



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 151 No. 317

Friday, May 24, 2024

Speaker: The Honourable Greg Fergus



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, May 24, 2024

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayer

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1000)

[*English*]

CANADA LABOUR CODE

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-58, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code and the Canada Industrial Relations Board Regulations, 2012, as reported (without amendment) from the committee.

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

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marie-Claude Bibeau (for the Minister of Labour and Seniors): moved that Bill C-58, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code and the Canada Industrial Relations Board Regulations, 2012, as amended, be concurred in.

[*English*]

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

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I request that the motion be carried on division.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marie-Claude Bibeau: moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what a pleasure it is to rise and speak to legislation that is

so important to Canada's economy and that would contribute in many different ways. I like to think that at times we get legislation before us that can receive wide support.

It is an issue which, for me on a personal note, I could ultimately go back to when I was first elected in 1988, was probably one of the most substantive issues I had to face in the Manitoba legislature, and it was done in a different form. Labour has always been an important aspect of my political career, as I know it has been for many of my colleagues. I am very proud that we have what I would suggest is a very progressive Prime Minister who understands how important labour is to our country. We have a very proactive Minister of Labour, who has been given a mandate to bring in anti-scab legislation. This is the type of legislation that I have talked about for many years. It is the type of legislation that the Minister of Labour has been talking about for a long time also. It is the type of legislation that when we were in opposition, we often saw private members' bills from the Conservative Party, which we were in opposition to because they were "anti-union organizing" pieces of legislation.

Therefore, it would appear, based on second reading and from what I have been hearing from other members in the chamber, that there is a very good chance that this legislation will pass unanimously. I really and truly hope that it does because it sends a very powerful message to all Canadians in terms of the important role unions play in today's society and the importance of having labour harmony in Canada, and in terms of how this legislation can have a positive impact.

I would encourage members to look at, for example, anti-replacement workers or anti-scab legislation that was brought in first in the province of Quebec. The next province that brought it in was British Columbia. I would argue, and many in this chamber would no doubt add their voices to it, that through the legislation, we saw more harmony in the workforce. Ultimately, I believe that the type of legislation being proposed and the expectation that it will receive widespread support, is really encouraging, and we should not be taking it for granted because as a political issue, as I say, it has been with me for many years. I will reflect on that just to give people a sense of how controversial it could be.

Government Orders

My home province of Manitoba is an important part of Canada's labour history. Before I go on to my specific case, just so that people following the debate today will realize, in labour history in Canada, one of the major protests we saw at the very beginning would have been with George Brown, who was the founder of *The Globe and Mail* and who organized and played an important role in terms of printing-press people, where there was a significant rally in front of the Ontario legislature in Toronto.

Fast forward to the one I often talk about, and that is the Winnipeg general 1919 strike, which is embedded in the minds of many, even non-union members. I often look at the *Winnipeg Free Press*, and one of the pages and pictures that it continually reprints is the trolley car that was turned over during the 1919 strike on Bloody Saturday, which has had an impact on the labour movement here in Canada.

• (1005)

In fact, on the 100th anniversary of the 1919 general strike, we contributed, as a House of Commons, to a trolley replica. It was put just outside of Pantages and across the street from the city hall so that people walking by get a sense of what had taken place because it stands out there, and they have to wonder why that is there. It is connected to something that the *Winnipeg Free Press* publishes on a regular basis about that trolley car.

That sculpture is very symbolic for the city of Winnipeg and even for our country, because through that strike that took place and through organized labour at the time, in the area I represent, with the Ukrainian Labour Temple, in the traditional north end of Winnipeg on McGregor Street, the organizers would often be in different areas, particularly in the north end of Winnipeg, organizing that strike.

We found that even though there were some low points where workers were hurt, maimed and killed, I took away, from that particular strike, that labour was not just concerned about the working conditions that people found themselves in. From my perspective, it took on a social movement of sorts. It was not just about working x number of hours and getting paid x amount of money, but also about the way of life and how people, particularly people with smaller incomes, were being exploited and were being taken advantage of. There was a role for unions at the time, not only to advocate for those wages and working conditions, but also to often reflect on social programming.

When I look at Winnipeg, I think it is a good example of what took place and the labour movement ever since. In 1988, when I was first elected, we had this thing called final offer selection, and at the time, it was being debated. The Progressive Conservative Party opposed the legislation, and the NDP supported the legislation but was not prepared to accept any amendments to the legislation. At the time, we were the official opposition to the Liberal Party. We wanted to maintain the legislation, and we were prepared to accept an amendment if the Conservatives would allow the legislation to survive.

We sat for many hours, late into the evening, on committees and heard from many different unions on a wide spectrum of issues. To get the final offer selection, it was actually fought for; it was a compromise. Final offer selection was brought in by Howard Pawley,

the NDP Premier, as a compromise, because in the election prior, Howard Pawley had actually promised to bring in anti-scab legislation. Manitoba was going to have anti-scab legislation, but because of the resistance, the NDP at the time decided not to bring in replacement worker legislation; as a compromise, it brought in the final offer selection.

In my first two years as a parliamentarian, in a minority situation, an extensive debate took place. It was like a crash course on the importance of labour, listening to so many representatives from labour and from management, and other stakeholders who came there.

• (1010)

We sat through all sorts of hours of committees and debates that took place. Sadly, final offer selection was killed. I would ultimately argue that it was prematurely killed because the political parties, collectively, could not see the merit in having final offer selection.

For those people who do not necessarily understand what final offer selection is, it provided the union the opportunity to say, "Look, negotiations are not going well, and there's a level of distrust that we cannot overcome", and then it would request that final offer selection be implemented. Through final offer selection, an arbitrator comes in and says to the union and to the management group, "Give me your best offer." Ultimately, that is what happens: Both sides present to the arbitrator, and the arbitrator is not allowed to change anything but has to take one over the other with no modifications.

If one were to review Hansard from that time, one would find that this was actually fairly effective. It made both union and management come to the table and give it their best shot, knowing full well that one side was not necessarily going to be overly happy, because the other side was going to be chosen. The argument, in part, at the time was that, over time, it would in fact work out. Final offer selection was used, and I believe it proved to be effective.

However, sadly, because there was no consensus achieved between the political parties, the personalities at the time, we ended up losing final offer selection in Manitoba. In my opinion, that set back labour relations and many of the efforts of unions. I would reflect on this over the years, and if members check, even as a member of Parliament in previous years I have raised the issue of final offer selection, as it was an opportunity that Manitoba lost because there was no political consensus.

Fast-forward to today, when there is a Minister of Labour who has invested so much time and energy with the department and who has come forward with a piece of legislation that is ultimately being supported, from what I understand, by all members of the House of Commons. Through the ideas of whether it is the Prime Minister's bringing it in as part of a platform, to issuing it in the form of a mandate letter to a caucus that truly understands the importance of labour and how it impacts the Canadian economy and society, we had the support to move forward on this substantive issue.

Government Orders

We quickly found out that we expected to receive support from the New Democrats and even the Bloc, because of the history of the Bloc in the province of Quebec, but we were pleasantly surprised that the Conservatives actually supported it going into committee. Some of my colleagues might question the motivation for that, but I am not going to do that. I am going to take it that they actually do support the legislation. I am going to say that the glass is half full, and it is going to be full, because at the end of the day, I really do think it is going to pass with the unanimous support of the House.

• (1015)

I should not take the Green Party for granted. My understanding is that the Green Party, being a progressive party, will hopefully also be endorsing the legislation. I cannot recall offhand what the leader of the Green Party has said.

I see the legislation as a positive thing. I think it sends a powerful message, and other provinces should take note of it. My daughter, who is a provincial MLA in Manitoba, brought it up in Manitoba shortly after we introduced the legislation here. Today I can tell members that the Province of Manitoba seems to be moving forward on the issue of anti-scab legislation, with a huge expectation that we will see that legislation brought into the province of Manitoba.

I think that is a wonderful thing because the federal legislation has limitations in terms of whom it impacts. The ideal situation would be to have provinces throughout the country recognize that not only do the province of Quebec and the province of British Columbia have it, but that now we also have leadership coming from Ottawa indicating that Ottawa is moving forward. More importantly, or just as importantly, it appears to be moving forward with the support of all political parties.

When we have had partisan debates in the past, I have not seen the type of support that the legislation before us has actually received, so I want to personally congratulate the Minister of Labour in particular and his team of individuals who were able to do the consultation that was necessary along with the work that is so very important to achieving a consensus. That consensus will in fact benefit all of us.

Not only am I optimistic for the province of Manitoba, but I also believe that there are other provinces that will take note, whether through individual members in other legislatures or political parties as a whole that will recognize that if Ottawa can pass this kind of legislation, then provincial jurisdictions can too. Two provinces have already done so and have had it in place for years.

That is why I believe it is legislation that could really have a positive outcome for us as a nation, because it is about labour harmony. When we talk about building a stronger and healthier economy, about having a sense of fairness, about enhancing the middle class or about investing in solid social programs, whether pensionable programs, health care services or other programs dealing with issues like seniors and people with disabilities, these are issues that the labour movement has been talking about for many, many years, and to which it has contributed in a positive way.

We have pharmacare on our agenda, and I can recall meeting with union reps to talk about the importance of pharmacare. I be-

lieve that, at the end of the day, we should take advantage of the consensus that I believe is here on the floor of the House of Commons. We recognize how this type of legislation would help Canada's economy and our society as a whole. I believe that it would have a positive impact on labour here in Canada.

There are lots of details within the legislation. The Minister of Labour has highlighted them. The bill also went through second reading where the details were highlighted. I would require another half an hour or so to go through the details, but I do not want to filibuster the legislation or ask for unanimous consent to have the leave to do so.

I will leave my comments on that positive note. It is great to see members of all political parties unite behind good, solid labour legislation.

• (1020)

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing to hear the member for Winnipeg North speak in the House, as opposed to one of the many other Liberals who always speak instead.

I have a couple of comments. First of all, the member said himself that this is such an important issue, that he has talked about it for so many years and that the Minister of Labour has talked about it for so many years. It is funny how it is so important that it has taken them nine years. I think there is a bit of political opportunism there.

The member talked a lot, as he did previously on Bill C-58, about the great strike in 1919. The Canadian Encyclopedia says the cause of the strike was inflation costs, due to which housing and food were too much to afford. How does the member feel about creating the identical situations in Canada, under his government, that caused the great strike in 1919?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, as a continuation of my speech and in the spirit in which the question was posed, I am going to keep positive, because if we look at Canada's interest rate or its inflation rate, we would find, in comparison to virtually any other country in the world, in particular, let us say, the G7 or G20 countries, Canada is doing exceptionally well. In fact, our inflation rate has dropped to 2.7% and we have been on target for the last four months. Hopefully we will see a decrease in the interest rate.

It is important that in the House of Commons, not only the government should be focused on trying to improve economic conditions. Even though we are doing much better than most of our peers, it is still important that we focus our attention on that rather than on a lot of the other, more negative, aspects of politics that we often witness on the floor of the House of Commons. By doing that, we are helping Canadians.

Hopefully, over the next number of months we can collectively come to an agreement, the inflation rate will remain in the direction it is going and we will see more relief with respect to interest rates, but we have to respect the independence of the Bank of Canada.

Government Orders

• (1025)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Marilène Gill (Manicouagan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that my colleague opposite sees the glass as half full. If I were on the same side of the House as he is, I would likely try to do the same thing.

He also mentioned that the government acted very quickly on Bill C-58. I would like to remind him that the first bill was introduced by my colleague from Bécancour—Nicolet—Saurel in 1990 and that 30 bills have been introduced since then, including my colleague from Thérèse-De Blainville's Bill C-276.

Since we are talking about timelines, the Bloc Québécois wants this bill to come into force as soon as it receives royal assent, but we could not come to an agreement in committee with the other parties, which want an 18-month delay between royal assent and the coming into force of the bill. We did, however, manage to agree on a 12-month delay. We are still concerned, because the bill could be at risk if an election is called before it comes into force.

Since the government wants to move so quickly and since everyone agrees with that, as indicated by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government who sees the glass as half full, why can Bill C-58 not come into force as soon as it receives royal assent?

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, when we first formed government in 2015-16, we took a number of substantive measures. The first was giving Canada's middle class a tax break. I am sure the member recalls that. It was very well received. Other legislation we brought in took back private members' bills that many had perceived as anti-union bills. That was very well received by the labour movement. We have also been very proactive in terms of providing supports, such things as apprenticeship training, looking at ways to promote and have more harmony within the labour force, and, of course, consultation.

We also have to factor in that there was a worldwide pandemic that had to be dealt with. There were all sorts of things, but even with a very busy legislative agenda over the years, the ministers have in fact been working with labour in particular, and with other stakeholders. It is great that the legislation is at the stage it is, which we should acknowledge, and we have built consensus. Because we did it right, we now have the type of consensus we have today. Hopefully the bill will pass today.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais (Edmonton Griesbach, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today is a good day for workers. It is a good day for New Democrats. It is a good day to make certain that unions can participate in making sure workers have powerful paycheques because powerful paycheques come from powerful unions. This is an incredible success and a testament to workers and their exercising of rights across the country.

It is immensely disappointing, though, to know both the Liberals and Conservatives, when New Democrats tabled this bill 15 times, voted against it. It is incredibly important that we acknowledge the hard work of the unions that have been pushing this for generations now. I am proud to be part of a party that forced the government to

bring this legislation to a vote. I am proud to be part of a party that is going to ensure unions actually have the power to make sure their material conditions are improved.

Why has it taken the Liberals so long to participate in making sure unions are more powerful?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, it is really encouraging to recognize that, for the first time, we very much have a progressive Prime Minister who understands and appreciates the importance of supporting Canadians and labour. The Prime Minister has not been in government for 15 years. I can understand the frustration. I made reference to Howard Pawley's promise of anti-scab legislation well over 30 years ago, and 30 years ago we could have had final offer selection. We have been waiting for the longest time for that, but because we now have the federal legislation, and because members of all political parties are likely going to be supporting it, Manitoba is likely going to be getting anti-scab legislation.

In other words, let us not necessarily look at patting ourselves on the back, although some might say I have been patting us on the back, too. Let us recognize the union workers and the workers across Canada, even non-union workers, and the many contributions labour has made that go far beyond the working environment and wages and so forth. We can think of the social programs we have today and the contributions the labour movement has had in making those become a reality, as well as the endless lobbying it does. I do thank the New Democrats and others who participated in making today possible.

• (1030)

Mr. Chandra Arya (Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the trade union movement has played a key role over a period of more than one and a half centuries in improving the working life of workers. The trade union movement has ensured that, as the country has industrialized and developed, the standard of living of all the people in society is good because of the agreements it was able to strike with employers.

This legislation affects federally regulated industry, with over 22,000 employers and about one million employees. I am glad the member talked about his experience in Manitoba when the final offer selection could not go through. He is right that, while it gives benefit to one million employees in the federally regulated sector, much more responsibility is with the provinces. I would like to ask him his opinion or his suggestions on how we can influence provinces to take measures in the same way the federal government is now moving.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, the most important thing is that the federal government has recognized anti-scab legislation is good legislation. The reason we brought it forward is that it is good for Canada, good for our economy and good for the workers. What is good for workers is good for Canada. That is the most important thing.

The second thing Ottawa can do is what we are doing today. We now appear to have a consensus, where all political entities in the House are going to be voting in favour of that. To me, that sends a very powerful message to all the provinces. The reason I brought up the Manitoba situation is that it was because of political partisanship that Manitoba never had anti-scab legislation. It was because of political partisanship that final offer selection was killed. Here, today, we are demonstrating that, if we put the political partisanship aside, good legislation can pass for the betterment of our country and our workers.

Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is always an honour to rise on behalf of the residents of Kelowna—Lake Country. I rise today to speak to Bill C-58, an act to amend the Canada Labour Code and the Canada Industrial Relations Board regulations. This legislation passed at second reading with support of the Conservatives and was recently scrutinized at the Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities, termed the human resources committee, where I am proud to serve as vice-chair on behalf of the Conservative caucus.

I would like to thank all Conservative members, but in particular I would like to thank the Conservative member for Dufferin—Caledon for his work on this legislation and for attending our committee meetings on this. The human resources committee heard from a wide variety of relevant witnesses to this legislation and to the issue of replacement workers at large. The committee heard from many labour representatives and business industry stakeholders.

We heard testimony from the Canada Industrial Relations Board, whose work will be affected by this legislation. From my observations, there seemed to be a lot of interest from all parties to ask questions and to delve into the work it does and how this legislation could potentially affect its workload and operations. I had a much better understanding of its internal processes once its representative had answered all of our questions.

Many witnesses at committee spoke of the importance of the board. The federal government is responsible for the national Canada Industrial Relations Board. While the legislation before us intends to encourage faster decision-making at the board, ultimately it is on the Liberal government to ensure it is properly operating to resolve labour conflicts that come before it and to meet the needs of those involved. Representatives of both employers and labour said that the Canada Industrial Relations Board needs to be operating faster now and moving forward. In fact, an amendment at committee, which is now in the legislation, would reduce the number of days required for the Canada Industrial Relations Board to render decisions.

One other point I will note in this legislation is that there was an amendment at committee, supported by all members, to move up the coming into force date for this legislation. I would like to bring to the House some of the important feedback we heard from various stakeholder witnesses on Bill C-58. Several points were raised during the committee's study of this legislation. While the Liberals may trumpet this legislation as focusing on replacement workers, they themselves have been replacing workers in government workplaces with Liberal-friendly external contractors.

Government Orders

It is a fact that the government has spent more on expensive external outsourced contractors than ever before. We know this affects workers in many ways. For example, the president of the Customs and Immigration Union appeared before the Standing Committee on Public Accounts. He said, when it came to the role of the disastrous \$60-million ArriveCAN app, “we believe the goal of the app is to replace officers”.

He spoke to how he believes that, had his workers been listened to during the ArriveCAN process, instead of being replaced by a two-person IT firm at the cost of \$60 million to taxpayers, then, “a great deal of what happened would not have happened.”

At the human resources committee's study of Bill C-58, we heard from labour representatives how outsourced contractors and consultants were a concern for their workers. The Liberal government says it stands on the side of labour, yet it actively sidelines its hard-working public service workers and, worse yet, replaces their work with expensive, outside, outsourced consultants and contractors at the cost of billions to taxpayers. We also heard from labour representatives that outside consultants and contractors can be demoralizing for their workers when someone has been hired from outside as an external contractor to oversee these duties or do the same duties.

• (1035)

The Liberals have hired a lot of public sector workers during their time in government. These workers surely have the needed experience and expertise, but then, behind closed doors, the Liberals choose to not trust them with major government initiatives. Instead, they replace their work with that of high-priced, Liberal-friendly contractors and consultants, at the cost of billions of dollars to Canadian taxpayers.

One of the things Bill C-58 would do would be to amend the maintenance of activities process to “encourage employers and trade unions to reach an earlier agreement respecting activities to be maintained in the event of a legal strike or lockout”.

Our committee heard from many stakeholders on the types of implementations that typically arise when identifying these essential activities. One of the challenges identified was what qualifies as work that is in the national interest, public safety or critical infrastructure. While these may be easy to identify as essential activities in some workplaces, we heard of some challenges of identifying essential activities in often limited windows of time.

Government Orders

Lastly, while I spoke earlier about the concerning trend of the Liberal government endorsing replacement work through outside contractors and consultants inside the government, I would also like to speak to the government's record of replacing Canadian workers with international workers as part of multi-billion dollar agreements with major corporations.

When the Liberals signed agreements that provided \$44 billion in taxpayer money to massively profitable corporations in exchange for building electric battery plants in Ontario, they promised that that would create Canadian jobs. When Conservatives pointed out that these plants would be built with international labour instead of Canadian labour, both the Liberal employment minister and Liberal industry minister tried to downplay the number, saying it would only be a small handful.

Conservatives did not believe the Liberals, and neither did Canada's building trades unions. Union members wrote a letter to the Prime Minister outlining how foreign workers are displacing Canadian labourers at the NextStar construction site, all while 180 local millwrights and ironworkers were unemployed and available to perform the necessary work.

The Canada's Building Trades Union president wrote a letter to the Prime Minister. He said, "Canadian workers are now being replaced by international workers at an increasing pace, on work that was previously assigned to Canadian workers". He used the word "replaced".

The Liberal ministers were also not truthful when they said this was only a short-term issue that required foreign replacement workers who had "specialized knowledge".

As the letter from Canada's Building Trades Union points out, "This is the brazen displacement of Canadian workers in favour of international workers, by major international corporations thumbing their noses at both the Government of Canada, taxpayers, and our skilled trades workers." The Liberals say that they want to ban replacement workers, yet they have allowed Canadian workers to be replaced in favour of the demands of internationally profitable organizations.

During the labour minister's appearance at committee on Bill C-58, we asked him why he had not demanded a memorandum as part of the deal to guarantee hiring Canadian contractors for the Stellantis plant. The minister said he did not view this as his role, and that it was a matter of provincial jurisdiction, even though potential foreign workers coming to Canada is a federal responsibility.

Workers cannot trust these words or the promises of more jobs supposedly outlined in these agreements with Stellantis or other deals. If the Liberals wanted to regain workers' trust, they should simply make the commitment for Canadian jobs outlined in these agreements public, but they refuse to do so.

At other committees, Conservative members tried to get access to the contracts. However, Liberal and NDP members filibustered to protect the government and prevent workers from hearing the truth.

● (1040)

In addition, Conservatives were pushing the Liberal government to release details of its agreement with Honda Canada on building its electric vehicle operations in Ontario. Such disclosure is necessary to ensure Canadians get all the jobs in this multi-billion dollar project. Yes, the NDP, the party that calls itself a friend of workers, is joining with the Liberals in hiding contracts from Canadian workers and the Canadian public.

Another thing I will bring up with respect to workers is the just transition legislation, which has been renamed. An internal government document disclosed that 2.7 million workers would be affected by the legislation. There is a lot of uncertainty with this. There is concern as to what this means, and it is creating stress for workers in the country, particularly those in the energy sector. This lengthy government document outlines some other potential jobs. However, they are nowhere near the same level for pay and benefits. There is concern among workers in this country, and legislation such as this certainly does not put people's minds at ease.

It is one of the great privileges of my role as the shadow minister for employment, future workforce development and disability inclusion to travel this country and speak to many workers. The input I have received from them has really been very meaningful. I appreciate those conversations and hearing what a lot of their issues and suggestions are.

Conservatives have been supporting the proposed legislation along the way and continue to do so. However, it is clear the legislation before us today alone will not resolve all the issues with respect to workers being replaced in many different ways.

● (1045)

Mr. Chandra Arya (Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I commend the Conservatives for supporting the bill, which would protect the fundamental rights of workers, and for recognizing the important work that trade unions do in promoting a healthy workplace and the safety of employees.

The federally regulated industries that are covered in the bill affect about 22,000 employers and about one million employees. However, the bulk of the working-class population in Canada works in industries and sectors that are provincially managed. What is the member's suggestion on how we can influence the provinces to adopt the objectives of the bill, so every Canadian worker will get the same benefit?

Government Orders

Mrs. Tracy Gray: Mr. Speaker, we are here today debating Bill C-58, which is in the final stages in the House. What I can say in reference to the specific bill, which is for federally regulated workers, is that it has gone through all the processes. I did not speak to all the amendments here today, just due to time, but we did have a number of amendments that came through at committee, that were approved and that are now in the legislation. Therefore, we look forward to moving forward with the legislation so that it can move to the next stages in the parliamentary process.

Ms. Laurel Collins (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, workers at Cascadia Liquor in Victoria, and across Vancouver Island, are on strike for fair wages. Now Cascadia Liquor faces a legal complaint for breaking B.C. law by bringing in replacement workers. New Democrats have been fighting for federal anti-scab legislation for decades, but the truth is that the Conservatives and Liberals voted against it. This happened most recently in 2016, when the NDP brought it forward, but there have been dozens of times.

Conservatives pretend they support workers, but we will not see them on a picket line. New Democrats will keep fighting for workers. I joined Cascadia workers on the picket line last week. I will continue to stand in solidarity with them, because powerful paycheques come from powerful unions.

Mrs. Tracy Gray: Mr. Speaker, I think that was a statement, as opposed to a question.

All I will say is that we have Bill C-58 before us here today. As I mentioned, we have been working the proposed legislation through the parliamentary processes. We had very good testimony at committee. We had some recommendations that were approved of through amendments, and here we are today at this stage. That is what we are debating.

As I mentioned, Conservatives support the amended legislation before us.

Mr. Rick Perkins (South Shore—St. Margarets, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have heard a lot from the illiterate Liberal economic policy on the other side with regard to this and other things.

One thing I find fascinating is that the Liberals take one position but do something else. While they have expressed themselves about the bill, they are allowing foreign replacement workers at the Stelantis plant in Windsor. They are so afraid to prove how they have protected Canadian jobs that they will not release their contracts and prove us wrong. They clearly have not protected these jobs, since we have foreign replacement workers. I have read their contracts.

What is the member's view on foreign replacement workers in relation to the bill?

Mrs. Tracy Gray: Mr. Speaker, absolutely, this is a concern. I outlined in some of my intervention here how we brought this up at committee. Unfortunately, the minister was very vague. The information the government had initially given on this was that it is a very small handful of people. We found out that this is factually incorrect.

It is very concerning. If the government does not have anything to hide, then it should absolutely disclose what the arrangements are.

• (1050)

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out that, many times, I hear Conservatives bring up criticisms of anti-scab legislation. They say it will extend, delay and make labour disputes last longer and longer; in fact, it is those labour disputes where replacement workers have been brought in that become dangerous, vicious and very long, and they tear communities apart. I think of the Giant mine in Yellowknife, where nine people were killed by people who were frustrated about being replaced without any choice.

Could the member comment on the fact that anti-scab legislation is actually good for bringing people together, for giving workers their right to remove their labour when they feel that they need to put pressure on management to get fair wages and good working conditions? That is the only power they have.

Mrs. Tracy Gray: Mr. Speaker, I can speak to the legislation that is before us today, Bill C-58. We have had healthy debate in the House of Commons over the legislation. We had a lot of testimony at committee, and it went through all the processes there. We had some amendments that made the legislation even better than it was before. I outlined a couple of them in my intervention.

Here we are today with the proposed legislation, which affects federally regulated industries. As I mentioned, we have supported the legislation and have worked toward making it better, in particular with the labour board. As I mentioned in my intervention, it was good to hear from the board and get a lot of our questions answered as to their internal operations. In that way, we could better understand how they deal with the different applications that come forth and what they are going to do moving forward in order to improve their processing times.

Ms. Bonita Zarrillo (Port Moody—Coquitlam, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I know that the Conservatives were playing many games at committee to try to prolong the vote on the legislation. Simply, why have the Conservatives not supported this over the years that the NDP has tried to move it forward? I just want to understand this more clearly.

Mrs. Tracy Gray: Mr. Speaker, the member sits with me at committee. I am unclear about what she is referencing, because we had committee days that were set to hear from witnesses on this. There were absolutely no delays.

I am really not sure what she is even referencing. We asked witnesses questions. We had clause-by-clause that went very expeditiously. I think the member is trying to create a story that is not there.

Statements by Members

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will stay away from the member's comments that clearly demonstrate the Conservatives' opposition to Stellantis, Volkswagen and Honda. I understand they do not support the federal government bringing those companies to Canada.

However, what confuses me is that I am not sure if the member fully understands anti-scab legislation. It means that, for a company that is in existence in Canada, if a strike takes place, the company would not be able to bring in replacement workers.

That is what we are actually talking about when it comes to replacement workers. I just want the member to give confirmation that this is, in fact, also her understanding.

Mrs. Tracy Gray: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the member's concern about my being informed. Of course I have read the legislation, and I sit on the committee that dealt with it clause by clause. I am very involved in the legislation.

I clearly gave examples of other ways that workers could be replaced, whether through external contractors and consultants, as I outlined in my intervention, or through foreign replacement workers, a term that was actually used by building trades in their letter to the Prime Minister. There are other ways that replacement workers can affect workers. That is what I was referencing in my intervention.

It is a way of replacing workers, although in the legislation, it is a very specific way of deeming it.

• (1055)

Mr. Blake Desjarlais (Edmonton Griesbach, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I find it comedic, in some ways, that the bill has been tabled eight times, and the Conservatives are now likely to vote in favour at this final hour. They know New Democrats have forced the vote on this, and they know that it is going to pass.

I find it comedic that the Conservatives are now trying to play it as though they have never seen the bill before. It has been tabled eight times in the House. They failed to vote for it eight times.

What explanation can the member give for why they voted against it so many times?

Mrs. Tracy Gray: Mr. Speaker, what I find comedic is that the NDP member is not acknowledging that he is actually part of the government. He is in a coalition agreement with the government.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: Answer the question.

Mrs. Tracy Gray: Mr. Speaker, he is tripping me up right now. He will not even allow me to actually answer the question.

This is the trend from this particular member. It is unbelievable that the member is in a coalition yet is actually asking that type of question.

As I referenced, we have Bill C-58 in front of us. That is what we are debating here today and what we will be voting on soon. That is what is before us.

Mr. Rick Perkins: Mr. Speaker, the interventions from the NDP-Liberals are interesting. They go about an inch deep on a lot of issues.

Let me provide a little more colour and give the member an opportunity to do this on the particular issue of foreign replacement workers in Stellantis.

Canada's Building Trades Unions have condemned the government for its use of foreign replacement workers for non-proprietary jobs at Stellantis, such as forklift driver jobs. They have over 138 members sitting at home, unemployed, in Windsor, while the government allows Stellantis to bring in over 900 construction workers, most of them in non-proprietary positions.

Could the member comment on why she thinks that the government talks out of one side of its mouth when its members are in the chamber on legislation, but when it is administering the law, it actually does the opposite?

Mrs. Tracy Gray: Mr. Speaker, the government has quite a trend of doing great photo ops and making lots of announcements, but the follow-through is really not great. We see that time and time again.

I have the letter that was sent by Canada's Building Trades Unions to the Prime Minister. It is very to the point about their concerns, which have not been eliminated or addressed. The government continues to deflect and be evasive on this issue. It is not being transparent.

As I mentioned, a number of my colleagues at different committees, including at our committee, have tried to get information on the contracts in order to protect workers. If the government really had nothing to hide, why would it not be disclosing these contracts?

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

HOLLYER HOUSE

Mr. Chandra Arya (Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, recently, I was pleased to attend the opening of Hollyer House, an affordable housing structure that has funding of \$2.72 million from the federal government. Hollyer House is a new, four-storey, 35-unit, mixed-use apartment building in Ottawa's west end, the Bells Corners neighbourhood. The building also is home to a community health and resource centre, the Western Ottawa Community Resource Centre, and to FAMSAC food cupboard.

The federal government funded \$100,000 for the community room located in Hollyer House. Thanks go to the Anglican Diocese of Ottawa and Christ Church Bells Corners for making this possible. This is an excellent example where our federal government has partnered with a willing organization to meet the mutually shared objective of addressing affordable housing and other needs.

• (1100)

RETIREMENT CONGRATULATIONS

Mr. Kevin Waugh (Saskatoon—Grasswood, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my member of the Legislative Assembly in Saskatchewan, Don Morgan, on his retirement coming up this fall.

Don graduated from the University of Saskatchewan College of Law in 1978. Between 1988 and 1992, he was chair and CEO of Saskatchewan Legal Aid Commission and was appointed as King's Counsel in 1990.

Don was first elected to the Legislative Assembly in November 2003 for the Sask Party and has served ever since. He had a number of portfolios: minister of justice and attorney general, minister of education, minister of advanced education and many more. Don served his constituents of Saskatoon Southeast faithfully, and he will be deeply missed.

Congratulations to Don on his upcoming retirement. It is well deserved.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AFRICA DAY

Mr. Adam van Koevorden (Milton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as Canadians, we join in the celebration of Africa Day with immense respect and admiration for the rich history, cultural diversity and remarkable civilizations of the African continent.

Africa Day is a poignant reminder of the lasting ties between Canada and Africa, rooted in the shared values of democracy, human rights and sustainable development.

My riding, Milton, is lucky to have a beautiful, diverse and growing African community. It is a vibrant community that reflects Africa's joie de vivre and community values.

I have had the great honour of visiting the four corners of Africa, from Morocco to Egypt, Tanzania, Madagascar, Mali, Liberia and Benin.

I climbed Kilimanjaro twice to raise money and awareness for NGOs such as Right To Play and WaterAid. I look forward to visiting the great African continent again.

Let us celebrate Africa Day and continue to advance the cause of peace, prosperity and solidarity both here and abroad.

* * *

[*English*]

TRIBUTES

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to three great Canadians who recently passed away.

Jerome Abraham struggled with addiction for many years before entering the recovery program at Discovery House in Penticton. After treatment, Jerome went on to lead Discovery House through a period of dramatic growth, helping so many men get their lives

Statements by Members

back and return to their families. We lost Jerome to cancer earlier this spring, but we will always be inspired by his legacy.

Laura Savinkoff was the centre, the heart, of a very active peace community based in Grand Forks. I last saw Laura at a workshop she organized to discuss the horrific situation in Gaza. She died suddenly two weeks later, gone too soon, but we will remember her spirit.

Finally, I want to mention the passing of Dr. Bruce Falls, a noted scientist and humble champion of nature conservation in Canada. Bruce died last month at the age of 100 after a lifetime of inspiring service to his country.

* * *

MUSIC INDUSTRY

Mr. Jaime Battiste (Sydney—Victoria, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our love of music brings us together as Canadians, but it is tough for our working musicians right now. This week, I spoke to JUNO-winning musicians who spoke to the struggles of being a musician because of anti-competitive ticketing companies.

Thankfully, the United States justice department has moved forward on an antitrust lawsuit against Ticketmaster and Live Nation Entertainment for their anti-competitive practices. With this monopoly, it is hard for Canadian fans to support our local musicians and venues. Our world-class artists deserve full crowds and vibrant local venues.

Our government has strengthened the powers of the Competition Bureau; invested historic amounts in arts and culture, including the Canada music fund; and supported live events through the boosted Canada arts presentation fund. Let us even the playing field so that the working recording artists and musicians who create the music can thrive, rather than the monopolies that squeeze our hard-working musicians.

* * *

• (1105)

PERTH REGIMENT

Mr. John Nater (Perth—Wellington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, 80 years ago this week, the brave soldiers of the Perth Regiment were fighting in the Cassino region of Italy. On May 26, 1944, shortly after the Hitler Line was breached, the Perth Regiment moved into the Liri Valley where they were heavily shelled by the enemy, but the brave fighting Perths advanced forward.

Statements by Members

Over the next several days, they crossed the Liri River and liberated the town of Ceprano and moved forward to Arnara. Several Canadian heroes made the ultimate sacrifice. Among them were Corporal John McRobb of St. Marys, and Private William Simpson and Private Jack Bailey, both of Stratford. Private Wilfrid Scott of Cromarty, who was serving with the Hastings and Prince Edward Regiment, also lost his life in that battle.

Days later, the world's attention would turn to D-Day, but we must never forget the courage of those who fought and those who fell in the Italian campaign.

We will remember them.

* * *

WHITEHORSE STAR

Mr. Brendan Hanley (Yukon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, *Illegitimus non carborundum* was the defiant motto of the Whitehorse Star, a paper that, this week, published its last edition after serving the Yukon for 124 years.

First published from a tent, the Whitehorse Star is a living record of the Yukon's colourful history. Fire and flood, disasters, royal visits and funerals, elections at all levels, first nations' signing of modern treaties, plane crashes, even Whitehorse's own dramatic events on September 11, 2001. Further back is the story of the Dawson City Nuggets and their intrepid journey to Ottawa in 1905 to challenge for the Stanley Cup. In more modern times, it seemed not a single event occurred where the Whitehorse Star was not there to capture the scene with photos or a story. The Whitehorse Star was local news at its best, connecting Yukoners to their local, national and international events and personages.

This Star has set, but local news must go on. I thank the many dedicated staff who made the Whitehorse Star come alive day after day.

Illegitimus non carborundum. "Do not let them grind you down".

* * *

SIXTEEN MILE ARENA

Ms. Pam Damoff (Oakville North—Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada came to Oakville last week when the Junior A Hockey National Championship was hosted at Sixteen Mile arena by the Town of Oakville and the Oakville Blades. Players and fans from across Canada came out to see their favourite teams battle it out for the 2024 Centennial Cup. The tournament significantly benefited Oakville's thriving local economy, bringing in more than \$5 million in economic benefit.

I attended the thrilling final game, when the Collingwood Blues beat the Melfort Mustangs 1-0 to win the 2024 Centennial Cup. Congratulations to the Collingwood Blues on their national championship win, and to the Calgary Canucks' Julien Gervais, who won the tournament's most valuable player.

Sixteen Mile Arena is the only venue in Canada that has hosted major national events for Hockey Canada, Skate Canada and Curling Canada.

A huge thanks to Todd Carey, the manager of Sixteen Mile Sports Complex in Oakville, Jamie Angus and the team for another successful event.

* * *

LIBERAL PARTY OF CANADA

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of this NDP-Liberal government, more Canadians are hungry and homeless. The latest Salvation Army report reveals alarming statistics: 68% of Canadians now rely on discounted food and 44% have to cut the grocery bills just to make ends meet. A staggering 40% are forced to buy less nutritious food due to cost, while 26% skip meals because they cannot afford groceries. That same report now says that one in four young adults are relying on food banks. The Calgary Food Bank report says that 44% of their users are feeling worse off than they did last year.

With so many empty stomachs and families continuing to struggle to get affordable food on their tables, what is the NDP-Liberal government's solution? Why, it is more big government greed. It is higher carbon taxes, more payroll taxes and more tax on tax.

The residents of Calgary Shepard know that this Prime Minister is just not worth the cost. They want a common-sense Conservative government and they want it now; a government that will axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime. Let us bring it home.

* * *

NATIONAL FIELD OF HONOUR

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the National Field of Honour in my riding of Lac-Saint-Louis provides a resting place for over 17,000 military service members and their immediate families. It is also a valued space for the community to regularly gather to honour those who have served and fought for Canada.

[*Translation*]

On Sunday, veterans, veterans' families and many other people will gather at the National Field of Honour along with the ambassador of France to celebrate the 80th anniversary of D-Day, the turning point in the Second World War that was made possible by the courageous participation of Canadian soldiers.

Statements by Members

● (1110)

[English]

I invite any members who may be in the area this Sunday to attend the ceremony. At the same time, it is my hope that the government will soon be able to assume ownership of the Field of Honour and accord it official status as a national military cemetery.

* * *

HOUSING

Mr. Michael Kram (Regina—Wascana, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of the Liberal-NDP Prime Minister, more Canadians than ever are hungry and homeless. The government recently promised to end chronic homelessness in Canada by 2030, but according to the Parliamentary Budget Officer, chronic homelessness is up 38% under the Liberals' watch, and fully 80% of homeless individuals in this country are homeless purely because of affordability reasons.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer's findings may come as a surprise to the current out-of-touch government, but they come as no surprise to ordinary Canadians. More and more young people are unable to move out of their parents' basements, and those who do often find themselves turning to food banks just to make ends meet. This is the reality after nine years of the Liberals and their NDP coalition partners. Everything is broken, and we need a new Conservative government to clean up the mess.

* * *

FOOD SECURITY

Mrs. Anna Roberts (King—Vaughan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, a D- is what the NDP-Liberal government scored in the 2024 Food Banks Canada report card. A D- is a failing grade for a failing government. Poverty and food insecurity continue to climb. The Sai Dham Food Bank, which services 26 municipalities in the GTA, reported an increase of 36% in visits by seniors. In the month of April, the food bank serviced 60,000 families, a jump from 29,000 in February.

This is shameful. Seniors need help. Canadians need help, but the Prime Minister is not listening. If children came home with a D-, any parent would hold them accountable. The NDP-Liberal government needs to be held accountable. The Prime Minister is just not worth the cost. Listen to Canadians, get out of the way and let Conservatives fix what you have broken.

The Deputy Speaker: I need to remind hon. members to run things through the Chair.

The hon. member for Ottawa West—Nepean.

* * *

SREBRENICA REMEMBRANCE DAY

Ms. Anita Vandenbeld (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the UN voted to establish the International Day of Reflection and Commemoration of the 1995 Genocide in Srebrenica, when 8,000 Bosnian Muslim men and boys were taken by Serb forces from a UN safe zone, shot and buried in mass graves. After years of painstaking documentation, in 2004 and 2007 inter-

national courts ruled that the crimes committed in Srebrenica constitute genocide.

I was working in Sarajevo 25 years ago. Every morning, I passed the mothers of Srebrenica holding photos of their lost sons and begging us for justice, like one mother who searched all of the mass graves for the red rubber boots that her little boy was wearing on that day. Those faces haunt me still. I hope that commemorating these atrocities will bring some peace and some healing.

* * *

RESOURCE ASSISTANCE FOR YOUTH

Ms. Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, many youth in Winnipeg Centre face unimaginable hurdles to success. We have one of the highest rates of child poverty in the country, at almost 40%, but Winnipeg's frontline organizations are leading the way and rising to this challenge. This includes Resource Assistance for Youth Incorporated, otherwise known as RaY, which provides support, services and training programs to youth who are most marginalized by systems, such as the Level Up! education and work placement program, which has empowered 775 youth to join labour markets or post-secondary education.

However, funding delays by the Liberal government are putting this program at risk, forcing layoffs for 12 staff members and eliminating services for 80 youth at risk. Lives are on the line if we fail to get this funding in our community.

All young people deserve opportunities to thrive, and the Liberals must end funding delays and give RaY the resources it needs to empower Winnipeg's youth.

* * *

● (1115)

*[Translation]***DRUMMONDVILLE VOLTIGEURS**

Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Drummond has been on cloud nine since our Voltigeurs won the Quebec Major Junior Hockey League's President Cup in four games against the Baie-Comeau Drakkar. They played to a crowd of frenzied fans at the Marcel-Dionne arena, which was filled to capacity.

It was a masterful performance.

Oral Questions

Top performers included Riley Mercer, a tough goaltender who frustrated opponents with his incredible skill throughout the series, and Vsevolod Komarov, a contender for the Canadian Hockey League title of defenceman of the year. How about Ethan Gauthier, a young man from my riding of Drummond, and the third in his family to wear the Rouges uniform, following in the footsteps of his father Denis and his brother Kaylen? Ethan was the team's top scorer, and ranked second in the entire league. He kept us on the edge of our seats all season, as I am sure he will again for a long time to come.

The year 2024 will forever remain a high point in Drummondville's hockey history. This weekend, the Voltigeurs are set to play at the Memorial Cup games. This time, all of Quebec will be cheering them on. Drummond is ready for a two-trophy parade.

Go Voltigeurs.

* * *

[English]

FOOD SECURITY

Mr. Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes, CPC): Mr. Speaker, food inflation has risen to a 40-year high and food banks across the country are seeing record demand. Canadians who once donated to their local food banks are now standing in line to receive help. People are skipping meals because they cannot afford three meals per day.

It is a sad story, but this is the record of the sellout NDP leader. Since he joined the Liberal government, life has gotten more expensive. Maybe it is because his brother is a top lobbyist for Metro, or maybe it is because he sold out our farmers and working-class Canadians by repeatedly raising taxes on them. Either way, we know the only thing that the NDP leader is looking out for is his own pension.

Canadians in southern and northern Ontario, Hamilton, Edmonton and British Columbia are turning their backs on the NDP and turning toward common-sense Conservatives in record numbers. Conservatives represent a return to normal, where hard work is rewarded, and not just for those who drive a BMW or wear a Rolex.

Conservatives are going to bring it home.

* * *

NATIONAL NURSING WEEK

Mr. Maninder Sidhu (Brampton East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honour of National Nursing Week to recognize and celebrate the incredible contribution of nurses, who are true heroes of our medical system.

The theme of this year's National Nursing Week is "Changing Lives. Shaping Tomorrow." This statement is certainly true. Nurses play a critical role in our health care system and in the future of our health. They are often the first point of contact for patients, providing compassionate care, emotional support and expert medical treatment directly impacting their lives.

I would like to especially celebrate the incredible nurses in my riding of Brampton East who are part of the team at Brampton

Civic Hospital, as well as medical offices across Brampton, and acknowledge all their hard work and dedication.

We thank all the nurses and health care heroes across the country for their unwavering commitment and service. Their efforts do not go unnoticed, and we are deeply grateful for everything they do to keep our communities healthy.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[English]

GOVERNMENT PRIORITIES

Ms. Leslyn Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years, the Liberal-NDP government is just not worth the cost of homelessness and hunger that Canadians are facing. Even Canadians who own their own homes are worried that they will become homeless when they have to renew their mortgages at much higher interest rates. Some payments will even triple, according to a new report.

When will the government rein in their inflationary spending so more Canadians do not have to worry about homelessness?

Mr. Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and to the Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is certainly well known that grocery price inflation is a problem that all countries are facing around the world. As for grocery price inflation in Canada, there is some good news that just came in with a report that shows that food price inflation is in fact coming down in Canada. It is at 1.4% in April, down from 1.9% the month before. That is certainly encouraging news for Canadians, but it is cold comfort, for sure. We are addressing the root causes of the issue by increasing competition in the marketplace and by investing in a national school food program.

Ms. Leslyn Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years, grocery prices have actually gone up under the Liberal-NDP government, and now Canadians are facing hunger and homelessness at unprecedented rates. The Liberal-NDP Prime Minister is just not worth the cost. Of the mortgages outstanding, as of February 2024, 76% of them will be up for renewal in 2026.

When will the Liberal-NDP Prime Minister stop his inflationary spending so Canadians can afford food and shelter once again?

Oral Questions

• (1120)

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us note, first of all, that this is the same member who called for Canada to exit the United Nations. This is the same member who sat down, with other members of her caucus, with far-right European politicians.

To the substance of the question, she talks about homelessness. She ought to read the most recent report of the Parliamentary Budget Officer, which makes clear that no fewer than 50,000 Canadians have been supported by this government's national housing strategy and specifically the reaching home program, which they would cut because they have an austerity agenda that they are ideologically committed to.

Ms. Leslyn Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals love to deflect away from Canadian suffering. The facts are that after nine years of the Liberal-NDP government, it is still not worth the cost of homelessness and hunger that Canadians are feeling.

According to the Parliamentary Budget Officer, chronic homelessness is up 38% across Canada. Nearly 80% of all homeless people say they just cannot afford a home to live in.

When will the NDP-Liberal government cap its inflationary spending and build the homes that Canadians need to live in dignity?

Mr. Adam van Koevorden (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change and to the Minister of Sport and Physical Activity, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again, it is ironic, coming from a member who has been advocating and has actually written a petition to this House of Commons for Canada to leave the United Nations altogether. We see, yet again, more disinformation from the Conservative members on climate change and affordability, two issues that they either do not understand or simply do not care about. If they did care, they would acknowledge that Canada is reducing our pollution and inflation is coming down, but the Leader of the Opposition wants to scrap it all. He does not want Canadians to receive their Canada carbon rebate on July 15. He just wants to make sure his rich oil and gas friends can pollute even more and get even richer.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FINANCE

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of this Liberal Prime Minister, more and more Quebecers are going hungry. I was touring Abitibi last week, and the food bank in Rouyn-Noranda is witnessing a very disturbing trend: fully 54% of the people who use the food bank in Rouyn-Noranda have a job. These people are working and getting paid, they do have money, but they do not have enough money to feed themselves. That is what Canada has come to, after nine years of this Liberal government, with the support of the Bloc Québécois, which blindly voted for \$500 billion in inflationary spending.

Is the government aware of this mess?

Hon. Marie-Claude Bibeau (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it seems that my colleagues on the other side of the House are unaware of what we have been through in recent years. Yes, it is true that people need help, and we are there for them. All the Conservatives know how to do is make cuts. Everywhere they have been, they have made cuts.

We are addressing food security. We are setting up a food program in schools, in partnership with the provinces. We have also introduced the Canada child benefit. Let us keep in mind that under the Conservative government, all families with children of the same age were given the same cheque. Ours are based on salary. We have lifted 500,000 children out of poverty with this program.

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, their plan is working so well that I have to describe what is happening in my community of Loretteville. It is an unusual situation, something I never thought I would see in my lifetime. Someone from Loretteville posted the following message online: “I was wondering if someone could trade me two or three home-cooked meals for some work. I can fix pretty much anything”.

After nine years of this government, a man has to ask his neighbours for food.

Does the government realize that we are in this situation because it has racked up deficit after deficit, doubled the debt and raised taxes?

Hon. Marie-Claude Bibeau (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is true that people are struggling. I have visited people in my riding, too. Across the province and all across Canada, we are meeting with people at food banks and with our partners.

We just went through a pandemic, which led to abnormally high inflation. It is coming down precisely because we are making the right decisions and focusing our investments and assistance on the people who need it most.

* * *

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mrs. Marilène Gill (Manicouagan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal calvary was out in full force yesterday to save the president of the Assemblée parlementaire de la Francophonie. In what was basically an unprecedented—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mrs. Marilène Gill: Mr. Speaker, can I start again?

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Manicouagan.

• (1125)

Mrs. Marilène Gill: Mr. Speaker, the Liberal calvary was out in full force yesterday to save the president of the Assemblée parlementaire de la Francophonie. In what was basically—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Deputy Speaker: Order.

The hon. member for Manicouagan.

Oral Questions

Mrs. Marilène Gill: Mr. Speaker, the Liberal calvary was out in full force yesterday to save the president—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mrs. Marilène Gill: Mr. Speaker, this is obstruction.

The Deputy Speaker: For the third time, the hon. member for Manicouagan.

Mrs. Marilène Gill: Mr. Speaker, I have all weekend.

The Liberal calvary was out in full force yesterday to save the president of the Assemblée parlementaire de la Francophonie, or APF. In what was basically an unprecedented situation, interpreters were needed at the meeting because many of the new members do not understand French.

We know the result. The president of the APF kept his position, despite the hurtful, scatological comments he made.

Does anyone in this government seriously think that this is helping the APF's credibility or that this incident has helped the French community here or elsewhere?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this unrelenting attack on a representative of Canada's francophonie brings dishonour to the Bloc Québécois.

People comment quite often that when the time comes to decide whether or not to support people who stand up for Canada's francophonie, the Bloc Québécois is strangely absent from the debate.

We are proud of our colleague. His presidency of the international Assemblée parlementaire de la Francophonie brings honour to us, and we are very eager to support him further.

Mrs. Marilène Gill (Manicouagan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, when the Bloc Québécois defends all francophones against violence, insult and injury, I believe it is working on behalf of all of La Francophonie.

Here are some of this morning's headlines: "Confidence vote: [APF president] saved by the Liberal cavalry"; "Full of s***"; "[The member] stays on as APF president".

That is what the Liberals' stunt has led to. Gross insults against witnesses can be overlooked because Liberals stand together. Standing together as Liberals means not standing together with La Francophonie.

Does the government realize that all it has accomplished is to weaken and perhaps even prevent a parliamentary assembly from working—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Government in the House of Commons.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what weakens the Assemblée parlementaire de la Francophonie, or APF, is not the fact that more members have joined. It is the fact that the Bloc Québécois is going after a member who took responsibility for what he said, apologized many times and now continues to stand up

for francophones across Canada and to honour us by being president of this international organization that is getting ready to soon welcome the world.

We will all stand behind the president of the APF as he carries out his duties.

* * *

[English]

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): *Uqaqtittiji*, water is life, and access to safe drinking water is a human right. In Nunavut, only eight out of 25 water treatment facilities pass their health and safety tests. The result is a very real possibility of unsafe drinking water for the people of Nunavut. Liberals have neglected to provide healthy drinking water for indigenous communities.

Will the Liberals act urgently to provide the funding that ensures Nunavut communities have clean, safe drinking water now?

Mrs. Jenica Atwin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indigenous Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know that it is unacceptable to have any communities without access to clean drinking water in this country. We have worked really hard, for the first time in our government's history, to put forward record investments around this.

Right now, there are 28 existing long-term drinking water advisories, and we have a project under way for every single one of them. We have already lifted 144 long-term drinking water advisories since 2015. About 96% of first nations still have access to their clean water, and we are going to make sure that it stays that way.

Particularly, for the north, where there are ongoing challenges specific to that region, we are going to make sure we work with them to find an indigenous-led, Inuit-led solution to this problem.

* * *

CANADA BORDER SERVICES AGENCY

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Mr. Speaker, more than 9,000 border workers have voted for a strike mandate. The Liberals keep asking more of these workers, like cracking down on stolen cars being smuggled out of Canada, but will not give them the resources they need. Our CBSA workers deserve better. They deserve a pension, better working conditions and respect. Canadians depend on these workers to keep them safe, but the Liberals are turning their backs on them.

Will the Liberals admit that, by failing to provide a fair retirement to these workers, they are setting the stage for unnecessary disruptions this summer?

Oral Questions

Mr. Anthony Housefather (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government is definitely committed to reaching agreements with all of our different public service unions that are both fair to the employees and reasonable to taxpayers.

We have already reached agreements with 17 different bargaining units that cover over 80% of represented employees. The best deals are found at the table. We urge the union to come to the table. We are happy to negotiate with them.

* * *

• (1130)

FINANCE

Mr. Greg McLean (Calgary Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the superintendent of financial institutions released his annual risk outlook yesterday. It is now a warning from its own regulator for the Liberal-NDP government to heed. Canadian homeowners who renew their mortgages over the next two years could face a payment shock. The root cause of this spike in payments is the government's loose spending policies. Large deficits have driven inflation, which have increased mortgage costs.

With all these warnings, will the Minister of Finance take a lesson and reverse her inflationary spending policies?

Mr. Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and to the Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us take note that the Parliamentary Budget Officer, just this week, described Canada's fiscal position as top of class, and so did the International Monetary Fund when describing Canada's growth in 2025.

We are also, I remind the Conservatives, rated number one in the world with a AAA credit rating, which has been reaffirmed by independent credit agencies. When it comes to combatting inflation, the Governor of the Bank of Canada says we are on the right track.

Let me ask the Conservatives this. Does the Conservative leader intend to fire all the independent experts in the world who disagree with his doomsday narrative?

Mr. Greg McLean (Calgary Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is avoiding every touchpoint the member does not want to pay attention to, including from his own regulator.

Let us look at the follow-on risks that OSFI identified: stress in the mortgage insurance industry, investment portfolio risk, asset management risk and insurance risk. All are rising. This house of cards does not end well. It is obvious to the regulator, and to all Canadians, that after nine years of failed economic policies, the government is just not worth the cost.

Can we see a redo on last month's disastrous budget that will bring back the fiscal balance Canadians desperately need?

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, at any point in time, a democracy is bound to face risk, particularly in the difficult economic environment that we face domestically and internationally. To echo my colleague who just spoke on this side, a AAA credit rating was affirmed recently by

Moody's, which said we have the best fiscal record in the G7 and the lowest debt and deficit in the G7. Those are foundation points that will carry us through difficult times.

It is a hard time for Canadians. The member talks about the Canadians who want to renew their mortgages. Where were the Conservatives over the years? We wanted to support Canadians. They were never there.

* * *

HOUSING

Mr. Marty Morantz (Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in 2020, the Prime Minister's own bank governor said interest rates are very low and they are going to be low for a long time. This week, OSFI reported that mortgage holders will face a payment shock because of high interest rates. They said the shock will be the worst for those who took low mortgage rates in 2020. Words matter.

After nine years of the NDP-Liberal Prime Minister misleading Canadians, will he finally admit he is not worth the cost to homeowners?

Mr. Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and to the Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it was great to have the independent Governor of the Bank of Canada attend the finance committee recently. When he was at committee, he said, "The budget does respect the fiscal guardrails that the government put in place," and that "Keeping the debt-to-GDP ratio on a declining track and importantly keeping deficits below one per cent of GDP in future years, the budget also commits to those guardrails going forward and that is helpful."

Those are the exact words of the independent Bank of Canada governor. I wonder if this is why the Conservative leader wants to fire the independent—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley.

Mr. Marty Morantz (Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, also in 2020, the Prime Minister said, "Interest rates are at historic lows Glen." Millions of people took out low-interest mortgages. Tuesday, his own bank regulators reported that homeowners renewing mortgages will now face a payment shock because of the high mortgage rates they got in 2020, increasing the risk of default.

Oral Questions

After nine years of the NDP-Liberal Prime Minister misleading Canadians, will he finally admit he is not worth the cost to people who are losing their homes?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada is proud of having one of the most stable and flexible financial institutions and financial markets in the world. It is also true that Canada's fiscal position is a particularly strong one.

What would put that all at risk? The banana republic promise of the Leader of the Opposition to fire the Governor of the Bank of Canada, sending shockwaves to global markets and exposing homeowners, mortgage holders, to intense interest rate risk.

• (1135)

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of the NDP-Liberal Prime Minister, more Canadians are now going hungry and homeless.

The latest annual risk outlook from OSFI highlights that 76% of mortgages will come up for renewal by the end of 2026. Now, the Prime Minister's high mortgage rates are creating misery for Canadian homeowners. Again, the Liberal government's own bank regulators are flashing red stop signs. The Bank of Canada governor has said that out-of-control federal spending is not helpful.

How much more mortgage payment pain will Canadian families have to face and endure to satisfy the NDP-Liberal government's big government spending?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that member should know better than to stand up and talk about financial markets, when his own leader is the person that has promised to send tremors into the international financial system by taking over, like some dictator, the operations of the Bank of Canada and arbitrarily firing the governor, who is, of course, watching inflation very carefully.

I know the member will have noticed that inflation, for the fourth straight month, is down to the Bank of Canada's target range. We want to continue getting that inflation number down.

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that overheated and over-the-top rhetoric is cold comfort to homeowners who are facing hundreds of dollars per month of increased mortgage costs because of the Liberal government's decisions during the pandemic.

The Liberals doubled the national debt and increased spending by \$600 billion over that time period, which led to higher mortgage interest costs at the same time that the Prime Minister was saying that interest rates would never go up, that they were so low and they would continue. Mortgage holders listened to the Prime Minister. They took out more mortgages and now they are facing higher mortgage rates, rates so punishing they will have a hard time paying.

When is the NDP-Liberal Prime Minister going to learn his lesson? Is he going to give homeowners a break on these mortgage rates?

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr.

Speaker, I would take the member seriously, were it not for the Conservative record.

Those same mortgage holders, in years past, benefited from a tax cut to the middle class that the Liberal government introduced. They benefited from the Canada child benefit. They are benefiting now from the child care program the government has introduced; dental care, where they are eligible; and pharmacare.

All those measures that benefit middle-income Canadians and lower-income Canadians working hard to join the middle class are measures that the Conservatives did not support at all, and they want to fire the Governor of the Bank of Canada. That is irresponsible. They never answered the question on that.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CLIMATE CHANGE

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, climate change is threatening the St. Lawrence River. That is what federal government scientists disclosed on Wednesday.

Water temperatures are reaching record levels, as much as five degrees above average. Oxygen levels are decreasing. As a result, species such as shrimp are in serious decline. The economy and biodiversity of our regions are at risk. Meanwhile, as scientists sound the alarm, the federal government is opening a new pipeline in western Canada to encourage dependence on dirty oil. All of this while we are in the midst of a climate crisis.

When will the Liberals starting listening to science?

Mr. Adam van Koeverden (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change and to the Minister of Sport and Physical Activity, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when we formed government in 2015, Canada was not even protecting 1% of its territorial waters and coastlines. We are now at 15% and on our way to at least 30% by 2030, which is the goal that all countries agreed to at COP15 in Montreal.

We are investing record amounts, particularly in partnership with indigenous people across the country, to protect more and more of our territory.

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the St. Lawrence River is the lifeblood of Quebec. It is the cradle of the Quebec nation, which has grown and developed along its shores over four centuries.

We now see that climate change is damaging those shores, threatening biodiversity and jeopardizing the survival of species that have been fished for generations.

In the meantime, the federal government is investing \$34 billion in a dirty oil pipeline. Dirty oil is the primary cause of global warming. Ottawa is literally making Quebeckers pay to harm our own ecosystems.

How much longer will we agree to entrust our money to this irresponsible country?

• (1140)

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois cannot be serious.

Members have before them the first government with credible targets and a plan to achieve net zero in 2050. We have a government that is looking out for our oceans by fighting against plastic and ready to implement a whole host of measures that will enable Canada to meet its Paris targets and will fight the effects of climate change, including in our St. Lawrence River.

* * *

[English]

FINANCE

Mrs. Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of the NDP-Liberal Prime Minister, more Canadians are hungry and homeless. The number of tent cities is growing across the country, and the number of people lining up at food banks has grown to over two million and continues to climb. The Salvation Army reports that 26% of Canadians are skipping or reducing meals.

The Prime Minister is not worth the cost. When will he finally stop his inflationary spending, which is forcing Canadians to go hungry?

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the member's constituency, where individuals might find themselves homeless, she can go back and show them the Leader of the Opposition's housing plan, which unfortunately says nothing about homelessness, zero. The Leader of the Opposition purports to present a vision for this country, but it is hollow. There is nothing there on so many issues, but specifically on homelessness. He has never cared about these issues. When it comes to supporting Canadians on a range of matters from homelessness to child care, pharmacare and dental care, Conservatives have been silent. They do not care.

Mrs. Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, here are the facts. After nine years of the NDP-Liberal Prime Minister, more Canadians are losing their home and going hungry. The number of Canadians who have reported food security challenges has increased, and 26% are skipping meals. Costs continue to rise and the government's plan to raise taxes will only make it worse. Canadians are losing hope.

The Prime Minister is not worth the cost. When will he finally admit his inflationary policies are hurting Canadians?

Mr. Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and to the Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our gov-

Oral Questions

ernment has a track record of leading with compassion and initiating programs that address the needs of the most vulnerable. Emergency food programs are certainly part of the support system for people who have immediate needs and are struggling to put food on the table.

Let us review this. Food Banks Canada said that the national school food program was a vital initiative. If the Conservatives are aligning themselves with Food Banks Canada, then why would they oppose a vital initiative, the national school food program, that is going to feed over 400,000 children?

* * *

CARBON PRICING

Mr. Stephen Ellis (Cumberland—Colchester, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of the NDP-Liberal Prime Minister, more Canadians are hungry and homeless. The Salvation Army is reporting that 26% of Canadians have been forced to skip meals because they cannot afford to buy groceries.

Our country is suffering under the government and its Prime Minister, who is not worth the cost. When will he axe the tax so that Canadians can afford to eat again?

Mr. Adam van Koevorden (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change and to the Minister of Sport and Physical Activity, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Food Banks Canada and its member organizations right across this country do essential work and important research, and I want to thank them for that. It has actually made some recommendations in its report, which the Conservatives have clearly not read. It recommends more supports for the working poor, like our Canada workers' benefit. It recommends improved social security, which Conservatives gutted when they were in power, while we have increased, improved and modernized the Canada child benefit and brought forward the Canada disability benefit.

While the Conservatives continue to put words in the mouths of poverty elimination experts and Food Banks Canada, we will continue to put food on the table with the national school food program, improve the national Canada child benefit and put money in pockets with the Canada carbon—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Cumberland—Colchester.

Mr. Stephen Ellis (Cumberland—Colchester, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it was interesting that yesterday at a meeting, the member for Milton said he was shocked to hear the report of how many Canadians were actually hungry. Even though the Liberals are continuing to announce programs to fix the problems they have created, we need a significant change in government.

Oral Questions

Once again, according to the Salvation Army, parents are skipping meals so their children and other family members can eat. Canadians should not have to live like this. After nine years, of course, the Liberal coalition government is not worth the cost.

Again, I will ask, when will the Prime Minister axe the tax so that Canadians can afford to eat again?

• (1145)

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member is from Atlantic Canada, and I have never heard anyone from Atlantic Canada suggest that we cut the Canada child benefit, that we cut and vote against the school nutrition program or that we cut an entire housing program designed to remedy the housing problems in Atlantic Canada.

The member should stand up for once to the leader who has an austerity agenda and wants to cut the very supports that are keeping his constituents and helping his constituents meet the current cost of living issue.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Laurel Collins (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, people in Victoria want to know that our coast and our endangered southern resident killer whales are protected. New reports show that cruise ships docking in Victoria are jeopardizing the orcas by dumping billions of litres of polluted waste water into the ocean. The United States has stricter laws, so under the Liberals' watch, cruise ships wait and dump in Canadian waters. They are even dumping in marine protected areas. The Liberals' regulations are woefully inadequate, and with the Conservatives, there would be even fewer rules.

Will the Liberals stop making the B.C. coast a dumping ground for polluted cruise waste?

Mr. Adam van Koevorden (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change and to the Minister of Sport and Physical Activity, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Victoria for her consistent advocacy for a cleaner environment and a greener future for all of Canada. Indeed, it is refreshing to stand up to talk about how we can protect this planet and how we can fight climate change, rather than whether we fight climate change. Her concerns with respect to the coast and the dangers to whale species and waterborne mammals are important to us and our government.

I would love to sit down and talk about local issues in Victoria and ensure that the government is supporting all vital endangered species.

* * *

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Mr. Blake Desjarlais (Edmonton Griesbach, NDP): Mr. Speaker, CKUA is a source of music, arts and community as one of Edmonton's most beloved public broadcasters, but it is facing a perfect storm with inflation and the cost of living crisis. It needs our help during these tough times. While other Canadian broadcasters receive federal help in similar circumstances, CKUA is being left

behind. CKUA supports local Canadian artists and brings Edmontonians together.

Will the Liberals stand up for Edmonton and our local media, and help out CKUA in its time of need, or will they continue to ignore it?

Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government has been there to support media from across this country from coast to coast to coast, from small communities to large ones. Much of the support for small communities would have been flowing had Conservatives not chosen to obstruct the passage of legislation that would have had money flowing to small community broadcasters across this country.

We are going to keep working hard for those broadcasters, and we are not going to stop until Canadians have that voice from coast to coast to coast.

* * *

JUSTICE

Ms. Valerie Bradford (Kitchener South—Hespeler, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on Monday our government unveiled a national action plan on combatting auto theft. The plan will work in conjunction with budget 2024 to keep communities safe from auto theft crime. Insurance crime experts have already called the plan a turning point for auto theft in Canada.

Can the Minister of Justice please highlight one of the concrete steps in the national plan that will make communities safer?

Hon. Arif Virani (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the rise in auto theft in our country is not caused by one-off incidents of teenagers taking a joyride; it is perpetrated by networks of organized criminals. That is why we are cracking down on organized crime. These crime rings prey on teenagers to do their dirty work, so we are adding an amendment to the Criminal Code to add a new aggravating factor to make tougher sentences for those who use young persons in the commission of an offence. We are also raising the maximum penalty for those who use violence during a daylight carjacking.

We are going to stop auto theft. We are going to stop organized criminals who are taking advantage of our kids. Enough is enough.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Mr. Branden Leslie (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of the NDP-Liberal government, more Canadians are hungry and homeless than ever before. One in four Manitobans does not have enough money to buy groceries and feed their family. Home prices are out of control and rent has skyrocketed to the point that people cannot afford to put a roof over their head.

How can the Prime Minister keep a straight face and try to tell 40% of Manitobans who are now paying more than 30% of their income for housing that everything in this country is, in fact, fine? Are Manitobans just experiencing it differently?

• (1150)

Mr. Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and to the Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I apologize in advance for not being able to take the Conservative Party seriously with its new-found empathy for Canadians who are struggling with the cost of living. It is not willing to step up. Any time our compassionate government leads with responsible solutions that try to lift up people who are vulnerable, the Conservatives vote against. They vote against dental care, child care and pharmacare. They vote against the national school food program.

How on earth can we expect anyone to take their new, feigned interest in Canadians who are struggling seriously?

Mr. Gerald Soroka (Yellowhead, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of the NDP-Liberal Prime Minister, more Canadians are hungry and homeless. Food insecurity in Alberta is now over 27%, and just yesterday the Edson Food Bank shared its latest data with me. It is now dealing with almost triple the food bank usage compared to 2020.

The Prime Minister is just not worth the cost. Will he stop his reckless inflationary spending and cancel the quadrupling of the carbon tax so Canadians can afford to put food on their table?

Hon. Jenna Suds (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to share today some of the feedback on our announcement of a national school food program in budget 2024.

The Coalition for Healthy School Food released a statement applauding the federal government for the investment and urging all provinces and territories to sign on to the new policy to provide nutritious, culturally appropriate, sustainable and affordable food to school children across this country.

On this side of the House, we will continue to make investments in children and family. On that side of the House, they need to explain to Canadians why they will not support feeding children.

Mr. Kevin Waugh (Saskatoon—Grasswood, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of the NDP-Liberal Prime Minister, more Canadians are hungry and homeless. One in four Canadians is experiencing food insecurity. Food Banks Canada even gave the NDP-Liberal government a failing grade. Forty per cent of Saskatchewan residents have visited a food bank, and 35% are worried about putting a meal on the table for their family.

The Prime Minister is not worth the cost, so why does he tell Canadians we have never had it so good?

Hon. Randy Boissonnault (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is rich coming from people who sat in a government that led through Canada's worst economic performance in the last 30 years after the 2008 financial crisis. They had no idea what to do, no idea how to get Canadians back on their feet. We have gone through a global pandemic. We have put in place measures to save not just

businesses but also people's livelihoods to get this country back on its feet. There has been 130% employment since before the pandemic.

They want to cut the Canada carbon rebate. They want to cut the Canada child benefit. They are about cuts. We are here to support Canadians each and every day.

* * *

CARBON PRICING

Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years, the Prime Minister is not worth the cost. According to the 2024 poverty report, 44% of Canadians are paying more than 30% of income on housing, which is a big F for the government. The NDP-Liberal government gets an A+ only when it comes to creating disastrous policies. The member for Whitby previously stated that we "are going to have to shift our lifestyles, and that is going to be painful". Is this the kind of pain he was talking about?

How much more pain will the Liberal-NDP government intentionally inflict upon Canadians before it axes the carbon tax?

Hon. Gudie Hutchings (Minister of Rural Economic Development and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I really find that quite rich coming from the party opposite. We have been trying to get the fall economic statement passed because it would give a family of four in the rural parts of his riding an extra \$1,344 a year. That is what we are doing for Canadians all across this country. I would ask the Conservatives to please pass the FES.

We know that people are having trouble with things. This is going to help people, along with \$10-a-day day care and along with dental care. We are doing a lot, and I know that is acknowledged.

* * *

[Translation]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in committee yesterday, as the members were studying an overhaul of the court challenges program, a Bloc Québécois amendment was rejected, which is appalling.

Oral Questions

It was a very simple amendment that called for just one thing: That the court challenges program respect the Official Languages Act, that it respect the law recognizing that French is under threat, that it recognize the existence of other laws, such as the Charter of the French Language in order to protect our language, and that it recognize the need to advance the existence of a majority-French society in Quebec.

Why is it so hard for the Liberals to respect the Official Languages Act?

• (1155)

Hon. Arif Virani (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the court challenges program was created by the Liberal Party of Canada. It was eliminated by the Conservative government and later reinstated by the Liberal Party during the current mandate.

As for protecting the French language and official bilingualism across Canada, we are there for official language minority communities, just as we are there to protect both official languages, which are enshrined in the Constitution.

Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it would be really nice if we could get serious answers to serious questions. It is disturbing that the government refuses to require the court challenges program to comply with this federal law, its own statute.

Once again, the Liberals are entangled in their own contradictions about the French language. They still have a hard time recognizing that there is only one official language at risk in Quebec, and that is French. They refuse to require that the court challenges program comply with their own legislation, the Official Languages Act.

Why should the program disregard the different situation of English and French in Canada and Quebec?

Hon. Arif Virani (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out that the court challenges program has been there from the beginning to protect official language minority communities. This program is designed to protect French outside Quebec and protect English in Quebec, for example.

We are proud of our dedication to protecting both official languages. We are proud to respect the reforms that have been made to the Official Languages Act, and to respect the protections that are already set out in section 16 of the Constitution.

* * *

FINANCE

Mr. Bernard Généreux (Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years under this Prime Minister, more and more Quebecers are going hungry or living on the streets.

The Bloc Québécois voted for \$500 billion in spending. It claims to represent Quebecers, but then it turns its back on them and votes in favour of inflationary, centralizing spending. While Que-

beckers are suffering, the Bloc Québécois is voting to give the federal government more money and Quebec less.

Which minister in this Bloc-Liberal government is going to stand up and defend these inflationary policies?

Hon. Marie-Claude Bibeau (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am always astonished when I hear my colleagues from Quebec dare to say such things. They know full well what we have been through in recent years. It is a global situation that affects us all, but fortunately we have a Liberal government that is there to help those who need it most. A Conservative government would be a disaster.

We are here to help those who need it most. Just think of the Canada child benefit, which is there to help families in need.

Mr. Bernard Généreux (Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years under this Prime Minister, more and more Quebecers are going hungry and living in the streets, in dire need.

While Canadians are suffering because of the Liberals' inflationary policies, the Bloc Québécois continues to encourage them. Quebecers are struggling under the weight of this broken economy, but what is the Bloc Québécois doing? It is voting in favour of a \$500-billion budget. The Bloc Québécois and the Prime Minister are simply not worth the cost.

Can this Bloc-Liberal government show a bit of empathy for Quebecers and think about their interests for once?

Hon. Marie-Claude Bibeau (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my Conservative colleague's comments are rather contradictory, to say the least. He is suggesting that we cut benefits. He wants us to spend less. What should we do exactly?

Should we drop the dental care benefits when they are helping not only seniors, but also young people and persons with disabilities who need it the most? What should we do? Should we make cuts to the school food program or to the local food infrastructure fund that is helping our organizations?

I would like to know what he would cut to reduce spending.

* * *

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Mr. Richard Lehoux (Beauce, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of this Liberal Prime Minister, supported by the Bloc Québécois, and his \$500 billion in inflationary, centralizing spending, one in five farms is unable to pay its debts. Our farmers are making a heartfelt plea to the government.

The Liberals are making things worse for farmers by making cuts to funding for 4-H clubs across Canada. We are talking about 17,000 young people and the 7,000 volunteer leaders who are training the next generation of farmers.

When will this Liberal government stop hurting the agricultural industry and start helping it feed Canadians?

• (1200)

Hon. Marie-Claude Bibeau (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleagues are having a memory lapse. The last time the Conservatives were in office, they made cuts to agricultural programs. They cut hundreds of millions of dollars from agricultural research and innovation and from the program to help farmers manage risks.

We are here. We are investing to help farmers be more resilient to climate change. We are investing in research, innovation and the development of new markets.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Fayçal El-Khoury (Laval—Les Îles, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, women are the driving force behind the economy. We have to give women even more tools to pursue their dreams, succeed and achieve their full potential. It is not just the right thing to do, it makes good economic sense.

Can the Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Official Languages tell the House what the government is doing to improve the lives of Canadian women workers?

Hon. Randy Boissonnault (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague from Laval—Les Îles for his question.

Our government believes in equipping women for success. That is why we are training women in skilled trades. That is why contraceptives will be free under our pharmacare plan. That is why we will defend a woman's right to choose.

We support women every step of the way. What are the Conservatives doing to support women? They vote no.

* * *

[English]

DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS

Mr. Corey Tochor (Saskatoon—University, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years, something is rotten in the state of Canada, more specifically in Ottawa, and we all can smell it. That is why there is a public inquiry regarding foreign interference in the first place. However, the government is once again trying to cover it up, redacting documents that it has already promised to send to the commission. Today, I speak for all Canadians when I say we all know the Prime Minister is not worth the cost.

Exactly what is the NDP-Liberal coalition government hiding?

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs (Cybersecurity), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the minister pointed out yesterday, the member opposite might wish to speak to his House leader, because in drafting the terms of reference for the inquiry, all parties in the House agreed to those terms, which included redactions for things like cabinet confidence and client-solicitor privilege. Therefore, it is pretty insincere for Conservatives to agree to the process and now criticize that very process. We have been clear with Canadians, and we will continue to work to deal

Oral Questions

with foreign interference, unlike Conservatives, who felt it did not politically advantage them.

Mr. Corey Tochor (Saskatoon—University, CPC): Well, the cover-up coalition continues, Mr. Speaker. Trust is one of the most precious things, and after nine years of the NDP-Liberal government, Canadians have learned exactly how much they can trust Liberal promises. The Prime Minister is not worth the cost. The minister promised that the commission would have complete access to the evidence, yet it has not been given what the government promised. In fact, the government did the exact opposite and is trying to cover up everything.

When will the Liberals finally quit with the cover-up and tell Canadians the truth?

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs (Cybersecurity), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am curious as to what point-percentage system the member opposite operates off for repeating Conservative slogans in one question. Perhaps, if the member opposite actually looked into the process on the inquiry, instead of rehearsing and practising slogans, he would know that his own House leader signed off on the process, which included some redactions for client-solicitor privilege and cabinet confidence. The Conservatives should spend more time on understanding interference and less time acting.

* * *

HEALTH

Mr. Scott Reid (Lanark—Frontenac—Kingston, CPC): Mr. Speaker, pulmonary arterial hypertension, also known as PAH, is a disease that blocks arteries in the lungs, causing high blood pressure in the lungs and damaging heart tissue. Patients diagnosed with PAH have, on average, three years to live.

In the United States, a drug called sotatercept was recently approved by the FDA. This drug increases quality of life and lifespan for PAH patients and even, in some cases, reverses the damage caused by the disease.

When will this life-saving drug be approved for use in Canada?

• (1205)

Mr. Yasir Naqvi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is a very thoughtful question. Of course, our number-one priority is to protect Canadians and to make sure they have all the necessary medications available to them. That is why we are actually bringing in pharmacare legislation, Bill C-64. I really hope the member opposite will support that bill because it would allow Canadians to have access to, initially, diabetes medications and contraceptives.

Routine Proceedings

In relation to the particular medication the member is speaking of, I look forward to looking into it and working with him so that I can give him a more precise answer on the approval process for that particular medication.

* * *

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Mr. Heath MacDonald (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food. The Conservative Party continues to delay Bill C-234. I am wondering if the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Agri-Food and Agriculture can give us an update.

Mr. Francis Drouin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a month ago I rose in this place and talked about the Conservative delay on Bill C-234, a bill they have been championing. This week, we found out they delayed it two weeks forward, again, to play politics on farmers' backs. On this side of the House, we act. On this side of the House, we support farmers, and we are proud of farmers. What we do not do is play politics on their backs.

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Mushkegowuk Cree region is ground zero for underfunded and systemically racist federal health policy. Through it all, the Weeneebayko Health Authority has worked hard to establish quality health care and proper facilities, yet at the 11th hour, the Minister of Indigenous Services walked away on her commitment to build a proper hospital. On Monday, national, regional and provincial leaders on health and indigenous rights will be coming to Ottawa to hold the government to account.

They want to know this: Why did the minister break her word to the people of James Bay?

Mrs. Jenica Atwin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indigenous Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for years, we have been working with WAHA and the communities it serves to shape the future of health care delivery. Conversations are ongoing with all partners as every level of government has a role to play to ensure health care for remote communities. From Toronto to Kenora to Moosonee, everyone deserves quality health care, regardless of who or where they are. We will keep working with Ontario and with WAHA to find a path forward.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a very painful, difficult point and one of which the government is aware. A Canadian citizen, a much loved member of Fredericton's community, Frederick Mwenengabo, has been in the hands of brutal kidnappers in Goma, in Congo, since mid-December 2023, for five long months. Freddy is a much-loved member of the Fredericton community, a human rights advocate, a human rights activist, and his family wants him home.

Can the government give us any update as to what is being done to get him out of the hands of murderers, thieves and criminals and to get him home?

Ms. Pam Damoff (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs (Consular Affairs), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for her continued advocacy on this case. We are aware of reports that a Canadian citizen was kidnapped in the Democratic Republic of Congo. We are in contact with the family, and I have met with the family. Kidnappings are an extremely sensitive matter, given the risk to a kidnapped victim's life. Due to safety and privacy reasons, no further information can be disclosed on this specific case.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mrs. Sherry Romanado (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the King's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 104 and 114, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 66th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs regarding the membership of the committee of the House.

If the House gives its consent, I move that the 66th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs presented to the House be concurred in.

● (1210)

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 agree to)

* * *

PETITIONS

JUSTICE

Mr. Tako Van Popta (Langley—Aldergrove, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition signed by over 800 people, primarily from my home province of British Columbia but also from right across Canada, who are concerned that, since 2014 violent crime has increased by 38% and gang-related homicides has increased by 126%.

Petitioners are concerned about the lack of regulations regarding the use of drugs in public places, about repeat offenders and catch-and-release policies. They are calling on the government to implement regulations and laws to protect the citizens and to reverse soft-and-crime catch-and-release policies.

GAZA

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition signed by 84 constituents who are drawing the attention of the government to the fact that continued assaults on Palestine have escalated to the degree that the actions of Israel have been designated a genocide.

Therefore, petitioners strongly urge the Government of Canada to work with the United Nations, Palestine and Israel to establish a permanent state of Palestine with the same rights as any other nation. They also call for immediate substantive humanitarian aid, overseen by the United Nations, Red Cross and Red Crescent to ensure the safety and well-being of all Palestinians in Gaza, the West Bank and Israel.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition signed by members of the constituency of Saanich—Gulf Islands who are deeply concerned about the actions of Canadian companies overseas that do not reflect our values or our respect for human rights.

Petitioners point out in this petition there are companies based in Canada that contribute to human rights abuses around the world and environmental damage, and that those who protest those Canadian companies and their operations are also harassed, attacked and killed, including indigenous peoples, disproportionately.

Petitioners call on the Government of Canada and the House of Commons to require companies based in Canada to prevent human rights abuses, to protect the environment globally and to ensure a legal right for people who have been harmed overseas to seek justice in Canadian courts.

JUSTICE

Mr. Michael Cooper (St. Albert—Edmonton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition through which petitioners are calling on Parliament to pass Bill S-281, known as Brian's bill, named in honour of Brian Ilesic, who was brutally murdered at the University of Alberta.

Petitioners are calling for this bill to be passed. It is a bill that seeks to amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act so that convicted murderers would not be eligible to apply for parole year after year after serving their minimum sentence. Rather, they would only be eligible for a parole hearing at the time of their automatic review, so that victims' families are not retraumatized again and again.

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to rise in the House today to present petition e-4919, which was initiated by Chris Tucker, the president of Port Renfrew's Chamber of Commerce in my riding of Cowichan—Malahat—Langford.

Routine Proceedings

The petitioners want the government to recognize that closing the recreational fishery endangers Port Renfrew's economy, threatening over 100 small business owners' livelihoods; that no supporting data for the efficacy of static closures has been provided by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, while many communities' economies face severe impacts; that critical threats to the southern resident killer whales, such as pollution and large shipping vessel traffic, remain under-addressed compared with the focus on recreational fishing; and that Port Renfrew's significant economic contribution, backed by a community and the Pacheedaht First Nation, underscores the need for sensible conservation efforts. They are advocating for a shift from arbitrary, punitive regulations to informed, evidence-based policies that ensure southern resident killer whale protection without compromising small communities' economic stability and future planning.

Therefore, the petitioners call upon the Government of Canada to adopt science-based regulations that recognize the marginal impact of the recreational fishery on the southern resident killer whales, do not require closures to recreational fishing and support a conservation-minded approach. What they want is thriving orcas, thriving oceans and thriving communities for many generations to come.

I am proud to support the good people of Port Renfrew.

● (1215)

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise and present three petitions today on behalf of the residents of Kelowna—Lake Country and the region. I will be very brief.

The first petition is calling on the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship of Canada to make available a specialized permanent residency pathway for Ukrainians currently in Canada under the Canada-Ukraine authorization for emergency travel provisions. This pathway would not require them to have a Canadian citizen or permanent resident family member in Canada.

UKRAINE

Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is calling on the Government of Canada to fulfill promises it made to the Government of Ukraine and the armed forces of Ukraine to supply 155-millimetre shells and national advanced surface-to-air missile systems.

The third petition is calling on the Minister of Defence to donate 83,000 discontinued surplus CRV7 rockets to the armed forces of Ukraine for the use of Ukraine's military defence against Russia's aggressive and illegal war.

Routine Proceedings

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Dan Mazier (Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is always an honour to present a petition on behalf of constituents.

I rise for the 38th time on behalf of the people of Swan River, Manitoba, to present a petition on the rising rate of crime. The people of Swan River are upset that jail is a revolving door for repeat offenders, as Bill C-75 allows violent offenders to be in jail in the morning and back on the street the same day. The Manitoba West district RCMP reported that just 15 individuals were responsible for 1,184 calls for service.

The people of Swan River are calling for jail, not bail, for repeat violent offenders. The people of Swan River demand that the Liberal government repeal its soft-on-crime policies, which directly threaten their livelihoods and their community.

I support the good people of Swan River.

AIR SERVICE TO INDIA

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise today to present yet another petition in regard to the relationship between Canada and India, and how the communities here in Canada are hoping to see more direct flights going from Canada to India. There is a special emphasis, because constituents of mine are talking about it, on flights from Winnipeg directly to India or somewhere in Europe as a secondary thing. I hope that parliamentarians or the industry as a whole is made more aware of that demand.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 2503, 2506 and 2508.

[Text]

Question No. 2503—**Mr. Michael Barrett:**

With regard to the social media post by Veterans Affairs Canada (VAC) on March 29, 2024, about a "March holiday season": (a) who wrote the post; (b) what is the process for approving VAC tweets, including which official in the minister's office reviewed the content before being posted and was the process followed in this case; (c) who decided to replace the term "Easter weekend" with "March holiday season"; (d) will VAC be adjusting its March holiday season greeting in years where Easter falls in April; and (e) has any VAC employee faced any disciplinary action as a result of the fallout from this post, and, if so, what measures were taken?

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Minister of Veterans Affairs and Associate Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in response to (a), the social media post was drafted by a member of Veterans Affairs Canada's departmental social media team.

In response to (b), as per Veterans Affairs Canada's established process, it was approved up to the director level in the department.

In response to (c), given all the holidays being celebrated over the month of March, including Easter, a decision was made to acknowledge all those celebrating a holiday in the month of March. An Easter-specific post was published on Easter Sunday.

In response to (d), Veterans Affairs Canada's holiday greetings will be adjusted accordingly each year.

In response to (e), no disciplinary actions were warranted nor taken. However, the internal approval process is being reviewed with the goal of ensuring greater oversight on social media plans.

Question No. 2506—**Mr. Dean Allison:**

With regard to Health Canada's MedEffect website: (a) is the process outlined in the guide entitled "Adverse Reaction Reporting and Health Product Safety Information: Guide for Health Professionals", the protocol that healthcare providers have to follow since December 1, 2020, to report COVID-19 vaccine adverse reactions; (b) if the answer to (a) is negative, (i) when did the process change, (ii) which official in what department initiated the process change, (iii) what was the reason for the change; (c) since December 2020, what has been the new reporting protocol guidance to report COVID-19 vaccine adverse reactions; (d) how were health professionals informed of the change in (c); and (e) what were the substantive differences from the protocol for reporting a vaccine adverse reaction prior to December 2020 and the new protocol outlined in (c)?

Mr. Yasir Naqvi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in response to (a), "Adverse Reaction Reporting and Health Product Safety Information: Guide for Health Professionals" outlines the submission methods available to health care professionals and anyone living in Canada wishing to voluntarily report adverse reactions, ARs, including adverse events following immunization, AEFIs, with vaccines, such as COVID-19 vaccines, and medical devices incident reports to the Canada vigilance program, CVP.

There have been no changes since December 2020 to the process for health care professionals and -consumers to voluntarily report to the CVP on AEFIs, including AEFIs for COVID-19 vaccines.

At the provincial and territorial level, legislation is in place that requires AEFIs to be reported by health care professionals to local provincial health units. These reports are shared with PHAC via the Canadian adverse events following immunization surveillance system, CAEFISS. Health Canada and PHAC collaborate to continuously monitor AEFIs with vaccines, including the COVID-19 vaccines, received through the CVP and the CAEFISS.

Following a December 2019 provincial/territorial, P/T, request, changes were made in December 2020 to the "Report a side effect" web page. The changes pertained only to the online reporting form and did not impact the ability for consumers and health professionals to voluntarily report AEFIs directly to Health Canada by telephone, mail, fax, or email.

The purpose of these changes was to minimize confusion due to the co-existing CVP and CAEFISS reporting paths and to acknowledge AEFI reporting through the long-standing public health route. As a result, consumers and health care professionals were directed to report AEFIs with COVID-19 vaccines to local public health authorities. These changes were supported by and authorized by senior officials within Health Canada and the Public Health Agency of Canada, PHAC.

The response to (b) is N/A.

In response to (c), following the December 2020 update to the vaccine section of the “Report a side effect” web page, comments were received from some health professionals and consumers seeking to more easily report AEFIs directly to Health Canada. Comments from health professionals and consumers indicated a need for Health Canada to restore the ability to voluntarily report AEFIs online to the Canada vigilance program.

To address this, in February 2023, Health Canada reinstated the direct link to Health Canada’s online reporting form on the “Report a side effect” web page. This change aimed to make direct AEFI reporting to Health Canada easily accessible to those who were unable to report AEFIs through other submission methods, e.g., fax, phone, mail.

In response to (d), PHAC was informed and had no objections to the web page update that reinstated the direct link to Health Canada’s online reporting form, as it co-leads AEFI surveillance along with Health Canada. Other stakeholders were not notified, as it is not standard practice to announce web page changes.

In response to (e), as noted in (a), (b) and (c), the updates to the “Report a side effect” web page did not change the protocol of reporting AEFIs. Voluntary reporting of AEFIs online directly to the CVP by health care professionals and consumers has been available before and after these website updates.

Question No. 2508—**Mr. Scot Davidson:**

With regard to the Canada Revenue Agency: as of April 8, 2024, how many T3 filing forms were completed by bare trusts, and how many taxpayers have filed T3 forms relating to bare trusts?

Hon. Marie-Claude Bibeau (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the above-noted question, what follows is the CRA’s answer as of April 8, 2024, that is, the date of the question.

On its website, it was originally noted: As part of Canada’s continuous efforts to ensure the effectiveness and integrity of the Canadian tax system, the rules governing which trusts must file an annual T3 trust income tax and information return, “T3 return”, have been changed for trusts with a taxation year ending after December 30, 2023. Specifically, all trusts, unless specific conditions are met, must now provide a T3 return including additional beneficial ownership information on an annual basis. As a result, many trusts that did not previously have to file are now required to file an annual T3 return.

However, on March 28, 2024, the CRA announced that it will not require bare trusts to file a T3 income tax and information return, T3 return, including schedule 15, “Beneficial Ownership Information of a Trust”, for the 2023 tax year, unless the CRA makes

Routine Proceedings

a direct request for these filings. Over the coming months, the CRA will work with the Department of Finance to further clarify its guidance on this filing requirement.

For the purposes of the above-noted question, information is being provided in respect to the 2023 tax year; the CRA has defined “completed” as “received”; as tax filing season is still in progress as of the date of the question, numbers may change over time.

As of April 8, 2024, the CRA has received 43,885 bare trust T3 returns since January 2024 in respect of the 2023 tax year. Please note that each return is associated with one trust.

Please note that, as bare trust is a construct of case law and the Income Tax Act, it would be the representative or the trustee that would complete the form. For this reason, the number of taxpayers cannot be provided.

* * *

[English]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, furthermore, if a revised response to Question No. 2364, originally tabled on April 10, and the government’s response to Questions Nos. 2502, 2504, 2505 and 2507 could be made orders for return, these returns would be tabled immediately in an electronic format.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that the aforementioned questions be made orders for return and that they be tabled immediately?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Text]

Question No. 2364—**Mr. Gord Johns:**

With regard to contracts awarded since the 2009-10 fiscal year, broken down by fiscal year: what is the total value of contracts awarded to (i) McKinsey & Company, (ii) Deloitte, (iii) PricewaterhouseCoopers, (iv) Accenture, (v) KPMG, (vi) Ernst and Young, (vii) GC Strategies, (viii) Coredal Systems Consulting Inc., (ix) Dalian Enterprises Inc., (x) Coradix Technology Consulting Ltd, (xi) Dalian and Coradix in joint venture?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 2502—**Mr. Garnett Genuis:**

With regard to the government’s approach to the visit of Nishan Duraiappah, Chief of Peel Regional Police, to Sri Lanka: (a) did the Government of Canada or any Canadian public entity assist in the visit, and, if so, who assisted and what form of assistance was provided; (b) did any Canadian government representative attend any meetings along with Chief Duraiappah, and, if so, what departments or agencies were in attendance; and (c) does the Government of Canada support or facilitate police exchanges or police cooperation between forces in Canada and Sri Lanka?

(Return tabled)

Government Orders

Question No. 2504—Mr. Sameer Zuberi:

With regard to the Canada Disability Benefit Act and the reference to regulations to be made under the Act in section 11: (a) will the regulatory framework be in place by June 2024, as stipulated under the Act; (b) how much progress has been made on the regulatory framework to date; (c) when does the government anticipate that benefits will start being paid out to eligible persons with disabilities; (d) what will be the eligibility criteria to qualify for the benefit; (e) what will the dollar amount of the benefit be to the average Canadian with a disability; (f) what metrics and standards will be used to determine the benefit amount; (g) what is the anticipated financial cost of the program; (h) how will the government determine whether the benefit has achieved the Act's stated goal of lifting Canadians with disabilities out of 'poverty'; (i) will the government implement one of the three scenarios laid out in the Parliamentary Budget Officer's November 2023 report entitled "The Canada Disability Benefit: Model and Scenarios", and, if so, which one; and (j) which stakeholders and interest groups are being consulted during the regulatory process?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 2505—Mr. John Brassard:

With regard to Old Age Security (OAS): (a) how many OAS payment recipients were not residents of Canada for tax purposes in the 2023 tax year; (b) what was the total amount paid out in OAS payments to the recipients in (a); and (c) for OAS program recipients outside of Canada, what is the breakdown by country of the aggregate number of recipients, and the total amount paid for each of the tax years 2022 and 2023?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 2507—Mr. Gerald Soroka:

With regard to the government's carbon tax rebates owed to businesses since the implementation of the federal carbon pricing program in 2019: (a) what is the total amount still owed by the federal government in carbon tax rebates to businesses, broken down by (i) small businesses, (ii) medium-sized businesses; (b) what are the specific amounts owed to businesses in each province and territory, broken down by (i) small businesses, (ii) medium-sized businesses; (c) what measures is the government taking to ensure that outstanding carbon tax rebates are processed and delivered to businesses in a timely manner; and (d) how many businesses, broken down by size (i.e., small, medium) and by province and territory, have not yet received their carbon tax rebates?

(Return tabled)

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that all remaining questions be allowed to stand at this time.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO ORDER PAPER QUESTIONS

Mr. Dan Mazier (Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a point of order regarding the government's response to my written Question No. 2485, which was published on the Order Paper on March 20, 2024.

In my written question, I asked the government about its consultation process for Parks Canada's detailed impact assessment of the "Management of Zebra Mussels in Clear Lake in Riding Mountain National Park", which was opened for public comment in February 2024. I asked the government, "Who did Parks Canada directly inform of the Detailed Impact Assessment, and when were each of them notified...?"

The government stated, "Parks Canada informed the following groups of the opportunity to publicly comment on the detailed im-

pact assessment". Included on the list of organizations that Parks Canada claimed to notify was my office, the Wasagaming Chamber of Commerce and Clear Lake Country, a local tourism association.

This was a concerning response given that neither my office nor I were informed that Parks Canada had initially launched an opportunity to publicly comment on the detailed impact assessment. Furthermore, it has come to my attention that neither the Wasagaming Chamber of Commerce nor Clear Lake Country were initially informed of the opportunity to publicly comment on the detailed impact assessment for Clear Lake within Riding Mountain National Park, despite being identified as key stakeholders by Parks Canada.

In the response, the government claimed that Dameon Wall, external relations manager for the Riding Mountain Field Unit, informed these stakeholders of the initial public comment period on behalf of Parks Canada. However, no records of this exist. This directly contradicts the government's response and indicates that the government provided false information to Parliament.

I hope the government will review this response and correct the record at the earliest opportunity.

• (1220)

The Deputy Speaker: I want to thank the hon. member for that point of order. That was the topic of a question of privilege that was brought forward in this chamber not so long ago.

At the time, we suggested that the House should decide on either sending this for review or something else. That is a decision that the House is going to have to make, but we will look at it a little closer to see if we can come back with something more concrete.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

CANADA LABOUR CODE

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-58, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code and the Canada Industrial Relations Board Regulations, 2012, be read the third time and passed.

Ms. Louise Chabot (Thérèse-De Blainville, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in 1977, under René Lévesque's Parti Québécois government, the Quebec Labour Code banned the use of replacement workers.

The Quebec labour minister at the time, Pierre Marc Johnson, said the following when the legislation was introduced, and I quote: "The purpose of this measure is not to automatically close factories during a lockout or legal strike, but rather to restore a healthy balance between the parties and eliminate practices that cause tension and violence during labour disputes.... Workers, not companies, are the first to suffer as a result of a work stoppage, and letting the employer carry on as though nothing is wrong during a lockout or legal strike creates a fundamental imbalance between the parties."

Government Orders

This was a major step forward for workers' rights in Quebec and a defining moment in the history of the labour movement and its struggle.

Today, 46 years later, Bill C-58 seeks to amend the Canada Labour Code to ban replacement workers. Bravo, or should I say, "it is about time"?

It is certainly a step forward for the rights of federally regulated workers, but above all, it is making up for lost time. The fate of thousands of workers and their right to bargain and to strike has been, continues to be and will continue to be undermined by this inexcusable delay, at least until the bill comes into force 12 months after receiving royal assent.

The effects of this injustice are still being felt. Quebec workers live under two systems. Federally regulated workers in Quebec who are currently in a dispute are paying the price for this injustice. Think of the port of Quebec workers who have been locked out for nearly two years. The employer is using replacement workers. No one is talking about it. No one is working on fixing this because it is business as usual. This is unacceptable.

Think of the Vidéotron employees in Gatineau, who are also locked out. In that telecommunications sector, thousands of jobs are being outsourced to call centres overseas. They too have been locked out for several months, and replacement workers are being used.

At the port of Sorel-Tracy, the United Steelworkers went on strike for 12 months, and scabs were brought in.

I could continue to list all of the injustices and shameful practices that employers have engaged in with impunity because, to date, the Canada Labour Code has not been changed to remedy this injustice.

Unions have been calling for anti-scab legislation as part of the Canada Labour Code for a long time, and so has the Bloc Québécois. Over the past 33 years, there have been 11 bills, the very first of which was tabled in 1990 by the dean of the House, the member for Bécancour—Nicolet—Saurel. Time after time, the Liberals and the Conservatives have blocked the Bloc Québécois's bills. I myself introduced Bill C-276 in this Parliament in May 2022.

The fight was waged by unions and the Bloc Québécois, with constant prodding and the strength of our convictions. The NDP will take credit for that. It was certainly part of that struggle too and, indeed, we commend its work, just as we commend that of the Department of Labour and the leadership the minister has shown.

However, there is a "but", and it is a big "but". Unfortunately, we have to wonder, given the way the bill has been crafted, with the proposed implementation deadline, for one, whether there is any real intention for this bill to actually see the light of day or whether it is just window dressing, meant to look good.

● (1225)

Everyone knows as well as I do that there is a clear difference between fact and appearance, just as there is a difference between declared values and practised values.

From the beginning, the Bloc Québécois has condemned the fact that the initial bill provided for an 18-month coming-into-force period following royal assent. Given this time frame and the fact that we have a minority government, it is no wonder that we are questioning the intent. We proposed an amendment in committee to repeal this delay, proposing that the bill come into force as soon as it receives royal assent. This amendment was rejected by all parties, because the NDP and the Liberals had agreed in advance to propose a 12-month delay. However, the vast majority of the unions we heard from said that there was no explanation for the delay and they too wanted the bill to take effect right after royal assent. That is what it means to protect workers, and the Bloc Québécois stepped up.

When we began studying the bill, we announced that we also wanted to improve it in committee and move fast to close the loophole to ensure that the nonsense of using scabs is banned for good. We proposed carefully chosen amendments put forward by the unions. Among other things, these amendments aimed to include federal public service employees and thus correct a major omission. The government, as an employer, has excluded its own employees from the scope of the bill. We proposed a relevant amendment, but it was ruled out of order because it would amend another act. In principle, however, it is very unfortunate that the bill does not apply to federal government employees. This error needs to be corrected and I hope it will be corrected.

We also made amendments to amend or repeal sections that allow exceptions to the prohibition rule. It may seem complicated. Strikebreakers are prohibited, but there are exceptions. Among the exceptions, I would particularly mention employees covered prior to the bargaining notice. The employer is permitted to use these employees as replacements for striking employees in the event of a dispute, lockout or strike.

It would even be possible for an employee in a bargaining unit of the same employer—but in a different local—to be called upon to replace workers or colleagues during a strike or lockout. This makes no sense whatsoever. The unions have rightly denounced this. If the law is supposed to be consistent, how can certain categories of workers, such as subcontractors and independent contractors, be excluded from this restriction? That sort of thing is prohibited under Quebec's law.

We also proposed an amendment to provide for an investigation mechanism that exists under the Quebec code. If the government wants to impose sanctions, if it wants to be tougher, it has to give the Canada Industrial Relations Board the means to do its job and investigate if the employer breaks the law. Employees cannot do that. Employees who are on strike or locked out cannot enter the factory or their employer's premises. An investigator would have to be called in. This amendment was also rejected.

We had also proposed an amendment to reduce the time limits for the Canada Industrial Relations Board orders so as not to unduly interfere with the strike. All these amendments were rejected.

Government Orders

• (1230)

We are disappointed that these proposed improvements were rejected. They are essential for ensuring the consistency of the bill's objective of fully recognizing the fundamental right to free collective bargaining and the right to strike. However, we can be proud that we put them forward, stood by our convictions, and listened to and supported union demands in the fight for workers' rights.

If the past is any indication, an opportunity to reform the legislation is unlikely to come around again any time soon. This supposedly historic bill deserved more care and attention to achieve its objectives. I hope that history will vindicate the struggle of workers and finally rectify the injustice they have laboured under for so many years.

Ms. Laurel Collins (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Bloc members have long held a similar position to ours on support for workers. I thank them for supporting workers.

Can the member tell us about the impact that this bill will have on people?

Ms. Louise Chabot: Mr. Speaker, as the member must know, a minimally effective bill would at the very least ensure that federally regulated workers have the right to free bargaining and the right to strike.

This bill also seeks to prohibit the use of scabs and will help maintain industrial peace during negotiations. It should also help shorten the length of disputes. That is significant, considering what is happening at the port of Quebec, where federally regulated Quebec workers have been locked out by their employer for two years now. No one cares because the employer is using scabs, which is allowed. This will make a major change.

It is important to always keep in mind that the right to strike and the right to free bargaining are fundamental charter rights. The Liberals should normally support those rights and enforce them. This will change everything, but it could have changed everything sooner.

• (1235)

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when I think of the legislation and its potential impact, and we can talk about those things that fall within the federal responsibility, I like to think that its passage would send a very powerful message. The province of Quebec, which the member made reference to, has had anti-scab legislation for many years now, as does the province of British Columbia. The national government is now bringing forward the proposed legislation and getting the support of all political entities inside the chamber, it would appear; ultimately, this could influence other provincial legislatures to do likewise and bring in anti-scab legislation. Could the member provide her thoughts on that issue?

[Translation]

Ms. Louise Chabot: Mr. Speaker, every province has its own jurisdictions. Every province decides on the social progress it wants to make with respect to labour law. In Quebec, that is it.

After 46 years, the federal government is now saying it is pleased with what is happening. It would have been even better if the government had the courage to include federal public servants in the bill. It would have been even better if the bill had come into force as soon as it received royal assent to eliminate the possibility of any further use of replacement workers.

There is still some work to be done here.

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague on her speech. I think that my colleague is second to none in the House when it comes to labour law.

Now, during the initial debates, many Bloc Québécois members asked the government why it imposed this 18-month delay after royal assent. We kept being told that the question needed to be asked in committee and that we would work on it in committee. What the committee managed to do was reduce the delay from 18 months to 12 months.

Does my colleague know why, unlike all other bills that come into force immediately following royal assent, this one comes into force 12 months later? In committee, did the members have the chance to get insightful, if not intelligent, explanations for this delay?

Ms. Louise Chabot: Mr. Speaker, my colleague asked me if we had gotten any intelligent explanations. I will not accuse anyone of being unintelligent, but I questioned the Minister of Labour and Seniors quite regularly, and we were told that the Canada Industrial Relations Board needs time to ensure that the law fully comes into force.

I am not entirely satisfied with that answer, because one would think that between the bill drafting stage and royal assent, the government would be able to apply all the resources needed to start the work.

I still have my doubts, because there is clearly a big difference between introducing a bill and hoping that it will pass.

Mr. Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for my colleague. Her speech was quite enlightening about this situation, meaning the lack of will to implement the bill and ensure that it can come into force in the short term.

As I do not have much time, I will be brief. The Quebec government settled this issue in 1977, almost 50 years ago. That is half a century. The first time someone decided to try to update the federal code to match Quebec's was in 1989. That someone was my colleague Louis Plamondon, the dean of the House. I was still in diapers in 1989.

Government Orders

Can my colleague from Thérèse-De Blainville explain why we have been talking about this same issue for so long, why it has yet to be resolved and why there is still a chance that it will not get resolved?

• (1240)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie): Before recognizing the hon. member for Thérèse-De Blainville, I would like to remind the member that he is not to refer to members of the House by their first or last name, but only by their position or the riding they represent.

The hon. member for Thérèse-De Blainville.

Ms. Louise Chabot (Thérèse-De Blainville, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the short answer is that there are probably a number of reasons, but it takes political will. For both sides of the House, after this many years, the system is all right. They can live with it.

In terms of labour law, there are no examples to cite here. Governments have introduced an increasing number of special laws that undermine workers' rights.

There was no political will to change the rules of the game. Will this time be different? Will the rules change? Workers who are currently in a dispute, on strike or locked out under this system know full well that the legislation will not apply to them or resolve their dispute. They are already fighting for future workers. The legislation will only come into force 12 months after it receives royal assent. In the meantime, the federal government will continue to enforce the code, which does not prohibit the use of replacement workers.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, could the member describe the other social benefits that workers, in particular unionized workers, have brought to our country, the province of Quebec, and so forth, through the advocacy of good, solid social programs?

[*Translation*]

Ms. Louise Chabot: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question, but I hope he knows the answer.

Since it began, the labour movement has not only advanced workers' rights but it has also helped society as a whole to progress, with greater social justice, greater equality and greater fairness. The unions did this not just for workers' rights but for all citizens. History shows that.

In Quebec, these struggles were important. Progress was made during the Quiet Revolution, when the socio-political context was difficult and there were bitter disputes. The unions played a part in and contributed to the evolution of society and established—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie): Unfortunately, I have to interrupt the hon. member for Thérèse-De Blainville. She has more than exceeded her time.

Resuming debate. The hon. member for Timmins—James Bay.

[*English*]

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would ask for the unanimous consent of the House to split my time with the member for Burnaby South.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie): Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie): The hon. member for Timmins—James Bay.

[*English*]

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Speaker, today is a powerful day, a day that I never thought I would actually see in the House of Commons, after eight efforts over the years in my time to bring forward legislation to protect workers from anti-scab actions by employers to deny them their fundamental rights. We are here today to bring this into law.

On my way here, I learned that, today, the International Court of Justice has called out Israel for the brutal genocide that is happening in Gaza and Rafah, calling on Israel to end this horrific campaign.

This is a day of justice. I think of Martin Luther King Jr.'s beautiful statement that “the arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends toward justice.” That slogan has been used many times over the years, but what people do not often reflect on is that the bending of that arc of justice is done in the face of immense opposition. It is done in the face of threat. It is done in the face of harassment. It is often done in the face of violence. However, the arc of the moral universe will move, inevitably, toward justice.

I was thinking about that, because my mom called me last night. My mom is a hardrock miner's daughter. In fact, her father, Joe MacNeil, started in the Cape Breton coal mines, back when Dominion Steel used to use the army against the coal miners in New Waterford and Glace Bay. They had a classic tactic. They would make the men and the families sleep in tents in the winter to break them. They called them communists, radicals and extremists. There was nothing radical or extreme about fighting for a living wage. What was radical and extreme was the capitalists who would use the army, putting a machine gun in the church steeple in New Waterford to try to intimidate working people.

However, in that moral universe, the arc bent relentlessly toward justice, because there is a moment when people just cannot put up with it anymore and will not put up with anymore.

Mom called me last night and told me how inspired she was. These are dark times, but my mom always sees hope. She said to me that she was so inspired to see the young people marching out of those university commencements, university students in the United States who were putting their careers on the line, facing serious harassment, being called all kinds of hateful things by an establishment that wants to shut them down. My mom said that young people get it. They are not going to sit silent in the face of a genocide.

Government Orders

Again, what bends toward justice is bending in the face of the harassment and the intimidation and the false threats that these young students are somehow extremists and radicals. There is nothing extreme about speaking up against the mass killing of children. What is extreme is going along with it, like last night. When the International Criminal Court has called for indictments against Benjamin Netanyahu for war crimes, the government and its key ministers would be drinking wine and schnaps with Israeli leaders here in Ottawa. We can say that we are friends. We are. Canada has a long, deep friendship with Israel, but friends do not let friends commit war crimes.

My mom said that she was so inspired by these young people who are standing up, walking out and marching in the streets. My mother said to me that she was going to get her walker and go down and walk with them. My mother has never been to a demonstration in her life, but she sees the mark of—

• (1245)

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Marty Morantz: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if this is relevant to the bill we are actually discussing.

The Deputy Speaker: I will remind everyone about relevancy.

The hon. member for Timmins—James Bay.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Speaker, I invite the hon. member to come talk to my mom. She would give him a few lessons in moral justice. The reason why I am talking about my mom is that my mom is a hard-rock miner's daughter. My mom always said to me to do the right thing throughout my life. Do we know what my dad said? He said to never cross a picket line. That was the family that we grew up in. When my mom calls me about justice, I listen, and I think the hon. member should listen about justice too, because my mom is not an extremist. My mom stands up for what is right. We are all called to stand up for what is right, which brings us to this bill.

Year in and year out, workers have had to fight for their basic right to be recognized. If they are facing injustice or poor pay, they have a right to withdraw their labour. Nobody ever gave the union movement or the labour movement anything in this country, certainly not any Conservative who has ever lived.

In my community, the fight for the eight-hour day was won at the Coniagas Mine in 1914. The miners who went on strike at the Coniagas Mine knew what the consequences were. The consequences were that half that workforce was fired and their families were evicted from their homes. None of those men were radicals or extremists like the Conservatives of the time called them, but they had reached a point where they were not going to put up with the brutal conditions underground anymore. They knew what the odds were. They knew that, if they stood up, many of them would be thrown out on the street, their families not able to be fed. They did it for the bigger vision, the bigger right. The arc of the moral universe may be long and it may take a long time, but it bends inevitably toward justice.

I think of all the strikes and labour battles that we have seen in the north and some of them have been brutal. They are stories that

are told in our region. There was the 1958 Inco strike, which one of my old-timer friends, Mike Farrell, told me was the Mine Mill union's Stalingrad. Families lost everything in that fight. They lost homes. They lost their cars. They lost their marriages. When I was walking with the copper and nickel miners in 2010 during the Vale strike, their grandchildren told me that their grandfather and grandmother were in that 1958 strike and that they were there today to live up to that obligation, because the arc of the moral universe bends toward justice, because people know what is right.

What I see from Conservatives is that they tell me that we should not speak up about international things and just talk about what is at home. That is not the Canadian way. That we should not get involved in something that has nothing to do with us is not the Canadian way. The Canadian way is that we bend toward justice because it is the right thing.

We are at this moment in Parliament where we may finally pass anti-scab. I have to say that I have my suspicions. If a Conservative government comes in, does one actually think Conservatives will ever defend workers? There is not a chance. We are going to see them stand up and see whether they stand for the right thing, because this is the moment.

I was talking about the strikes in the north. There is nothing more bitter than when someone brings in scabs to tell a family that they are going to starve them out, that they are going to bust them, that they are going to use the cops and use the state to beat workers down and take away the one right that we have as workers, the right to either supply our employment or take it away if we are not being treated with justice. We have had many of these horrific battles.

It was mentioned earlier about Peggy Witte, one of the most horrible corporate leaders ever, who was lionized by the Canadian mining industry and who led to the nine men being killed in Yellowknife's Giant Mine. What they also do not tell us about what Peggy Witte did was that she robbed the pensions of workers from my region at Pamour mine, and she got away with it.

We have to have laws that protect workers and protect them in strikes so that they can engage fairly. On this day, when we are here at the final moment to maybe get past the finish line with anti-scab, while the international community is now calling out the genocide in Gaza, we have to think about how powerful it is to be at this moment. Yes, the struggle is long, the struggle is hard and the struggle does not end easy, but we have to always bend that power toward justice, fairness and the right of the individual, whether in their union or as a civil human being, to live in dignity. That is what we are here for.

Government Orders

• (1250)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to speak to the legislation earlier, but one thing I would like to amplify is that the federal legislation is fantastic, we are glad to see it and it will hopefully receive the support of every member in the House. However, I am thinking of the impact in the rest of the country in terms of other provincial legislatures. British Columbia and Quebec already have anti-scab legislation. The potential message that it sends to other provinces and territories is that having anti-scab legislation is okay. We do not need to be fearful of it.

Could the member could provide his thoughts on the potential of this legislation to influence provincial jurisdictions, where more workers would benefit by having anti-scab legislation?

• (1255)

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Speaker, it is really important that we see that commitment to workers' rights at the federal government level to withdraw their wages and not have to deal with the private security companies, the scab buses coming in and the violence that ends up on the picket lines. I have seen the abuse of workers' rights in the mining communities I represent. When we establish a norm, it will bring both sides back to the table quicker. When mines have not stockpiled a year's worth of nickel and decide they are going to use scab labour and starve their out opponents, that destroys not just the relationship but communities in the long term. People leave and do not put up with it. This is a good way to settle this.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the member for Timmins—James Bay on his excellent speech. It was one of the most inspiring speeches we have heard in support of the cause of workers. If there is anything that needs to be recognized today, it is that the NDP always defends workers in its speeches. I am glad to hear that.

However, the Bloc Québécois had proposed an amendment in committee to ensure that the bill would come into force immediately after being passed, not a year later. In his speech earlier, my colleague referred to people who stop earning wages when they are on strike, so they have a hard time putting food on the table and paying their mortgage. Then they see scabs right under their noses, doing their jobs in their place, which is particularly frustrating. I was wondering where the NDP's fine speeches were when they voted against our amendment.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Speaker, that is a good question.

Obviously, I am concerned about the Liberals' plan for the coming into force of the bill. This is clearly a problem for workers across Canada, especially with the possibility that the next government will be Conservative. The Liberal government must fulfill its obligation to implement this bill now for Canadian workers.

[*English*]

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I was reflecting on my colleague's use of the term “arc”, and that arc does not bend on its own. In many cases,

we have to force it to bend. While I can take pride, as a New Democrat, today for having brought the House of Commons to this moment, I recognize that with this effort and the many efforts of NDP MPs over the years, we did not arrive at this moment alone. It was those in the labour movement that fought for this change. They were the agitators, the people who forced MPs to arrive at this moment.

Can my colleague reflect on that incredible activism of the labour movement that brought the House of Commons to where it is today?

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Speaker, I will share with my colleague that when I was in his region on Vancouver Island, I visited a graveyard that had been desecrated. The graves of Japanese families who worked in the mines were desecrated in the Second World War. There was a plaque on the wall saying miners had rebuilt the graveyard as best they could. The plaque was made by the nickel and copper miners who belonged to Mine Mill Local 598 in Sudbury. The miners heard about what had happened to the Japanese and raised money in the 1950s so that people on Vancouver Island would know that their comrades were there.

That is the arc of justice. It bends because people stand up and say they are going to make it bend, and that is what we are here to do today.

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am really honoured to be able to follow after my colleague and dear friend, the member for Timmins—James Bay. This is a really special occasion. I want to talk a bit about where I am speaking to you from today, which is the Union Centre in Winnipeg, after having just met with representatives of the Manitoba Federation of Labour. What is so poignant about that—

The Deputy Speaker: There is a point of order from the hon. member for Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley.

Mr. Marty Morantz: Mr. Speaker, the member clearly has a prop in the view right behind him. If members want, the next time I speak, I will bring in a big poster that says the message I want to say and put it right up here behind me. The member has to be called out of order, and he cannot speak until he removes the prop.

• (1300)

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, you have already ruled on this in the past. There have been MPs speaking from a variety of locations.

I would ask you to ensure that Conservative MPs respect the member's speech and respect the bill. If they are in favour of anti-scab legislation, there should be no problem with allowing the speech to continue. It is absolutely appropriate, as you have ruled in the past.

Government Orders

The Deputy Speaker: While I appreciate that, there have been a number of occasions in the House, especially during the time that we had a lot of online participation, when we ruled on not having props in the background, not having words in the background and in some cases not having flags in the background. Therefore, maybe I can ask that we get rid of the wording in the background. That is perfect. There we go; when we ask, it shall be done.

The hon. member for Burnaby South.

Mr. Jagmeet Singh: Mr. Speaker, I notice that the Conservatives are upset because I was going to reference the Winnipeg strike, actually, and there are pictures of the Winnipeg strike behind me, which actually capture the story even better than the words do. I want to talk about why the strike is so important. Maybe this is why the Conservatives are upset: They do not like it when the power of workers comes together to fight back and defend working people.

What happened in 1919, in the very same time in we find ourselves in right now, which is mid-May to late June, 30,000 workers, basically the entire workforce of Winnipeg, and in a lot of ways all of Manitoba at the time, came together and shut down the city and effectively shut down the province, fighting for fairness for workers. They were protesting the unfair work conditions, the poverty and specifically about issues like collective bargaining.

It is so poignant that I am here in Winnipeg at the Union Centre, having just spoken with representatives of the Manitoba Federation of Labour and its president, Kevin Rebeck, whom I want to thank for all of his hard work. I also want to thank the MFL for all of its hard work.

It is so poignant to be speaking to the bill today in this place, from this spot. I have to say what an honour it is that today our Bill C-58, which we fought for, would ban scabs once and for all at the federal level. It is a historic result of the hard work of New Democrats, and I have to say this would not have happened were it not for New Democrats' forcing the government to do it.

I also have to acknowledge that this would not have happened were it not for labour and for unions that have long led the charge for anti-scab legislation, and I want to thank them. I also have to acknowledge that it is an accomplishment we have achieved that we are debating this right now in the House and that the Manitoba NDP is also going to move forward with it. I want to salute and acknowledge that.

I have to say that it has been a long time coming. New Democrats have been fighting for decades for it to happen. In the past 15 years, New Democrats have tabled anti-scab legislation eight times. That is eight times that our unions, labour and New Democrats have fought for this. The last time it came up for a vote, in 2016, the Liberals and Conservatives teamed up to vote against it. The leader of the Conservatives voted against banning scabs eight times in the past, so it is clear whose side the Conservatives stand on. However, with the supporting guidance of our labour allies, union leaders and activists, we have finally secured this moment.

The legislation is about giving more power to workers. It is about giving power to workers so they can negotiate a fair deal and so we can ban scabs once and for all. Let us talk about what that means.

Banning scabs is about giving more power to workers and less power to the big bosses and to CEOs. It is about ensuring that when a worker makes the difficult decision to go on strike, their job is not stolen by scabs. That is what this is about.

[*Translation*]

Banning scabs at the federal level is unprecedented. As with many things, Quebec was forward-thinking and already legislated this at the provincial level. This federal bill, which was negotiated by my colleague from Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, is inspired by the Quebec legislation, but goes even further.

Many Quebeckers working in federally regulated businesses will now have more power thanks to the NDP. It is not thanks to the Bloc Québécois, the Conservatives or the Liberals, but thanks to the NDP. If our party had been in power, the bill would have been even better, but we were forced to work with the Liberals. Throughout these negotiations, the Liberals sided with the big union bosses. We sided with labour and I am proud of the work of my team.

This is an historic moment. Banning replacement workers will give more power to workers and less power to the CEOs. Workers will have more power to negotiate better salaries. During this inflationary period, that is what workers need.

● (1305)

[*English*]

This bill, Bill C-58, is about making sure that workers get the respect they deserve, which is needed now more than ever because we know times are tough. We know that workers are getting gouged by corporate greed, corporate greed at the grocery stores, corporate greed when it comes to corporate landlords jacking up rents and corporate greed in telcos that charge Canadians some of the highest fees in the world for their cellphones and for Internet services.

Workers are fighting back. We are seeing workers organizing across this country. We are seeing it recently in Starbucks and in Amazon. We are seeing it in the public and in the private sectors. Unions are on the front line of fighting inflation because that is what unions do; they fight for working people, and New Democrats do as well. This anti-scab legislation is one additional tool to protect workers from getting ripped off and exploited by big bosses.

Government Orders

However, I want to acknowledge that this is not the only thing New Democrats have fought for, specifically for workers. We have forced the federal government to bring in two additional measures already. We have made it the law of the land in Canada that federally regulated workers will get 10 paid days of sick leave, which was never the law before, and we made that happen. We also forced the Liberal government to bring in a sustainable jobs act, which would ensure that workers have a seat at the table, by law, and that anytime we discuss the future of jobs in our country, we talk about training opportunities for workers that go through unions and that we create good union jobs with good wages as we look towards a net zero economy. That is what we established with the sustainable jobs act, which again, is something that Conservatives tried to fight against every step of the way.

Speaking of fighting every step of the way, I want to be very clear. When I say New Democrats made this happen, it is because we had to force the Liberals, we had to force the Prime Minister, to act. We know that the Prime Minister and the Liberal Party voted against anti-scab legislation just a few years ago. Without unions and without the New Democrats, nothing happens; none of this happens. New Democrats had to force the Prime Minister to bring in this legislation after decades, and even after forcing the Liberals to bring it in, they missed the mark. We had to fight to strengthen the legislation for workers with amendments. Earlier this month, we amended the bill to speed up the implementation from 18 months to 12 months. Workers will be protected sooner because of that.

We also made sure that we closed loopholes to prevent any attempts of employers from skirting these laws. As well, we specifically made sure that workers will not be exploited by employers who try to use employees from another workplace, or use students or volunteers as scab workers. This is about ensuring that employees can strike for better wages without their bargaining rights being threatened. Big bosses will have to now show up in good faith to bargain at the bargaining table and to negotiate in a manner of good faith. However, imagine what we could have done if the out-of-touch Liberals were not in the way. Strong anti-scab legislation would already have been in place. Corporate greed and big bosses would be in check.

I also want to talk about the serious risk presented by the leader of the Conservatives. The leader of the Conservatives likes to cosplay that he is there for working people, but we all know that the leader of the Conservatives and the Conservative Party want to wage a war against unions, a war against workers, in direct contrast to what this bill, Bill C-58, is all about. The leader of the Conservative Party would bring back anti-union legislation, as he did when he was in cabinet with the Harper government. He would bring in laws to make it harder for workers to fight for better deals. In 2013, the leader of the Conservative party said, very boldly, "I am the first federal politician to make a dedicated push toward this goal!"—

The Deputy Speaker: I have to apologize to the hon. member, but the 10 minutes has gone by in a flash. Maybe he will have an opportunity to finish his speech in response to some of the questions.

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.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate where the leader of the New Democratic Party is. In fact, if he went a bit further down Main Street, he would see that we have the iconic image of the streetcar sculpture. It is a very significant icon because of its meaning with respect to the 1919 general strike, not only for Winnipeg but also, I would suggest, for all of Canada. It is really ironic in the sense that, today, we have anti-scab legislation, and that streetcar was perceived as coming in with replacement workers, so I really appreciate the background.

It looks as though the legislation will get all-party support in passing, if not today, then possibly Monday. Whenever it happens, it happens. Does the member agree with me that it sends a very encouraging message to other jurisdictions? Hopefully, for example, the Province of Manitoba will quickly have anti-scab legislation on the books too. Could the leader of the New Democratic Party provide his thoughts on the federal legislation we have before us today?

• (1310)

Mr. Jagmeet Singh: Mr. Speaker, I had always hoped, and I know labour and union leaders had always hoped, that establishing anti-scab legislation at the federal level would be used as a tool to inspire and inform other provincial jurisdictions to bring in similar legislation. For New Democrats, union leaders and labour leaders, the goal is to ensure that nowhere in our country, in no jurisdiction and at no level, will workers ever be threatened with scabs stealing their jobs. That is ultimately the goal of New Democrats, and we want to make it very clear: We want workers to be able to negotiate fair deals and, if they choose to have to go on strike to fight for that fairness and fight for fair wages, to be able to do so without the threat of a scab stealing their job. That is what I hope to achieve with the bill. New Democrats and the labour movement hope it will inspire other provincial jurisdictions to bring it in.

However, with Manitoba, rest assured, there is already a strong commitment from the premier to bring in anti-scab legislation. They have already tabled it, and it will be moving forward.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I wanted to thank the member for Burnaby South for his speech. However, he did not give much credit to the Bloc Québécois. I would like to point out to the member that there are still holes in the bill. For example, federal public servants are not among the workers covered by this bill.

There is, however, one aspect that interests me above all others, and that is the fact that the bill will come into force only 12 months after royal assent. The Bloc Québécois had proposed an amendment to bring it into force immediately after royal assent, as is the case for other bills.

Government Orders

Could the member for Burnaby South explain how this 12-month delay is reasonable, considering that we are in a minority government and, therefore, the bill could die on the Order Paper?

Mr. Jagmeet Singh: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that we have the New Democrats to thank for this situation. There would be no anti-scab legislation without the pressure we were able to exert through the agreement between the NDP and the Liberal government. Without us, workers would not have this protection. This is really the fruit of our effort and the labour movement's effort. We are very grateful for the work done by the labour movement.

As far as implementation is concerned, the Liberal government wanted an 18-month delay. We forced it to reduce that delay to 12 months. Let us be clear: Without the pressure that we brought to bear, this bill would never have been introduced and we would never have had this debate. It really is thanks to us that workers in federally regulated businesses in Quebec and across the country will receive this protection.

[English]

Mr. Blake Desjarlais (Edmonton Griesbach, NDP): Mr. Speaker, powerful paycheques come from powerful unions.

I am proud to be a New Democrat today. I thank the leader of the New Democratic Party for their consistent efforts in making what we knew was possible a reality. For 15 years, New Democrats have tabled this piece of legislation. Eight times we have seen Liberals and Conservatives join forces to make certain that workers are not more powerful.

This is a remarkable day for workers. I thank workers and all my colleagues in the New Democratic Party for this work. However, I am nervous and scared that we could possibly see a Conservative government try to roll back some of these protections and try to force workers back to work, as it often does when it joins forces with the Liberals, with back-to-work legislation.

Could the member speak to how important it is to have powerful unions?

• (1315)

Mr. Jagmeet Singh: Mr. Speaker, I have to thank my colleague for that great question, and he is right to be worried.

We know that the Conservatives have voted against back-to-work legislation the past. Their leader voted against it eight times in the past. He is in favour of back-to-work legislation. He has opposed anti-scab legislation. He has fought card-check legislation. He has voted against the minimum wage, not once but twice. He vowed to cut workers' pensions and to slash employment insurance to save half a billion dollars for CEOs, which would leave workers out to dry. We know this is a legitimate concern.

We believe very strongly that we not only need to have this anti-scab legislation in place, but also need to be very clear that strong unions have to be supported so that they can fight for good wages for workers. The only way workers get fairness is with strong unions.

Let us be very clear. The New Democratic Party is the only labour party at the federal level. We are proudly founded by unions.

We will always defend unions' ability to fight for workers to ensure they get fair wages and fair working conditions.

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on the motion.

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

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, for this historic vote, decades in the making, I would ask for a recorded vote.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 45, the division stands deferred until Monday, May 27, at the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions.

* * *

[Translation]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to order made Wednesday, February 28, I request that the ordinary hour of daily adjournment of the next sitting be 12 midnight.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to order made Wednesday, February 28, the minister's request to extend the said sitting is deemed adopted.

* * *

CANADA-NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR ATLANTIC ACCORD IMPLEMENTATION ACT

BILL C-49—NOTICE OF TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, an agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Order 78(1) or 78(2) with respect to the third reading stage of Bill C-49, An Act to amend the Canada—Newfoundland and Labrador Atlantic Accord Implementation Act and the Canada-Nova Scotia Offshore Petroleum Resources Accord Implementation Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts.

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

[English]

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I suspect that if you were to canvass the House, you would find unanimous consent to call it 1:30 p.m. at this time so that we can begin private members' hour.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*Translation*]

EFFECTIVE AND ACCOUNTABLE CHARITIES ACT

(Bill S-216. On the Order: Private Members' Business:)

May 16, 2022 — Resuming consideration of the motion of Mr. Lawrence (Northumberland—Peterborough South) — That Bill S-216, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act (use of resources of a registered charity), be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance.

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would ask for unanimous consent for the following motion.

That, notwithstanding any standing order, special order or usual practice of the House, the order for the second reading of Bill S-216, An Act to amend the Income

Private Members' Business

Tax Act (use of resources of a registered charity), standing on the Order Paper in the name of the member for Northumberland—Peterborough South shall be discharged and the bill withdrawn.

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

I hear none. The House has heard the terms of the motion. All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

(Motion agreed to)

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: Accordingly, the order for second reading is discharged and the bill is dropped from the Order Paper.

(Order discharged and bill withdrawn)

The Deputy Speaker: It being 1:20 p.m., the House stands adjourned until Monday, May 27, at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 1:20 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Friday, May 24, 2024

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Canada Labour Code

Bill C-58. Report stage	23755
Ms. Bibeau (for the Minister of Labour and Seniors)	23755
Motion for concurrence	23755
(Motion agreed to)	23755
Third reading	23755
Mr. Lamoureux	23755
Mr. McCauley	23757
Mrs. Gill	23758
Mr. Desjarlais	23758
Mr. Arya	23758
Mrs. Gray	23759
Mr. Arya	23760
Ms. Collins (Victoria)	23761
Mr. Perkins	23761
Mr. Cannings	23761
Ms. Zarrillo	23761
Mr. Lamoureux	23762
Mr. Desjarlais	23762

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Hollyer House

Mr. Arya	23762
----------------	-------

Retirement Congratulations

Mr. Waugh	23763
-----------------	-------

Africa Day

Mr. van Koeverden	23763
-------------------------	-------

Tributes

Mr. Cannings	23763
--------------------	-------

Music Industry

Mr. Battiste	23763
--------------------	-------

Perth Regiment

Mr. Nater	23763
-----------------	-------

Whitehorse Star

Mr. Hanley	23764
------------------	-------

Sixteen Mile Arena

Ms. Damoff	23764
------------------	-------

Liberal Party of Canada

Mr. Kmiec	23764
-----------------	-------

National Field of Honour

Mr. Scarpaleggia	23764
------------------------	-------

Housing

Mr. Kram	23765
----------------	-------

Food Security

Mrs. Roberts	23765
--------------------	-------

Srebrenica Remembrance Day

Ms. Vandenbeld	23765
----------------------	-------

Resource Assistance for Youth

Ms. Gazan	23765
-----------------	-------

Drummondville Voltigeurs

Mr. Champoux	23765
--------------------	-------

Food Security

Mr. Barrett	23766
-------------------	-------

National Nursing Week

Mr. Sidhu (Brampton East)	23766
---------------------------------	-------

ORAL QUESTIONS

Government Priorities

Ms. Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	23766
Mr. Turnbull	23766
Ms. Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	23766
Mr. Fragiskatos	23767
Ms. Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	23767
Mr. van Koeverden	23767

Finance

Mr. Deltell	23767
Ms. Bibeau	23767
Mr. Deltell	23767
Ms. Bibeau	23767

Official Languages

Mrs. Gill	23767
Mr. MacKinnon	23768
Mrs. Gill	23768
Mr. MacKinnon	23768

Northern Affairs

Mr. Julian	23768
Mrs. Atwin	23768

Canada Border Services Agency

Mr. MacGregor	23768
Mr. Housefather	23769

Finance

Mr. McLean	23769
Mr. Turnbull	23769
Mr. McLean	23769
Mr. Fragiskatos	23769

Housing

Mr. Morantz	23769
Mr. Turnbull	23769
Mr. Morantz	23769
Mr. MacKinnon	23770
Mr. Kmiec	23770
Mr. MacKinnon	23770

Mr. Kmiec	23770
Mr. Fragiskatos	23770
Climate Change	
Ms. Pauzé	23770
Mr. van Koeverden	23770
Ms. Pauzé	23770
Mr. MacKinnon	23771
Finance	
Mrs. Block	23771
Mr. Fragiskatos	23771
Mrs. Block	23771
Mr. Turnbull	23771
Carbon Pricing	
Mr. Ellis	23771
Mr. van Koeverden	23771
Mr. Ellis	23771
Mr. MacKinnon	23772
The Environment	
Ms. Collins (Victoria)	23772
Mr. van Koeverden	23772
Canadian Heritage	
Mr. Desjarlais	23772
Mr. Noormohamed	23772
Justice	
Ms. Bradford	23772
Mr. Virani	23772
The Economy	
Mr. Leslie	23772
Mr. Turnbull	23773
Mr. Soroka	23773
Ms. Sudds	23773
Mr. Waugh	23773
Mr. Boissonnault	23773
Carbon Pricing	
Mr. Carrie	23773
Ms. Hutchings	23773
Official Languages	
Mr. Champoux	23773
Mr. Virani	23774
Mr. Champoux	23774
Mr. Virani	23774
Finance	
Mr. Généreux	23774
Ms. Bibeau	23774
Mr. Généreux	23774
Ms. Bibeau	23774
Agriculture and Agri-Food	
Mr. Lehoux	23774
Ms. Bibeau	23775
Employment	
Mr. El-Khoury	23775
Mr. Boissonnault	23775

Democratic Institutions	
Mr. Tochor	23775
Ms. O'Connell	23775
Mr. Tochor	23775
Ms. O'Connell	23775
Health	
Mr. Reid	23775
Mr. Naqvi	23775
Agriculture and Agri-Food	
Mr. MacDonald	23776
Mr. Drouin	23776
Indigenous Affairs	
Mr. Angus	23776
Mrs. Atwin	23776
Foreign Affairs	
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	23776
Ms. Damoff	23776

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Committees of the House	
Procedure and House Affairs	
Mrs. Romanado	23776
Motion for concurrence	23776
(Motion agree to)	23776
Petitions	
Justice	
Mr. Van Popta	23776
Gaza	
Mr. Cannings	23777
Human Rights	
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	23777
Justice	
Mr. Cooper	23777
Fisheries and Oceans	
Mr. MacGregor	23777
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship	
Mrs. Gray	23777
Ukraine	
Mrs. Gray	23777
Public Safety	
Mr. Mazier	23778
Air Service to India	
Mr. Lamoureux	23778
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Lamoureux	23778
Questions Passed as Orders for Returns	
Mr. Lamoureux	23779

Points of Order

Government Response to Order Paper Questions

Mr. Mazier 23780

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Canada Labour Code

Bill C-58. Third reading 23780

Ms. Chabot 23780

Ms. Collins (Victoria) 23782

Mr. Lamoureux 23782

Ms. Pauzé 23782

Mr. Barsalou-Duval 23782

Ms. Chabot 23783

Mr. Angus 23783

Mr. Lamoureux 23785

Mr. Barsalou-Duval 23785

Mr. MacGregor 23785

Mr. Singh 23785

Mr. Lamoureux 23787

Ms. Pauzé 23787

Mr. Desjarlais 23788

Division on motion deferred 23788

Business of the House

Mr. MacKinnon 23788

**Canada-Newfoundland and Labrador Atlantic Accord
Implementation Act**

Bill C-49—Notice of Time Allocation Motion

Mr. MacKinnon 23788

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Effective and Accountable Charities Act

(Bill S-216. On the Order: Private Members' Business):.. 23789

Mr. Berthold 23789

Motion 23789

(Motion agreed to) 23789

(Order discharged and bill withdrawn) 23789

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>