Joly
Julian
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor
Martinez Ferrada

PAIRED

Members

Bezan
Duguid
Desbiens
Lametti— 4

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed from March 10 consideration of the motion that Bill S-224, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (trafficking in persons), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Thursday, June 23, 2022, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill S-224 under Private Members' Business.

● (1555)

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

(Division No. 271)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Albas
Alghabra
Allison
Anandasangaree
Arnold
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Barlow
Aitchison
Aldag
Ali
Anand
Angus
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Baldinelli
Barrett

Private Member's Business

Barron	Barsalou-Duval	Lauzon	Lawrence
Battiste	Beaulieu	LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Beech	Bendayan	Lehoux	Lemire
Bennett	Bergeron	Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Berthold	Bérubé	Liepert	Lightbound
Bibeau	Bittle	Lloyd	Lobb
Blaikie	Blair	Long	Longfield
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
Blaney	Block	MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacGregor
Blois	Boissonnault	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maguire
Bradford	Bragdon	Maloney	Martel
Brassard	Brière	Martinez Ferrada	Masse
Brock	Brunelle-Duceppe	Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
Calkins	Cannings	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	Mazier
Caputo	Carrie	McCauley (Edmonton West)	McDonald (Avalon)
Casey	Chabot	McGuinty	McKay
Chagger	Chahal	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLean
Chambers	Champagne	McLeod	McPherson
Champoux	Chatel	Melillo	Mendès
Chen	Chiang	Mendicino	Miao
Chong	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Michaud	Miller
Collins (Victoria)	Cooper	Moore	Morantz
Cormier	Coteau	Morrice	Morrison
Dabrusin	Dalton	Morrissey	Motz
Damoff	Dancho	Murray	Muys
Davidson	Davies	Naqvi	Nater
DeBellefeuille	Deltell	Ng	Noormohamed
Desilets	Desjarlais	Normandin	O'Connell
Dhaliwal	Dhillon	Oliphant	O'Regan
Diab	Doherty	O'Toole	Patzer
Dong	Dowdall	Paul-Hus	Pauzé
Dreeshen	Drouin	Perkins	Perron
Dubourg	Duclos	Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Dzerowicz	Poilievre	Powlowski
Ehsassi	El-Khoury	Qualtrough	Rayes
Ellis	Epp	Redekopp	Reid
Erskine-Smith	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Rempel Garner	Richards
Falk (Provencher)	Fast	Roberts	Robillard
Fergus	Ferreri	Rodriguez	Rogers
Fillmore	Findlay	Romanado	Rood
Fisher	Fonseca	Ruff	Sahota
Fortier	Fortin	Sajjan	Saks
Fragiskatos	Fraser	Samson	Sarai
Freeland	Fry	Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia
Gaheer	Gallant	Scheer	Schiefke
Garrison	Gaudreau	Schmale	Seeback
Gazan	Généreux	Serré	Sgro
Genuis	Gerretsen	Shanahan	Sheehan
Gladu	Godin	Shields	Shipley
Goodridge	Gould	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Gourde	Gray	Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
Green	Guilbeault	Singh	Small
Hajdu	Hallan	Sorbara	Soroka
Hanley	Hardie	Sousa	Steinley
Hepfner	Hoback	Ste-Marie	Stewart
Holland	Housefather	St-Onge	Strahl
Hughes	Hussen	Stubbs	Sudds
Hutchings	Iacono	Tassi	Taylor Roy
Idlout	Ien	Thériault	Therrien
Jaczek	Jeneroux	Thomas	Thompson
Johns	Joly	Tochor	Tolmie
Jowhari	Julian	Trudeau	Trudel
Kayabaga	Kelloway	Tumbull	Uppal
Kelly	Khalid	Valdez	Van Bynen
Khera	Kitchen	van Koeverden	Van Popta
Kmiec	Koutrakis	Vandal	Vandenbeld
Kram	Kramp-Neuman	Vecchio	Vidal
Kurek	Kusie	Vien	Viersen
Kusmierczyk	Kwan	Vignola	Villemure
Lake	Lalonde	Virani	Vis
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux	Vuong	Wagantall
Lantsman	Lapointe	Warkentin	Waugh
Larouche	Lattanzio	Webber	Weiler

Private Member's Business

Wilkinson
Williamson
Zahid
Zimmer

Williams
Yip
Zarrillo
Zuberi — 322

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Members

Bezan
Duguid

Desbiens
Lametti — 4

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

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

* * *

● (1600)

FEDERAL FRAMEWORK ON HOUSING FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH NON-VISIBLE DISABILITIES

The House resumed from March 20 consideration of the motion.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Thursday, June 23, 2022, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on Motion No. 59 under Private Members' Business in the name of the member for London West.

● (1610)

[*Translation*]

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

(*Division No. 272*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultarif
Albas
Alghabra
Allison
Anandasangaree
Arnold
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Barlow
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Bennett
Berthold
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blanchet
Blaney
Blois
Bradford
Brassard
Brock
Calkins
Caputo
Casey
Chagger
Chambers

Aitchison
Aldag
Ali
Anand
Angus
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Baldinelli
Barrett
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bendayan
Bergeron
Bérubé
Bittle
Blair
Blanchette-Joncas
Block
Boissonnault
Bragdon
Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe
Cannings
Carrie
Chabot
Chahal
Champagne

Champoux
Chen
Chong
Collins (Victoria)
Cormier
Dabrusin
Dancho
DeBellefeuille
Desilets
Dhaliwal
Diab
Dong
Dreeschen
Dubourg
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Ehsassi
Ellis
Erskine-Smith
Falk (Provencher)
Fergus
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Garrison
Gazan
Genuis
Gladu
Goodridge
Gourde
Green
Hajdu
Hanley
Hepfner
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Johns
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Kelly
Khera
Kmiec
Kram
Kurek
Kusmierczyk
Lake
Lambropoulos
Lantsman
Larouche
Lauzon
LeBlanc
Lehoux
Lewis (Essex)
Liepert
Lloyd
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
May (Saenich—Gulf Islands)
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod
Melillo

Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cooper
Coteau
Dalton
Davidson
Deltell
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Doherty
Dowdall
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Ferrerri
Findlay
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Fry
Gallant
Gaudreau
Généreux
Gerretsen
Godin
Gould
Gray
Guilbeault
Hallan
Hardie
Hoback
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Jeneroux
Joly
Julian
Kelloway
Khalid
Kitchen
Koutrakis
Kramp-Neuman
Kusie
Kwan
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Lapointe
Lattanzio
Lawrence
Lebouthillier
Lemire
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lightbound
Lobb
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor
Maguire
Martel
Masse
May (Cambridge)
Mazier
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLean
McPherson
Mendès

Private Member's Business

[English]

INCOME TAX ACT

The House resumed from March 21 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 third time and passed.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Thursday, June 23, 2022, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at third reading stage of Bill C-241 under Private Members' Business.

● (1625)

[Translation]

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

(Division No. 273)

YEAS

Members

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

- | | |
|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Mendicino | Miao |
| Michaud | Miller |
| Moore | Morantz |
| Morrice | Morrison |
| Morrissey | Motz |
| Murray | Muys |
| Naqvi | Nater |
| Ng | Noormohamed |
| Normandin | O'Connell |
| Oliphant | O'Regan |
| O'Toole | Patzer |
| Paul-Hus | Paupé |
| Perkins | Perron |
| Petitpas Taylor | Plamondon |
| Poilievre | Powlowski |
| Qualtrough | Rayes |
| Redekopp | Reid |
| Rempel Garner | Richards |
| Roberts | Robillard |
| Rodriguez | Rogers |
| Romanado | Rood |
| Ruff | Sahota |
| Sajjan | Saks |
| Samson | Sarai |
| Savard-Tremblay | Scarpaleggia |
| Scheer | Schiefke |
| Schmale | Seeback |
| Serré | Sgro |
| Shanahan | Sheehan |
| Shields | Shipley |
| Sidhu (Brampton East) | Sidhu (Brampton South) |
| Simard | Sinclair-Desgagné |
| Singh | Small |
| Sorbara | Soroka |
| Sousa | Steinley |
| Ste-Marie | Stewart |
| St-Onge | Strahl |
| Stubbs | Sudds |
| Tassi | Taylor Roy |
| Thériault | Therrien |
| Thomas | Thompson |
| Tochor | Tolmie |
| Trudeau | Trudel |
| Turnbull | Uppal |
| Valdez | Van Bynen |
| van Koeverden | Van Popta |
| Vandal | Vandenbeld |
| Vecchio | Vidal |
| Vien | Viersen |
| Vignola | Villemure |
| Virani | Vis |
| Vuong | Wagantall |
| Warkentin | Waugh |
| Webber | Weiler |
| Wilkinson | Williams |
| Williamson | Yip |
| Zahid | Zarrillo |
| Zimmer | Zuberi — 320 |

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Members

- | | |
|--------|-------------|
| Bezan | Desbiens |
| Duguid | Lametti — 4 |

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Private Member's Business

Maguire	Martel	Holland	Housefather
Masse	Mathysen	Hussen	Hutchings
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	Mazier	Iacono	Ien
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean	Jaczek	Joly
McPherson	Melillo	Jowhari	Kayabaga
Michaud	Moore	Kelloway	Khalid
Morantz	Morrice	Khera	Koutrakis
Morrison	Motz	Kusmierczyk	Lalonde
Muys	Nater	Lambropoulos	Lametti
Normandin	O'Toole	Lamoureux	Lapointe
Patzer	Paul-Hus	Lattanzio	Lauzon
Pauzé	Perkins	LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Perron	Plamondon	Lightbound	Long
Poilievre	Rayes	Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
Redekopp	Reid	MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Rempel Garner	Richards	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Roberts	Romanado	Martinez Ferrada	May (Cambridge)
Rood	Ruff	McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
Savard-Tremblay	Scheer	McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Schmale	Seeback	McLeod	Mendès
Shields	Shipley	Medicino	Miao
Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné	Miller	Morrissey
Singh	Small	Murray	Naqvi
Soroka	Steinley	Ng	Noormohamed
Ste-Marie	Stewart	O'Connell	Oliphant
Strahl	Stubbs	O'Regan	Petitpas Taylor
Thériault	Therrien	Powlowski	Qualtrough
Thomas	Tochor	Robillard	Rodriguez
Tolmie	Trudel	Rogers	Sahota
Uppal	Van Popta	Sajjan	Saks
Vecchio	Vidal	Samson	Sarai
Vien	Viersen	Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Vignola	Villemure	Serré	Sgro
Vis	Vuong	Shanahan	Sheehan
Wagantall	Warkentin	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Waugh	Webber	Sorbara	Sousa
Williams	Williamson	St-Onge	Sudds
Zarrillo	Zimmer— 172	Tassi	Taylor Roy

NAYS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Atwin
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Battiste
Beech	Bendayan
Bennett	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Blois	Boissonnault
Bradford	Brière
Casey	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Dong
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Fergus
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Gaheer	Gerretsen
Gould	Guilbeault
Hajdu	Hanley
Hardie	Hepfner

Holland	Housefather
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Ien
Jaczek	Joly
Jowhari	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Khera	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lattanzio	Lauzon
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Lightbound	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Martinez Ferrada	May (Cambridge)
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod	Mendès
Medicino	Miao
Miller	Morrissey
Murray	Naqvi
Ng	Noormohamed
O'Connell	Oliphant
O'Regan	Petitpas Taylor
Powlowski	Qualtrough
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Sahota
Sajjan	Saks
Samson	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sorbara	Sousa
St-Onge	Sudds
Tassi	Taylor Roy
Thompson	Trudeau
Turnbull	Valdez
Van Bynen	van Koevorden
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Virani	Weiler
Wilkinson	Yip
Zahid	Zuberi— 152

PAIRED

Members

Desbiens Duguid— 2

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-283, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and the Corrections and Conditional Release Act (addiction treatment in penitentiaries), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made earlier today, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-283, under Private Members' Business.

Private Member's Business

● (1635)

[English]

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

(Division No. 274)

YEAS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
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	Dowdall
Dreeschen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Ellis	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Fast	Ferreri
Findlay	Fortin
Gallant	Gaudreau
Généreux	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Hoback	Jeneroux
Kelly	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Larouche
Lawrence	Lehoux
Lemire	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Martel	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLean	Melillo
Michaud	Moore
Morantz	Morrison
Motz	Muys
Nater	Normandin
O'Toole	Patzer
Paul-Hus	Pauzé
Perkins	Perron
Plamondon	Poilievre
Rayes	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Richards	Roberts
Rood	Ruff
Savard-Tremblay	Scheer
Schmale	Seeback
Shields	Shiple
Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
Small	Soroka
Steinley	Ste-Marie
Stewart	Strahl
Stubbs	Thériault

Therrien	Thomas
Tochor	Tolmie
Trudel	Uppal
Van Popta	Vecchio
Vidal	Vien
Viersen	Vignola
Villemure	Vis
Vuong	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Williams
Williamson	Zimmer— 146

NAYS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Battiste
Beech	Bendayan
Bennett	Bibeau
Bittle	Blaikie
Blair	Blaney
Blois	Boissonnault
Bradford	Brière
Cannings	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	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Fergus	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Gaheer
Garrison	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gould
Green	Guilbeault
Hajdu	Hanley
Hardie	Hepfner
Holland	Housefather
Hughes	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Idlout	Ien
Jaczek	Johns
Joly	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)

Routine Proceedings

McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod	McPherson
Mendès	Mendicino
Miao	Miller
Morrice	Morrissey
Murray	Naqvi
Ng	Noormohamed
O'Connell	Oliphant
O'Regan	Petitpas Taylor
Powlowski	Qualtrough
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Sahota	Sajjan
Saks	Samson
Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Singh
Sorbara	Sousa
St-Onge	Sudds
Tassi	Taylor Roy
Thompson	Trudeau
Turnbull	Valdez
Van Bynen	van Koeverden
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Virani	Weiler
Wilkinson	Yip
Zahid	Zarrillo
Zuberi— 177	

PAIRED

Members

Desbiens

Duguid— 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

• (1640)

[*Translation*]

The member for Laval—Les Îles on a point of order.

Mr. Fayçal El-Khoury: Mr. Speaker, during the vote on Bill S-224, I had a technical problem that lasted a few minutes and resulted in a voting error.

I am requesting unanimous consent to allow me to change my vote to vote for the bill.

The Speaker: Does the member have unanimous consent to change his vote?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*English*]

The Speaker: I wish to inform the House that because of the deferred recorded divisions, Government Orders will be extended by 80 minutes.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

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 11 petitions. These returns will be tabled in an electronic format.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CANADA BUSINESS CORPORATIONS ACT

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-42, An Act to amend the Canada Business Corporations Act, and to make consequential and related amendments to other Acts.

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

* * *

[*English*]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

HEALTH

Mr. Sean Casey (Charlottetown, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 11th report of the Standing Committee on Health in relation to Bill S-203, an act respecting a federal framework on autism spectrum disorder.

[*Translation*]

The committee has studied the bill and has decided to report the bill back to the House without amendment.

[*English*]

I would like to congratulate and thank the member for Edmonton—Wetaskiwin for a very compelling presentation to the committee and a long record of advocacy on this issue.

• (1645)

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Hon. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage, entitled “Strengthening the Status of the Artist in Canada”.

[*English*]

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

Mr. Martin Shields (Bow River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the Conservatives' supplementary report on the impact of the Status of the Artist Act on the working conditions of artists.

Conservatives recognize the volatility of year-over-year income in the arts and culture industry, but we believe in a free and fair market and would stress that guaranteed basic income should not be considered as a means of earning or supplementing an income in Canada.

Canadian artists are world-class. Assuming that the government-granted guaranteed income would assist artists in achieving success is a disservice to the talent, hard work and dedication of so many artists who are striving for and achieving success on their own merit. Canadian artists have, for decades, risen above to achieve world-wide success.

We also recognize the rapidly evolving nature of the arts and culture industry in the online sphere and would encourage the government to allow digital creators to flourish, absent of government intrusion into their work. Should a review of the Status of the Artist Act occur, a focus on reducing regulatory and taxation burdens should be a priority.

The Conservatives wish to thank all the witnesses, analysts, clerks and interpreters for their work during this study.

[Translation]

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the seventh report of the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development on Bill S-5, an act to amend the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999, to make related amendments to the Food and Drugs Act and to repeal the Perfluorooctane Sulfonate Virtual Elimination Act.

[English]

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

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. Emmanuel Dubourg (Bourassa, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 10th report of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs, entitled “Main Estimates 2023-24: Votes 1 and 5 under Department of Veterans Affairs and Vote 1 under Veterans Review and Appeal Board”.

[Translation]

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Mrs. Sherry Romanado (Longueuil—Charles-LeMoine, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among the parties, and I believe that you would find unanimous consent for the following motion:

That, notwithstanding any standing order or usual practice of the House, the remainder of the debate pursuant to Standing Order 66 on motion No. 21 to concur in the first report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights, be deemed to have taken place and the motion be deemed agreed to.

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

It is agreed.

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

(Motion agreed to)

Routine Proceedings

[English]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, if you seek it, I think you will find unanimous consent for the following.

I move:

That, notwithstanding any standing order, special order or usual practice of the House, on the day the House begins debate on the motion for second reading of Bill C-41, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, no later than the ordinary hour of daily adjournment or when no member rises to speak during the debate, whichever is earlier, the motion be deemed adopted on division and the bill be read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights.

• (1650)

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to the hon. member's moving the motion will please say nay. It is agreed.

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

(Motion agreed to)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives share the desire to move forward discussion of this bill quickly. Therefore, I seek unanimous consent for the following motion: That, notwithstanding any standing order, special order or usual practice of the House, in relation to the motion adopted earlier today regarding the second reading motion of Bill C-41, an act to amend the Criminal Code and to make consequential amendments to other acts, Monday, March 27, be the day designated for the debate.

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

An hon. member: No.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I move that the 25th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, presented to the House on Wednesday, March 8, be concurred in.

I would like to start by acknowledging that this is a debate that was supposed to be held yesterday, but the Conservatives unbelievably rescheduled the debate to today. They denied consent yesterday to have this debate on the public inquiry, so now we are holding the debate today. As we well know, because the Conservatives did that procedurally, it delays the discussion we are to have later on about the tax increase on beer, wine and spirits.

Routine Proceedings

For anybody who is tuning in to see that debate, because the Conservatives screwed up procedurally yesterday, we will have the debate later on about having the House call on the Liberal government to cancel its April 1 tax increase on beer, wine and spirits. The NDP will be voting yes on that, and there will be a round of speeches later on this evening, but because of the Conservatives screwing up yesterday and forcing the debate to today on the public inquiry, we are called upon now to have a debate on the 25th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs. I want to read into the record of the House that report on the public inquiry.

This was an NDP motion, and I would like to thank my colleague from North Island—Powell River for putting forward this motion. She does extraordinary work at procedure and House affairs. What she has put forward, what procedure and House affairs has adopted, and what we are now debating for the next three hours is:

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(3)(a)(vi) and the motion adopted by the committee on Thursday, March 2, 2023, the committee has considered the matter of foreign election interference.

Your committee calls on the Government of Canada to launch a national public inquiry into allegations of foreign interference in Canada's democratic system, including but not limited to allegations of interference in general elections by foreign governments;

That this inquiry be granted all the necessary powers to call witnesses from the government and from political parties;

That this inquiry investigates abuse of diaspora groups by hostile foreign governments;

That this inquiry have the power to order and review all documents it deems necessary for this work, including documents which are related to national security;

That the individual heading this inquiry be selected by unanimous agreement by the House Leaders of the officially recognized parties in the House of Commons; and

That this inquiry does not impede or stop the committee's study on foreign election interference, including the production of documents and the calling of witnesses.

Members will recall that yesterday, New Democrats, playing their role as the adults in the House of Commons, forced the government, which had not been taking the issue of foreign election interference seriously, in our opinion, to relent and allow Katie Telford and other witnesses to come before the procedure and House affairs committee. Subsequently, we put in place in procedure and House affairs a motion that would allow for this foreign election interference study to be continued.

As I have said all along, the member for Burnaby South has been very clear, and NDP MPs have been very clear, that we believe that, given the size and scope of the allegations that have come forward, there is no doubt that we need a national public inquiry on the issue of foreign election interference.

I am going to outline some of those individuals who have a broad understanding of this issue who have also called for a national public inquiry. There is no doubt that this is an important issue. I understand that Bloc members also support the idea of a national public inquiry. Unbelievably, though, as we know, and we saw this yesterday, Conservatives denied the debate that was scheduled on the national public inquiry. They forced that debate to today. I will be talking about some of the evidence around some of the allegations that include Russian interference a few moments from now, but the

reality is that the Conservatives have steadfastly objected to the idea of investigating foreign interference related to the Russian government and state actors, which I find disturbing.

There are the Chinese government and Chinese state actors, and I think all Canadians are concerned about why Conservatives would want to stop investigations into Russian government interference and Russian state actor interference. This concerns me because this should be an issue that rallies all members of Parliament. We should all be stepping up to ensure our elections are free of any taint of foreign interference, and that they are free and fair right across the country.

● (1655)

We have a proud tradition of free and fair elections. No one denies that the election results up until now have been election results that reflect, in a first-past-the-post system, what Canadians have voted for. We would prefer to see proportional representation. That would certainly change the representation in the House and make it more closely related to how Canadians have actually voted, but in a first-past-the-post system, which tends to disjoint the actual parliamentary representation, no one denies that our elections have been free and fair up until now.

The allegations are concerning, and that is why it is important that all members of Parliament vote on this issue in the coming day or two. We believe, very strongly, that members of Parliament have to respond to concerns that Canadians have raised. As a result of that, we are putting forward this motion today.

We would have preferred yesterday. The Conservatives stopped that from happening. They may say that it was inadvertent, that they just screwed up procedurally. I do not know. Whether it was inadvertent or purposeful, the reality is that they denied Canadians the right to hear the debate on a national public inquiry yesterday, which is so important. Fortunately, we are having that today.

I wanted to talk a bit about some of the evidence that has come forward, the allegations that are concerning, which are so important to triggering a national public inquiry. The member for Burnaby South has been exceedingly strong on that issue, talking about the importance of putting that in place. The government did not want to act, and we saw, as well, the government being reluctant even to offer key witnesses up. The NDP has forced that issue, so those witnesses are now going to be available to the procedure and House affairs committee.

We also believe, undeniably, that a national public inquiry is warranted. The rapporteur has now, again, because of NDP pressure, been given a date, a deadline, in the month of May, the third week of May, to submit that possible consideration of a national public inquiry.

I think that members of Parliament, by endorsing the NDP committee report, the motion for a national public inquiry, will get us considerably closer to the point where the rapporteur will be obliged, I believe, to respond to the concerns that have been raised by so many Canadians by actually putting the national public inquiry in place.

Routine Proceedings

Who has said that a national public inquiry is warranted? The former director of CSIS Richard Fadden has said that a public inquiry is absolutely warranted. Jean-Pierre Kingsley, a former director of Elections Canada, has said that as well. This is very relevant, and I will come back to that in just a moment.

Gerald Butts, the former chief of staff to the Prime Minister, has also stated that it is important to have a national public inquiry. Artur Wilczynski, the former head of the Communications Security Establishment, said as well that a national public inquiry is warranted.

There is no doubt. We have a situation where we have to put this into place. These are elements that the NDP will continue to push.

I wanted to, for the record, talk about some of the allegations that have come forward that are concerning. This should be covered by a national public inquiry. Members of Parliament will be asked to vote on this in the coming hours. It is important that they reflect what has been a broad concern for Canadians. Over 70% have said that a national public inquiry is warranted.

This started the more recent discussions, of course, over the last few weeks, but I would suggest that the implication of the Russian government and Russian state actors in the convoy last year also raised broad concerns, and there have been concerns raised previously.

● (1700)

There was a series of articles in *The Globe and Mail* by Robert Fife and Steven Chase. Sam Cooper from *Global News* has also done work as a journalist to bring forward some of these facts and allegations. These journalists have provided this information. I want to quote from one of the stories that came out, published on February 17 by Robert Fife and Steven Chase, in which they said the following of documents that had come out that raise serious allegations about foreign election interference. The article reads:

CSIS also explained how Chinese diplomats conduct foreign interference operations in support of political candidates and elected officials. Tactics include undeclared cash donations to political campaigns or having business owners hire international Chinese students and “assign them to volunteer in electoral campaigns on a full-time basis.”

Sympathetic donors are also encouraged to provide campaign contributions to candidates favoured by China – donations for which they receive a tax credit from the federal government.

Then, the CSIS report from Dec. 20, 2021 says, political campaigns quietly, and illegally, return part of the contribution – “the difference between the original donation and the government’s refund” – back to the donors.

These allegations are profoundly disturbing because what they represent is criminal activity, contraventions of the Elections Act. The Elections Act we have put into place is far different than what exists in other countries. For example, in the U.S., washes of money, dark money, can come in to influence the electorate. In Canada, we have strict financing provisions that must be followed, and if they are not, as former Conservative MP Dean Del Mastro found out, people go to jail for trying to skirt election laws. As the Conservative government found out, and the Conservative Party under the Harper regime found out as well with the in-and-out scandal, there are significant penalties for trying to get around our election laws.

The allegations contained within this article of having undeclared cash donations and of having business owners hire students to volunteer on a full-time basis, being in other words, paid students, and of ensuring that there is some kind of in and out where the money is provided to the campaign but is in some way reimbursed, are all illegal. These allegations contained in these reports show potentially serious violations of the Canada Elections Act.

Penalties, as I mentioned earlier, can be sizable fines and even prison terms. For the government to not move on this, to essentially stonewall this issue is, in my mind, hugely irresponsible. When we have allegations that point to what could be serious violations, criminal activity, around our elections, we have to make sure, if these allegations prove to be right, that the criminal penalties apply and the proper investigations take place.

This is the first concern we have, and it is why the NDP has been pushing in such a resolute way to ensure that we have a national public inquiry. It is because of the concerns that have been raised. These, being serious allegations, need to be treated seriously. This is the opportunity for all members of the House of Commons, on this NDP vote, to ensure they are doing everything to protect elections. Hopefully there will be a unanimous voice of all members of Parliament standing up to say to the government that it is time to put in place a public inquiry now. It has to be independent. It has to be transparent. It needs to happen now.

This is the reason why New Democrats have pushed for the type of public inquiry that handles all forms of foreign interference. I will say the Conservatives were very reluctant to have the Russian state actors and Russian government examined as part of this. They wanted to carve it off and make it a very targeted public inquiry.

● (1705)

Fortunately, we were able to push them back on that. Ultimately, the report that will come is the broad public inquiry I mentioned earlier in the report. However, that broad and public inquiry has to include Russia for the following reasons.

For the record, during the debates at the procedure and House affairs committee, I read a series of articles by *Canada's National Observer* that pointed to Russian state actor and Russian government involvement in the so-called convoy movement that hurt and harmed so many people, particularly in downtown Ottawa. Our memory is still fresh of the hundreds of businesses that were shut down, the hundreds of senior citizens who could no longer get their groceries delivered and the people with disabilities who were denied basic medications because of this unbelievable imposition and takeover of downtown Ottawa.

Without belabouring the details, what is of most concern in this particular debate is the Russian involvement. There have been a number of studies that have come out and a series of articles from *Canada's National Observer*, which are very important.

Routine Proceedings

I want to read from a recent study that came out a few months ago, written by Caroline Orr Bueno and published in *The Journal of Intelligence, Conflict and Warfare*, volume 5, issue 3. It is an analysis of many of the sources that talk about the issue of the convoy and Russian involvement.

I want to read a few excerpts for the record.

It states, “Russia views homegrown protest movements like this”, referring to the convoy:

...as an opportunity to exacerbate social divides and sow discord as part of its asymmetric assault on western democracies.... [T]here is ample evidence of Russia’s involvement in far-right movements around the world.... From the National Front in France to the Northern League in Italy to the Alternative for Germany (AfD), Russia’s ruling political party—

In this regime, which is a dictatorship, “has established formal and informal ties with ultranationalist movements across Europe”.

Members will recall that three members of the Conservative caucus met with the Alternative for Germany. This is very germane to the issue of foreign interference. The study goes on to state, “Russian disinformation campaigns have been cited as a contributing factor in pandemic-related protests, extremist activity, and unrest”.

I would profoundly disagree with saying that this kind of documentation is not something that should be taken seriously and that we should carve off Russian interference so that we just focus on one country. What is before the House is a comprehensive public inquiry, which includes not only the Chinese involvement, disturbing as it is, but also the involvement of Russia and other countries.

I want to conclude with some quotes about the convoy.

The study goes on to state:

In addition to amplifying convoy-related coverage on television, Russian state media also produced a significant amount of online content related to the convoy movement.

It also references that social media amplified that coverage by Canadian supporters of the convoy.

We also have concerns that have come up recently about Iran issuing death threats against Canadians in a study that came out from the Indian government.

A study came out this week by the British Columbia Sikhs Gurdwaras Council and the Ontario Gurdwaras Committee.

One of the quotes from that study states:

...there is significant evidence on the record establishing that Indian officials and intelligence operatives have manufactured news, offered bribes to [news] media outlets for favourable news coverage, amplified targeted messages to disrupt public debate, interfered in electoral processes across the country, and attempted to manipulate Canadian policymakers on a number of occasions.

● (1710)

[*Translation*]

It is important that we have a transparent national public inquiry. The NDP is moving this motion today to seek the support of all members. This should not be a partisan issue, but something that we all look into, because our democracy is precious. People have given their lives for democracy.

Looking to the future, it is important that we use all the tools at our disposal to prevent any foreign interference, whether from Russia, China or any other country. No foreign government or state actor should be able to influence our government in any way whatsoever. I hope that all members will support our motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons (Senate), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have said this a number of times: I do not think my position is that far off from that of the NDP. I am just concerned about the fact that the NDP thinks this needs to happen in a public inquiry.

The member and I are both on the PROC committee, or he was on it for a few meetings, and we heard from experts that a public inquiry is not the best venue to do this. He said there were some allegations; fair enough. However, more importantly, we have professionals to look into those allegations. CSIS specifically said it takes information, and when necessary, refers it to the RCMP. The RCMP also said it has no active investigations going on. One does not have to be great at reading between the lines to figure out the reality there.

Why does the member think it has to be a public inquiry? Why can we not use one of the other mechanisms that we already have to do this very important work?

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, I would differ with my colleague on the issue of active investigations because our questioning of officials seems to indicate a disconnect between allegations and investigations. My sense is that it is not completely clear that allegations that come forward are automatically investigated, for example, by the commissioner of elections, who has the ability and responsibility to enforce our electoral laws and ensure they are obeyed.

We have a situation where there are holes. There are tools that could be used. A public inquiry would allow us to get answers for Canadians, which is why the NDP pushed strongly to have witnesses like Katie Telford and Jenni Byrne come before the procedure and House affairs committee. We pushed hard on that because we believe it is important to get answers to those questions.

We also need to have the tools and recommendations to ensure that whenever the next election happens, whether this year, 2024 or 2025, the elections are free of any possibility of foreign interference, whether from China, Russia, Iran or India.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, there is something unusual going on here. We keep hearing that this is not a partisan issue. Every party is non-partisan here, as everyone knows. None of the parties are partisan.

I find it rather strange that my NDP colleagues are bringing this up now. The Bloc Québécois quickly announced that it is in favour of a public inquiry. Why are they moving this motion this evening? I think that their main goal is not to embarrass the government, but rather to embarrass the Conservative Party on its opposition day.

Our NDP colleague had the gall to say that he was doing this in a non-partisan way. I am not the Conservatives' biggest fan, but members of the House owe each other a modicum of respect. We usually respect the other opposition parties' opposition days.

I do not see why the NDP is bringing this up today. Are they hoping to redeem themselves after yesterday, when they voted against our Conservative colleagues' motion calling for a public inquiry? I do not know. I am not saying that their intentions are bad, but that is the feeling I am getting. We will hear what they have to say about that.

• (1715)

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, my colleague is asking the wrong person that question. As my colleague knows, and as all members know, we were supposed to debate this motion yesterday. The Conservatives and the Conservative House leader know that full well. We were supposed to debate it yesterday. The Conservatives screwed up procedurally. Since we did not debate the motion yesterday, it had to happen today.

The Bloc Québécois should be asking the Conservatives that question, because they are the ones who screwed up the procedure for the whole week, and they know that full well.

As for yesterday's motion, that motion was no longer particularly useful, since the NDP had succeeded in demanding that several witnesses appear before the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs. Now the NDP wants to push for a public inquiry. In our opinion, this is a non-partisan issue that all members should look into.

With respect to House procedure, my colleague from the Bloc should really be asking the Conservative Party that question.

[*English*]

Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as all of us should be aware, foreign interference in our elections is a growing concern.

We have all heard repeatedly that it did not have a meaningful impact on the past two elections. However, we know moving forward that the lack of clarity for candidates, MPs and mayors, as we have heard from the previous mayor of Vancouver, is just a growing concern. It is something that the public is seized with. Canadians are concerned about our systems, and they want to have faith in their systems.

Could the member talk a little about why we are seeing this partisan game between the Liberals and Conservatives? I think there needs to be a public inquiry. I think that national security needs to be recognized and honoured. Those two things could happen at the same time. Why do these two parties not seem to think it can?

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, that is an excellent question, and I would really like to thank the member for North Island—Powell River for her great work in protecting Canadian democracy. She

Routine Proceedings

shows that every day in her work at procedure and House affairs, and she has a national reputation as a result.

The reason we are having this debate now is that we have had Liberals say that they do not want a public inquiry because this is not an issue of enough importance to warrant it. We profoundly disagree.

Conservatives have said that they want a public inquiry, but it should not touch Russia. They do not want to go there. Again, that is profoundly disturbing.

The NDP wants to have a public inquiry that touches on and examines all forms of foreign interference. We believe that is where Canadians are as well. We believe Canadians want this to be tackled in an effective way and that all the measures that some other countries have taken as well would be put into place. However, a public inquiry is warranted and needed, and we believe it is needed now.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to take the floor to agree with the important points being made here today by the hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby.

The Greens are also calling for a public inquiry that is expanded rather than being limited to foreign interference from the People's Republic of China. As the member was just pointing out, there is abundant and very clear evidence of Russian interference, and I would also say, of U.S. right-wing Republican interference in our domestic affairs in recent times. We need to know what other countries have interfered in our elections over historical periods. This should include other countries' large companies, like fossil fuel industries headquartered in the United States, that interfere with our elections in a very specific way through misleading and inaccurate political advertising.

Does the hon. member have any further thoughts on whether we expand it to look at the United States?

• (1720)

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, that is why the NDP has proposed a comprehensive public inquiry into foreign interference.

That could include U.S. sources as well. Certainly there seem to have been allegations of right-wing groups in the U.S. funding the convoy. Is that something that could have an impact on election campaigns? Not if we put measures into place to ensure that that does not influence our next election in any way.

That is why we wanted to make sure that all tools are being used and that a public inquiry put into place examines all facets of foreign interference. I think this is something that Canadians want to see as well. They believe in our democratic system and the rights and responsibilities of members of Parliament. We need to take that democracy seriously and put into place measures to ensure that this democracy continues.

Routine Proceedings

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons (Senate), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I did not realize that this was where the day would go, but I guess we have to be prepared for anything.

I have to hand it to the NDP. They said that they wanted to bring forward their concurrence on this particular report, and they did that. The reality is, for those who do not really understand what is going on, that the Conservatives have an opposition supply day today. However, what has happened because of the fact that they sidelined the NDP yesterday, I guess, is that this is just payback for that. Nonetheless, it is a very important topic. I am glad that we have the opportunity to continue talking about this.

I do not think that my position, personally, is too far from that of the member for New Westminster—Burnaby. However, I do take exception with his last comment that the Liberals said that they did not want a public inquiry. I actually was very clear about this.

By the way, I will be sharing my time with the member for Winnipeg North.

I was very clear about this at committee. I said in a speech at committee, at the beginning of this, when a public inquiry was first floated, that I actually thought a public inquiry kind of made the most sense. Why not broaden it and allow the public to have that insight?

We heard from the experts who came forward that a public inquiry would not gather any more information than what could be provided at committee. A public inquiry of this nature, which is going to dive into some highly sensitive information and highly sensitive reports, needs to be treated with the classification specifications that surround it.

It is not just in our own domestic interest to ensure that it occurs. It is also in the interest of the relationship that we have with our allies. We share secrets. We share information. They share information with us. If it becomes very apparent to our allies that we are unable to hold information safely, then they are not going to be interested in continuing to work with us. This is what we heard from the experts who came to committee and who talked about why a public inquiry was not the right route.

At the beginning, I started off thinking that, yes, a public inquiry kind of makes the most sense. However, I was very easily persuaded by those experts coming forward to actually see this occur in a different way, in a way that allows for the classification of that information to remain intact. I find it unfortunate that the member for New Westminster—Burnaby would make that comment and say that Liberals are against it. No, Liberals listened to the advice of the experts, and we formed our opinion based on that.

That is the only difference, in my opinion, between my position and that of the NDP. I agree with them. Why not look at all foreign interference? The Conservatives have been very hell-bent on ensuring that the only issue we look at is Chinese interference, but we know that interference comes from other foreign state actors.

Foreign interference in elections is not a new concept. This has become more obvious and more real within the last 10 or 15 years, as people have been able to infiltrate through social media networks

to get information out there in different ways and be sinister in ways that may have been a little more difficult in the past. What we have are real threats. I think that Canadians should be concerned, and they are rightfully concerned.

For me, this does not come down to a matter of whether we study foreign interference. I am actually relieved to see so many people interested in this. The previous minister of public safety, in 2020, sent an actual copy of election preparedness and foreign interference to every single member in the House. He sent a physical copy of a report that he put together, specifically talking about China in that. Not a single member in the House stood up. No Conservatives stood up to say they wanted to talk about the report by the previous public safety minister.

• (1725)

In one sense, I am glad that we are having this conversation out in the open and in the public forum. It is important to do that and to get to the bottom of these issues, but it is also really important to study all interference, not just by China, and to do it in the context that respects the classification of the information. We heard from expert after expert, and I do not think there was a single individual who came before PROC, with expertise in understanding how to utilize this information, who said that a public forum would be the best place to have this discussion.

Having said all of that, the government appointed a special expert to specifically look into this: former governor general David Johnston. He was tasked with looking into a number of things, one of which included the best way for Canadians to go forward with this issue to fully understand it. The Prime Minister said, when he announced this, that he will take whatever recommendations come forward from that independent expert.

Of course, Conservatives, as they are heckling me right now, will say that Mr. Johnston is biased, that he is a family friend and so on. We are talking about David Johnston, who is 81 years old. Now they are laughing about it. We are talking about David Johnston, one of the most highly respected Canadians in this country, who is going to look into this issue. If they want to continue to heckle and run all over his incredible reputation, they can go right ahead, like the former speaker of the House, the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle—

The Deputy Speaker: Order.

Hon. Andrew Scheer: On a point of order, I have a quick question, Mr. Speaker. It has been a while since I occupied the Speaker's chair and oversaw the House administration. I know that the hon. member had a “check for context” label attached to his last week. Does Hansard do that when an hon. member misleads the House?

The Deputy Speaker: We will have to go back and take that under advisement for the member.

In the meantime, I am going to allow the hon. parliamentary secretary to continue his speech.

Routine Proceedings

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I have not been caught with any hashtags or tags associated with my YouTube accounts yet, but I would remind the former speaker that perhaps he should take some lessons from his predecessor, the Hon. Peter Milliken, who was able to sit in that chair much longer than he was.

In any event, the point here and the important thing to consider is that we need to take the politics out of this issue. We saw Conservatives who came forward and spoke on video. I forget the name of the member's riding right now, but he sits on PROC with me. He said, on video, that a member of Parliament is an agent of Beijing. A sitting Conservative member of Parliament said that.

An hon. member: Red Deer—Lacombe.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, it was the member for Red Deer—Lacombe who said that a member of this House is an agent—

• (1730)

The Deputy Speaker: Order. I do believe we are getting a little off topic here.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, this is all very erudite, but a member on the Conservative backbench was, I believe, threatening the member from Kingston with his phone. I do not think one can threaten people with their phone, but he was waving it around, at least as a prop or a possible weapon.

The Deputy Speaker: I do not really think people were trying to read it. It is really hard to read at that kind of distance.

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, nobody was threatening anybody with a phone. The member happened to have it in his hand. That is ridiculous. It is beneath the House for someone to suggest that.

The Deputy Speaker: There we go. Everybody take a breath. Order.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the member for Timmins—James Bay's pointing that out, but I can assure him that, despite the big game that they talk, there is no Conservative in here who actually threatens me, not successfully anyway.

What I was getting at was that the member for Red Deer—Lacombe actually said that a member of Parliament is an agent of Beijing. He said that in a video, and now they want to laugh and to talk about who is playing politics. Who actually does that? I would like to hear one Conservative who gets up to ask me a question actually address that. I have asked the member for St. Albert—Edmonton, and I have asked multiple times in committee. Nobody will actually address it. The members took the member for Red Deer—Lacombe off the committee, and they did not let him continue to go to the committee, as a result of what he said. That is actually what happened.

Let us get back to this concurrence motion. It is very important that we study this. We have to be careful about the venue in which we do it, and that is the only difference that I have from the NDP on this particular concurrence motion.

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our hon. colleague is a good soldier. He goes on and on

and quotes lots of things. I would like to quote something from the media that is breaking news, and perhaps he would like to check his phone. The breaking news right now is that a “Liberal MP...secretly advised Chinese diplomat in 2021 to delay freeing Two Michaels”. I would like to ask my hon. colleague for a comment on that.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I have been speaking for the last 15 minutes, not including interruptions, and I am unaware of the breaking news that this member is referencing. I look forward to looking into it.

We see, once again, the exact same rhetoric that comes from Conservatives. We see the exact same thing the member for Red Deer—Lacombe was trying to do, when he was walking through an airport and was looking like the hero on his way back to Ottawa saying, “I’m on my way to Ottawa to fight for you and deal with the agents of Beijing.” Come on, that is not what this place is supposed to be about. The rhetoric that comes from Conservatives, including that last question, is intentionally trying to mislead Canadians, and I find it extremely unfortunate.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Denis Trudel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I did not understand the beginning of my colleague's speech, but I understood the end.

This is not the first time that the Liberals and Conservatives accuse each other of partisanship, but I can tell my colleague that, in the Special Committee on the Canada–People's Republic of China Relationship this week, the Liberal members treated some witnesses appallingly.

We were talking about Chinese police stations. Experts came to talk to us about that. There was also Safeguard Defenders, whose studies indicate that there are Chinese police stations in 100 countries around the world. It is believed that there are 233,000 people around the world who have been deported, questioned and brought back to China because of China's interference in other countries' affairs. This NGO has documented evidence. The Liberal members cast doubt on all of that.

Why would Canada, which is average in almost every area, suddenly be better at fighting interference from a world power like China? It is absolutely unacceptable to think that.

Partisanship always comes from both sides, and always from the same place.

• (1735)

[*English*]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, we certainly did not dismiss the issue. As a matter of fact, the minister, on a number of occasions, said that he was dealing with it. I find it very interesting that the Bloc today is suddenly coming to the defence of the Conservatives. It is like blue and blue lite. Why do they not just get together?

I realize Conservatives do not believe in climate change. They are nowhere near as progressive as Bloc members are on climate change, but maybe if the Bloc got together with the Conservatives it could impart some of that wisdom, as it relates to climate change, to the Conservatives. I think they would actually make a great party if they got together.

Routine Proceedings

Mr. Matthew Green (Hamilton Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, there are going to be a lot of questions regarding the mandate of this special rapporteur nobody asked for. When it comes to a public inquiry, we only need to look at what happened after the Emergencies Act. When the Liberal government refused to co-operate with the parliamentary committee, it took the Rouleau commission to get the answers Canadians deserved.

We know this is a very serious issue. Does the hon. member agree that, should the special rapporteur come back and finally call for a public inquiry, he would finally allow that to happen, at that point at least, rather than continue the delays, the filibusters, and all the theatre and shenanigans that the hon. member is used to?

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I really wish he had listened to my speech, because not only did I say I would accept it, but the Prime Minister also said he would accept it, when he announced this. We have already made it very clear that we will accept any recommendation that comes back from the expert who is looking into this on behalf of Canadians, a former governor general. We will implement what those recommendations are, including if it is a public inquiry.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I sat in PROC with the hon. member during this, and time and time again, we saw the Conservatives ignore the fact that it was actually under our government, in 2019, that NSICOP first tabled the report on foreign interference. Does the member agree that the Conservatives were asleep at the wheel and they are only waking up to this issue now?

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, when the Conservatives were in government, they did absolutely nothing, and we have done a number of things since then. We brought in NSICOP. We brought in a special panel that oversees elections. We brought in Bill C-76, which tightens up foreign interference and which they voted against.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will continue on from where my colleague and friend just left off.

I think it is important for us to recognize that from the government's perspective and, I would like to think, that of parliamentarians in general, there should be zero tolerance for international foreign interference in our elections. Ultimately, I would suggest this should be done in an apolitical fashion.

The Conservatives, for a wide variety of reasons, fundraising being one of them, have chosen to politicize this issue. It is indeed very unfortunate, because they do a disservice to an issue that is very serious.

Canadians are looking for responsible leadership. We see what the Prime Minister and the government have been able to accomplish over the last number of years in dealing with the issue, and we see a huge vacuum of leadership—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I want to remind hon. members that they do not have the floor and it is not their option to speak at this point.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, what we have witnessed is a huge vacuum of leadership coming from the Conservative Party of Canada.

Mr. Todd Doherty: As soon as you guys got into Parliament.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I just mentioned to members, one of whom is sitting right beside me and I am sure heard me properly, that there is no option to speak when somebody else has the floor.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I am trying to make a fairly simple point here. If we take a look at actions on this issue, we see it is not new. Not only is it not new, but it affects many countries, not just Canada. We can talk about the U.S. We can talk about some countries over in Europe. There are other democracies where we have witnessed and seen international foreign interference in elections. That has been happening for years now.

In fact, when Stephen Harper was the Prime Minister, we all know that a report went to him at that time. Ironically, the minister who was responsible for democratic reform is the current leader of the Conservative Party. It is safe to say that while he was the minister of democratic reform under Stephen Harper, they did absolutely nothing when they were made aware of the issue.

We can fast-forward to the 2015 election, when there was a change in government. We saw a number of changes by the Prime Minister and parliamentarians back in 2015 that made substantive changes in a wide variety of ways. There were legislative changes that, for example, saw Canada complying with what our other Five Eyes countries were doing by implementing a parliamentary committee of the House, which also has participation from the Senate, with the security clearance to investigate this issue in every possible and imaginable way.

As we have seen, our independent agencies, like Elections Canada and CSIS, and the top security adviser to the Prime Minister have given opinions in regard to the issue of the 2019 and 2021 elections. The conclusion has been very clear: Any interference has not affected the outcome of either one of those elections. The Conservative Party is aware of that, yet its members choose to continue to flaunt the issue and ratchet it up in the hopes that they can get Canadians even more upset with the issue. When I hear of issues such as foreign interference, I ask what they hope to achieve. They hope to achieve interference, cause problems and confusion, and cause the public to lose confidence. That is what these agents from abroad are hoping—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

• (1740)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. Again, I want to remind members that unless I have asked for questions and comments, there is no option for them to be speaking at the moment and mentioning people by their names. Members should wait for questions and comments, because there will be five minutes of questions and comments for the hon. member.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, the point is that the Conservative Party of Canada, in co-operation with a few others, is ultimately doing what a lot of these perpetrators of foreign interference are trying to do, and that is to take away public confidence in our elections. The Conservatives have no problem with feeding into that, even though every member of this House knows full well that we have had independent, well-respected agencies and individuals come forward and be very clear that there has been no impact on the last two federal elections. They know that for a fact.

We can look at what has been brought forward by the government just recently with the establishment of a special rapporteur in the name of David Johnston. David Johnston is a former governor general of Canada, someone appointed by former Prime minister Stephen Harper, a Conservative prime minister. He is an individual with impeccable credentials. He is a true Canadian in every imaginable way. He has the expertise and background to look at the situation, as other independent agencies and individuals have done, and come forward with recommendations.

The Prime Minister himself has been very clear that if Mr. Johnston comes back and says a public inquiry is necessary, that will happen. One would think the Conservative opposition, in particular, would respect that. Instead, what they are doing is assassinating the character of an incredible Canadian, much as we have witnessed over the last number of years. The Conservatives have no hesitation in making personal attacks on the Prime Minister or anyone else in the government.

I would just suggest and ask that the Conservatives be more open-minded to doing what is in the best interests of Canadians, step aside on some of the partisanship stuff they have put on the table and recognize that David Johnston is in fact a positive way for us to move forward in dealing with this very important issue.

• (1745)

Mr. Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC): Madam Speaker, during the debate in the House, we received some breaking news from Global News, and I think the member would want to get to the bottom of some of the allegations that continue to come out. We have heard that a Liberal MP advised Chinese officials that they should keep the two Michaels held hostage in China for longer, because if they were released it would benefit the Conservative Party. Those types of allegations continue to drip out day after day.

Is not the best way to get to the bottom of this foreign interference once and for all to hold a full independent public inquiry as soon as possible?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, it is important that we recognize, first and foremost, that Canada is not the only country where election interference allegations have been levelled. It is also

Routine Proceedings

important to recognize that China is not the only player. The Conservative Party always seems to want to raise the issue of China, whether it is over the pandemic or whatever it might be. I find that most unfortunate.

At the end of the day, we need to remain focused. What has been assigned to our special rapporteur is something the Conservatives should be a little more patient and respectful about. Let us see what comes from Mr. Johnston.

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Villemure (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Madam Speaker, there is a lot of talk this week about the special rapporteur. People keep saying that he is independent. I have my doubts about that.

I would like to ask the member for Winnipeg North a question. If the rapporteur is independent, is he objective?

I am asking him the difference between independence and objectivity.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I believe that if we take a look at what Mr. Johnston has done over the years as an individual, a great Canadian and someone who has contributed, he is virtually second to no other in the capacities and roles he has had in our society. At the end of the day, I believe in his integrity and look forward to ultimately seeing his report.

I suspect the member will see a government that is very proactive in acting on the recommendations that are brought forward. However, whether one is a member of the Bloc or Conservative Party, trashing this individual and throwing him under the bus or sandbagging him is very much disrespectful and completely uncalled for.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Madam Speaker, yesterday, the Conservatives blocked our efforts to have an inquiry into foreign interference in the election system. Today, we are calling on the government to do the right thing, because we have to restore public confidence in our institutions.

We just heard very disturbing allegations that a sitting MP gave advice about the treatment of the two Michaels. These were two innocent Canadians held illegally by the Chinese government. To think that in any way they could be treated as political pawns for the advantage of either the Conservatives or Liberal Party is shocking. We need to get this to an inquiry that has the tools to draw witness testimony and that can do this in a transparent manner so that Canadians get answers. It would also stop the Conservative leader from his character assassination against people like David Johnston, who have served our country with integrity.

I have no problem with Mr. Johnston. I have a problem with the lack of a full inquiry, and I am asking the Liberals to do the right thing and restore confidence among the Canadian people at this time given the shocking allegations we just heard.

Routine Proceedings

• (1750)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, if I was to take a hybrid approach to what NDP members are proposing, I would suggest that one thing I like about their suggestion is that this be broadened to go beyond any sort of foreign interference in elections by China, because there are a number of players. I would also suggest that we take into consideration that Canada is not alone in this as a democracy. There is a much bigger picture to look at.

I have full trust and confidence in Mr. Johnston being able to do what is necessary to provide Canadians a great level of comfort through the recommendations he will be coming forth with. I believe that will be happening before the end of May.

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is always an honour to rise in this place to represent the interests of the good people of Regina—Qu'Appelle and represent my caucus as the opposition House leader.

We need to frame what is going on here because what we saw over the last few weeks was a despicable display at committee, a mockery of the parliamentary process. We found out that the Prime Minister has known for years about allegations of foreign interference from the Communist regime in Beijing, specifically helping the Liberal Party. Chinese representatives of that Communist regime here in Canada said they preferred a Liberal government, and there are reports coming from *The Globe and Mail*, citing CSIS reports and national security committee reports, indicating that there is a large “clandestine network” of funding of candidates that is coming from the Communist regime in Beijing. Conservatives have been trying to shine a light on this at committee. We have all seen the lengths that the Liberals have gone to.

Today is what is called an opposition day. Today is the supply day when opposition parties are allowed to introduce a topic and have a debate on something. Normally the government gets to set the calendar. This is its right, as it brings forward legislation, but a certain number of days throughout the year are allocated to each opposition party. For today, the Conservatives put forward a motion to call on the government to abandon its plan to increase taxes on beer, wine and spirits. That is what we are supposed to be debating right now.

On Monday, we had a fulsome debate on this whole issue of foreign interference, and I should point out that Conservatives, at the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, indicated to the NDP that we are totally fine with expanding the scope of the investigation. We believe that if there are allegations of foreign interference coming from any country, they should be investigated. We were willing to work with the New Democrats on that. We were hoping that they would vote in favour of our motion on Monday calling on the Prime Minister's chief of staff to testify at committee. The problem was that they did not let us know. They kept ragging the puck. It was a very simple question. It was the exact same motion that we had proposed at committee. Even the NDP House leader had indicated his support at committee.

It kind of reminds me of something that happened a little while ago. I was in the chamber and I saw the NDP House leader get up and try to indicate that the NDP opposed certain amendments at committee when it was dealing with Bill C-21. Of course, Bill C-21

is the piece of legislation that would massively expand the power of the government to take away lawful firearms from Canadians. I am not trying to mix topics too much, but the reason I am talking about this is that Conservatives recognized instantly what was going on. We saw it at committee. We said it was going to make unlawful so many firearms that hunters and indigenous communities use every season for their long-held Canadian heritage and history of using firearms legally.

What happened was that Conservatives at the committee saw that not only were these bad policy amendments, but they were also out of order, beyond the scope of the bill itself, so at the committee, almost immediately, we asked the chair to rule those amendments out of order. The chair said no. The Liberal chair said that the amendments were in order.

Why do I bring this up? At committee, the Conservatives challenged the chair. We asked our colleagues in the Bloc and the NDP to please support us on this as the amendments were out of order. The NDP voted no. The NDP voted to keep those amendments in Bill C-21, yet the NDP House leader came to this chamber and asked the Speaker to do what his team actually voted against at committee. He tried to take credit, saying they were bad. It was only after their MPs heard from their constituents, who told them how terrible it was. This is exactly what we are facing here today.

• (1755)

We have tried to give the opportunity to the NDP members multiple times to hold this government to account and yet, time and time again, they are showing Canadians that they would rather prop up Liberal corruption and help keep the truth covered, instead of shining a light. It is very disappointing. It is very disappointing that we see the NDP here on an opposition day move this motion. They are trying to come up with this phony story.

Conservatives want a public inquiry. We have called for it. We were trying to get this report back in the House; we could have dealt with this last week. They are the ones playing procedural games and we are not going to let them get away with it. We are going to highlight to Canadians the hypocrisy that the NDP has been showing.

I just want to indicate that I am splitting my time with the hon. member for St. Albert—Edmonton.

Routine Proceedings

In closing, I want to make a couple of points about this. I hear from colleagues across the way who are throwing all kinds of baseless allegations that are just not backed up by facts. Conservatives have been calling for a public inquiry. The first time the Leader of the Opposition raised this issue in the House, the Prime Minister said that he did not know anything about it, so we started to press. We started to call for this. We started to call for a full, independent public inquiry. What did the government do? It appointed a special rapporteur.

I understand. I understand the hon. government House leader and I am hoping to have a discussion with him in a few moments, but it is important to set the stage for it.

I will wrap it up with this. It is impossible to restore the confidence that has been shaken by the Prime Minister's inaction on this file without a public inquiry, not a special rapporteur with close family ties to the Prime Minister, not someone on the Trudeau Foundation board. We support the call for a full public inquiry and we are just disappointed that it took so long to drag the NDP kicking and screaming to ensure that the Prime Minister's chief of staff testifies at committee.

Mr. Matthew Green (Hamilton Centre, NDP): Madam Speaker, we heard the hon. member speak at length, in fact, trying to make his party a going concern in this conversation, when even in its own opposition day motion, which, by the way, turned out to be useless, its own leader did not even vote for it. Could the hon. member please tell all Canadians, with all the bluster the Conservatives have just had over the last week, why, if their opposition day was so important, their own leader did not even decide to show up and vote for it?

Hon. Andrew Scheer: Madam Speaker, if we just replay what happened on Monday, if the NDP had just indicated that it was going to support our motion right from the beginning, the Prime Minister would have realized it was inevitable and we could have addressed—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

• (1800)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. I just want to remind members again, and I am sure those members were already in the House a while ago when I mentioned this, that when somebody else has the floor, it is not an option for them to speak. If they have other questions and comments, they should wait until I ask for questions and comments.

The hon. official opposition House leader.

Hon. Andrew Scheer: Madam Speaker, as I was saying, if the NDP members had not turned their phones on silent and stopped reading their emails as we were trying to work with them to get their support, and if they had said, “Yes, we are going to support your motion and we are going to tell our coalition partners that we are going to support your motion”, we could have had all of this taken care of on the weekend and we would have been happy to move a different motion on Monday. If anybody was wasting the House's time with that, it was the NDP, taking so long, getting dragged kicking and screaming to do the right thing.

That is why that happened on Monday.

Hon. Mike Lake (Edmonton—Wetaskiwin, CPC): Madam Speaker, just after watching that exchange there, I cannot be more struck by the difference in position in 2004, 2005 and 2006 with the NDP leader at that time with the sponsorship—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): There seems to be some cross-debate here and I would just ask members to please wait until it is time for questions and comments, and for the hon. member who is going to answer the question to maybe listen to the question, so that he will know what he is responding to.

The hon. member for Edmonton—Wetaskiwin.

Hon. Mike Lake: Madam Speaker, I just want the hon. member to comment on the difference in the NDP approach right now versus the NDP approach back in 2004, 2005 and 2006, around the sponsorship scandal. Those two positions, those two approaches, around transparency and holding the government of the day to account could not be more different.

Hon. Andrew Scheer: Madam Speaker, my hon. colleague was very active in politics. I think he joined the House in 2006, but of course he would have been watching all that unfold in 2004.

Finally, at the right time, the leader of the NDP at the time suddenly realized that he could not keep propping up a government that was under that kind of scandal and with that cloud hanging over it, which ultimately worked out for the NDP down the road. The NDP ended up having a bigger caucus in the 2011 election after standing on that principle. We have seen what has happened in the last few elections under the current NDP leader, when the caucus has diminished after every election.

I think the two things go hand in hand, and I appreciate the hon. member's pointing that out.

Mr. Matthew Green: Madam Speaker, again the member will not answer the question.

The question was this: If the Conservatives' opposition day motion was so important, to get Telford to the ethics committee, which I am on, by the way, and it was because of the NDP that we actually got Telford to PROC, not their useless motion, why can the member not stand up today and explain to all the Canadians who are watching this why the leader of the official opposition could not even be bothered to vote on their own motion?

Hon. Andrew Scheer: Madam Speaker, why did it take the leader of the NDP two weeks to decide that he was going to do the right thing and ensure that the Prime Minister's chief of staff testified?

If the hon. member wants to talk about why this or that happened, why does it always take so much public pressure to get the NDP to do the right thing? That is what the Canadians who used to vote for the New Democrats want to know.

Routine Proceedings

I come from Saskatchewan, the home of the NDP. Since the New Democrats decided to sell out their core principles, as they used to be in favour of transparency and ethics, they have been shut out of Saskatchewan. Their caucus has diminished in every single election. If they want to continue to show Canadians that they are way more excited to be part of the club, that they can make deals with the government and move pieces around and feel like they are more relevant than they have ever been while they are selling out their core principles, they can fill their boots.

Mr. Michael Cooper (St. Albert—Edmonton, CPC): Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the concurrence motion, which was strengthened considerably as a result of the Conservative amendment brought forward at the procedure and House affairs committee.

In the face of the alarming revelations of Beijing's interference in two elections that took place under the Prime Minister's watch, Canadians deserve answers. This interference has been characterized by Global News and The Globe and Mail based upon their review of CSIS documents as a vast campaign of interference in the 2019 election and an orchestrated machine in the 2021 election to help the Liberals secure a minority government and to defeat certain Conservative candidates. Canadians deserve to know about the scale of Beijing's election interference and what is really at the heart of this scandal, namely: What did the Prime Minister know, when did he know it and what did he do or fail to do about Beijing's attack on our democracy?

In order to get to the truth, two things need to happen. First, the procedure and House affairs committee, which is seized with a study on Beijing's election interference, must be able to do its work unimpeded. It must do its work without the obstruction that we have seen over the past several weeks, driven by the Liberals but often supported by the junior partner of the cover-up coalition, the NDP. It is important that an independent public inquiry be called. This is a position that Conservatives have consistently supported. Indeed, we strengthened the very weak NDP motion at the procedure and House affairs committee, which I will get into momentarily.

On both of these questions, what is the NDP's track record? Well, it is a pretty pathetic one. At the direction of their boss, the Prime Minister, NDP members joined with Liberal MPs at the procedure and House affairs committee to block the testimony of Katie Telford. They worked with the Liberals not once, not twice, but three times to block Katie Telford from coming to the committee. She is a key witness for getting to the bottom of what the Prime Minister knows and what he failed to do about Beijing's election interference. Again, it is what one would expect of the junior partner of the cover-up coalition.

Then NDP members, no doubt facing public pressure, suddenly flip-flopped and indicated that they were supporting my straightforward motion to have Katie Telford appear at the procedure and House affairs committee. One would think that if they were posturing their support that they would welcome the Conservative motion that was brought forward in the House. However, all of a sudden, they flip-flopped again and voted against that motion.

Now, in fairness to NDP members, they did ultimately support my motion when the Liberals finally ended their filibustering. Still, it took weeks of pressure from the public and Conservatives before they finally did the right thing and supported bringing Telford to committee. However, it must also be noted that they voted against a much stronger motion that Conservatives put forward in the House, which was voted on yesterday. The NDP, the junior partner of the cover-up coalition, sided with the Liberals and voted against a motion that had considerably more teeth than the PROC motion does.

● (1805)

In addition to that, as the junior partner of the cover-up coalition, the NDP has worked with the Liberals to cover up the production of documents at the procedure and House affairs committee, not once but twice. They voted against a Conservative motion proposing that the independent parliamentary inquiry review relevant documents, having regard for national security and other considerations. This independent review would have been instead of giving the government; the PMO; and the Prime Minister, who has so much to answer for, a veto over what is produced to the committee. The NDP voted against that. They joined the Liberals in blocking the production of documents.

The NDP talks a good game about a public inquiry, but the motion they put forward at the procedure and House affairs committee was considerably weak. It would have given the Prime Minister the unilateral power to appoint the commissioner of the inquiry. What Conservatives put forward as an amendment was to say no, that the Prime Minister should not have the only say. If there is to be a public inquiry, as we believe there should be, such an inquiry must be truly independent. Moreover, it must be perceived to be independent. Therefore, our amendment provided that all recognized parties in this House should agree upon the head of the public inquiry to ensure not only the independence of that inquiry but the perception of its independence.

● (1810)

In that regard, Conservatives considerably strengthened the very concurrence motion that this House is debating today. By contrast, the NDP were prepared to let the Prime Minister have a do-over of Rosenberg. There, the Prime Minister appointed a Liberal crony, someone who was the president of the Trudeau Foundation for several years. Not only was he the president of the Trudeau Foundation, but he also actually facilitated a \$200,000 donation from a Beijing political operative to the Trudeau Foundation. We said that should not happen again. That individual was appointed to review the 2021 election, completely undermining the credibility of the findings of Rosenberg's report.

Again, there we have it: the NDP members playing games, talking out of both sides of their mouths, flip-flopping and putting forward weak motions at PROC. They say they want a public inquiry, but they were prepared to turn it over to the Prime Minister. What we have is a completely unserious NDP when it comes to getting to the bottom of foreign interference, specifically Beijing's election interference. The NDP has actually spent more time criticizing Conservatives, trying to hold us accountable, than they have the Liberal government. We know, based upon all the reports and the limited documents that have been produced to our committee, that the government has a lot to answer for given that the Liberal Party was a beneficiary or that, at least, Beijing's objective was to assist the Liberal Party.

Why would it take weeks for the NDP to get around to doing what should have happened weeks ago, which is for Telford to come to committee? After all, she is the Prime Minister's top political advisor. She is arguably the second most powerful person in the government, outside of the Prime Minister, and she was intimately involved in both the Liberal Party's 2019 and 2021 election campaigns.

I am glad the cover-up coalition's junior partner finally—

• (1815)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member's time is up.

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, professional, apolitical civil servants have very clearly indicated that there was no impact from any international interference, particularly citing China, on the outcome of either the 2019 or 2021 election. The Conservative Party knows that.

We now have Mr. Johnston looking into the matter. He will be coming back with recommendations. He is an incredible Canadian with impeccable credentials.

Will the Conservative Party support his conclusions?

Mr. Michael Cooper: Madam Speaker, first of all, Conservatives have been very clear that Beijing's election interference did not impact the overall election result in 2019 or 2021, but Beijing's interference may have had an impact in some ridings. If it had an impact on any riding, that is alarming; it is a matter of national concern, and it needs to be addressed. However, the Prime Minister has been entirely unwilling to do this; instead, he is dodging, deflecting and covering up.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Denis Trudel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, BQ): Madam Speaker, there are so many unknowns in this story of foreign interference that the government's refusal to agree to an independent inquiry is absolutely unacceptable.

Three weeks ago, in the Special Committee on the Canada–People's Republic of China Relationship, I asked an RCMP officer that question. We now know that Safeguard Defenders says that the Chinese police stations start out as Chinese community centres of-

Routine Proceedings

fering help to the poor, helping them find clothing and shelter. Over time, these community centres become Chinese intelligence centres. Safeguard Defenders has documented evidence. Two such centres, one in Brossard and one in Montreal, were recently identified.

Three weeks ago, before the *Journal de Montréal* announced that these two centres were now Chinese police stations, the RCMP denied before the committee that there were Chinese police stations in Quebec. At the time, we knew that there were Chinese police stations in Toronto and Vancouver, but the RCMP denied it. The RCMP is like the government; at least we think so. It denied the facts and, three weeks later, we read the story in the newspaper. There is much we do not know.

What do the government and intelligence services know, and what do they not know? Does the RCMP know, or does it not know? What are they investigating, and what are they not investigating? It is absolutely unacceptable that we not get to the bottom of this with a fully independent inquiry.

[*English*]

Mr. Michael Cooper: Madam Speaker, I completely agree with my hon. colleague.

He highlights to what degree the Liberal government has turned a blind eye to Beijing's interference, not only in our elections but also in other aspects. These include interference in our sovereignty, such as by opening up at least seven illegal police stations under the Liberal government's watch. Chinese Canadian citizens are being intimidated and harassed.

What has happened? What have the Liberals done? No charges have been laid. No diplomats have been expelled. The best that the foreign affairs minister could say is that one diplomat's visa was denied. That is it. That is not a government that takes Beijing's interference seriously.

Mr. Matthew Green (Hamilton Centre, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am confused. We heard the hon. member go on at length about the NDP, railing about the NDP and how he is very frustrated.

I can appreciate that. We were able to get done, at his committee, what he could not over weeks of work, which is to get Katie Telford there. The member should be thanking us. Instead, he stands up to deride us.

I am going to ask him the same question I asked the Conservative House leader: If the Conservatives' motion was so important, why did the Leader of the Opposition not even have the courage or the courtesy to Canadians to come in and support their own bill?

Mr. Michael Cooper: Madam Speaker, I would remind the hon. member that it was the NDP that worked with the Liberals three times to block Katie Telford from appearing before the committee. That is the NDP record. New Democrats cannot walk that back, and they cannot hide from that track record.

It was only as a result of public pressure and Conservative pressure, and the fact that we finally put a motion before the House to have a vote, that the Liberals capitulated; finally, the NDP capitulated, too. I guess the cover-up coalition finally recognized they could not—

Routine Proceedings

• (1820)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The member's time is up.

The hon. member for Trois-Rivières.

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Villemure (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am very happy to stand here today in the House. I would like to say hello to the citizens of Trois-Rivières.

For weeks now, we have been talking about China's interference, and for weeks, most of us have agreed that we need an independent public inquiry. I think we all agree on that, with the exception of a few indomitable Gauls. Usually we are the indomitable Gauls.

What is at stake here is the public interest. There is no room for partisanship; partisanship is for elections. We need to act in the public interest. I must admit that what I am seeing is that the government is more interested in praising the leak than acting in the public interest.

Those who work in ethics always try to determine the right thing to do, so long as the intent is to do good. This is a serious question that requires introspection and a certain distance from the issue. It involves being willing to discuss the issue in question. In ethics, one tries to determine what should be done in the circumstances. Our anglophone friends talk about doing the right thing, whereas in French we talk about *ce que nous devons faire pour bien faire*. Whoever wants to do that needs guidelines.

Right now, I am unaware of any laws respecting foreign interference, so we cannot say that we will enforce the law. However, we will have to do something, since the current legal vacuum needs to be filled. In order to determine what to do, we need to determine what happened.

In the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics, of which I am a member, we recently raised many questions concerning foreign interference. We are talking about foreign interference from China, but we could also be talking about Russia, Iraq or any number of other countries. I would especially like to mention a question I asked a few witnesses the other day. I asked them whether the current government was familiar with China, and the answer was a resounding “no”. I asked them whether the current government understood China, Russia or Iraq, and the answer was “no”. It is hard to stop a leak when we do not know that there is a leak. In this case, we need to start by recognizing that there is a leak.

Half-heartedly, feeling threatened, the Prime Minister recognized that perhaps it might be time to act. The decision was then made to appoint someone who would bear the title of rapporteur. European legislation often refers to rapporteurs. A rapporteur examines a situation, drafts a short summary and provides that summary. Unlike what is currently being alleged, the rapporteur will not decide whether there will be a public inquiry or not. The rapporteur will simply report facts. The person to whom the rapporteur reports those facts will decide what will happen. The rapporteur is being called independent. I will not question Mr. Johnston's résumé, obviously, but I will clearly question his proximity to the Trudeau family, with the Pierre Elliot Trudeau Foundation—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. There is a lot of talking in the House. I would ask those who wish to talk to leave so that the hon. member can enjoy the respect he deserves during his speech and so that everyone can hear what the hon. member has to say.

The hon. member from Trois-Rivières.

Mr. René Villemure: You read my mind, Madam Speaker.

I was about to say that in order to stop a leak, you need to recognize that there is a leak. We talked about the special rapporteur. The government says that he is independent. Not every interest is a conflict of interest. However, when we look at the interests, we have to sometimes wonder whether there is not a confusion of interests. Perhaps it is not a conflict of interest, but a confusion of interests.

There is a saying to the effect that justice must be done and that it must appear to be done. It is the same thing when we talk about a possible conflict of interest. We must appear to be above reproach. In this case, the very presence of Mr. Johnston raises a little something we call doubt and doubt causes mistrust.

What do we need to do here? Are we creating more mistrust? That does not make sense. Supposedly, we want to do the opposite.

If my colleagues are not interested in my speech, they can just tell me. Apparently, they are not interested.

I was talking about doubt. I would like to ask a question if I can be heard over the din of the many discussions—

• (1825)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member for Jonquière on a point of order.

Mr. Mario Simard: Madam Speaker, I am having a hard time hearing my colleague. I would like to hear what he has to say.

Could the members opposite quiet down a little?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I had not noticed that it was worse than before. However, if people want to have conversations, they should do so in the lobby. As I said earlier, it is important that the hon. member who has the floor be able to deliver their speech and that others be able to ask their questions and make comments.

The hon. member for Trois-Rivières.

Mr. René Villemure: Madam Speaker, my colleague is having trouble hearing, and I am having trouble thinking straight.

I was saying that we have a rapporteur. We are told he is independent. There must be no conflict of interest or confusion of interests. There must be an absence of appearance as well. I was saying that the mere presence of Mr. Johnston creates doubt. Doubt breeds mistrust. Mistrust breeds defiance. We saw defiance on full display last winter. We do not like defiance. We do not want to get to that point.

However, I have questions for the government about this. They will precede the ones that will be asked of me. Nevertheless, what does it mean to call someone independent?

In Latin, “in” means “in relation to”, and the word “dependence” speaks of a choice. Someone who is independent is free to make their own choices. Is the rapporteur free to make his own choices? I do not know. I have not seen his mandate, but I am going to suggest four other things we should rely on.

Can we say that the rapporteur is neutral? I would be surprised if he was, because he still has to be for justice, for the public interest. He is not neutral.

Is he impartial? Impartiality is often confused with neutrality, but they are not the same thing. Impartiality means being able to decide fairly by taking a higher vantage point. An impartial person has a choice between A and B. He will make his choice, according to the principles that have been proposed to him. Is he impartial? That is my wish.

However, the two concepts that pique my interest are objectivity and subjectivity. It will come as no surprise to learn that the word objectivity comes from the Latin *objectum* which means “something presented to the senses”. An *objectum* is an object that is presented to oneself. It is in front of us; we see it. That is objective in English. We often confuse it with subjectivity, the *subjectum*, which is the person holding the object that is not yet in front of us.

Is the rapporteur looking at the object or holding the object? I hope a colleague will ask me that question. I would love to answer that one.

There is objectivity and subjectivity. I, personally, am looking for objectivity, to be honest. I think we need objectivity; otherwise, doubts will continue to persist and we will head down the same path again.

Now the thing to do, and I am sure everyone will agree, is to act responsibly, and I am referring to what the government should do, not the rapporteur. The word “responsible” is often mentioned, but rarely defined. I will continue with my definitions. The word “responsible” comes from two Latin words. The first, *res*, means “thing”, and the second, *spondere*, means “promise”. A responsible person is someone who can promise a thing. Is the government being responsible in this case? To answer that, there is a little test with three questions.

Here are the three questions. Does the Prime Minister or the government have the choice of means? In my view, yes, they have the choice of means. There are many means available to the government. Next, is the government exercising that choice of means, or is it stuck with just one option? I think we have a problem here. The first question is whether there is a choice of means, the second is whether that choice is being exercised, and the third is whether there is a will to act.

As far the will to act goes, I think that if the government were any more reluctant, it would be dead. It is extremely reluctant to act, and this reluctance is not healthy for democracy. It is not healthy because even if everything that is being said were true, doubts are keeping us from finding out or understanding the truth

Routine Proceedings

of the matter. We will certainly insist on having a public, independent and, I would add, objective inquiry.

I am adding an extra layer of difficulty here, but if the government is so sure that it is right, and I will give it the opportunity to respond, it should agree to make an objective choice, which cannot be done with the presence of Mr. Johnston, regardless of his credentials. I am the first to acknowledge academic value, but the shadow cast by doubt leads us to believe that this will not work out.

• (1830)

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, Mr. Johnston, in his career, whether it was as Governor General of Canada, in his role on national leadership debates, or many other things he has done in his lifetime of 80-plus years, has been impeccable with his credentials. What is being asked of him is something I, and I suspect a vast majority of Canadians, would see he is quite capable of doing in an apolitical fashion and acting on what is in the best interest of Canada.

Based on the member's speech, is the Bloc's position going to be that, no matter what Mr. Johnston reports, it will see no validity to the report?

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Villemure: Madam Speaker, of course not. If he calls for an independent inquiry, then we will agree. However, I will say one thing. I will answer his question directly.

Imagine if, hypothetically speaking, the government appointed someone who has had an impeccable career in the field of, say, ethics, someone who has received accolades around the world, who received an honorary degree and is known for his publications. Imagine if it said that this person was independent, but that he had campaigned for the Bloc Québécois.

Setting aside my academic and professional record, would anyone have a problem with me being named rapporteur?

[*English*]

Mr. Matthew Green (Hamilton Centre, NDP): Madam Speaker, if there is one person in the House I would trust with that role, it would be the hon. member for Trois-Rivières, because he is a subject matter expert. He has literally written books on ethics. I have the privilege of serving with him on the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics, so I am keen to hear his thoughts.

We heard about whether there would be credibility, but I would like to set that aside and ask him to create a distinction between credibility and legitimacy in the eyes of the public as it relates to public interest and just how deeply concerning this file is, particularly given some of the reports that continue to come out. There are reports that came out today which are deeply concerning.

Can he perhaps expand on how he might feel about the value of a public inquiry that is completely independent, that is given the purview to have access to all the important information rather than taking information in drips and drops as it is coming out in the press today?

Routine Proceedings

[Translation]

Mr. René Villemure: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, who sits with me on the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics, as he mentioned. I have to say that he always considers the public interest, which is remarkable. I will therefore consider his question carefully.

The question was whether credibility or legitimacy is at stake here. In terms of credibility, Mr. Johnston's reputation is impeccable. However, the relationship between Mr. Johnston and the other interests is not. It is somewhat obscure or murky.

In a matter as important as foreign interference, where information is being revealed in dribs and drabs every day, there is nothing better than to be lily white. One has to be beyond reproach, and that has nothing to do with credibility. It is something else. Therefore, I hope that we will have an independent and impeccable inquiry.

• (1835)

Mr. Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Madam Speaker, my colleague talked about objectivity and subjectivity.

People sometimes say that objectivity is just mass subjectivity. I would like my colleague to expand on that.

Mr. René Villemure: Madam Speaker, I thought he was a friend.

To some extent, subjectivity is how one views an object. At the same time, we know that there are 360 degrees, and I believe that views can vary somewhat.

I am not convinced that subjectivity could be combined, nevertheless we must take inspiration from the fact that there are a number of viewpoints and we cannot neglect any of them. That is why we must be impeccable.

Mr. Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Madam Speaker, I really liked my colleague's speech. It was inspiring as usual. It leads me to draw a parallel.

In 2022, I had the opportunity to visit a city in the former East Germany. While I was there, one of the first things I went to see was the famous Stasi Museum. The Stasi is the secret police that existed when the Soviet Union controlled East Germany. At one point, there were as many as 95,000 Stasi agents and 175,000 informers in East Germany. They were everywhere. The strength lay in the fact that nobody knew who they were, and that is how they managed to impose their reign of terror. No one knew who the Stasi agents or informers were. Basically, their strength lay in secrecy.

The government does not want to launch a public inquiry, which I think would bring secrets to light. That is pretty much what we are seeing with the Chinese regime right now. I am trying to understand why the government would want to maintain that secrecy when what would weaken a regime like that the most is greater transparency.

Mr. René Villemure: Madam Speaker, in 2015, I heard someone say that light was the best disinfectant. It seems clear to me. We could apply that concept today.

When I was young, there was a dictionary we used at school that was called *Je doute, je cherche, je trouve*, which literally translates

to "I doubt, I seek, I find". Right now I doubt. The government does not want to seek, so we may not find.

What I would like right now is an independent public inquiry.

[English]

Mr. Matthew Green: Madam Speaker, early on in this, there was some discussion about how this information was being leaked and the sensitive nature of it, as it is about national security.

However, given the recent revelations, or at least what is being reported on and alleged, and I have to make it clear it is an allegation at this point, could the hon. member share, with his subject matter expertise on ethics, the importance for institutions such as the federal government to have built-in, whistle-blowing protections for civil servants?

Even sometimes in the highest, most sensitive breaches, should they come across thresholds that may breach criminality, whistle-blower protections would be an essential foundation or component of protecting our democracy.

[Translation]

Mr. René Villemure: Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for his question. It is an exceedingly difficult topic.

Protecting whistle-blowers is something many people are concerned about, but they are not doing anything about it. We need to get to the heart of the matter.

It is important to understand that, at CSIS, for example, a whistle-blower is a person who has reached the limit of what they can tolerate. CSIS members serve the government, and as someone who knows a few of them, I can say that they care very deeply about their country. When they reach that limit, the situation becomes intolerable. When they speak out, they are doing their duty. They are not criminals; they are heroes. We should come up with a system.

It is hard to understand, but we really need to consider creating a proper system for protecting whistle-blowers. If not, what is going to happen? There will be more situations like this one.

Today, more allegations have been made by Global News. I have only one word to describe them: devastating. To add insult to injury, at a certain point, I think an independent public inquiry becomes unavoidable. We need to think about what will happen in the wake of this, such as a system for protecting whistle-blowers.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, could the member provide his thoughts on other international players? It is not just China that is involved in doing this. Could he provide his thoughts on that matter?

• (1840)

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Villemure: Madam Speaker, I think that foreign interference has become more common in recent years because of technological advancements, but the tried-and-true persuasion techniques have always worked.

Earlier I mentioned Iran, China, obviously, Russia and other countries. The United Arab Emirates are now surveilling more countries than anyone else. They have the technology, and they are open about it. They are among the most prolific spies in the world in terms of the number of countries under surveillance. No one is worried about them.

Whether they are spying on Canada, I have no idea. One thing is certain, though: Surveillance is becoming increasingly common, increasingly harmful, and increasingly intrusive.

To be honest, I would look much further afield than just China.

[*English*]

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for North Island—Powell River.

I am glad to rise on this important issue. Time and time again I have stood in the House to talk about the importance of standing up to strengthen our democracy and our democratic institutions, and to talk about foreign interference being a persistent and real threat. The problem we are seeing throughout this debate, and I have been a regular at the PROC committee these days, is that the Conservatives have tried to make the issue of foreign interference a partisan issue when it is in fact a Canadian issue. Every single Canadian in this country, regardless of who they vote for, should be able to know that their democratic institutions are strong and that they protect against foreign interference.

However, we have seen that the Conservatives stood by for years. They closed their eyes and covered their ears to any sort of issue around foreign interference until they felt it could be in their political interest. It was not a surprise to me, but it should be shocking to Canadians, that when the Minister of Democratic Institutions asked the Leader of the Opposition why, when he was the minister of democratic institutions, he did nothing to protect and safeguard our institutions and elections, he said it was not in Conservative partisan interests to do so at the time. That should tell Canadians everything they need to know about how reckless Conservatives are when it comes to national security and foreign interference.

They keep speaking about how it is a cover-up or there is something Liberals are trying to hide. Talk about an incompetent opposition. They are claiming a cover-up when a 2019 NSICOP report that was tabled in this very House raised the issue of foreign interference. Talk about hiding in plain sight. I guess Conservatives prefer not to read the reports that are tabled in the House.

We have not only been busy working on addressing foreign interference but we have also taken additional steps. The mandate letter of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Infrastructure and Communities talks about strengthening our democratic institutions

Routine Proceedings

from foreign interference. However, the Conservatives once again pretend this is something we have never talked about, that we have never discussed and that we are not seized with, but there is documented evidence that we are the only government that has put forward the most concrete steps to strengthen our democratic institutions.

That is not to say that more is not needed to be done. In fact, we supported the study at PROC to look at additional ways and measures, and things that we could be continuously doing. The fact remains that foreign interference is going to be pervasive, and it is going to constantly change, so any member in the House, or any Canadian, who thinks they have the answer and we will never need to look at this again, is wrong. This is something that Parliaments and governments around the world have to ensure they are constantly staying on top of so these pervasive threats do not take hold.

I also find it interesting that the Conservatives proclaim they support our national security community, yet our national security community has said that Canadians, and Canadians alone, determine the outcome of our elections, but Conservatives continue to undermine that fact. The non-partisan national security community has stated it time and time again at committee, but Conservatives try to undermine that. They try to sow doubt in our non-partisan public service. We do not believe in that. We trust that these officials are seized with keeping Canadians safe. Our national security community wants to ensure that national security documents are handled with the care and protections that national security documents require.

• (1845)

The Conservatives would have us believe that they should just release all of this information because a few members on PROC feel like looking at it, instead of going to the appropriate location, which is NSICOP, where every member of that committee has national security clearance, where there is extreme care given to the documents that are provided and handled, and where an enormous amount of information is provided. The committee is extremely independent, it tables reports and is extremely professional. Might I add, the secretariat is above all.

Routine Proceedings

I actually served on this committee, so I can speak with extreme passion and knowledge to the fact that the NSICOP secretariat is a professional resource that parliamentarians now have. In fact, NSICOP's reports have been regarded around the world for the work it has done, and the Conservatives want to ignore that fact and undermine the work that has been done. It is a multi-party committee, with representation from all parties and the Senate, so I find it interesting that the Conservatives do not want to use this committee that, in fact, we ensured was created in the House, where parliamentarians could access these top secret security documents in a way that is responsible.

I think every Canadian would want their parliamentarians to treat national security with the seriousness and responsibility that national security deserves. It keeps not only us as Canadians safe but those who have stepped up to serve and protect our country. However, the Conservatives, once again, continue to be reckless with our national security community, and I think Canadians have seen through that time and time again.

It is also no surprise to me, but it is interesting that members of PROC and my colleague, the member for Kingston and the Islands, mentioned the behaviour of one individual on that committee who was actually pulled off. I also find it interesting that the behaviour and conduct of several members of the Conservatives at that committee has been absolute chaos. It has been partisan and has resulted in nothing. There is so much turmoil, and I guess Conservatives just going in circles, that Conservatives are abandoning their PROC members and saying, "Ah, maybe we should take this to ethics" where maybe their members can get it through the finish line, I do not know. However, Conservatives themselves are infighting and cannot seem to even stay on track with what their objectives are, because their objectives are not to strengthen our democracy; their objectives are to simply throw partisan grenades, and it is not working.

I think that if we want to have reasonable and serious debate about—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Madam Speaker, if the Conservatives had come to this debate with the seriousness that it deserves, not only would their leader and House leader have not abandoned their PROC committee members in trying to punt this to ethics, where they might have a different result, but Canadians would also have more faith. The fact is that this is nothing more than a Conservative partisan ploy, just like their leader confirmed on why he never did anything when he was the minister of democratic institutions—

• (1850)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member for Calgary Centre is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Greg McLean: Madam Speaker, the hon. member has twice put this piece of information out there, which seems to be a back channel way of—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): That is a point of debate.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Madam Speaker, this proves the point that Conservative members have the weakest chin I have ever seen. They sit here and throw insult after insult to members, and the second I stand up they have a point of order because they are unhappy with the comment their own leader made. I would ask the hon. member to check Hansard, and to also toughen up, because if they can dish it, they should be able to take it.

I will conclude with the fact that our government takes this issue incredibly seriously. That is precisely why we have implemented a committees such as NSICOP and the critical election incident public protocol, or CEIPP. This continues to be in the minister's mandate letter. We want to study this and continue to have more recommendations. That is why we have appointed a special rapporteur. We look forward to, and we will accept, all of his recommendations.

Mr. John Nater (Perth—Wellington, CPC): Madam Speaker, how can the parliamentary secretary stand in this place after filibustering with her Liberal colleagues for 24 hours to prevent the Prime Minister's chief of staff from testifying before the committee?

My question is very simple. What is the government hiding from Canadians?

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Madam Speaker, the government is hiding absolutely nothing. In fact, what I think, certainly from my—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Madam Speaker, the members can laugh; it means nothing.

In many speeches at PROC, I actually highlighted the hypocrisy from the Conservative Party, the fact that foreign interference has been happening for years and the Conservatives did nothing, and the fact that former Conservative political staffers have come out criticizing the Conservatives on this issue. I continue to point out that the Conservatives do not actually call out the members of their own caucus who sat down with an alt-right member of a foreign government, and did not call out the attempts of foreign interference amongst their own ranks.

At PROC, I called out Conservative hypocrisy and I continue to do so now.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to comment on the speech by my colleague opposite.

First, in listening to her speech, one would have thought that this debate was initiated by the Conservatives. That is quite something. I am not a Conservative supporter, but we must set the record straight—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Routine Proceedings

[English]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): It is not time to make comments. Order.

The hon. member for Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères.

[Translation]

Mr. Xavier Barsalou-Duval: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I was saying that I wanted to set the record straight. The NDP asked for this debate. It seems that the Liberals are afraid to mention it because the NDP is a member of their coalition.

Now for my question, which is about partisanship. In her speech, my colleague used a certain word about every three sentences, perhaps even in every sentence, and that word is “partisan”. She was once again accusing the Conservatives of partisan politics.

I do not understand why she is only targeting the Conservatives, because the Bloc is also asking for a public inquiry into Chinese interference. The NDP is now asking for the same thing. Many people in civil society are asking for the same thing. It is as though anyone who asks for something the Liberals do not want is being partisan. I am trying to understand this.

Is it not the other way around? Is it not the Liberals who are being partisan and have things to hide or partisan interests to protect?

• (1855)

[English]

Ms. Jennifer O’Connell: Madam Speaker, I feel bad that the Bloc members feel left out. I can offer this: I find it interesting that the Bloc members are standing up about foreign interference now, yet they actually declined to come to foreign interference briefings that our government put forward to ensure that all parties had information on foreign interference and could help protect their campaigns and know how to spot it.

Fear not, Bloc members, I do not leave you out of being reckless. When you have opportunities to get briefings from the national security community about how to predict and prevent foreign interference, I suggest you take them. It is serious.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I want to remind the hon. member to address all questions and comments through the Chair.

Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP): Madam Speaker, I want to thank the member for splitting her time with me. I really do appreciate having a voice in this important debate this evening.

My question to the member is about something she mentioned in her speech, which is that she feels NSICOP is the right place for these conversations. However, we know we are in now in the situation that Canadians are concerned, and we have just had another leak come out through the media that is extremely concerning for Canadians. They are the focus for all of us in the House.

We need to honour national security, but there are ways to do it that are public, transparent and independent. I am wondering if the

member could speak to why her government does not want to support that.

Ms. Jennifer O’Connell: Madam Speaker, I respect my hon. colleague a lot, as well as the work she does on the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs. I think we actually want to achieve some of the same things. I think where we are having difficulties is the fact that we are not finding the committee to be the place where we can have these honest conversations. I have said, multiple times, that I would love to see PROC bring in witnesses from, for example, international sources, countries that have been facing this, and looking at the policies they have implemented and what we can learn from them.

If we can get down to business and work on how to strengthen our democratic institutions, I am all for it and I am happy to work with any member in the House to do so.

Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am really honoured to be here speaking on behalf of the good people of North Island—Powell River, who have expressed to me some of their serious concerns around foreign interference and what that means for Canadian elections.

I am also really disappointed, in a way, that we are here, because I know that on Monday, my dear friend, the member for New Westminster—Burnaby, gave a very important speech in the House and spoke very clearly about his desire to bring forward this motion on Tuesday. I also know that, after that very public statement, which was also talked about in the media, the Conservatives, the next day, decided to do something different to block that opportunity for us to talk about why a public inquiry around foreign interference in our democratic institutions is so important.

I wish we had had this discussion yesterday. I think it would have been incredibly important and I think it is a good reminder that we are in a position right now where I see partisanship coming much too much into this conversation.

I think Canadians are calling on us very loudly and very clearly, to the best of us honouring national security, saying they want to understand what is happening in this country and what it means for our democratic institutions when foreign interference is becoming a growing concern.

We heard today, just about an hour ago, of a strong allegation against a currently sitting MP in relation to the two Michaels, whom we all fought so hard in the House to get home.

As this keeps coming and we keep seeing more and more indications of foreign interference, Canadians are rightfully wondering what is happening. They want to make sure the process is accountable to them as the voters in this country and accountable to people running for office in whatever roles they are running for, and that when they are put in these situations, they understand, at least basically, what the process would be moving forward.

Routine Proceedings

I am the member who sits on the Standing Committee for Procedure and House Affairs. I really appreciate the important work PROC does. I have been put in a very difficult situation in PROC over the last few months.

Often, my Conservative friends come in and propose things around national security that really scare me. This issue is so serious. It is about how the people in this room are chosen and the processes behind that.

I have had to vote against the Conservatives numerous times because they are bringing forward motions that really do not honour our sacred trust in making sure that our processes are clean and that we do not expose, outwardly, anything that would be sacred for national security.

I hope everyone in the House understands that, even though we have our partisan realities and we want to contrast with other parties and show how we would do a better job, we must never forget that what we owe in this place, beyond our parties, is an oath to Canadians. It is an oath that, at the end of the day, we will do what we feel is in the best interest of all Canadians.

I think that, as we go through this, we have to honour the fact that the Conservatives keep focusing on one country. They keep focusing on China, when we know that multiple countries have been involved in trying to have foreign interference in Canada and other countries.

My granny used to always say to me that, if it is coming out of my mouth, I had better make sure I am paying for the words, because if I am not paying for what is said, then somebody else is paying and I owe them.

We have to remember that when we talk about these issues, there are Chinese Canadians in this country who have been begging for this country to take this seriously for a very long time, years and years under both Conservative and Liberal governments, saying they feel the pressure and they know it is out there and they want us to take action on it.

I hope that, as we remember this, we also honour Chinese Canadians in this country and the hard work they have done to try to bring this forward. That is important because we have lived through hard times and we do not need to see any discrimination happening in that way.

Recently, in fact just yesterday, the NDP was able to use its leverage to make sure we had transparency, and Katie Telford is going to be coming to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

● (1900)

I think that is an important step, one that our leader worked very hard on. He was the first person, the first leader, the member for Burnaby South, to call for a public inquiry. That is why we are here today. We are here today because, in PROC, a motion was brought forward by the NDP saying that a public inquiry is the best way to go forward. Why is it the best way to go forward? It is because it is independent, because it is transparent to Canadians and it is public.

There is a time and a place, I fulsomely believe, to make sure we honour national security, we have those important conversations that are behind closed doors, and we are held to account by what happens outside those doors. With all of the leaks we are seeing, there is concern, and that is why we need a public inquiry.

I respect that a special rapporteur has been put in a position and given a mandate. However, I will not accept it until we get to a place where there is actual accountability to Canadians that honours national security but will also make sure our processes are clear, so we do not have people coming forward in the media, either elected officials or people who have run, who feel very insecure about what they have experienced and the information is not clear to them. We need to know. We need to know when these things are coming forward and that they are real.

The Conservative members moved a motion. I, in my role, amended it. It was accepted as a friendly amendment. Absolutely, the next concerning thing is that we went through hours of filibustering by the Liberals. Now that has ended and hopefully we get to the next step, which is action. It was unfortunate to see that, when our motion came forward, everybody in there except the Liberals voted for it.

Looking at the behaviour we saw at committee, I think all Canadians would agree the best place to move forward is a public inquiry. When partisanship gets into this, it becomes more and more ugly. Not too long ago, the person who came forward secretly to the media on some of these very serious issues said in an article that they came forward because they truly believed they needed to. They felt that not a single leader in the House was a traitor to this country and that they wanted to see all actions be public but non-partisan.

What is unfortunately happening in the House is that we are seeing way too much partisanship. We are seeing it at committees. I would say that does not honour the responsibility we all have to Canadians. When we do not have trust in our institutions, it begins something really terrible. We have seen this historically in other countries.

I was reading a book the other day by Gabor and Daniel Maté. One of the things I found very profound was a line in it that said, and I am paraphrasing, that when people cannot trust, when they do not believe in the systems around them, they will believe absolutely anything. We must be clear. As we become more afraid, people will begin to believe things that are not true.

We saw what happened during the convoy. We saw what happened during the pandemic when people became so fearful that they lost their sense of connection to their communities and to their families. When people lose their connections to their communities and their families and their country, we see a lot of things start to fall apart.

I am asking everyone in this place: Please remember our commitment to Canada. Please remember our commitment to creating strong institutions. Please make sure we do not encourage Canadians to lose faith in those democratic institutions but to question them and see how we can make them stronger. When we start to question these institutions without an intention to create stronger institutions we can trust in, when we are just using partisan games that are trying to get us points, then we forget our commitment to Canada.

I hope everyone in this place knows we have a lot of work to do in this country, but building a better and stronger country should be the commitment we all share. I hope everybody will support this motion, because a public inquiry will help Canadians have faith in this country.

• (1905)

Mr. Peter Fonseca (Mississauga East—Cooksville, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the hon. member brought up the convoy. During the convoy, we saw that it was trying to sow division among Canadians. We saw the threat to the security and safety of Canadians here. However, a lot of the convoy was also being promoted through Russian television. We saw the Conservatives out there with convoy members who came with a manifesto to overthrow the government. They were backslapping them. There were Conservatives with MAGA hats on. Many of the Conservatives were supporting the convoy participants out there who were doing illegal things.

What can the member say about that? She brought up the convoy. Can she talk about the interference that came from Russia with their television stations, their radio and how they were trying to promote the convoy that the Conservatives were supporting?

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Madam Speaker, I think that is a serious question. I want to add that there was actually a public inquiry and it really helped us translate what had happened. We saw a significant amount of money come from multiple countries, including the United States.

We need to make sure this is a broad spectrum. We cannot focus on one country; we must focus on all countries. Threats have come to our attention, and CSIS has been clear about which countries they are from. We need to take this very seriously because these are our democratic institutions. People want to have faith that when they vote, the people around this table are the people they voted for.

The convoy was very destructive, and it created an environment of fear. That is not what we need in this country. It was disheartening to see such strong support from the Conservatives and to hear such a strong and clear message about white supremacy coming from the convoy. They were not honouring the fact that in this place, we should support all Canadians.

Mr. Michael Cooper (St. Albert—Edmonton, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to ask my colleague, respectfully, why the NDP joined the Liberals in blocking Katie Telford from appearing before committee not once, not twice, but on three occasions? They did finally come around and support my motion, and that is a good thing.

Earlier, my hon. colleague said that Telford was a mere staff member and that she should therefore not be called. The second

Routine Proceedings

most powerful person in the government is the Prime Minister's chief of staff. Why did the NDP block Telford?

• (1910)

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Madam Speaker, I invite all Canadians to listen to me. I have been on the record at PROC many times. I sit with the member on PROC, and we certainly do not always agree, but I respect some of the work he has done.

At the end of the day, it is very simple. I do not believe in bringing staff for decisions that ministers and prime ministers make. I think ministers and prime ministers have to be accountable for their actions. I am surprised the member is asking me this question since I have already answered it, but as I said at PROC, it got to a point where the leaks kept coming. At some point, we have to say that if this continues, it will build distrust in our systems, and we need to make sure we have transparency. In addition, as the member knows, it was the first motion that did not have anything about documents in it, and I felt very seriously that it could not be put before the committee without wrecking national security. I will not stand for that.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ): Madam Speaker, I must say that am surprised to hear my colleague claim that we are being too partisan. What are we dealing with tonight if not partisanship?

What is happening tonight is that the NDP realized that it was sticking too close to the government, so it is hoping to use this China situation to restore its public image. It decided to cut the Conservative Party's opposition day short, not by going back to the purpose of the motion, which is to get results, but by trying to distance itself from the Liberal Party.

It is pretty funny, especially when I hear my colleague telling us that there is too much partisanship. I need her to explain partisanship to me.

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

[*English*]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Madam Speaker, if the member would stop yelling, I would certainly be happy to answer the question.

At the end of the day, our commitment, which I noted repeatedly in my speech, is to Canadians. We feel strongly that this needs to be voted on. Canadians want to see where we are on the public inquiry. Our leader asked for it first. We have heard other leaders asked for it. It took them a while, but this is how we can be transparent to Canadians and that is our goal.

[*Translation*]

Mr. John Nater (Perth—Wellington, CPC): Madam Speaker, I wish to inform you that I will be sharing my time with the hon. member for Mégantic—L'Érable.

Routine Proceedings

[English]

Let us be very clear: The confidence of Canadians is shaken, and the only way that we as parliamentarians can help to restore the confidence of Canadians in our democratic system is through an open and public independent inquiry. We in the Conservative Party have called for this very clearly, and we are once again calling for it today. However, let us look back at what has happened in the past few weeks and in the past few months.

Unfortunately, we in the Conservative Party have had to drag not only the government but also the NDP kicking and screaming to hold those in government accountable. At the procedure and House affairs committee, three times our efforts to hear testimony from the Prime Minister's chief of staff were blocked by the Liberals and their NDP coalition partners. Why? It is because they are hiding something. If they are not, they should open up and allow the chief of staff to testify.

We need to know what the Prime Minister knew, when he knew it and why he sat on it. Why is that so difficult for the government to understand? Why is it so difficult for its members to see that Canadians' confidence has been shaken? Certainly, I have lost confidence in the government, and I think a lot of Canadians, each and every day, have more and more difficulty trusting the government. Why have they lost trust in the government? It is because it will not stand up and be clear with Canadians, and it is being aided and abetted by the fourth party, the New Democrats. The New Democrats are failing in their duty as opposition parliamentarians.

The opposition has a sacred duty to the people of Canada to hold—

Mr. Charlie Angus: You can thank us for the debate tonight.

• (1915)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. I just want to remind members that it is not yet time for questions and comments. I hope they are going to wait and take their turn then. There are seven and a half minutes for the hon member to do his speech before we have questions and comments.

The hon. member for Perth—Wellington.

Mr. John Nater: Madam Speaker, I thank my friends from the far corner of this chamber. There is a reason they are so far in the corner, and frankly, in the next election they will not even be in this chamber, because Canadians are losing faith in them to fulfill their role as opposition parliamentarians.

It is our role as Canadians—

Mr. Matthew Green: Wishful thinking.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. One more time, I want to remind members on all sides to make sure they hold on to their questions, comments and thoughts. They might want to jot them down instead of yelling them out.

The hon. member for Perth—Wellington.

Mr. John Nater: Madam Speaker, I seem to have hit a nerve with certain NDP members in this House, but the truth hurts sometimes.

That is what we have seen for weeks on end at the procedure and House affairs committee. In fact, over a period of three weeks, we listened to filibuster speech after filibuster speech by Liberal parliamentarians. One Liberal MP even went so far as to say the OC Transpo light rail inquiry was a good example of why we should not have an inquiry, as though OC Transpo's light rail should ever be an example cited in this House on anything, let alone the need for a public inquiry on foreign interference into Canadian elections.

I want to highlight something. A year ago, bureaucrats recommended to the government the need for a foreign agent registry. A food bank, for example, has to register in order to lobby the Liberal government. However, when bureaucrats recommended this for foreign governments trying to influence Canadian public officials, the Liberals sat on it. They sat on it for months on end.

The Conservatives took real action. We took real action back in April 2021, before the last election. Our former colleague from Steveston—Richmond East, Mr. Kenny Chiu, introduced what was then called Bill C-282, which would have required the creation of a foreign influence agent registry in Canada. Now we are finally seeing the Liberals come around to that, but they are not actually taking action. They are not taking the action needed to restore the confidence of Canadians. That is why we need an open and public independent inquiry.

We heard testimony from experts, some of the folks who have been in service to our country. I want to note one example, the former Canadian ambassador. He said:

Australia has its registry of foreign agents, which requires transparency of Australians who act for foreign governments. The United States has the Foreign Agents Registration Act. It has also taken steps to prosecute people who have been found to be interfering in the business of Congress, and indeed congressional elections. The U.K. has identified a person who was very active in British politics and funded several politicians as a foreign agent working for China. Those things send messages.

Recently we also saw Britain leaning on the Chinese consulate in Manchester, England, after protesters were dragged into the consulate and beaten. The result was that five diplomats left the consulate.

They're taking action, but we aren't.

The former ambassador made a great point. He cited other examples of governments taking action. However, where is the Liberal government? How many diplomats has it expelled? It is none, zero, not a single one, despite having authority to do so under the Vienna convention. It has failed to act and has done nothing to make those who may be interfering in Canadian elections *persona non grata* under the rules provided to us.

I also want to quote Charles Burton, a senior fellow. He said:

Routine Proceedings

Certainly, the disinformation that was launched in the recent election, in particular in Steveston—Richmond East at former MP Kenny Chiu, was largely in the Chinese language and largely inaccessible to people who are monitoring elections. In other words, we don't have the capability within the Canadian system to deal with activities in the diaspora community that could affect election results improperly.

Let us be clear. We need to stand up and protect each and every Canadian's democratic rights, and that includes Canadians in diaspora communities from around the globe. The disinformation and intimidation being used in online apps and discussion groups, through which foreign forces are trying to dissuade, persuade and improperly interfere in our elections, need to be stopped and need to be addressed. However, what we see time and time again from the Liberals are efforts to deny, deflect and then finally delay. That is what we are seeing right now. We are seeing delays. Not until the end of May will we actually have an opportunity to hear whether or not maybe, perhaps, kind of, if they feel like it, we will have a public inquiry.

• (1920)

We are calling for a public inquiry. We are calling for it now, to stop the delays and actually take action to end foreign interference by the Communist party in Beijing.

What we are hearing from different members, including government members, is to let NSICOP look at it, let NSICOP do it. I will remind members that NSICOP is not a committee of Parliament and does not come with the rights and privileges that Parliament enjoys. In fact, I would draw the House's attention to the 2019 report from NSICOP, in particular paragraph 298. The Prime Minister was given this report in August 2019, before the 2019 election, and yet did not implement the recommendation in paragraph 298, which included informing and training members of Parliament on foreign interference. Of course, because the Prime Minister got the report first, before every other Canadian, he sat on that report. It was not made public until 2020, after the 2019 election.

Forgive me if I do not have faith in the Liberals using a secret committee, where they hear secret testimony and have a report that goes first and foremost to the Prime Minister, and if I do not believe that this would be an alternative. The only alternative is a full, public, independent inquiry where Canadians could have their faith restored that we are not being impacted by foreign interference into Canadian elections.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I find the speech by the member opposite interesting. First he asked what the Liberals were hiding and why they would not let the Prime Minister's chief of staff come to the committee. Can the member opposite not take yes for an answer? The chief of staff is coming to committee.

In addition to that, he spoke about the former member Kenny Chiu. Officials who appeared at committee said that it was Canadians who determined the outcome of the election and that officials could not determine that the source of chatter in that election against Mr. Chiu could be identified back to a foreign agent.

Is the member opposite suggesting that he knows more than the national security community? Will he stand in his place today and

say that he has information and disagrees with the non-partisan public service?

Mr. John Nater: Madam Speaker, the experts in the public sector and in the private sector are warning against the impact of foreign interference in Canadian elections.

The member can try to deny it. The member can try to downplay it. However, Canadians are worried. Canadians are concerned. Leading experts who have dealt in diaspora communities, who have seen the undue influence, who have seen the foreign police stations being used as intimidation in major cities in our country, see what is happening and understand what is happening. For the Liberals to try to downplay this as a serious issue is really pathetic, and it really diminishes the trust of Canadians in what is happening in our country today.

[Translation]

Mr. Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Madam Speaker, I was going to ask a question about my Conservative colleague's speech, but there was a question a moment ago from a Liberal member about my Conservative colleague's speech. I must admit that, as a good Quebecker, I was “flabbergasté”.

I know Kenny Chiu. I worked with him. He is a respectable, up-standing man who deserves respect.

In the last question from the Liberals about my friend Kenny Chiu's experience, it looked to me like they thought what happened to him was funny.

I would like to hear my colleague's thoughts on the seriousness with which the Liberals are talking about Chinese interference in our democracy.

• (1925)

Mr. John Nater: Madam Speaker, it is indeed very sad and depressing to hear the Liberals with their accusations, saying that this is not a big challenge, that this is not something that Canadians should be concerned about.

Canadians know very well that it is a problem if the Communist Party in Beijing has had any influence. Even if only one Canadian was affected, that is one too many.

[English]

One impact on a single Canadian by a foreign government is one impact too many, so we need to stand up and say very clearly that the Communist Party in Beijing has no role and no right to impact Canadians in our democratic elections.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais (Edmonton Griesbach, NDP): Madam Speaker, let us play the facts game.

The facts are that New Democrats were the first to call for a national public inquiry. That is a fact. As a matter of fact, we are debating that right now. The members of this House have an opportunity to join New Democrats and ensure that there will be a national public inquiry into foreign interference.

Routine Proceedings

One more fact is that Conservatives are playing defence for terrible oligarch regimes like Russia, which they do not want included in a public inquiry. Why did the Leader of the Opposition fail to even show up for his own opposition day motion, which called for some of the things they are talking about now? I want to know why the Conservatives are blocking our attempt to ensure that there will be a transparent public inquiry into this work. We need to see this inquiry expanded to all—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): We have to allow the hon. member to answer.

The hon. member for Perth—Wellington, a brief answer, please.

Mr. John Nater: Madam Speaker, let us talk about the facts. Three times the members of the NDP voted against hearing from Katie Telford. Three times they blocked the Prime Minister's chief of staff from coming to committee to say what the Prime Minister knew, when he knew it, and why he covered it up.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his excellent speech, as well as for setting the stage for the debate we are having tonight.

Tonight, we were supposed to be once again discussing this government's efforts to raise taxes on Canadians. It is making the cost of living continue to rise and taking more money from the pockets of people who have none to spare. We wanted to use our opposition day to discuss issues that I, personally, think are of great concern to Canadians.

Opposition days are simple enough to understand. Over a given number of weeks during a parliamentary session, the opposition parties get certain days when they can choose the topic of the day and thus force a government vote on topics of the opposition's choice. Since we are coming to the end of this parliamentary period, we were entitled to two opposition days this week.

We used our first day to demand that Katie Telford and several other individuals appear before the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics to testify about foreign interference. The vote was scheduled for Tuesday. The opposition parties do not always work together, but it was expected that all opposition parties would agree that the Prime Minister's chief of staff should appear.

A lot has happened since then. I have to say that I am disappointed with the NDP's attitude.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Luc Berthold: Madam Speaker, I hear them shouting. They have been doing it all evening. They shout, they complain. Then they claim that they were the first ones to call for a public inquiry. Then they are outraged because it is not working. They say to themselves that that they might step on the government's toes, so maybe they should change their position. Without the other opposition parties, the NDP would not have a national public inquiry, because the motion would not have passed in committee. On their own, the NDP cannot get anything done.

They found a dance partner. When it suits them, they work with the government. They form a coalition. Now they have realized that they are getting a little too cozy with the Liberals on this issue. It took some time for them to realize it. It dawned on them little by little.

It started with the articles that were published by Global News. This started last November. We started to see articles on foreign interference. First there was one, then another, and another. Gradually we came to realize that, unfortunately, there really was a problem with foreign interference in our elections by the regime in Beijing.

The opposition parties started to ask the Prime Minister questions. The Prime Minister did what he always does. Whenever there is a scandal, he starts by denying it. Then he tries to deflect the question. Then he finds someone else to blame. In this case, it was the media, the big bad media, for daring to break stories about the elections and Beijing's interference in our elections. More stories broke, and then an opportunity presented itself at the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

We have often called on the Prime Minister to answer those questions. The Prime Minister has never answered a single one of our questions. The Prime Minister was given the opportunity to act responsibly, and to take responsibility for his decisions and for the things he did or did not do. He was asked whether he was aware of it and whether he had been informed there was foreign interference in the 2019 and 2021 elections. He was asked what action he took. I can no longer remember the number of questions he was asked in the House. Unfortunately, as I said, the Prime Minister never gave any answers. He changed the subject. He went off on multiple tangents. He accused the Conservatives of partisanship and of all the world's ills rather than accept responsibility. That is the crux of the debate: accepting responsibility.

● (1930)

None of the Liberal ministers who have been found guilty of ethics violations or poor management of their department have taken responsibility. The passport crisis and the crisis at the Canada Revenue Agency come to mind.

We decided to turn to other sources of information so that Canadians could find out the truth. We decided to call the Prime Minister's chief of staff, Katie Telford, to appear. We wanted to ask her to come forward and tell us what she knew, when she found out and what the government did. We also wanted to ask her if she told the Prime Minister what she knew, when she told him and when the Prime Minister took action, which he never did.

The big surprise was that NDP members refused in committee to support a motion to hear Ms. Telford's testimony. They refused to do so not once, not twice but three times. In fact, this is no surprise because the NDP is in a coalition with the Liberal Party. The NDP members rejected the motion three times. Meanwhile, the articles kept coming out day after day. At one point, the pressure built up so much that—surprise, surprise—the NDP finally announced that they were going to support the motion before the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs so that Ms. Telford could be called to appear.

Mr. Peter Julian: That is utterly ridiculous.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I would remind the hon. member that this is not a conversation. The hon. member for Mégantic—L'Érable has the floor and we will allow him to finish his speech.

Mr. Luc Berthold: Madam Speaker, my colleague from the NDP who is talking during my speech and his colleague who is a member of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs are quite aware of all the efforts I have made for us to work together on this file. They cannot deny it. I called them, I communicated with them in an effort to have the opposition parties hold the government accountable for its actions. My colleague is well aware that we worked together to make this public inquiry happen. He is well aware that we changed the motion calling for a public inquiry in order for the appointed commissioner to be chosen by Parliament and by the leaders of all the parties. The Conservatives made that change. Otherwise we would not have independence because the NDP were leaving it up to the Liberals to choose who could preside over the inquiry.

They claim to be the first ones to come up with the idea, which is quite something. They had an idea, but that idea would have led to a non-independent inquiry. As a show of good faith, we agreed to amend our motion. Our motion called for an investigation of the Beijing regime, which the Canadian Security Intelligence Service has said is the greatest threat to our elections today. The NDP wanted this to be extended to other countries and other foreign powers that might have an interest in influencing our elections. We agreed. Then the NDP comes along and says that they were the first, as though they are the only ones who want to get to the bottom of foreign interference in elections, and that the nasty Conservatives are being partisan. It is amazing to see what has transpired today, and to think that we can work together and get something done.

I think the Conservatives have been the least partisan on this issue. In fact, I am certain we have been non-partisan, considering all the concessions we made. The Liberals filibustered for 24 hours because we had the best interests of Canadians at heart and we wanted to get to the bottom of the Beijing regime's interference in our elections. That is what happened.

Today, the members of the NDP are taking up half of our opposition day because they want to score political points. That is the only reason. The NDP has changed its mind on foreign interference many times. Were it not for the pressure from the Conservatives and the public, were it not for the media revelations, the NDP would still be backing the Liberal-NDP coalition in trying to protect the Prime Minister and his seats for as long as possible. That is

Routine Proceedings

the reality. I am extremely disappointed with the NDP and that we no longer have the collaboration that we had with them before.

• (1935)

[*English*]

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the member opposite a two-part question.

He was in the House when the member for Perth—Wellington was speaking and said foreign interference to even one Canadian is unacceptable. Does the member opposite agree with that?

His caucus members met with an alt-right MP, Christine Anderson, from a foreign government. She came to this country spouting anti-Islamic rhetoric, denying the Holocaust and glorifying Nazis. If the member actually does not support even one Canadian being influenced by foreign interference, will he and his party ask that those three members be removed from their caucus?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Berthold: Madam Speaker, first they deny, then they divide and then they accuse and try to avoid answering questions. That is standard practice among the Liberals when they are caught with both hands in the cookie jar.

That is what they did in the WE Charity scandal. They said that it was not them, then they said that it might have been them and then finally they found a scapegoat. That is how it works. When there is a Liberal scandal, there is a little red book with instructions on what to do. It is always the same thing. Every time there is a scandal, they do the same thing. They deny, they deflect and they find a scapegoat.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, my colleague in the House is well aware that I appreciate him very much, but his speech really takes the cake.

The facts he concocted about the NDP's involvement in moving this motion today and also in getting Katie Telford to testify at committee—all of that was thanks to the work of the NDP. I am glad we had support from the other parties, but really, as he well knows, it was the NDP that got the job done.

I have three questions for my colleague.

First, why did the Conservatives try to eliminate the Russians from the scope of this public inquiry? Second, and this is an important question, why did they remove Katie Telford from our original motion? Today's motion makes no reference to Katie Telford because the Conservatives amended it. Third, why did his leader, the member for Carleton, refuse to vote on the Conservative motion yesterday?

• (1940)

Mr. Luc Berthold: Madam Speaker, once again, the NDP can scream and yell and stand up and say that it was the first, but the fact is that it cannot get anything done on its own.

Routine Proceedings

It took the Bloc Québécois and discussions with that party and the Conservatives to get this done. Had it not been for the Conservatives, there would be no motion right now. We would still be studying something in committee because the NDP would not have obtained the necessary support.

I am not sure the Liberals would have supported the NDP if it had called for an independent national public inquiry with a commissioner appointed by all of the parties. Would the NDP have had the Liberal's support for that? No. It would not. It took the three parties.

Unfortunately, the NDP does not recognize that the opposition parties can sometimes work together, but that, in the end, the result is that the three opposition parties must—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): We have time for one last question.

The hon. member for Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia.

Ms. Kristina Michaud (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, BQ): Madam Speaker, I do not know if my colleague will agree with me, but as I sit in the House tonight, listening to the various debates and the various speeches, I feel like I am watching a pointless contest. It just makes no sense. One party says, “We asked for it first”, and the other party says, “No, we asked for it first”. Each accuses the other of being the most partisan. This is ridiculous.

I am trying to convince young people in my riding to take an interest in politics and look at what goes on in the House of Commons, because there are some debates worth watching. Tonight, I would tell them to turn off their television. This debate is outrageous. It is like listening to children argue over whose dad is stronger.

We have been talking about this for weeks. The NDP has obviously just woken up in time for the Conservatives' opposition day. What we are hearing now is that we all agree that the government should be held accountable.

Since we all agree, why can we not work together to hear what the government has to say for itself to the opposition and to Canadians?

Mr. Luc Berthold: Madam Speaker, I totally agree with my colleague. There is too much partisanship in the debate, too much back and forth and too much bickering between everyone, when the opposition parties should join forces and form a united front to show the government that the public inquiry and our objective are important. We represent Canadians.

I agree with my colleague, but unfortunately, their government is refusing to call a public inquiry.

[*English*]

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Madam Speaker, it is really important tonight of all nights that we discuss this issue. In a world of disinformation and political interference from foreign actors, democracy is in a fragile condition these days. It is incumbent upon us as parliamentarians to reassure the public and give them reason to believe that the public service has integrity. This is the reason that New Democrats came forward tonight to

bring this motion, and we can see how excited the Conservatives are that, once again, they are able to respond to the NDP's lead on this. This is why, on a number of issues, we have used our position in Parliament not to burn the House to the ground but to try and find solutions.

When the Liberals overreached on Bill C-21, the gun bill, the Conservatives just loved it. They were going to raise money off of it. We were like, “No, we are going to find a solution so that farmers and hunters are not targeted.” We pushed relentlessly and negotiated. That is what we do in Parliament.

It is the same for the issue of getting Ms. Katie Telford to come before committee. The Conservatives were just using their tactics of character assassination and smear, but we said no to the Liberals. We said that we have to find a way to start getting answers.

The NDP was the first party, with our leader, to call for a public inquiry. Tonight, we are the ones leading this discussion. We need this because we are in a situation where we have just gotten allegations, which I think are explosive, that a sitting member of Parliament may have advised a senior Chinese official over the illegal detention, the hostage-taking, of Michael Kovrig and Michael Spavor, whom we know as “the two Michaels”.

The hostage-taking of those two men was a real line that was crossed in this new century in terms of the breakdown of international order and international law. It was incumbent upon all of us, regardless of party, to put the interests of those men and their families first.

I know the member who has been accused. I have sat with him on committee. I am not here to say whether those allegations are true. However, I am saying they are so explosive that the Prime Minister must respond. One of the ways he can respond now is by following the New Democrat call for a public inquiry to restore confidence.

I am not confident that addressing this in just a parliamentary committee is enough. We are also dealing with serious state secret issues. A lot of this comes through what CSIS is going to tell us. Quite frankly, I do not trust the Conservative leader with this kind of information anymore because I see the tactics that he has brought forward.

I blame the Prime Minister for delaying, obfuscating, not addressing the seriousness of this issue and undermining public confidence. However, I think it is equally dangerous to use the tactic of character assassination and smear, as well as trashing anyone who stands in the way of the Conservative agenda on this. Knowing what they are doing, I would certainly never be comfortable knowing that state secrets could be brought to a committee. They can say what they want about David Johnston or the decision of the Prime Minister, in terms of whether it was right or wrong to appoint a special rapporteur, but shame on Conservatives who trashed the reputation of a former governor general. This is a man who was appointed by Stephen Harper and who serves his country with dignity. He deserves better than this kind of smear.

I do not think I will ever be invited to a Trudeau Foundation dinner; I would be very surprised if I were. However, when we have institutions that actually serve the public, it is not acceptable to decide to try and smear them as though they are some kind of Chinese, communist-run foundation of friends and pals. That is ignorant. I disagree with the Prime Minister on most things, but I would never stoop so low as to say that he is some kind of paid stooge for a foreign government. However, that is the language that comes from the leader of the Conservative Party, and that is dangerous because it undermines confidence.

The first time I was called a “traitor”, I thought it was a joke because I serve my country with dignity. However, I realized language like calling people “traitors” and “enemies” is now part of the Conservatives’ discourse. This is why we have death threats in this country. There are disinformation reports from the World Economic Forum. We have to rise above this.

● (1945)

There was a time when the Parliament of Canada would have been shocked and appalled that any member would have partied with an extreme right neo-Nazi German extremist, like Christine Anderson. However, she is a folk hero to many on that side. There was a time when any Conservative leader who knew that their members were cavorting with extreme-right German extremist groups would have drawn a line, but that does not happen anymore.

We are in a situation where we are moving further away from where we need to be as an institution that reassures faith in the public that they can trust not only that our elections are completely protected and the rights of citizens are protected, but also that public institutions serve the public interest and that the people we elect to serve are doing it with a belief that public service is a public good. We have to get back there.

When we look at the situation before us, with the allegations of foreign interference, we know that there were serious questions during the convoy about Russian disinformation, proxy sites and the use of RT. It favoured certain political interests in this country, because it was undermining the present government, but there were serious questions about Russian disinformation in the convoy scandal.

We need to make sure that we have the tools to examine if this is interfering with how our democracy operates. The situation of allegations of potential interference by Chinese state actors is also concerning for another profound reason. We see a rise of anti-Asian hate and anti-Asian violence in this country. We need to say very clearly, as parliamentarians, that we are not exploiting this situation for our own personal and political gain. We are deeply concerned, just as people in the Chinese community are concerned and just as people in the Iranian community or any other community would be concerned, about any potential foreign actors. This is why the Prime Minister needs to reassure the public that he understands this.

I respect David Johnston. I do not know if we needed him as a special rapporteur. The allegations that have come out tonight are very serious, and I think the Prime Minister must respond to those allegations. I think it is incumbent upon the Prime Minister to say that we have to take this out of the realm of the partisan monkey

Routine Proceedings

house, which this place has sometimes descended to in the last few days, and to put it in the hands of an independent inquiry that has the power to compel testimony, the power to gather documents and—

● (1950)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): It is my duty to interrupt the proceedings at this time and put forth with the question on the motion now before the House.

[*Translation*]

The question is on the motion.

[*English*]

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

The hon. member for North Island—Powell River.

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Madam Speaker, I would request a recorded division.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Pursuant to order made on Thursday, June 23, 2022, the division stands deferred until Thursday, March 23, at the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 1190, 1192, 1196 and 1200.

[*Text*]

Question No. 1190—**Mr. Kyle Seeback:**

With regard to the Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA) and the list of companies from Xinjiang which have been prohibited from importing goods into the United States under the Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act: (a) does CBSA currently allow imports from companies on the list into Canada; and (b) what is the volume and value of goods which entered Canada from companies on the list since January 1, 2020, broken down by month, company, and type of goods imported?

Ms. Pam Damoff (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to part (a), in Canada, the legislative authority for border services officers to give effect to the import prohibition of goods mined, manufactured or produced wholly or in part by forced labour is subsection 58(1) of the Customs Act, which is the authority to determine the tariff classification, together with tariff item 9897.00.00 of the customs tariff.

Unlike U.S. laws, the customs tariff does not provide authority to deem goods as prohibited prior to importation and without evidence. Nor does it provide for a company- or country-specific ban on goods having been mined, manufactured or produced with forced labour. Tariff classification determinations on imported goods are made on a case-by-case basis and are based on the available information at the time of importation. Goods are permitted entry if all import requirements are met, unless there is sufficient and appropriate information available to link each good with forced labour.

Routine Proceedings

The CBSA is responsible for the administration and enforcement of the customs tariff. The labour program of Employment and Social Development Canada, or ESDC, provides support for the forced labour import prohibition by conducting research and analysis on the risk of forced labour for specific complaints or allegations. The CBSA may use this information and other sources of information to identify and intercept shipments containing goods suspected of being produced by forced labour.

With regard to part (b), CBSA records are based on advanced shipment information required by the reporting of imported goods regulations. The data that importers are legally obligated to submit to CBSA when importing commercial goods does not provide CBSA with full traceability through an importer's supply chain. As such, while the CBSA has no records of imports by companies on the Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act, or UFLPA, entity list, the agency cannot definitively confirm that there have not been imported goods linked to the listed companies.

Question No. 1192—Ms. Melissa Lantsman:

With regard to Transport Canada and the shortage of commercial pilots: (a) what was the average processing time for each of the four categories of aviation medical certifications as of (i) January 1, 2020, (ii) January 1, 2022, (iii) July 1, 2022, (iv) January 1, 2023; (b) what was the number of pending medical certification applications, broken down by category, as of (i) January 1, 2020, (ii) January 1, 2022, (iii) July 1, 2022, (iv) January 1, 2023; (c) since January 1, 2020, how many medical certification applications in each of the four categories had a processing time of more than (i) 40 days, (ii) six months, (iii) one year; (d) what was the average processing time for Restricted Area Identity Cards (RAICs) as of (i) January 1, 2020, (ii) January 1, 2022, (iii) July 1, 2022, (iv) January 1, 2023; (e) what was the number of pending RAIC applications as of (i) January 1, 2020, (ii) January 1, 2022, (iii) July 1, 2022, (iv) January 1, 2023; (f) what is the normal processing time or standard for RAIC applications; and (g) of the pending RAIC applications on each of the dates in (e), how many applications took longer to process than the normal processing time or standard?

Hon. Omar Alghabra (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since information technology, IT, systems and hybridized processes, which involve a combination of paper and digital file processing, are currently being updated and modernized, Transport Canada is unable to provide the data requested with respect to the average processing time for medical certificate applications. The most recent data for aviation medical certificate applications received in January 2023 demonstrates that Transport Canada is currently reviewing eligible applications within the service delivery standard.

In January 2023, 75% of applications were for existing medical certificates that received immediate in-office renewal by medical examiners. An additional 17% of applications were for new medical certificates, and all were reviewed within the service delivery standard of 40 business days, with an average review time of nine to 14 business days depending on the region. The remaining files are complex medical files requiring additional review to determine whether the applicants meet the applicable medical standards to ensure aviation safety. These are not subject to the service delivery standard of 40 business days.

With respect to the backlog, IT systems began collecting data on the backlog of aviation medical certifications in July 2022. In July 2022, the backlog of aviation medical certificate applications awaiting processing was estimated at 5,000. As of February 6, 2023, Transport Canada estimates a backlog of approximately 5,600 aviation medical certificate applications that are awaiting processing.

However, the backlog is composed of medically complex applications requiring additional review to determine whether the applicants meet the applicable medical standards to ensure aviation safety. These are not subject to the service delivery standard of 40 business days. Category 4 applications are excluded from these totals as they are based on medical declarations, not medical examination reports. The service delivery target for category 4 certificates is 40 business days, and there is currently no backlog.

Transport Canada is working to improve its processes and ensure there are sufficient resources and staff to process aviation medical certificates in the most efficient manner possible to address the backlog. Notably, Transport Canada is digitalizing its processes by implementing an electronic medical examination review system to eliminate paper-based dependencies. Close to 90% of applications are now processed electronically. Applicants are encouraged to apply as early as possible for aviation medical certificates.

Any individual who requires unescorted access to the restricted areas of designated airports across Canada, such as pilots, must first obtain a transportation security clearance from Transport Canada. Transport Canada grants transportation security clearances to applicants who do not pose a risk to transportation security. A transportation security clearance is needed before a restricted area identity card can be issued and administered by airport authorities. Although restricted area identity cards are governed by Transport Canada regulatory requirements, which specify conditions for when and how they may be issued, used and cancelled, they are issued and administered by individual airport authorities.

Question No. 1196—Mr. Ted Falk:

With regard to the government's decision to spend \$90 million on 200 Senator Armoured Personnel Carriers to be donated to Ukraine: (a) was this contract sole-sourced or awarded through a competitive bidding process; (b) if the contract was sole-sourced, what was the rationale for not using a competitive bidding process; and (c) was theatre (combat) experience taken into account when awarding this contract, and, if so, how and why were these vehicles chosen over other Canadian-made vehicles that already have such experience?

Mr. Bryan May (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada has stood firmly with Ukraine and the Ukrainian people in the face of unwarranted Russian aggression as they fight to defend their sovereignty, freedom and independence.

Since February 2022, National Defence has committed or delivered over \$1 billion in military aid to Ukraine, including battle tanks, heavy artillery, body armour, gas masks, helmets, drone cameras, funding for high-resolution satellite imagery, anti-armour weapons systems, rocket launchers, small arms and ammunition, as well as other highly specialized pieces of military equipment. This amount includes the complete allocation of \$500 million in military support for Ukraine announced in budget 2022. More information about Canada's military support to Ukraine can be found at the following link: <https://www.canada.ca/en/department-national-defence/campaigns/canadian-military-support-to-ukraine.html>.

On January 18, 2023, the Minister of National Defence announced that Canada will donate 200 Senator armoured personnel carriers, or APCs, to Ukraine. The vehicles are being purchased from Roshel, a Canadian company based in Mississauga, Ontario. This package of military assistance responds to a Ukrainian request for these specific vehicles and builds upon Canada's donation of eight Roshel commercial pattern armoured vehicles in April 2022. Additional information on the contract for the additional 200 Roshel Senator vehicles can be found below.

With regard to part (a), the contract was sole-sourced, with the Canadian Commercial Corporation, or CCC, acting as the contracting authority.

With regard to parts (b) and (c), the Roshel Senator vehicles were specifically requested by the Government of Ukraine. The Armed Forces of Ukraine, or AFU, currently possess Roshel Senator vehicles in their fleet and have experience using these vehicles in theatre.

Question No. 1200—Mr. Gary Vidal:

With regard to Indigenous Services Canada and on-reserve schools: (a) what is the total number of (i) schools, (ii) teachers, (iii) students; (b) what are the training and educational requirements to become a certified teacher in these schools; and (c) what percentage of teachers have an undergraduate or higher degree in (i) education, (ii) another field?

Mr. Vance Badawey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indigenous Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, insofar as Indigenous Services Canada, or ISC, is concerned, the response is as follows.

With regard to part (a)(i), ISC provides funding to 450 elementary and secondary schools on reserves across Canada, including seven federally administered schools. Federally administered schools are community-run but under federal responsibility, and teachers and the education director are federal public servants. There are six in Ontario and one in Alberta.

With regard to part (a)(ii), as of March 31, 2022, 4,433 teachers were reported by first nations and/or organizations designated by first nations to deliver elementary and secondary education programming. Please note that this field is not mandatory and may not include information on all teachers. In support of first nations control of first nations education, first nations are best placed to respond to specific questions regarding the teachers employed within schools.

With regard to part (a)(iii), there are 75,228 students.

Routine Proceedings

With regard to parts (b) and (c), in support of first nations control of first nations education, first nations operate and manage first nations schools on reserve, including the hiring of teachers and subsequent validation of their credentials. First nations are best placed to respond to specific questions regarding the teachers employed within schools. Please note that teacher certification requirements will vary between provinces.

* * *

[English]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, furthermore, if the government's response to Questions Nos. 1191, 1193 to 1195, 1197 to 1199 and 1201 to 1206 could be made orders for return, these returns would be tabled immediately.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Text]

Question No. 1191—Mr. Kyle Seeback:

With regard to government contracts with entities prohibited from importing goods into the United States under the Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act in the United States: (a) since January 1, 2016, has any department, agency, Crown corporation or other government entity purchased any goods from the (i) Baoding LYSZD Trade and Business Co., Ltd., (ii) Changji Esquel Textile Co. Ltd. (and one alias: Changji Yida Textile), (iii) Hetian Haolin Hair Accessories Co. Ltd. (and two aliases: Hotan Haolin Hair Accessories; and Hollin Hair Accessories), (iv) Hetian Taida Apparel Co., Ltd (and one alias: Hetian TEDA Garment), (v) Hoshine Silicon Industry (Shanshan) Co., Ltd (including one alias: Hesheng Silicon Industry (Shanshan) Co.) and subsidiaries, (vi) Xinjiang Daqo New Energy, Co. Ltd (including three aliases: Xinjiang Great New Energy Co., Ltd.; Xinjiang Daxin Energy Co., Ltd.; and Xinjiang Daqin Energy Co., Ltd.), (vii) Xinjiang East Hope Nonferrous Metals Co. Ltd. (including one alias: Xinjiang Nonferrous), (viii) Xinjiang GCL New Energy Material Technology, Co. Ltd (including one alias: Xinjiang GCL New Energy Materials Technology Co.), (ix) Xinjiang Junggar Cotton and Linen Co., Ltd., (x) Xinjiang Production and Construction Corps (including three aliases: XPCC; Xinjiang Corps; and Bingtuan) and its subordinate and affiliated entities, (xi) Aksu Huafu Textiles Co. (including two aliases: Akesu Huafu and Aksu Huafu Dyed Melange Yarn), (xii) Hefei Bitland Information Technology Co., Ltd. (including three aliases: Anhui Hefei Baolongda Information Technology; Hefei Baolongda Information Technology Co., Ltd.; and Hefei Bitland Optoelectronic Technology Co., Ltd.), (xiii) Hefei Meiling Co. Ltd. (including one alias: Hefei Meiling Group Holdings Limited), (xiv) KTK Group (including three aliases: Jiangsu Jinchuang Group; Jiangsu Jinchuang Holding Group; and KTK Holding), (xv) Lop County Hair Product Industrial Park, (xvi) Lop County Meixin Hair Products Co., Ltd., (xvii) Nanjing Synergy Textiles Co., Ltd. (including two aliases: Nanjing Xinyi Cotton Textile Printing and Dyeing; and Nanjing Xinyi Cotton Textile), (xviii) No. 4 Vocation Skills Education Training Center (VSETC), (xix) Tanyuan Technology Co. Ltd. (including five aliases: Carbon Yuan Technology; Changzhou Carbon Yuan Technology Development; Carbon Element Technology; Jiangsu Carbon Element Technology; and Tanyuan Technology Development), (xx) Xinjiang Production and Construction Corps (XPCC) and its subordinate and affiliated entities, (xxi) Baoding LYSZD Trade and Business Co., Ltd., (xxii) Hefei Bitland Information Technology Co. Ltd., (xxiii) Hetian Haolin Hair Accessories Co. Ltd., (xxiv) Hetian Taida Apparel Co., Ltd., (xxv) Hoshine Silicon Industry (Shanshan) Co., Ltd., and Subsidiaries, (xxvi) Xinjiang Junggar Cotton and Linen Co., Ltd., (xxvii) Lop County Hair Product Industrial Park, (xxviii) Lop County Meixin Hair Products Co., Ltd., (xxix) Xinjiang Production and Construction Corps (XPCC) and its subordinate and affiliated entities, (xxx) Yili Zhuowan Garment Manufacturing Co., Ltd.; and (b) if the answer to any part of (a) is affirmative, what are the details of the contract, including the (i) date, (ii) vendor, (iii) amount, (iv) description of goods or services?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 1193—Mr. Blake Richards:**

With regard to Veterans Affairs Canada (VAC): (a) what are the details of all funding agreements VAC has, or has had, in place with the Canadian Virtual Hospice since January 1, 2020; (b) what are the details of any projects funded, in whole, or in part, with the Canadian Virtual Hospice, including, for each, the (i) project description, (ii) purpose of the project, (iii) amount of federal contribution; and (c) has VAC sent or received any correspondence or communication to or from the Canadian Virtual Hospice related to medical assistance in dying and, if so, what are the details of such correspondence or communication, including the (i) date, (ii) title, (iii) type of communication, (iv) sender, (v) recipient, (vi) summary of contents?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1194—Mr. Rick Perkins:

With regard to government contracts on professional and special services which were signed since January 1, 2016, and that have a value greater than one million dollars: what are the details of all such contracts, including (i) the contract start and end dates, (ii) the vendor, (iii), the value, (iv) the description of work completed, (v) whether the contract was sole-sourced or awarded through a competitive bidding process, (vi) the reason the work was unable to be completed using existing public service resources?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1195—Mr. Rick Perkins:

With regard to contracts entered into by the government where the vendor did not meet its contractual obligations, since January 1, 2019: what are the details of all such instances, including, for each contract, the (i) date, (ii) vendor, (iii) value, (iv) description of goods or services agreed to in the contract, (v) part of the contractual obligation which the vendor did not meet, (vi) corrective action taken, (vii) amount recovered by the government, if any?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1197—Mr. Don Davies:

With regard to the government's contract with the Pacific Gateway Hotel in Richmond, British Columbia, for the provision of quarantine facilities and accommodations during the COVID-19 pandemic: (a) on what date was the contract signed; (b) what was the end date for the contract; (c) what was the rationale for awarding the contract; (d) how much has the government paid to date for all services provided by this site, broken down by type of cost (meals, security, etc.) and total cost per year; (e) what are the details of any other costs associated with the provision of quarantine facilities and accommodations at this site, including, for each, the (i) vendor, (ii) amount paid by the government, (iii) description of goods or services; (f) how many people elected to use this facility as a designated quarantine facility, broken down by total users per month and year; (g) is the government contractually required to continue paying for any services at this site following the end of pandemic restrictions, and, if so, what are the details, including amounts of any such required payments; and (h) has the government had to pay this site for any other cost related to the contract, such as damages, upkeep, or renovations, and, if so, what are the details, including dates and amounts of all such costs?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1198—Ms. Lianne Rood:

With regard to funding applications submitted to the Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario, broken down by fiscal year from 2019-20 to 2021-22 and by region: (a) how many applications were submitted; (b) what proportion of applications were submitted by small businesses; and (c) what was the success rate of applications submitted by small businesses?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1199—Ms. Lianne Rood:

With regard to the Regional Relief and Recovery Fund in Ontario, broken down by fiscal year since 2020-21: (a) what are the (i) names of the applicants, (ii) purpose of the projects, (iii) amounts of funding requested, (iv) amounts of funding approved, for all projects funded through the Regional Relief and Recovery Fund; (b) what percentage of projects benefited not-for-profit organizations; and (c) what percentage of projects funded were specifically designed to aid in economic recovery for individuals identifying as (i) Indigenous, (ii) LGBTQ2S+, (iii) racialized Canadians?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1201—Mr. Dan Mazier:

With regard to the statement in the government response to Order Paper question Q-965 that "93.5% of Canadians have access to high-speed Internet, or are targeted to receive access through program commitments": (a) what is the breakdown of the percentage of Canadians who (i) currently have access to high-speed internet, (ii) do not currently have access, but are targeted to receive access through program commitments; and (b) what is the breakdown of (a) in (i) rural areas, (ii) northern areas, (iii) First Nation reserve areas, (iv) each province and territory?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1202—Mr. Tony Baldinelli:

With regard to Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada (IRCC) transferring refugees to Niagara Falls, Ontario, from the province of Quebec: (a) when was the first transfer of refugees from Quebec to Niagara Falls; (b) since the date of the first transfer, how many refugees have been transferred from Quebec to Niagara Falls in total; (c) what is the monthly breakdown of the number of refugee transfers from Quebec to Niagara Falls; (d) which hotels is the government using to lodge refugees in Niagara Falls; (e) how many hotel rooms are currently being occupied by refugees in Niagara Falls; (f) what is the capacity of each hotel room that is being occupied by refugees in Niagara Falls; (g) how many refugees are staying in each hotel room in Niagara Falls; (h) what is the average length of time IRCC expects (i) an individual refugee, (ii) a refugee family, to be lodged in a Niagara Falls hotel room; (i) for all refugees being lodged in government funded Niagara Falls hotel rooms, and without identifying names or other personal information, how many days has each refugee stayed; (j) what is the average cost per night that IRCC pays per refugee for staying in a Niagara Falls room; (k) for the night of February 1, 2023, what was the total cost IRCC paid hoteliers to house refugees located in Niagara Falls; (l) what is the average cost that IRCC pays per refugee who lives in a Niagara Falls hotel room for daily meals and refreshments; (m) for the day of February 1, 2023, what was the total cost IRCC paid hoteliers to feed refugees located in Niagara Falls; (n) what are the countries of origin for refugees who have been transferred from Quebec to Niagara Falls; (o) how many refugees come from each country of origin; (p) how many funds have been transferred by the federal government to the municipality of Niagara Falls to deal with the influx of refugees in the city; (q) how many funds have been transferred by the federal government to the Region of Niagara to deal with the influx of refugees in the region; (r) how many funds have been transferred by the federal government to local not-for-profit, charitable, and non-governmental organizations in Niagara Falls to deal with the influx of refugees in the city; (s) what are the names of the specific not-for-profit, charitable, and non-governmental organizations who have received federal government funding; (t) what is the breakdown of funding for each organization to date; (u) how many more refugees does IRCC currently plan to transfer from Quebec to Niagara Falls; (v) since the IRCC began transferring refugees to Niagara Falls from Quebec, how many refugees have moved out of government funded hotel rooms in Niagara Falls and into personal accommodations; (w) when does the federal government plan to stop paying for refugee hotel rooms in Niagara Falls; and (x) what are the terms and conditions of the financial agreement that IRCC has with each hotelier located in Niagara Falls that houses refugees and receives federal monies to provide this service?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1203—Mr. Michael Barrett:

With regard to the Memorial to the Victims of Communism: (a) what specific work was done on the memorial between January 1, 2022, and February 1, 2023; (b) what is the monthly breakdown of (a); (c) is the 2023 target completion date stated in the government's response to Order Paper question Q-519 still accurate, and, if so, when in 2023 will the memorial be completed; and (d) if the 2023 target completion date has been delayed, what is the new target completion date and what is the reason for the delay?

(Return tabled)

Business of Supply

PETITIONS

HUMAN RIGHTS IN ALGERIA

Mr. Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Madam Speaker, it is in solidarity with the Kabyle and Algerian people that I table petitions 12158298 and 12245272.

Since December 2019, there has been a crackdown on Algerian citizens, specifically Kabyles, who have been arbitrarily arrested for publicly expressing their political opinions. Human rights organizations have identified more than 500 people unjustly imprisoned in Algeria on the basis of false allegations of membership in a terrorist organization, since the pacifist Movement for the Self-Determination of Kabylia was wrongfully declared as such by the current Algerian government.

The petitioners are calling on the Government of Canada to condemn this arbitrary situation in Algeria as well as the equally arbitrary arrests and convictions of these hundreds of prisoners of conscience, particularly Kabyles, who are unjustly languishing in prison.

In closing, I want to congratulate Mr. Rachid Bandou, who officially started this petition.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1955)

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—TAX INCREASE ON BEER, WINE AND SPIRITS

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC) moved:

That, given that,

- (i) the Liberal government is increasing taxes on beer, wine and spirits by 6.3% on April 1, 2023,
- (ii) this is the largest tax increase on alcohol in the last 40 years,
- (iii) the heads of eight different unions representing brewery workers across the country, who are nervous about their jobs, have written to the Minister of Finance calling for a freeze to the April 1, 2023 tax increase on beer, citing "a freeze on federal beer taxes is the single most important thing you can do for our workers and their families",
- (iv) this tax increase will unfairly punish Canadians already struggling with increased costs due to 40-year inflation highs, and make it harder for Canadians to enjoy a drink after a long day's work, or while relaxing with friends or celebrating with their families,

He said: Madam Speaker, it is great to finally get to this motion, which is very timely because in just a few days, the Liberal government, supported by its coalition partners in the NDP, is going to raise taxes on enjoying a nice drink after a long, hard day's work or when celebrating something with family or visiting with friends. All that is going to be even more expensive.

I am very pleased to split my time with my hon colleague from Niagara Falls.

Question No. 1204—**Mr. Gérard Deltell:**

With regard to expenditures related to the government's participation in the Conference of the Parties (COP27) in Egypt, in November 2022: what is the breakdown of the \$1,077,126.40 spent on hotels and other accommodations, as referenced in the government's response to Order Paper question Q-1039, including (i) what hotels were used, (ii) how much was spent at each hotel, (iii) how many rooms were rented at each hotel and for how many nights, (iv) what was the room rate, or range of room rates, paid at each hotel, (v) how many different individuals' accommodations the \$1,077,126.40 covered?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1205—**Mr. Adam Chambers:**

With regard to phone lines paid for by the government, broken down by cellular line versus traditional landline, for each part of the question: (a) how many phone lines was the government paying for as of January 1, 2023; (b) how many of the phone lines are dormant; (c) how many of the phone lines are active but have not been used or have not had any activity in the last year; (d) how many of the phone lines are considered redundant; and (e) what was the total amount spent on phone lines during the 2022 calendar year, broken down by service provider?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1206—**Mr. Jeremy Patzer:**

With regard to the Canada Emergency Response Benefit (CERB): how many government employees were fired or terminated as a result of receiving CERB payments while also being employed by the government, broken down by department, agency, or other government entity?

(Return tabled)

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I ask that all remaining questions be allowed to stand at this time.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): 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.): Madam Speaker, I ask that all notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand at this time.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Beaulieu: Madam Speaker, I would ask for the unanimous consent of the House to present a petition.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Does the hon. member have unanimous consent to present his petition?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Business of Supply

I had a fairly lengthy speech prepared about this, but because the New Democrats, in order to cover up their shameful foot-dragging on forcing the Prime Minister's chief of staff to testify at committee in a desperate attempt to distract Canadians from what they were up to in backroom deals with their coalition partners, they have taken up a lot of time during the day. Therefore, I am actually going to cede the floor right now.

I know there is normally a question and comment period. I will not be able to stay for that, so we can move right on to the speech by my hon. colleague from Niagara Falls, who represents a lot of the hard-working grape growers and vintners, to finish with his remarks.

I would like to indicate that all Conservative members will be splitting their time throughout the rest of the debate today.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I am not sure if the member was speaking on the motion or if he had a point of order. I am a little unsure, because I thought he said he was splitting his time. If he was splitting his time, I do have a question for him.

● (2000)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member is going to leave the chamber, so there will not be time for questions and comments.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Niagara Falls.

Mr. Tony Baldinelli (Niagara Falls, CPC): Madam Speaker, Canadians work hard for their paycheques, and they earn every cent of their income. That is their money to spend or save as they see fit. It is not the government's money to take through tax-and-spend inflation. At least, that is the way we Conservatives see it, which is in stark contrast to the high-tax Liberal government, which craves more and more taxes to continue feeding and fuelling its record spending.

That is why today we Conservatives are calling on the Liberal government to cancel its massive 6.3% tax increase on beer, wine and spirits this April 1, to give relief to middle-class Canadians and those seeking to join them. Canadians do not want to be taxed more. They want to be taxed less.

Another frustrating element to this is that the Liberal government acknowledges and knows that the finances and personal savings of Canadians are under attack, but what it fails to acknowledge or realize is that it is the very driver of this problem and a big reason why Canadians are suffering. It is the big taxer and the reason why inflation remains far above the 2% target range the Bank of Canada is trying to achieve.

Even non-partisan experts have said that the government's policies have led to the inflationary problems we are facing today. Both the current and former governors of the Bank of Canada have recently spoken up. Last month, Tiff Macklem said, "inflation in Canada increasingly reflects what's happening in Canada", and Mark Carney said, "Really [now] inflation is principally a domestic story".

Also frustrating is the fact that this escalator tax is automatically set to increase every year without Parliament getting a vote. It is

undemocratic and unfair, particularly in respect to a matter of taxation. The power to stop this tax rests solely in the hands of the government, and Conservatives on this side of the aisle are demanding today that the government cancel this tax before it is hiked by 6.3% on April 1, which is just 10 days away.

Locally, across Niagara, this alcohol escalator tax will punish many wineries, craft breweries and distilleries, as well as anyone who enjoys consuming these wonderfully made Canadian products while visiting Niagara, which is the number one leisure tourism destination in all of Canada. Further, what many Canadians already know is that these alcoholic beverages are already taxed at incredibly high rates.

A January 2023 opinion piece, published by the St. Catharines Standard and penned by Franco Terrazzano, who is the federal director of the Canadian Taxpayers Federation, states, "Taxes already account for about half of the price of beer, 65 per cent of the price of wine and more than three-quarters of the price of spirits. You could spend about \$125 if you pick up two bottles of wine, a 24-pack of beer and a 26-ounce bottle of whisky" and more than \$76 of that would go to paying just the taxes. He continues, "In fact, Canadians pay so much tax that picking up a case of beer on the way to a party in Prince Edward Island would cost you more in taxes than the total retail price of a case of beer in 25 American states."

Members can think about that for a moment. Now the Liberal government is going to slap a new tax of 6.3% on top of all those taxes people are already paying for our expensive alcoholic products without any parliamentary approval. It is no wonder that, through these tax measures, the price of alcohol and meals in stores and restaurants is going up. As a result, the savings in our bank accounts are going down.

This does not take into account the negative aspects these tax policies are having on those hard-working Canadians who are employed in the hospitality sector, and those who work in the wineries, distilleries and breweries throughout our country.

A recent article published in the Toronto Star, by Manuela Vega, said it best when she reported, "Restaurants Canada, a national, not-for-profit association representing the country's food service industry is calling on the federal government to freeze the duty, saying in a tweet that 'the restaurant sector cannot absorb another federal tax increase at this vulnerable time.'"

● (2005)

Her article went on to highlight the comments from the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, which indicated, "It's time to freeze alcohol taxes to protect 150k Canadian jobs connected to making and selling beer." It is the government's job to create the conditions so businesses can flourish and generate the jobs, wealth and prosperity needed by Canadians to go about their daily lives, and to try to get ahead.

Business of Supply

Instead, after eight years of the Liberal government, Canadians pay more today for their goods and services, and they are getting less. Groceries, gas, home heating and more are getting more expensive by the day because of these reckless Liberal spending habits. There are direct consequences that come as a result of the Liberal government recklessly spending the cupboards bare.

Will the government be able to live up to the expectations it set out in its new federal tourism growth strategy? The tourism minister has spent the last several months asking the industry to think big on ideas to expedite economic recovery from the devastating impacts of COVID-19.

However, fear is now beginning to grow in the tourism community that the Liberal government is once again failing to understand that the industry is still in recovery mode. It appears that, once again, the Liberal government is setting itself up to over-promise and under-deliver. This is a great shame for tourism communities across the country, such as mine in Niagara, which welcomes visitors from throughout the world.

What is to happen to the wine sector support program, which was put in place because of the Liberal government's ineptitude on trade policy? The two-year, \$166-million program has ended. The industry has asked for it to be extended, yet there have been no updates about its renewal. Last year's budget showed that the government would raise \$390 million over five years in new revenue by now applying the excise tax to 100% Canadian-made wines. Where are those funds going?

After eight years of the Liberal government, Canadians' paycheques and life savings are under attack by the big, bloated and tired Liberal government, and its high taxes and reckless spending, which have only driven up inflation. After eight years of the Liberals' recklessness, Canadians have to work harder, work longer and even work multiple jobs just to take home lower earnings to get by.

After eight years of this disastrous Liberal government, Canadians could be forgiven for wanting to have a drink. On April 1, it will be 6.3% more expensive. Canadians do not want another big Liberal tax. Canadians want change, and that starts with the House of Commons agreeing with our Conservative motion to cancel the Liberal government's April 1 tax increase on wine, beer and spirits.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am glad the member is still around for my question. I would—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member knows we do not mention the presence or absence of a member in the House.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, thank you for the corrective comment. I withdraw the comment.

I am really curious about something, given the Conservative appetite to ratchet up this particular issue. When was the first time the member opposite raised this issue with either the Minister of Finance, the Prime Minister or any minister of the government?

Mr. Tony Baldinelli: Madam Speaker, when I was elected, the first issue that I spoke to, and the first question I asked in the House of Commons, had to do with the WTO challenge that Australia brought about because of the escalator tax and its impact on the Canadian wine sector. The government failed to act. We told the government in 2017 not to act on putting forward that escalator tax. It did so, and it did so to the detriment of the Canadian wine sector. It is now paying the price.

● (2010)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Madam Speaker, this also affects the survival of our microbreweries. It is important to people living in Quebec as it affects the prosperity of our towns and villages. What are the members' thoughts on the survival of these microbreweries?

In the context of inflation, providing direct assistance might be more impactful than cutting the excise tax, which would do very little.

[*English*]

Mr. Tony Baldinelli: Madam Speaker, speaking about breweries, for example, Canadian brewers directly employ over 20,000 Canadian workers, many in unionized positions with an average compensation nearing \$40 per hour. That is according to Statistics Canada. What are we doing by putting disincentives to their products being sold and putting their jobs at jeopardy? That helps nobody. We want to create an environment that creates jobs.

Why is the government continuing to tax Canadians when they need relief?

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Madam Speaker, the member for Niagara Falls mentioned the wine industry and the impacts on it. Many wineries never had to pay an excise tax in Canada, but because of the actions of Australia and the WTO, Canada's government backed down and took away that exemption, and now those wineries suddenly have to pay a tax they never had a business case for.

I will let the member finish on that, because I know he can speak for hours on the subject, and he has maybe a minute or so. I would ask the member to please expand on that, because it really affects the wineries in my region as well.

Mr. Tony Baldinelli: Madam Speaker, my colleague and I may disagree on other politics, but the one thing we can agree is that 100% Canadian-made wines are to the benefit of everyone throughout this country.

Business of Supply

When the Conservatives were in power in 2006, they implemented an excise exemption for 100% Canadian-made wines. The sector grew from 300 wineries to over 700, employing 9,000 people. This new escalator tax puts those jobs at risk. The margins in the wine sector, as the member will know, are very slim. Why is the government putting those jobs at risk?

There is a replacement program. The government is going to be generating \$390 million because of this new excise tax being applied to Canadian wines, and the government cannot assure the industry that those funds are for it. What are they going to do? Where is that \$390 million going? That is what we want to know.

Mr. Robert Kitchen (Souris—Moose Mountain, CPC): Madam Speaker, I suspect my colleague from Niagara Falls, like the rest of us, has received hundreds to thousands of emails from his constituents about the tax coming into place as of April 1, and these escalating taxes are going to be on top of the carbon tax and on top of a tax upon a tax. In my riding, at the regional college, they are looking at doing a brewmaster program to further enhance this great industry.

I am wondering if my colleague would mention how his constituents are feeling about the huge impact this tax will have on them.

Mr. Tony Baldinelli: Madam Speaker, it is going to have a tremendous impact. I probably have the largest number of wineries and grape growers in the country, as well as the largest manufacturing plant in the country, with Arterra. Now I am just bragging, but I have a lot to brag about. I would like to thank—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): We will do the bragging at some other point. Right now, we have to resume debate.

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade.

Mr. Arif Virani (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade, Export Promotion, Small Business and Economic Development, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I appreciate contributing to this evening's debate, although we had a bit of a late start.

What is important about today's debate is that it is set in the context of basic issues about affordability, basic issues about rising costs and the cost of living, which is a challenge for families right around the country. It is no different for my riding of Parkdale—High Park and for the 337 other ridings around the country. People feel it every week when they are at the grocery store. It is difficult for many people, and we understand that. That is why we put in place a series of measures to make life more affordable for millions of Canadians.

Our focus on this side of the House throughout this rise in the cost of living has been on Canadians who need the help the most. It is no longer possible to help everyone in Canada, as we did during the pandemic, so we are seeking and have been pursuing, quite diligently, targeted measures. That is really critical, particularly in light of the situation we are facing with inflation, as it currently stands. Our capacity to spend is not unlimited, nor would it be prudent to

spend in an unlimited manner. What we are doing is trying to help those who need it the most.

Let me talk specifically about the nature of this evening's debate with regard to the excise duty on alcohol. Let us be very clear that we are not talking about an approximately 6.7% rise in the price of alcohol. What we are talking about is a rise in the excise duty. I can tell members what that translates into if we equate it to the price of a bottle of beer. I will say quite candidly that I am one of those purchasers of bottles of beer. Like many other members of this House, I appreciate a good bottle of beer, including from a microbrewery, such as Henderson's, from just outside my riding, such as Waterloo Dark, such as Upper Canada Lager, and the list goes on. When we translate what this means to a person like me, to a family like mine, to Canadians in this chamber and those watching our proceedings on this Wednesday evening, it translates to less than one cent per can of beer. It is less than one cent. In fact, it is 0.78¢, so not even one full cent per beer is what this price escalator reveals.

Why is it indexed in the manner it is? It is quite simple. We use this as a frequent tool to ensure that, as the cost of producing the goods we put taxation measures on changes and as the cost of living changes, so does the excise tax duty. There is a direct proportionality. That is the basic premise that we are dealing with.

I will be splitting my time with the member for Vaughan—Woodbridge, who is also a lover of finer things. I think he is more fond of wine. I am personally more fond of the great thing that comes from wheat and grain, including a good pint here and there, beer in particular. This is a good segue into wine, which is next in my speaking notes.

What we have been doing to support the sector is that we have implemented a wine sector support program, which provided up to \$166.2 million to Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada in 2022-23, as it will in the forthcoming fiscal year, to support wineries in adapting to ongoing and emerging challenges. Indeed, the member for Niagara Falls, with whom I serve on the Standing Committee on International Trade, is very fond of promoting, as he should, the excellent wines from the Niagara Region. We are supporting those wines from the Niagara Region.

Small and medium-sized brewers right now also benefit from the currently lower rate of excise duties on the first 75,000 hectolitres. One hectolitre is 100 litres, so that means, with my crude math, that one has to create 7.5 million litres before one hits the level of the higher excise duty applying. Just that simple feature of having a threshold that is hit at 75,000 hectolitres saved brewers up to \$851,000 per brewer in 2022. That is significant in terms of supports that are already in place.

What we have also done as a government is repeal the excise duty on non-alcoholic beer. One may be a designated driver or one may not feel the need for alcohol on a given evening or at a given weekend barbecue. Sometimes people pursue non-alcoholic beer. That is a great thing. We have a vibrant non-alcoholic beer industry. What we did is repeal the excise duty on that particular type of beer altogether on July 1, 2022, to encourage growth in that sector.

Business of Supply

What I also want to indicate today is that Canadians who are watching need to contextualize this discussion. When we talk about an escalator on the excise duty, when we talk about issues that relate to the cost of living, we have to put that in the context of what we are doing about the cost of living as the Government of Canada.

● (2015)

We are doing a great deal. The targeted measures that we have rolled out over the past several years are vast, and I am going to list some of them. We have implemented changes to the Canada workers benefit. That means eligible low-income and modest-income families can receive up to \$2,461 this year alone. Single Canadians, through the Canada workers benefit's improvement, without children, could get up to \$1,428. We have provided \$2.5 billion to 11 million Canadian individuals and families with low and modest incomes through the GST credit payment.

We are providing tax-free payments of up to \$650 per child per year. That is through a phenomenally popular program that covers dental expenses for kids under 12 through the Canada dental benefit, a program, among others, that the members of His Majesty's official opposition had the wisdom to vote against. That program alone has already helped 230,000 children with an aspect of their health care that was not covered previously, absent this new benefit that we have created.

We are offering a tax-free payment of \$500 to help low-income renters who are struggling with the cost of housing. My first remarks in the context of this evening's debate were about helping those who need it the most. Our view is that people who already receive the Canada housing benefit are among the lowest-income Canadians who are struggling with the cost of housing and with affording their rent. They are precisely the people who need our help the most, and that is what we have been doing with that top-up. There have been 625,000 applications received for that top-up to the Canada housing benefit, demonstrating the acute need that exists in the economy at present.

We have heard the official opposition rightfully raise the issue of seniors on many occasions. Seniors and seniors in poverty deserve our assistance and they deserve it in a targeted manner. What we did is put a 10% increase on old age security payments for seniors who are 75 or older. That provides over \$800 in additional support to full pensioners in their first 12 months.

Thanks to our agreements with provinces and territories, we are reducing child care fees. This is actually quite incredible. I believe the mover of this motion is from the province of Alberta. In his province, fees have already been reduced by 50%, ahead of schedule. By 2026, our Canada-wide early learning and child care plan will bring fees for regulated child care down to \$10 a day on average from coast to coast to coast. In fact, the \$10-a-day goal has already been achieved by some provinces that were early adopters of our plan. Unfortunately, I cannot say the same for my own province of Ontario, which was the very last adopter of this plan. We will not realize the benefits of \$10-a-day child care in Ontario as fast as we could have, had there been a bit more earnestness on the part of Premier Ford, but I will leave that discussion for another day.

In terms of the province of the mover of this motion, Alberta, the savings already in effect will be an estimated \$8,610 on average per

child, per year, for my friend's constituents. If we compare the magnitude of that kind of savings with 0.78¢ per can of beer, I think members can appreciate the priority we are placing and where we are placing it, in terms of Canadians and their true needs. Canadians are facing challenges; there is no doubt.

In these final two minutes, what I would say is that improvements have been occurring. Last month alone, 22,000 jobs were created, more than double what was expected. More than 20 million Canadians now have jobs. That is 830,000 more Canadians employed than prior to the COVID-19 pandemic; 126% of the jobs that were lost since the peak of the pandemic have now been recovered. On average, wages have increased 5%. For women, age 25 to 54, the participation rate is now at an all-time high of 85.7%. I will draw a direct linkage between that statistic and the child care policy that I just outlined. By empowering affordable child care, we unlock the potential of women to fully participate in the economy. That is a critical initiative. That is a gender-focused initiative. That is a feminist initiative. That is an initiative I am proud to stand by.

In this final minute, what I will say is that Canadians are here, and on all sides of the House. We promote our wine and our beer industry. It is vital to job growth in this country. It is a vitally proud industry for Canadians of all stripes, from all political backgrounds. What we are not debating is support for that sector. What we are debating is the impact of the excise duty escalator. What I would say to Canadians who are watching tonight is that, yes, the price will go up by 0.78¢, less than one cent per can of beer, but what we are doing is addressing the costs of Canadians by the acute measures that I have outlined. That is important and I think we should all raise a toast to just that kind of initiative.

● (2020)

Mr. Tony Baldinelli (Niagara Falls, CPC): Madam Speaker, when my colleague talks about the jobs that the government has created, he fails to recognize the impact of COVID on tourism and hospitality communities such as Niagara. During COVID, 40,000 people almost immediately lost their jobs. The sector is still struggling to recover, and regressive tax policies such as the escalator tax are preventing people from getting their full employment back. The impacts on restaurants are staggering, preventing restaurant owners from hiring those people back.

How would he comment on that?

Mr. Arif Virani: Madam Speaker, again, I highlight the member's advocacy for his sector of Niagara and the tourism that takes place there. It is critical to the Canadian economy, to the Ontario economy and to the region of Niagara.

Business of Supply

What I would put to him quite simply is that the issues I hear about in Niagara, from the tourism sector, do relate to acute shortages, but they are not tracing those acute labour shortages in the sector to the excise duty escalator. The 0.78¢ per beer is not directly impacting the industries he is advocating for. What is affecting them is things like the pandemic itself and things like acute labour shortages, people rethinking where they want to work and how they want to work.

The ways we can address that are by encouraging more of the policies that are helping get people back to work, including through immigration, which we are strongly advocating for.

• (2025)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille (Salaberry—Suroît, BQ): Madam Speaker, I want to respond to the speech by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for International Trade by focusing specifically on the excise tax issue as it relates to small producers of currant wine or pear cider. As we speak, these producers pay an excise tax that is completely unjustified. Their production is so small that they cannot compete internationally and thus are unfairly taxed.

Quebec has an abundance of artisanal producers who make alcoholic wines or ciders from berries. I am asking my colleague opposite, who sits at the decision-making table, if he will take the opportunity before the next budget to present to the minister the idea of exempting producers of pear cider or berry wines, who currently pay an excise tax.

Thanks to the efforts of the member for Joliette on the last budget, we succeeded in exempting producers of mead and apple cider from the excise tax. Unfortunately, we have not had the time to get to other fruit producers—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I must allow some time for the hon. parliamentary secretary to respond.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Arif Virani: Madam Speaker, Blanche de Chambly comes to mind and its version with blueberries from the Saguenay region. It is important to support industries like microbreweries in Quebec and across Canada.

As I mentioned in my speech, with the excise duties currently in place, the cap is 65,000 hectolitres, so we already have a system in place that benefits microbreweries. What needs to be studied is the issue of fruit in our alcoholic beverages.

[*English*]

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Madam Speaker, I will just point out quickly, and I may be answering the previous question for him, that I do not think cideries and alcoholic beverages made from berries pay excise tax. That is my understanding.

I would like to ask the parliamentary secretary what the government will be doing to make the excise tax writ large more fair for Canadians who have to compete with American companies, which have a much lower excise tax? Especially for small producers,

small distilleries and breweries, it really puts them out of the market in terms of competition with those companies.

Mr. Arif Virani: Madam Speaker, I appreciate the question from my colleague, who also sits on the trade committee with me.

What I would say to him, quite directly, is that we are ensuring that our Canadian micro producers, whether that is for beer or wine from his region, etc., are competitive vis-à-vis their American counterparts, ensuring, first, that the quality of the product they are producing is competitive, and second, that the taxation system does not disadvantage them.

That is something we have been advocating for, and that is something we will continue to advocate for.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Francesco Sorbara (Vaughan—Woodbridge, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak to our country's economic situation. Our government understands that many Canadians are struggling to make ends meet during this period of high inflation. Fortunately, inflation in Canada has been slowly declining recently. The OECD expects inflation to return to its target level by the end of 2024. Inflation in Canada was 8.1% in June 2022. It has since fallen to 5.2% in February.

[*English*]

Canadian inflation is still too high, but it is lower than what we see in many peer economies. It is going in the right direction, and going lower. For example, it is 8.5% in the European Union, and 10.1% in the United Kingdom. In fact, as we continue navigating through these difficult times, our country is faring much better than most other G7 countries. Canada is facing the same global economic headwinds from a position of fundamental economic strength, a sound fiscal balance sheet, an AAA credit rating, and an unemployment rate at a very low level.

• (2030)

The facts speak for themselves. Our government made targeted investments to support Canadians and our economy through the pandemic, and these efforts are paying off. Last week, it was great to see the announcement by Volkswagen, which is bringing literally tens of thousands of jobs here to the province of Ontario and benefiting Canadians from coast to coast to coast.

As a result of our government's leadership, Canada has experienced a strong rebound from the pandemic recession, with a 3%-plus growth rate in 2022, which is one of the strongest in the G7. On top of that, we continue to see the strongest increase in real disposable income in the G7.

[*Translation*]

In addition, the more than 170,000 jobs created in January and February and a historically low unemployment rate of 5% clearly demonstrate the resilience of the Canadian economy.

However, we recognize that many Canadians are struggling to make ends meet. Canadians are feeling the consequences of high inflation when they go grocery shopping, fill up their gas tank or pay their rent or mortgage.

Business of Supply

Unfortunately, we can no longer help everyone, as we did during the pandemic. That said, our government has put measures in place to continue to help those who really need it.

[*English*]

We will help those most impacted by inflation.

With regard to the excise duty on alcohol, when it comes in inflationary adjustments to the excise duty rates on beer or wine, I would like to reassure my colleagues that they do not generally represent an increase in real dollar terms. They broadly preserve the effectiveness of these excise duty rates over time and generally ensure rates stay constant relative to the product on which they are levied.

[*Translation*]

Our government recognizes the important contribution that Canada's wineries, breweries, cideries and distilleries make to the national economy through job creation and the sale of high-quality products.

That is why the government implemented the wine sector support program, which is providing up to \$166.2 million to agriculture and agri-food in the 2022-23 and 2023-24 fiscal years. This will help wineries adapt to current and emerging challenges.

Canadian small and medium-sized brewers currently benefit from reduced excise tax rates on the first 75,000 hectolitres of beer produced per year. This has provided support of up to \$851,350 per brewer in 2022.

[*English*]

The government also repealed the excise duty on non-alcoholic beer starting on July 1, 2022, to encourage growth in this sector of the beer industry.

For the Canadians who need it the most, those most vulnerable, those most impacted by rising prices or inflation and those who feel the bite of rising prices most acutely, our government is there with inflation-relief measures. For example, we provided a one-time \$500 payment to Canadian low-income renters through the Canada housing benefit.

We cut regulated child care fees by 50%, on average, across the land. Here in Ontario, day care fees have come down 52.7%, representing up to \$6,000 or \$7,000 of real before-tax savings for families in Ontario in some instances. Those are hard-earned dollars that stay in the pockets of Ontario families, and our government led the charge on this. We collaborated and worked with all the provinces, and we got it done. It is helping Canadian families not only here in Ontario but across Canada.

We have also doubled the GST credit for six months. This measure alone provided \$2.5 billion in additional targeted support to the roughly 11 million individuals and families who already receive the credit. This includes the more than half of those receiving the benefit who are Canadian seniors.

We enhanced the Canada workers benefit to put an additional \$2,400 into the pockets of low- and modest-income families.

• (2035)

[*Translation*]

We are also brining in the Canada dental benefit, which provides parents with children under the age of 12 who do not have access to dental insurance with direct payments of up to \$650 per year, for a total of \$1,300 per child over the next two years for dental care. It is estimated that 500,000 Canadian children will benefit from this targeted investment of \$938 million.

These are just a few examples of what our government is doing to help Canadian families from coast to coast. However, we understand that our spending capacity is not infinite and that it is important that we continue to pursue a tight fiscal policy. The measures we are implementing to help Canadians are not adding fuel to the fire of inflation. They are simply providing targeted and fiscally responsible assistance to those who need it most.

[*English*]

The Deputy Prime Minister reaffirmed the government's commitment to presenting prudent fiscal management ahead of budget 2023 at a recent meeting with chief economists for the major Canadian financial institutions. Canada has the lowest deficit and net debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7, maintaining our AAA credit rating through the COVID pandemic, and we are going strongly for the future.

We also committed to \$9 billion in savings from a government spending review in the 2022 budget. According to a recent OECD survey, Canada's net debt-to-GDP ratio is well below the average for the OECD, the European Union and the United States. This continued track record of fiscal strength has allowed the government to continue providing necessary targeted economic support to those who need it the most: those most impacted by the inflationary period that Canada went through and is still going through, but which is receding.

In conclusion, Canada's economy is performing relatively well compared with the economies of our G7 peers, and there are good reasons for optimism. However, our government understands that many Canadians still need some support to get through these difficult times. That is why we will continue providing inflation relief to Canadians who need it the most and are the most vulnerable, for example, those who are most exposed to inflation and those on fixed incomes. We will continue doing so in a targeted, fiscally responsible way. The last thing we want is to make inflation worse. We are making life more affordable for Canadians while continuing to build an economy that works for everyone, helps the middle class and helps those working hard to join the middle class.

As we prepare for budget 2023, we also understand the need for further investments to create good jobs for Canadians to ensure that Canada remains a competitive place to do business, particularly in light of the U.S. inflation reduction act.

Business of Supply

The Global Automakers were here this evening. I sponsored that event. It was great to see the representatives from Volkswagen there. Obviously, we congratulated them and I congratulated them on choosing Canada for their first North American battery plant. It is a plant for the future and creating thousands of jobs.

[Translation]

As the global economy undergoes the most significant transformation since the industrial revolution, Canada cannot be left behind. That is why we will continue to work tirelessly to create more high-quality jobs, invest in our communities and build a more prosperous Canada for future generations. We are preparing measures that will give Canada the tools it needs to succeed.

[English]

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Madam Speaker, I appreciate our colleague across the way, but I do not think that he understands that every time they raise the costs for small business owners of doing business, there is a direct impact. Restaurants Canada has said that this tax increase would cost individual restaurants more than \$30,000 per year on average. That is one staff member. That is a full-time equivalent or maybe a couple of part-time employees. These small business owners are going to have to make decisions on whether they hire students or more staff. These tax increases cost small business owners.

They are so out of touch. Has this colleague ever run a small business? Does he understand that small business owners are now making decisions on whether they are going to keep the doors open or they are going to close? A tax increase of this magnitude is not just a cent on one can of beer; it has a very real human cost—

• (2040)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Vaughan—Woodbridge.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Madam Speaker, it is great to see the hon. member for Cariboo—Prince George in the House. I know that area of the world very well, and it is great to see my friend.

The over 18,000 small businesses that exist in the city of Vaughan have no greater champion than I, as their member of Parliament for the last seven years and before then. My relationship with the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, Restaurants Canada and all those stakeholders that the member mentioned is second to none. I have been a vocal champion for them. I have one of the largest wineries and winery operators in my riding. I meet with them regularly. I know the issues well. I chair the wine caucus here in Ottawa, and I continue to advocate for the issues that impact all sectors of the economy, especially the one—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I have to go to questions.

The hon. member for Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques.

[Translation]

Mr. Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am very proud to represent the people of Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, but I am most proud of their expertise. I am proud of

those individuals and entrepreneurs who are successful and who contribute to my region's economic development. Specifically, I am talking about the people who make beer, so microbreweries and microdistilleries.

The motion we are discussing today mentions this sector. We are talking about people who get up every morning to grow our regional economy, develop their expertise and know-how and put our beautiful region on the map.

Currently, we have a government that, despite the current context of inflation, intends to increase taxes on their products. That in the very antithesis of what the government claims to be doing, which is helping those who really need it.

I invite my colleague from Vaughan—Woodbridge to call alcohol producers in his neck of the woods, specifically microdistillers and microbrewers, and ask them whether they agree with the excise tax increase. After talking to my constituents, I can say that they are totally—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I must give the member a chance to respond.

The hon. member for Vaughan—Woodbridge.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his question. It is very important to talk about the people who get up every morning and do that job.

[English]

Those entrepreneurs who have actually made a success of our wine, craft brews and beer sectors in Canada and those individuals who created the wineries, whether in Quebec, Nova Scotia or in southern Ontario in the Niagara area, are individuals who took risks, created jobs and created wealth. I applaud them, and I will always advocate for them. One of the reasons I ran for office was to ensure that we have a strong economy, because we know that the economy we inherited from the Conservatives was not going anywhere. We turned it around, and we are going full steam ahead.

Ms. Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): *Uqaqtittiji*, many other MPs have discussed beer distilleries in their ridings; Nunavut has one as well, NuBrewCo. This is a brewing company in Iqaluit, and it is already taxed territorially. I am concerned that this small distillery in Iqaluit will be impacted heavily by the taxes that are being proposed, and as such, I will be supporting the Conservative motion.

Can the member talk about how the government will make sure that small distilleries like NuBrewCo will continue to get the federal support needed to keep operating?

Business of Supply

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Madam Speaker, I know that our small business minister, the member for Markham—Thornhill, and the parliamentary secretary are working very hard to grow our small businesses. I encourage the member for Nunavut to reach out to these two individuals and me. We will obviously assist in any way possible. We will ensure that small brewers, big brewers and our wine and beer industry across Canada continue to grow, continue to foster and—

● (2045)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Continuing debate, the hon. member for Joliette.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ): Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the hon. member for Abitibi—Témiscamingue.

As members know, unlike sales tax, which represents a percentage of the value of a product, the excise tax on alcohol is a fixed amount by volume as set out in the Excise Tax Act. Traditionally, that amount was occasionally reviewed and adjusted to inflation through an amendment to the act. However, since 2017, the act has included an automatic indexing formula, which means that the amount of the excise tax goes up every year based on inflation. That is why the excise tax on alcohol is going to increase by 6.3% on April 1 to reflect the high level of inflation we have seen over the past year.

Today's motion will not actually have a very big impact. We are talking about 1¢ per can of beer. This motion is not a real response to the increased inflation that is driving up the price of food in particular. This is a clear example of the populism of the Conservatives who are more interested in coming up with gimmicky slogans than they are in developing serious public policy.

Furthermore, when it comes to beer, only large breweries will benefit from the adoption of today's motion. Given that microbreweries only pay a fraction of the excise tax, they will benefit far less from a freeze on the tax rate. Of the 1,200 breweries in Canada, including the more than 300 in Quebec, only 12 pay the full amount of the excise tax on the majority of their production. Most of these 12 breweries are owned by foreign multinationals.

The decision to apply a different tax rate to microbreweries, the artisans who are passionate about agri-food living in every region, was implemented in the 2006 budget after the Bloc Québécois advocated for it for years. The Bloc Québécois has been fighting for our microbreweries for a long time. That decision would give them the opportunity to compete against the giants of the industry, whose production costs are much lower thanks to economies of scale. Since the implementation of the preferential rate, the number of microbreweries has skyrocketed and increased eightfold to our great pleasure. For a small artisanal microbrewery, indexing the amount of the excise tax might only represent a 0.1¢ or 0.2¢ increase per can. We are talking about that very small amount today. This means that when we buy a 12-pack of beer, we would pay an additional amount of just a little over 1¢.

In budget implementation Bill C-19 from spring 2022, the Bloc Québécois managed to extend to cider and mead producers the

same support that had been extended to microbreweries 15 years ago. They are now completely exempt from the excise tax. Our support for small local producers is not limited to microbreweries. Unfortunately, since the government has a very restrictive definition of cider and mead, the producers who flavour their products with berries and aromatics continue to pay the tax. That is something we really hope to see resolved in the next budget, just like the application of the tax on wine made from other fruit such as pears, blueberries or even maple, which showcases our land. They should be treated the same way as our apple cider producers.

For hard alcohol, we are talking about an increase of roughly 25¢ for a 750-millilitre bottle. Again, we are not talking about a catastrophic increase, but it adds to the overall price increases.

With respect to spirits, frankly, the Bloc Québécois would have preferred that the Conservatives propose applying to microdistilleries the model that is already in place for microbreweries and impose only a fraction of the tax that is required of the industry giants. That would have a much greater impact. It would come down to about \$3 per bottle rather than the meagre 25¢ that is being discussed today, but it would apply only to our small local producers. We hope the government listens carefully to what the Bloc Québécois is saying and will take it into account in its budget next Tuesday.

Our small producers are suffering, struggling to compete with the industry giants. As I said before, they would benefit greatly from a more targeted measure. Unfortunately, that is not what today's motion proposes. It has very little impact on consumers.

On every one of their opposition days, the Conservatives come back with their mantra: We need to lower taxes, cut EI by lowering the premium rate, cut retirement income by lowering the pension contribution—which also has an impact in Quebec, because the Canada pension plan and the Quebec pension plan are harmonized. They keep coming back to the idea of eliminating pollution pricing to pander to the oil companies.

● (2050)

Today's motion, while not intrinsically bad, is along the same lines and does not represent a real plan to fight inflation. We are talking about 1¢ for a can of beer or 25¢ for a \$40- or \$50-bottle of spirits. This is not the end of the world, especially considering that alcohol represents only 4% of the average household's market basket.

Skyrocketing housing and food prices are crushing Quebecers and Canadians, especially those living on modest or fixed incomes. Measures that address the causes and effects of inflation would be much more useful than today's motion, which will have an essentially marginal impact on consumers. However, we do recognize that it could have a greater impact on restaurant and bar owners, who have been profoundly affected by the COVID-19 crisis.

Business of Supply

As members are well aware, the Excise Act does not just determine the amount of the excise tax. It also determines the terms and conditions for the sale of alcohol. Along with the Importation of Intoxicating Liquors Act, it states that only the government of a province can import or distribute alcohol. Quebec or the province can delegate that responsibility to a private importer or distributor by granting them a licence, but the province holds the exclusive power to govern the importation and trade of liquor on its territory. The fact that international trade is an area of federal jurisdiction is incongruous, and I am going to talk briefly about the history behind that.

Canada's first referendum took place in 1898. In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, many Protestant churches, particularly Baptist churches, were strongly advocating for the prohibition of alcohol. These prohibitionist movements were active in the United States and English Canada, just like in Lucky Luke.

The Canadian plebiscite on the prohibition of alcohol, which was held on September 29, 1898, was on the passage of a law prohibiting the importation, production and sale of alcoholic beverages across Canada. This law on prohibition would have taken the form of an amendment to the Criminal Code.

The yes camp won by 51.2% to 48.8%. It was a tight vote, but the yes camp won. However, the referendum exposed an important cultural divide in Canada. Every province except Quebec voted yes, but opposition to prohibition in Quebec was massive: 81.2% of the population voted against it, as they did in the case of conscription. The opposition was not only massive, but it was also very acrimonious. The members from Quebec in the House of Commons stated that they could not vote for a prohibition law because their families and communities would never forgive them.

The prime minister at the time, Wilfrid Laurier, noted that there was a cultural divide between Quebec and English Canada on this issue. He felt that the federal Parliament did not have the legitimacy to legislate, which would amount to imposing the decision of the majority on the minority that wanted nothing to do with it—the French Canadians at that time—even though it had the constitutional power to do so.

I hope the government is taking notes. It must not take unilateral action, and it should tell every province and Quebec to manage their own jurisdiction. That is how it was during the first years of Confederation. Instead of introducing legislation imposing prohibition across Canada, it chose to amend the laws on the importation and trade of alcohol and leaving it up to the provinces to regulate.

That is why still today that responsibility falls to the provinces. Of course, this creates some inconsistencies, such as the ban on transporting alcohol from one province to another, which prohibits a resident of Ottawa from bringing home a bottle that he may have purchased at the liquor store in Quebec. However, the principle is interesting: If there is a difference between Quebec and Canada on a given topic, then the federal Parliament should refrain from imposing a blanket solution that applies indiscriminately from coast to coast to coast.

I hope that the government and my colleagues from English Canada are listening carefully to this history lesson. I hope they

will draw from it and stop imposing the will of Canada on Quebec when there is a difference of opinion, and delegate the powers. To my colleagues, I would say, “a word to the wise”.

[*English*]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons (Senate), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I listened to the member's speech, and in particular the part where he talked about the various other issues that are genuinely impacting the daily lives of individuals throughout our country, such as inflation and the rising cost of food and other items. However, we are standing here talking about an excise tax increase that does not even add one cent per can of beer, as we heard previously.

I am wondering if the member has any insight into why he thinks the Conservatives chose this as their opposition day motion when we could have been talking about some very important issues, some of which the member mentioned.

• (2055)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question. Obviously, I will let the Conservative Party explain its reasons.

To answer the question on inflation, there are a number of elements. We can think, in particular, of social housing, which should be better funded. In the budget being tabled by the minister next Tuesday, we hope to see significant funding allocated to social housing to ensure change, even if only at this level.

To come back to the excise tax, I hope that my colleague will be able to speak with his cabinet colleagues. We would like to have the same model for microdistilleries as for microbreweries, namely a progressive excise tax to allow small players to enter the market and compete with the giants.

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Joliette for his speech. The historical part of his speech was particularly powerful and interesting. As he said, I hope the government is taking notes.

There was a time when Canada considered that fifty plus one was a majority in a referendum. That was often the case over the course of democracy's history. It is an interesting point, and the government should remember it as well.

With respect to this idea of applying the microbrewery model to microdistilleries, can my colleague explain, in concrete terms, how that would really help them?

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Madam Speaker, historically speaking, we have seen that the excise tax on alcohol is quite high, in general. In the early 2000s, the Bloc made a proposal to encourage new players like local craft producers and microbreweries. The idea was to reduce this tax by 10 and then increase it progressively as the microbrewery grew, increasing its sales and production. It would pay 20% of the tax, then 30% of the tax, and so on until its production levels could compete with the industry giants.

Business of Supply

Today, we are proposing that the government do this with microdistilleries. It is a booming sector. Reduce the tax by 10 for the small players, and then raise it gradually. That would put a little more craft in our lives.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, I have a question and a comment from the Rheault Distillery in the riding of Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusking, in northern Ontario. A minister said that there is a graduated system for the excise tax on beer, but as the member is well aware, the reality is that the government forgot about small distilleries. No matter what volume is produced, whether it be 1,000 litres or a million litres, all distilleries pay the same tax.

Does the member agree that the graduated system that is used for breweries should also apply to distilleries?

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague from New Westminster—Burnaby for his question and suggestion.

As I said in my speech, we got that proposal adopted some time ago. I also believe that, when I served with the hon. member on the Standing Committee on Finance, those were the kinds of measures that we adopted and then asked the government to look at and implement. Those measures sought to promote local products and to give small business owners just starting out, including those in the spirits sector, an advantage when entering the market.

Mr. Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Madam Speaker, as a proud resident of Abitibi-Témiscamingue, I can say that microbreweries are at the heart of our identity.

Whether we choose the Foublonne or Brother John from Trèfle Noir in Rouyn-Noranda, the stout from Pierre de fée in La Sarre, the Blonde du Frère Moffett from Barbe Broue, in Ville-Marie, and in Témiscamingue, the Tête de Pioche from the Prospecteur in Val-d'Or, or simply a beer from a Quebec microbrewery we can pick up at the Chez Gibb cornerstore, there is always a way to have a drink from Abitibi-Témiscamingue. We even have very good wines produced by the Domaine des Duc. The member for Joliette has even tasted it.

The Conservatives' motion essentially replicates the recommendation in the pre-budget consultation report of the Standing Committee on Finance that called on the government to freeze the federal excise tax on beer, spirits and wine at the 2022 rates for the 2023 and 2024 fiscal years until inflation returns to the Bank of Canada's target range, somewhere between 1% and 3%.

The excise tax on alcohol is a fixed amount by volume. Traditionally, that amount has been occasionally reviewed in a budget implementation bill. Since 2017, the law has set out an automatic escalator formula based on the consumer price index. As a result, the excise tax will go up 6.3%, reflecting the high level of inflation we experienced in 2022.

We will therefore be supporting the Conservative motion because, in the midst of this inflationary surge, hiking a consumption tax that would further increase prices would be ill-advised.

That said, admittedly, the impact of the alcohol excise duty escalator on the final selling price of the product will be rather minimal. We are talking about 1¢ per can of beer.

This motion is not a real response to the inflationary pressure on food prices. Moreover, only the big brewers would truly benefit from the adoption of this motion. Regional microbreweries pay only a fraction of the excise tax and will therefore benefit much less from the tax rate freeze.

In fact, thanks to pressure from the Bloc Québécois in 2006, it is only after 75,000 hectolitres that a microbrewery pays the full tax rate. Under that amount, the cost varies between 10% and 85% of the value of the tax depending on the number of hectolitres produced.

Of the 1,200 breweries in Canada, including the more than 300 in Quebec, only 12 pay the full amount of the excise tax on the majority of their production. Most of these 12 breweries are owned by foreign multinationals.

There are other ways to help microbreweries and their brewmasters, who introduce us to new flavours. For example, the government could exempt microbreweries from paying the tax on the first 10,000 hectolitres, as recommended by the Canadian Craft Brewers Association. In fact, 80% of microbreweries produce less than 2,000 hectolitres per year.

The regulations on the excise tax and its escalator based on capacity made it possible for many craft microbreweries to expand, but the 75,000-hectolitre threshold is now a barrier to their growth, according to the Canadian Craft Brewers Association, which I salute. Another solution that would help our local businesses compete against the big breweries would be to raise the threshold while keeping the rate brackets.

One of the positive aspects of the 2022 spring budget was the excise tax exemption for producers of cider and mead, such as Miel-lerie de la Grande Ourse de Saint-Marc-de-Figuery. I salute the member for Joliette for waging and winning this battle. His example should be followed and should provide further inspiration to the government today.

However, the government still has a very restrictive definition of what constitutes cider and mead. Producers who flavour their products with berries or aromatics continue to pay the tax. The Bloc Québécois hopes that all of this will be resolved in the upcoming budget.

We also hope that the excise tax exemption will apply to producers who make wine from other types of fruit, such as blueberries, which promote our region.

Business of Supply

In Val-d'Or, in the riding of my neighbour from Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, there is a company that specializes in producing distilled beverages. Spiritueux Alpha Tango produces Bravo Charlie and Echo Foxtrot gin, Valentine amaretto, Mission Kosmos vodka and even Mayday liqueur, which is made of black spruce and cinnamon. I want to say that Quebec's microdistilleries are on an impossible mission to the cosmos and that their mayday signal is not receiving an answer from the government. That is a problem. Even their gin is made using cattails. There is something interesting and inspiring about that.

With the excise tax at over \$12 per litre of alcohol, a bottle of Alpha Tango gin will cost 25¢ more. That is not a catastrophic increase, but it is in addition to the general increase in prices. As the saying goes, it takes four quarters to make dollar.

• (2100)

The Bloc Québécois would have proposed a different solution than the Conservatives. We need to duplicate the microbrewery model for microdistilleries and impose only a fraction of the tax that is charged to industry giants. That way, a bottle of Grande dérive, from Miellerie de la Grande Ourse, would cost \$3 less per bottle instead of the meagre 25¢ being discussed today. This would apply to all those small, local producers who give us a taste of their regional expertise.

I sincerely hope that the government will listen to this suggestion. It would allow our flavour artisans to benefit from a more targeted measure. Nevertheless, I repeat, we will support the Conservative motion because its merit lies in the message that the House is sending to the government.

That being said, the solution to inflation is not simply a measure like this. Microbreweries in Abitibi-Témiscamingue have a long list of problems. In early February, Le Trèfle Noir, a source of pride in Rouyn Noranda, sold its recipes to Lagabière, a microbrewery in Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu. Owner Alexandre Groulx, whom I commend, said that inflation, the pandemic and the labour shortage led him to sell part of his business.

Our entrepreneurs need more than a band-aid solution. They need concrete solutions. We must ensure that our farmers benefit from measures to help them produce, in particular by creating a special emergency account similar to what was done during the pandemic, which would help ensure they are supported when they need it. There is a significant cash flow crisis within the farming community. Obviously, these are the raw materials used by our microbreweries and microdistilleries. We also need to address the labour shortage in all our regions and the housing crisis.

These two problems are hindering the economic development of Abitibi-Témiscamingue. Some measures do exist, including a tax credit for returning recent graduates, a tax credit for immigrants who choose the regions of Quebec, tax incentives for experienced workers, increased transfers for the creation of social and community housing, and so on. The Bloc Québécois has solutions. We need the government to listen. With the budget only one week away, I hope it is listening.

In conclusion, I invite all parliamentarians to support local microbreweries and microdistilleries, especially those in Abitibi—

Témiscamingue. They will see that our products are full of local flavours, and I am sure they will become their favourites. Above all, they will have to enjoy them in moderation.

• (2105)

[*English*]

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Madam Speaker, I have to agree with the member on the subject. Beyond capping this escalator tax, we really should be looking at restructuring the excise tax, especially for spirits.

We also have the craft breweries of Canada asking for that, even though they have the staggered rise in excise tax based on how much they produce. It is way more than breweries or distilleries are paying in the United States, for instance.

Could the member comment further on that? This is something that should be looked at. The distillers in my riding are very concerned about the unfairness of the way the excise tax for spirits is calculated today.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Sébastien Lemire: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his interest in this issue. I recently met Jean-François Nellis, the owner of Pit Caribou since 2019. Pit Caribou is one of the most important microbreweries in the Gaspé and a member of the Association des microbrasseries du Québec.

One of the things we talked about is the notion of the space in which microbreweries operate, which is of vital importance. The microbrewery model brings life and vigour to an area. It is good for the tourism industry and it is obviously good for the local economy.

People say that microbreweries create jobs and contribute to the social fabric. Microbreweries are often located in the regions. One-third of microbreweries are found in towns with a population of less than 10,000. That is really interesting. When looking for ways to ensure that our economy is not centred just in Toronto or on oil from western Canada, we can really see a solution in microbreweries.

To answer my colleague's question, one of the fundamental issues is the notion of liquidity. Companies need to have liquidity and the excise tax has a direct impact on that. Cutting the excise tax will help our microbreweries improve their ability to invest, develop new products and innovate.

[*English*]

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Madam Speaker, 88% of the beer Canadians enjoy is brewed and created here in Canada by over 20,000 hard-working Canadians employed by these breweries, whether microbreweries or large breweries like Pacific Western Brewing in my town of Prince George. They are worried. The unions are worried and labour is worried. The breweries are saying they cannot handle a 6% tax increase.

I want to ask if my hon. colleague is hearing the same in his riding as we are hearing, if the breweries are saying the same things. Maybe he has some more stories he can tell us about how these breweries are just worried about the next day and whether or not they are going to be able to keep the doors open.

• (2110)

[Translation]

Mr. Sébastien Lemire: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Cariboo—Prince George for the question. I am pleased to see him here in person in the House.

Indeed, these discussions are under way. It is not easy for businesses to survive, especially SMEs and especially because of COVID-19. That is what the owner of the Trèfle Noir microbrewery said.

My colleague from Joliette managed to get the excise tax on spirits reduced. David Ouellet, from Miellerie de la Grande Ourse developed a gin and a mead. His products enjoy great commercial success, so much so that he has a hard time producing enough. By lowering this tax, we encourage creation. I will say that again because it is a clear example. This lends itself to local pride and a sense of belonging. We need to listen to that and give businesses some oxygen. In an inflationary context, this is something that is essential.

These producers will return this to us one-hundred-fold because this promotes our regions and that is invaluable. Obviously, this creates jobs and we cannot pass on that.

[English]

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the wonderful MP for Elmwood—Transcona.

My riding of South Okanagan—West Kootenay is the finest in the country in many ways, but one of its best features is the thriving beer, wine and spirits sector. I think everyone here knows that we make the best wine in Canada, but we might be here all night if I were to list all of those wineries. Perhaps fewer know the sheer number and quality of craft breweries, so I would like to try to list them here, with apologies if I miss any. Abandoned Rail, Cannery, Highway 97, Neighbourhood, Slackwater and Tin Whistle are all in Penticton. There is also Firehall in Oliver, North Basin in Osoyoos, Rossland Beer in Rossland, Trail Beer Refinery in Trail, and Tailout Brewing in Castlegar.

Then there are the distilleries. We have Legend Distilleries in Naramata. It used to be my old doctor's office, but it has been turned into a distillery. We have Maple Leaf Spirits and Old Order in Penticton; Dubh Glas in Oliver, where my friend Grant Stevely makes what I think is the best gin in Canada, Noteworthy Gin; Tumbleweed in Osoyoos; Kootenay West in Trail; Tonik in Crescent Valley; and Kootenay Country Craft in Winlaw. There may be more. It is hard to keep up.

I was recently talking to my friends Jorg and Anette Engel, who own Maple Leaf Spirits, which is a small craft distillery in Penticton. It is one of the first craft distillers in the region, and they have taken advantage of the bountiful fruit of the Okanagan to produce

Business of Supply

award-winning brandies and other liquors. In fact, their brandy won the award for best brandy in Canada last year for the second time. As their business grew over the past 20 years, they saw other small distilleries establish in the region, and that strong growth in the craft distillery sector has been mirrored and even exceeded by the growth in the number of breweries and small wineries. This sector is therefore particularly important in South Okanagan—West Kootenay.

These businesses, many of them small family-owned companies, have combined two traditional pillars of the local economy, agriculture and tourism, to create a powerful new centre of growth for the region. However, like many sectors, this sector has been hard hit recently by soaring inflation. The cost of almost everything that goes into their products has been rising. The grain that goes into beer and spirits has more than doubled in price. The price of bottles has gone up. They also share another inflation-related challenge that no other sector has to deal with, and that is an excise tax that automatically rises as inflation rises. Since 2017, this tax has gone up every year without legislation or parliamentary debate, and this year it will increase by a whopping 6.3%, the largest one-year increase in the last 40 years.

Distillers like that of the Engels are going to be struggling to survive. They recently wrote me a letter, and I would like to read some of it here:

Our locally produced Craft liquors are more expensive in liquor stores than imported and multi-national brands, through the Federal Excise Tax. The rates of excise duty on spirits are adjusted annually on April 1st, based on changes to the Consumer Price Index. As a craft distillery, we now pay \$1.74 in excise tax for each 375ml bottle.... That is \$3.48 for each 750ml bottle, or \$5.22 for each 1 liter bottle. Here in Canada, Excise is further more than doubled by 167% provincial mark-ups, to burden domestic distillers with a tax barrier of approximately \$9 on every 1 liter bottle in a liquor store, increasing every year. In liquor stores, our products compete with liquor from the USA, who have reduced their excise tax to a fraction of what we must pay. We see an imbalance on the market. We want our products to get priced in liquor stores on a level playing field with products coming from out of country.

These concerns are shared with other distillers across the country. Marcel Rheault and Mireille Morin own Rheault Distillery in Hearst, Ontario. They have very similar concerns. They make Loon Vodka and other great products. They say they have to remain competitive, so they cannot mark up their prices to keep their margins intact. Again, this is echoed across Canada in every craft distillery, every craft brewery and every small winery in the country.

• (2115)

I want to be clear that all of these businesses are fine with paying the excise tax on beer, wine and spirits, but they are concerned about the fairness of how this tax is now structured and calculated. On top of the escalator feature, excise taxes on alcoholic beverages produced in Canada are treated differently depending on whether they are wine, beer or spirits, and very differently when compared with excise taxes levied by our biggest trading partner, the United States.

Business of Supply

Excise taxes are much lower in the United States and are structured so that small producers pay much less, on a sliding scale, than bigger producers. In Canada, only the beer excise tax is scaled that way, by the size of the operation, but the average tax here is still much higher than it is in the United States. It is twice that, and the independent craft brewers of Canada would like to fix it.

One issue is the federal definition of a craft brewery, which is a brewery that produces less than 75,000 hectolitres of beer per year. If a brewery makes more beer than that, it pays the full excise tax. However, there are different definitions. In Alberta and Saskatchewan, the definition of a craft brewery is one that produces less than 400,000 hectolitres, and in the United States the definition means seven million hectolitres. That is what they consider a craft brewery south of the border. It is clear that it would be helpful for Canadian breweries if these definitions and regulations were synchronized as much as possible so that competition is as fair as possible. Craft brewers have put forward a reasonable suggestion to the government that would do just that, and I urge the Minister of Finance to consider it seriously.

The wine sector is in a special situation because most wineries in Canada never had to pay excise tax until last year, when Canada eliminated an exemption for wines made from Canadian grapes after a trade dispute with Australia. After strong lobbying from the wine industry, the federal government did step up with a support program to help wineries adapt to this new reality, but that support is set to disappear next year. The excise tax will continue after next year, of course, so it makes sense that a more long-term solution is needed.

Craft distillers are the hardest hit in many ways. As I mentioned earlier when reading the letter from Maple Leaf Spirits, the excise tax on a one-litre bottle is \$5.22, and when we add provincial taxes, that goes up to about nine dollars. This makes it very difficult for local producers such as Jorg and Anette Engel to compete with imports from other countries that are taxed at a fraction of that rate. We need a similar restructuring of the excise tax on spirits to level the playing field.

These are all reasonable, common-sense recommendations, and I know from experience that the government will sometimes listen to such recommendations and make the right decisions. When the beer industry came to me last year and pointed out that de-alcoholized beer was being charged an alcohol excise tax, I put forward a private member's bill that would remove that tax. To its credit, the government included that provision in last year's budget, so it can be done.

The House of Commons finance committee has recommended that the government freeze the excise tax rate at 2022 levels for at least the next two years, and I hope the government takes up that advice for the budget coming next Tuesday. I also hope it will listen to Canadian producers of beer, wine and spirits and restructure the excise tax to make it fairer for small producers so that this sector can continue to make fine products and make a very important contribution to our local economies.

● (2120)

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Madam Speaker, I appreciate our hon. colleague's speech, because for the

first four minutes he entered into Hansard the names all the micro-breweries and breweries in his riding. I think he owes a care package to all member who are currently present in the House.

When the escalator tax was introduced and brought in back in 2017 before COVID, Finance Canada officials testified at committee that the Liberals did no modelling on how this tax would impact small businesses and breweries all across our country. Why does the government continue its mismanagement of monetary policy? Is the member hearing the same as what we are hearing? Perhaps he has some suggestions on what the government can do to scrap the tax and make things more affordable for Canadians.

Mr. Richard Cannings: Madam Speaker, I thank the member for Cariboo—Prince George. It is good to see him in person. As others have said, we missed him here in person in this place. We know he has been active virtually, but I—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I remind the hon. member not to mention the presence or absence of members in the House.

The hon. member.

Mr. Richard Cannings: Madam Speaker, I will retract that, but it is good to see him.

We do not want to scrap the tax. We want to restructure it so that it is fair. For it to go up 6% in one year when we are already facing the effects of inflation is too much to ask of these producers. We want it capped and we want all these taxes restructured so that small producers are treated fairly and can compete.

Mr. Adam van Koevorden (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and to the Minister of Sport, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my friend and colleague from South Okanagan—West Kootenay for being an advocate for the wineries and small craft breweries in his riding. I have two breweries in my riding. Orange Snail and Third Moon are both awesome. They do a lot in our community. Andrews Farm produces wine as well, and we have strong connections to Pelee Island in Milton. That is a great Ontario winery.

This is all about balance, as my hon. colleague pointed out. It is not a matter of just scraping a tax all at once; I think that would be irresponsible. Consumption has an impact on the health care system, so we have to consider those ramifications.

On the topic of balance, how does my hon. colleague suggest we approach that? What would be reasonable? I agree with him that a 6.3% increase to the excise tax is not reasonable to ask our breweries, vineyards and spirit producers to shoulder. What would be appropriate?

Business of Supply

• (2125)

Mr. Richard Cannings: Madam Speaker, I do not think it would be too difficult to ask for. When the government brought in this escalator tax, inflation was pretty marginal. There was very little inflation, so it was only going up 1% or 2% per year. I would like to see something less drastic than just following inflation every year, because if it goes up 6%, that is drastic. What would be more important for these producers, especially the small producers, is to develop a fair sliding scale of excise tax payments that makes it easier for them to compete with the bigger players and especially the imports.

[Translation]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille (Salaberry—Suroît, BQ): Madam Speaker, I really enjoyed my colleague's speech. I had the opportunity to taste the wines produced in his riding. I have friends who live in the Okanagan Valley, in Summerland's Trout Creek area. It is really the place to have a nice drink and enjoy local flavours. He understands the Bloc Québécois's position. Quebec is home to many small craft producers who have developed berry wines and ciders.

Can my colleague explain why it is so important that the government listen and exempt these producers from the excise tax so that they can benefit—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I must interrupt the hon. member.

[English]

I will give the hon. member for South Okanagan—West Kootenay 15 seconds to answer.

Mr. Richard Cannings: Madam Speaker, if someone makes cider or mead and then throws some berries into it, suddenly they are paying an excise tax. They do not pay it when it is produced without the berries. It does not make sense. I think that illustrates the excise tax needs a serious going over to make it fair in many ways.

[Translation]

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, I want to tell the story of Marcel Rheault and Mireille Morin, the owners of the Rheault Distillery in Hearst, Ontario, which produces Loon Vodka. They cannot raise their price any more to be competitive. A 6% tax hike is something that is really going to hurt them and their product, which has won many awards for its quality. It is for people like Marcel and Mireille that we need to adopt this motion this evening.

[English]

I am very pleased to rise and talk a little bit about the situation in Winnipeg. We have a lot of local brewers and distillers in the province of Manitoba. I think especially of Crown Royal, but there are many beer makers in Manitoba, such as Half Pints, Barn Hammer, Torque and Little Brown Jug. I could go on; there are a number. Manitobans are pleased to support their local brewers when they reach into the fridge for a beer at the end of a long week, if that is their choice. We want them to be able to continue to do that and continue to support local economies when they do. However, the fact of the matter is that many producers, particularly smaller

producers, are in a tight spot when it comes to an increase in the excise tax.

The excise tax is not based on a percentage of their revenue or of their profit; it is a certain amount they have to pay for every unit sold, so when it goes up, it really has an impact on their business model. Also, because that increase in the rate of tax is tied to inflation, we are seeing that be a particularly high increase this year.

I think it was always a problem having a tax tied to inflation, a tax levied at an absolute rate, which is raised at the rate of inflation. It is something that was raised in 2017-2018 when the Liberals first brought this in. People asked, "What if we have a period of extraordinary inflation?" They said, "Well, that is not likely to happen. Inflation has been very consistent." Of course, we know that major events can change the course of an economy, and Canada, along with many other parts of the world, has certainly been experiencing that. We have had a major event with the pandemic and there are major events happening as a result of climate change. Those are having an impact on the economy.

As we see inflation go up, we should not see the government exacerbating the problem of inflation by having an automatic increase in the tax, which is not to say that no taxes can increase, but it is appropriate to have a debate and a vote in Parliament in order to have that happen. What we are seeing now is the fruit of a decision to take Parliament out of the equation and have those taxes increase automatically at the rate of inflation instead of increasing them deliberately by a choice of Parliament in the face of difficult economic circumstances.

As my colleague for South Okanagan—West Kootenay pointed out earlier, quite rightly, there are other issues with the excise tax. New Democrats support the idea of a more gradual ramping up of the excise tax in order to help smaller brewers and smaller producers be more competitive when they are trying to carve out a space for themselves in what is a very competitive market with a lot of established, large players. That is not exactly what the motion calls for tonight, but I think that is part of the larger conversation we might be able to have more readily in this place if the excise tax were not already on an automatic escalator.

It would mean that government would have to come back to this place every year if it wanted to see the excise tax go up, and that would create opportunities for parliamentarians, like New Democrats, who are interested in a fairer excise tax structure for smaller producers, to raise those issues at that time. Today, then, we are doing this in the context of an opposition day motion, because otherwise there is no natural opportunity to be able to discuss this kind of thing.

I do think there is a real argument to be made about the particular economic circumstances we find ourselves in for Canadians who enjoy the odd beer and who are already facing increasing costs on groceries, rent and everything else. They do not need an added increase in the excise tax on their beer.

Business of Supply

• (2130)

There is an argument to be made for small businesses that are going to be distressed by having to pay these additional costs and worrying about whether they can raise their prices in order to pass that on to the consumer without just getting shut out of the market.

I also think there is a more general and principled argument about the role of Parliament in approving taxation, where we can have great debates in this place about what the appropriate rate of taxation is on various things, and I am sure that we can find at least as much disagreement as we find agreement on that. I think it is important that this debate come to this place and that increases in taxes are approved.

I would say this is just the other side of the coin of another measure that I do not personally support, which is indexing income tax brackets to inflation, too. I think that governments and legislatures, particularly, have a responsibility to evaluate the circumstances and make decisions, in a particular time, about what is appropriate.

If that is a change in tax brackets, that is something that should be deliberately debated and about which a very intentional decision should be made. When it comes to something like the excise tax, likewise, that is something that should be debated and there should be an intentional decision about it.

I think this mechanism of an automatic escalator is problematic because it removes people's democratically elected legislators from the equation when we are having important debates about what an appropriate rate of taxation is.

I am a member of the finance committee, and I was certainly very happy to see in the finance committee's pre-budget consultation report a recommendation to freeze this planned excise tax increase, so that lets us know that it is not just coming from one party. It takes a majority voice on a committee in order to issue a recommendation, and I think the government should take very seriously the fact that coming out of one of the most senior committees of the House of Commons was a recommendation not to proceed with this tax hike.

I think they need to look at the extent to which the excise tax will be increased because of the extraordinary period of inflation we have been living through over the last 12 months. This was not the kind of usual inflation that was normal in the Canadian economy prior to the pandemic. I do not believe this is what the government of the day foresaw. It is certainly not what Canadians foresaw when this automatic escalator was put in, and I think it is reasonable to recognize that the situation calls for a different course of action.

That is why I am pleased to rise in support of the motion, alongside my other New Democratic colleagues.

• (2135)

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Don Valley North is rising on a point of order.

* * *

DON VALLEY NORTH

Mr. Han Dong (Don Valley North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have informed the Prime Minister and the leadership of the Liberal Party

caucus that I will be sitting as an independent member at the conclusion of these remarks. Mr. Speaker, I am in your hands as to what happens next.

To all my colleagues in Parliament, media reports today quoted unverified, anonymous sources that have attacked my reputation and called into question my loyalty to Canada. Let me be clear: What has been reported is false and I will defend myself against these absolutely untrue claims. Let me assure members that, as a parliamentarian and as a person, I have never advocated, and I will never and would never advocate or support the violation of the basic human rights of any Canadian or of anyone, anywhere, period. The accusations are false.

My family came to Canada for freedom. I have had the privilege of being elected to the House, and believe I have served honourably. I pledge to continue to serve honourably and fulfill my oath of office. I will continue to serve the residents of Don Valley North as an independent member of the House.

I am taking this extraordinary step because to sit in the government caucus is a privilege, and my presence there may be seen by some as a conflict of duty and the wrong place to be as independent investigations pursue the facts of this matter. I will be sitting as an independent member so that the business of government and, indeed, the business of Parliament, is not interrupted as I work to clear my name and the truth is presented to Parliament and to the Canadian people. I am a proud Liberal and I am proud of the work our government does, day in and day out, to serve the people of Canada. I also do not want to distract from that important work.

Before concluding, I want to assure Mr. Michael Spavor and Mr. Michael Kovrig and their families that I did nothing to cause them any harm. Like everyone in the House, I worked hard and advocated for their interest, as a parliamentarian. The allegations made against me are as false as the ones made against them.

I will continue to work on my constituents' behalf as their member of Parliament.

I thank my staff. I know the days ahead will be difficult, but I will be there to support them as we continue to serve the people of Don Valley North.

I love my family, in particular my parents, who brought us here to Canada; my wife, Sophie; and my kids. I love them. I thank them for all the support and love they give me. The truth will protect us. Our honour and our family will get through this together.

• (2140)

The Deputy Speaker: I thank the member for his statement. I assure him that the House will be making the appropriate changes to the seating plan.

We will take a quick breather here for a moment before we go back to questions and comments.

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—TAX INCREASE ON BEER, WINE AND SPIRITS

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. Robert Kitchen (Souris—Moose Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is great to hear that the member for Elmwood—Transcona is going to support our opposition day motion.

It is interesting. We have heard from the government members, and their comeback is that this escalating tax is 1¢ on a beer. If it is 1¢ on a beer and they downplay that so much, why is it that we even bother putting the 1¢ on a beer? Why are we not giving Canadians that break?

The unfortunate part is that Canadians have lost trust in the current government. What we need to do is start building that trust back in Canadians. One of the first steps to do that is to show them they have cause.

I appreciate the member's comments and I wonder if he would like to speak further on that aspect.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I feel I would be remiss if I did not take a moment to acknowledge what has happened in the House with the member for Don Valley North. Obviously I am not in a position to speak to the veracity of the claims that have been made in the media, but I think this is an important reminder of the very real personal and professional impacts the debate we have been having on foreign interference in elections can have.

It is an example of why it is important that we have a public inquiry, so we can have a proper airing of the kinds of accusations being made in the media, in many cases now by anonymous sources, and so that folks in the Chinese-Canadian community know that those claims are being considered by someone who has access to the full evidence and has the power to clear names where names should be cleared. That is why it is important that we have nothing short of a public inquiry.

On the question that was posed, it is a good point that while it is a relatively small increase in some ways, that argument does not really pass muster because it is a big impact on the bottom lines of these smaller producers of beer, spirits and wines. At the end of the day, if it is not that big of an increase, which is what the government is saying, then it is not that big a loss for it to bypass it.

We know that other government revenue has grown a fair bit because of inflation. This is not the place to do it. If the government wants other revenue, we know there are companies, such as Loblaws, frankly, that can afford to pay more in tax. The government should be looking at them, not smaller producers of beer, spirits and wine, to raise revenue.

• (2145)

Mr. Adam van Koevorden (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and to the Minister of Sport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was eager to ask my colleague from Elmwood—Transcona a question about a balance on the taxation of products that lead to certain health outcomes.

I was also eager to stand to say it was kind of him to acknowledge the pain that our colleague is going through, but then the

Business of Supply

member politicized it a little, and I was pretty disappointed. I am a bit shaken because of what these types of debates do to people and families in this place. I think that is exactly why a non-partisan person should be the one to determine whether or not there is a public inquiry in this case. I hope we can let that stand and allow that person to do the work.

Going back to the excise tax on beer, it comes down to a balance on precisely how we tax these products to ensure that they are providing commensurate revenue for health care in this country. I am a big fan of the products that the member mentioned. I am a big fan of the two breweries and the winery in my riding. Where does that balance sit?

The Deputy Speaker: I will provide a bit of a caution to members to make sure that we stick to the debate we are having tonight.

The hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I already said my piece on the other matter.

In respect of the member's question on the motion that we are dealing with this evening, I would say that there is definitely a debate to be had about that proper balance. My point is that an automatic escalator makes it harder to have that debate, and it does not cause a debate to be had of necessity when those taxes go up.

Let us have those debates and let us make those decisions here on the floor of Parliament. An automatic escalator actually deviates from that very path of having a debate about the right balance in this place.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I will refrain from commenting on the need for an independent public inquiry. In a context where the federal government is experiencing significant budget surpluses and in a time of high inflation, why does the Liberal government want to increase the tax by 6.3%?

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I would not say the federal budget is in a surplus situation. I think we are still going to see deficits. The 6% increase to the tax is due to the fact that we have an automatic mechanism to escalate the tax.

I think this is wrong. We as parliamentarians need to have debates and make deliberate decisions about tax increases. In the current environment, we are in a period of extreme inflation compared to previous decades. I do not think now is the time to have an exceptional tax increase on these products.

[*English*]

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster, CPC): Mr. Speaker, off the top, I will say that I will be splitting my time with the member for Beauce.

Business of Supply

The cost of living is rising faster than at any time in the last 40 years, and the NDP-Liberal government's inflationary deficits and high taxes are driving up those costs. Hard-working Canadians whose paycheques do not go nearly as far as they once did are having trouble making ends meet. Canadians are already out of money and cannot afford to have the Prime Minister dive deeper and deeper into their pockets.

The average Canadian family is already spending more of their income on taxes than on basic necessities. More of their hard-earned dollars are going to taxes than on food, shelter and clothing combined, yet there is no break on the horizon. It is actually just the opposite. Life will get more expensive for Canadians on April 1. With the failed Liberal carbon tax set to increase, Canadians will be paying even more at the pumps and on their home heating bills.

On April 1, the Liberal carbon tax will increase to 14¢ per litre of gasoline, and the carbon tax will add 12¢ per cubic metre of natural gas. Of course it does not end there. On April 1, the NDP-Liberal government's automatic escalator on the alcohol excise tax will mark the largest tax increase on alcohol in the last 40 years. This tax increase will not only punish Canadian consumers, but also hurt workers in the tourism, hospitality and restaurant sectors.

It is a big hit to our brewers and our winemakers also. Today's Conservative motion recognizes the significant impact of this tax increase, and it is an opportunity for the NDP-Liberal government to reverse course and cancel this punishing increase.

The tourism, hospitality and restaurant sectors were some of the hardest hit by the pandemic restrictions imposed on these sectors. The reality is that many small businesses in these sectors are still struggling to keep their doors open. According to Restaurants Canada, more than 50% of licensed restaurants are either losing money or just breaking even. Many of these small businesses are still carrying debt from the pandemic, and the April 1 excise tax increase would not help these businesses that are just trying to keep the lights on, nor will the increased carbon tax, which is also going to drive up their cost of doing business.

The government should, at a minimum, have a "do no harm" approach. It should not be actively making it harder and more expensive to do business in Canada, but that, unfortunately, is the course we are on. Instead of addressing the concerns of restaurateurs, craft brewers, vintners and distillery owners, the Prime Minister is making it harder for them to do business and remain competitive.

Yet the Liberals will not even take responsibility for the hardship caused by their high tax agenda. In fact, the way the Liberal members often talk in this House, one would think that Canadians have never had it so good, which really shows just how out of touch they are and how out of touch their policies are.

When it comes to the excise escalator tax, we have all heard the Liberal rhetoric in this place that downplays the cost of the hike. The reality is that they are increasing taxes on beer, wine and spirits by 6.3% this year alone, totalling an 18% increase since 2017. A report released by Restaurants Canada indicates that the planned tax increase would cost restaurants and bars an extra \$750 million in new annual costs. For individual restaurants, the tax hike would be more than \$30,000 annually, on average.

Restaurant owners are not the only ones sounding the alarm. The heads of eight different unions representing brewery workers sent a letter to the Minister of Finance. Brewery workers are worried about the impact that this tax increase would have on their jobs. For brewers, the planned increase would cost them more than \$45 million in federal taxes, and it threatens the job viability of the 20,000 Canadians they employ. In that letter, the unions representing brewery workers clearly state that a freeze on federal beer taxes is the single most important thing that the Minister of Finance could do for their workers and for their families.

We know that an escalator tax is problematic to begin with, allowing the government to hike taxes annually without any debate or consideration of its impact on industry and Canadians. The Liberals tied this escalator tax to the rate of inflation, so this tax is directly impacted by their economic mismanagement. As I said, this year the tax rate is 6.3%, but if the NDP-Liberal government refuses to reverse course on its disastrous policies, which are fanning inflation and the cost of living, who knows what the tax increase will be next year.

● (2150)

Fighting inflation should be a priority for the government, and I certainly hope in next week's budget we see an end to the government's inflationary spending and no new taxes for Canadians. This is so hard-working Canadians can get some real relief. The more inflation makes life unaffordable for Canadians, the more they will need to pay to, for example, have a drink after a long day's work or to celebrate a special occasion with their family or friends.

While the Liberals may want to stand in this place and say this tax increase is pennies on the bottle, it is important to also put that into perspective. Alcohol is already highly taxed in Canada. On average, 46% of the retail price of beer is a tax. Tax is 65% of the price of wine and more than three quarters of the price of spirits. The April 1 tax increase will nickel-and-dime Canadians who are already being stretched to their max, making basic necessities and the cost of doing business more expensive across the board.

The many industries directly impacted by this planned tax hike cannot afford it either. Craft brewers, distillers and winemakers who are also struggling with inflationary costs cannot afford higher taxes that will make it harder to do business and stay competitive. The many small businesses in the tourism, hospitality and restaurant sector, which were hit hard by pandemic restrictions and are already struggling to keep their doors open and their lights on, simply cannot afford new business costs either.

Business of Supply

Today's Conservative motion is an opportunity for every member of this House to stand up for Canadians and Canadian businesses. Let us give Canadians and the many Canadian businesses directly impacted by the excise escalator tax a break and let us cancel the April 1 tax increase on beer, wine and spirits.

Given what the NDP did this evening, I will be foregoing my questions and comments to allow some of my other colleagues to have their remarks put on the record.

• (2155)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am a little concerned because this is the second time it happened today where I was hoping to ask a question of the member, but the member literally walked out.

I will take that back. I will not say that the member walked out, but I would like to ask the member a question, if I could.

The Deputy Speaker: I appreciate the hon. member wants to ask a question, but the availability of a member is important when it comes to answering. The courtesy is whether they stay or not.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I realize neither one of us is supposed to say whether a member is here or not, so I am just rising to pose my question to the member who just spoke.

If she genuinely believes the Conservative Party's motion is worthy of supporting, could she tell me that this is something we should vote for?

The Deputy Speaker: That is debate, and we will be moving on to the next speaker.

The hon. member for Beauce has the floor.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Richard Lehoux (Beauce, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to our party's opposition day motion on the Liberal government's escalator tax on beer, wine and spirits. This unfair tax introduced by the government in 2017 is extremely troubling and will once again increase the cost of things that Canadians regularly consume.

This tax will not only have a major impact on consumers, but it will also harm many small businesses, including microbreweries, vineyards and other alcohol producers. It will harm restaurants, hotels and bars as well. These small businesses deserve a break after being hit so hard during the pandemic.

However, this government is determined to increase taxes on everything in an attempt to recover the money it wasted over the past eight years. On April 1, the escalator tax will increase by a staggering 6.3%. Since 2017, the tax has increased by an average of only 1% to 2% a year, but in 2023, it will be three or four times that.

That is why, in this motion, our party is calling on the government to abolish this tax and to assure Canadians that next week's budget will contain a commitment to cancelling this tax. As I mentioned earlier, it will hit small businesses the hardest. This unfair tax plan will negatively impact not only our alcohol industry, but also our tourism industry, which is still picking up the pieces after the COVID-19 pandemic.

Alcohol is taxed enough already. According to the Canadian Taxpayers Federation, taxes make up 50% of the price of beer, 65% of the price of wine and 75% of the price of spirits, on average. The heads of eight unions representing the country's brewery workers have written to the Minister of Finance asking her to freeze this tax. They are extremely concerned about job losses in their industry because of this dangerous Liberal tactic.

In a country where inflation is at a 40-year high, why does the government want to keep on hiking taxes instead of helping Canadians prosper? To make matters worse, this tax increase will take effect on April 1. What a coincidence. That is the same day the government plans to triple the carbon tax on Canadians.

Not only will the price of gas go up, but the price of alcohol will also skyrocket. That is cruel. When I spoke earlier about the effect of the carbon tax on small businesses, I did not even mention the impact it will have on alcohol producers. Their monthly expenses to run their facilities will go up, and so will their shipping costs.

How does the government think our sector can remain competitive on the national stage? I think it is very sad that the government is tying our industry's hands with such a policy. Canada produces some of the best beer, wine and spirits in the world, but they are being unfairly targeted by the Liberal government.

The Minister of Tourism continues to stand up in the House and say that this will add only 1¢ per can of beer. I do not know where he is getting his figures, but according to Beer Canada, there will be a net increase of about 10% in the price of beer in 2023.

In my riding, many small businesses have contacted my office to share their concerns about this increase. I spoke about it with a producer in my riding just this morning. Ms. Simard, owner of Verger à Ti-Paul in Saint-Elzéar, is very worried about her business's ability to remain competitive as April 1 approaches. Her cider business is still in the initial stages of development, and she is very frustrated with this 6.3% tax, which will slow the growth of her business considerably.

Mr. Poulin, owner of Frampton Brasse, a farm and brewery in Frampton, in the Beauce area, says that larger, older businesses like his are just as worried and frustrated by this tax.

Points of Order

Whether a business has been operating for one year or 20, it will have to deal with the disastrous consequences of this failed Liberal policy. These are mostly small businesses, and their products are distributed solely in the region. Consequently, this additional tax will be passed on directly to consumers, who are often the neighbours of these businesses and want to support local products.

● (2200)

This spend-happy, tax-happy government is preventing young entrepreneurs from achieving their dreams and owning a business. In my riding and across the country, labour availability remains a major issue. It will be much more difficult for small breweries and cideries to retain staff because of low profit margins. Companies will be forced to cut back on production time, making them less and less profitable—

The Deputy Speaker: There seems to be a lot of discussion going on in the House. I would ask members to please leave the House if they to continue their conversations, so that everyone can hear the debate.

The hon. member for Beauce.

Mr. Richard Lehoux: Mr. Speaker, the bureaucracy and other obstacles such as this government's tax system are driving investments to other countries. This needs to stop. The Conservatives were strongly opposed to this escalator tax when it was first introduced by the Liberals. We even campaigned on the idea of getting rid of it. Members within the Liberal caucus do not seem to agree with this policy. Just ask the member for London North Centre, who said that the government should not move forward with this tax and it should not be tied to inflation either.

In conclusion, the cost of living keeps going up faster than the prevailing wage, and measures to make goods more affordable are sorely lacking in Canada. I sincerely hope that the government and the Minister of Finance will listen to the Conservatives, but mostly to Canadians, and that they will cancel this tax in the budget they are bringing down next week. I hope that the other opposition parties will join us in voting on this motion in order to pressure this government into doing what is necessary and scrapping this tax for once and for all.

* * *

● (2205)

[*English*]

POINTS OF ORDER

PERIOD FOR QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FOLLOWING SPEECHES

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am really quite concerned. We have a tradition in the House of Commons that if a 10-minute speech has been delivered, there is a five-minute question and answer period, and if it is a 20-minute speech, there is a 10-minute question and answer period. What we are seeing is chicken-Tory-soup, of sorts, where the Conservatives seem to feel they can give a 10-minute speech and then not have to be held accountable for their comments, even on an opposition day.

Obviously, that is something I would ask, if not of you, then of the Speaker, to be looked at and reported back to the House. It sets a dangerous precedent to say to members that they can stand up, deliver a speech and feel that they do not have to be accountable for the words they have said by choosing not to stand in their place.

The Deputy Speaker: I appreciate the point of order.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. If members do not have the courage to defend their speeches, they should not speak in the House, quite frankly. They have a responsibility to be accountable to members in the House. This is the third or fourth member of the Conservative Party who ran out of the House after giving their speech. Yesterday, we saw the leader of the Conservative Party not even vote on his own motion.

I think this conduct is unbecoming of parliamentarians. If they are going to speak, they should have to stay and answer questions.

Mrs. Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. It is the usual practice of the House that it is absolutely inappropriate to make mention of the presence or absence of any member of this chamber. I think it is absolutely inappropriate for the members opposite, who have been ducking accountability for weeks in the House, to come here and try to accuse Conservative members of not being accountable, when they have shown zero accountability on a number of important issues, including foreign interference.

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same topic. I believe that whether a member is still present in the House or not, the member should be permitted to ask questions. In question period, a member of the opposition will address a question to a minister who may not be there, and someone else will get up and answer in place of the minister. Therefore, the fact that a member is no longer in the House does not mean that one should not have the opportunity to ask questions, even if they are not going to be answered.

The Deputy Speaker: I know we are getting into a really strange place.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Deputy Speaker: Could you give me a moment while I have the Chair? I will get to the hon. member in a moment. I can see the hon. member, and I will get to him as soon as I possibly can. I also see that there is an opportunity here to remind folks that we do not want to set precedents that we do not want to support ourselves. I do not want to see government members doing the same thing, when the opposition is trying to ask questions as well. It would create a problem later on down road.

The hon. member for Kitchener Centre with the same point of order, I believe.

Points of Order

Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP): Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I think this is a question of the quality of our democracy. If, in the House of Commons, we were to switch to speeches back and forth, as opposed to debate with questions and answers, I think the level of accountability on all sides would be reduced. I ask you to rule on this very fair point of order.

• (2210)

Mr. Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

This is not out of order. These are points of debate from people who are angry about how things have transpired this evening. The parliamentary secretary to the House leader is here. The government whip is here. Maybe I am not supposed to refer to their presence. If the members on the Liberal side want to talk about amending the Standing Orders, that is actually what needs to happen here. There is no violation of the Standing Orders happening here. This is simply a waste of time, which we are used to from the member who is about to speak.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons (Senate), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

First of all, it is not questions. It is questions and comments. Five minutes of comments should be allowed if the individual is no longer in the House. Standing Order 43(c) says, “Except as provided in Standing Orders 95, 97.1(2)(c)(i) and 126(1)(a), following any 10-minute speech, a period not exceeding five minutes shall be made available...to allow members to ask questions and comment briefly on matters relevant to the speech and to allow responses thereto.”

What needs to happen is that the Conservatives need to realize that they were outwitted by the NDP today, suck it up, call it a day and move on. Tomorrow is a new day.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

I think we should recall that at one time in the House of Commons there was a period without questions and comments. It was not until the McGrath committee report of the 1980s that Parliament adopted the practice of having questions and answers after comments.

If we look at certain provincial legislatures, like the legislature in Manitoba, they do not have the practice of questions and comments. The McGrath committee found that parliamentary debate would be far better if members were asked questions after their speeches. It was due to a very deliberate attempt to improve the quality of debate, by the McGrath committee in 1989, that we have questions and comments.

Unless we are going to study the issue and change our Standing Orders, I do not think members should go back on an important reflection of members at that time. It has been the tradition, up until now, to have meaningful debate in the chamber by having questions and comments, and that is what members are doing. Whether they are leaving the chamber or whether they are just stupefied, which I can believe with some members on the Conservative bench, and they choose to stay in their place—

The Deputy Speaker: I will read from the Standing Orders. I will complete the clause that says, “Following any speech by the Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition, a minister moving a government order, or the member speaking in reply immediately after such minister, and following any 20-minute speech, a period not exceeding 10 minutes shall be made available, if required, to allow members to ask questions and comment briefly on matters relevant to the speech and to allow responses thereto.”

Bosc and Gagnon state, “If the questions and comments period is interrupted by another proceeding, when debate resumes on the motion, the questions and comments period will continue only if the Member who made the initial speech is present.”

There is also a ruling from 1986 that I can go and dig up, if people want.

As much as I am uncomfortable with what is going on here tonight, I believe there is a small piece of input from the hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I just have a question. Was the time between the end of the speech and the beginning of Q and A interrupted by other business of the House?

The Deputy Speaker: No.

I did reference “if available”. Whether I say if somebody is in the House or not means whether they are available and whether they can.

I am not the debater of what is required and what is not in this particular case. Folks, I am going to move on to the next speaker, which is the hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

• (2215)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, to answer my colleague who asked me if I will hang around to answer questions: absolutely. It is about accountability. At least the Liberal Party of Canada stands for accountability, transparency and so forth.

We have seen a demonstration, and it has happened to me personally today twice, where a Conservative stood in his place and delivered his speech and I wanted to ask him a question, but I could not. One was the former speaker, the official opposition House leader.

It is not a reflection on the rules, but I would encourage members, in particular from the Conservative Party, to please understand that there is a tradition of a higher sense of accountability. If they say something in the chamber, they should at least provide members the opportunity to challenge, comment or ask a question. I have witnessed this first-hand as a parliamentarian in the House of Commons, but this is the first time that I have actually been stood up twice when I asked a question of a Conservative and they did not have the courage—

The Deputy Speaker: I believe we have another point of order. It is a point of order night. You guys are great.

Business of Supply

The hon. member for Brantford—Brant.

Mr. Larry Brock: Mr. Speaker, before the commencement of the speech from the member opposite, there was a brief exchange between me and I believe the member opposite for Milton. Under his breath, he called me an “asshole”. Therefore, I would be asking for a full apology and a retraction.

An hon. member: Is it true?

Mr. Larry Brock: Mr. Speaker, now I have heard from the NDP that it is true, so I would like—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Deputy Speaker: All right. Order.

Everybody can sit down. I am just trying to bring the temperature down here a little bit. We are going to take a second.

The member for Elmwood—Transcona.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I just want to reassure my colleague that I did not say that it was true; I asked if it was true.

The Deputy Speaker: Okay, that is a clarification.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I just do not understand. Is he saying the accusation is true or that it is true that the member for Milton said it? I think there is a big difference there, and we really want to know and understand.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Milton.

Mr. Adam van Koevorden: Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge that the member and I had an exchange. However, what I said was: “Aren't you a lawyer?”

Now, I understand the word he said is sometimes confused with the word “lawyer”. However, I did not use the term that he said. It is unparliamentary language. I apologize if I offended the member, but I did not use that word.

The Deputy Speaker: I do not know if that was any better, but there you go.

While I recognize the late hour and the energy that everybody seems to be experiencing, I want to make sure that everybody has the opportunity to speak and be heard when they have that opportunity.

Right now, the floor is to the hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader with eight minutes and 57 seconds left.

* * *

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—TAX INCREASE ON BEER, WINE AND SPIRITS

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to get into the reality of the Conservative opposition motion that they are talking about today. We have to put it in proper perspective.

Over the last number of months, there has been a great deal of canvassing. The Prime Minister often says that Ottawa is a great place to be, and one has to bring the issues and the concerns of the constituents in one's ridings to Ottawa.

I can assure those who are following the debate that we bring a wide variety of different types of issues from out in our communities to Ottawa. We do this to ensure that we reflect what Canadians want to see.

The Conservatives are really focused on things like character assassination. In contrast, we are concerned about making sure that we have the backs of Canadians.

I say that because today they want to talk about beer and wine tax. There is no doubt that beer, alcohol, is a very important issue. I do not question that. However, when I do the math, I think it works out to about 15¢ or 16¢ on a case of 24 beers. That is what they want to talk about.

That is an opposition day. They get a few every year. I would suggest that if we were to listen to someone like me, who likes to respond to what my constituents are talking about, they talk about a wide variety of issues of great concern, whether it is inflation, health care or the environment. The list goes on.

By the way, I will be splitting my time with the member for Edmonton Strathcona.

I can assure everyone that there is a great number of issues. However, the Conservatives want to talk about taxes. They are being selective. One of the very first things we did in government, back in 2015 when Canadians kicked out Stephen Harper, was to reduce the tax for the middle class.

How did the Conservatives respond to that reduction, that legislation that reduced the tax for Canada's middle class? They ran. They voted against it.

We also increased the tax for Canada's wealthiest 1% of people. Once again, how did we see the Conservative Party vote? It voted against that too.

Let us fast-forward, right from the beginning to where we are today. It was not that long ago, three or four months, maybe five, that the Deputy Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance, said we want to provide additional tax relief for Canadians. We brought in legislation to say that we are going to double the GST rebate temporarily for the next six months.

Originally, the Conservatives actually opposed that tax initiative. In fairness, it took a little bit of shaming, quite a while, but at the end of the day, they actually flip-flopped. I say it somewhat candidly, but I compliment them on their change of heart.

I am glad, because that tax break that we provided, if we relate it to this one, would buy hundreds of bottles of beer, that one break. At the end of the day, we understand the benefits and the drawbacks of what is happening in our communities from a taxation perspective.

They are talking specifically about alcohol and beer. We are all concerned about that issue. We have a budget coming up awfully soon. I know that I am getting anxious about it; maybe there might even be the odd Conservative who is getting anxious about it. We anticipate that there is going to be a wide spectrum of issues dealt with in that budget.

• (2220)

For years, I have been a very strong advocate, for example, on the health care file. Health care, I have argued in the past, is part of our Canadian core identity. I would suggest that it might have been more advantageous to talk about the health care issue based on what the Conservative Party has been talking about for the last few days, something Canadians are genuinely concerned about: the recognition of credentials and how we get more health care workers, whether doctors, nurses or support workers, into the system.

Conservatives might not fully understand jurisdictional responsibilities and things of that nature. They might be trying to intentionally mislead people in terms of what they could be capable of doing, especially if we look at the history of the Conservative Party. It is not very good when it comes to health care; I can assure everyone of that.

At the end of the day—

The Deputy Speaker: There is a point of order by the hon. member for Pickering—Uxbridge.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives are heckling. I would encourage them, if they have questions or concerns, to ask them. The opportunity is there. I would welcome them asking questions instead of running out.

• (2225)

The Deputy Speaker: That is not really a point of order, but the hon. member will have questions and comments after he finishes his speech in two minutes and 53 seconds.

I would ask everyone to come to order.

The hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader has the floor.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I am glad we are talking about budget priorities. I believe that at the end of the day, we will see things in the budget that will be there in a very real and tangible way for Canadians.

I say to my Conservative friends across the way that we all know there is a great deal of consultation that takes place, whether it is the individual member of Parliament, the work members do within their constituencies and talking to constituents or meetings and discussions within caucuses. There are discussions held virtually throughout the year, but in particular, there are the pre-budget debates. At the end of the day, I believe we will see a budget that reflects the interests of Canadians.

As I indicated—

Hon. Andrew Scheer: I'm here to ask you a question.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: I'll stay here for your question.

Business of Supply

Mr. Speaker, I can say that I am going to be looking in areas that really concern the constituents of Winnipeg North. I know my colleagues will be doing likewise for the ridings they represent.

We have been advocating to the appropriate ministers, including the Minister of Finance, in different ways. These areas may be the bigger issues of our health care system, what is taking place in our environment or the importance of many of those infrastructure programs at the local level. We will continue to advocate where we believe the government should be establishing its priorities in terms of budgetary and legislative measures.

For those following the debate, as I mentioned at the beginning, we take the ways we can use our taxation policies to ensure we have a healthier economy and society very seriously. We can see this in the tax breaks for the middle class, the tax hike on Canada's wealthiest 1%, the GST rebate and the enhancement to the Canada workers benefit. We can also invest in the CRA to ensure, for example, that they stop the people who are trying to avoid paying their fair share.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I come from New Westminster—Burnaby, the heart of some of the best breweries and wineries in all of Canada. I will mention the award-winning Steel and Oak Brewing Co.; Another Beer Co., or ABC, which has terrific products; the Dageraad Brewing in Burnaby, which has a lot of innovation in its products; and Pacific Breeze Winery, which provides excellent wines.

There is no doubt that the tax increase would have a big impact. The government is aware of this. We have been speaking of this for hours. The simple question is this: Why will the government not stop the price increase? Why will it not just halt it, so that it does not increase on April 1?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to speculate about anything in regard to the budget, but what I can say is that I believe it works out to 14¢ or 15¢ for a case of 24 bottles of beer. That is less than a penny per bottle of beer. That is the essence of what we are talking about. Canadians from coast to coast are concerned about a wide spectrum of issues, whether it is health care, the environment, what is happening around the world today and in Ukraine, how we can continue to support Canadians or how we ensure that there is ongoing transparency and accountability. There is a wide spectrum of things that are out there. I do not know to what degree 12¢ or 15¢ for a case of 24 beers rates as the top priority of Canadians. I suspect it does not.

• (2230)

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I heard the hon. member just lamenting the fact that he did not have the opportunity to ask me a question, so I am happy to stand here now and give him the opportunity to at least answer a question, which is something that his leader never does, so maybe he will break that mould. It is a bit ironic after the many, many weeks at committee when Liberal MPs embarrassed themselves and demeaned themselves in their theatrical filibuster to try to prevent senior officials in the Liberal Party from testifying.

Business of Supply

However, we are talking about an escalator tax, an automatic tax increase, on beer, wine and spirits. I did hear the hon. member say it is a few pennies, but we can add it all up and add up the increase on the carbon tax and add up the increased mortgage payments that people have to make as interest rates go up. If the Liberals say that it is not a big deal and it is just a few cents a bottle, the obvious question is, well, then why raise it?

When the Liberals talk about the cost of living and when they talk about all the costs that are falling onto Canadians, why do they believe that Canadians should pay even more, when they come home from work, to enjoy a cold beer after an honest day's work or to bring friends over to celebrate a birthday? Why do they believe that Canadians should pay more for that while the Prime Minister jets around on vacation, billing taxpayers for flights all over the country, sometimes thousands of dollars to avoid driving just an hour? Why do the Liberals believe that Canadians should pay more while they bill taxpayers so much?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I am still focused on how the member started the question. He was being critical of the Prime Minister because he was saying he was not happy with the answer when he asked a question. At least the Prime Minister hangs around and answers the question. He stays to respond.

The very same member, when I attempted to ask a question, evaporated into thin air. I am not going to say where he was, but he totally refused to answer the question. Therefore, I would suggest that he is consistent with the Conservative policy in general. It is very hard to understand because, at the end of the day, someone would say there is nothing to it. There is no—

The Deputy Speaker: Let me get in one more question.

The hon. member for Abitibi—Témiscamingue.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what my colleague from Winnipeg North thinks of the lobbying of interest groups that want to limit alcohol consumption to two drinks per week as recommended by their research. This could have consequences for the profitability of many of the regional microbreweries and craft distilleries in our regions. I want to salute Éduc'alcool, which conducted studies and has promoted responsible consumption habits for Quebecers consisting of two drinks a day for women and three for men, and 10 drinks per week for women and 15 for men. This approach has been adopted in Quebec and keeps our local economy going.

Will the government respect the Éduc'alcool guidelines or will it adopt those of the lobbies that essentially encourage prohibition?

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, one of the things I do respect is provincial jurisdiction, where liquor stores and so forth are administered through provincial governments. They do have all sorts of programs out there dealing with drinking responsibilities.

I would think the stakeholders, the provinces and Ottawa all play a role in responsible drinking.

Mr. Chris Warkentin (Grande Prairie—Mackenzie, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I move:

That the honourable member for Calgary Rocky Ridge be now heard.

• (2235)

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on the motion.

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

Mr. John Nater: Mr. Speaker, I would request a recorded division.

The Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

During the ringing of the bells:

• (2250)

The Speaker: It being 10:50 p.m., I have no choice but to interrupt the bells.

Pursuant to order made on Friday, March 10, and this being the final supply day in the period ending March 26, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings on the opposition motion and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the business of supply.

The question is on the motion. May I dispense?

Some hon. members: No.

[*Chair read text of motion to House*]

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

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Berthold: Mr. Speaker, I request a recorded division.

The Speaker: Call in the members.

• (2335)

[*English*]

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

(*Division No. 275*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultouf	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Angus	Arnold
Ashton	Bachrach
Baldinelli	Barlow
Barrett	Beaulieu
Bergeron	Berthold
Bérubé	Bezan
Blaikie	Blanchet
Blanchette-Jonas	Blaney
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins
Cannings	Caputo

Business of Supply

Carrie
 Chambers
 Chong
 Cooper
 Dancho
 Davies
 Deltell
 Desilets
 Doherty
 Dreeshen
 Ellis
 Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
 Fast
 Findlay
 Gallant
 Gaudreau
 Généreux
 Gill
 Godin
 Gourde
 Green
 Hoback
 Idlout
 Johns
 Kelly
 Kmiec
 Kramp-Neuman
 Kusie
 Lake
 Larouche
 Lehoux
 Lewis (Essex)
 Liepert
 Lobb
 Maguire
 Masse
 May (Saanic—Gulf Islands)
 McCauley (Edmonton West)
 McPherson
 Michaud
 Morantz
 Morrison
 Muys
 Normandin
 Patzer
 Pauté
 Perron
 Poilievre
 Redekopp
 Rempel Garner
 Roberts
 Ruff
 Scheer
 Seeback
 Shipley
 Sinclair-Desgagné
 Small
 Steinley
 Stewart
 Stubbs
 Therrien
 Tochor
 Trudel
 Van Popta
 Vidal
 Vignola
 Vis
 Wagantall
 Waugh
 Williams
 Zarrillo

Chabot
 Champoux
 Collins (Victoria)
 Dalton
 Davidson
 DeBellefeuille
 d'Entremont
 Desjarlais
 Dowdall
 Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
 Epp
 Falk (Provencher)
 Ferreri
 Fortin
 Garrison
 Gazan
 Genuis
 Gladu
 Goodridge
 Gray
 Hallan
 Hughes
 Jeneroux
 Julian
 Kitchen
 Kram
 Kurek
 Kwan
 Lantsman
 Lawrence
 Lemire
 Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
 Lloyd
 MacGregor
 Martel
 Mathysen
 Mazier
 McLean
 Melillo
 Moore
 Morrice
 Motz
 Nater
 O'Toole
 Paul-Hus
 Perkins
 Plamondon
 Rayes
 Reid
 Richards
 Rood
 Savard-Tremblay
 Schmale
 Shields
 Simard
 Singh
 Soroka
 Ste-Marie
 Strahl
 Thériault
 Thomas
 Tolmie
 Uppal
 Vecchio
 Vien
 Villemure
 Vuong
 Warkentin
 Webber
 Williamson
 Zimmer— 170

Aldag
 Ali
 Anandasangaree
 Arya
 Badawey
 Baker
 Beech
 Bennett
 Bittle
 Blois
 Bradford
 Casey
 Chahal
 Chatel
 Chiang
 Cormier
 Dabrusin
 Dhaliwal
 Diab
 Drouin
 Duclos
 Ehsassi
 Erskine-Smith
 Fillmore
 Fonseca
 Fraser
 Fry
 Gerretsen
 Guilbeault
 Hanley
 Hepfner
 Housefather
 Hutchings
 Jen
 Joly
 Kayabaga
 Khalid
 Koutrakis
 Lalonde
 Lametti
 Lapointe
 Lauzon
 Lebouthillier
 Longfield
 MacDonald (Malpeque)
 Martinez Ferrada
 McDonald (Avalon)
 McKay
 McLeod
 Mendicino
 Miller
 Murray
 Ng
 O'Connell
 O'Regan
 Powlowski
 Robillard
 Rogers
 Sahota
 Saks
 Sarai
 Schiefke
 Sgro
 Sheehan
 Sidhu (Brampton South)
 Sousa
 Suds
 Taylor Roy
 Trudeau
 Valdez

NAYS

Members

Alghabra
 Anand
 Arseneault
 Atwin
 Bains
 Battiste
 Bendayan
 Bibeau
 Blair
 Boissonnault
 Brière
 Chagger
 Champagne
 Chen
 Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
 Coteau
 Damoff
 Dhillon
 Dong
 Dubourg
 Dzerowicz
 El-Khoury
 Fergus
 Fisher
 Fortier
 Freeland
 Gaheer
 Gould
 Hajdu
 Hardie
 Holland
 Hussen
 Iacono
 Jaczek
 Jowhari
 Kelloway
 Khera
 Kusmierczyk
 Lambropoulos
 Lamoureux
 Lattanzio
 LeBlanc
 Lightbound
 MacAulay (Cardigan)
 MacKinnon (Gatineau)
 May (Cambridge)
 McGuinty
 McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
 Mendès
 Miao
 Morrissey
 Naqvi
 Noormohamed
 Oliphant
 Petitpas Taylor
 Qualtrough
 Rodriguez
 Romanado
 Sajjan
 Samson
 Scarpaleggia
 Serré
 Shanahan
 Sidhu (Brampton East)
 Sorbara
 St-Onge
 Tassi
 Thompson
 Turnbull
 Van Bynen

Business of Supply

van Koeverden
Vandenbeld
Weiler
Yip
Zuberi— 149

Vandal
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid

Dubourg
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Gould
Guilbeault
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Larouche
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor
Maloney
Masse
May (Cambridge)
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod
Mendès
Miao
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
O'Connell
O'Regan
Perron
Plamondon
Qualtrough
Robillard
Rogers
Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Singh
Sousa
St-Onge
Tassi
Thériault
Thompson
Trudel
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vandenbeld
Villemure
Vuong

Duclos
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Fry
Garrison
Gazan
Gill
Green
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Joly
Julian
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lametti
Lapointe
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Lemire
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
May (Saarich—Gulf Islands)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Mendicino
Michaud
Morrice
Murray
Ng
Normandin
Oliphant
Pauzé
Petipas Taylor
Powlowski
Rayes
Rodriguez
Romanado
Sajjan
Samson
Savard-Tremblay
Schieffe
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sinclair-Desgagné
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Therrien
Trudeau
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandal
Vignola
Virani
Weiler

PAIRED

Members

Desbiens

Duguid— 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

● (2340)

[Translation]

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (C), 2022-23

Hon. Mona Fortier (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.)
moved:

That the Supplementary Estimates (C) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2023, be concurred in.

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

[English]

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

● (2350)

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

(Division No. 276)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Beaulieu
Bendayan
Bergeron
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blanchette-Joncas
Blois
Bradford
Brunelle-Duceppe
Casey
Chagger
Champagne
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Victoria)
Coteau
Damoff
DeBellefeuille
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Dong

Alghabra
Anand
Angus
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Battiste
Beech
Bennett
Bérubé
Bittle
Blair
Blaney
Boissonnault
Brière
Cannings
Chabot
Chahal
Champoux
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davies
Desilets
Dhaliwal
Diab
Drouin

Business of Supply

Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 209

Yip
Zarrillo

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Berthold	Bezan
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chambers
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	Deltell
d'Entremont	Doherty
Dowdall	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Ferreri	Findlay
Gallant	Généreux
Genuis	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Gray
Hallan	Hoback
Jeneroux	Kelly
Kitchen	Kmiec
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kurek	Kusie
Lake	Lantsman
Lawrence	Lehoux
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	Maguire
Martel	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Melillo	Moore
Morantz	Morrison
Motz	Muys
Nater	O'Toole
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Perkins	Poilievre
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Roberts	Rood
Ruff	Secheer
Schmale	Seeback
Shields	Shipley
Small	Soroka
Steinley	Stewart
Strahl	Stubbs
Thomas	Tochor
Tolmie	Uppal
Van Popta	Vecchio
Vidal	Vien
Viersen	Vis
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Williams	Williamson
Zimmer— 115	

PAIRED

Members

Desbiens
Duguid— 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Hon. Mona Fortier moved that Bill C-43, An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the federal public administration for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2023, be now read the first time and be printed.

(Motion deemed adopted and bill read the first time)

Hon. Mona Fortier moved that the bill be read the second time and referred to a committee of the whole.

[Translation]

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, if you seek it, I believe you will find agreement to apply the results of the previous vote to the current vote with the Liberals voting yes.

[English]

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Mr. Speaker, we agree to apply the vote, with the Conservatives voting nay.

[Translation]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply and will be voting in favour.

[English]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply and will be voting in favour.

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Greens agree to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

Mr. Kevin Vuong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the vote, voting in favour.

[Translation]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and I will be voting in favour of the motion.

● (2355)

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

(Division No. 277)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bendayan	Bennett
Bergeron	Bérubé
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney
Blois	Boissonnault
Bradford	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Casey	Chabot
Chagger	Chahal
Champagne	Champoux
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Collins (Victoria)	Cornier
Coteau	Dabrusin

Business of Supply

Damoff	Davies	Van Bynen	van Koeverden
DeBellefeuille	Desilets	Vandal	Vandenbeld
Desjarlais	Dhaliwal	Vignola	Villemure
Dhillon	Diab	Virani	Vuong
Drouin	Dubourg	Weiler	Wilkinson
Duclos	Dzerowicz	Yip	Zahid
Ehsassi	El-Khoury	Zarrillo	Zuberi— 208
Erskine-Smith	Fergus		
Fillmore	Fisher		
Fonseca	Fortier		
Fortin	Fragiskatos		
Fraser	Freeland		
Fry	Gaheer	Aboultaif	Aitchison
Garrison	Gaudreau	Albas	Allison
Gazan	Gerretsen	Arnold	Baldinelli
Gill	Gould	Barlow	Barrett
Green	Guilbeault	Berthold	Bezan
Hajdu	Hanley	Block	Bragdon
Hardie	Hepfner	Brassard	Brock
Holland	Housefather	Calkins	Caputo
Hughes	Hussen	Carrie	Chambers
Hutchings	Iacono	Chong	Cooper
Idlout	Ien	Dalton	Dancho
Jaczek	Johns	Davidson	Deltell
Joly	Jowhari	d'Entremont	Doherty
Julian	Kayabaga	Dowdall	Dreeshen
Kelloway	Khalid	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Khera	Koutrakis	Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Kusmierczyk	Kwan	Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Lalonde	Lambropoulos	Ferrier	Findlay
Lametti	Lamoureux	Gallant	Généreux
Lapointe	Larouche	Genuis	Gladu
Lattanzio	Lauzon	Godin	Goodridge
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier	Gourde	Gray
Lemire	Lightbound	Hallan	Hoback
Long	Longfield	Jeneroux	Kelly
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAtulay (Cardigan)	Kitchen	Kmiec
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacGregor	Kram	Kramp-Neuman
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney	Kurek	Kusie
Martinez Ferrada	Masse	Lake	Lantsman
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)	Lawrence	Lehoux
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	McDonald (Avalon)	Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
McGuinty	McKay	Liepert	Lloyd
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod	Lobb	Maguire
McPherson	Mendès	Martel	Mazier
Mendicino	Miao	McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Michaud	Miller	Melillo	Moore
Morrice	Morrissey	Morantz	Morrison
Murray	Naqvi	Motz	Muys
Ng	Noormohamed	Nater	O'Toole
Normandin	O'Connell	Patzner	Paul-Hus
Oliphant	O'Regan	Perkins	Poilievre
Pauzé	Perron	Redekopp	Reid
Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon	Rempel Garner	Richards
Powlowski	Qualtrough	Roberts	Rood
Rayes	Robillard	Ruff	Scheer
Rodriguez	Rogers	Schmale	Seeback
Romanado	Sahota	Shields	Shipley
Sajjan	Saks	Small	Soroka
Samson	Sarai	Steinley	Stewart
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia	Strahl	Stubbs
Schiefke	Serré	Thomas	Tochor
Sgro	Shanahan	Tolmie	Uppal
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Van Popta	Vecchio
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard	Vidal	Vien
Sinclair-Desgagné	Singh	Viersen	Vis
Sorbara	Sousa	Wagantall	Warkentin
Ste-Marie	St-Onge	Waugh	Webber
Sudds	Tassi	Williams	Williamson
Taylor Roy	Thériault	Zimmer— 115	
Therrien	Thompson		
Trudeau	Trudel		
Turnbull	Valdez		

NAYS**Members**

Business of Supply

PAIRED

Members

Desbiens

Duguid— 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[*English*]

Accordingly, this bill stands referred to a committee of the whole. I do now leave the chair for the House to go into committee of the whole.

(Bill read the second time and the House went into committee of the whole thereon, Mr. Chris d'Entremont in the chair)

(On clause 2)

Mrs. Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC): Mr. Chair, I wonder if the President of the Treasury Board can confirm that the supply bill is in its usual form.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Mona Fortier (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Chair, the presentation of this bill is identical to that used during the previous supply period.

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 2 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 2 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall clause 3 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 3 agreed to)

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Shall clause 4 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 4 agreed to)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall clause 5 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 5 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall clause 6 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 6 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall schedule 1 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Schedule 1 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall schedule 2 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Schedule 2 agreed to)

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Shall clause 1, the short title, carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 1 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall the preamble carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Preamble agreed to)

The Chair: Shall the title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Title agreed to)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall the bill carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Bill agreed to)

The Chair: Shall I rise and report the bill?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Bill reported)

Hon. Mona Fortier moved that the bill be concurred in.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, again, I think you will find unanimous consent to apply the results of the previous vote to this vote. The Liberals will be voting in favour of the motion.

[*English*]

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Mr. Speaker, we agree to apply the vote, with the Conservatives voting nay.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour of the motion.

[*English*]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply and will be voting in favour.

Business of Supply

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Greens agree to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

Mr. Kevin Vuong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the results of the previous vote and vote in favour.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the vote and will be voting in favour of the motion.

• (2400)

[*English*]

Mr. Han Dong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and vote yes.

[*Translation*]

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

(*Division No. 278*)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bendayan	Bennett
Bergeron	Bérubé
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney
Blois	Boissonnault
Bradford	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Casey	Chabot
Chagger	Chahal
Champagne	Champoux
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Collins (Victoria)	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
DeBellefeuille	Desilets
Desjarlais	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Dong	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fergus	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Gaheer	Garrison
Gaudreau	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gill
Gould	Green
Guilbeault	Hajdu
Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Holland
Housefather	Hughes
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Idlout
Ien	Jaczek

Johns	Joly
Jowhari	Julian
Kayabaga	Kelloway
Khalid	Khera
Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Kwan	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Larouche	Lattanzio
Lauzon	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lemire
Lightbound	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
Masse	Mathysen
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanieh—Gulf Islands)
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod	McPherson
Mendès	Mendicino
Miao	Michaud
Miller	Morrice
Morrissey	Murray
Naqvi	Ng
Noormohamed	Normandin
O'Connell	Oliphant
O'Regan	Paupé
Perron	Petitpas Taylor
Plamondon	Powlowski
Qualtrough	Rayes
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Sahota	Sajjan
Saks	Samson
Sarai	Savard-Tremblay
Scarpaleggia	Schieffe
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
Singh	Sorbara
Sousa	Ste-Marie
St-Onge	Sudds
Tassi	Taylor Roy
Thériault	Therrien
Thompson	Trudeau
Trudel	Turnbull
Valdez	Van Bynen
van Koevorden	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vignola
Villemure	Virani
Vuong	Weiler
Wilkinson	Yip
Zahid	Zarrillo
Zuberi — 209	

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Berthold	Bezan
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chambers
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	Deltell

Business of Supply

d'Entremont	Doherty
Dowdall	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Ferreri	Findlay
Gallant	Généreux
Genius	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Gray
Hallan	Hoback
Jeneroux	Kelly
Kitchen	Kmiec
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kurek	Kusie
Lake	Lantsman
Lawrence	Lehoux
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	Maguire
Martel	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Melillo	Moore
Morantz	Morrison
Motz	Muys
Nater	O'Toole
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Perkins	Poilievre
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Roberts	Rood
Ruff	Scheer
Schmale	Seeback
Shields	Shipley
Small	Soroka
Steinley	Stewart
Strahl	Stubbs
Thomas	Tochor
Tolmie	Uppal
Van Popta	Vecchio
Vidal	Vien
Viersen	Vis
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Williams	Williamson
Zimmer— 115	

PAIRED

Members

Desbiens

Duguid— 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Hon. Mona Fortier moved that the bill be now read the third time and passed.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, again, I think you will find unanimous consent to apply the results of the previous vote to this vote. The Liberals will be voting in favour of the motion.

[*English*]

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Mr. Speaker, once again, the Conservatives agree to apply the vote, and the Conservatives will vote nay.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour of the motion.

[*English*]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply and will be voting in favour.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Greens agree to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Vuong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the results of the previous vote, voting in favour.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

[*English*]

Mr. Han Dong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the vote and vote yes.

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

(*Division No. 279*)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alhabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bendayan	Bennett
Bergeron	Bérubé
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blanchette-Jones	Blaney
Blois	Boissonnault
Bradford	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Casey	Chabot
Chagger	Chahal
Champagne	Champoux
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Collins (Victoria)	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
DeBellefeuille	Desilets
Desjarlais	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Dong	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fergus	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Gaheer	Garrison
Gaudreau	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gill
Gould	Green
Guilbeault	Hajdu

Business of Supply

Hanley	Hardie	Brassard	Brock
Hepfner	Holland	Calkins	Caputo
Housefather	Hughes	Carrie	Chambers
Hussen	Hutchings	Chong	Cooper
Iacono	Idlout	Dalton	Dancho
Ien	Jaczek	Davidson	Deltell
Johns	Joly	d'Entremont	Doherty
Jowhari	Julian	Dowdall	Dreeshen
Kayabaga	Kelloway	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Khalid	Khera	Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk	Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Kwan	Lalonde	Ferreri	Findlay
Lambropoulos	Lametti	Gallant	Généreux
Lamoureux	Lapointe	Genuis	Gladu
Larouche	Lattanzio	Godin	Goodridge
Lauzon	LeBlanc	Gourde	Gray
Lebouthillier	Lemire	Hallan	Hoback
Lightbound	Long	Jeneroux	Kelly
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	Kitchen	Kmiec
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)	Kram	Kramp-Neuman
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Kurek	Kusie
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada	Lake	Lantsman
Masse	Mathysen	Lawrence	Lehoux
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty	Liepert	Lloyd
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	Lobb	Maguire
McLeod	McPherson	Martel	Mazier
Mendès	Medicino	McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Miao	Michaud	Melillo	Moore
Miller	Morrice	Morantz	Morrison
Morrissey	Murray	Motz	Muys
Naqvi	Ng	Nater	O'Toole
Noormohamed	Normandin	Patzer	Paul-Hus
O'Connell	Oliphant	Perkins	Poilievre
O'Regan	Pauzé	Redekopp	Reid
Perron	Petitpas Taylor	Rempel Garner	Richards
Plamondon	Powlowski	Roberts	Rood
Qualtrough	Rayes	Ruff	Scheer
Robillard	Rodriguez	Schmale	Seeback
Rogers	Romanado	Shields	Shiplely
Sahota	Sajjan	Small	Soroka
Saks	Samson	Steinley	Stewart
Sarai	Savard-Tremblay	Strahl	Stubbs
Scarpaleggia	Schieffe	Thomas	Tochor
Serré	Sgro	Tolmie	Uppal
Shanahan	Sheehan	Van Popta	Vecchio
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)	Vidal	Vien
Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné	Viersen	Vis
Singh	Sorbara	Wagantall	Warkentin
Sousa	Ste-Marie	Waugh	Webber
St-Onge	Sudds	Williams	Williamson
Tassi	Taylor Roy	Zimmer — 115	
Thériault	Therrien		
Thompson	Trudeau		
Trudel	Turnbull		
Valdez	Van Bynen		
van Koeverden	Vandal		
Vandenbeld	Vignola		
Villemure	Virani		
Vuong	Weiler		
Wilkinson	Yip		
Zahid	Zarrillo		
Zuberi — 209			

NAYS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Berthold	Bezan
Block	Bragdon

PAIRED

Members

Desbiens Duguid — 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

* * *

[Translation]

INTERIM SUPPLY**Hon. Mona Fortier (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.)**
moved:

That the House do concur in interim supply as follows:

That a sum not exceeding \$89,678,492,027 being composed of the following amounts, each item rounded up to the next dollar:

Business of Supply

(1) three twelfths (\$23,752,533,318) of the total of the amounts of the items set forth in the Proposed Schedule 1 and Schedule 2 of the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2024, except for those items below:

(2) twelve twelfths of the total of the amounts of Department of Finance Vote 5, and Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Vote 20, of the said estimates, \$2;

(3) eleven twelfths of the total of the amounts of Department of Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Votes 1 and 5, Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Vote L30, Department of Indigenous Services Vote 1, Department of National Defence Vote 10, Leaders' Debates Commission Vote 1, Public Health Agency of Canada Vote 5, Royal Canadian Mounted Police Vote 10, and Treasury Board Secretariat Vote 5, of the said estimates, \$26,789,930,964;

(4) ten twelfths of the amount of Department of Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Vote 10, of the said estimates, \$4,042,639,040;

(5) nine twelfths of the total of the amounts of Department of Indigenous Services Votes 5 and 10, Department of Justice Vote 1, and Public Health Agency of Canada Vote 1, of the said estimates, \$14,949,847,633;

(6) seven twelfths of the total of the amounts of Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety Vote 1, Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission Vote 1, Department for Women and Gender Equality Vote 5, Public Health Agency of Canada Vote 10, and Statistics Canada Vote 1, of the said estimates, \$701,016,431;

(7) six twelfths of the total of the amounts of Administrative Tribunals Support Service of Canada Vote 1, Canadian Accessibility Standards Development Organization Vote 5, Canadian Air Transport Security Authority Vote 1, Department of Agriculture and Agri-Food Vote 1, Department of Employment and Social Development Vote 5, Department of Health Vote 10, Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario Vote 5, and The Jacques-Cartier and Champlain Bridges Inc. Vote 1, of the said estimates, \$7,193,709,994;

(8) five twelfths of the total of the amounts of Canada Council for the Arts Vote 1, Canadian High Arctic Research Station Vote 1, Department of Citizenship and Immigration Vote 10, Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Vote 1, Department of Veterans Affairs Vote 5, Office of the Parliamentary Budget Officer Vote 1, Royal Canadian Mounted Police Vote 1, Treasury Board Secretariat Vote 1, and Windsor-Detroit Bridge Authority Vote 1, of the said estimates, \$4,961,276,773;

(9) four twelfths of the total of the amounts of Canadian Space Agency Vote 10, Canadian Transportation Agency Vote 1, Department of Citizenship and Immigration Vote 1, Department of Health Vote 1, Department of Industry Votes 1 and 10, Department of Public Works and Government Services Vote 1, Library of Parliament Vote 1, National Security and Intelligence Review Agency Secretariat Vote 1, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council Vote 5, Office of the Auditor General Vote 1, Parks Canada Agency Vote 1, Privy Council Office Vote 1, Public Service Commission Vote 1, Shared Services Canada Votes 1 and 5, Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council Vote 5, Treasury Board Secretariat Vote 20, and VIA Rail Canada Inc. Vote 1, of the said estimates, \$7,287,537,872;

be granted to His Majesty on account of the fiscal year ending March 31, 2024.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, again, I believe that if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the result from the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting yes.

[English]

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree to apply the vote, with Conservatives voting nay.

[Translation]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the result from the previous vote to this vote, with our members voting in favour.

[English]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

[Translation]

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply the result of the previous vote to this vote. It will be voting in favour of the motion.

● (2405)

[English]

Mr. Kevin Vuong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the results of the previous vote, voting in favour.

[Translation]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the results of the previous vote to this vote and I am voting in favour.

[English]

Mr. Han Dong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and am voting yes.

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

(Division No. 280)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bendayan	Bennett
Bergeron	Bérubé
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney
Blois	Boissonnault
Bradford	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Casey	Chabot
Chagger	Chahal
Champagne	Champoux
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Collins (Victoria)	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
DeBellefeuille	Desilets
Desjarlais	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Dong	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fergus	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Gaheer	Garrison
Gaudreau	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gill
Gould	Green
Guilbeault	Hajdu
Hanley	Hardie

Business of Supply

Hepfner	Holland	Calkins	Caputo
Housefather	Hughes	Carrie	Chambers
Hussen	Hutchings	Chong	Cooper
Iacono	Idlout	Dalton	Dancho
Ien	Jaczek	Davidson	Deltell
Johns	Joly	d'Entremont	Doherty
Jowhari	Julian	Dowdall	Dreeshen
Kayabaga	Kelloway	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Khalid	Khera	Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk	Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Kwan	Lalonde	Ferrier	Findlay
Lambropoulos	Lametti	Gallant	Généreux
Lamoureux	Lapointe	Genuis	Gladu
Larouche	Lattanzio	Godin	Goodridge
Lauzon	LeBlanc	Gourde	Gray
Lebouthillier	Lemire	Hallan	Hoback
Lightbound	Long	Jeneroux	Kelly
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	Kitchen	Kmiec
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)	Kram	Kramp-Neuman
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Kurek	Kusie
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada	Lake	Lantsman
Masse	Mathysen	Lawrence	Lehoux
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanech—Gulf Islands)	Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty	Liepert	Lloyd
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	Lobb	Maguire
McLeod	McPherson	Martel	Mazier
Mendès	Medicino	McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Miao	Michaud	Melillo	Moore
Miller	Morrice	Morantz	Morrison
Morrissey	Murray	Motz	Muys
Naqvi	Ng	Nater	O'Toole
Noormohamed	Normandin	Patzer	Paul-Hus
O'Connell	Oliphant	Perkins	Poilievre
O'Regan	Pauzé	Redekopp	Reid
Perron	Petitpas Taylor	Rempel Garner	Richards
Plamondon	Powlowski	Roberts	Rood
Qualtrough	Rayes	Ruff	Scheer
Robillard	Rodriguez	Schmale	Seeback
Rogers	Romanado	Shields	Shiplely
Sahota	Sajjan	Small	Soroka
Saks	Samson	Steinley	Stewart
Sarai	Savard-Tremblay	Strahl	Stubbs
Scarpaleggia	Schieffe	Thomas	Tochor
Serré	Sgro	Tolmie	Uppal
Shanahan	Sheehan	Van Popta	Vecchio
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)	Vidal	Vien
Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné	Viersen	Vis
Singh	Sorbara	Wagantall	Warkentin
Sousa	Ste-Marie	Waugh	Webber
St-Onge	Sudds	Williams	Williamson
Tassi	Taylor Roy	Zimmer — 115	
Thériault	Therrien		
Thompson	Trudeau		
Trudel	Turnbull		
Valdez	Van Bynen		
van Koeverden	Vandal		
Vandenbeld	Vignola		
Villemure	Virani		
Vuong	Weiler		
Wilkinson	Yip		
Zahid	Zarrillo		
Zuberi — 209			

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Berthold	Bezan
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock

PAIRED

Members

Desbiens Duguid — 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.*[Translation]*

Hon. Mona Fortier moved that Bill C-44, An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the federal public administration for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2024, be read the first time.

(Motion deemed adopted and bill read the first time)

[English]

Hon. Mona Fortier moved that the bill be read the second time and referred to a committee of the whole.

Business of Supply

[Translation]

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, once again, I believe that if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the result from the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting yes.

[English]

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives, I am sure to the surprise of all assembled, agree to apply the vote and vote nay.

[Translation]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the result from the previous vote to this vote and will be voting in favour of the motion.

[English]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply and will be voting in favour.

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Greens agree to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

Mr. Kevin Vuong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the results of the previous vote, voting in favour.

[Translation]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the result from the previous vote to this vote. I will be voting in favour of the motion.

[English]

Mr. Han Dong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the vote, voting in favour.

[Translation]

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

(Division No. 281)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bendayan	Bennett
Bergeron	Bérubé
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney
Blois	Boissonnault
Bradford	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Casey	Chabot
Chagger	Chahal
Champagne	Champoux
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Collins (Victoria)	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies

DeBellefeuille	Desilets
Desjarlais	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Dong	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fergus	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Gaheer	Garrison
Gaudreau	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gill
Gould	Green
Guilbeault	Hajdu
Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Holland
Housefather	Hughes
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Idlout
Ien	Jaczek
Johns	Joly
Jowhari	Julian
Kayabaga	Kelloway
Khalid	Khera
Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Kwan	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Larouche	Lattanzio
Lauzon	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lemire
Lightbound	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
Masse	Mathysen
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanieh—Gulf Islands)
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod	McPherson
Mendès	Medicino
Miao	Michaud
Miller	Morrice
Morrissey	Murray
Naqvi	Ng
Noormohamed	Normandin
O'Connell	Oliphant
O'Regan	Pauzé
Perron	Petitpas Taylor
Plamondon	Powlowski
Qualtrough	Rayes
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Sahota	Sajjan
Saks	Samson
Sarai	Savard-Tremblay
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
Singh	Sorbara
Sousa	Ste-Marie
St-Onge	Sudds
Tassi	Taylor Roy
Thériault	Therrien
Thompson	Trudeau
Trudel	Turnbull
Valdez	Van Bynen

Business of Supply

van Koeverden
Vandenbeld
Villemure
Vuong
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi — 209

Vandal
Vignola
Virani
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albas
Arnold
Barlow
Berthold
Block
Brassard
Calkins
Carrie
Chong
Dalton
Davidson
d'Entremont
Dowdall
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Ferreri
Gallant
Genuis
Godin
Gourde
Hallan
Jeneroux
Kitchen
Kram
Kurek
Lake
Lawrence
Lewis (Essex)
Liepert
Lobb
Martel
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Melillo
Morantz
Motz
Nater
Patzer
Perkins
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Roberts
Ruff
Schmale
Shields
Small
Steinley
Strahl
Thomas
Tolmie
Van Popta
Vidal
Viersen
Wagantall
Wauh
Williams
Zimmer — 115

Aitchison
Allison
Baldinelli
Barrett
Bezan
Bragdon
Brock
Caputo
Chambers
Cooper
Dancho
Deltell
Doherty
Dreeschen
Ellis
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Findlay
Généreux
Gladu
Goodridge
Gray
Hoback
Kelly
Kniec
Kramp-Neuman
Kusie
Lantsman
Lehoux
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lloyd
Maguire
Mazier
McLean
Moore
Morrison
Muys
O'Toole
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Reid
Richards
Rood
Scheer
Seeback
Shipley
Soroka
Stewart
Stubbs
Tochor
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vis
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson

PAIRED

Members

Desbiens

Duguid — 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[*English*]

Accordingly, this bill stands referred to a committee of the whole. I do now leave the chair for the House to go into committee of the whole.

(Bill read the second time and the House went into committee of the whole thereon, Mr. Chris d'Entremont in the chair)

(On clause 2)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC): Mr. Chair, can the President of the Treasury Board confirm that the bill is in its usual form?

[*English*]

Hon. Mona Fortier (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Chair, the form of this bill is the same as that passed in the previous supply period.

The Chair: Shall clause 2 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 2 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall clause 3 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 3 agreed to)

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Shall clause 4 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 4 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall clause 5 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 5 agreed to)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall schedule 1.1 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Schedule 1.1 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall schedule 1.2 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Business of Supply

Some hon. members: On division.

(Schedule 1.2 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall schedule 1.3 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Schedule 1.3 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall schedule 1.4 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Schedule 1.4 agreed to)

● (2410)

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Shall schedule 1.5 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Schedule 1.5 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall schedule 1.6 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Schedule 1.6 agreed to)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall schedule 1.7 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Schedule 1.7 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall schedule 1.8 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Schedule 1.8 agreed to)

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Shall schedule 2 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Schedule 2 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall clause 1, the short title, carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 1 agreed to)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall the preamble carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Preamble agreed to)

The Chair: Shall the title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Title agreed to)

The Chair: Shall the bill carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Bill agreed to)

The Chair: Shall I rise and report the bill?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Bill reported)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Mona Fortier moved that the bill be concurred in.

[*English*]

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the result from the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting yes.

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives agree to apply the vote, with the Conservatives voting nay.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the results of the previous vote to this vote and will be voting in favour of the motion.

[*English*]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply the results of the vote just taken to this vote and will be voting in favour of the motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Vuong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the results of the previous vote, voting in favour.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting in favour of the motion.

*Business of Supply**[English]***Mr. Han Dong:** Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and am voting yes.

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

*(Division No. 282)***YEAS**

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bendayan	Bennett
Bergeron	Bérubé
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney
Blois	Boissonnault
Bradford	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Casey	Chabot
Chagger	Chahal
Champagne	Champoux
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Collins (Victoria)	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
DeBellefeuille	Desilets
Desjarlais	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Dong	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fergus	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Gaheer	Garrison
Gaudreau	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gill
Gould	Green
Guilbeault	Hajdu
Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Holland
Housefather	Hughes
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Idlout
Ien	Jaczek
Johns	Joly
Jowhari	Julian
Kayabaga	Kelloway
Khalid	Khera
Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Kwan	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Larouche	Lattanzio
Lauzon	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lemire
Lightbound	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)

MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
Masse	Mathysen
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod	McPherson
Mendès	Mendicino
Miao	Michaud
Miller	Morrice
Morrissey	Murray
Naqvi	Ng
Noormohamed	Normandin
O'Connell	Oliphant
O'Regan	Pauzé
Perron	Petitpas Taylor
Plamondon	Powlowski
Qualtrough	Rayes
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Sahota	Sajjan
Saks	Samson
Sarai	Savard-Tremblay
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
Singh	Sorbara
Sousa	Ste-Marie
St-Onge	Sudds
Tassi	Taylor Roy
Thériault	Therrien
Thompson	Trudeau
Trudel	Turnbull
Valdez	Van Bynen
van Koeverden	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vignola
Villemure	Virani
Vuong	Weiler
Wilkinson	Yip
Zahid	Zarrillo
Zuberi — 209	

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Berthold	Bezan
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chambers
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	Deltell
d'Entremont	Doherty
Dowdall	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Ferreri	Findlay
Gallant	Généreux
Genuis	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Gray
Hallan	Hoback
Jeneroux	Kelly
Kitchen	Kmic
Kram	Kramp-Neuman

Business of Supply

Kurek	Kusie
Lake	Lantsman
Lawrence	Lehoux
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	Maguire
Martel	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Melillo	Moore
Morantz	Morrison
Motz	Muys
Nater	O'Toole
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Perkins	Poilievre
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Roberts	Rood
Ruff	Scheer
Schmale	Seeback
Shields	Shipley
Small	Soroka
Steinley	Stewart
Strahl	Stubbs
Thomas	Tochor
Tolmie	Uppal
Van Popta	Vecchio
Vidal	Vien
Viersen	Vis
Wagantall	Warkentin
Wagh	Webber
Williams	Williamson
Zimmer— 115	

PAIRED

Members

Desbiens

Duguid— 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Hon. Mona Fortier moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, once again, at the risk of wearing out my welcome, I believe that if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the results from the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting yes.

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives agree to apply the vote, with the Conservatives voting nay.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will vote in favour of the motion.

[*English*]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agree to apply and will be voting in favour.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply the vote and will vote in favour of the motion.

● (2415)

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Vuong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the results of the previous vote, and I am voting in favour.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting in favour of the motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Han Dong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and vote yes.

[*Translation*]

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

(*Division No. 283*)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bendayan	Bennett
Bergeron	Bérubé
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blanchette-Jonas	Blaney
Blois	Boissonnault
Bradford	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Casey	Chabot
Chagger	Chahal
Champagne	Champoux
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Collins (Victoria)	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
DeBellefeuille	Desilets
Desjarlais	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Dong	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fergus	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Gaheer	Garrison
Gaudreau	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gill
Gould	Green
Guilbeault	Hajdu
Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Holland
Housefather	Hughes
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Idlout
Ien	Jaczek
Johns	Joly
Jowhari	Julian
Kayabaga	Kelloway
Khalid	Khera
Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Kwan	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe

Business of Supply

Larouche	Lattanzio	Davidson	Deltell
Lauzon	LeBlanc	d'Entremont	Doherty
Lebouthillier	Lemire	Dowdall	Dreeshen
Lighbound	Long	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)	Falk (Provencher)	Fast
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Ferreri	Findlay
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada	Gallant	Généreux
Masse	Mathysen	Genuis	Gladu
May (Cambridge)	May (Saaneich—Gulf Islands)	Godin	Goodridge
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty	Gourde	Gray
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	Hallan	Hoback
McLeod	McPherson	Jeneroux	Kelly
Mendès	Medicino	Kitchen	Kmiec
Miao	Michaud	Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Miller	Morrice	Kurek	Kusie
Morrissey	Murray	Lake	Lantsman
Naqvi	Ng	Lawrence	Lehoux
Noormohamed	Normandin	Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
O'Connell	Oliphant	Liepert	Lloyd
O'Regan	Pauzé	Lobb	Maguire
Perron	Petipas Taylor	Martel	Mazier
Plamondon	Powlowski	McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Qualtrough	Rayes	Melillo	Moore
Robillard	Rodriguez	Morantz	Morrison
Rogers	Romanado	Motz	Muys
Sahota	Sajjan	Nater	O'Toole
Saks	Samson	Patzer	Paul-Hus
Sarai	Savard-Tremblay	Perkins	Poilievre
Scarpaleggia	Schieffe	Redekopp	Reid
Serré	Sgro	Rempel Garner	Richards
Shanahan	Sheehan	Roberts	Rood
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)	Ruff	Scheer
Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné	Schmale	Seeback
Singh	Sorbara	Shields	Shiple
Sousa	Ste-Marie	Small	Soroka
St-Onge	Sudds	Steinley	Stewart
Tassi	Taylor Roy	Strahl	Stubbs
Thériault	Therrien	Thomas	Tochor
Thompson	Trudeau	Tolmie	Uppal
Trudel	Turnbull	Van Popta	Vecchio
Valdez	Van Bynen	Vidal	Vien
van Koeverden	Vandal	Viersen	Vis
Vandenbeld	Vignola	Wagantall	Warkentin
Villemure	Virani	Waugh	Webber
Vuong	Weiler	Williams	Williamson
Wilkinson	Yip	Zimmer— 115	
Zahid	Zarrillo		
Zuberi— 209			

NAYS

Members

Aboultatif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Berthold	Bezan
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chambers
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho

PAIRED

Members

Desbiens Duguid— 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

[English]

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Friday, March 10, the House stands adjourned until this day, March 23, at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 12:16 a.m.)

CONTENTS

Wednesday, March 22, 2023

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Criminal Code

Bill C-283. Second reading	12395
Mr. Lamoureux	12395
Ms. Michaud	12395
Ms. Barron	12397
Ms. Dancho	12398
Mr. Anandasangaree	12400
Mr. Blanchette-Joncas	12401
Mrs. Goodridge	12402
Mrs. Gray	12403
Motion	12404
(Motion agreed to)	12404
Division on motion deferred	12404

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Canada-U.S. Relations

Mr. Kusmierczyk	12404
-----------------------	-------

Alberta's Film and Television Industry

Mr. Barlow	12404
------------------	-------

World Tuberculosis Day

Ms. Damoff	12404
------------------	-------

Quebec Social Workers' Week

Mrs. DeBellefeuille	12405
---------------------------	-------

Tragic Events in Quebec

Ms. Bendayan	12405
--------------------	-------

Government Policies

Mr. Baldinelli	12405
----------------------	-------

Ramadan

Ms. Khalid	12405
------------------	-------

Ramadan

Mrs. Zahid	12405
------------------	-------

Ramadan

Mr. Genuis	12406
------------------	-------

Daljit Bains

Mr. Sarai	12406
-----------------	-------

Housing

Mr. Morantz	12406
-------------------	-------

Carbon Tax

Mr. Shipley	12406
-------------------	-------

Innovative Agri-Food Businesses

Mrs. Shanahan	12406
---------------------	-------

Red Dress Alert

Ms. Gazan	12407
-----------------	-------

Montreal Alouettes

Mr. Lemire	12407
------------------	-------

Development of National Defence Land

Mr. Deltell	12407
-------------------	-------

Community Literacy Week

Mr. MacKinnon	12407
---------------------	-------

ORAL QUESTIONS

Housing

Mr. Poilievre	12408
Mr. Trudeau	12408
Mr. Poilievre	12408
Mr. Trudeau	12408
Mr. Poilievre	12408
Mr. Trudeau	12408
Mr. Poilievre	12408
Mr. Trudeau	12408
Mr. Poilievre	12409
Mr. Trudeau	12409

Democratic Institutions

Mr. Blanchet	12409
Mr. Trudeau	12409
Mr. Blanchet	12409
Mr. Trudeau	12409

Grocery Industry

Mr. Singh	12409
Mr. Trudeau	12409

Housing

Mr. Singh	12410
Mr. Trudeau	12410
Mr. Poilievre	12410
Mr. Trudeau	12410
Mr. Poilievre	12410
Mr. Trudeau	12410
Mr. Poilievre	12410
Mr. Trudeau	12410
Mr. Poilievre	12411
Mr. Trudeau	12411
Mr. Poilievre	12411
Mr. Trudeau	12411
Mr. Poilievre	12411
Mr. Trudeau	12411

Democratic Institutions

Mr. Blanchet	12411
Mr. Trudeau	12412
Mr. Blanchet	12412
Mr. Trudeau	12412

Housing	
Mr. Poilievre	12412
Mr. Trudeau	12412
Mr. Poilievre	12412
Mr. Trudeau	12412
Mr. Poilievre	12412
Mr. Trudeau	12413
Carbon Pricing	
Mr. Poilievre	12413
Mr. Trudeau	12413
Employment	
Mr. Singh	12413
Mr. Trudeau	12413
Veterans Affairs	
Mr. Singh	12413
Mr. Trudeau	12413
Automotive Industry	
Ms. Kayabaga	12414
Mr. Trudeau	12414
Carbon Pricing	
Mr. Poilievre	12414
Mr. Trudeau	12414
Mr. Poilievre	12414
Mr. Trudeau	12414
Taxation	
Mr. Poilievre	12414
Mr. Trudeau	12414
Mr. Poilievre	12415
Mr. Trudeau	12415
Diversity and Inclusion	
Mr. Champoux	12415
Mr. Trudeau	12415
Mr. Champoux	12415
Mr. Trudeau	12415
International Trade	
Mr. Poilievre	12415
Mr. Trudeau	12415
Mr. Poilievre	12415
Mr. Trudeau	12416
Mr. Poilievre	12416
Mr. Trudeau	12416
Foreign Affairs	
Mr. Hanley	12416
Mr. Trudeau	12416
International Trade	
Mr. Poilievre	12416
Mr. Trudeau	12416
Mr. Poilievre	12416
Mr. Trudeau	12417
Mr. Poilievre	12417
Mr. Trudeau	12417

The Environment	
Mr. McLeod	12417
Mr. Trudeau	12417
Foreign Affairs	
Mr. Singh	12417
Mr. Trudeau	12417
Climate Change	
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	12417
Mr. Trudeau	12417

PRIVATE MEMBER'S BUSINESS

Pandemic Day Act	
Bill S-209. Second reading	12418
Motion agreed to	12419
(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee) ..	12419
Criminal Code	
Bill C-289. Second reading	12419
Motion negatived	12420
Criminal Code	
Bill S-224. Second reading	12420
Motion agreed to	12422
(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee) ..	12422
Federal Framework on Housing for Individuals with Non-Visible Disabilities	
Motion	12422
Motion agreed to	12423
Income Tax Act	
Bill C-241. Third reading	12423
Motion agreed to	12424
(Bill read the third time and passed)	12424
Criminal Code	
Bill C-283. Second reading	12424
Motion negatived	12426

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Lamoureux	12426
Canada Business Corporations Act	
Mr. Champagne	12426
Bill C-42. Introduction and first reading	12426
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	12426
Committees of the House	
Health	
Mr. Casey	12426
Canadian Heritage	
Ms. Fry	12426
Mr. Shields	12426

Environment and Sustainable Development	
Mr. Scarpaleggia	12427
Veterans Affairs	
Mr. Dubourg	12427
Justice and Human Rights	
Mrs. Romanado	12427
Motion	12427
(Motion agreed to)	12427
Business of the House	
Ms. McPherson	12427
Motion	12427
(Motion agreed to)	12427
Committees of the House	
Procedure and House Affairs	
Mr. Julian	12427
Motion for concurrence	12427
Mr. Gerretsen	12430
Mr. Simard	12430
Ms. Blaney	12431
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	12431
Mr. Gerretsen	12432
Mr. Doherty	12433
Mr. Trudel	12433
Mr. Green	12434
Ms. O'Connell	12434
Mr. Lamoureux	12434
Mr. Strahl	12435
Mr. Villemure	12435
Mr. Angus	12435
Mr. Scheer	12436
Mr. Green	12437
Mr. Lake	12437
Mr. Cooper	12438
Mr. Lamoureux	12439
Mr. Trudel	12439
Mr. Green	12439
Mr. Villemure	12440
Mr. Lamoureux	12441
Mr. Green	12441
Mr. Beaulieu	12442
Mr. Barsalou-Duval	12442
Ms. O'Connell	12443
Mr. Nater	12444
Mr. Barsalou-Duval	12444
Ms. Blaney	12445
Ms. Blaney	12445
Mr. Fonseca	12447
Mr. Cooper	12447
Mr. Simard	12447
Mr. Nater	12447
Mr. O'Connell	12449
Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe	12449
Mr. Desjarlais	12449
Mr. Berthold	12450
Ms. O'Connell	12451

Mr. Julian	12451
Ms. Michaud	12452
Mr. Angus	12452
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Lamoureux	12453
Questions Passed as Orders for Returns	
Mr. Lamoureux	12455
Motions for Papers	
Mr. Lamoureux	12457
Petitions	
Human Rights in Algeria	
Mr. Beaulieu	12457

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Business of Supply	
Opposition Motion—Tax Increase on Beer, Wine and Spirits	
Mr. Scheer	12457
Motion	12457
Mr. Baldinelli	12458
Mr. Lamoureux	12459
Mr. Lemire	12459
Mr. Cannings	12459
Mr. Kitchen	12460
Mr. Virani	12460
Mr. Baldinelli	12461
Mrs. DeBellefeuille	12462
Mr. Cannings	12462
Mr. Sorbara	12462
Mr. Doherty	12464
Mr. Blanchette-Joncas	12464
Ms. Idlout	12464
Mr. Ste-Marie	12465
Mr. Gerretsen	12466
Mr. Savard-Tremblay	12466
Mr. Julian	12467
Mr. Lemire	12467
Mr. Cannings	12468
Mr. Doherty	12468
Mr. Cannings	12469
Mr. Doherty	12470
Mr. van Koeverden	12470
Mrs. DeBellefeuille	12471
Mr. Blaikie	12471
Don Valley North	
Mr. Dong	12472
Business of Supply	
Opposition Motion—Tax Increase on Beer, Wine and Spirits	
Motion	12473
Mr. Kitchen	12473
Mr. Blaikie	12473

Mr. van Koeverden	12473	(Clause 1 agreed to)	12485
Mr. Beaulieu	12473	(Preamble agreed to)	12485
Mrs. Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	12473	(Title agreed to)	12485
Mr. Lehoux	12475	(Bill agreed to)	12485
Points of Order		(Bill reported)	12485
Period for Questions and Comments Following Speeches		Motion for concurrence	12485
Mr. Lamoureux	12476	Motion agreed to	12487
Mr. Julian	12476	Third reading	12487
Mrs. Goodridge	12476	Motion agreed to	12488
Mr. Scarpaleggia	12476	(Bill read the third time and passed)	12488
Mr. Morrice	12477	Interim Supply	
Mr. Strahl	12477	Mrs. Fortier	12488
Mr. Gerretsen	12477	Motion for concurrence	12488
Mr. Blaikie	12477	Motion agreed to	12490
Business of Supply		Bill C-44. First reading	12490
Opposition Motion—Tax Increase on Beer, Wine and Spirits		(Motion deemed adopted and bill read the first time)	12490
Mr. Lamoureux	12478	Second reading	12490
Mr. Julian	12479	Motion agreed to	12492
Mr. Scheer	12479	(Bill read the second time and the House went into committee of the whole thereon, Mr. Chris d'Entremont in the chair)	12492
Mr. Lemire	12480	(On clause 2)	12492
Mr. Warkentin	12480	Mrs. Kusie	12492
Motion	12480	Mrs. Fortier	12492
Motion agreed to	12482	(Clause 2 agreed to)	12492
Supplementary Estimates (C), 2022-23		(Clause 3 agreed to)	12492
Mrs. Fortier	12482	(Clause 4 agreed to)	12492
Motion for concurrence	12482	(Clause 5 agreed to)	12492
Motion agreed to	12483	(Schedule 1.1 agreed to)	12492
Bill C-43. First reading	12483	(Schedule 1.2 agreed to)	12493
(Motion deemed adopted and bill read the first time)	12483	(Schedule 1.3 agreed to)	12493
Second reading	12483	(Schedule 1.4 agreed to)	12493
Motion agreed to	12485	(Schedule 1.5 agreed to)	12493
(Bill read the second time and the House went into committee of the whole thereon, Mr. Chris d'Entremont in the chair)	12485	(Schedule 1.6 agreed to)	12493
(On clause 2)	12485	(Schedule 1.7 agreed to)	12493
Mrs. Kusie	12485	(Schedule 1.8 agreed to)	12493
Mrs. Fortier	12485	(Schedule 2 agreed to)	12493
(Clause 2 agreed to)	12485	(Clause 1 agreed to)	12493
(Clause 3 agreed to)	12485	(Preamble agreed to)	12493
(Clause 4 agreed to)	12485	(Title agreed to)	12493
(Clause 5 agreed to)	12485	(Bill agreed to)	12493
(Clause 6 agreed to)	12485	(Bill reported)	12493
(Schedule 1 agreed to)	12485	Motion for concurrence	12493
(Schedule 2 agreed to)	12485	Motion agreed to	12495
		Third reading	12495
		Motion agreed to	12496
		(Bill read the third time and passed)	12496

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>