HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 148 • NUMBER 434 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, June 14, 2019

Speaker: The Honourable Geoff Regan

CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, June 14, 2019

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayer

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

● (1005)

[*English*]

FISHERIES ACT

The House resumed from June 11 consideration of the motion in relation to the amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-68, An Act to amend the Fisheries Act and other Acts in consequence.

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to once again be here to talk about the Senate amendments to Bill C-68.

I would be remiss if I did not talk about what we have witnessed over the last three and a half years, this week and last night, with the egregious affront to our democracy. It is pertinent to this discussion, because what we have seen with Bill C-68, Bill C-69, Bill C-48 and Bill C-88 is the government's attempt to subvert democracy to pass legislation that is really payback for the assistance the Liberals received in the 2015 election.

Last night, we had the debate, or the lack of debate, on Bill C-69. There were hundreds of amendments from the Senate, and the government forced closure on that debate without any debate whatsoever. Even the Green Party, in its entirety, stood in solidarity with the official opposition to vote against the government on this. That says something.

Bill C-68 is the government's attempt, in its members' words, to right the wrongs of the former Conservative government in amending the Fisheries Act in 2012. The Liberals said that the Conservatives gutted the Fisheries Act. The bill would replace the wording for HADD, the harmful alteration, disruption or destruction of fish habitat. However, we studied this. We consulted on this, and not one example was given. When pressured yesterday, throughout the last week and throughout the last year, not the minister nor anyone from the government was able to provide one example of where the 2012 changes to the Fisheries Act by the previous Conservative government led to the harmful alteration, disruption or destruction of fish habitat. As a matter of fact, despite the government's assertions that changes to the Fisheries Act are necessary to restore the lost protections for fish and fish habitat, the government's response to Order Paper Question No. 626 showed that the government had no record of harm or proof of harm to fish or fish habitat resulting from the 2012 changes.

On November 2, 2016, the then Minister of Fisheries and Oceans appeared before the fisheries committee and stated that “Indigenous people have expressed serious concerns with the amendments made to the [Fisheries Act]” and that his department was “holding face-to-face meetings with various indigenous groups and providing funding so that they can attend these meetings and share their views on the matter”. However, according to the government's response to Order Paper Question No. 943, DFO did not undertake any face-to-face consultation sessions in relation to the review of the changes to the Fisheries Act in the 2016-17 fiscal year.

The Liberals have stood before Canadians in the House and have been disingenuous. They continue to use the same eco-warrior talking points we see from Tides, Greenpeace and the World Wildlife Fund, which is essentially an attack on our natural resource sector, whether that be forestry, fisheries, oil and gas, mining or agriculture. That is what Bill C-68, Bill C-88, Bill C-48 and Bill C-69 are attempting to do. They want to shut down anything to do with natural resources.

In the Senate right now, Bill C-48 is being debated. It deals with the tanker moratorium on the west coast, yet we have double and triple the number of tankers on the east coast, but it does not matter. We do not see groups like Greenpeace, Tides and the WWF protesting those ships and oil tankers from foreign nations that have far more egregious human rights issues than what we have here in our country.

Dirty oil is flowing through our eastern seaport, but there has not been one mention of that by the government. Instead, it wants to shut down anything to do with western Canada's economic opportunities, and that is egregious and shameful, and that is why we are here today.

The Senate amendments with respect to Bill C-68 were decent amendments. They folded into Bill S-203, the cetaceans in captivity bill, and Bill S-238, the shark finning bill.

For those who are not aware of the shark finning bill, it would ban the importation of shark fins, with the exception that they must be attached to the carcass. Shark fin is a delicacy in some Asian cultures and is used in soup and medicinal products. We asked officials at committee if shark fin in any form could be imported into our country, and they replied that it could be imported in soup. That was their testimony. When pressed further on this, they said, "soup is soup".

The whole intent of Bill S-238 is to stop the importation of shark fins so that shark fin soup may be stopped or that at least the fins would be imported into the country with the entire carcass used. That is a fairly reasonable thing to ask.

The other Senate amendments to Bill C-68 that are important are with respect to the inshore fishery. We heard time and again that the inshore fishery is important to Atlantic fishermen. Adjacency and the inshore fishery are the same thing, but the language is different on either coast. It is important to our coastal communities and fishermen who depend on fishing for their livelihood.

Another important Senate amendment is with respect to third-party habitat banking. I went into great detail about what third party habitat banking means in terms of fish habitat. That was a reasonable amendment put forward by a Conservative, and all senators agreed with it.

Interestingly enough, before the Senate finished studying the bill, the minister directed our fisheries committee to study third-party habitat banking. Prior to the fisheries committee getting a chance to study it, the Liberals scrapped any of the third party habitat banking amendments brought forth by the Conservative Party and agreed to by independent senators. It was an exercise in futility.

Senator Wells, who appeared before committee just the other day, said that by all accounts, it appeared that the only people who were interested in protecting fish and fish habitat were those around the table, and the only people who were against protecting fish and fish habitat with respect to third party habitat banking were the officials. That is odd.

I want to talk again about why we are here. I spoke at length about the influence of third party groups at the highest levels of our offices. I will remind the House that the former chief adviser to the Prime Minister, Gerald Butts, was the president and CEO of the World Wildlife Fund. The Prime Minister's new director of policy is a former top executive at Tides Canada.

Why is this important? It is important because these are the very organizations whose mandate is to shut down Canada's resources every step of the way and to tarnish Canada's natural resource sector on the world stage.

● (1010)

It says right on their own websites that they were going to use celebrities, their media and their influence to tarnish Canada's oil and gas and forestry to attack and landlock our resources. They have now permeated every office in this government.

In 2015, 114 third parties poured $6 million into influencing the election outcome, and many of those parties were funded by the U.S.-based Tides foundation. The World Wildlife Fund is deciding fisheries policy on the east coast.

As the shadow minister for Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, I went to meetings with the former fisheries minister, and there were no fisheries stakeholders there. The table was surrounded by environmental groups. We are placing a higher priority on these environmental groups than we are on the stakeholders who make their living and depend on our natural resources for their economic well-being.

Late last night, I took another phone call about another mill closure in my riding of Cariboo—Prince George. I know that colleagues understand our economic plight in western Canada. We have seen a lot of emotion over the last weeks and months about the plight of the west. The reality is that we are losing our jobs, and we do not have other opportunities. It is not that we are against the environment, unlike what a parliamentary secretary said yesterday, in response to Bill C-88, which is that the Conservatives blame the Liberals for putting such a high priority on the environment. That is not true. We blame the Liberals for putting such a high priority on environmental groups, not on the stakeholders, indigenous peoples and our local communities that depend on our natural resources for well-paying jobs to provide for their families.

There are hundreds of workers in my riding and adjacent ridings, and thousands of workers across the province of British Columbia, who are waking up today to more work curtailment and job closures. That is shameful.

When the House hears our emotion and concern when we raise the issues, it is not that we are against the environment, as much as the Minister of Environment would like people to believe that. It is that these policies the government has put forth have shaken the confidence of industry. They have a real impact. They may not impact those members of Parliament from downtown Toronto or in major urban centres, but they impact rural Canadians, and that is the truth.

I am going to close by reminding the House that this House does not belong to any of us who are in here. We are merely vehicles to be the voices of the electors. There are 338 members of Parliament in this House. Last night, we saw one courageous Liberal who stood against what her government was doing. We have been placed here to be the voices of those who elected us.

Despite saying in 2015 that they would let debate reign, the Liberals have time and again forced closure and time allocation on pieces of legislation. In doing so, they have silenced the voices of the electors who have put us here.

● (1015)

I would like to move the following motion, seconded by the member for North Okanagan—Shuswap:

> That the motion be amended by deleting all of the words after the word "That" and substituting the following:
>
> "the amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-68, An Act to amend the Fisheries Act and other Acts in consequence, be now read a second time and concurred in."

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The amendment is in order.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Pontiac.

● (1020)

Mr. William Amos (Pontiac, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the member opposite's passion. I also appreciate the economic struggles that a number of industries in his region are going through. However, I can say without a doubt that one of the reasons I got into politics was the atrocious law reform the Harper government engaged in, particularly with respect to the Fisheries Act and fish habitat.

Scientists all across this country were well aware of this. They did not just believe politicians that something was awry with Harper's amendments to the Fisheries Act. They believed the science, because diminishing habitat for fisheries and fish in Canada is the wrong thing to do.

Canadians across this country are so glad that this government is sticking to its guns and restoring those protections, because they trust scientists more than they trust politicians, who ultimately do not really know what is most important for fish habitat. It is the scientists we have to trust, and that is exactly what our government is doing.

Why does the member opposite not trust the scientists across Canada?

Mr. Todd Doherty: Mr. Speaker, who is being divisive now?

At committee, we had scientists, academics, environmental groups and industry. People from all over our country came before committee, even groups that one would think would not be friendly to Conservatives, as apparently we waged a war on scientists, but we had the very same scientists before our committee. When they were asked, time and again, to provide examples that the 2012 changes to the Fisheries Act resulted in any harmful alteration, disruption or destruction of fish or fish habitat, none were given.

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my colleague talked about the thousands of jobs that might be affected by the act's coming into place. I live in a coastal community, and I have not heard from a single constituent who does not want to see the act brought back to fix the gutting of the act done by the Conservatives with respect to fisheries protections. We are talking about thousands of jobs in my riding that are directly related to the health of the fish habitat.

In one part of the member's speech, he talked about third party habitat banking. He said the only opposition was from bureaucrats around the table, who are against it. He did not talk about indigenous communities, which have made it very clear that they have not been adequately consulted.

The member sits with me on the committee. He knows that indigenous peoples were not invited to the Senate committee to speak about their concerns. We know that indigenous communities have made it very clear that third party habitat banking can often be manipulated. It is a trading scheme.

Why does the member feel he can support this with no regard for indigenous communities and hearing their voices?

Mr. Todd Doherty: Mr. Speaker, our hon. colleague is sorely mistaken. Perhaps I would ask that the volume be turned up on that side so he can hear me a bit more clearly.

When I talked about jobs being lost, I referenced thousands of jobs being lost across our province right now because of the forestry policies and the lack of securing a softwood lumber agreement. The member knows full well that we can turn on the TV or look at the newspaper every day, and there is another mill closure. There is work curtailment going on throughout our province. Our forestry sector has been under attack from the very beginning of the current government.

With respect to third party habitat banking and the testimony, we heard that there were indigenous representatives on the Senate side who supported this wholeheartedly. As a matter of fact, there were indigenous groups that rode in and provided feedback to the Senate. That is why the Conservative senator was able to garner support from the independent senators across the way so that this amendment would be included and not gutted, as we usually see in Liberal-led committees.

● (1025)

Mr. Mel Arnold (North Okanagan—Shuswap, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for Cariboo—Prince George for his speech on this topic, the Senate amendments to Bill C-68. We have sat together on the fisheries committee for years now. We have seen a government that has totally ignored the restoration of fish stocks across the country. Time and again, recommendations from our committee have called on the current government to take action. It failed to do so.

I also want to speak briefly on comments I got from a fisheries officer, who said that the changes we made in 2012 made it much easier for fisheries officers to do their job. Rather than having to gather incredible amounts of evidence, convince Crown prosecutors and then take cases to court, which would take years to prosecute, with the changes made in 2012 fisheries officers are able to immediately demand restoration where damage has been done. There has been no indication that habitat has been lost or damaged in any of the evidence ever produced by the government or in testimony at committee.

I would like the member to comment further on why the government fails to do anything to restore fish stocks, whether Atlantic salmon or salmon on the west coast, and why it continues to push this ill-conceived bill through the House.

Mr. Todd Doherty: Mr. Speaker, our colleague from North Okanagan—Shuswap is former president of the Canadian Wildlife Association. Our colleague from Red Deer—Lacombe is a former Parks employee and I believe has a degree in zoology. Our former colleague on the fisheries committee, the member for Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa, is a marine biologist. I would put our bench up against the Liberals' bench any time. I am proud to serve with these colleagues.

When we met with DFO front-line officers on the ground, they told us that, previous to the 2012 changes, it was onerous for them to regulate and enforce. As a matter of fact, because it was too challenging, they received directives not to bother doing it, which made it hard. The changes in 2012 made it very clear. It was black and white: this is right and this is wrong. It set in motion a clear course and a schedule for proponents so they knew where they overstepped their boundaries, when they were in the right and when they were in the wrong.

As a matter of fact, a witness stated that the 2012 changes "have in practice broadened the circumstances in which the section 35 prohibitions apply and increased the circumstances in which an authorization and offsets are required."

It gave the tools that our front-line officers needed to enforce the rules. It made it clear when proponents were offside and when they were following the rules. It did not make it easier, and it did not gut the Fisheries Act.

I will offer this. Time and again, including today, we have asked for evidence that the 2012 changes resulted in any harmful alteration, disruption or destruction, and none could be provided.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I am able to answer a question from my hon. colleague from Cariboo —Prince George.

Yes, Bill C-38, in the spring of 2012, gutted the Fisheries Act. Yes, it was an appalling decision to take away protections for habitat. On the ground, the effect was that habitat officers for DFO were laid off. I got calls all the time. My hon. colleague knows I tell the truth on these things. People would call me to say they called DFO about a beach where a clam licence was allowed that was being over-harvested, and DFO would tell them that officials could not get there and there was nothing they could do. There were times when habitat was being destroyed and people working on stream restoration who lost funding would call DFO to say that habitat was being lost for cutthroat trout and for getting salmon back, and the answer would be that DFO could not help, because there was no law and DFO did not have any manpower.

We need Bill C-68 to be passed. I lament that it was a bit weakened when my amendment that was accepted at committee was removed, but this bill needs to pass. Every single fisheries organization, the economic backbone of my community, wants this legislation passed before we leave this place.

● (1030)

Mr. Todd Doherty: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comment from my hon. colleague, but I will again offer this. At committee, when officials, academics, environmentalists and scientists were pressed, there was not one piece of evidence that the 2012 changes to the Fisheries Act by the former Conservative government led to any harmful alteration, disruption or destruction.

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise today to speak to Bill C-68, which would amend the Fisheries Act. I will be splitting my time with my good colleague and friend from South Okanagan—West Kootenay.

It has been a positive week for our oceans. Monday, Bill S-203 was passed, which would end cetaceans in captivity. There was also an announcement to ban single-use plastics, although we are waiting for the details. It has been a progressive week.

Now we have Bill C-68, an opportunity to fix the gutting of the Fisheries Act under the Conservatives. I am glad this place has an opportunity to do even more work to ensure that aquatic environments are safeguarded, which should be our priority as parliamentarians.

The bill would restore protections for all fish across Canada, protections that were previously removed by the Conservatives six years ago. This could have been changed sooner. We wish it had been done sooner, but we are glad it is being done now and we welcome changes to this bill.

Fish stocks are in decline in many parts of the country, as we know, especially on the west coast. It is due, in large part, to the negative impacts of human activity on fish habitat and the health of water bodies overall. Bill C-68 would put back into place legal protections needed to conserve fish habitat and the aquatic environment in a manner consistent with the minister's mandate to restore lost protections and introduce modern safeguards to the Fisheries Act.

With respect to the specifics, Bill C-68 would first and foremost compel the minister to consider any effects that decisions under the Fisheries Act might have on the rights of indigenous peoples of Canada and authorize agreements to be made with indigenous governing bodies. It is so important that the work we do embeds these protections and the rights of indigenous communities.

Pacific salmon are a primary food source for culture and the economy of indigenous peoples and people in coastal communities. The government has taken steps to help incorporate the rights and traditions of indigenous peoples to support their economic and cultural sustainability. I am very proud of the determined and continued stewardship of the indigenous communities in our country, especially on the west coast and in my riding. We really need their input and local knowledge to do this work; it is absolutely essential.

I want to share with the House a couple of comments.

Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council president, Dr. Judith Sayers, said that while Bill C-68 may not be everything Nuu-chah-nulth would like to see, it was a fulfillment of the Liberal promise to undo the damage the previous government did to the act. She said that habitat restoration was critical for their fisheries to remain sustainable so they may continue to exercise our rights and that the inclusion of indigenous wisdom was a start to recognizing their laws and knowledge systems. She did highlight, though, the need for co-management and the need to work toward that.

Eric Angel, the fisheries program manager for Uu-a-thluk, which is a Nuu-Chah-Nulth fisheries program, said:

> The changes to the Fisheries Act under Bill C-68 are the most important amendments to federal fisheries legislation in a hundred years. Nuu-chah-nulth are very concerned that these proposed changes become law. The restoration of habitat protection that was stripped out of the Fisheries Act under the Harper government is absolutely critical. We are facing a crisis on the west coast with the destruction of salmon habitat and we desperately need this legislation to be able to force government to do a better job of looking after fish habitat. The proposed act also contains some small but important steps towards recognizing the laws and traditional knowledge systems of First Nations.

It is important to move forward with this. We know water is sacred. We, as parliamentarians, are coming to better understand that. We have a commitment to improve the ecology, especially the habitats that surround indigenous communities in coastal communities, as well as their important rights, ensuring their local knowledge and leadership in their traditional territories are respected. They have taken the lead on water issues. In my riding and many indigenous communities, the bill would directly and positively affect them.

Bill C-68 would also modernize measures to protect fish and fish habitat in ecologically significant areas and establish standards and codes of practice, a public registry and create fish habitat banks initially by different projects. This bill would also allow the minister to establish advisory panels and to set fees, including for the provision of regulatory processes, and allow the minister to make regulations for the conservation and protection of marine biodiversity.

● (1035)

We are happy to see clauses that build greater oversight over what companies do to fish habitats. It would allow the minister to stop companies from putting down anti-salmon breeding mats and protect the stock of coastal salmon.

The New Democrats are pleased to see that after so many years of trying, the bill would prohibit the import and exportation of shark fins. We have been working incredibly hard to ensure this practice is a thing of the past.

I want to thank my colleague and friend, the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam, for his tireless efforts to make this happen, both in Bill C-68 and through Bill S-238. I also want to thank the members of the fisheries and oceans committee, who have taken the time to look at the issue closely.

The fact remains that shark populations, both in Canada and abroad, are at significant risk. My office has heard from many ordinary citizens, as well as conservation experts, who feel strongly about the effort to protect shark populations from needless slaughter. We have spent enough time over several parliaments looking at the issue and this is a critical juncture for us to act.

Along the same vein, this bill would further enshrine the ban on the capture and captivity of cetaceans, which I mentioned earlier. I am so grateful to the House for its support of Bill S-203 on Monday. It shows that the House is an active participant in changing the dialogue on marine conservation, and also on animal rights. I am pleased this bill gives us an opportunity to reaffirm that participation.

Bill C-68 would strengthen the enforcement powers and establish an alternative measures agreements regime, which includes $284 million over five years to enforce the protection of habitat wherever fish are present. This bill would allow the minister to stop or limit fishing for a period of 45 days to address the threat to the proper management and control of fisheries so the conservation and protection of fish is maintained.

Bill C-68 goes beyond just restoring the protection and habitat that were removed in the changes to the Fisheries Act in 2012. It goes as far as to include all fish in the definition of "fisheries", and would include the rebuilding of depleted fish stocks in the Fisheries Act.

All that said, the latest suite of amendments proposed by the Senate presents some setback to the work that the House has been doing. The biggest thing that comes to mind are the changes that touch heavily on third-party habitat banking.

The creation of habitat banks has been poorly executed in the past, where first nations, municipalities and conservation organizations saw damage accumulated in their territory or watershed and the habitat bank in a neighbouring first nations territory or watershed. Therefore, it was disappointing to see these amendments, calling for the proposal of third-party banking. There was no consultation with indigenous groups, which mostly oppose it.

While I am happy to see the Liberal government is listening to some of these concerns and has proposed to remove these amendments, I am disappointed in the Liberal government for not taking the opportunity to really make a difference in protecting water flows, both upstream and downstream.

Back in the spring of 2018, when Bill C-68 was before the fisheries and oceans committee, the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam proposed several amendments to strengthen the bill. These amendments included proposals that explicitly recognized that the quantity, timing and quality of water flows were vital to ensuring the free passage and the protection of fish and fish habitat. These important amendments were passed by a majority vote during the clause-by-clause review.

The Senate has not taken the issue of water flows seriously. It proposed that the addition of upstream protection was unimportant and that companies that obstructed the flow of water should do the bare minimum required to conserve populations. This was something the industry wanted. We worked with conservation groups to find a solution to water-flow issues, but the Senate only listened to the lobbyists, who cannot be bothered to be proactive partners in conservation.

What is more, the Liberals are on board with this amendment, despite the expert advice of the Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat, which pointed to the absence of legal protections for environmental flows, resulting in a situation where fisheries resources, fish habitat and the supporting freshwater ecosystems may not be consistently protected across Canada.

I am sure I could speak for a lot longer on this, but this is a great step. I have to commend the government for working together with us to repair so much of the damage left by the previous government. However, if we are to walk the path to restoration, it will take many more steps.

● (1040)

Ms. Pamela Goldsmith-Jones (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs (Consular Affairs), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his leadership on this. It is just a joy to work with him on behalf of British Columbians.

The very first department the Treasury Board reviewed when we formed government was DFO. It restored $1.4 billion into the base budget, which tells us the magnitude of the horrific cuts the Stephen Harper government made. It had threatened to close the DFO lab at the waterfront in West Vancouver, which is widely considered as the best lab for access to fresh water and salt water in North America. It had constantly diminished the DFO office in Squamish, and it closed DFO offices in Pender Harbour, which has caused a subsequent lack of enforcement and monitoring of overfishing, which continues to be a source of strong disappointment on the path of the community.

The outrageous cuts made by the Stephen Harper government are still forefront in our minds. Our Liberal government has worked tirelessly to put back some of those lost protections. Does my hon. colleague have any confidence that the Leader of the Opposition would take us back to those dark days?

Mr. Gord Johns: Mr. Speaker, we are going to miss my good friend from West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country. She has been a true fighter for coastal British Columbia and for our fish. I have enjoyed working with her.

However, with respect to her comments, there is a lot of fear from coastal people that a government led by the Conservative Party of Canada would take us back and would remove protections for fish. This is very important legislation.

When the member talked about restoring cuts, more fisheries officers are being hired in our riding. I want to commend the government for that. Is it enough? No. The government has announced money when it comes to coastal restoration funds and the B.C. salmon funds. However that money is moving way too slowly out the door. Our fish are in a crisis.

I urge the government to get that money out the door as soon as possible. Groups in my riding have been denied, repeatedly, on applications, whether it be the West Coast Aquatic marine society or the Coastal Restoration Society, formerly known as Clayoquot CleanUp. They are trying to clean up debris for fisheries habitat protections and also cleaning up marine debris, which we know affects our fish.

I urge the government to get that money out the door, the $142 million. It partnered with the Province of British Columbia. I want to hear more about the southern resident killer whale money and where it will go, because the government has not broken that down. The government has been too slow to roll out the oceans protection plan. It has not met one of its scheduled targets on funding to date.

Mr. Mel Arnold (North Okanagan—Shuswap, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will forgive the member for falling off topic here. What we are debating today are the Senate amendments to Bill C-68, and he did not touch on those, not that I can pick out, at any point during his intervention. Therefore, I would like to bring him back to that. I forgive the member for it, because he has only been part-time on this committee over the past three and a half, four years.

Why would the Liberal government reject sensible amendments from a Senate committee that would actually see a net gain in fish habitat and fish habitat values, from the third party habitat banking? The Liberal government seems to refuse to do anything that would increase or improve fish habitat. That is the amendments that the government is kicking aside.

The member for Courtenay—Alberni seems to have ignored all of that in his intervention. Why?

● (1045)

Mr. Gord Johns: Mr. Speaker, it is always nice to rise when we hear the Conservatives try to put down the NDP members who have been fighting for salmon.

All people have to do is look at the record of how many times the New Democrats have risen on Pacific salmon and compare it to the record of the Conservatives. I have risen more than all 97 members of the Conservative caucus on Pacific salmon alone. When the Conservatives talk about who shows up part-time, I wonder who that is. They like to show up at the very end of the session.

On the amendments, I have already outlined my concerns around third party banking, which could be completely manipulated and indigenous communities have not been heard. How can the member raise this issue and want to go ahead, just ramming it through, without hearing from indigenous communities? It is unacceptable. It is just another reflection of how the Conservatives see the priorities of free and prior informed consent of indigenous communities.

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to speak to Bill C-68, an act to amend the Fisheries Act and other acts in consequence. Today, we are debating the Senate amendments to the bill, as was just mentioned. I initially spoke to this bill at report stage almost exactly one year ago today. I will be covering some of the same ground as I did then, but today I want to spend a little more time speaking in general terms about fisheries conservation.

Although I grew up in the Okanagan Valley far from the coast, my family has a deep history in coastal fisheries. My mother's family, the Munns, once controlled the cod fishery of Labrador. My great-uncle William Azariah Munn was what one might call a cod liver oil baron. He was also an amateur fisheries biologist and historian. W.A. Munn not only researched the Viking sagas but was the first to suggest that Vineland was located on the northern peninsula of Newfoundland, which was subsequently vindicated by the findings at L'Anse aux Meadows. He wrote the first detailed account of the annual migration of codfish in the Newfoundland waters in 1922. I found that out when I was reading the assessment report on northern cod when it was declared endangered. It was cited in the report.

I will mention in passing that I am wearing my Memorial University tie this morning to honour that part of my heritage and history. I thank Bill Kavanagh for that.

Although I grew up in the interior, like most kids of that era, I grew up fishing, in my case, catching small rainbow trout in a small creek near our house. I knew the importance of cool waters and deep pools in a stream shaded from the summer sun, good fish habitat in my part of the country.

The Fisheries Act has long been the strongest piece of legislation that protected habitat, terrestrial or aquatic, in Canada. I used to be a biologist in my past life. I spent a lot of time working on ecosystem health, endangered species recovery and time and again my colleagues would point out that the only legislation, federal or provincial, that effectively protected habitat outside parks was the federal Fisheries Act. This habitat protection was at the core of earlier versions of the Fisheries Act. Conservatives took out that protection in 2012 with Bill C-38, one of their omnibus budget bills.

The action resulted in a public outcry. Four former fisheries ministers, including one of my constituents, Tom Siddon, wrote an open letter to the government urging it to keep habitat protections in the act. I saw Tom last weekend at an event in my riding and I am happy to say that he is still standing up for the environment.

This act still is deficient in a few ways regarding habitat. For instance, while it talks about water in the rivers and lakes as fish habitat, it does not discuss the amount of that water, the flow. That is clearly a problem as water is obviously the most important ingredient in fish habitat. Those deep, cool pools I fished in are becoming shallower and warmer. Bill C-68 would empower the fisheries and oceans minister to make management orders prohibiting or limiting fishing to address a threat to the conservation and protection of fish. I am fully in favour of that power, but I wonder how often it would be used despite the fact that it would likely be recommended on a regular basis by scientists.

Fish are consistently treated differently from terrestrial species in conservation actions. As an example, of all the fish species assessed as threatened or endangered in recent years by the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada, less than half have been placed on the Species at Risk Act schedules. A bird or mammal in trouble is generally added to those schedules as a matter of course, but fish are out of luck. This attitude must change.

I am happy to see the Senate amendment that includes shark-finning laws proposed by my colleague from Port Moody—Coquitlam over the years and Senator Mike MacDonald in the other place. I am very happy to see those private members' bills rolled into this new act in the Senate amendments.

I am also happy to see there is a provision in this act that would give the DFO more resources for enforcement. I hope that some of these resources can be used to rebuild the DFO staff that used to be found throughout the interior of B.C. to promote fish habitat restoration, rebuild fish stocks and watch what is happening on the ground. There are no DFO staff left at all in my riding in the Okanagan and Kootenay regions, despite the fact that there are numerous aquatic stewardship societies across the riding that used to have a great relationship with the DFO. Volunteer groups that are devoted to aquatic habitats in the Arrow Lakes, the Slocan Valley, Christina Lake, the Kettle River watershed, Osoyoos Lake and Vaseux Lake could all benefit through a renewal of those staffing levels.

● (1050)

I would like to close with a good-news story that shows what can happen when Canadians take fish conservation into their own hands, identify problems and solutions and then work hard to make good things happen. That is the story of restoring salmon populations in the Okanagan. This story involves many players from both the United States and Canada but it is mainly a story of the Syilx people, the indigenous peoples of the Okanagan, who came together to bring salmon back to the valley.

Salmon, *n'itxw*, is one of the four food chiefs of the Syilx and central to their culture and trade traditions. In fact, that is true for many other first nations in the B.C. interior and Yukon, indigenous communities hundreds or thousands of kilometres from the ocean that rely on salmon, that have always relied on salmon and whose cultures are inextricably tied to salmon.

When I was a kid in the Okanagan, very few salmon came up the river from the Pacific. The Okanagan is part of the Columbia system, and those fish had to climb over 11 dams to get to the Okanagan River and back to their spawning grounds. Most of the Columbia salmon runs died out after huge dams like Grand Coulee and Chief Joseph were built and blocked its free flow. The Okanagan flows into the Columbia below Grand Coulee, so a handful of sockeye came back to the Okanagan every year.

However, after years of work by the Okanagan Nation Alliance and other groups, we often see runs of over 100,000 fish, occasionally 400,000 or more. The Okanagan River is once again red with sockeye in the autumn. In most years there is a successful sports fishery for sockeye in Osoyoos Lake.

The ONA has spearheaded significant restoration projects on the Okanagan River, restoring natural flows to small parts of the river and creating ideal spawning beds in others. They organize cultural ceremonies and salmon feasts that bring the broader communities together to celebrate the cycle of the salmon.

The ONA has grown to be one of the largest inland fisheries organizations in Canada with 45 full-time staff. Compare that to zero for the DFO in my area. It has its own state-of-the-art hatchery and fish virology lab.

To make a difference, to change our country and our communities for the better, we must have a vision for a better future. The Syilx vision includes healthy lakes and rivers filled with salmon, salmon that enrich the entire ecosystem and enrich the lives of everyone in the region. I share that vision. The vision includes restoring salmon not just to the entire Okanagan system, but to the upper Columbia River as well, reviving the salmon culture in the Kootenays.

That small creek I used to fish in as a kid now has more than rainbow trout. Every year a few chinook salmon, the big guys, make it into that creek after their epic trip up from the Pacific. That is beyond my wildest dreams.

If we take care of our lakes, our rivers and even the smallest creeks, we can keep this country healthy and beautiful. As the Syilx Okanagan song says, "We are beautiful because our land is beautiful."

The bill before us could have been bolder and more effective, but it is a chance to take a small step towards that end, towards that vision.

Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed the member's remarks.

There has been a lot of discussion by a number of people from the west coast not so much on the Senate amendments but on the Fisheries Act itself and where it is going. I am from the east coast and I agree with the member that more always can be done.

What was not mentioned in a lot of the comments that have been made trying to get over the damage done by the previous government in terms of fisheries habitat and so on, is the fact that saving fisheries habitat at my end of the country is different from that at the member's end of the country. We have small brooks, small streams, even smaller fish.

I wonder if the member could talk about how important habitat restoration is beyond economic issues. There is the recreational fishery. Families enjoy going fishing. We need a healthy fish habitat in order to have that. I wonder if he might comment on that area, that it goes beyond just the economics of fishermen that one would think would be related to the Fisheries Act but to the community itself and the individuals that live in them.

● (1055)

Mr. Richard Cannings: Mr. Speaker, I totally agree with the member for Malpeque.

An example from my riding is that the Okanagan River was channelized in the 1950s to make the water get out of town faster in the spring flood. That has resulted in a huge loss of habitat quality and in habitat, period. A lot of that has been the loss of the trees and shrubs along the river.

Groups have been working hard in the Okanagan Valley in the last 10 or 20 years to restore some of that. It is remarkable how that change feels when you are walking along parts of the river. There are trails along the dikes that control the river now and there are cool areas where this habitat has been restored, where the fish habitat has been restored. It is a very popular recreation area. As I mentioned, restoring the salmon has brought back those recreational fisheries as well. People cannot believe they are in the Okanagan Valley in the middle of the desert and they are actually fishing for wild sockeye salmon. It is a huge boon to the economy and to the well-being of the people who live there.

Mr. Blaine Calkins (Red Deer—Lacombe, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am very saddened to hear the rhetoric around fisheries that I have heard in this debate. Nothing has happened that is catastrophic in the world of fisheries as a result of the changes that were made to the Fisheries Act in 2012. Nobody anywhere in this country can point to a single incident of anything directly related to the changes in that bill. Everybody wanted those changes. Counties wanted them and even fisheries officers wanted those changes so that they could more effectively enforce the law.

I remember issues where farmers whose fields were flooded actually drained their fields and were charged because the old language in the act interpreted a flooded field as a fisheries habitat, even though it was only flooded for a couple of days. People faced ridiculous charges for things like that. There is nothing actually done for fish by changing the legislation in a way that actually prevents restoration and habitat projects from going ahead.

What we actually need are amendments that will do things like habitat banking which, for some reason, the government does not want to do anything about by increasing spawning channels. Rather than stopping all activity, we should enhance things, do offsets and increase the productivity of the natural environment. That is not done by changing legislation that gets in the way of all of these things.

The continually stumbling and bumbling of the left-hand side arguments that somehow we need legislation that pretends humans do not exist in the world is what is actually causing the environmental degradation that we have right now. We need enhancement. We need the ability to intervene and to work hard on behalf of fisheries. These changes are not doing it.

Mr. Richard Cannings: Mr. Speaker, I was not at the committee so I do not know the details, but the first thing I would say is that if no incidents are reported about bad things happening to fish habitats, I think the big problem there is that there are no fisheries biologists out there looking for them. The member's colleague talked about forestry and all the difficulties it was going through. There are hardly any forest service employees in British Columbia that now go and check on habitat situations in the forest landscape.

I have people from my riding complaining to me every day about habitat issues on the forest landscape that relate to water quality and incidents around creeks. There is just no one up there looking at this, so I am not surprised there are no reports of any negative incidents. If there were more staff, we would know about those incidents.

I will just leave it at that. I know we are running out of time.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

● (1100)

[*Translation*]

275TH ANNIVERSARY OF SAINT-PHILIPPE

Mr. Jean-Claude Poissant (La Prairie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, 2019 is an important year for Saint-Philippe because it is celebrating its 275th anniversary. I have to admit that I have soft spot for this municipality because that is where I was born and where I raised my family, on my father's and grandparents' farm.

To give you a little bit of history, Saint-Philippe was officially founded on November 5, 1744, when Monseigneur de Pontbriand, bishop of Quebec, gave the order for a church, a rectory and a cemetery to be built there.

Saint-Philippe is 93% agricultural, but it has become more urbanized over the years. Everyone has been happy to see neighbourhoods and quiet residential streets springing up in the municipality.

As we celebrate this 275th anniversary, I invite residents of Saint-Philippe to keep an eye on the local paper to learn more about the events that will be taking place throughout the year. I also encourage them to express their pride in Saint-Philippe and its motto, “Semer pour l’avenir”, or “sowing seeds for the future”.

* * *

[*English*]

THYROID DISEASE

Hon. Diane Finley (Haldimand—Norfolk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, June is Thyroid Awareness Month in Canada. Thyroid disease affects roughly four in 10 Canadians from all walks of life and from all political stripes. Many notable men and women have been diagnosed with the disease, including former U.S. president George H. W. Bush, former first lady Barbara Bush and their dog Maggie; U. S. senators Hillary Clinton and Bernie Sanders; John F. Kennedy Jr.; and the former member for Trinity—Spadina, Olivia Chow.

I have been vocal about my own experience with Grave's disease to encourage Canadians to get to know the early warning signs, because only half of those with thyroid disease ever get properly diagnosed. If treated early, thyroid disease has a very high cure rate, but if untreated, it can lead to very serious health complications, including severe vision impairment and joint problems.

I encourage Canadians to visit thyroid.ca, educate themselves on the early warning signs and visit their doctors to confirm a diagnosis.

[*Translation*]

NIAKWA PARK RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

Mr. Dan Vandal (Saint Boniface—Saint Vital, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to once again rise in the House to talk about a resident association in my riding of Saint-Boniface—Saint-Vital.

[*English*]

Niakwa Park is a small but vibrant community that was built some 65 years ago. It is well represented by an active residents association. Chaired by Chris Chipman, the volunteer-led Niakwa Park Residents Association organizes many family-friendly activities throughout the year: a winter sleigh ride, an outdoor ice rink, pizza in the park, movie night in the park and an annual picnic.

[*Translation*]

It is always a pleasure to attend events organized by the residents of Niakwa Park and to meet people from that neighbourhood.

[*English*]

The Niakwa Park Residents Association is another great example of how dedicated volunteers help build inclusive and dynamic communities.

* * *

[*Translation*]

TROIS-RIVIÈRES

Mr. Robert Aubin (Trois-Rivières, NDP): Mr. Speaker, a few days from now, I will have completed my second term as a member of Parliament thanks to the support of the people of Trois-Rivières.

Naturally, I want to thank them, but I also want to take this opportunity to explain why the work of an opposition MP matters. No, we are never photographed holding oversized cheques, but without my entire team's tireless work combined with the active engagement of individuals and various regional economic players, we would not have obtained $30 million to support pyrrhotite victims or resurrected the concrete quality study to help grey zone victims recover. We would not be awaiting a high-frequency train announcement that I expect will happen soon. We would not have seen an overhaul of compensation for victims of thalidomide, federal investments in Trois-Rivières that would make a Liberal back-bencher go red, enhanced international visibility for Trois-Rivières because of the Francophonie, and so many more things that I do not have enough time to list.

I was given a mandate to hold the government accountable, to serve Trois-Rivières and to put forward alternatives to the measures proposed by a majority government elected by a minority of voters.

Mission accomplished, I say, and until next time, if that is what the people want.

[*English*]

SACKVILLE-BEDFORD-BURNSIDE CONNECTOR

Mr. Darrell Samson (Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give an update to the House on the construction of the Sackville-Bedford-Burnside connector. This project will improve safety and travel time for commuters and commercial traffic between Burnside and Sackville. The construction of the connector has already begun, and over 500 jobs will be created.

Over 40,000 vehicles travel between Sackville and Burnside each day and cause extensive traffic backlogs. I was proud to attend the Prime Minister's announcement of our government's investment of $86 million to address the issue. After 30 years of planning, this important addition to the 100-series highway network is a great example of the partnership between the provincial and federal governments.

I look forward to sharing more updates with my constituents as we move forward on this very important and successful project from our government.

* * *

● (1105)

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Ziad Aboultaif (Edmonton Manning, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister continues to fearmonger to Canadians by picking fights with the provinces over national unity. What he does not understand is that he is the threat to Canadian unity. Whether it is Pierre Elliott Trudeau or our current Prime Minister, history tells us that whenever there is a prime minister from this family in office, our nation is at risk.

Canadians deserve more than the current Prime Minister, someone who will not divide Canadians by killing pipeline projects and forcing Canadians to pay a job-killing carbon tax.

Canada's Conservatives will not support Bill C-69. Instead, a government under our Conservative leader will repeal the bill when we form government in October, unite Canadians and get Canada's energy sector back to work, all while helping all Canadians get ahead.

* * *

HONG FOOK MENTAL HEALTH ASSOCIATION

Ms. Jean Yip (Scarborough—Agincourt, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize Hong Fook Mental Health Association, in my riding of Scarborough—Agincourt, for receiving the Advancing Minority Mental Health award from the American Psychiatric Association Foundation. It is the first-ever agency outside the United States to receive this award, in recognition of its efforts to increase public awareness and to provide comprehensive mental health care for under-served minorities.

I am proud to be part of a government that prioritizes mental health and has made a historic $5-billion investment in mental health initiatives across the country. We reopened Veterans Affairs offices to increase mental health supports for veterans. We supported a pan-Canadian suicide prevention service with trained responders providing 24/7 crisis support, and we have invested in home care for seniors and access to community-based mental health services, particularly for children and youth.

Mental health affects everyone. Our government is determined to continue providing Canadians with the mental health support they need so that they can lead healthy lives.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUEBEC CEREBRAL PALSY ASSOCIATION

Mr. Jean Rioux (Saint-Jean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Association de paralysie cérébrale du Québec is turning 70 this year. For the past 20 years, the association has been led by president Joseph Khoury, a remarkable, passionate leader. It is an honour for the riding of Saint-Jean to host the association's headquarters.

As members of Parliament, it is important for us to show solidarity with people who have cerebral palsy. We have a duty to educate the public and all levels of government on the urgent needs of the people who struggle with cerebral palsy every day and their loved ones, who are also affected, and the respect they are owed.

I want to thank the Association de paralysie cérébrale du Québec for its outstanding commitment and contribution. Operation Papillon Vert, a campaign that was launched this year, is a concrete example of the work the association does to help people with cerebral palsy.

* * *

[*English*]

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Earl Dreeshen (Red Deer—Mountain View, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last night Canadians witnessed the spectacle of the Liberal government choosing to support competing oil-producing nations over Canadian resource developers. The Liberals ignored the pleas of nine provincial premiers, first nations and territorial leaders and millions of Canadians by shutting down debate on Bill C-69.

How many hospitals will be built in Canada through our purchases of Saudi oil? How many social programs will be financed by our friends in Nigeria? How many environmental causes and human rights efforts Canadians hold dear will be jeopardized by these Liberals shutting in the resource expertise of the world's most responsible energy producers?

By following the misguided dogma of the Prime Minister, the Liberals will be following him into the political abyss. The only way to truly protect our environment, to give certainty to job creators and to ensure Canada's strong social fabric is to make this divisive Liberal leader a single-use prime minister. On October 21, Canadians will make that choice.

● (1110)

DARTMOUTH—COLE HARBOUR

Mr. Darren Fisher (Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to honour Dartmouth—Cole Harbour. There has never been a better time to live in Dartmouth. Our city is vibrant, and we feel a deep sense of pride. It is an absolute honour making sure that our community is supported.

Our government invested in daylighting the Sawmill River, revitalizing Sullivan's Pond and the Canal Greenway Park. We invested in our incredible paddling and rowing community, the Legion, Cole Harbour Place, the Sportsplex, the Dartmouth North Community Centre, NSCC, the Beazley Park basketball courts, the Fairbanks Centre, and the Shubenacadie Canal. We invested in the Dartmouth ferry terminal and in new buses and infrastructure. We have made sure that shipbuilding jobs stay in Nova Scotia. Ships stay here. We have also invested in small businesses and non-profits across the riding so they can grow and create more jobs.

I am so proud to call the city of lakes my home. I thank my constituents for putting their support, faith and trust in me.

From the Natal Day parade to the Cole Harbour Harvest Festival, I encourage Canadians across the country to visit Dartmouth—Cole Harbour.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ARGENTEUIL—LA PETITE-NATION

Mr. Stéphane Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, young families, seniors, small and medium-sized businesses, and the people of my riding can count on our government.

Through the Canada child benefit, we have invested nearly $6 million, which has helped 9,000 families in my riding.

We have also invested $400,000 through the new horizons for seniors program, to improve the quality of life for our seniors.

We have made historic investments to connect households in my riding to high-speed Internet.

Through various programs, our government has invested over $25 million in infrastructure and innovation projects in Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation. I am proud of the work our government has done to help the middle class and those working hard to join it.

I hope everyone has a great summer, and I look forward to seeing you at the many events that will be taking place in the beautiful riding of Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation.

* * *

[*English*]

CARBON PRICING

Mr. Mel Arnold (North Okanagan—Shuswap, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Alberta is starting to see some relief, with the lowest fuel prices in the country, because it no longer has a carbon tax.

Meanwhile, in B.C., we are hammered with a carbon tax, driving fuel prices so high that people are actually burning more fuel. They are driving longer distances to cross the border, often idling at long border-crossing lineups just to buy cheaper U.S. gas, and at the same time are creating a safety hazard by filling up jerry cans and putting them in the backs of passenger vehicles, basically converting SUVs into fuel tankers. This is all to avoid paying into the Liberals' carbon tax plan.

Now the Parliamentary Budget Officer reports that the carbon tax would need to increase in some provinces by five times the current punishing rate, to over $100 per tonne, driving up fuel prices another 23¢ per litre.

When will the Prime Minister and his environment minister stop punishing Canadians for just trying to get to work and admit that they do not have an environmental plan but they only have a tax plan?

* * *

GOVERNMENT POLICIES

Mr. Robert Oliphant (Don Valley West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank you, the table officers and all the pages for the tremendous work in ensuring the effectiveness of the 42nd Parliament. It has been an honour to serve in Ottawa for the last four years, and I look forward to four more years.

We are making a difference here by lowering taxes on the middle class and for small businesses, creating over a million jobs since 2015, lifting over 300,000 children out of poverty with the Canada child benefit, and ensuring that over 800,000 others are lifted out of poverty and have a chance to make a difference of their own in this country.

We are helping our world's most vulnerable while welcoming newcomers every day to make Canada stronger.

Investments in infrastructure, transit, and renewable energy, a national housing strategy, and our climate plan are all ensuring that we live better, healthier lives.

Canadians elected a government that would, like Toronto's Raptors, be champions, and we are delivering. We are making a difference for the people of Don Valley West and all of Canada.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ANTHONY DELATRI

Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau (Berthier—Maskinongé, NDP): Mr. Speaker, on June 5, the town of Louiseville paid a glowing tribute to one of its great personalities.

Anthony Delatri had an outstanding 26-year-long career as a cartoonist, working primarily for Le Nouvelliste newspaper. He produced over 8,000 cartoons throughout all those years. His cartoons can be found in several books and museums.

Mr. Delatri was also a great athlete who had an immense influence on his community. He was inducted into the Quebec badminton hall of fame in 1994 and the Mauricie sports hall of fame in 2005.

On his 97th birthday, the town's tennis courts were renamed "Tennis Delatri de Louiseville" in his honour.

I would like to sincerely thank the town of Louiseville, as well as Michel Neveu, who had the inspired idea of paying tribute to Mr. Delatri.

We are proud of Mr. Delatri. He is a credit to Louiseville.

* * *

● (1115)

[*English*]

CARBON PRICING

Mr. Jamie Schmale (Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, one of the most common complaints I hear from my constituents is about the rising cost of fuel. All across this country, Canadians are struggling to pay the government's carbon tax while trying to avoid insolvency. Parents are having to make hard choices between heating their homes and after-school activities for their kids.

Now the Parliamentary Budget Officer is reporting that it is going to get a lot worse for families. To meet Paris targets, all Canadians, no matter where they live, will have to pay five times what they pay now. If they think gas prices are high now, try adding another 23¢ of Liberal carbon taxes on top of that.

The Prime Minister never came clean on the true cost of his carbon scheme, and now we know why. The Prime Minister has no plan to lower emissions. His only plan is another cash grab, which is already hurting over-taxed Canadians. When will the Prime Minister admit that he made a mistake, kill the carbon tax and take real action on climate change?

* * *

TORONTO RAPTORS

Mr. Arif Virani (Parkdale—High Park, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, at a YMCA, in 1891, a Canadian named James Naismith invented the game of basketball.

Yesterday night, 128 years later, a Canadian team, our Toronto Raptors, brought the NBA championship home. There were doubters and cynics, but there was also a steely resolve, the resolve of die-hard fans and ones more recently on the bandwagon, who got on board in Jurassic Park from coast to coast to coast in this country and beyond. They got on board to cheer the most diverse team, representing the most diverse city for the most diverse nation on earth.

From Kawhi to Kyle, from Pascal to Serge, from Marc to the indefatigable, toothless Freddy V., this team, our Raptors, showed basketball fans around the world that we do not understand the meaning of the word "quit", and that when we sing about being the true north strong and free, we mean it.

I thank the Raptors for an incredible run and what is going to be an amazing parade on Monday, and I say, "Let's go Raptors!"

ORAL QUESTIONS

[*English*]

CARBON PRICING

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Budget Officer proved yesterday that the Liberals' carbon tax cannot achieve what is promised unless it is twice as high as they have admitted: "$50 per tonne after 2022, there will be a shortfall. We won't be able to meet the country's targets for greenhouse gas reduction." The only way to do it is to double the promised price to over $100 a tonne, which translates into an increase of 23¢ a litre for the price of gas.

Will the government admit that its carbon tax, while it makes no sense, costs 23¢?

Mr. Sean Fraser (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, the hon. member is seeking to mislead Canadians in order to scare them into supporting his party. The analysis that he refers to by the Parliamentary Budget Officer presumes that no further measures will be implemented to reduce emissions over the next 11 years and does not factor in certain measures that have already been announced or are being implemented now, such as the largest investment in public transit in the history of Canada, new subsidies to make electric vehicles more affordable or advancements in innovation that will actually improve carbon sequestration technologies.

If the Conservatives would be honest with themselves, they would realize that our plan is going to make life more affordable for Canadian households at the same time as we bring our emissions down.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, actually, the Parliamentary Budget Officer took into consideration every single policy lever that the current government is using and said that with those policies the country will miss its Paris targets by 80 million megatonnes per year, and that the only way to change that is to increase the carbon tax five times what it is now and twice what the government has admitted, at a cost of 23 painful cents more per litre for gasoline.

Why were the Liberals attempting to hide this higher tax until after the election?

● (1120)

Mr. Sean Fraser (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with respect, the report of the Parliamentary Budget Officer does not represent the government's agenda going into the next election. We have been very clear that when it comes to our plan to put a price on pollution, the price is going to increase to $50 a tonne until 2022, at which time the policy will be reviewed.

I would be happy to speak to the hon. member's constituents, who should know by now that eight out of 10 households that the hon. member represents will be left better off as a result of our plan. If he does not want to accept my opinion on this piece, I would point him to the previous report of the same Parliamentary Budget Officer, who indicates that only the wealthiest 20% would pay more and that 80% of that member's constituents will be better off at the end of the year.

I look forward to seeing him on the doorsteps campaigning on a promise to take $307 from a typical family of four in his constituency.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals' promise that the cheque was in the mail was never kept. It was not as advertised. We now know that the rebates were a third smaller and the tax will be twice as high as advertised, so smaller rebates than promised and higher taxes than admitted. These facts are now known to us. We now know that, according to the Parliamentary Budget Officer, for the Liberals to keep their own promises, they would have to increase the tax to a rate that would cost the average family over a thousand dollars a year in Ontario, including gas prices that are 23¢ higher.

Why did they try to cover it up before the election?

Mr. Sean Fraser (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I find it entertaining that the hon. member is putting so much stock in the PBO's report, when he will not even submit his own party's platform for consideration, because it is hiding the true cost to Canadians.

When it comes to the size of the rebate, we have said the entire time that a typical family of four in the province of Ontario would receive a rebate of $307. That is as true today as it was when we first announced our plan.

He is confusing statistics by saying that the average payout, which pertains to a family of a smaller size, is different than that for a family of four. This is simple arithmetic. I would be happy to walk him through it after question period, but I sense that after a few months he is choosing not to listen because he knows our plan is the right plan.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we know full well that the Liberals have spent the past three years trying to convince Canadians that the Liberal carbon tax would allow them to meet the Paris targets and, more importantly, reduce greenhouse gas emissions. That is false on all counts.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer confirmed yesterday that Canada would not meet its Paris targets and, worse still, that the Liberals would have to raise the Liberal carbon tax to five times what it is now in order to meet those targets.

Will the Liberals be honest with Canadians and tell them exactly how much they plan to increase the tax if, heaven forbid, they are re-elected in six months?

[*English*]

Mr. Sean Fraser (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I note that the hon. member's own province of Quebec has a price on pollution and our system does not apply. I would be curious if he would go out and say that the province does not have the authority to put the price on pollution that exists and is supported by members of his province.

The hon. member knows that in the provinces where the federal backstop applies, eight out of 10 families are better off at the end of the year. This is not some Liberal partisan plan. We can look to last year's Nobel Prize winner in economics, who has developed this sort of approach. We can look to Mark Cameron, Stephen Harper's former director of policy, who has indicated that families will be better off. We can look to Doug Ford's chief budget adviser, who testified before the Senate in this Parliament, saying that the number one thing we can do to move toward a low-carbon economy is to put a price on pollution and—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent.

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will ask it in English this time.

Based on the Quebec experience, yes, we have a cap-and-trade system in Quebec, but what are the results? There is zero reduction of emissions. This is the result when we tax people: no reduction of emissions. This is the Quebec experience. This is the truth. These are the facts. This is the science.

Will the minister be clear with Canadians for once? Can the Liberals explain how much they will raise taxes?

Mr. Sean Fraser (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with respect, if the hon. member would listen to the details of our plan, he would realize that as the price on pollution increases approaching 2022, so does the rebate. The more time goes on, the cost is not increased, but the rebate to families increases—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I just want to interrupt the hon. parliamentary secretary. The hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent asked a question, and I am sure he wants to hear an answer. With all the chatter, we are depriving him from hearing that.

Order. I will let the hon. parliamentary secretary continue.

● (1125)

Mr. Sean Fraser: Mr. Speaker, in the remaining time I have, I will reiterate the point that anybody who has any equity in this conversation knows that the number one thing we can do to reduce emissions is to put a price on pollution.

We have found a way to make life more affordable at the same time, by returning the rebate directly to households. This marries the theme of our government, which is to make life more affordable for those who need it. Whether with the Canada child benefit, the middle-class tax cut or the price on pollution, we are doing the right thing for our environment and making life easier for families.

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Niki Ashton (Churchill—Keewatinook Aski, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canadians want bold action on climate change, and they know that there is no time to waste.

The NDP has called on the government to invest in green jobs and green energy, but what did the Prime Minister do? He bought fridges and pipelines for his billionaire pals. Four years in power, and all we have seen from the Liberal government are more subsidies for big oil and its pipelines. This is not how we save the environment.

When will the Liberals stop siding with the big polluters so we can win the fight against climate change?

Mr. Sean Fraser (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with respect, I have a great appreciation for NDP's desire to do something about the environment. It is too bad its desire does not match its ability to think out a plan that makes sense. If we look at the Ecofiscal Commission's review of the NDP plan, it has said that NDP's measures for big emitters will actually do nothing to reduce emissions and will hurt the Canadian economy at the same time.

We can tell that New Democrats lack the thoughtfulness that the climate debate demands when we look at the hon. member's question, which confuses fridges for refrigerants, which are actually one of the fastest-growing causes of climate change globally.

I share the New Democrats' desire to do something about climate change, but the difference is that we have thought about how to make it happen.

* * *

PHARMACARE

Ms. Niki Ashton (Churchill—Keewatinook Aski, NDP): Mr. Speaker, people in our north and across the country are forced to make impossible choices because of the high cost of medication.

It is inconceivable that in 2019, in Canada, people have to choose between buying food and medication. Liberals have been putting pharmaceutical and insurance companies in the driver's seat, but the Hoskins advisory board is clear: Canadians need a universal, public, single-payer pharmacare.

This is what the NDP has been pushing for. Enough of the half-measures and the favours to the Liberals' corporate friends. Will the Liberal government implement universal, comprehensive, public pharmacare, yes or no?

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me be very clear. Our government is absolutely committed to making sure that every Canadian has access to a national pharmacare program, and the work is absolutely under way.

In budget 2019, we announced funding: $35 million for the creation of a Canadian drug agency, and also $1 billion to address the situation of rare diseases. We will continue to work with our partners on the ground, provinces and territories, indigenous leaders and the health care sector, as we want to make sure that we make pharmacare a reality for all Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Robert Aubin (Trois-Rivières, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Dr. Hoskins' report is crystal clear: we need a universal public pharmacare program. In fact, that is something the NPD is firmly committed to bringing in.

People should not have to cut up their pills to make their prescription last longer. Instead of listening to what people need, the successive Liberal and Conservative governments have consistently sided with large insurance companies.

Can the Liberal government commit, as we have, to implementing a universal pharmacare program as early as next year?

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, I want to be very clear. Our government is determined to ensure that all Canadians have access to a pharmacare program. The work is in progress.

In budget 2019, we announced $35 million to create a Canadian drug agency. We also want to ensure that there is money for it. We invested $1 million to address the issue of drugs for rare diseases. We will continue to work with the provinces and territories to ensure that all Canadians have access to a national pharmacare program.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Robert Aubin (Trois-Rivières, NDP): Mr. Speaker, while the Conservatives and Liberals prepare for a war of words on the carbon tax, young people are marching in the streets to demand climate action. Political will and leadership are necessary to combat climate change. Both the Conservatives and the Liberals have shown that they have neither.

We in the NDP have the courage to act as well as an ambitious plan to start transitioning to green energy.

Will the government commit to stop subsidizing the oil sector and start transitioning to sustainable energy?

[*English*]

Mr. Sean Fraser (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have enormous respect for the young people who are advocating for more climate action. I wish politicians of all stripes would pay heed to the message they are sending us, which is we need to take action and we need to take action now.

The NDP is advocating for plans that we started implementing three years ago, not just putting a price on pollution but moving toward having 90% of our electricity generated from non-emitting resources by 2030; like making the largest investment in public transit in the history of our country; like making record investments in energy efficiency and green technology. With respect to fossil fuel subsidies, we have already phased out eight of nine that exist in the tax code.

When it comes to the NDP plan to eliminate all fossil fuel subsidies immediately, it has forgotten to consider that it actually provides electricity to northern communities and other—

● (1130)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The hon. member for Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill.

* * *

CARBON PRICING

Ms. Leona Alleslev (Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill, CPC): However, Mr. Speaker, he is not going to actually meet the targets.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer has confirmed what the Conservatives have been saying all along; that the Liberal carbon tax is a cash grab, not a climate change plan. The Prime Minister has tried to hide the real cost of his carbon tax, but the PBO has laid out the truth. The cost of gasoline would rise by at least 25¢ per litre.

When Canadians are trying to get ahead, not just get by, will the Prime Minister tell Canadians how much the full and final cost of this carbon tax will be?

Mr. Sean Fraser (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, to repeat an earlier answer, the analysis laid out in the report does not consider certain measures that will be implemented in the next 11 years and in fact leaves out certain measures that have already been announced, such as our investments in public transit, our subsidy for zero emissions vehicles or advancement in carbon sequestration technology.

With respect to the cost of our plan to put a price on pollution, I am pleased to advise the hon. member that eight out of 10 families that live in the riding she represents will be better off. They will have already received a climate action incentive of $307 and that will climb year over year.

It will be curious to see how that member campaigns in the next election with a promise to take that money from her constituents.

Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): That is simply not true, Mr. Speaker.

Half of Canadians are about $200 away from being able to pay their bills each month, yet the Liberals carbon tax will put a painful 23¢ per litre increase in the price of gasoline, and that will do nothing to help climate change.

The Liberals have said they want to help the middle class, but they are punishing it and those hoping to join it. Why?

Mr. Sean Fraser (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we now see Conservative MP after Conservative MP repeating false points in this chamber. It is entirely inappropriate. When it comes to the issue of affordability, I note that the Parliamentary Budget Officer previously confirmed—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I do not know what it is about the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment, but he keeps getting help from the other side when he is trying to answer a question to which the member for Sarnia—Lambton wants an answer. I want everybody to let the hon. parliamentary secretary answer the question and we will keep it down so the member can hear the answer.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Sean Fraser: Mr. Speaker, on occasion the truth can hurt, but it is important we say it as loud as we can no matter how many times it takes.

The truth is that the Parliamentary Budget Officer has confirmed that eight out of 10 families will be better off. If the Conservatives were concerned about affordability, I am curious as to why they voted against a tax cut for nine million middle-class Canadians and voted in favour of maintaining a favourable tax system for the wealthiest 1%. When they had an opportunity to support the Canada child benefit, which put more money into the pockets of nine out of 10 families, they voted against that.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Joël Godin (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are the ones telling untruths.

This government is not telling the truth. After discrediting the United Nations it continues to undermine the findings of scientists and a number of relevant authorities, including the commissioner of the environment. Even the Parliamentary Budget Officer, an independent officer of the House of Commons, said yesterday that the Liberals' plan was insufficient to meet the Paris targets.

When it comes to the environment, the Liberals are misleading Canadians.

Once again, why is this Liberal government incapable of telling the truth?

[*English*]

Mr. Sean Fraser (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it would be easier to take criticism from a member of a party that has actually advanced a climate plan to date. The Conservatives refuse to and they refuse to put their plan before the Parliamentary Budget Officer.

If we want to see what a Conservative climate plan looks like, we should look at Doug Ford, who dismantled flood protections and showed up asking what the heck was going on. When we look at it, it will be less effective to reduce emissions and will be twice as expensive for households.

I would suggest the member, instead of attacking our plan, which is credible, talk to some of his caucus colleagues, who seem not to understand that climate change is real, who say that global warming is simply body heat coming off humans, who refuse to acknowledge the signs. When we look at the IPCC or Canada's changing climate report, it is real and we have a duty to—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The hon. member for Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Joël Godin (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate to hear that from the Liberals. This government is out of touch and has no credibility on environmental matters. What planet is it living on?

The Liberals are the only ones who believe that Canada will meet its Paris targets with their plan. I invite the Liberals to come back to planet Earth and do something now to protect it.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer said that Canadians will have to get poorer and pay five times more than the current carbon tax if we want to meet the Paris targets. Canadians deserve the truth.

Why is the government hiding the truth?

● (1135)

[*English*]

Mr. Sean Fraser (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would point the hon. member to an article this past week, in which his leader refused to acknowledge the connection between severe weather events and climate change. The deputy leader of the Conservative Party tweeted out a quote to a similar effect. He has caucus colleagues who point to snowbanks in Saskatchewan in February as proof that climate change is not real. He has colleagues who do not want to abide by the Paris agreement, yet he has the audacity to criticize us on our plan to meet those targets.

The fact is that we will meet our targets, because failure is not an option. This is the greatest challenge of our generation and we found a way to do it that makes it more affordable for families.

* * *

CARBON PRICING

Mr. Dane Lloyd (Sturgeon River—Parkland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Budget Officer has released a scathing report that the Liberals will not meet their Paris climate change targets, that is, unless they raise the price at the pump by 23¢ a litre.

The Liberals have promised that they will not raise this until after the election. No kidding. They will wait until after the election when they no longer need Canadian votes, but still need their money.

When will the Liberals finally come clean and tell Canadians the true cost of their carbon tax plan?

Mr. Sean Fraser (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member represents part of the province of Alberta, which I called home for a number of years. I am pleased to share with the hon. member that the province he represents will have constituents next year receiving a climate action incentive of $888 at tax time, which is more than they will pay as a result of our plan to put a price on pollution.

If he puts so much stock in the Parliamentary Budget Officer's report, I would challenge him to speak to his leader about presenting the Conservative Party platform so they can understand the cost. If he wants to look a little further, I can point him to the prior report of the PBO, which indicated that eight out of 10 families would have more money in their pockets.

I do not know why this is the case, but the Conservatives seem allergic to money for—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The hon. member for Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock.

Mr. Jamie Schmale (Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the environment minister said that she would make her Paris targets, but the PBO has confirmed that the only way the Liberals' carbon tax will work is if they charge 23¢ a litre more for gasoline. Life is already too expensive. Canadians are already struggling to pay their heating bills and buy groceries. Clearly, this punishing tax plan will severely hurt families and seniors, particularly those on fixed incomes.

When will the Liberals finally admit that their carbon tax is not an environmental plan but a tax plan?

Mr. Sean Fraser (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I find the question rich coming from a member who decided to hide the fact that the climate action incentive existed in a publication to his constituents, which was designed to tell them how they could maximize their tax refund. The fact is that families of four in Ontario received $307 this year, and that rebate will grow over time.

It seems as though the Conservatives are putting their fingers in their ears, saying they do not want to hear the truth because the truth is not helpful to them. Every time they have the chance, they vote against measures that put more money in the pockets of Canadian households. We found the most effective way to reduce emissions, we found a way to make life more affordable and, every time, they seem to vote against measures that have that impact.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Before I go to the next question, I want to remind some members who have very strong voices that carry very well to be mindful of the strength of their voices. It drowns out answers we are trying to hear.

The hon. member for Vancouver Kingsway.

* * *

PHARMACARE

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Hoskins' advisory council was clear that Canadians needed public pharmacare, yet the government refuses to commit to it. People are making impossible choices when it comes to the prescription drugs they need, choices like paying their rent or filling a prescription, cutting pills to make a bottle last longer or skipping their medicine altogether. People are getting sicker and dying.

A simple question deserves a clear answer from the health minister. Will the Liberals implement a universal, comprehensive, single-payer pharmacare or not?

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we agree that Canadians should not have to choose between putting food on their table and paying for prescription medication. That is why we are committed to ensuring that all Canadians have access to a national pharmacare program. The work has been under way for a few years.

The first thing we have done is some work to lower the costs of drugs in the country. In budget 2019, we announced $35 million to ensure we would have a Canadian drug agency that would help us make this plan a reality.

We are deeply committed to ensuring that all Canadians have the prescriptions they deserve.

* * *

● (1140)

HEALTH

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): That is what the Liberals said in 1997, Mr. Speaker.

There were 11,500 Canadians who died from opioid overdoses between 2016 and 2019. Opioid deaths have risen every year of the Liberal government's mandate. This is a true epidemic.

The Liberals say that they are doing everything possible, but they are not. We need a national declaration of a public health emergency, federal funding for overdose prevention sites, more investments into treatments and an end to the cause of this carnage, which is a poisoned street supply.

Why are the Liberals refusing to take these overdue measures that will save lives?

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the numbers that were announced yesterday are not just numbers; they are our brothers, sisters and neighbours. Our government is taking action.

We have invested more than $350 million to ensure more treatments are available to Canadians. We have also introduced harm reduction as a key pillar to our drug strategy. Also, we have approved more than 40 supervised consumption sites. We recognize that supervised consumption sites save lives.

We will continue to work with our partners on the ground to ensure we do all that we can to turn the tide on this national public health crisis.

* * *

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Mel Arnold (North Okanagan—Shuswap, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal attack on the energy sector has crippled Alberta and is impacting B.C. After 50 years, a houseboat company in Sicamous has announced it is shutting down, affecting 150 employees.

The mayor of Sicamous has blamed the downturn in the Alberta economy and the pipeline dispute for having taken a toll on the community.

Today, the Liberals are announcing a western economic growth strategy, as if they have not done enough damage already.

When will the Liberals end their attack on the west?

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me take this opportunity to highlight some of the investments that are happening in western Canada: a $40-billion single private sector investment in the LNG sector and a $9-billion investment in the petrochemical sector right in my home province of Alberta. We are moving forward on the Enbridge Line 3, which is almost completed on the Canadian side. We are moving forward on the Keystone XL pipeline. As well, we are moving forward in the right way and fixing the process on the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion.

Mr. Chris Warkentin (Grande Prairie—Mackenzie, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it has been a tough week for Alberta here in Ottawa.

The Prime Minister has rammed through his anti-pipeline, anti-energy bills, Bills C-69 and C-48, and announced a carbon tax for the province of Alberta. These attacks are driving investment and opportunity out of the province.

Without a hint of irony, this very morning those same Liberals announced their western Canada job strategy. It is like hiring the arsonists to rebuild the house after they lit the fire.

When will the Liberals realize that the only growth strategy that will work is if they end their attack on Canada's energy sector?

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, coming from a member from Alberta, it is very interesting for him to not acknowledge the good work that is being done to support the energy sector. We are the government that is creating conditions for private sector investment to happen in the energy sector. There was a $40-billion investment in one single project, which is the largest private sector investment to happen in our history. There was a $9-billion investment in the petrochemical sector, which will create thousands of jobs for Alberta workers, something of which we are very proud.

Mr. Blaine Calkins (Red Deer—Lacombe, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Alberta has been shown nothing but disdain from the Liberal government for the last three and a half years. The Liberals continue their assault on the energy sector. Last night they shut down debate on Bill C-69, which has devastated many of my constituents.

People have lost their businesses, their jobs and their homes. They have lost hope. Some have even taken their own lives.

When everyone is telling the environment minister that her plan is a disaster, she chooses to ignore this advice. Everyone has been repeating it so long and saying it so loud. Why will she not listen?

● (1145)

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-69 puts in better rules that allow good projects to move forward in a way that respects the environment and allows Canadians to participate in the process.

We are fixing a system that led to a number of large projects failing and being challenged in Federal Court because Stephen Harper brought in changes in 2012 that gutted environmental protections and restricted the ability of Canadians to participate in a regular process.

We firmly believe that Bill C-69 would allow—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The hon. member for Lakeland.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have put hundreds of thousands of Albertans out of work, with brutal consequences: rising bankruptcies, family breakdowns, substance abuse, crime, suicides and a loss of hope and dreams. That hurts all of Canada.

The Liberals are ramming through laws to block oil exports and kill resource projects, and will make everything more expensive with their carbon tax. After only one hour of debate on hundreds of amendments, the Liberals forced through their no more pipelines bill, Bill C-69, even though nine provinces and all territories want major changes.

Why are the Liberals so relentless in their attacks on Albertans?

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again, let me highlight that for 10 years, the Harper government failed to build a single pipeline to get our resources to non-U.S. markets. We are changing that. The ability for our energy sector to grow is very important, and we have been able to expand our global markets.

Let me highlight another investment. We have invested more money in Alberta in infrastructure in the last four years than the Stephen Harper government did in 10 years.

We are delivering for Albertans and we will continue to do so.

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, next Tuesday we are expecting the final decision regarding the Trans Mountain expansion project. While we fear the Liberals will impose this pipeline on B.C., coastal communities like mine are still hopeful the Liberals will make the right decision in their interests, instead of siding with the interests of profitable big oil companies.

There is still time for the Liberals to do the right thing for our air, our water and our coast. On June 18, will the government listen to the voice of coastal communities and cancel the Trans Mountain expansion project, yes or no?

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we respect and appreciate a diversity of opinion among indigenous communities on energy sector development. We are listening to them carefully. We engaged with them in a very meaningful two-way conversation. We are following the direction of the Federal Court of Appeal to move forward on this project in the right way.

As the hon. member knows, we are set to make a decision on this project by June 18.

* * *

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. Murray Rankin (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, student debt is a huge burden for so many young Canadians. Steacy from Victoria tells me there is so much interest accumulating on her student loans that she cannot pay the principal of the debt. She feels she just cannot get ahead.

People like Steacy have been working for years and still cannot pay their debt. Getting an education should not mean getting an unmanageable debt.

The NDP government in British Columbia has eliminated the interest on student loans. Will the government follow B.C.'s lead and eliminate the interest on Canada student loans?

Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the member would know, it was our government that invested in opportunities for students to gain that education.

We doubled the amount of low-interest grants to all Canadians, to part-time students as well as full-time students. We have increased the amount of support in those non-repayable grants. Also, until students are making at least $25,000, they have a holiday on repayment.

We are doing what has been asked of us as a government to help support student access.

* * *

[*Translation*]

GOVERNMENT PRIORITIES

Mr. Darrell Samson (Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Harper's Conservatives handed out cheques to millionaires. Our government created the Canada child benefit.

Harper's Conservatives gave tax credits to the rich. Our government introduced the new parental sharing benefit.

The difference between these policies is clear: middle-class families receive almost $51,000 more per child under our government than under the Conservatives.

Could the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development explain what our government is doing to help the middle class?

● (1150)

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to answer the question posed by my colleague from Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook.

He is quite right, we were elected to grow the middle class and the economy. He is right in that our plan gives a middle-class family an average of $51,000 more per child over the course of 18 years than the Conservative plan for the wealthy did.

He is right, we will continue to invest in the Canada child benefit, housing, child care services and public transit to continue to grow the middle class and the economy.

* * *

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister will meet with the President of the United States next week and I am certain that President Trump has no time to waste on small talk.

The U.S. President also has a problem with illegal migrants at his border. He understands the situation.

The Prime Minister has done nothing so far to renegotiate the safe third country agreement, but the meeting with Mr. Trump is a golden opportunity to do so.

Will the Prime Minister renegotiate the safe third country agreement, yes or no?

Mr. Peter Schiefke (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Youth) and to the Minister of Border Security and Organized Crime Reduction, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives want to make us think that they want to protect our borders and change the safe third country agreement, but their record definitely proves otherwise.

The Conservatives cut $1.2 billion from the budgets of our security agencies and, what is more, during their 10 years in power they did not hold any discussions with the U.S. about changing and improving the safe third country agreement.

We have already had discussions about the safe third country agreement. We have invested $1 billion to provide the resources needed to protect our borders. This has led to a 47% decrease in asylum seekers who—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The hon. member for Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles.

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, if his Prime Minister had not created the problem with his infamous tweet, far fewer people would be showing up at Roxham Road.

What is more, the people who come to the United States from various countries around the world show up with a passport. People need a passport to get into the United States. Then, all of a sudden, when they get to Roxham Road, they no longer have any identification. No one can tell me that those people are not taking advantage of the system.

When will the Prime Minister show some backbone, talk to Mr. Trump and resolve the problem with the safe third country agreement?

Mr. Peter Schiefke (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Youth) and to the Minister of Border Security and Organized Crime Reduction, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I apologize on behalf of all the children and young people who show up at our border without a passport.

Here are the facts. Our government managed to reduce by 45% the number of asylum seekers coming across our border irregularly. Unlike the Conservative government, the Liberal government invested to give the outstanding individuals who work for the CBSA and the RCMP the resources they need to do their job, which is to ensure that no one enters Canada without undergoing a security check or—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The hon. member for Cariboo—Prince George.

* * *

[*English*]

FORESTRY INDUSTRY

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last night, I received more notices of job losses and mill closures in my riding in northern B.C. The Liberals' inaction on softwood and their failed policy is leading to thousands of job losses right across our province of British Columbia

We already have the highest gas prices in North America. Another 25¢ a litre will be the final nail in the coffin. An increase in the gas tax will only fuel more job losses for our forestry industry.

These are real people and real jobs. Why do the Liberals continue to pound Canadians with a job-killing carbon tax that will not even reduce emissions?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we will take no lessons from the Conservatives when it comes to softwood lumber. Let me just point out that it was the Conservative example of accepting quotas on softwood lumber that stiffened our spines and stiffened the spines of the steel sector, in refusing to accept tariffs or quotas on steel and aluminum.

The Conservatives are prepared to capitulate and accept crummy trade deals. We are not.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Order. Order on both sides. Shouting back and forth is not going to get us through question period. Before the hon. member for Barrie—Innisfil gets up to ask a question, I just want to remind everyone that I am sure whomever he is pointing the question to will want to hear it and he wants to hear the answer. Therefore, just try to maybe not shout at each other across the floor.

The hon. member for Barrie—Innisfil.

* * *

AIR TRANSPORTATION

Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure they are going to want to hear this one.

The Liberals are reportedly giving $18 million, tax dollars, to build an exclusive airport runway near Cabot Cliffs golf course in Cape Breton even though the Port Hawkesbury airport is only an hour away. Many in the community, including the mayor, are concerned this would bankrupt the company that runs their community airport and the small businesses that depend upon it.

Instead of pandering to millionaires who, God forbid, have to drive an hour to get to the golf course after landing in their private jets, why is the Prime Minister putting this community asset at risk to accommodate his elite millionaire friends?

● (1155)

Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Cape Bretoners always appreciate when someone from Ontario who knows nothing about it sticks his nose in their business.

There is a private airport in Port Hawkesbury. There are no scheduled flights into that airport. The project in Cabot Links has put over 700 people to work specifically there. The unemployment rate was at 25% when I was first elected in 2000 and what is going on, on the west side of the island is absolutely spectacular. For the member to jump up and and let on he knows what is going on there—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The hon. member for South Okanagan—West Kootenay.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Order. If hon. members would let me know when we can continue, I will be more than happy to go on to the next question.

The hon. member for South Okanagan—West Kootenay.

* * *

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the backbone of the South Okanagan economy is threatened by federal bureaucratic barriers and red tape. There is a vital irrigation canal that is in urgent need of repair. The town of Oliver and the province of British Columbia have both made funding commitments but they have been waiting three years for the federal government to step up with its share. The system is essential for 5,000 acres of orchards and vineyards.

Will the government cut through the red tape and finally get this project funded?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have enormous respect for my colleague from South Okanagan—West Kootenay. He will be pleased to hear that we have invested already $300,000 in two projects in the town of Oliver. In October of last year we met with the outgoing mayor, Ron Hovanes, and chief of the Osoyoos first nation, Clarence Louie, a meeting which my colleague attended.

The member for South Okanagan—West Kootenay is well aware that our office is continuing to engage with the new mayor and his council. We are working tirelessly to make sure that we can invest in the town of Oliver.

We will continue to work, as we have done before, to make sure that the people of Oliver have what they deserve.

* * *

[*Translation*]

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau (Berthier—Maskinongé, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in 2019, access to a cell network and high-speed Internet are essential services, but these services are getting more and more expensive and less and less reliable. Rather than stand up for the people, the Liberals and Conservatives are allowing big telecom companies to get rich and pocket billions of dollars.

Can the federal government put the people's interests ahead of big telecoms' interests and make a pledge today to lower people's bills and ensure reliable service?

Mr. Rémi Massé (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform my colleague that, since taking office, our priorities for connectivity have been accessibility, competition and affordability. In regions where there is lots of competition, costs have actually gone down by 32%.

We have also launched a new program called connecting families, which gives low-income families access to the Internet for $10 a month. Canadians are our priority, our plan is working, and we are investing for our people.

* * *

[*English*]

CANADA SUMMER JOBS PROGRAM

Mrs. Karen Vecchio (Elgin—Middlesex—London, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last year, thousands of Canadian organizations offering kids summer camps and helping out seniors were ineligible for Canada summer jobs because of the Liberals' values test, but now the Liberals have decided to fund a group that has terrorist links, a group that paid $550,000 in fines and lost its charitable status from CRA. Yesterday, the minister said she would review the decision.

Can the minister confirm that this group with terrorist links does not meet the Liberals values test?

● (1200)

Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we unequivocally condemn violent extremism. Any kind of behaviour such as that is not tolerated. I know that my colleague across the way understands that and shares that view.

ESDC is conducting a review of this matter in conjunction with Service Canada in Ontario. They have been on site. The organizations approved for funding must adhere to specific terms and conditions, and we await the outcome of that review.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Steven Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): What outcome, Mr. Speaker? The CRA took away the Islamic Society of North America's charitable organization status over a year ago. We condemned the situation. They talk and talk but have not actually done anything. Meanwhile, the Liberals are giving $25,000 to an entity that is directly or indirectly linked to terrorist activities.

When will the minister cancel the cheque and take that grant away from an organization that does not reflect Canadian values?

[*English*]

Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member across has been involved in this program for a number of years and would know how the money rolls out.

There is a review. The officials are working on this review right now, and we await that review. Certainly if anything is out of the ordinary, there will be no money flowing.

Mr. Matt Jeneroux (Edmonton Riverbend, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is a group that funded terrorism. Just revoke the grant.

The Prime Minister put a values test on the summer jobs program targeting groups that did not agree with him. Fast forward to this week, and we find out that the government gave $25,000 to an organization that funded terrorism overseas. Now he says that he is checking to see if the organization meets the terms and conditions of the summer jobs program. I think the government is the one that needs to check its values.

Again, just revoke the grant.

Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pending the outcome of the review, there will be action taken by this government.

However, I am amazed by the Conservatives' new-found interest in summer grants and summer students, because what they wanted to do when they were in power was cut the program out altogether. The member for Carleton cut $24 million from the youth employment strategy. The Conservatives are letting on now that they care about summer students. They are letting on now that they care about this program.

This is a party of action, this is a government of action, and we will take the appropriate action.

* * *

STATUS OF WOMEN

Ms. Jean Yip (Scarborough—Agincourt, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Scarborough—Agincourt residents are concerned that women continue to work in part-time and precarious jobs with little opportunity to advance in their careers. My constituents desire equality and economic security for all Canadians, no matter what gender.

Can the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Women and Gender Equality please share with the House some of the work that is being done to ensure that we are working to improve the economic security and prosperity of women?

Mr. Terry Duguid (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Women and Gender Equality, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for Scarborough—Agincourt for her question and for her tireless advocacy.

Our government is focused on gender equality and economic security by creating the Canada child benefit, by creating 40,000 child care spaces, by supporting women in STEM and in the skilled trades and by ensuring equal pay for work of equal value.

With one million jobs and historically low unemployment, Canadians see real progress towards gender equality and economic security for the women of Canada.

* * *

TRANSPORT

Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Oshawa's port is an economic driver in my community. The Liberals ignored the GM plant closure, and now they are trying to take away our right to manage our own port. The Minister of Transport actually claimed that this is going to be good for Oshawa, but now he is trying to impose a management board that will likely have zero representation from the people of Oshawa. That is right: zero say in the management of our own port. This is what happens when they do not have any meaningful consultation.

My ask is this: When will these top-down Liberals actually and finally listen to local stakeholders and commit to having local representation on this board?

Mr. Terry Beech (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government has announced the intent to amalgamate the Oshawa and Hamilton port authorities. Both ports play an important role in southern Ontario by linking our businesses to global markets and by providing jobs to middle-class families.

The integration will also enable ongoing growth in both ports. It is anticipated that this action would unlock greater economic opportunities for working Canadians. With greater combined strength, the new port authority would be in a better position to make investments in port facilities and intermodal connections in south Ontario.

Of course, we consult with our partners, we work with municipalities and we work with our partners in ports to ensure their economic success for Canadians.

* * *

● (1205)

SCIENCE

Mr. Marwan Tabbara (Kitchener South—Hespeler, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, the member for Milton was forced to delete a tweet that suggested that there is no link between climate change and extreme weather patterns, completely disregarding science that shows that climate change is real. This was so predictable, considering the 10 years of Harper Conservative cuts and the muzzling of scientists, resulting in scientists protesting the death of evidence on Parliament Hill.

Can the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Science and Sport please explain the importance of science and evidence-based decision-making?

Ms. Kate Young (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Science and Sport and to the Minister of Public Services and Procurement and Accessibility (Accessibility), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Conservative members should be ashamed of their climate-change-denying comments. They have chosen to broadcast false, irresponsible viewpoints, disregarding the science and not listening to the evidence once again.

Our government believes that science plays a central role in building a thriving, clean economy, and we will take no lessons from the Conservatives, who for 10 years refused to take action. We are the government that has invested over $10 billion in science, and we will always support our students and researchers.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are very concerned about the escalating violence against Christians in Nigeria and about the Liberal government's decision to close the office of religious freedom at a time when it was effectively working in Nigeria.

The former parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs said that the office had "successfully developed a community-based mechanism to help defuse tensions between different religious and ethnic groups", including Christians and Muslims.

Why did the Liberal government close an office that it knew was effectively reducing violence and deaths?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me be very clear. Our government has put human rights, including the right of all people to freely practise their religion, at the centre of our foreign policy.

We are very clear that we are living in a time when people around the world and in Canada are facing increased attacks for their religious beliefs. That is absolutely wrong. That includes Christians, it includes Muslims and it includes Jews. Our government is very clear in condemning these acts and in working to prevent them in Canada and in working to prevent them around the world.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HEALTH

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, drugs in Canada are more expensive than in most countries around the world. However, that situation should have changed. The Patented Medicine Prices Review Board changed its reference pricing list for setting drug prices. The new regulations were supposed to come into effect on January 1 of this year, but the government still has not passed them. That is just wrong. The government caved in to pressure from the big pharma lobby.

Does the government still plan to adopt these regulations and if so, when?

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are determined to do everything we can to lower the price of drugs. For the past two years, we have been working jointly with the pan-Canadian pharmaceutical alliance to bring together the provinces and territories on a bulk purchasing arrangement. We have saved billions of dollars so far.

We are also in the process of modernizing the regulations affecting drugs and changes will be announced soon.

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, that is not a reassuring answer. The minister says that her government is doing everything in its power to lower the price of drugs. The regulations were supposed to come into effect in January, but we are still waiting. The price of drugs is still too high. Those rules would save the public $2.6 billion.

If I understand correctly the underlying message of the minister's response, the government is opting to be a doormat to the pharmaceutical companies.

I am therefore asking the government to confirm that it has done an about-face, that it will never adopt its regulations and we are going—

● (1210)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The hon. Minister of Health.

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will repeat once again for my colleague that we are committed to doing everything we can to lower the cost of drugs. We do hope to bring forward a national pharmacare program, so one of our priorities is lowering the cost of drugs.

We have been doing our job from day one. We joined the pan-Canadian pharmaceutical alliance, bringing together all provinces and territories. We have saved millions of dollars so far. We are currently modernizing drug regulations. Once again, as I said earlier, we will be announcing changes to the regulations in the near future.

* * *

[*English*]

AUDITOR GENERAL OF CANADA

Hon. Tony Clement (Parry Sound—Muskoka, Ind.): Mr. Speaker, in defence of their indefensible cuts to the Auditor General's budget, the Liberals keep relying on cuts made under the Harper government. As the one who implemented those budget reductions as the Treasury Board president, I can tell the House that I received prior written assurances from the auditor general that those budget reductions would not impact any of his operations or investigations.

Why did the current government not seek similar assurances before making its cuts?

Mr. Greg Fergus (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board and Minister of Digital Government, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yes, I can only imagine how that conversation went after they fired Linda Keen and after they reduced the budget for the parliamentary budget officer at the time. I imagine the conversation must have gone something like, "Yes, boss. Yes, boss. We're okay with what you give us." That is really not acceptable.

What is really important is that public servants, under the Harper government, felt intimidated, they felt cowed and some of them lost their jobs for having stood up to speak truth to power. We do not have to take any lessons from the Harper Conservatives about how to treat our public servants with respect.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Paul Manly (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, GP): Mr. Speaker, I am astounded to learn that the government thinks it can use article 6 of the Paris accord to earn carbon credits for exporting fracked gas to Asian markets. Does the government not realize that fracked gas has the same carbon footprint as coal?

When will the government have the political courage to take responsibility for its international obligations and reduce the emissions of the oil and gas industry in Canada? When will the government ban the climate-destroying practice of gas fracking?

Mr. Sean Fraser (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while I am aware of article 6 of the Paris Agreement, given that our government was key in facilitating the negotiation of that agreement, our plan to reduce emissions is not just to displace global emissions by producing more and more oil and gas products in Canada but to actually reduce our consumption in Canada as well.

We are doing so through over 50 measures, including putting a price on pollution, moving toward 90% of our electricity being generated from non-emitting resources by 2030, and making the largest investment in public transit and record investments in efficiency, green technology and others. I would be happy to walk the hon. member through it.

I am curious as to what the Conservatives' plan will be, because their signal is that they are going to produce more in order to reduce our emissions, and it simply makes no sense.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

ORAL QUESTIONS

Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC): Mr. Speaker, while I understand that things do get heated in this House of Commons, the member for Cape Breton—Canso, whom I have respect for, showed indignation that a member from Ontario would dare to ask a question about Cape Breton and stand up for those residents. I will remind the member as well that the minister for ACOA is from Ontario. Therefore, if the member would like to apologize to me, I will accept that.

Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Cape Breton—Canso, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I consider the member to be a friend. If his feelings were hurt, I certainly want to apologize.

He is right. The minister is from Ontario. He has done a tremendous job working with the people of Cape Breton to provide opportunities and I look forward to that relationship continuing.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Deltell: Mr. Speaker, I believe you will be overjoyed to find unanimous consent for the tabling of a document entitled

Routine Proceedings

"Inventaire québécois des émissions de gaz à effet de serre en 2016 et leur évolution depuis 1990". This science-based document from Quebec's environment ministry found that, between 2014 and 2016, there was no reduction in GHG emissions.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

● (1215)

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8) I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's responses to seven petitions.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMUNITIES

Mr. Churence Rogers (Bonavista—Burin—Trinity, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 32nd report of the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, entitled "Establishing a Canadian Transportation and Logistics Strategy: Part 2".

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

I want to thank the members of the transport committee for working with the people in eastern Canada, particularly in my province of Newfoundland and Labrador, and discussing and dealing with issues in regard to trade corridors and transportation infrastructure. I want to thank the witnesses who appeared and gave good advice and recommendations to our committee to inform us in preparation of this report.

Mr. Matt Jeneroux (Edmonton Riverbend, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Conservative members of the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities support the committee's report that was just tabled, as transportation corridors are integral to the safe and efficient flow of goods in and out of Canada. However, we felt it necessary to supply a complementary report as the main report does not include three important recommendations that we heard loud and clear.

Those recommendations are the following: that the government of Canada eliminate the federal carbon tax and work co-operatively with individual provinces on the carbon reduction plan; that the Government of Canada withdraw Bill C-69, because it will create delays and uncertainty for proponents of projects related to transportation corridors; and that the Government of Canada withdraw Bill C-48, because it will have a negative impact on Canada's reputation and is not based in science or navigation practices.

During our brief study, we heard testimony by witnesses from Quebec and the Maritimes on the negative impact these Liberal policies would have on Canada's transportation corridors.

I encourage the Minister of Transport and the Minister of Environment and Climate Change to read our supplementary report, but if they do not have time for that, I hope they will simply adopt our recommendations. We believe that doing this will greatly support Canada's transportation system and our vitally important trade corridors.

FINANCE

Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 31st report of the Standing Committee on Finance in relation to Bill C-101, an act to amend the Customs Tariff and the Canadian International Trade Tribunal Act. The committee has studied the bill and has agreed to report it back to the House without amendment.

I expect this will be my last report in the 42nd Parliament as committee chair. Therefore, I want to take this opportunity to thank the several clerks and the many analysts from the Library of Parliament who worked with us during this 42nd Parliament for all their hard work during sometimes inhumane hours, four pre-budget consultations, four budgets, four budget implementation acts and much more.

I also want to offer a sincere thanks to members of all parties and their staff as well as to my staff for their hard work and sincere efforts in working on the finance committee.

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Blaine Calkins (Red Deer—Lacombe, CPC) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-458, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (sentencing principles – remote emergency medical or police services).

He said: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Red Deer—Mountain View for seconding my bill.

My bill seeks to amend the Criminal Code by providing for changes that evidence that an offence was directed at a person or property that was vulnerable because of the remoteness from emergency or medical or police services be a factor when considering sentencing. Rural Canadians are particularly vulnerable right now. Statistics Canada, police reports, all the information points to the fact that rural Canadians are specifically being targeted by criminals.

If my bill is passed it would ensure that criminals will face longer times in jail for purposely targeting rural areas, contrary to Bill C-75, which would just speed up the revolving door, which is a hot button issue in my riding and for all rural Canadians, many of whom are tired of being repeat victims.

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

* * *

● (1220)

[*Translation*]

INTEREST ACT

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-459, An Act to amend the Interest Act (prepayment charge).

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce this bill, which is inspired by a bill that was tabled in the last Parliament by my then colleague Laurin Liu, who was the member for Rivière-des-Mille-Îles.

Breaking a mortgage contract before it comes to term triggers significant penalties. For example, if a couple signs up for a five-year mortgage to buy a $300,000 house and then gets a divorce after three years, the penalty they would be charged for the forced sale of the house could be as high as $9,000. These fees are widely panned, and they are the number one source of complaints to Canada's Ombudsman for Banking Services and Investments.

This bill will limit the penalty for breaking a mortgage early to six months' worth of interest. If anyone thinks this bill sounds a little extreme, I would point out that these fees have been banned in the United States. We believe that this is a necessary measure for protecting mortgage holders who unfortunately need to break their mortgage early, rather than letting the big banking firms pocket these fees. The bill would put an end to this exploitation.

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

* * *

[*English*]

PETITIONS

JUSTICE

Mr. Murray Rankin (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions to present to the House today.

The first petition is an e-petition from Mr. Roger Clark of Ottawa calling on the government to appoint an independent commissioner to conduct a public inquiry into the circumstances regarding Dr. Hassan Diab's extradition.

HOUSING

Mr. Murray Rankin (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the second petition concerns the housing crisis in our country.

Currently, over a quarter of a million Canadians experience homelessness every year and 90% of the funding for the government's so-called national housing strategy will only flow after the next election.

The petitioners call on the government to bring forward 50% of the strategy's funding before the next election.

[*Translation*]

RAIL TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Robert Aubin (Trois-Rivières, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am running out of new words and novel ways to present the many petitions on the high-frequency train, but I do want to point out that the people of Trois-Rivières are tenacious. They are working, not just for themselves, but for all Canadians living in the Quebec City-Windsor corridor who support this high-frequency train. This train would significantly help reduce greenhouse gases and would stimulate economic and tourism development. I obviously support their position.

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Paul Manly (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, GP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to stand to present a petition on behalf of my constituents who are concerned about the closure of Department of National Defence land that has been used for recreational purposes for many years. They understand the safety concerns of this area.

These residents of British Columbia, Canada, call upon the House of Commons to clarify the safe operation of the DND rifle range on this land, establish a schedule for public access to the land in the buffer zone of the range, order a feasibility study to look at relocating the range to a more suitable, less populated area, and engage in a community consultation with recreational users, the Regional District of Nanaimo, the City of Nanaimo and the Snuneymuxw First Nation about the future use of this land.

This DND range was started in 1920 and the city has grown massively. I have another 2,000 petitions in the office of the clerk and I know there are petitions with several thousand signatures waiting for me to pick up in Nanaimo.

● (1225)

PENSIONS

Mr. Mel Arnold (North Okanagan—Shuswap, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today I am presenting two petitions from constituents in my riding of North Okanagan—Shuswap. Both petitions are calling on the government to withdraw Bill C-27, an act to amend the Pension Benefits Standards Act, 1985.

CHILDREN'S RIGHTS

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to present a petition today on behalf of the residents of British Columbia. The petition was initiated by the Elizabeth Fry Society, which celebrated its 80th anniversary last month.

Highly mobile children face specific challenges because of homelessness or the incarceration or substance abuse of their parents. These petitioners draw our attention to the obstacles these children face in receiving the government benefits that children in less precarious situations easily access. We must do more to remove the barriers between these often invisible children and programs like the Canada child benefit and the child special allowance. Revenue Canada requirements and all ministries must consider the context of poverty in developing program requirements to ensure that the poor can meet them. We must ensure that each and every child in Canada can receive, without discrimination, the supports they need to enjoy the rights guaranteed to them by the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child.

I would like to thank the petitioners, staff and volunteers of the Elizabeth Fry Society for highlighting these challenges faced by our society's most vulnerable children.

[*Translation*]

WILD SALMON

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I am truly honoured to rise today to present two petitions.

The first petition has to do with the threat to wild salmon in British Columbia.

[*English*]

The petitioners ask that the House of Commons immediately implement the 75 recommendations of the inquiry launched under the previous government into the collapse of sockeye salmon under the leadership of Mr. Justice Cohen.

OPIOIDS

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, this petition is on a critical issue. Now that we realize the opioid crisis is actually reducing the life expectancy of Canadians, we need to change our frame from this being a criminal issue of drug use to a medical issue of drug poisoning. The petitioners ask the Government of Canada to cease incarceration of people who suffer from drug abuse and addiction and shift the model to that focused on treatment, as is done in Portugal.

PHYSICIAN-ASSISTED DYING

Mr. Dane Lloyd (Sturgeon River—Parkland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition on behalf of many of my constituents, who are calling on the government to support the passage of Bill C-418, a bill that seeks to reaffirm our fundamental rights found in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, those being the rights to conscience and religious freedom. They are calling for these changes because in the wake of the passage of Bill C-14 regarding medical assistance in dying, there is a lack of clarity on what the rights are of medical professionals and medical institutions regarding conscience rights on these very contentious social issues.

POSTAL BANKING

Ms. Irene Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions to present.

The first is from petitioners who support postal banking. They point out once again that nearly two million Canadians desperately need an alternative to payday lenders whose crippling lending rates affect the poor, marginalized and indigenous and rural communities. There are 3,800 Canada Post outlets in these communities, where there are fewer and fewer banks and credit unions and the infrastructure to make a rapid transition to postal banking. The petitioners ask the Government of Canada to enact my motion, Motion No. 166, to create a committee to study and propose a plan for postal banking under the Canada Post Corporation.

● (1230)

ANIMAL WELFARE

Ms. Irene Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this petition is with regard to animal testing. It is unnecessary in terms of providing safety to the cosmetics industry. The EU has banned the testing of cosmetics on animals. The petitioners are in overwhelming support of a ban on the testing of cosmetics on animals to ensure the safety of those sentient creatures that become victims of such testing.

OPIOIDS

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and honour to rise today to present two petitions on behalf of residents in my riding of Courtenay—Alberni. These residents are from Courtenay, Cumberland, Parksville and Port Alberni.

The petitioners call on the government to address the opioid crisis. They cite that since 2016, over 11,000 Canadians have died preventable deaths from fentanyl-poisoned sources. They also cite that these deaths are more than all deaths combined from SARS, H1N1 and Ebola.

The petitioners want the Government of Canada to declare the current opioid crisis and fentanyl poisoning crisis a national public health emergency under the Emergencies Act in order to manage and resource it, with the aim to reduce and eliminate preventable deaths. They want the government to reform current drug policy to decriminalize personal possession. Last, they want, with urgency and immediacy, a system to provide safe, unadulterated access to substances so that people who are using substances experimentally, recreationally or chronically are not at imminent risk of overdose due to a contaminated source.

HOUSING

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my second petition calls on the government to put an end to the housing crisis. The petitioners cite that over one in five Canadian households are spending over 50% of their income on housing and that while the Liberal government promised to build more affordable housing, most of the funds are held up until after the next election, and more and more Canadians are one paycheque away from not making ends meet.

The petitioners are calling on the government to build more affordable housing units urgently, with more co-op and non-profit housing.

CHILDREN'S RIGHTS

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured and pleased to rise today to present a petition signed by people all over Vancouver Kingsway and the Lower Mainland. They are very concerned about the welfare of Canada's most vulnerable children. They point out that housing first program funds are one-size-fits-all and fund only the adult individual, with no additional allocation for a parent with children. The amount is set at a rate per adult, which they believe further materially deprives children.

The petitioners point out that many children are excluded from receipt of the Canada child benefit and children's special allowances, as they are in informal care arrangements and their caregivers are ineligible to claim the tax deductions for children and therefore cannot establish eligibility for the monthly payments. They further point out that certain subpopulations of children systematically derive no benefit from the above-mentioned programs.

The petitioners are calling on the government to provide the Canada child benefit and the children's special allowances benefit to all children; to ensure that all children, without discrimination in any form, benefit from special protection measures and assistance; and to recognize that children of parents with addictions or parents who are incarcerated or homeless are in need of special support to enable them to achieve improved life outcomes.

* * *

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: Questions Nos. 2442, 2445, 2446 and 2452.

[*Text*]

Question No. 2442—**Mr. Luc Berthold**:

> With regard to the canola crisis and the request from the Premier of Saskatchewan to increase the loan limit on Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada's Advance Payments Program from $400,000 to $1 million: (*a*) why has the government not yet increased the loan limit; (*b*) will the government be increasing the loan limit to $1 million; (*c*) if the answer to (*b*) is affirmative, when; and (*d*) if the answer to (*b*) is negative, why not?

Hon. Marie-Claude Bibeau (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, including the Canadian Pari-Mutuel Agency, in response to (a), on May 1, 2019, the government announced that it intends to amend the agricultural marketing programs regulations to temporarily increase loan limits under the advance payments program for 2019.

In response to (b), the regulatory amendment would change the 2019 loan limits to allow for advances of up to $1 million on all commodities. The first $100,000 of the advances will remain interest-free on all commodities, except canola. Canola advances will be eligible for up to $500,000 interest-free.

In response to (c), as of May 29, canola advances are eligible for up to $400,000 in interest-free loans. Producers will be able to apply for the new amounts as early as June 10, and new advances above $400,000 will be issued as of June 26.

Question No. 2445—**Mr. John Brassard**:

> With regard to the government's advertising and promotional campaign related to the Climate Action Incentive: (*a*) what are the various components of the campaign (postcards, partnership with H&R Block, etc.); (*b*) what are the total expenditures related to the campaign; and (*c*) what are the details of all expenditures related to the campaign, including (i) vendor, (ii) amount; (iii) date and duration of contract, (iv) description of goods or services provided, (v) to which campaign components is the expenditure related?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Environment and Climate Change Canada does not have any expenditures related to Q-2445.

With regard to the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, the agency does not have any expenditures related to Q-2445.

With regard to Parks Canada, Parks Canada does not have any expenditures related to Q-2445.

Question No. 2446—**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher**:

> With regard to the Canada Infrastructure Bank: (*a*) what is the complete list of infrastructure projects financed by the bank to date; and (*b*) for each project in (*a*), what are the details, including (i) amount of federal financing, (ii) location of project, (iii) scheduled completion date of project, (iv) project description?

Mr. Marco Mendicino (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to infrastructure projects, the Canada Infrastructure Bank invested $1.283 billion in the Réseau express métropolitain, REM, project, a 67-kilometre light rail, high-frequency network with 26 stations located in greater Montreal in the province of Québec: https://rem.info/en/reseau-express-metropolitain.

In response to (a), the infrastructure project is Réseau express métropolitain, REM.

In response to (b)(i), the amount of federal financing is $1.283 billion, in the form of a 15-year senior secured loan at a rate starting at 1% and escalating to 3% over the term of the loan. The $1.283-billion investment completes the project's $6.3-billion financing.

In response to (b)(ii), the project location is greater Montreal.

In response to (b)(iii), with regard to the scheduled completion date of the project, the REM is the largest public transit project undertaken in Québec in the last 50 years. The first trains are expected to start running in 2021 from the South Shore to Bonaventure-Central Station.

In response to (b)(iv), with regard to project description, the REM is a new, integrated 67-kilometre public transit network intended to link downtown Montréal; the South Shore; the West Island, Sainte-Anne-de-Bellevue; the North Shore, Laval and Deux-Montagnes; and the airport through the operation of an entirely automated and electric light rail transit, LRT, system.

Question No. 2452—**Mr. Dave MacKenzie**:

> With regard to the federal carbon tax and the Climate Action Rebate, broken down by province where the federal carbon tax is in effect: (*a*) what is the total amount of revenue projected to be collected from the carbon tax in each of the next five fiscal years, starting with 2019-20; and (*b*) what is the total amount expected to be disbursed to individuals through the Climate Action Rebate in each of the next five fiscal years, starting with 2019-20?

Mr. Joël Lightbound (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.) : Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada has a plan that protects the environment while growing the economy. On October 23, 2018, the Government of Canada announced that there would be a price on carbon pollution across Canada in 2019. On the same day, the Department of Finance published a document named "Backgrounder: Ensuring Transparency", which outlines amounts of projected fuel charge proceeds and climate action incentive payments, from 2019-20 to 2023-24. The document can be found on the Department of Finance website: https://www.fin.gc.ca/n18/data/18-097_2-eng.asp.

* * *

[*English*]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the government's responses to Questions Nos. 2439 to 2441, 2443, 2444, 2447 to 2451 and 2453 could be made orders for returns, these returns would be tabled immediately.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Text*]

Question No. 2439—**Mr. Scott Reid**:

With regard to the Visitor Welcome Centre complex on Parliament Hill: (*a*) in what year were the plans for both the current Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the Visitor Welcome Centre complex first included in the Long Term Vision and Plan or, if the year pre-dates the Long Term Vision and Plan, in previous long term plans for the Parliamentary Precinct, including the identity of the applicable Parliamentary Precinct plan; (*b*) what body or bodies (i.e. Parliamentary Precinct Branch, elements of the Parliamentary Partners, Parliamentary Precinct Oversight Advisory Committee, architectural consultants, other bodies, etc.) first recommended the footprint and current plan for both Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the Visitor Welcome Centre complex; (*c*) did the Parliamentary Precinct Oversight Advisory Committee provide the Parliamentary Precinct Branch, the Minister of Public Works, or any other organization, with recommendations or observations with respect to the Visitor Welcome Centre complex, including dates, recipients, and details of those recommendations or observations; (*d*) what is the approval milestone record for both Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the Visitor Welcome Centre complex plan, including the dates on which, and the mechanisms through which, approvals were granted and funding was appropriated; (*e*) when are reports respecting deficiencies in construction, engineering, design and architecture of the Visitor Welcome Centre complex provided to the Parliamentary Precinct Branch, and when and to what extent is the information contained in those reports provided to other partner organizations; (*f*) when Phase 2 of the Visitor Welcome Centre complex is completed, how many public entrances and exits will exist, where will they be located, and what will be each one's capacity, relative to the others; (*g*) with respect to Phase 1 of the Visitor Welcome Centre complex, when Phase 2 of the Visitor Welcome Centre complex is completed, will the function of Phase 1 as the main visitor entrance and screening point remain the same, or will its functions be relocated, expanded, or replicated elsewhere in the complex; (*h*) with respect to the services presently located in Phase 1 of the Visitor Welcome Centre complex, including visitor security screening, the Parliamentary Boutique, and other visitor services, when Phase 2 of the Visitor Welcome Centre complex is completed, (i) what will be the disposition of those services, (ii) will they be replicated in multiple locations, (iii) will they be expanded, (iv) will they be relocated, (v) where will they be expanded, relocated, or replicated, as applicable; (*i*) what is the currently projected completion date and cost estimate for Phase 2 of the Visitor Welcome Centre complex; (*j*) what funds, and for what purposes, have already been expended on Phase 2 of the Visitor Welcome Centre complex; (*k*) with respect to contracts that have been engaged for Phase 2 of the Visitor Welcome Centre complex, (i) how many contracts have been engaged or signed, (ii) what is the value of each contract, (iii) what parties are subject to each contract, (iv) what is the purpose and function of each contract, (v) when was each contract engaged or signed, (vi) what is the termination date or milestone of each contract, (vii) what are the penalties for premature termination or alteration of each contract; (*l*) what are the formal mechanisms or instruments through which the Parliamentary Precinct Branch receives authoritative direction, recommendations, advice, approvals, or other feedback from (i) the Minister of Public Services and Procurement, (ii) the Treasury Board Secretariat, (iii) the Cabinet, (iv) the House of Commons, (v) the Senate of Canada, (vi) the Library of Parliament, (vii) the Parliamentary Protective Service, (viii) any other body; and (*m*) with respect to the formal mechanisms or instruments referred to in (*l*), what are the details of each communication received by the Parliamentary Precinct Branch respecting Phase 2 of the Visitor Welcome Centre complex from each source listed in (*l*) since 2001, including for each instance the (i) date, (ii) source, (iii) recipient(s), (iv) subject matter, (v) description, (vi) mechanism or instrument used to convey it?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 2440—**Mr. John Nater**:

With regard to "March madness" expenditures where the government makes purchases before the end of the fiscal year so that departmental funds do not go "unspent", broken down by department agency or other government entity: (*a*) what were the total expenditures during February and March of 2019 on (i) materials and supplies (standard object 07), (ii) acquisition of machinery and equipment, including parts and consumable tools (standard object 09); and (*b*) what are the details of each such expenditure, including (i) vendor, (ii) amount, (iii) date of expenditure, (iv) description of goods or services provided, including quantity (v) delivery date, (vi) file number?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 2441—**Mr. John Nater**:

With regard to government expenditures on membership fees, broken down by department, agency and Crown corporation, since April 1, 2018: (*a*) how much has been spent; and (*b*) what are the details of each expenditure, including (i) name of organization or vendor, (ii) date of purchase, (iii) amount spent?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 2443—**Mr. Chris Warkentin**:

With regard to "repayable" loans and contributions given out by the government since January 1, 2016: what are the details of all such loans and contributions, including (i) date of loan or contribution, (ii) recipient's details, including name and location, (iii) amount provided, (iv) amount "repaid" to date, (v) description or project or purpose of loan or contribution, (vi) program under which loan or contribution was administered?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 2444—**Mr. John Brassard**:

With regard to management consulting contracts signed by the government since June 1, 2018, broken down by department, agency, and Crown corporation: (*a*) what was the total amount spent; (*b*) for each contract, what was the (i) vendor name, (ii) amount, (iii) date, (iv) file number; (*c*) each time a management consultant was brought in, what was the desired outcome or goals; (*d*) how does the government measure whether or not the goals in (*c*) were met; (*e*) does the government have any recourse if the goals in (*c*) were not met; (*f*) for which contracts were the goals met; and (*g*) for which contracts were the goals not met?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 2447—**Mr. Martin Shields**:

With regard to government procurement and contracts for the provision of research or speech writing services to ministers, since June 1, 2017: (*a*) what are the details of contracts, including (i) the start and end dates, (ii) contracting parties, (iii) file number, (iv) nature or description of the work, (v) value of contract; and (*b*) in the case of a contract for speech writing, what is the (i) date, (ii) location, (iii) audience or event at which the speech was, or was intended to be delivered, (iv) number of speeches to be written, (v) cost charged per speech?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 2448—**Mr. Martin Shields**:

With regard to expenditures on consultants, since January 1, 2018: what are the details of all such contracts, including (i) amount, (ii) vendor, (iii) date and duration of contract, (iv) type of consultant, (v) reason or purpose consultant was utilized?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 2449—**Mr. David Anderson**:

With regard to individuals who have illegally or "irregularly" crossed the Canadian border, since January 1, 2016: (*a*) how many such individuals have been subject to deportation or a removal order; and (*b*) of the individuals in (*a*) how many (i) remain in Canada, (ii) have been deported or removed from Canada?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 2450—**Mr. David Anderson**:

With regard to all contracts awarded by the government since January 1, 2018, broken down by department or agency: (*a*) how many contracts have been awarded to a foreign firm, individual, business, or other entity with a mailing address outside of Canada; (*b*) for each contract in (*a*), what is the (i) name of vendor, (ii) country of mailing address, (iii) date of contract, (iv) summary or description of goods or services provided, (v) file or tracking number; and (*c*) for each contract in (*a*), was the contract awarded competitively or sole sourced?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 2451—**Mr. Bob Saroya**:

With regard to the $327 million announced by the government in November 2017 to combat gun and gang violence: (*a*) what specific initiatives or organizations have received funding from the $327 million, as of April 29, 2019; (*b*) what is the total of all funding referenced in (*a*); and (*c*) broken down by initiative and organization, what are the details of all funding received as of June 1, 2018, including the (i) name, (ii) project description, (iii) amount, (iv) date of the announcement, (v) duration of the project or program funded by the announcement?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 2453—**Mr. Steven Blaney**:

With regard to cabotage or coasting trade licenses granted by the Minister of Public Safety or the Minister of Transport: (*a*) how many cabotage or coasting trade licenses were granted to foreign vessels in (i) 2016, (ii) 2017, (iii) 2018; and (*b*) what is the breakdown of the licenses granted in (*a*) by (i) country of registration, (ii) tonnage of vessel?

(Return tabled)

[*English*]

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

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

FISHERIES ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion in relation to the amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-68, An Act to amend the Fisheries Act and other Acts in consequence, and of the amendment.

Mr. Dan Ruimy (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to speak today to the message from the Senate regarding Bill C-68, an act to amend the Fisheries Act and to make consequential amendments to other acts. Once enacted, this bill will repeal the changes that the former Conservative government implemented when it gutted the Fisheries Act in 2012, and restore lost protections.

I would like to thank the Senate for its work on this bill, as well as the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, who is continuing the great work of the Minister of Intergovernmental and Northern Affairs, who first introduced this bill when he was at Fisheries. Of course, we hope for his quick recovery.

I will be splitting my time with the member for North Okanagan—Shuswap.

Since I was elected, I heard this message loud and clear. As a new MP, the challenge to find sustainable solutions was daunting. After much consultation, I zeroed in on what I felt should be the starting point, the Fisheries Act, which, as I had been told by the people I work with, had been gutted over the years so that fish and fish habitat no longer had the strong protections that were once there.

For two and a half years, I worked with groups such as the Alouette River Management Society, the Kanaka Education and

Environmental Partnership Society, the Katzie and Kwantlen first nations, streamkeepers, the cities of Pitt Meadows and Maple Ridge, as well as people like Julie Porter, Ken Stewart, Jack Emberly, Greta, Cheryl, Lina, Sophie, Ross, Doug, and the list goes on.

These are not political or partisan people; they are folks who care deeply about their community. They all helped me to better understand the importance of these changes, and I thank them very much. Together, over the course of two years, we identified and discussed key pieces of legislation in the Fisheries Act that could be improved. I submitted my report to the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, with recommendations on how we can further strengthen the Fisheries Act and restore some of the lost protections, and here we are today.

I would like to speak to the specific changes we are seeking through the motion. We will be accepting a majority of the amendments made by the Senate, including many that were moved by the government through Senator Harder, and we will be respectfully rejecting just three amendments.

The first amendment we are rejecting is an amendment that was made to the definition of fish habitat by Senator Poirier. In her amendment, the senator reduced the scope for the application of fish and fish habitat provisions by deleting "water frequented by fish" from the definition of fish habitat. By narrowing the scope of fish habitat, this amendment goes against the very objective of this bill to provide increased protections.

We are also amending an amendment by Senator Christmas so that the language used in relation to section 35 and aboriginal treaty rights is consistent with the rest of the bill. On this amendment, the minister has received support from Senator Christmas.

The other amendments we will be rejecting were made by Senator Wells, regarding habitat banking and collecting fees in lieu of offsets. These amendments were initially proposed by the Canadian Wildlife Federation, which has since written a letter to support the removal of the amendments, as significant consultations are required and it would be premature at this time to include the amendments.

This motion takes full consideration of the amendments made by the Senate, and I hope all members can join us in passing the bill.

Bill C-68 has many important components that Canadians across the country support. I would like to speak about the fish stocks provisions proposed in Bill C-68, which are aimed at strengthening Canada's fisheries management framework and rebuilding depleted stocks.

The fish stocks provisions would introduce legally binding commitments to implement measures to, first, manage our major fish stocks at or above levels necessary to promote their sustainability and, second, to develop and implement a rebuilding plan for a major fish stock if it becomes depleted. Maintaining stocks at healthy levels and rebuilding depleted stocks are essential to the long-term economic viability of our fishing communities and the health of our oceans.

That is why, in the fall economic statement, the Government of Canada announced an investment of $107.4 million over five years, starting this fiscal year, as well as $17.6 million per year ongoing to support the implementation of the fish stocks provisions.

● (1235)

This new funding will help accelerate the implementation of the fish stocks provisions for the major fish stocks in Canada. As many members are aware, a number of important fish stocks in Canadian waters have shown significant declines over the past couple of decades and some more recently. This new investment will enable the Department of Fisheries and Oceans to implement these strong legislative tools for all key stocks.

As robust science is the bedrock of our fishery management system, the largest share of the investment will go to science activities. We will make targeted investments to increase the number of at-sea science surveys, so we can better and more frequently assess the state of our fish stocks across a broad range of major fish stocks and marine areas.

As well, we will hire additional fisheries scientists to carry out these new survey activities, analyze the data from these at-sea surveys and prepare science advice for our fisheries managers through our world-class peer review process. As a result, we will be more effective at detecting changes in the health of fish stocks and provide more robust science advice to manage these stocks to achieve sustainability goals. We will also be able to develop a better understanding of the threats facing our depleted fish stocks, which will allow us to take a targeted approach in our rebuilding efforts.

This funding will enable external groups, including indigenous groups, academics, industry and non-government organizations, to participate in fisheries data collection and the scientific assessment of Canada's major fish stocks. Additional support will be provided to establish and enhance existing partnerships and help develop scientific and technical capacity within these external groups.

With this funding we will also make investments to increase the capacity in fisheries management to develop precautionary approach management measures and rebuilding plans to meet the fish stocks provisions in collaboration with indigenous groups and stakeholders. It will also enhance our capacity to carry out socio-economic analyses to better understand the potential impacts of proposed management measures and the costs and benefits of different management options that are aimed at rebuilding fish stocks.

Over the next five years, the government has committed to making the majority of the 181 major fish stocks subject to the fish stocks provisions. Canadians have told us that sustainable fisheries are a priority, and we agree. This investment is essential in order to prescribe the major stocks as quickly as possible to the protections offered by the fish stock provisions.

We are also developing a regulation to set out the required contents of rebuilding plans so that all the plans are comprehensive and consistent. Under the proposed regulation, a rebuilding plan must be developed and implemented within two years of the stock becoming depleted.

Our government believes it is our collective responsibility to exercise our stewardship of Canada's fisheries and their habitat in a practical, reasonable and sustainable manner. The proposed fish stocks provisions and other measures in the amended Fisheries Act restore protections for fish and fish habitat, and introduce modern safeguards while facilitating sustainable economic growth, job creation and resource development.

With these stronger legislative tools to help keep our fish stocks healthy, and the funding to support their implementation, Canada's seafood sector, which employs over 76,000 people and contributed a landed value of $3.4 billion in 2017, will have a brighter future.

It is no doubt that this bill will implement changes that Canadians have long been waiting for. These amendments will restore lost protections and ensure that our fisheries are sustainable for future generations. The Senate made a number of amendments, and while we cannot support all of them, I believe we have put forth a reasonable motion that I hope all members can support.

● (1240)

Mr. Mel Arnold (North Okanagan—Shuswap, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments from the hon. member.

I would like to ask the member how he feels about the recommendations that have come from the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans, known as FOPO within these walls. There have been continuous recommendations from that committee on how we could have already started to rebuild Canada's fish stocks. We did studies early on in this parliamentary session on the northern Atlantic cod, on the Atlantic salmon. There were many recommendations, unanimous recommendations that were agreed to by every member on that committee, no matter which political party members came from.

However, the Liberal Party, his minister and the department have absolutely refused to take steps on any of those measures to restore the endangered or declining fish stocks.

● (1245)

Mr. Dan Ruimy: Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak to what I know and what I have seen from working with my constituents, who, as members of a watershed community, really enlightened me on fish and fish habitat.

When I look across our region, waterways that once were connected and are no longer connected and fish are struggling to reach the ocean or to come back. These are the problems we face. The erosion of fish habitat has led to where we are today.

If we want to fix the challenges to which the member has referred, we have to look at a broader range of efforts. This includes taking care of fish habitat.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet (Hochelaga, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the member, because I was not here when he gave his speech. I therefore do not know whether he spoke about what I am going to say, but I imagine that he did not.

The National Energy Board, or NEB, ordered Kinder Morgan to stop installing plastic anti-salmon spawning mats in eight B.C. rivers, but the mats are unfortunately still there.

Does the member think that the minister should intervene and order Kinder Morgan to stop installing these mats?

Mr. Dan Ruimy: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her question.

[*English*]

One of the challenges we faced was that the Fisheries Act was gutted in 2012. Looking back, from 2004 to 2016, 80% of fisheries officers were gone. We went from 73,000 hours down to 14, 885 hours. The one thing that I kept hearing when we were faced with challenges, and perhaps some of the challenges you were referring to, was that—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Todd Doherty): Order, please. I ask the hon. colleague to direct his comments to the Chair.

The hon. member.

Mr. Dan Ruimy: Mr. Speaker, with respect to one of the challenges to which my colleague referred, again, this is what I heard on the ground from the people in my riding. If there is no way to effectively enforce any of the policies in place, then we cannot go forward. In effect, it is so important to move forward with the amendments and the Fisheries Act because it will put more boots on the ground, more DFO on the ground. My community has been telling me for the last three and a half years that this could solve the problem.

Mr. Mel Arnold: Mr. Speaker, when I questioned him earlier, the member talked about our needing to undertake new measures to restore our fish stocks. New measures are proposed in these amendments from the Senate through this third party habitat banking that could immediately be put to use to restore fish stocks, which is badly needed across the country from coast to coast to coast.

Why is his government refusing to adopt these amendments from the Senate that could be the new tools that we need?

Mr. Dan Ruimy: Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that we have accepted some of the recommendations from the Senate. From everything we have heard, the fish banking is not ready. There is too much work to be done, and to be included in this would be premature. We need to ensure that this Fisheries Act moves forward.

Mr. Mel Arnold (North Okanagan—Shuswap, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we all want to see healthy fish stocks, prosperous fisheries and a thriving economy, and I believe all those are possible at the same time. We can achieve that by using Canadian technology, Canadian ingenuity and Canadian investment. We can do all that and rebuild our declining fish stocks.

We have national conservation organizations, like Ducks Unlimited, the Canadian Wildlife Federation, local fishing game clubs and stream keeper organizations ready to create and improve fish habitat. Using Canadian technology, Canadian ingenuity and Canadian investment in proactive ways that would actually see fish habitat increased and improved in advance of projects would ensure prosperous fisheries and a thriving economy. This could all be made possible under the third-party habitat banking amendments being put forward by the Senate.

Before the Senate had even voted on sending these amendments to Bill C-68 back to this House of Parliament, the fisheries minister basically gave a directive to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans, FOPO, to do a study on third party habitat banking. Imagine that. I say it was a directive, because although the parliamentary committees are supposed to be free to set their own agenda, that committee has a majority of Liberal members who would dare not deny a request from their own minister.

Therefore, on June 10, as a directive from the fisheries minister, we began a study of third party habitat banking. Also on June 10, we finished a study on third party habitat banking. We started and finished in one day, in two hours. It was an abomination of a study, with no mention of a report back to the minister and no report to the House of Commons. It was of almost of no use at all other than perhaps being able to say "we consulted", part of the fake consultation I have seen with the government time and again over the past three and a half years.

However, I say almost nothing out of that study, except what we heard from witnesses that day. They spoke about third party habitat banking, saying that it would be a good thing to incorporate, that the difficult details around third party habitat banking could be worked out through the regulations and orders in council. The regulations need not be fully ironed out in order for Bill C-68 to be amended and passed. We also heard testimony from multiple witnesses that third party habitat banking could create net gains to habitat. Imagine, conservation organizations and local angling clubs being able to work proactively to create an enhanced fish habitat.

It should be the dream and goal of any fisheries minister to increase and improve fisheries habitat. However, as we have seen so many times over the past three and a half years, Liberal fisheries ministers fail to do what is right and instead give deals to their buddies and relatives, getting caught up in scandal. They fail to deliver and fund restoring fish stocks.

We also heard in testimony during that short "but we can say we consulted" meeting on June 10, that during the Senate study of Bill C-68, the only witnesses who spoke against third party habitat banking were the minister and DFO staff, undoubtedly under the direction of the fisheries minister.

● (1250)

Why would every other witness support third party habitat banking and the minister's department oppose it? Why would a minister not want to see net gains to fish habitat? Why would a minister ignore and cast aside testimony, ideas and proposals that would be good for fish, fisheries and the economy?

I can only surmise that it is because the fisheries minister, like his Liberal predecessors, are out of touch with Canadian fisheries and the Canadian way.

I also want to point out the fake and disingenuous consultations by the former fisheries minister from Beauséjour undertaken during his tenure. I do wish to send best wishes to the former fisheries minister regarding his health.

While he was minister, the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans, FOPO, undertook a study on changes to the Fisheries Act. While that study was on the book, three different news releases went out on the consultation process, three conflicting news releases under that minister's watch.

The first one, on October 16, 2016, stated that all briefs received during the consultations would be provided to the committee for its study. The next one, on November 16, 2016, again stated the feedback heard would be shared with the committee for its study. However, that feedback never reached the committee in time.

After multiple requests from indigenous groups and committee members to extend the timeline of the study, the Liberal members refused to extend that time so we could incorporate the briefs solicited and paid for with taxpayer dollars.

In the end, over $2 million was spent for indigenous groups to provide briefs to the committee for study. Over $1.2 million of those briefs for consultation and input for the review were not received before the Liberals closed off the study. Those taxpayer dollars were not received by the committee in time for the study. Imagine what $1.2 million could have done for fish habitat in the hands of conservation groups and organizations.

I can imagine that because my background is in conservation. My first interest in this was with fish and game clubs, putting boots on and getting in the streams creating spawning habitat. What our clubs could have done with $1.2 million, which the Liberal government wasted because it could not get that information to the committee on time.

Now here we are up against time. The government has called time allocation on debate on these Senate amendments after minimum time back in the House. It has taken the government three and a half years to get the bill this far and it is still not right.

Dozens of amendments came from the Senate on Bill C-68, most of them tossed aside by the Liberal government, amendments that really could make a difference in the streams, creating more fish habitat, creating more fish, creating more opportunities for fishermen and creating a strong and vibrant economy.

It is really disappointing to have debate cut short. Ten minutes for me to speak to this is really less than half the time I would have liked in a full speaking time of 20 minutes.

I have talked about how the FOPO study was denied extensions. We have talked about briefs being received after the report deadline. We have heard testimony many times that there was no proof of any harm to fish habitat from the 2012 changes to the Fisheries Act.

● (1255)

One of the first things I did in this parliamentary session was to put in an Order Paper question asking for any proof of harm or loss of habitat as a result of the 2012 changes to the Fisheries Act. More than three years later, not one piece of evidence has been provided. Therefore, the fisheries minister and the current government are being deceitful, if I can use that word, to the Canadian public and this Parliament. I have lost respect for them because of that.

I thank the House for the time to be able to discuss these amendments, and I will welcome questions.

● (1300)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not necessarily agree with the member, but I appreciate his thoughts on the legislation. In terms of his closing comments, in reflecting on the legislation, the member has had ample opportunity in different ways to have a significant contribution both inside the House and outside the House in committees and in the Senate. He will find not only that the legislation is supported by many different stakeholders, but even within the chamber it is supported by New Democrats, from what I understand, by Green Party members, from what I understand, and by others who are supporting the legislation and wanting to see it go forward.

Can the member opposite, in a very clear way, indicate why, if it were up to the Conservative Party, the legislation would never pass? If we provided the member what he wanted, unlimited debates on time where any grouping of a number of MPs would be able to prevent the government from being able to pass the legislation, does he believe that would be a good thing? If so, why did Stephen Harper never believe that to be the case?

Mr. Mel Arnold: Mr. Speaker, as I stated, my background is in conservation. I see what conservation organizations can do with a few dollars provided and the many hours of volunteer time that they put in at the streams to create fish habitat and to improve hatcheries to make sure we have fish in the streams. A lot of the time, it is not for their own benefit. They do not get to fish for those fish. They do not get to catch anything or reap any harvest from it. They simply are doing it because it is the right thing to do.

That is what these amendments from the Senate were aimed to do. It was to increase the ability of non-profit organizations, including fish and game clubs and conservation organizations, to get into the streams and do some work proactively and create and improve fish habitat. Here we have a government that is scrapping these amendments from the Senate and blocking the possibility for that to happen.

Mr. Terry Duguid (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Women and Gender Equality, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is nice to know there is a fellow zoologist in the House with me. I call myself an environmental biologist by trade.

I wonder if the hon. member would reflect back on some of the dark days that my colleague from Winnipeg North and others have mentioned. We had a fisheries department and a Fisheries Act that were very much guided by science and evidence. Two hundred DFO scientists were fired. Let us remember the Experimental Lakes Area. You remember, Mr. Speaker; you come from lake country. The Experimental Lakes Area, the finest outdoor laboratory in the world, was shuttered by the Conservatives. The Freshwater Institute was depopulated of scientists.

I wonder if the hon. member would just offer us a few comments on his party's view of the importance of science as it has guided this legislation through our chamber.

Mr. Mel Arnold: Mr. Speaker, not being part of the previous government, I will not comment on that. However, I will comment on the government that I have been in opposition to since I arrived here in this House.

What I have seen is a government that claims to be doing everything for the science and the fisheries, and yet it continues to ignore that science. When we take a look at what is happening on the west coast with our west coast salmon fisheries, we see it is shutting down the recreational fisheries, blocking or destroying the jobs of hundreds of west coast fishermen, fish guides and angling tackle shops with no regard to what the science really says.

We know there are bigger issues out there, but the government refuses to look at the science and where it could make the biggest difference in increasing the number of chinook stocks on the west coast. Rather, it is punishing the fishermen who make the smallest impact.

● (1305)

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the Senate amendments to Bill C-68, an act to amend the Fisheries Act, a terribly flawed piece of legislation that erodes the rights of Canadians.

I wish to acknowledge and thank, on behalf of all Canadians, the research team of the Ontario Landowners Association for the work done by the group on Bill C-68, particularly Elizabeth Marshall and Tom Black. The report they prepared but were not able to present to the Standing Senate Committee on Fisheries and Oceans has been highly informative. Canadians will understand, after my remarks are finished, that when we are working with bad legislation, all the tinkering in the world will not fix the wrong assumptions that are at the heart of this bill.

The Liberal Party is attempting to violate the Constitution by artificially extending its jurisdiction in contradiction to its constitutional limits. It is also trying to do indirectly what it cannot do directly, which has been struck down in the Canadian courts. The federal government does not have the constitutional jurisdiction to expand environmental protection through the Fisheries Act, as this is in violation of provincial jurisdiction, as well as in violation of private rights established under common law, the Constitution Act, 1867, and the letters patent/Crown grant.

Though many laws regulate water and water use, the Fisheries Act remains the only legislation that directly addresses the protection and conservation of fish and fish habitat. Enacted in 1868, the act is one of Canada's oldest pieces of legislation. In 2012, the Fisheries Act was significantly amended.

I am now going to turn to the Senate testimony. We had the OPG, Ontario Power Generation, look at its generation portfolio on hydro power. It determined that it would take an up to 80% increase in instantaneous passage of flow as a principle for meeting the objectives of the new definition of "fish habitat", and that it would no longer be peaking and holding back water or meeting grid demands, outside of the greenhouse gas emissions impact, which would bear out. That was very important.

The amendments of the Senate involved a move from protecting fish generally to focusing on only prohibiting serious harm to fish that were part of a commercial or aboriginal fishery. That is what the 2012 amendments did. These amendments were common sense in application and were done after listening and acting on the concerns of stakeholders.

The 2012 Conservative amendments respected the Canadian Constitution. It was my pleasure to recommend to the committee reviewing the Conservative amendments a witness to provide practical observations as to why the Fisheries Act needed to be amended.

Jack Maclaren is a multi-generational orchard farmer from my riding of Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke. Jack had the unfortunate experience of having a ditch, hand dug by his grandfather and great-grandfather to collect and direct water to their orchard, declared a navigable waterway after he started to clear a blocked culvert that was flooding the road to his farmhouse.

Needless to say, Jack and many other farmers just like him welcomed the Conservative common sense amendments passed by our government in 2012. The Liberal Party, under the guise of protection of so-called "fish habitat" in unlikely places like Jack's ditch, is actually looking to use the Fisheries Act as environmental legislation, when the federal government has already protections established under the Canada Shipping Act and the Canadian Environmental Protection Act.

What really caught my attention on Bill C-68 was the addition in committee of a new concept in Canadian law, the concept of water flow or, as it is referred to in other documents, environmental flow. It was added in proposed subsection 2(2) to amend the act.

Water flow is a hot topic in my riding of Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke. The spring of 2019 now has the dubious distinction of being the worst in recent memory for flooding along the Ottawa River. My constituents are skeptical when the Prime Minister and the member from Ottawa blame every significant weather event on climate change.

They do not believe the Liberal Party leader when he claims a new tax on Canadians, the Liberal carbon tax, will stop the Ottawa River from flooding. The residents of the Ottawa Valley have a suspicion that recent flooding has been caused by either government policy or human error, or some combination of both. They want answers.

The question now being asked is whether the federal government caused the flooding. Were the dam operators instructed to hold back water when they should have been releasing water to meet the federal government's new definitions of fish habitat? These are questions my constituents feel can only be answered by an independent inquiry, an external review.

● (1310)

Expert testimony before the standing committee, which I referred to before, certainly seemed to confirm that the Government of Canada was planning to make flooding on the Ottawa River an annual occurrence, judging by the question asked by a senator to a representative of Ontario Power Generation, which operates the dams on the river. The expert said:

> When OPG, Ontario Power Generation, looked at our generation portfolio on hydro power, we determined that we would take an 80 per cent instantaneous passage of flow as a principle for meeting the objectives of the new definition of "fish habitat." We would no longer be peaking and holding back water or meeting grid demands, outside of the greenhouse gas emissions impact which would bear out.... Everyone can remember the spring of 2017 in Ontario and the Ottawa Valley. We had a once in a generation flood event. We had the capacity to hold water on the watershed with our water management plans. We have detailed some impacts. One of the outcomes was that the city of Montreal would have been under a metre more of water if we had not had the ability to store water on the watershed because of flooding in the Great Lakes.

The first thing that jumped out at me was the comment that Montreal would have been under an additional metre of water had Bill C-68, as it was voted on and passed in the House of Commons by the Liberal Party, been enacted.

The next thing that jumped out while listening to the expert testimony given to that Senate committee on the decision by the Liberal Party to bring forward legislation like Bill C-68 was the limitations that would be placed on one of the cleanest, most renewable and most reliable sources of electricity. It produces almost no greenhouse gases. Canadian hydroelectricity is the envy of the world. Why would Canadians want to throw away that advantage?

A representative from Quebec, who is the president of WaterPower Canada, an organization that represents more than 60% of all electricity produced in Canada, stated:

> If Bill C-68 is passed in its current form, its impact on our industry's ability to operate its current stations and build new ones will be catastrophic.

This led me to do some research on who was lobbying for proposed subsection 2(2) in Bill C-68, and I then discovered that the controversial clause added during committee was proposed by the Green Party. It was then supported by the Liberal majority to be included in the legislation.

Why was the Liberal Party on the House of Commons committee voting in favour of an amendment put forward by the Green Party that would be so disastrous for Canada? Is the Liberal Party really so afraid of losing votes to the Green Party that it would shift that far left?

I was then introduced to the name of a lobbyist who was on the payroll of the controversial Tides foundation. These foundations are recognized as threats to Canadian democracy. The Tides foundation is a foreign-funded organization that has been identified, among other activities, as funding a campaign to block Canadian pipelines.

Canadians lost $20 billion last year by being held a captive seller to American big oil interests. Tides Canada's American parent foundation, the Tides foundation, from which it receives funding, has been funding dam busting in the western United States, so it is no surprise that the U.S. foundation would fund similar activities in Canada.

Registered as a lobbyist for Tides Canada, Tony Maas could count on some powerful friends in the Liberal Party, starting with the now disgraced former principal secretary to the Prime Minister, Gerald Butts. Tony Maas worked for Gerald Butts when Butts was at the World Wildlife Fund. With the puppet master on his side, Maas figured he could get anything he wanted.

Maas had moved from the World Wildlife Fund to run a project funded by Tides Canada on water. In that capacity, the decision was made to use the Liberal campaign promise to make amendments to the Fisheries Act to move forward with a radical agenda on water by introducing a totally new concept in Canadian law on water flow. This was done by avoiding fisheries departmental scrutiny when Bill C-68 was first introduced to the House of Commons and waiting until committee, after second reading, to inject proposed subsection 2(2) into the bill. By doing this, checks and balances that normally occur in a department before legislation is introduced could be avoided.

The concept of water flows, or environmental flows, comes from the 2007 globalist document the Brisbane declaration. Like many globalist documents, the words written do not match with reality. While it is next to impossible to build any new hydroelectric power dams, as identified by the president of WaterPower Canada, the declaration envisages the eventual removal of existing dams in favour of flood plain restoration and the return of free-flowing rivers.

● (1315)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Pursuant to order made Thursday, June 13, 2019, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the consideration of the Senate amendments to Bill C-68 now before the House.

The question is on the amendment.

Shall I dispense?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[*Chair read text of amendment to the House*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota):

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Pursuant to orders made on Tuesday, May 28, the division stands deferred until Monday, June 17, 2019 at the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions.

* * *

CORRECTIONS AND CONDITIONAL RELEASE ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-83, An Act to amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act and another Act.

Hon. Bardish Chagger (for the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.) moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours that, in relation to Bill C-83, An Act to amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act and another Act, the House:

agrees with amendments 1, 4(a) and 5(b) made by the Senate;

proposes that amendment 2 be amended by replacing the text of the amendment with the following:

"(c.1) the Service considers alternatives to custody in a penitentiary, including the alternatives referred to in sections 29 and 81;

(c.2) the Service ensures the effective delivery of programs to offenders, including correctional, educational, vocational training and volunteer programs, with a view to improving access to alternatives to custody in a penitentiary and to promoting rehabilitation;";

proposes that amendment 3 be amended by replacing the text of the amendment with the following:

"(2.01) In order to ensure that the plan can be developed in a manner that takes any mental health needs of the offender into consideration, the institutional head shall, as soon as practicable after the day on which the offender is received but not later than the 30th day after that day, refer the offender's case to the portion of the Service that administers health care for the purpose of conducting a mental health assessment of the offender.";

proposes that amendment 4(b)(i) be replaced by the following amendment:

1. Clause 10, page 7: replace lines 25 to 28 with the following:

"(2) The Service shall ensure that the measures include

(a) a referral of the inmate's case, within 24 hours after the inmate's transfer into the structured intervention unit, to the portion of the Service that administers health care for the purpose of conducting a mental health assessment of the inmate; and

(b) a visit to the inmate at least once every day by a registered health care professional employed or engaged by the Service.";

respectfully disagrees with amendment 4(b)(ii) because it may not support the professional autonomy and clinical independence of healthcare professionals and does not take into account the inmate's willingness to be transferred to a hospital or the hospital's capacity to treat the inmate;

respectfully disagrees with amendment 5(a) because it would result in a significant addition to the workload of provincial superior courts, and because further assessments and consultations with the provinces would be required to determine the probable legislative, operational and financial implications at federal and provincial levels, including amendments to the Judges Act and provincial legislation and the appointment of additional judges;

proposes that amendment 6 be amended to read as follows:

"6. Clause 14, page 16:

(a) replace line 7 with the following:

"48 (1) Subject to subsection (2), a staff member of the same sex as the inmate may";

(b) add the following after line 15:

"(2) A body scan search of the inmate shall be conducted instead of the strip search if

(a) the body scan search is authorized under section 48.1; and

(b) a prescribed body scanner in proper working order is in the area where the strip search would be conducted.";";

proposes that amendment 7(a) be amended by replacing the text of the French version of the amendment with the following:

"c) l'identité et la culture autochtones du délinquant, notamment son passé familial et son historique d'adoption.";

proposes that amendment 7(b) be amended to read as follows:

"(b) replace lines 32 and 33 with the following:

"ing the assessment of the risk posed by an Indigenous offender unless those factors could decrease the level of risk.";";

respectfully disagrees with amendment 8 because extending the concept of healing lodges designed specifically for Indigenous corrections to other unspecified groups is a major policy change that should only be contemplated following considerable study and consultation, and because it would impede the ability of the Correctional Service of Canada, which is responsible for the care and custody of inmates pursuant to section 5 of the Act, to be part of decisions to transfer inmates to healing lodges;

respectfully disagrees with amendment 9 because extending of the concept of community release designed specifically for Indigenous corrections to other unspecified groups is a major policy change that should only be contemplated following considerable study and consultation;

respectfully disagrees with amendment 10 because allowing offenders' sentences to be shortened due to the conduct of correctional staff, particularly given the existence of other remedies, is a major policy change that should only be contemplated following considerable study and consultation, including with provincial partners, victims' representatives, stakeholder groups and other actors in the criminal justice system;

respectfully disagrees with amendment 11 because five years is an appropriate amount of time to allow for robust and meaningful assessment of the new provisions following full implementation.

● (1325)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-83 has two main objectives.

First, it will allow federal inmates to be separated from the general prison population when necessary for security reasons. Second, it will ensure that these inmates have access to the interventions, programs and mental health care they need to safely return to the general prison population and make progress toward successful rehabilitation and reintegration.

[*English*]

The bill would achieve these objectives by replacing the current system of administrative segregation with structured intervention units. In SIUs, inmates will be entitled to twice as much time out of their cells, four hours daily instead of two, and two hours of meaningful human contact every day. We have allocated $448 million over six years to ensure that the correctional service has the resources to provide programs and interventions to inmates in SIUs and to implement this new safety system effectively. That funding includes $150 million for mental health care, both in SIUs and throughout the federal corrections system.

Bill C-83 was introduced last October. It was studied by the public safety committee in November and reported back to the House in December with a number of amendments. There were further amendments at report stage in February, including one from the member for Oakville North—Burlington, that added a system of binding external review. In recent months, hon. senators have been studying the bill and have now sent it back to us with proposed amendments of their own.

A high level of interest in Bill C-83 is indicative of the importance of the federal corrections system and of the laws and policies that govern it. Effective and humane corrections are essential to public safety. They are a statement of who we are as a country. In the words of Dostoyevsky, the degree of civilization in a society is revealed by entering its prisons.

I extend my sincere thanks to all the intervenors who have provided testimony and written briefs over the course of the last nine months and to the parliamentarians in both chambers who have examined this legislation and made thoughtful and constructive suggestions.

Since the Senate social affairs committee completed clause-by-clause consideration of this bill a couple of weeks ago, the government has been carefully studying the committee's recommendations, all of which seek to achieve laudable objectives. We are proposing to accept several of the Senate's amendments as is or with small technical modifications.

First off, with minor adjustments, we agree with amendments that would require a mental health assessment of all inmates within 30 days of admission into federal custody and within 24 hours of being transferred to an SIU. This fits with the focus on early diagnosis and treatment that would be facilitated by the major investments we are making in mental health care. We agree with the proposal to rearrange section 29 of the act, which deals with inmate transfers, to emphasize the possibility of transfers to external hospitals.

● (1330)

[*Translation*]

I thank the hon. senators for their efforts and contributions.

[*English*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The hon. parliamentary secretary will have time remaining in her debate when the matter is next before the House.

* * *

ACCESS TO INFORMATION ACT

BILL C-58—NOTICE OF TIME ALLOCATION

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise that agreements could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Orders 78(1) or 78(2) with respect to the consideration of certain amendments to Bill C-58, an act to amend the Access to Information Act and the Privacy 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 of the bill.

* * *

CORRECTIONS AND CONDITIONAL RELEASE ACT

BILL C-83—NOTICE OF TIME ALLOCATION

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise that agreements could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Orders 78(1) or 78(2) with respect to the consideration of certain amendments to Bill C-83, an act to amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act and another act.

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

* * *

ACCESS TO INFORMATION ACT

BILL C-58—NOTICE OF CLOSURE MOTION

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wish to give notice that with respect to the consideration of the Senate amendments to Bill C-58, an act to amend the Access to Information Act and the Privacy Act and to make consequential amendments to other acts, at the next sitting of the House a minister of the Crown shall move, pursuant to Standing Order 57, that the debate be not further adjourned.

* * *

CORRECTIONS AND CONDITIONAL RELEASE ACT

BILL C-83—NOTICE OF CLOSURE MOTION

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wish to give notice that with respect to the consideration of the Senate amendments to Bill C-83, an act to amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act and another act, at the next sitting of the House a minister of the Crown shall move, pursuant to Standing Order 57, that the debate be not further adjourned.

* * *

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, should we be able to find a way forward to advance the government's agenda, Tuesday, June 18, 2019, shall be an allotted day, but if we are not able to find a way forward, I will have to find another day later next week.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): It being 1:30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

STANDING ORDERS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Frank Baylis (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.) moved:

That: (a) the House eliminate the lists of members submitted by the parties to the Speaker which are used during debate, oral questions, Standing Order 31 statements and other rubrics of the House of Commons and, acknowledging the right of recognition of the Speaker to establish a system to recognize members, that Standing Order 17 be replaced with the following:

"17(1) Every Member desiring to speak is to rise in his or her place, except during proceedings pursuant to Standing Orders 38(5), 52 and 53.1, and address the Speaker.

2) Speaking lists of members submitted by the parties shall not be permitted and the Speaker shall have the sole discretion to recognize Members to speak and to establish his or her own system of recognition, taking into consideration the following:

(a) the relative proportion of recognized parties and independent Members, including any agreement between the recognized parties as to speaking rotations;

(b) any provisions provided for in the Standing Orders relating to the first or subsequent rounds of speeches;

(c) the priority granted to the leaders of the recognized parties in opposition, or their designates, in the initial round of oral questions;

(d) the priority granted to Members of recognized parties in opposition and to independent Members during oral questions, without excluding Members of the governing party;

(e) Members who rise to catch the Speaker's eye to be recognized;

(f) whether a Member has caused disorder, until the Speaker is satisfied that the behaviour has ceased; and

(g) any other consideration which the Speaker determines to be relevant.

(3) A Member shall give the Speaker twenty-four hours' written notice of his or her intention to make a statement pursuant to Standing Order 31. Each sitting day, the Speaker shall cause a list of Members who will be recognized to speak to be published.";

(b) in order to eliminate the Friday sittings of the House and restrict voting times:

(i) Standing Order 24(1) be replaced with the following: "The House shall meet on Mondays at 11 a.m., on Tuesdays and Thursdays at 9:00 a.m., and on Wednesdays at 2 p.m. unless otherwise provided by Standing or Special Order of this House.",

(ii) Standing Order 24(2) be amended by deleting the words "except Friday and at 2:30 p.m. on Fridays",

(iii) Standing Order 27(1) be amended by replacing the word "tenth" with the word "eighth" and the word "ten" with the word "eight",

(iv) Standing Order 28(2)(a) be amended by replacing each occurrence of the word "Friday" with the word "Thursday", and by adding, after the words "falls on", the words "a Friday,",

(v) Standing Order 30(5) be replaced with the following: "At 2:00 p.m. on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays, Members, other than Ministers of the Crown, may make statements pursuant to Standing Order 31. Not later than 2:15 p.m., oral questions shall be taken up. At 3:00 p.m. on Tuesdays and Thursdays, and after Routine Proceedings has been disposed of on Mondays and Wednesdays, the Orders of the Day shall be considered in the order established pursuant to section (6) of this Standing Order.",

(vi) Standing Order 30(6) be amended by deleting all words after the words "Wednesday AFTER THE DAILY ROUTINE OF BUSINESS Notices of Motions for the Production of Papers. Government Orders. Private Members' Business — from 5:30 to 6:30 p.m.: Public Bills, Private Bills, Notices of Motions and Notices of Motions (Papers).",

(vii) Standing Orders 30(7) and 111(3) each be amended by replacing the word "ten" with the word "eight",

(viii) Standing Orders 32(7) and 34(1) each be amended by replacing the word "twenty" with the word "sixteen",

(ix) Standing Orders 36(8)(b), 39(5)(b), 92(2), 92(4)(a), 92.1(1), 113(1) and 114(2)(a) each be amended by replacing the word "five" with the word "four",

(x) Standing Order 45(5)(a)(ii) be amended by deleting the words "that is not a Friday",

(xi) Standing Order 45(6) be replaced with the following: "Notwithstanding section (5) of this Standing Order, the division on a votable opposition motion on the last allotted day of a supply period cannot be deferred, except as provided in Standing Order 81(18)(b).",

(xii) new Standing Orders be added as follows:

"45(6.1)(a) A recorded division demanded on any debatable motion on a Monday before the period provided for oral questions is deferred until after the time provided for oral questions that day. A recorded division demanded on a Thursday after 4 p.m. is deferred to the next sitting until after the time provided for oral questions. The bells for all such deferred recorded divisions sound for not more than fifteen minutes.

(b) Notwithstanding any other Standing or Special Order, the sitting shall be suspended from 10:30 p.m. to 9 a.m. the next day when the House is taking several recorded divisions successively without intervening debate.

58.1 No dilatory motion shall be allowed on Mondays before the period provided for oral questions or on Thursdays after 4 p.m.",

(xiii) Standing Order 50(1) be amended by replacing the word "six" with the word "five",

(xiv) Standing Order 50(6) be amended by deleting the words "or after",

(xv) Standing Order 50(7) be amended by replacing the word "sixth" with the word "fifth",

(xvi) Standing Order 51(1) be amended by replacing the word "sixtieth" with the word "fiftieth", and each occurrence of the word "ninetieth" with the word "seventieth",

(xvii) Standing Order 52(11) be deleted,

(xviii) Standing Order 54(1) be amended by deleting the words "(2 p.m. on a Friday)",

(xix) Standing Order 66(1) be amended by deleting the words "and after 11 a. m. on Fridays",

(xx) Standing Order 81(4)(a) be amended by deleting the words "or, if taken up on a Friday, at the conclusion of Private Members' Business",

(xxi) Standing Order 81(10)(a) be amended by replacing each occurrence of the word "seven" with the word "six", the word "eight" with the word "seven", the word "twenty-two" with the word "nineteen", and by deleting the words "and no more than one fifth thereof shall fall on a Friday",

(xxii) Standing Order 81(18)(c) be amended by replacing number "10" with number "9",

(xxiii) Standing Order 86.2(1) be amended by replacing the word "sixty" with the word "forty-eight",

(xxiv) Standing Order 97.1(1) be amended by replacing each occurrence of the word "sixty" with the word "forty-eight", and each occurrence of the word "thirty" with the word "twenty-four",

(xxv) Standing Order 97.1(2)(f) be amended by replacing the word "sixtieth" with the word "forty-eighth", and the word "thirty" with the words "twenty-four sitting",

(xxvi) Standing Order 97.1(3) be amended by replacing each occurrence of the word "thirty" with the word "twenty-four", the word "sixtieth" with the word "forty-eighth", and the word "ninetieth" with the word "seventy-second",

(xxvii) Standing Order 107(2) be amended by replacing the word "five" with the word "four", and the word "twentieth" with the word "sixteenth",

(xxviii) Standing Order 110(1) be amended by replacing the word "five" with the word "four", and the word "thirty" with the word "twenty-four",

(xxix) Standing Order 110(2) be amended by replacing the word "thirty" with the word "twenty-four",

(xxx) Standing Order 111(1) be amended by replacing the word "thirty" with the word "twenty-four", and the word "ten" with the word "eight",

(xxxi) Standing Order 124 be amended by replacing the word "fifteenth" with the word "twelfth",

(xxxii) the Conflict of Interest Code for Members of the House of Commons be amended by replacing, in subsection 28(9), number "10" with the word "eight", and by replacing, in subsections 28(10) and 28(12), number "30" with the word "twenty-four",

(xxxiii) the Code of Conduct for Members of the House of Commons: Sexual Harassment Between Members be amended by replacing, in section 11, each occurrence of number "30" with the word "twenty-four", by replacing, in section 55 and subsection 56(1), number "10" with the word "eight", by replacing, in paragraph 56(2)(a), the word "tenth" with the word "eighth", by replacing, in subsection 56(3), the word "30th" with the word "twenty-fourth", and by deleting, in subsection 56(3), the words "that is not a Friday";

(c) in order for committee chairs to be elected and members to have to agree before being replaced from a committee:

(i) the following new Standing Orders be added:

"104.1(1) The Chairs of the standing and standing joint committees of the House, as listed in Standing Orders 104(2) and 104(3), shall be elected by Members of the House for the duration of a session.

(2)(a) Not later than four sitting days after the opening of Parliament and each subsequent session, the Chief Government Whip, after consultation with the Whips of the other recognized parties, shall move a motion under "Motions", notice of which was given pursuant to Standing Order 54, that, in relation to standing and standing joint committees provides:

(i) for the allotment of Chairs according to the proportional size of the recognized parties in the House; and

(ii) indicate the party to which the Chair will be allocated, provided that the party forming the government has the first opportunity to identify which standing and standing joint committees it shall chair in its allotment, excluding the committees identified in paragraph (c) of this section, followed by all other recognized parties, in descending order, for the remaining committee positions in their respective allotments.

(b) From time to time as required, another motion may be moved pursuant to paragraph (2)(a) of this Standing Order, provided it establishes which committee Chair positions are to be declared vacant.

(c) Only a Member from an opposition party may be a candidate for the Chair of the following standing committees:

(i) Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics;

(ii) Government Operations and Estimates; and

(iii) Public Accounts.

(d) Only a Member from the Official Opposition may be a candidate for the Joint Chair acting on behalf of the House on the Standing Joint Committee for the Scrutiny of Regulations.

(3) No Member may speak on a motion moved pursuant to paragraph (2)(a) of this Standing Order more than once nor longer than ten minutes and, after one hour of consideration, unless previously disposed of, the Speaker shall interrupt and put all questions necessary to dispose of the motion forthwith. Proceedings on this motion shall not be interrupted or adjourned by any other proceeding or by the operation of any Order of the House.

(4) Within four sitting days following the adoption by the House of the motion provided for under section (2) of this Standing Order, the elections for the Chairs of standing and standing joint committees shall take place, provided that the Speaker shall give forty-eight hours' notice of the election.

(5)(a) The Speaker, the Deputy Speaker, the Assistant Deputy Speakers, Ministers, leaders of recognized parties, House Officers and Parliamentary Secretaries shall not be eligible for election as Chair of a standing or standing joint committee.

(b) Candidates for the position of Chair shall only be from the party designated by the House, pursuant to section (2) of this Standing Order.

(6) No Member may be a candidate for more than one chair position.

(7) The balloting shall proceed under the supervision of the Speaker, who shall also have responsibility for making all arrangements necessary to ensure the orderly conduct of the elections.

(8) Any Member who wishes to be considered for election as Chair of a standing or standing joint committee shall, not later than 6:00 p.m. on the day preceding the election:

(a) inform the Clerk of the House, in writing, of the name of the committee for which the Member is seeking to be Chair;

(b) provide signatures of fifteen Members of the same party as the candidate, or ten percent of the Members of the same party, whichever is lower; and

(c) no Member may sign the statement of more than one candidate for Chair of the same committee.

(9) The Clerk of the House shall prepare a list of names of candidates for each standing or standing joint committee, and shall provide the list to all Members prior to the balloting

(10) The ballot shall take place during the hours of sitting on the day designated by the Speaker.

(11) Members wishing to indicate their choice for each standing or standing joint committee Chair, shall rank their preferences by marking the number "1" in the space adjacent to the name of the candidate who is the Member's first preference, the number "2" in the space adjacent to the name of the Member's second preference and so on until the Member has completed the ranking of all the candidates, in all elections, for committee Chairs for whom the Member wishes to vote.

(12) A ballot on which a Member has ranked one or more, but not all, of the candidates is valid only in respect of the candidate or candidates whom the Member has ranked.

(13) Upon completion of all ballots for which the Member wishes to vote, the Member shall then deposit ballots into the appropriate ballot box.

(14) Once balloting is closed, the Clerk of the House shall count the number of first preferences recorded on the ballots for each candidate for each committee.

(15) If no candidate has received a majority of first preferences, the Clerk of the House shall:

(a) eliminate the candidate who received the least number of first preferences from any subsequent counts and, in the event that, at the conclusion of a count, there is an equality of votes between two or more candidates, both or all of whom have the fewest first preferences, eliminate all of the candidates for whom there is an equality of first preferences;

(b) in all subsequent counts, treat each second or lower preference as if it were a first preference for the next highest candidate in the order of preference who is not eliminated; and

(c) repeat the process of vote counting described in paragraphs (a) and (b) until one candidate has received a majority of first preferences.

(16) Every ballot shall be considered in every count, unless it is exhausted in accordance with section (17) of this Standing Order.

(17) A ballot is exhausted when all the candidates on that ballot in respect of which a preference has been made are eliminated.

(18)(a) In the event that, after all other candidates have been eliminated, the process of vote counting has resulted in an equality of largest number of first preferences between two or more candidates, the Speaker shall inform the House to that effect, and shall cause a vote to be held during the hours of sitting of the House on a day designated by the Speaker, as provided for in section (10) of this Standing Order.

(b) On the day designated pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section, Members shall be provided by the Clerk of the House with ballot papers, on which shall be listed, in alphabetical order, the names of all candidates who have not been eliminated, and the vote shall proceed in the manner provided for in this Standing Order.

(19) Following the successful completion of each election, the Clerk of the House shall provide the Speaker with a list of all elected standing or standing joint committee Chairs. The Speaker shall inform the House accordingly, at the earliest opportunity.

20) After standing or standing joint committee Chairs have been declared elected, the Clerk of the House shall destroy the ballots together with all records of the number of preferences marked for each candidate and the Clerk of the House shall in no way divulge the number of preferences marked for any candidate.

(21)(a) Should a Chair vacancy arise, the Speaker shall announce the date of the election to fill the vacancy, not later than eight sitting days following such announcement, pursuant to the Standing Orders.

(b) The following are conditions upon which a vacancy would occur in the position of Chair:

(i) the Chair has ceased to be a Member of the House;

(ii) the Chair has given written notice to the Speaker of a wish to resign as Chair;

(iii) the committee has reported a resolution that it has no confidence in the Chair and the report has been adopted by the House;

(iv) the Chair has accepted a position which is not eligible for election as Chair of a standing or standing joint committee, pursuant to Standing Order 104.1 (5); or

(v) the Chair is no longer a member of the party to which the Chair of that committee has been allocated.

114(5) During a session, a member of a standing, standing joint or special committee may only be replaced with the consent of the member, except when:

(a) The member becomes ineligible pursuant to Standing Order 104(6)(a) and

(b) or resigns from the committee pursuant to Standing Order 114(2)(d);

(b) The member ceases to be a Member of Parliament; or

(c) The member ceases to be affiliated with the party to which the committee position is allocated.",

(ii) each Standing Order listed herein be replaced with the following:

"104(1) At the commencement of the first session of each Parliament, after the election of committee chairs pursuant to Standing Order 104.1, the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, which shall consist of ten Members, including the elected Chair, and the membership of which shall continue from session to session, shall be appointed to act, among its other duties, as a striking committee. The said Committee shall prepare and report to the House within the first eight sitting days after its appointment, and thereafter, within the first eight sitting days after the commencement of each session, lists of Members to compose the standing committees of the House pursuant to Standing Order 104(2), and to act for the House on standing joint committees.

105(1) A special committee shall consist of not more than fifteen members.

(2) The Chair of a special committee shall be elected in the same manner as the election of Chairs of standing and standing joint committees, if not already designated by the Order establishing the committee.

106(1) Within eight sitting days following the adoption by the House of a report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs pursuant to Standing Order 104(1), each Chair of a standing committee shall convene its first meeting, provided that forty-eight hours' notice is given of any such meeting.

106(2)(a) At the commencement of every session and, if necessary, during the course of a session, each standing or special committee shall elect two Vice-Chairs.

(b) When the Chair is a Member of the government party, the first Vice-Chair shall be a Member of the Official Opposition, and the second Vice-Chair shall be a Member of an opposition party other than the Official Opposition.

(c) When the Chair is a Member of the Official Opposition, the first Vice-Chair shall be a Member of the government party and the second Vice-Chair shall be a Member of an opposition party other than the Official Opposition.

(d) When the Chair is a Member from neither the government party nor the Official Opposition, the first Vice-Chair shall be a Member of the government party and the second Vice-Chair shall be a Member of the Official Opposition.

(e) In the case of the Standing Joint Committee for the Scrutiny of Regulations, the first Vice-Chair shall be a Member of the government party and the second Vice-Chair shall be a Member of an opposition party other than the Official Opposition.",

(iii) Standing Order 104(2) be amended by adding, after the words "ten Members,", the words "including the elected Chair,",

(iv) Standing Order 104(3) be amended by adding, after the words "lists of Members", the words ", including the elected Joint Chair,",

(v) Standing Order 106(3) be amended by deleting each occurrence of the words "Chair or";

(d) in order to initiate debate on the matter of a petition:

(i) Standing Order 36(7) be replaced with the following:

"36(7)(a) No debate on or in relation to a petition shall be allowed on the presentation of a petition. A Member may, however, request that a take-note debate on the matter of a petition take place in the Hall pursuant to Standing Order 53.2, provided that the petition contains a total number of signatures equal to or higher than 70,000.

(b) Any Member may request a take-note debate on the matter of a petition either upon presentation of the petition, or in writing to the Speaker within ten sitting days following the presentation of the said petition.

(c) A request made pursuant to this Standing Order shall be published in the Journals and deemed referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.",

(ii) the following new Standing Orders be added:

"36.1(1)(a) At the beginning of the first session of a Parliament, and thereafter as required, the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs shall name one Member from each of the parties recognized in the House and a Chair from the government party to constitute the Subcommittee on Petitions.

(b) Upon a Member requesting a take-note debate on the matter of a petition pursuant to Standing Order 36(7), the Subcommittee on Petitions shall meet within five sitting days to consider the request for a debate.

(c) In determining whether a debate should occur in the Hall the Subcommittee shall take into consideration the following conditions:

(i) the subject has not recently been debated or is unlikely to be debated in the House in the near future; and

(ii) the subject is determined to be suitable for debate in Parliament, according to the criteria adopted by the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

(2) After having met pursuant to section (1) of this Standing Order, the Subcommittee on Petitions shall forthwith deposit with the clerk of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs a report recommending whether or not a take-note debate on the matter of a petition shall or shall not occur, giving the reasons when not recommending such a debate, and that report, which shall be deemed to have been adopted by the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, shall be presented to the House at the next earliest opportunity as a report of that Committee and shall be deemed concurred in as soon as it is presented.

53.2(1) When a report pursuant to Standing Order 36.1(2) has been presented to the House, the Clerk of the House shall cause to be placed on the Notice Paper for the Hall a notice of motion, which shall stand in the name of the Member requesting the debate. The take-note debate shall take place in the Hall within ten meetings of the Hall following the presentation of the report, at a time designated by the Deputy Speaker pursuant to Standing Order 168(3) and the motion shall be deemed moved upon commencement of the debate.

(2) The rules to apply to a take-note debate held in the Hall, whether in relation to the matter of a petition or any other subject that the House may refer to it, shall be as follows:

(a) the Minister who proposed the motion or the Member who requested the debate on the matter of a petition may speak first provided that if the Minister or Member is not present at that time, he or she is not deemed to have spoken to the motion;

(b) no Member may speak for longer than twenty minutes, provided that a Member may indicate to the Deputy Speaker that he or she will be dividing his or her time with another Member, and each speech may be followed by a period of not more than ten minutes for questions and comments;

(c) when no Member rises to speak or after three hours of debate, whichever is earlier, the debate shall end; and

(d) the ordinary time of daily adjournment and any proceedings pursuant to Standing Order 38 shall be delayed accordingly.";

(e) in order to establish a second, parallel debating chamber:

(i) the following new Standing Orders be added after Standing Order 159:

"160(1) The Hall shall be established as a committee of the House to consider, in addition to any matters referred to it by the House from time to time, the following items of business:

(a) Private Members' Business;

(b) Statements by Members (pursuant to Standing Order 31);

(c) Routine Proceedings, which shall be as follows:

(i) Tabling of Documents (pursuant to Standing Orders 32 or 109);

(ii) Statements by Ministers (pursuant to Standing Order 33);

(iii) Presenting Reports from Interparliamentary Delegations (pursuant to Standing Order 34);

(iv) Presenting Reports from Committees (pursuant to Standing Order 35);

(v) Introduction of Private Members' Bills; and

(vi) Presenting Petitions (pursuant to Standing Order 36(6)).

(d) Take-Note Debates on petitions (pursuant to Standing Order 53.2);

(e) Adjournment proceedings (pursuant to Standing Order 38);

(f) Emergency Debates (pursuant to Standing Order 52);

(g) Take-Note Debates (pursuant to Standing Orders 53.1 and 53.2);

(h) Debate on a motion to concur in a committee report or for the continuation of such a debate (pursuant to Standing Order 66);

(i) Other items referred from the House or, on agreement of the House, by a committee of the House.

(2) Nothing in the provisions related to the Hall should be interpreted as preventing any business from being considered by the House. The Hall is a supplementary and parallel venue through which House business can be conducted.

(3) The Clerk of the Hall shall record the proceedings of the Hall as the Minutes of Proceedings of the Hall. The minutes shall form part of a distinct section in the Journals of the House.

161(1) The Hall shall meet from Monday through Friday during weeks on which the House is scheduled to sit, subject to Standing Order 28, unless otherwise provided by Standing or Special Order of the House.

(2) On Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays, the Hall shall meet in a location determined by the Speaker of the House. On Fridays, the Hall shall meet in the House of Commons chamber.

(3) The Hall shall meet on Mondays at 11 a.m., on Tuesdays and Thursdays at 10 a.m., on Wednesdays at 3:30 p.m., and on Fridays at 9:00 a.m.

(4) Except as otherwise provided for in the Standing Orders, at 6:30 p.m. on any sitting day except Friday, the Chair shall deem a motion to adjourn the sitting until the next sitting day moved and seconded, whereupon such motion shall be debatable for not more than thirty minutes. The "Adjournment Proceedings" shall be taken up pursuant to Standing Order 38. At the conclusion of debate on the motion to adjourn, the Chair shall deem the motion to adjourn to have been carried and shall adjourn the sitting until the next sitting day. At 2:30 p.m. on Fridays, the Chair shall adjourn the Hall to the next meeting day.

(5) The hours and days of meetings of the Hall shall be subjected to the following exceptions:

(a) The Hall shall not meet until the second Monday after the commencement of each Session.

(b) The Chair shall suspend the meeting:

(i) when the bells ring to call in the Members to any recorded division in the House. The Chair shall not convene or resume a meeting when the bells are ringing or during the taking of a recorded division in the House.

(ii) from 2 p.m. until 3:30 p.m. on Mondays, Tuesdays, and Thursdays, and at any other time Statements by Members and Oral Questions may be taken up in the House;

(iii) when, in the opinion of the Chair, the presence of members is expected in the House for other reasons;

(iv) between items of business, except to proceed to the Adjournment Proceedings, unless there is unanimous consent of the Members present to continue to meet and proceed with the next scheduled item of business;

(v) at any time when debate on an item of Private Members' Business has been concluded prior to the normal time provided for that debate, or has been interrupted pursuant to paragraph (e) of this section, unless the sponsor of the next scheduled item is present and there is unanimous consent of the Members to proceed without suspending.

(c) The Deputy Speaker may, at his or her discretion, extend the hours of the meeting when an Order of the House is adopted pursuant to Standing Order 27(1) or if the hours of sitting of the House are extended by special order. In doing so, the Deputy Speaker shall determine the schedule according to requests arising from consultations under Standing Order 168(2).

(d) A period of time corresponding to the time taken for suspensions or delays in convening as a consequence of the bells ringing or the taking of recorded division, or for other interruptions, shall be added to the time provided for the order of business that was interrupted or delayed. Other orders of business and, where applicable, the ordinary time of daily adjournment, shall be delayed accordingly.

(e)(i) If a period of time of ten minutes or less is taken from an item of Private Members' Business considered in the Hall as a consequence of a suspension or delay, a period of time corresponding to the time of the delay or interruption shall be added to the end of the hour, delaying the next order of business accordingly and taking as much time of the business set out in section (6) of this Standing Order as necessary. On Fridays, business scheduled pursuant to Standing Order 168(3) shall be delayed accordingly.

(ii) If a period of more than ten minutes is taken, the said Private Members' Business, or any remaining portion, shall be added to the business of the Hall on a day to be determined by the Deputy Speaker pursuant to Standing Order 168(3), who shall designate a day and time for the item to be resumed within the next ten meetings of the Hall following the delay or interruption.

(6)(a) At 1:30 p.m. on Mondays, Tuesdays, and Thursdays, at 4 p.m. on Wednesdays, and at 9:30 a.m. on Fridays, the Hall shall proceed to Routine Proceedings for a period not exceeding 30 minutes, which shall be as follows:

Tabling of Documents (pursuant to Standing Orders 32 or 109);

Statements by Ministers (pursuant to Standing Order 33);

Presenting Reports from Interparliamentary Delegations (pursuant to Standing Order 34)

Presenting Reports from Committees (pursuant to Standing Order 35)

Introduction of Private Members' Bills

Presenting Petitions (pursuant to Standing Order 36(6))

(b) When the time provided pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section is delayed for more than thirty minutes as a consequence of a suspension or delay pursuant to paragraph (5)(e) of this Standing Order, Routine Proceedings shall not be taken up that day.

(7) The order of business of the Hall shall be as follows:

(a) 30 minutes of Statements by Members, pursuant to Standing Order 31, at the beginning of each sitting;

(b) Private Members' Business shall be taken up for:

(i) two hours on Mondays, from 11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.;

(ii) three hours on Tuesdays and Thursdays, from 10:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.; and

(iii) four hours on Fridays, from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.;

c) 30 minutes of adjournment proceedings, pursuant to Standing Order 38, at the end of each day except on Fridays.

162 All Members shall be members of the Hall.

163(1) The presence of at least one government member, one opposition member and the Chair shall be necessary to constitute a meeting of the Hall.

(2) If at any time during a meeting a quorum is not present, the Chair shall suspend the meeting until there be a quorum, or until the time scheduled for the next order of business. If there is no further business scheduled, the Chair shall adjourn until the next meeting.

(3) Whenever the Chair adjourns the Hall for want of a quorum, the time of the adjournment, and the names of the Members then present, shall be inserted in the Minutes of Proceedings of the Hall.

164(1) The Standing Orders of the House shall be observed in the Hall so far as may be applicable.

(2) The provisions of Standing Orders 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 67.1, and 78 shall not apply to meetings of the Hall.

(3) Dilatory motions shall not be admissible during meetings of the Hall, except where provided for in the provisions of these Standing Orders.

(4) At any time, a Minister may move in the House, without notice, a motion to be decided immediately without debate or amendment, requiring that an item of business under Government Orders be reported back to the House for further consideration. Notwithstanding Standing Order 171, when such a motion is adopted, the item in question must be reported back to the House at the earliest opportunity during the sitting. Any such report filed with the Clerk of the House shall be deemed presented to the House. The Speaker shall inform the House at the earliest opportunity that a report has been received and an entry in relation thereto shall be inserted in the Journals of that sitting. The item shall again be considered in the House on a day and at a time determined by the government, but no later than at the conclusion of the fourth sitting day after the motion was adopted.

(5) A motion, or an amendment to a motion, of censure of or non-confidence in the government shall be inadmissible in the Hall.

165 In addition to the Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees of the Whole, the following Members may chair the Hall:

(a) Any Assistant Deputy Speaker; and

(b) Any member of the Panel of Chairs, appointed pursuant to Standing Order 112, when so requested by the Deputy Speaker, in the absence of the Deputy Speaker or one of the Assistant Deputy Speakers.

166(1) The Chair shall have the same responsibility to maintain and preserve order and decorum in the Hall as the Speaker has in the House, deciding all question of order, provided that the Chair shall not entertain questions of privilege. No debate shall be permitted on any decision.

(2) A decision of the Chair may not be subject to an appeal to the Hall but may be brought to the attention of the Speaker by any Member and the Speaker shall have the power to rule on the matter.

(3) If any Member persistently disregards the authority of the Chair, the Chair may order the Member to withdraw from the room until the next order of business, or for the remainder of that meeting. No such order shall be subject to an appeal to the Speaker or the House.

(4) In the event of a Member disregarding an order of the Chair pursuant to section (3) of this Standing Order, the Chair shall order security personnel to remove the Member. Notwithstanding any action taken pursuant to this Standing Order, the Chair may report the conduct of a Member to the House by rising in the House pursuant to Standing Order 47.

167(1) The Hall shall not make any decisions on any item of business.

(2) At the expiry of the time allotted to any item of business where a decision is required, the Chair shall report the question to the House; and any question shall be put in accordance with Standing Order 171.

(3) Any debate on an item of business under consideration by the Hall shall adjourn following an order of the House requiring it to be reported back to the House pursuant to Standing Order 164(4).

168(1) The business taken up at any meeting of the Hall shall be such as the Deputy Speaker shall appoint, except when otherwise ordered by the Speaker or the House.

(2) For any business pursuant to section (3) of this Standing Order, the Deputy Speaker shall determine the business taken up by the Hall, following consultations; and, when possible, the time allotted for proceedings shall be divided as equitably as practical according to requests arising from those consultations.

(3) For any meeting of the Hall, the Deputy Speaker shall schedule the business to be considered during the time not otherwise provided for in Standing Orders 161(5), 161(6) and 161(7) according to requests arising from consultations under section (2) of this Standing Order.

(4) In consultation with the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker shall:

(a) make all arrangements necessary to ensure the orderly conduct of the Hall;

(b) ensure that all Members have not less than 24 hours' notice of the order of business to be considered in the Hall;

(c) ensure that the notice required is published, in a distinct and dedicated section of the Notice Paper;

(d) include in this section a list of all questions or matters reported to but not yet disposed of by the House.

169(1) If a motion is moved in the House by a Minister of the Crown to have an order of the day be proceeded with at a meeting of the Hall, the question shall be put immediately without debate or amendment. In putting the question on the motion, the Speaker shall ask those Members who object to rise in their places. If 15 or more Members rise, the motion shall be deemed to have been withdrawn; otherwise, the motion shall have been adopted.

(2) When a motion under section (1) is adopted, the Deputy Speaker shall schedule the business to be considered in the Hall during the time not otherwise provided for in Standing Orders 161(5), 161(6), and 161(7).

170(1) In the Hall, the Standing Orders, as they relate to the rules of debate and time limits for speeches, shall apply, subject to the following provisions:

(a) During debate on an item of business, a Member may rise and, if recognized by the Chair, ask the Chair whether the Member speaking is willing to give way. The Member speaking shall either:

(i) refuse to give way and continue speaking; or

(ii) accept to give way and allow the Member to ask a short question or make a brief response immediately relevant to the Member's speech. Such an intervention may not exceed 30 seconds.

(b) In any case, if a Member making the request causes disorder, the Chair may, at his or her discretion, interrupt the Member and give the floor to the Member making a speech.

(2) Any period of time taken from a Member during a speech for interventions made under paragraph (1)(a) of this Standing Order or for points of order, shall not be deducted from the time allocated to that Member's speaking time.

(3) Notwithstanding any provisions of the Standing Orders, in the Hall, less formal rules of debate may be allowed at the discretion of the Deputy Speaker. As such, unless a Member present objects, the Deputy Speaker may allow a Member, among other matters, to speak twice on a motion, to use visual aids if necessary, to ask a question to the sponsor of the Private Members' Business item being debated, or to participate in a debate in a manner not expressly provided for in the Standing Orders.

171(1) Notwithstanding Standing Order 164(4), when the Hall has completed consideration of a motion, bill or any other item of business, or upon conclusion of an item of business to be reported to the House, the Clerk of the Hall shall create a report to the House which shall include a certified copy of any bill or item of business to be reported to the House, together with any schedules of amendments and unresolved questions, and shall deposit the report with the Clerk of the House after the adjournment of the Hall.

(2) Receipt by the Clerk of the House of a report from the Clerk of the Hall shall be deemed for all purposes to constitute the report being laid before the House, and any such receipt shall be inserted in the Journals of the House.

(3) Once a report has been received by the House, all questions requiring a decision from the House shall be put successively without debate or amendment at each sitting during Routine Proceedings provided that any recorded division demanded shall be deferred to the next sitting day at the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions. Any recorded division demanded during Routine Proceedings on a Thursday shall be deferred to the following Monday at the ordinary hour of daily adjournment.",

(ii) each Standing Order listed herein be replaced as follows:

"28(1)(a) The House and the Hall shall not meet on New Year's Day, the day fixed for the celebration of the birthday of the Sovereign, St. John the Baptist Day, Dominion Day, Labour Day, Thanksgiving Day, Remembrance Day and Christmas Day. When St. John the Baptist Day and Dominion Day fall on a Tuesday, the House and the Hall shall not meet the preceding day.

(b) The Hall shall meet on Fridays during weeks where the House is scheduled to sit pursuant to this Standing Order, provided that it shall not meet on Good Friday and, when St. John the Baptist Day and Dominion Day fall on a Thursday, the Hall shall not meet the following day.

31 A Member, other than a Minister of the Crown, may be recognized, under the provisions of Standing Orders 30(5) or 161(7)(a), to make a statement for not more than one minute. The Speaker or the Chair of the Hall, as the case may be, may order a Member to resume his or her seat if, in their opinion, improper use is made of this Standing Order.

36(6)(a) Members desiring to present a petition may do so during Routine Proceedings in the House under the rubric "Presenting Petitions", a period not to exceed 15 minutes.

(b) Provided that it has not been presented to the House, Members may also present a petition in the Hall during Routine Proceedings under the rubric "Presenting Petitions". This period shall not exceed the time provided for Routine Proceedings as set out in Standing Order 161(6).

38(3) When several Members have given notices of intention to raise matters during Adjournment Proceedings, the Speaker shall decide the order and if such matters are to be raised in the House or in the Hall. In doing so, the Speaker shall have regard to the order in which notices were given, to the urgency of the matters raised, and to the apportioning of the opportunities to debate such matters among the Members of the various parties in the House. The Speaker may, at his or her discretion, consult with representatives of the parties concerning such order and be guided by their advice. The Speaker may also consult the Deputy Speaker for matters concerning the Hall.

38(4) By not later than 5 p.m. on any Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday, the Speaker shall indicate to the House and the Deputy Speaker shall indicate to the Hall the matter or matters to be raised during Adjournment Proceedings that day.

52(2) Members wishing to move, "That this House do now adjourn" or "That the Hall has considered an urgent matter" under the provisions of this Standing Order shall give to the Speaker, at least one hour prior to raising it in the House, a written statement of the matter proposed to be discussed

52(3) When requesting leave to propose an emergency debate, the Member shall:

(a) rise in his or her place and present without argument the statement referred to in section (2) of this Standing Order;

(b) specify whether they wish to have the debate take place in the House or in the Hall.

52(8) If the Speaker so desires, the decision upon whether the matter is proper to be discussed may be deferred until later in the sitting, when the proceedings of the House may be interrupted for the purpose of announcing the decision.

52(9)(a) If the Speaker is satisfied that the matter is proper to be discussed and that the debate is to take place in the House, the motion shall stand over until the ordinary hour of daily adjournment on that day, provided that the Speaker, at his or her discretion, may direct that the motion shall be set down for consideration on the following sitting day at an hour specified by the Speaker;

(b) If the Speaker decides that the debate is to take place in the Hall, the Speaker shall instruct the Deputy Speaker to place the emergency debate on the order of the day of the Hall on that day or on the following day that is not a Friday, at a time specified by the Deputy Speaker pursuant to Standing Order 168(3).

52(12)(a) The proceedings on any motion being considered in the House, pursuant to section (9)(a) of this Standing Order, may continue beyond the ordinary hour of daily adjournment but, when debate thereon is concluded prior to that hour in any sitting, it shall be deemed withdrawn. Subject to any motion adopted pursuant to Standing Order 26(2), at 12:00 midnight on any sitting day, the Speaker shall declare the motion carried and forthwith adjourn the House until the next sitting day. In any other case, the Speaker, when satisfied that the debate has been concluded, shall declare the motion carried and forthwith adjourn the House until the next sitting day.

(b) The proceedings on any motion being considered in the Hall, pursuant to section (9)(b) of this Standing Order, may only take place during times scheduled pursuant to Standing Order 168(3). At the expiry of the time scheduled by the Deputy Speaker, the motion shall be deemed carried and the Hall shall proceed with the next item of business.

53.1(2)(a) A take-note debate ordered by the House shall begin at the ordinary hour of daily adjournment and any proceedings pursuant to Standing Order 38 shall be suspended on that day.

(b) If a take-note debate is to take place in the Hall, it shall begin at the time set for business scheduled pursuant to Standing Order 168(3).

66(2) A motion for the concurrence in a report from a standing or special committee, when moved in the House, shall receive not more than three hours of consideration, after which time, unless previously disposed of, the Speaker shall interrupt and put all questions necessary to dispose of the motion without further debate or amendment, provided that, if debate is adjourned or interrupted:

(a) the motion shall again be considered either in the House on a day designated by the government after consultation with the House Leaders of the other parties, or in the Hall on a day and at a time designated by the Deputy Speaker pursuant to Standing Order 168(3), but, in any case, not later than the eighth sitting day after the interruption;

(i) when debate on the motion is continued in the House, it shall be resumed at the ordinary hour of daily adjournment on the day designated pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section and shall not be further interrupted or adjourned,

(ii) when debate on the motion is continued in the Hall, it shall be resumed at a time designated by the Deputy Speaker pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section, and shall not be further adjourned or interrupted, except if required in accordance with Standing Order 161(5)(b) in which case the adjournment proceedings shall be delayed accordingly;

(b) when no Member rises to speak or after three hours of debate, whichever is earlier:

(i) If the debate on the motion for concurrence has been concluded in the House, the Speaker shall put all questions necessary to dispose of the motion, provided that any recorded division demanded on the motion shall stand deferred to an appointed time on the next Wednesday, no later than the expiry of the time provided for Government Orders on that day.

(ii) If the debate on the motion for concurrence has been concluded in the Hall, the Deputy Speaker shall report the motion to the House pursuant to Standing Order 171.

86.1 At the beginning of the second or a subsequent session of a Parliament,

(1) All items of Private Members' Business originating in the House of Commons that were listed on the Order Paper during the previous session shall be deemed to have been considered and approved at all stages completed at the time of prorogation and shall stand, if necessary, on the Order Paper or, as the case may be, referred to committee.

(2) The List for the Consideration of Private Members' Business established pursuant to Standing Order 87 shall continue from session to session. The items on the second order of precedence at the time of prorogation shall be added at the beginning of the first order of precedence at the time of prorogation and together shall constitute a new first order of precedence.

87(1)(a)(i) At the beginning of the first session of a Parliament, the List for the Consideration of Private Members' Business shall be established by adding first the names of eligible Members from the List for the Consideration of Private Members' Business of the preceding Parliament, in the same order they were at dissolution, retaining only the names of any returning Member of the House. Then, after notifying all Members of the time, date and place, the Clerk of the House, acting on behalf of the Speaker, shall, conduct a random draw of the names of all remaining Members of the House which shall be added to that List. On the sixteenth sitting day following the draw, the first ninety names on the List shall, subject to paragraph (c) of this Standing Order, constitute the first order of precedence.

89 The order for the first consideration of any motion or subsequent stages of a bill already considered during Private Members' Business, of second reading of a private bill and of second reading of a private Member's public bill originating in the Senate shall be placed at the bottom of the first order of precedence. The order for the second consideration of any such item shall be added to the bottom of the second order of precedence.

91 Notwithstanding Standing Orders 30(6) and 161(7), the consideration of Private Members' Business shall be suspended at the beginning of the first session of a Parliament and, at the time otherwise provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business,

(i) the House shall continue to consider any business before it until a first order of precedence is established pursuant to Standing Order 87(1);

(ii) the business of the Hall shall be scheduled in the manner provided for in Standing Order 168.

93(1)(a) Except as provided for in Standing Order 96(1), unless previously disposed of, bills at the second reading stage or motions shall receive not more than two hours of consideration pursuant to Standing Order 89 and, unless previously disposed of, shall be again considered only when it reaches the top of the second order of precedence.

(b) Provided that:

(i) when proceedings then before the House are disposed of, every question necessary to dispose of the motion or of the bill at the second reading stage, shall be put forthwith and successively without further debate or amendment;

(ii) unless otherwise disposed of, at the end of the time provided for the consideration of the said item, any proceedings then before the Hall shall be interrupted and the item reported to the House pursuant to Standing Order 171.

(c) Any recorded division on an item of Private Members' Business demanded pursuant to Standing Order 45(1) shall be deferred to the next Wednesday, immediately before the time provided for Private Members' Business.

94(1)(a) The Speaker shall make all arrangements necessary to ensure the orderly conduct of Private Members' Business including ensuring that:

(i) at the beginning of a Parliament, Private Members' Business in the House not begin earlier than forty-eight hours after the presentation of the first report presented pursuant to Standing Order 91.1(2);

(ii) at the beginning of a Parliament, Private Members' Business in the Hall, begin eight sitting days following consideration of items pursuant to subparagraph (i) of this section;

(iii) all Members have not less than twenty-four hours' notice of items to be considered during Private Members' Business; and

(iv) the notices required by subparagraph (iii) of this paragraph is published in the Notice Paper for the House and for the Hall.

94(1)(b)(i) In the event of it not being possible to provide the notice required by subparagraphs (a)(iii) or (a)(iv) of this section, Private Members' Business shall be suspended for that day and the House shall continue with or revert to the business before it prior to Private Members' Business until the ordinary hour of daily adjournment.

(ii) In the event of it not being possible to provide notice of an item of Private Members' Business pursuant to Standing Order 168(4), the hour provided for the said item to be considered by the Hall shall be suspended until the next order of business. The said item shall retain its place in the order of precedence.

94(2)(b) In the event that the Speaker has been unable to arrange an exchange,

(i) the House shall continue with the business before it prior to Private Members' Business,

(ii) the Deputy Speaker shall schedule the business to be considered in the Hall pursuant to Standing Order 168(3).

97(2)(a) When debate on a motion for the production of papers being considered during Private Members' Business has taken place for a total time of one hour and fifty minutes, in the manner provided for in Standing Order 89, the debate shall at that point be interrupted whereupon a Minister of the Crown or a Parliamentary Secretary speaking on behalf of the Minister, whether or not such Minister or Parliamentary Secretary has already spoken, may speak for not more than five minutes, following which the mover of the motion may close the debate by speaking for not more than five minutes, after which, unless otherwise disposed of,

(i) any proceedings then before the House shall be interrupted and every question necessary to dispose of the motion, shall be put forthwith and successively without further debate or amendment; or

(ii) any proceedings then before the Hall shall be interrupted and the item reported to the House pursuant to Standing Order 171.

(b) Any recorded division on an item of Private Members' Business demanded pursuant to Standing Order 45(1) shall be deferred to the next Wednesday, immediately before the time provided for Private Members' Business.

98(2) The report and third reading stages of a Private Member's bill shall be taken up on two days pursuant to Standing Order 89 and, unless previously disposed of, the order for the remaining stage or stages shall be again considered when the said bill reaches the top of the second order of precedence.

98(3)(a) When the report or third reading stages of the said bill are before the House on the first of the days provided pursuant to section (2) of this Standing Order, and if the said bill has not been disposed of prior to the end of the first thirty minutes of consideration, during any time then remaining, any one Member may propose a motion to extend the time for the consideration of any remaining stages on the second of the said days during a period not exceeding five consecutive hours, provided that:

(i) the motion shall be put forthwith without debate or amendment and shall be deemed withdrawn if fewer than twenty Members rise in support thereof; and

(ii) a subsequent such motion shall not be put unless there has been an intervening proceeding.

(b) When a motion is adopted pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section, the item shall be dropped to the bottom of the first order of precedence after having been once considered, notwithstanding Standing Order 89, and shall be again considered in the House, notwithstanding Standing Order 88, only when it reaches the top of the said order of precedence, at the end of the time provided for Private Members' Business, except on a Monday when the period shall begin at the ordinary hour of daily adjournment.

98(4)(a) On the second day provided pursuant to section (2) of this Standing Order, unless previously disposed of, at the end of the time provided for the consideration thereof,

(i) any proceedings then before the House shall be interrupted and every question necessary to dispose of the then remaining stage or stages of the said bill shall be put forthwith and successively without further debate or amendment;

(ii) any proceedings then before the Hall shall be interrupted and the item reported to the House pursuant to Standing Order 171.

99(1)(a) The proceedings on Private Members' Business in the House shall not be suspended except as provided for in Standing Orders 2(3), 30(4), 30(7), 52(14), 83(2), 91, 92(1)(b) and 94(1)(b) or as otherwise specified by Special Order of this House. No Private Members' Business shall be taken up in the House on days appointed for the consideration of business pursuant to Standing Order 53 nor on days, other than Mondays, appointed for the consideration of business pursuant to Standing Order 81(18).

(b) The proceedings on Private Members' Business in the Hall shall not be suspended except as provided for in Standing Orders 91, 94(1)(b), and 161(5), or as otherwise specified by Special Order of this House.",

(iii) the following new Standing Orders be added:

"28(6) On Fridays when the House is adjourned and the Hall has met, the Minutes of Proceedings of the Hall, along with any report deposited pursuant to Standing Order 171, shall be published in the Journals.

35(3) No reports pursuant to Standing Orders 91.1(2), 92(3), 97.1(1), 104(1), 119.1(2), and 123 may be presented to the Hall.

66(2.1) A motion for the concurrence in a report from a standing or special committee may be debated in the Hall provided that a similar motion has not been moved in the House and that the debate be requested and scheduled by the Deputy Speaker pursuant to Standing Order 168(3), and that, after three hours of consideration, unless previously disposed of, the Deputy Speaker shall report the motion to the House pursuant to Standing Order 171.

88 The first hour of debate on any item of Private Members' Business pursuant to Standing Orders 93(1) and 98(2) shall be considered by the House from Monday to Thursday at the time provided for in Standing Order 30(6), and by the Hall on Fridays at the time provided for in Standing Order 161(7). The second hour of debate shall be considered by the Hall from Monday to Thursday at the time provided for in Standing Order 161(7).",

(iv) Standing Order 30(3) be amended by replacing the words "At 3:00 p.m. on Mondays and Wednesdays, at 10:00 a.m. on Tuesdays and Thursdays, and at 12:00 noon on Fridays, the House shall proceed to the ordinary daily routine of business, which shall be as follows:" with the words "At 3:00 p.m. on Mondays and Wednesdays, and at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesdays and Thursdays, the House shall proceed to Routine Proceedings, which shall be as follows: Reports from the Hall (pursuant to Standing Order 171)",

(v) Standing Order 52(1) be amended by adding, after the word "consideration", the words "or for a motion to consider such a matter in the Hall",

(vi) Standing Order 52(4) be amended by adding, after the word "discussed", the words "and shall decide if the debate shall occur in the House or in the Hall",

(vii) Standing Order 52(10) be amended by deleting the words "on any day, except Friday," and by adding, after the words "same day", the words "in the House",

(viii) Standing Order 53.1(1) be amended by adding, after the words "designating a day", the words "and place",

(ix) Standing Order 53.1(3) be amended by adding, after the words "to a debate", the words "in the House",

(x) Standing Order 66(3) be amended by adding, after the words "be moved", the words "in the House",

(xi) Standing Orders 87(1)(b), (c), (d), 87(5), 91.1(1), 92.1(3), (4), (5), and 98(1) each be amended by replacing each occurrence of the words "order of precedence" with the words "first order of precedence",

(xii) Standing Order 87(2) be amended by replacing the words "order of precedence" with the words "first order of precedence", and replacing the word "fifteen" with the word "forty",

(xiii) Standing Order 87(3) be amended by replacing the word "fifteen" with the word "fifty", and adding, after the words "names of all", the word "eligible",

(xiv) Standing Order 87(4) be amended by replacing the words "of an order" with the words "a first order",

(xv) Standing Order 90 be deleted,

(xvi) Standing Order 92.1(2) be amended by replacing the word "five" with the word "four", and replacing the words "Order of Precedence" with the words "first order of precedence",

(xvii) Standing Order 93(2) be deleted,

(xviii) Standing Order 93(3) be renumbered 93(2),

(xix) Standing Order 94(2)(a) be amended by replacing the words "by the order" with the words "by any of the orders", and replacing the words "placed in the order" with the words "placed within the same order",

(xx) Standing Order 95(1) be amended in the French version by deleting the words "la Chambre étudie", and adding, after the word "vote", the words "est à l'étude",

(xxi) Standing Order 97(1) be amended by adding, after the word "called", the words "in the House",

(xxii) Standing Order 97.1(2)(c) be amended by adding, after the word "Business", the words "in the House";

(f) the Standing Orders, as amended, take effect at the beginning of the 43rd Parliament;

(g) the amendments to the Standing Orders outlined in (e), and other correlative changes, take effect provisionally at the beginning of the 43rd Parliament, that two years after their implementation, the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs undertake a review of their application and make recommendations on whether to amend the provisional Standing Orders, to continue with them provisionally, to make them permanent, or to rescind them, and that the said Standing Orders remain in effect until such time as the Committee has presented its report and the report has been concurred in by the House;

(h) the name of the Hall be chosen by the House at the beginning of the 43rd Parliament, by secret ballot, provided that any suggested name for the Hall on the ballot be signed by at least 20 Members of the House;

(i) the Clerk of the House be authorized to make any required editorial and consequential alterations to the Standing Orders, including to the marginal notes, as well as such changes to the Order Paper and Notice Paper, as may be required; and

(j) the Clerk of the House be instructed to print a revised edition of the Standing Orders of the House.

● (1420)

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am sure you enjoyed that reading.

Before I start talking about the motion, I would like to point out that none of the ideas in the motion are mine. Not only that, I did not write most of the motion. Therefore, people cannot get mad at me for its being so long to read. It was actually the work of many members of this House of Commons, and I would like to thank them.

I will start with the Conservative member for Lanark—Frontenac—Kingston, who collaborated on this along with his assistant, Dennis Laurie. I would also like to thank the Conservative member for Wellington—Halton Hills, the NDP member for Elmwood—Transcona and the NDP member for Victoria, who also collaborated with me on parts of this motion. The Green Party member for Saanich—Gulf Islands also contributed, as well as the Liberal member for Coast of Bays—Central—Notre Dame and the Liberal member for Laurentides—Labelle.

All of these people, and many more, helped put this together. It was a project done by many people in the House, and I would like to thank them. In addition, I really have to thank the procedural clerk, Ms. Isabelle Dumas, who probably saw far more of me than she wanted to as we were working on this.

Fundamentally, this motion is trying to do one thing.

I would take members back to ancient Greece, the foundation of democracy, and Pericles' *Funeral Oration*. Normally, a funeral oration was given at the end of a year of war to recognize the dead, but in his oration, Pericles did something unique. He asked what they died for, what they fought for, and he talked about their way of government: democracy. He said, "[W]e are called a democracy, for the administration is in the hands of the many and not of the few."

That was 2,450 years ago, and to this day, the battle of democracies versus autocracies exists. In fact, scholars tell us that right now we are in what is called the third wave of autocratization, as opposed democratization. All over the world, democratic principles and institutions are being attacked, and this could be through lack of a free media, lack of fair and open elections, a leader of a great nation declaring himself leader for life, fake elections, or a leader attacking democratic institutions.

Canada has not been immune to this. Over the last 30 years, we have seen a centralization of power more and more towards the centre: less and less for the many, and more and more for the few.

This motion seeks to address that by doing three things. It seeks to take power and give it back: one, to the Speaker; two, to members of Parliament; and three, to our citizens. I believe that, in so doing, we will get a better and stronger democracy.

What will they do?

Mr. Speaker, you have the title "Speaker", because it is your role to decide who speaks. However, over the last 25 years in Canada, there has been a perversion of the Westminster system, which does not exist anywhere else, where you are no longer the Speaker, and I mean no disrespect, but you are now the reader of a list, and that is not how our democracy was meant to be. I sincerely believe that if you had your full powers, Mr. Speaker, we would have far more civility in the House of Commons and far better debate.

Two, as a member of Parliament, I am here to represent my constituents, and I need more freedom to do that. I need the freedom that existed here in Canada and elsewhere before it became centralized. We need to put it back in the hands of the many. In doing so, I would be able to present this motion. I am doing it at the last minute because I was lucky, or unlucky, depending on how we look at it, to have my motion come up at this time. However, if we make the changes in this motion, every member of Parliament can expect to have a private member's bill during his or her time here.

As well, committees would have a leader chosen by the House. The job of a committee is to take bills from the government, review them and report back to the House, not to the leadership. If we elect our committees, and have them elected through the entire House, they would have the legitimacy of the House.

● (1425)

The third thing this motion would do is give powers to our citizens. Right now, we talk to our citizens once every four years when we ask whom they want to elect. However, this motion would allow that, if there is a matter of great importance to people and they are able to get 70,000 citizens to sign a petition, we would debate it in Parliament. There would be an interaction there. A lot of people tell me that this is inside baseball and nobody cares about this. I disagree. When I have talked to citizens, they tell me that they want us to be more civil to one another; they want us to be more productive; and they want us to have better, truer debates. I firmly believe that this motion would bring us there.

Given our lack of time, it is unlikely that this motion will come to a vote. I recognize that, but it does not take away from the importance of our discussing it. I believe our democracy in Canada is one of our most precious gifts. It reminds me a bit of health. They say we never appreciate our health until we lose it. Not just around the world but here in Canada, we are seeing our democracies reduced.

Last week, we commemorated 75 years since D-Day. There are people who do not exist because their grandfather or grandmother died in the Second World War. They are not here, do not exist. My grandfather fought but luckily survived. I believe, sincerely, that we honour them and we honour their sacrifices by not taking our democracy for granted. I believe that, by making these changes to our democracy, we will strengthen it. In so doing, we will ensure that the administration of our democracy is in the hands of the many and not the few.

● (1430)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The hon. member for Pierrefonds—Dollard will have approximately eight minutes coming to him when Motion No. 231 comes back before the House. He will also have five minutes of questions coming to him. I am sure we all look forward to hearing that.

The time provided for consideration of private members' business has now expired and the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

[*Translation*]

It being 2:30 p.m. the House stands adjourned until Monday at 11 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1). Have a good weekend, everyone.

(The House adjourned at 2:30 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Friday, June 14, 2019

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

ORAL QUESTIONS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS