



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 151 No. 266
Tuesday, December 12, 2023

Speaker: The Honourable Greg Fergus



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, December 12, 2023

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayer

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

● (1000)

[English]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2) and consistent with the policy on the tabling of treaties in Parliament, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the treaty entitled “Convention relating to the distribution of programme-carrying signals transmitted by satellite”, done at Brussels on May 21, 1974.

* * *

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8)(a), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 31 petitions. These returns will be tabled in an electronic format.

* * *

[Translation]

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

Mrs. Marie-France Lalonde (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1), I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the report of the Canada-France Interparliamentary Association regarding its participation in the 49th annual meeting in Île-de-France and Normandy, France, from April 1 to 8, 2023.

Mr. Francis Drouin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1), I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, four reports from the Canadian Branch of the Assemblée parlementaire de la Francophonie or APF.

The first report deals with its participation in the meetings of the Parliamentary Affairs Committee and the Network of Women Par-

liamentarians of the APF, held in Rabat from March 1 to 3, 2023. The second report covers its participation in the 29th assembly of the Africa Region of the APF, held in Niamey, Republic of Niger, from May 16 to 18, 2023. The third report is on its participation in the mission to the United Nations in New York on June 9, 2023. The last report is on its participation in the IX Jeux de La Francophonie, held in Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of the Congo, from August 3 to 7, 2023.

* * *

[English]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PUBLIC SAFETY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. Heath MacDonald (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the tenth report of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security in relation to Bill C-320, an act to amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act. The committee has studied the bill and has decided to report the bill back to the House without amendment.

SCIENCE AND RESEARCH

Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 108(3)(i), I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the eighth report of the Standing Committee on Science and Research, entitled “Government of Canada’s Graduate Scholarship and Post-Doctoral Fellowship Programs”. Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this report.

● (1005)

Mr. Corey Tochor (Saskatoon—University, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party disagrees with the recommendations in this report. We do not support unfunded spending. We agree that graduate students and post-doctorate fellows play an important role within our universities and they are disproportionately affected by the carbon tax, runaway inflation, the doubling of rent and the doubling of mortgages. We all know that if the government brings forward new, unfunded spending, it is just future deficits for future generations to pay back, so we disagree with the recommendations found in this report.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Mr. John Williamson (New Brunswick Southwest, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 35th report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, entitled “Specific COVID-19 Benefits”.

Routine Proceedings

There are also three dissenting reports to this committee report. We will hear from the official opposition on one of those in a moment.

[Translation]

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

[English]

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present the Conservative Party's dissenting report.

It cost \$32 billion for political interference by this government when it ignored CRA recommendations on prepayment controls for the Canada emergency wage subsidy and the CERB and instead based the \$100-billion-plus program on the flimsiest prepayment controls.

The head of the CRA testified in committee that the Liberal cabinet overrode recommendations by the CRA on setting up more stringent prepayment controls and instead forced the department to dole out taxpayers' dollars based on a mere self-attestation despite, as the Auditor General stated, knowing full well this would lead to very large eligibility problems. Despite the Auditor General's Office stating that \$32 billion in questionable payments was hugely understated, the Government of Canada, Employment and Social Development Canada, and the CRA still questioned the feasibility and economics of pursuing ineligible claims. Thus, in order to correct this gross negligence from the Liberal government, the Conservative Party members submit four recommendations.

Recommendation one is that former minister of national revenue and current Minister of Fisheries and Oceans apologize to the Auditor General of Canada for her politically motivated attacks on the Auditor General's integrity.

Recommendation two is that the CRA immediately implement the Auditor General of Canada's methodology that calculated levels of ineligibility for the COVID benefit wage subsidy.

Recommendation three is that the CRA and Employment and Social Development Canada accept the findings of the Auditor General in their entirety and perform immediate and extensive post-payment verifications to identify payments made to ineligible recipients.

Recommendation four is that the CRA and Employment and Social Development Canada end their post-payment verification delays and work immediately to retrieve all ineligible COVID financial aid.

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the eighth report of the Standing Committee of Canadian Heritage entitled "Job Cuts Announced at CBC/Radio-Canada".

[Translation]

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Waterloo, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 54th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

[English]

Pursuant to its mandate under Standing Order 111.1, the committee has examined the proposed appointment of Mr. Eric Janse to the position of Clerk of the House of Commons. The committee recommends that the House ratify the appointment of Mr. Eric Janse to the position of Clerk of the House of Commons, and I would like to send my congratulations.

* * *

● (1010)

PETITIONS

NORTHERN RESIDENTS TAX DEDUCTION

Mr. Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Madam Speaker, I have two petitions to present today.

After eight years, this Prime Minister has made life unaffordable for Canadians with his carbon tax. Mackenzie residents are simply asking for some relief from this Liberal Prime Minister in this petition.

We, the undersigned residents of Mackenzie, B.C., call upon the House of Commons to reconsider the northern living allowance classification for Mackenzie and change from its current prescribed immediate zone of 50% deduction to full prescribed northern zone of 100% deduction.

FIREARMS

Mr. Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Madam Speaker, the second petition is from residents of Skeena—Bulkley Valley. Sadly, their own MP would not present this petition on behalf of residents of Smithers—

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The member is experienced and he knows that is a clear violation of what petitions are supposed to be.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member's point is well taken. Please do not refer to other members. As the hon. member knows, it is not admissible.

The hon. member for Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies.

Mr. Bob Zimmer: Madam Speaker, I think the point being made is that they have tried to get their local member of Parliament to do this and they will not do it—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Routine Proceedings

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I have already told the hon. member that is not permissible and the hon. member should not refer to the person, and should apologize for making that reference.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. Please forgive the Conservatives. They are about to make a very important decision on a vote. That is why they are on edge. You have asked him to apologize. He has not apologized and his own members are telling him—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Bob Zimmer: Madam Speaker, I guess if it is in the rules of the House of Commons then I will apologize, but I certainly will not apologize for speaking on behalf of residents of Skeena—Bulkley Valley.

I will speak to the petition but they are trying to interrupt—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): All the hon. member has to do is to speak to the petition and not refer to anything else.

Ms. Jenny Kwan: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am asking for the member, through you, to retract those comments. It is not following the rules—

An hon. member: He already did.

Ms. Jenny Kwan: No, he did not.

Madam Speaker, he apologized but I am asking for him to retract those comments.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): We will allow the member to go straight to the petition. If not, we will move to someone else.

The hon. member for Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies.

Mr. Bob Zimmer: Madam Speaker, I will get to the petition finally.

We, the undersigned citizens and residents of Canada draw the attention of the House of Commons to the following: Whereas the Trudeau government has attempted to ban and seize the—

An hon. member: You cannot say the Prime Minister's name.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member knows that, even if the petition says it, he cannot mention names of current members of the House.

Mr. Bob Zimmer: Madam Speaker, one more time. The Prime Minister—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Bob Zimmer: Madam Speaker, can I actually get this done? The truth hurts, I guess.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies has the floor and I will allow him to present the petition without mention of names.

Mr. Bob Zimmer: Madam Speaker, we, the undersigned citizens and residents of Canada draw the attention of the House of Commons to the following petition—

• (1015)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, the member should also know he is not allowed to read the petition. He is supposed to give the essence of the petition.

Mr. Larry Maguire: Madam Speaker, I am sure if everyone would just calm down, my colleague from Prince George would get to the intent of the petition.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): That is exactly what I just said, that the hon. member will get to the essence.

Mr. Corey Tochor: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, the government is challenging your ruling. You have asked the member to read the petition. He is reading the petition—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I asked for the essence of the petition, as is the rule for everyone.

The hon. member for Prince George, please.

Mr. Bob Zimmer: Madam Speaker, we, the undersigned citizens and residents of Canada draw the attention of the House of Commons to the following: Whereas the Prime Minister's government has attempted to ban—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Read the essence of the petition, as is the rule. Members cannot read all the articles because they will read the whole petition.

Mr. Bob Zimmer: Madam Speaker, I guess the truth hurt over there. The Liberals do not like us reading a pro law-abiding firearms petition into the record in the House of Commons.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Bob Zimmer: Madam Speaker, the Prime Minister's government has attempted to ban and seize hunting rifles and shotguns of millions of Canadians. The targeting of farmers and hunters does not fight crime.

The Prime Minister's government has failed those who participate in the Canadian traditions of sport shooting. Therefore, the undersigned petitioners call on the Government of Canada to stop any and all current and future bans on hunting and sport shooting firearms.

MILITARY CHAPLAINCY

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster, CPC): Madam Speaker, I have a few petitions to present today.

The first petition is on public prayer in the Canadian Armed Forces. The recent directive that was issued to military chaplains banning religious symbols and prayer at public ceremonies, such as that of Remembrance Day, undermines our religious freedom. Ironically, this is one of the very values that our men and women in uniform have fought to defend.

Routine Proceedings

The petitioners are calling on the House of Commons to affirm the right to public prayer in our Canadian Armed Forces.

FREEDOM OF POLITICAL EXPRESSION

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster, CPC): Madam Speaker, my next petition is with regard to Canadians having the right to be protected against discrimination. Canadians can and do face political discrimination, but it is a fundamental Canadian right to be politically active and vocal.

It is in the best interest of Canadian democracy to protect public debate and the exchange of differing ideas. Bill C-257 seeks to add protection against political discrimination to the Canadian Human Rights Act.

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster, CPC): Madam Speaker, in my final petition, the undersigned understand that adoptive and intended parents are at a disadvantage when it comes to leave and time with their children. All parents deserve equal access to parental leave benefits, and Bill C-318 would deliver this equitable access.

The Speaker has said this bill needs a royal recommendation, and the undersigned are asking that the government provide that royal recommendation to Bill C-318.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP): Madam Speaker, I will be presenting two petitions today.

The first petition is from members of my constituency who are very concerned about the climate emergency. They are asking the government to reduce emissions by at least 60% below 2005 levels, to make sure the fossil fuel industry and related infrastructure wind down, to end fossil fuel subsidies, to transition to a decarbonized economy and to focus on protecting and strengthening human rights, workers' rights and indigenous rights, sovereignty and knowledge.

There are many signatures, and I appreciate the petitioners' hard work. They want to make sure this transition happens by increasing the taxes on the wealthiest corporations and people to finance it.

EXPANDED POLYSTYRENE

Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP): Madam Speaker, the second petition is with respect to a big issue in the riding I represent of North Island—Powell River regarding foam in marine infrastructure that continues to pollute Canadian beaches. The petitioners talk about expanded polystyrene, commonly known as styrofoam, in the marine environment and the harm it causes for marine life, seafood resources and ecosystems.

These citizens are calling on the Government of Canada to prohibit the use of expanded polystyrene in the marine environment.

• (1020)

FOOD SECURITY

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have two petitions to present today, both on the same subject. One is signed by members of the North Addington Educa-

tion Centre in Kingston, and the other is signed by the St. Marguerite Bourgeoys Catholic School community.

These petitioners are calling on the federal government to implement a national school food program through budget 2024 for implementation in the fall of 2024. They bring to the government's attention Statistics Canada data from 2022 indicating that one in four children in Canada lives in a food-insecure household. They also draw to the government's attention that Canada is the only G7 country without a school food program.

Finally, they draw to the government's attention that there are 388 million children throughout the world in developed countries who benefit from such a food program, yet we do not have one in Canada.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Mr. Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon, CPC): Madam Speaker, indulge me for a moment:

Joy to the world, the Lord is come
Let Earth receive her King...

In places of worship across this country, Canadians come together to sing *Joy to the World* and other Christmas carols during Advent and the Christmas season. Unfortunately, the Canadian Human Rights Commission recently stated that this holiday is discriminatory, colonialist and intolerant to Canadian society.

My constituents reject that notion and call upon the Government of Canada to denounce the recent report by the Canadian Human Rights Commission, which discriminates against Christianity and freedom of religion for all Canadians.

HEALTH CARE WORKERS

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): Madam Speaker, I have two petitions to present today on behalf of my constituents.

The first one draws attention to the fact that only 41% of doctors with international credentials work as doctors in Canada, and 30% of nurses with international credentials work as nurses in Canada. That is about 53,000 foreign or internationally trained professionals, and many of them have great difficulty. We just had a case of that here in the Ottawa region, where an Ottawa doctor did not get her PR status.

My constituents are calling for the Minister of Employment to create a blue seal program with a 60-day standard for licensing doctors and nurses. This will make processes more streamlined and help fill Canada's shortages of health care professionals.

ENERGY SECTOR

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): Madam Speaker, my second petition draws the attention of the House to the following: The value of the energy sector is about 10% of Canada's GDP. It pays over \$26 billion in taxes at all levels of government, and it paid about \$48 billion in royalties and taxes in 2022.

Constituents are calling for Bill C-50, the “unjust transition act”, to be abandoned. They say that a central planning agenda is not fair, just or right. Instead, they would like the acceleration of Canadian energy projects and infrastructure, technology and exports and green-lighting of green energy projects.

FREEDOM OF POLITICAL EXPRESSION

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, I have a number of petitions to present to the House today.

The first is from some great people from Skeena—Bulkley Valley. I want to thank them for signing this petition in support of Bill C-257. It is a private member's bill put forward by me in the House to combat political discrimination.

Petitioners note that it should be a protected right in Canada to be free from discrimination on the basis of political views, yet there is no such protection in the Canadian Human Rights Act. They support this bill, which would add political belief and activity to the Canadian Human Rights Act as prohibited grounds of discrimination.

HUMAN RIGHTS IN ERITREA

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, next I am pleased to table a fairly lengthy petition about human rights in Eritrea, which was organized and signed by members of the Eritrean Canadian community. They are deeply concerned about the human rights situation in Eritrea and about attempts at foreign interference by Eritrea here in Canada.

To briefly go through the points, they note how Eritrea has been ruled by a brutal authoritarian dictator for the last 30 years, with no constitution, no elections, no parliament, no freedom of the press and no freedom of movement and association. Eritrea has been called the “North Korea of Africa”. They note how Eritreans continue to flee indefinite military conscription and religious persecution, how hundreds of thousands of Eritreans have fled the country, how those who have managed to flee still face intimidation and extortion from representatives and agents of the Eritrean regime abroad and how their families in Eritrea are harassed and forced to pay tens of thousands of dollars simply because their children have fled.

Petitioners note that the Eritrean embassy and other representatives of the diaspora have been utilized to surveil and monitor those in the diaspora. Various concerns are raised throughout this petition about violence that is organized outside Eritrea by the Eritrean regime. Petitioners also note the alignment of Eritrea's dictator with Vladimir Putin and the collaboration with Russia's aggressive agenda around the world.

Therefore, the petitioners call on the Government of Canada to engage Eritrean political and human rights activists and pro-democracy groups to take a leadership role among western allies to chal-

lenge the Eritrean dictators' malicious conspiracy with Vladimir Putin; to do more to combat foreign interference in Canada by Eritrea, including rejecting the entry visas of those who are affiliated with the regime; to enforce Canada's asylum laws properly against those who provide—

• (1025)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): May I remind the hon. member that we really just want a short summary of each petition and not the whole reading out of it. I know it is a lengthy one, but it does go into many details.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, I want to commend the petitioners, who have worked very hard to put many different items in this petition. I am summarizing it, but there is a great deal raised.

Petitioners want the proper enforcement of Canada's asylum laws and strengthened sanctions for human rights abusers. They also want Canada to call for the release of imprisoned journalists, including Swedish Eritrean journalist Dawit Isaak, and 11 imprisoned parliamentarians. Petros Solomon, Mahmoud Ahmed Sheriffo, Haile Woldetensae and Ogbe Abraha are political prisoners—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, the member, who has probably tabled more petitions than any other member inside the chamber, is very much aware of the rule that the member is supposed to capture the essence of the petition and not read—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I would like the hon. member to proceed, so other members can present petitions.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, I hope, partisanship aside, that I can just briefly read the names of these political prisoners, because putting their names on the record is important to them and their families. I read some of their names already. The other imprisoned Eritrean parliamentarians are Hamid Himid, Saleh Idras Kekya, Estifanos Seyoum, Berhane Ghebrezgabihier, Aster Fesehazion, Germano Nati and Beraki Gebreselassie.

Petitioners want to see advocacy for their release.

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, the next petition that I am presenting is in support of Bill C-318, for my colleague. Petitioners want to see the government support this bill and provide a royal recommendation to allow all parents to have equal access to parental leave benefits, including adoptive families.

Routine Proceedings

WOMEN'S SHELTERS

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, the next petition that I am presenting highlights the decision, according to petitioners, by the Liberal government to cut funding from women's shelters. They say that, sadly, women's shelters are seeing increased demand. They note the high cost of living and the challenges of those facing domestic violence and other areas of wasteful spending on bureaucracy and consultants, money that could be better spent on helping the most vulnerable.

Therefore, they call on the government to restore funding to women's shelters.

CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, next, I am presenting a petition that is in support of Premier Blaine Higgs in New Brunswick and his policy to protect the rights of parents. The petitioners want to see the federal government butt out and not try to insert itself into decisions that should properly be made by provinces and parents.

FALUN GONG

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, the final petition I am presenting today highlights the ongoing persecution of Falun Gong practitioners in China. Petitioners discuss the history of the petition and various human rights abuses that have taken place as part of that. They call on the Canadian Parliament and the government to take action to raise the issues of the persecution of Falun Gong more frequently and more forcefully in international fora.

I commend these petitions to the consideration of colleagues.

* * *

● (1030)

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 1861, 1863, 1864, 1867 to 1869, 1879, 1884, 1886, 1891, 1892, 1896, 1901, 1903, 1905, 1909, 1915, 1919, 1922, 1923, 1925, 1927, 1933, 1936 to 1938 and 1942.

[Text]

Question No. 1861—**Mr. Michael Kram:**

With regard to the 2 Billion Trees Program mentioned in the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources's announcement of August 2, 2023: how many of the trees were planted under (i) the Disaster Mitigation and Adaptation Fund, (ii) the Low Carbon Economy Fund, (iii) neither the Disaster Mitigation and Adaptation Fund or the Low Carbon Economy Fund?

Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in 2021-22 and 2022-23, over 110 million trees have been planted towards the federal government's commitment to plant two billion incremental trees over 10 years.

With regard to (i), no trees planted under the Disaster Mitigation and Adaptation Fund have been counted towards this total.

With regard to (ii), 54 million trees planted by provinces and territories via Environment and Climate Change Canada's Low Carbon Economy Fund in 2021-22 and in 2022-23. The 2 Billion Trees program was designed to ensure that existing climate change programs that support tree planting are counted towards the Government's commitment to plant two billion trees, which includes the Low Carbon Economy Fund.

With regard to (iii), over 56 million trees planted via Natural Resources Canada's 2 Billion Trees program. No other trees planted under other government programs have been counted toward this total to date. In order to be included, trees planted must be incremental to business as usual, and must be reported by proponents with sufficient detail to support verification.

Question No. 1863—**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:**

With regard to the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC): (a) what are the specific job performance benchmarks or criteria for an employee of the CMHC to receive a bonus or salary increase; (b) how does the number of new housing units constructed, or the creation of new housing starts, in Canada affect whether an employee of the CMHC receives a bonus or salary increase; (c) how does the performance of a CMHC program affect whether an employee of the CMHC receives a bonus or salary increase; and (d) how does the progress of meeting CMHC's planned results, as laid out in the CMHC 2023-2027 Corporate Plan, affect whether an employee of the CMHC receives a bonus or salary increase?

Mr. Chris Bittle (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, or CMHC, with regard to (a), employees set SMART, namely specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound, objectives tied to the responsibilities of their individual positions. Each year managers assess the performance of the employee and assign a performance rating on a 5-point scale, namely does not meet expectations, meets most expectations, meets all expectations, exceeds most expectations, exceeds all expectations. Employees who meet or exceed their objectives are eligible for an annual individual incentive payment and salary increase.

With regard to (b) to (d), the Guidelines of the Performance Management Program for Chief Executive Officers of Crown Corporations, which can be found at <https://www.canada.ca/en/privy-council/programs/appointments/governor-council-appointments/performance-management/crown-appointees.html>, from the Privy Council Office, Senior Personnel Secretariat outlines the process for determining whether and at what level a performance-based compensation is payable.

Question No. 1864—**Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan:**

With regard to the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) and the National Housing Strategy: (a) how many new homes have been completed with the assistance of any type of funding from the National Housing Strategy, since 2017, in total and broken down by province or territory; (b) how many new homes does the CMHC expect will have been completed in 2023 with the assistance of any type of funding from the National Housing Strategy; (c) what is the breakdown of (a) and (b) by program or initiative; and (d) will the National Housing Strategy help to construct enough homes by 2030 to meet the CMHC's projection that Canada needs 5.8 million new homes to restore affordability?

Routine Proceedings

Mr. Chris Bittle (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, or CMHC, and the National Housing Strategy, and with regard to (a), (b) and (c), please refer to the information available on the National Housing Strategy results website, which can be found at <https://www.placetocalhome.ca>. More precisely, the detailed breakdown requested can be found by downloading the file made available on the Housing Funding Initiative Map section of the website, which can be found at <https://www.placetocalhome.ca/housing-funding-initiatives-map>.

With regards to the Housing Accelerator Fund, as of October 27, 2023, the committed permits to be facilitated for this program is 14,509 units. HAF is still undergoing the assessment of applications, hence, any further information cannot be provided.

With regard to (d), to restore affordability, CMHC estimates that Canada will need 3.5 million more units on top of what is already projected to be built based on current rates of new construction.

The National Housing Strategy is contributing to increasing housing supply across Canada and aims to create 160,000 new units but the federal government cannot achieve affordability for everyone in Canada on its own. The government needs partners, all orders of government, the private and non-profit sectors, and others who share our goal of creating a new generation of housing in Canada. Collaboration, partnership and innovation will be critical in addressing this supply shortfall.

Question No. 1867—Mr. Kelly McCauley:

With regard to heavy body armour acquisition and usage by the RCMP, since 2016: (a) how many sets of heavy body armour have been purchased for the RCMP, broken down by year; (b) what is the yearly breakdown of the total costs associated with the purchases in (a); (c) how many requests for proposals (RFP) have been issued for heavy body armour; (d) what are the details of each RFP, including, for each, (i) the date, (ii) how many sets of heavy body armour were desired, (iii) the RFP number; (e) how many and what percentage of RCMP vehicles have two sets of heavy body armour; (f) how many sets are currently in inventory or storage, but have not yet been issued to RCMP officers; (g) of the sets currently in use by the RCMP, how many are expired; and (h) what is the total number of sets currently owned by the RCMP, and, of those, how many are in use?

Ms. Jennifer O’Connell, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs (Cybersecurity), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to (a) to (d), the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, or RCMP, undertook an extensive preliminary search in order to determine the amount of information that would fall within the scope of the question and the amount of time that would be required to prepare a comprehensive response. The level of detail of the information requested is not systematically tracked in a centralized database. The RCMP concluded that producing and validating a comprehensive response to this question would require a manual collection of information that is not possible in the time allotted and could lead to the disclosure of incomplete and misleading information.

With regard to (e), on December 7, 2020, OM - ch. 99.2., Active Threat Training and Equipment, was updated to ensure that as many operational frontline members as possible are personally assigned unit-issued hard body armour, or HBA. This national operational standard ensures that the members at greatest risk receive the

equipment and training they need to perform their duties as safely as possible.

The current benchmark for HBA is that “all operational frontline members are to be personally assigned unit-issued HBA by March 31, 2022.”

With regard to (f), as of October 26, 2023, 1,619 sets of HBA have been ordered, but have not yet been delivered to the RCMP National Warehouse. As soon as the HBA sets are received by the RCMP Uniform and Equipment Program, or U&E, there is a two-week preparation and quality assurance process that takes place before they can be shipped out to the Divisions.

With regard to (g) to (h), as of October 26, 2023, according to procurement records, there have been 18,595 sets of HBA procured by the RCMP. Since this number is based on procurement records, it does not take into account HBA sets that have been disposed of, lost, or destroyed. Of the sets that were deployed, 3,994 have expired. Based on Divisional annual HBA attestations, there are 12,607 HBA sets in use in the Divisions.

Question No. 1868—Mr. Blake Richards:

With regard to the morale of the Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) and the statement in a July 23, 2023, briefing note from Canadian Forces Chaplain General, BGen Guy Bélisle, that “CAF leaders and members feeling more undervalued and underappreciated than at any point in recent memory”: (a) what is the government’s assessment of why CAF leaders and members feel undervalued and underappreciated; (b) what new measures, if any, will the government implement to improve CAF morale; and (c) when was the last time that the CAF conducted a thorough analysis of the state of morale, and what were the findings of that analysis?

Mrs. Marie-France Lalonde (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the well-being of Canadian Armed Forces, or CAF, personnel is of the highest priority to the CAF and National Defence, and the retention of trained and experienced personnel is fundamental to the professionalism and operational effectiveness of the organization. The Defence Team wants every Canadian to see service to Canada within the CAF as a first-rate career choice, which is why efforts are underway to strengthen how the organization recruits, retains, and takes care of its people.

With regard to (a) and (c), National Defence and the CAF recognize that military service places unique demands on CAF members and their families, including unique cost-of-living challenges due to operational tempo and job requirements. The CAF is also experiencing a shortfall in personnel, and the Defence Team is undertaking significant reconstitution efforts to make the organization stronger and more effective.

Your Say Matters: Defence Team Well-Being Survey, or YSM, is a survey aimed to obtain Defence Team members’ attitudes, perceptions, and experiences on a broad range of work and organizational factors related to well-being, organizational culture, and retention.

Routine Proceedings

The 2022 YSM was administered, at random and in anonymous format, to members of the Defence Team, including CAF members, Regular and Primary Reserve, and National Defence civilian personnel, between March and May 2022, with approximately 8,000 CAF respondents. The results showed overall that the responding CAF members have moderate levels of morale, with more than a third of the respondents reporting low morale.

With regard to (b), National Defence is committed to improving the morale and welfare of the CAF and have implemented a number of initiatives in support of this effort. This includes delivering a 12.03% cost of living increase for CAF members and covering rations and quarters for members who have not yet completed all qualifications required for their first employment in their military occupation.

The CAF is further advancing meaningful culture evolution efforts to help build a more inclusive environment. Since its creation in 2021, Chief Professional Conduct and Culture conducted engagement with over 16,000 Defence Team members and external stakeholders to listen and learn from their lived experience, which informs the way forward to improving the culture within the Defence Team.

Ensuring that our soldiers, sailors, and aviators are equipped with modern and effective equipment also remains a priority for National Defence. This includes continued investments through Strong, Secure Engaged. For example, since 2017, the Government of Canada has developed a clear plan of action to modernize continental defence, including an investment of \$38.6 billion over 20 years in NORAD modernization, and delivered critical new equipment to the CAF. This includes the purchase of F-35 advanced fighter aircraft, Canadian Surface Combatant ships, Arctic and Offshore Patrol Ships, Tactical Armoured Patrol Vehicles and the Medium Support Vehicle System.

Finally, further initiatives will be launched in 2024 as efforts continue to create a healthier work environment for all to thrive and achieve increased operational readiness and effectiveness.

Question No. 1869—**Mr. John Nater:**

With regard to the Financial Consumer Agency of Canada's (FCAC) July 2023 Guideline on Existing Consumer Mortgage Loans in Exceptional Circumstances (Guideline): (a) how many financial institutions who provide mortgage lending in Canada were consulted by the FCAC on this Guideline; (b) did any of the financial institutions consulted raise concerns with the FCAC regarding the Guideline, prior to the implementation, and, if so, what are the details, including what concerns were raised and by which financial institutions; (c) if no financial institutions were consulted before the FCAC implemented the Guideline, why were they not consulted; (d) have any financial institutions raised concerns with the FCAC since the Guideline was introduced, and, if so, what are the details, including what concerns were raised and by which financial institutions; and (e) is the Guideline temporary or will the FCAC leave it in place indefinitely?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Financial Consumer Agency of Canada, or FCAC, protects Canadians by supervising the compliance of federally regulated financial entities, such as banks, with their legislative obligations, codes of conduct and public commitments, and by strengthening Canadians' financial literacy.

In response to the current economic environment, FCAC developed the Guideline on Existing Consumer Mortgage Loans in Exceptional Circumstances, which can be found at <https://www.canada.ca/en/financial-consumer-agency/services/industry/commissioner-guidance/mortgage-loans-exceptional-circumstances.html>. The Guideline sets out how FCAC expects federally regulated financial institutions to provide tailored support to consumers with mortgages on their principal residence who are experiencing severe financial difficulty.

Guidelines establish practices that FCAC expects regulated entities to incorporate within their business operations. They are intended to assist regulated entities in complying with market conduct obligations stemming from legislation, regulations, codes of conduct and public commitments.

With regard to (a), consultations are part of FCAC's standard practice in developing guidelines. FCAC launched public consultations on the proposed Guideline on March 21, 2023, and received comments until the close of the consultation period on May 5, 2023.

FCAC participated in 13 stakeholder engagements and received 36 written submissions from stakeholders, including members of the public, consumer advocacy groups, academics, financial institutions, and industry associations.

Industry-specific consultations took place via engagements with the Canadian Bankers Association, or CBA, representing a wide range of Schedule I, Schedule II, and Schedule III banks, namely Member banks, which are listed at <https://cba.ca/member-banks?l=en-us>, the Canadian Credit Union Association, or CCUA, for Canada's credit unions, and some caisses populaires.

With regard to (b), four of the 36 written submissions received from stakeholders were submitted by financial institutions or their respective trade associations (the CBA and the CCUA). FCAC's "What we heard: Public consultation on the Guideline on Existing Consumer Mortgage Loans in Exceptional Circumstances", which can be found at <https://www.canada.ca/en/financial-consumer-agency/corporate/transparency/consultations/mortgage-loans/what-we-heard.html>, provides an anonymized summary of all the comments received during the public consultations and indicates how FCAC addressed this input.

With regard to (c), this part is not applicable given the response to (a).

With regard to (d), since the Guideline's implementation, financial institutions raised some of the following concerns with FCAC through regulatory supervisory touchpoints: consistency of guidelines and the consistent interpretation of those guidelines, timelines for the update of systems, how to define and identify consumer at risk, and more.

With regard to (e), the guideline is a response to the current exceptional circumstances facing mortgage holders. FCAC will continue to monitor the economic environment and adjust its approach, as appropriate.

Question No. 1879—Mr. Peter Julian:

With regard to the Privy Council Office's Results and Delivery Unit: (a) what is the total amount of mandate letter commitments that are being tracked from the 2021 ministerial mandate letters, broken down by reporting lead (i.e. minister); and (b) as of October 2023, broken down by reporting lead (i.e. minister) and identification number, how many of the 2021 ministerial mandate letter commitments are identified (i) as completed by the government, (ii) to have seen actions taken by the government but not completed, (iii) as not being pursued by the government?

Mr. Terry Duguid (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and Special Advisor for Water, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the list of mandate letter commitments, as aligned with the December 2021 mandate letters, is publicly available at <https://open.canada.ca/data/en/dataset/8f6b5490-8684-4a0d-91a3-97ba28acc9cd>.

Information regarding the progress of our government's commitments is publicly available as part of the Public Accounts of Canada, at <https://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/recgen/cpc-pac/index-eng.html>, the Government Expenditure Plan and Main Estimates, at <https://www.canada.ca/en/treasury-board-secretariat/services/planned-government-spending/government-expenditure-plan-main-estimates.html>, the Supplementary Estimates, at <https://www.canada.ca/en/treasury-board-secretariat/services/planned-government-spending/supplementary-estimates.html>, and the budgets, at <https://www.canada.ca/en/departement-finance/services/publications/federal-budget.html> and at <https://www.canada.ca/en/news.html>.

Question No. 1884—Mr. Tako Van Popta:

With regard to the Lytton Homeowner Resilient Rebuild Program: (a) how much money has been distributed through the program to date; (b) how many recipients have received funding through the program; (c) what was the average payment amount received; and (d) how many applications have been received to date?

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan (Minister of Emergency Preparedness, Minister responsible for the Pacific Economic Development Agency of Canada and President of the King's Privy Council for Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to (a), concerning the Lytton Homeowner Resilient Rebuild Program, Pacific Economic Development Canada, or PacifiCan, distributed \$0 between May 31 and October 24, 2023. In order to receive the fire-resilient or fire-resilient and net zero homes grant, the homeowner is required to complete home construction and meet all stated program requirements. As of October 24, 2023, all three applicants were in process but had not yet achieved the requirements.

With regard to (b), as of October 24, 2023, a total amount of \$279,288 has been committed towards three recipients.

With regard to (c), the average payment to participants is \$0 as of October 24, 2023. The average is expected to be \$93,096 once grants are distributed.

With regard to (d), as of October 24, 2023, PacifiCan received three applications.

Question No. 1886—Mr. Michael D. Chong:

With regard to the government's response to the explosion at the Al Ahli Hospital in Gaza, which occurred on October 17, 2023: (a) to whom were the Minister of Foreign Affairs' comments on October 17, 2023, that "Bombing a hospital is an un-

Routine Proceedings

thinkable act, and there is no doubt that doing so is absolutely illegal", which were posted on X (Twitter), addressed; (b) on what basis did the Minister of Foreign Affairs assess that the explosion at the Gaza hospital was illegal; (c) when did the Minister of National Defence notify the Minister of Foreign Affairs that the government's statement, the "more likely scenario is that the strike was caused by an errant rocket fired from Gaza", would be issued; and (d) did the Minister of Foreign Affairs change her position regarding the illegality of the explosion at the Al Ahli hospital following the statement in (c) from the Minister of National Defence, and, if not, why not?

Hon. Robert Oliphant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the following reflects a consolidated response approved on behalf of Global Affairs Canada ministers.

The Government of Canada unequivocally condemns the brutal and horrific terrorist attacks against the people of Israel by Hamas, which took place October 7, 2023. Canada has been clear that Israel, like all states, has a right to defend itself, and that it has an obligation to do so in accordance with international law. Canada has called on all parties to protect civilians and civilian infrastructure.

The Government of Canada also recognizes the dire situation and human tragedy in Gaza and has been clear that the price of justice cannot be the continued suffering of all Palestinian civilians. Canada has called for Canadians, including foreign nationals, to be permitted to leave, for the release of all hostages, for unimpeded access for humanitarian aid, including life-saving access to medical services, food, fuel, and water, and for an end to the violence.

The Government of Canada continues to work with allies and partners in the region towards a lasting peace. Canada stands firmly with the Israeli and Palestinian peoples in their right to live in peace, security, and dignity, without fear, and supports a two-state solution where a peaceful, prosperous, and safe Palestinian state thrives alongside a peaceful, prosperous, and safe state of Israel.

Global Affairs Canada regularly prepares situation reports and briefing products that cover a broad range of developments in Israel, the West Bank, and Gaza, as it does for other regions. Such reports are used alongside a variety of other sources, including open-source media reports and information from other government departments, in assessing the veracity of reporting on international incidents and determining an appropriate response.

As indicated by the Department of National Defence, or DND, on October 21, 2023, analysis conducted independently by the Canadian Forces Intelligence Command indicates with a high degree of confidence that Israel did not strike the al-Ahli hospital on October 17, 2023. Based on open source and classified reporting, the DND and the Canadian Armed Forces have assessed that the strike was more likely caused by an errant rocket fired from Gaza. This assessment is informed by an analysis of the blast damage to the hospital complex, including adjacent buildings and the area surrounding the hospital, as well as the flight pattern of the incoming munition. Reporting from Canada's allies corroborates the Department of National Defence and the Canadian Armed Forces' findings.

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 1891—Mrs. Karen Vecchio:**

With regard to the Auditor General's report entitled "Modernizing Information Technology Systems": why does the government not retain historical data as cited in section 7.40 of the report?

Hon. Anita Anand (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, due to technical limitations with the Application Portfolio Management, or APM, system, it cannot record historical information about applications. The system was designed in 2013, and at the time it was only meant to record a point-in-time snapshot about applications, and not a historical time series. There is currently an active APM system redesign project and retaining historical data is one of the requirements for the new system, and although we cannot confirm that the vendor will be able to implement this requirement in the new software, appropriate solutions will be in place to alleviate the current limitations.

The upcoming systems will be designed to integrate a robust array of cutting-edge features and data, enhancing our capabilities and providing deeper insights into our environment. Through these modern advancements, we will gain a more comprehensive understanding of the IT ecosystem, fostering improved adaptability and informed decision-making.

As an interim solution and given the existing limitation, Excel extracts of the data have been made annually since 2018-19, and daily since January 2022 to allow for historical data analysis.

Question No. 1892—Mr. Tim Uppal:

With regard to the finding in the Auditor General's report entitled "The Benefits Delivery Modernization Programme", that "Employment and Social Development Canada, in 2017, encountered numerous obstacles and delays in its implementation of the programme and had to make difficult choices about the sequence of key steps": (a) what were these obstacles and delays; and (b) what difficult choices were made?

Mr. Stéphane Lauzon (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizens' Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General's report on Benefits Delivery Modernization, or BDM, states that "Employment and Social Development Canada, since 2017, encountered numerous obstacles and delays in its implementation of the programme and had to make difficult choices about the sequence of key steps."

BDM is a complex, large scale, multi-year undertaking, and the programme plan continues to be refined as scope, timing and other factors are assessed. As the work underway in BDM continues, the Programme is gaining a greater understanding of the complexity of unraveling the decades-old Old Age Security, or OAS, and Employment Insurance, or EI, system.

The obstacles and delays encountered by Employment and Social Development Canada, or ESDC, since 2017 were mainly due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the downstream impacts, as well as the switch from EI to OAS as the first benefit to onboard.

Due to COVID impacts, a number of key resources were temporarily deployed outside of the Programme to support the GC's overall emergency response. At the peak of the response, nearly 25% of BDM's employees were deployed outside of the Programme to assist other departments and agencies. Specifically, BDM's employees assisted with the Canada Emergency Response Benefit, or CERB, the Public Health Agency of Canada, or PHAC, with their call centre and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans,

or DFO, with their Fish Harvesters Benefit. As a result, some key decisions and activities related to the BDM Programme were delayed, resulting in downstream impacts on the Programme Definition phase.

To address these developments, the BDM Programme conducted an assessment to identify what elements of Programme Definition could still be delivered. Consequently, the timelines for the completion of the Programme Definition phase were delayed.

In 2021, in response to an elevated risk of system failure, ESDC accelerated the migration of OAS, the oldest of the three legacy systems, ahead of EI.

Question No. 1896—Mr. Mike Morrice:

With regard to the Canada Revenue Agency's (CRA) administration of Part XIII of the Income Tax Act over the past 20 tax years: (a) has the CRA held any Canadian resident tenant (i.e. residential or commercial) liable for failing to withhold and remit the tax payable by their non-resident landlord or required a Canadian resident tenant (i.e. residential or commercial) to pay any outstanding taxes of their non-resident landlord; (b) if the answer to (a) is affirmative, what are the total number of instances of this occurring, broken down by tax year, tenancy type (i.e. residential or commercial), and total amount of funds that the Canadian resident tenant was held liable to pay; (c) does the CRA have any internal policies, directives, standards or guidelines on administering Part XIII of the Income Tax Act within the context of a relationship between a Canadian resident tenant (i.e. residential or commercial) and a non-resident landlord; (d) if the answer to (c) is affirmative, what are the details of any such documents; (e) has the CRA modified, or does the CRA have plans to modify in the future, its policies, directives, standards or guidelines on administering Part XIII of the Income Tax Act following the ruling of the Tax Court of Canada in 3792391 Canada Inc. v. The King, 2023 TCC 37; and (f) if the answer to (e) is affirmative, what are the details of any such modifications?

Hon. Marie-Claude Bibeau (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what follows is the response from the Canada Revenue Agency, or CRA, as of October 24, 2023, the date of the question.

With regard to (a), per a review of the records available within its systems, the CRA has held one Canadian resident tenant liable for failing to withhold and remit the tax payable by their non-resident landlord as a result of an audit.

With regard to (b), only one case, which was a commercial tenancy, was found. To protect the integrity of the CRA's work and to respect the confidentiality provisions of the Acts it administers, the CRA cannot provide taxpayer information or comment on specific taxpayer files.

With regard to (c), the CRA's Non-Resident Audit Manual contains guidance on the administration of Part XIII of the Income Tax Act in cases where rental income for Canadian properties is received by a non-resident.

Routine Proceedings

With regard to (d), to preserve the integrity of its compliance programs, as a standard practice the CRA does not disclose specific details about its audit or review techniques. However, a general summary of the CRA's Non-Resident Audit Manual referred to in (c) follows: If a payer fails to withhold the required amount of the Part XIII tax from an amount paid to a non-resident, the payer and non-resident are both liable for this amount and the general practice of the CRA is to assess the payer for any amount owing. However, the CRA's Non-Resident Audit Program takes into consideration all relevant facts and may instead assess the non-resident.

With regard to (e) and (f), as there are currently no plans to make changes to the CRA's policies, directives, standards or guidelines on administering Part XIII of the Income Tax Act following the ruling of the Tax Court of Canada in 3792391 Canada Inc. v. The King, 2023 TCC 37, no further details regarding modifications apply in this case.

Question No. 1901—**Ms. Leslyn Lewis:**

With regard to Infrastructure Canada's program funding: (a) since 2015, has Infrastructure Canada become aware of any projects funded by the department that have, or are alleged to have, employed illegal labour or projects in which any employee, or individual working in relation to the project, was not paid the minimum hourly wage required by federal or provincial law; (b) if the answer to (a) is affirmative, what are the details of each instance, including the (i) name of project, (ii) project description, (iii) summary of wrongdoing or allegations, (iv) date on which the department became aware, (v) description of the actions taken, including the dates of each action, (vi) date on which the Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities or the minister's office was first notified, (vii) actions taken by the Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities, if any; and (c) what mechanisms are in place to ensure that no projects receiving government funding employ illegal labour or labour that is not paid the minimum hourly wage required by law?

Mr. Chris Bittle (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to program funding for Infrastructure Canada, or INFC, in response to (a), INFC is not aware of any projects that have been funded by the department since 2015 that have, or are alleged to have, employed illegal labour or projects in which any employee, or individual working in relation to the project, was not paid the minimum hourly wage required by federal or provincial law.

With regard to (b), the answer to (a) is negative. INFC has not been made aware of illegal labour practices or minimum wage infractions on its funded projects through any of its project monitoring practices or interactions with recipients.

With regard to (c), information on recipients' labour practices is not collected through project applications or project reporting. However, INFC's contribution agreements with funding recipients include a standard provision requiring that all projects be compliant with all applicable laws and regulations, which would include all applicable labour laws.

Question No. 1903—**Mr. Garnett Genuis:**

With regard to visas for international students in Canada: how many international students (i) are currently studying in Canada, (ii) are studying at institutions accredited by Universities Canada, (iii) are in post-graduate studies, (iv) have transferred institutions within Canada during their period of study, (v) have completed their program of study in the last year, (vi) dropped out of their program of study in the last year, (vii) died in the last year, (viii) died by suicide in the last year?

Mr. Paul Chiang (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, IRCC, does not hold information on the number of study permit holders who are current-

ly residing in Canada, mainly due to the fact that people can leave the country at any point in time.

With regard to part (i), as a proxy, IRCC holds information on the total number of study permit holders. On September 30, 2023, 1,015,744 study permit holders held a valid permit.

With regard to part (ii), 343,470 students are studying at institutions recognized by Universities Canada.

With regard to part (iii), 133,370 are in post-graduate studies.

With regard to parts (iv) through (viii), this data is not tracked by IRCC.

Please note that data are preliminary estimates and subject to change. Study permits are valid on September 30, 2023, and a client's most recent study permit is considered. A client's designated learning institution, DLI, is based on the current permit. The list of DLIs is based on the following website for Universities Canada: <https://www.univcan.ca/universities/member-universities/>. Universities Canada is a membership organization and not an official accrediting organization.

Please also note that the study level of a client is based on the recent permit. Post-graduate studies are defined as clients who have identified their level of study being either a master or a doctorate.

Question No. 1905—**Mr. Taylor Bachrach:**

With regard to the government's recently published draft Clean Electricity Regulations: (a) how many megawatts of unabated fossil fuel electricity does Environment and Climate Change Canada estimate will be remaining on Canada's electricity grid in 2035; and (b) how many tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions will this represent on an annual basis?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, to support reliability and affordability, the draft regulations include flexibilities that allow a limited and declining ongoing role for fossil fuel generation. This flexible approach will enable provincial utilities and system operators to plan and manage their systems in accordance with relevant provincial circumstances, while creating a clear signal for reducing emissions over time.

Routine Proceedings

According to the regulatory impact analysis statement, RIAS, for the draft clean electricity regulations, CER, in 2035, 9% of Canada's electricity capacity will come from emitting sources, which are expected to decline over time. This would account for approximately 19,789 megawatts of emitting electricity capacity. However, it is important to note that this value also includes biomass and waste generation, which are not considered fossil fuels. The complete breakdown of forecasted electricity capacity under the draft regulatory scenario can be seen in table 5 of the CER RIAS. Further information is available at the following link: <https://www.gazette.gc.ca/rp-pr/p1/2023/2023-08-19/html/reg1-eng.html>

The regulations on their own would decrease annual emissions from 62 megatonnes to less than nine megatonnes remaining from grid electricity in 2035. These remaining emissions will also be exposed to the carbon price of a particular year to further bring us to net zero.

The proposed CER is expected to deliver nearly 342 megatonnes of cumulative emissions reductions between 2024 and 2050.

These projections are from the RIAS that accompanied the draft CER. Please note that Environment and Climate Change Canada will provide updated estimated impacts associated with the final regulations when they are published. The impacts may differ to the extent that the final regulations differ from the draft CER published in the Canada Gazette, part I.

Question No. 1909—Mr. Taylor Bachrach:

With regard to the Pacific Salmon Strategy Initiative: (a) how much of the initiative's \$650 million budget has been allocated within each of the strategy's pillars; (b) what projects have received funding commitments and under which pillars do these fall; and (c) what is the total amount of funding that has been disbursed under each of the pillars?

Hon. Diane LeBouthillier (Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to part (a), program funding for the Pacific salmon strategy initiative, PSSI, is distributed in the following manner: \$262.5 million over five years, starting in 2021-22, is for conservation and stewardship; \$145.3 million over five years, starting in 2021-22, is for salmon enhancement; \$204.4 million over five years, starting in 2021-22, is for harvest transformation; and \$35 million over five years, starting in 2021-22, is for integration and collaboration.

With regard to part (b), numerous new initiatives and projects are now under way across all four implementation pillars of the Pacific salmon strategy initiative.

Under the conservation and stewardship pillar, new science investments have been made to improve understanding of salmon ecosystems. The British Columbia salmon restoration and innovation fund, a cost-shared federal-provincial program, has also been renewed. Fisheries and Oceans Canada, DFO, is demonstrating leadership internationally through funding science and high seas inspection in the north Pacific Ocean. Funding is also supporting the launch of the new DFO habitat restoration centre of expertise, which is advancing a number of initiatives related to salmon habitat restoration, including emergency salmon recovery efforts related to the recent flood, drought and wildfires in British Columbia.

Examples of current projects under way under the salmon enhancement pillar include the expansion of mass marking programs,

which supports mark selective fisheries for the recreational fishing sector; the retrofitting and modernizing of existing hatcheries; and the planning and designing of new salmon hatchery facilities.

Under the harvest transformation pillar, PSSI is supporting modernized harvest management approaches for indigenous, commercial and recreational Pacific salmon fisheries that respond to current and future population trends. In addition, the department continues to explore new harvest opportunities for indigenous harvesters through terminal fisheries, and the recreational sector through mark selective fisheries. The new Pacific salmon commercial licence retirement program has also recently completed the first application round, where commercial salmon licence eligibility holders are able to voluntarily retire their licence eligibilities permanently for market value through reverse auction.

Finally, several initiatives are under way under the PSSI's integration and collaboration pillar, most notably the launch of a targeted action plan measure, number 41, under the recently announced federal UN declaration act action plan, and efforts to modernize DFO's Pacific salmon data and its availability through a new Pacific salmon data portal.

With regard to part (c), here is a breakdown of funds disbursed under each of the four PSSI implementation pillars: \$33.5 million has been disbursed under conservation and stewardship; \$28.4 million has been disbursed under salmon enhancement; \$33 million has been disbursed under harvest transformation; and \$8.4 million has been disbursed under integration and collaboration.

Question No. 1915—Mr. Kelly McCauley:

With regard to cost estimates related to the Benefits Delivery Modernization Programme: (a) what methodology was used by Employment and Social Development Canada to conclude the programme would cost \$1.7 billion; and (b) what methodology was used by the third-party review to conclude that the cost would be between \$2.7 billion and \$3.4 billion?

Mr. Stéphane Lauzon (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizens' Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to part (a), in 2017, the benefits delivery modernization program was in the initial planning or program definition phase. As is typical and expected for programs of this size and magnitude, at the program definition stage there is uncertainty around the program's overall scope, full requirements, including the technology solutions, and the procurement necessary to support those solutions. The combination of these factors means that the initial \$1.7-billion cost was an initial planning assumption based on what was known at the time. In multi-year, large-scale IT transformations, it is very difficult to forecast costs with any degree of precision at program inception. As expected and known, the cost profile would evolve and move upwards as further planning, deeper discovery and learned experience become clearer.

With regard to part (b), preliminary benchmarking exercises and third party validations were used to support those initial planning efforts, again with the information known at the time. As the program has evolved and more is known about the sheer complexity of unravelling decades of IT systems structure, benefits delivery modernization, BDM, is in a better position to offer more realistic cost forecasts. This case study used a data-driven approach to develop a top-down rough order of magnitude costs for the BDM program based on the experiences of other comparator organizations selected for the study that were undertaking IT transformation projects related to benefits delivery modernization. These organizations are located in Australia, Scotland, the U.K., Ontario and New Zealand. While no comparator organizations were a match for the BDM's scope and complexity, the report did conclude that based on the experiences of those organizations, cost and time would increase. A secondary analysis was performed to consider these findings and impacts of higher inflation, actual expenditures and the inherent complexity of decades-old IT systems on overall program costs.

Question No. 1919—**Mr. Kyle Seeback:**

With regard to the government's approach to a digital services tax (DST): (a) will the DST still go into effect as of January 1, 2024, as planned; (b) how much revenue is the government expected to receive as a result of the retroactivity of the tax back to 2022; (c) how much DST revenue is the government projected to receive in 2024; (d) has the government done a cost-benefit analysis on the DST, and, if so, what are the details, including the findings of the analysis; and (e) what are the details of all communication or representations the government received from representatives of other G20 countries related to the implementation of a DST since the proposal was first unveiled, including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) country, (iii) type of communication, (iv) summary of the comments or concerns raised?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada's priority and preference have always been to take a multilateral approach to the tax challenges of digitalization. Canada continues to strongly support the two-pillar multilateral plan agreed to in 2021 and has been actively working with international partners to bring it into effect. In October 2021, the federal government agreed to pause the implementation of Canada's digital services tax, which had been announced in 2020, until the end of 2023, in order to give time for negotiations on pillar one to conclude. Meanwhile, at least seven other countries, including Austria, France, India, Italy, Spain, Turkey and the United Kingdom, have continued to apply their own digital services taxes. Canada reaffirms its desire to see pillar one implemented and will continue to work with our international partners to bring the new multilateral system into effect as soon as a critical mass of countries is willing. Until that time, and in order to protect Canada's national economic interest, the government intends to move ahead with its long-standing plan for legislation to enact a digital services tax in Canada and ensure that businesses pay their fair share of taxes and that Canada is not at a disadvantage relative to other countries. Current legislation in the House, Bill C 59, would allow the government to determine the entry into force date of the new digital services tax.

Question No. 1922—**Mr. Warren Steinley:**

With regard to the Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat (TBS) and information technology (IT): (a) what policies and procedures are in place to ensure independent assessment and oversight, as well as ensuring value-for-money, on IT projects over \$2.5 million; (b) does the TBS have a policy regarding the role of research (IT database subscription services), benchmarking and value-assurance services in IT, and, if so, what is that policy; (c) how many contracts are currently in place for research (IT database subscription services), benchmarking and value-assurance services in IT; (d) what is the total value of the contracts in (c); (e) how many suppliers

Routine Proceedings

does the TBS use for research (IT database subscription services), benchmarking and value-assurance services; (f) of the suppliers in (e), how many suppliers include retired civil servants from the government; (g) what steps does the TBS take to ensure these service providers aren't conflicted through partnerships, alliances, downstream implementation conflicts and other contractual arrangements; and (h) did the TBS request research, benchmarking or value-assurance services for the development of the ArriveCAN app, and, if so, what are the details of what was done?

Hon. Anita Anand (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.):

Mr. Speaker, with regard to part (a), as per the policy on the planning and management of investments, deputy heads are responsible for ensuring that investment decisions demonstrate best value and sound stewardship, taking into account the life-cycle costs of assets and services, as well as ensuring that the governance of all projects provides for effective and timely decision-making, communication, control and oversight and is supported by appropriate structures and processes, such as committees, quality assurance and the use of independent reviews.

As per the directive on the management of projects and programs, the chief information officer of Canada is responsible for establishing a digital investment oversight program, including identifying projects that are subject to oversight by the chief information officer of Canada; conducting oversight activities; requiring the responsible deputy head to commission independent reviews; commissioning independent reviews; and requiring the responsible deputy head to undertake specific course corrections as deemed necessary by the chief information officer of Canada based on evidence gathered in the course of overseeing identified projects.

With regard to part (b), the Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, TBS, does not have a policy regarding the role of research on IT database subscription services, benchmarking and value-assurance services in IT.

With regard to part (c), TBS has one contract for independent IT project review services for Government of Canada digitally enabled projects and programs, with contract number 24062-22-021, in which two suppliers were qualified: BDO Canada LLP, 2406A-22-021, and MDOS Consulting Inc., 2406B-22-021.

With regard to part (d), the total value of the contract is \$3,616,000, or \$1,808,000 for each of the two vendors, on an as-and-when-needed basis through the issuance of individual task authorizations against the contract, over the three-year term of the contract, signed November 2021.

With regard to part (e), TBS uses the two suppliers, BDO Canada LLP and MDOS Consulting, associated with the independent review contract.

With regard to part (f), of these suppliers, both have used former civil servants retired from the government during the course of our engagement with them.

Routine Proceedings

With regard to part (g), TBS ensures procurement activities are conducted in accordance with regulations, trade agreements and Treasury Board policies and procedures, such as the directive on the management of procurement and the integrity regime. Furthermore, TBS specifically works with vendors to ensure that there are no real or perceived conflicts of interest that could compromise the integrity of review activities or outputs.

With regard to part (h), TBS did not request any independent review services for the development of the ArriveCAN application.

Question No. 1923—Mr. Clifford Small:

With regard to rescue missions by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard: (a) how many search and rescue missions were required to respond to incidents arising from the recreational cod or groundfish fishery in each of the last five years, broken down by month, year and province or territory; and (b) what are the details of each mission since 2018, including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) location, (iii) incident summary?

Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to rescue missions by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, please note that the Canadian Coast Guard, CCG, does not track data specific to recreational fishing activities, and as such, any data is at risk of being incomplete or not representative of the question asked. Therefore, the CCG is providing a nil response.

Question No. 1925—Mr. Clifford Small:

With regard to Marine Protected Areas in Atlantic Canada and the Canadian Arctic: (a) how many new Marine Protected Areas are planned by 2025 in Atlantic Canada, and what are the details, descriptions, and locations of each area; (b) how many new Marine Protected Areas are planned by 2025 in the Canadian Arctic, and what are the details, descriptions, and locations of each area; (c) for each new area in (a) and (b), what are the (i) latitudinal and longitudinal coordinates, (ii) protection goals and the planned fishing restrictions; and (d) what percentage of Canada's (i) Atlantic waters, (ii) Arctic waters, are Marine Protected Areas as of now, and what will the percentage be in 2025 and 2030?

Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the following response from Fisheries and Oceans Canada, DFO, describes marine protected areas established under the Oceans Act that are under the authority of the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard. This response does not include information on other marine protected areas, such as national marine conservation areas, marine national wildlife areas and migratory bird sanctuaries, that are established and managed by Environment and Climate Change Canada or Parks Canada.

With regard to part (a), there is one Oceans Act marine protected area, MPA, proposed in Atlantic Canada as a contribution toward the marine conservation target of 25% by 2025: Fundian Channel-Browns Bank.

The proposed Fundian Channel-Browns Bank area of interest, AOI, is located south of Yarmouth, Nova Scotia, in the Scotian Shelf bioregion. The site's approximate size is 7,200 square kilometres. The AOI is divided into two geographically separate components. The western section is centered on Georges Basin, and the larger eastern section encompasses the Fundian Channel, also known as the northeast channel, and part of Browns Bank. It encompasses diverse sensitive benthic habitat that provides feeding and nursery areas for a variety of commercial and non-commercial species. The site is representative of a diverse range of habitat

types, including basin, bank, deepwater slope and channel habitats. It includes a migratory corridor and is an area of high biodiversity. The site hosts the densest known concentration of large gorgonian corals in Atlantic Canada and significant concentrations of sponges, which provide important habitat for several depleted groundfish species.

With regard to part (b), there are three proposed MPAs being considered for designation in the Arctic: the Southampton Island AOI, Sarvarjuaq and Qikiqtait.

The Southampton Island AOI encompasses the nearshore ocean around Southampton Island and Chesterfield Inlet in the Kivalliq region of Nunavut. The site's approximate size is 93,087 square kilometres, and it is located near the confluence of Hudson Bay and Foxe Basin waters, making it an area of high marine productivity. The area serves as an important migration pathway for marine mammals such as narwhals, beluga whales and bowhead whales, and the marine area supports colonies of nesting seabirds.

Sarvarjuaq is on the Canadian side of the North Water Polynya and is located in northern Baffin Bay between Canada and Greenland. It is one of the largest reoccurring polynyas in the Arctic, and Inuit-led conservation of this area is being advanced in partnership with the Qikiqtani Inuit Association, QIA. This area is a highly productive ecosystem; its high rates of biodiversity and biological productivity support an abundance of marine life. It is a key feeding area and migration corridor for seabirds, fish and mammals such as narwhals, walruses, beluga and bowhead whales, ringed, bearded and harp seals, and polar bears.

Qikiqtait is the marine region surrounding an archipelago of over 1,500 islands in southeastern Hudson Bay and is home to the southernmost community in Nunavut's Qikiqtani region, Sanikiluaq. Inuit-led conservation of this site is being advanced in partnership with the QIA and local boards and organizations.

QIA's terrestrial priorities for conservation and protection are being advanced collaboratively with Environment and Climate Change Canada. This area is surrounded by 35 recurrent polynyas that help sustain high populations of invertebrates such as sea urchins, sea cucumbers and bivalves. It is also a refuge, feeding area and migratory corridor for marine mammals such as seals, belugas, polar bears and walruses; fish such as Arctic char; and seabirds such as the Arctic eider duck.

With regard to part (c)(i), latitudinal and longitudinal coordinates for the proposed MPAs outlined in this response are not available as boundaries have not been finalized. Consultation on site design, including boundary delineation, is ongoing with partners and stakeholders as part of the MPA establishment process.

With regard to part (c)(ii) on protection goals, in the Atlantic, the overarching conservation goal for Fundian Channel-Browns Bank is “to conserve and protect the ecological integrity of the area, including its biodiversity, productivity, ecosystem components and special natural features”. In the Arctic, the conservation objectives and priorities for the Southampton Island AOI, Qikiqtaaluk and Sarvartuaq are in development with partners, communities and stakeholders.

On planned activity restrictions, in the Atlantic, activity restrictions for the Fundian Channel-Browns Bank AOI are still being developed with partners, communities and stakeholders. In the Arctic, activity restrictions for each of the three proposed MPAs in the area are still being developed with partners, communities and stakeholders and will depend on the tool used to designate the area.

With regard to part (d), Canada has conserved 14.66%, or 842,823 square kilometres, of its marine and coastal areas to date through MPAs and other effective area-based conservation measures. With regard to part (d)(i), 3.72%, or 214,176 square kilometres, is in Atlantic waters. Of the current percentage total, Oceans Act MPAs protect 6.11%, or 351,517 square kilometres, of Canada's total marine and coastal areas, with 0.34%, or 19,388 square kilometres, of protected area in Atlantic waters. With regard to part (d)(ii), 9%, or 517,779 square kilometres, is in Arctic waters. Of the current percentage total, Oceans Act MPAs protect 6.11%, or 351,517 square kilometres, of Canada's total marine and coastal areas, with 5.63%, or 323,519 square kilometres, in Arctic waters. The percentage of area designated as Oceans Act MPAs in Atlantic and Arctic waters in 2025 and 2030 will depend on the final boundaries of the proposed MPAs and the point at which they are designated.

Question No. 1927—**Mr. Corey Tochor:**

With regard to exhibit 8.2 in the Auditor General's report entitled “The Benefits Delivery Modernization Programme”: (a) in reference to the June 2022 case study, what were the transformational steps that were postponed; (b) in reference to the November 2022 case study, (i) by how much did costs actually increase since the study was conducted, (ii) are initial cost estimates for software and implementation still well below the average comparator project and the industry average; and (c) in reference to the March 2023 programme review, were there delays to the migration component, and, if so, how long were they?

Mr. Stéphane Lauzon (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizens' Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to part (a), as a result of the strategic assessment conducted by Canada's chief information officer, CIO, in June 2022, Employment and Social Development Canada, ESDC, reviewed the remaining approved scope of the benefits delivery modernization program, BDM, and proposed moving several planned BDM deliverables to organizations outside of BDM, such as digital identity services, social insurance register replacement and long-term cloud service procurement. Also, BDM agreed to defer some of its planned deliverables until after old age security, OAS, benefits are transferred through the workforce and workload management systems implementation. The department further assessed the impacts, risks and dependencies associated with the scope changes and developed an integrated plan for formally amending the BDM program's scope.

With regard to part (b), BDM is a complex, large-scale, multi-year undertaking, and as expected, costs continue to be refined as scope, timing and outside factors are assessed. In 2017, \$1.75 bil-

lion was the preliminary planning assumption. In 2020, \$2.2 billion was the updated planning estimate. From 2021 to 2023, there was a recognition of increased costs and a need to reset the program.

The main drivers for the evolution of costs are a greater understanding of the complexity of unraveling 60-year-old systems, experience and lessons learned, increased global security threats and the impact of unanticipated global inflation. Since the November 2022 case study by PricewaterhouseCoopers, PwC, on benchmarking for cost estimation, BDM undertook an internal exercise to further refine estimates based on current plans, which have been revised as the program progresses and moves into implementation. The revised program estimate is based on the latest BDM integrated road map and accounts for known costs from the program definition, foundations phase, OAS implementation, platform maturity, employment insurance, EI, on BDM planning and implementation, Canada pension plan, CPP, on BDM, and the program management and oversight BDM project costs. Cost projections to the end of the program in 2030 have increased based on the above but have not yet been confirmed.

With regard to part (c), in the fall of 2022, the revised OAS on the BDM project plan was approved, with the migration of 600,000 foreign benefit recipients scheduled for June 2023 and the migration of all 6.9 million OAS recipients scheduled for December 2024. In March 2023, ESDC reviewed cloud security measures to better protect the new cloud platform from security issues. The first OAS release was successfully achieved on June 12, 2023, and the project remains on track for the full migration for the December 2024 date.

Question No. 1933—**Mr. Brian Masse:**

With regard to the Disaster Mitigation and Adaptation Fund (DMAF), since the program officially launched in 2018: (a) how many applications for funding have been received from the City of Windsor, Ontario; (b) of the applications in (a), how many have been approved; (c) what is the total amount of funding distributed in Windsor, Ontario, through the fund since its official launch; (d) does the government have a plan in place to assist with increased inflationary costs to the currently approved projects; and (e) does the government plan to increase the total federal DMAF fund due to the ever-increasing costs associated with DMAF projects?

Mr. Chris Bittle (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the disaster mitigation and adaptation fund program, DMAF, was officially launched in 2018.

With respect to part (a), since 2018, the DMAF has received a total of four applications from the City of Windsor, Ontario.

With respect to part (b), among the four applications received, two projects were approved.

Routine Proceedings

With respect to part (c), the total federal contribution committed for the projects is \$64,831,491 from the DMAF.

With respect to part (d), applicants under direct delivery programs are encouraged to build appropriate contingencies into their budget estimates. Contingencies provide a buffer for early cost estimates but can also serve as a cushion toward unexpected increases.

With respect to part (e), the maximum federal contribution committed for a specific project is based on the cost estimates provided by the recipient at the application stage. As stipulated in the applicant guide, the approval in principle letter and the contribution agreements, it is the recipient's responsibility to manage the approved funding amount for a given project.

Question No. 1936—**Mr. Brad Vis:**

With regard to the Pacific Salmon Strategy Initiative: (a) how much of the \$647 million pledged for the initiative has been spent since the announcement in budget 2021; (b) what are the objectives and deliverables of the fund; (c) how are the objectives and deliverables measured; and (d) what are the details of each project funded through the initiative, including, for each, the (i) date of the announcement, (ii) project description, (iii) project location, (iv) funding recipient, (v) projected total project cost, (vi) amount of federal contribution towards the total project cost, (vii) expected completion date of the project?

Hon. Diane LeBouthillier (Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to part (a), the total program expenditures for the Pacific salmon strategy initiative, PSSI, across year one, 2021-22, and year two, 2022-23, to date is \$58.8 million, with \$37.3 million for operational expenses, \$9.4 million for capital and \$12.1 million for grants and contributions. In 2023-24 to date, mid-year, a total of \$44.7 million has been spent, of which \$21.6 million is for vote 10.

With regard to part (b), the PSSI seeks to address the steep declines in Pacific salmon through a series of immediate and long-term measures to conserve and rebuild Pacific salmon and their ecosystems. The goal is that over the long term, Pacific salmon and their ecosystem are conserved and restored through targeted action in collaboration with partners.

With regard to part (c), the PSSI's results are being measured in accordance with the Government of Canada's planning and reporting requirements and reported on annually through the departmental results report of Fisheries and Oceans Canada. The department is also tracking implementation through internal project management and governance structures. Through PSSI's external engagement, first nations, partners and stakeholders have expressed strong support for DFO to share outcomes publicly and enhance transparency. In response to this feedback, the department has committed to publishing year in reviews, which will share progress and key results achieved through the PSSI on an annual basis. The first year in review is expected to be published later this fall.

With regard to part (d)(i), the PSSI was launched on June 8, 2021. Since 2021, a number of key activities have been implemented, with external funding provided through programs including but not limited to the renewed B.C. salmon restoration and innovation fund, the Pacific salmon commercial licence retirement program and over 30 indigenous harvest transformation projects.

With regard to part (d)(ii), the PSSI is a five-year initiative aimed at stemming historic declines in Pacific salmon by conserving and restoring Pacific salmon and their ecosystems. Through collabora-

tion with first nations, the Province of British Columbia, the Yukon territory, harvesters and key salmon stakeholders, the PSSI aims to improve understanding of salmon stocks and ecosystems, protect and conserve salmon habitats and ensure the sustainability of Canada's Pacific salmon populations.

With regard to (d)(iii), PSSI projects and activities take place across British Columbia and the Yukon territory.

With regard to part (d)(iv), through PSSI investments, the department has provided funding to a broad range of recipients, including first nations in British Columbia and the Yukon territory, indigenous organizations, environmental groups, harvesters and other key salmon stakeholders.

With regard to parts (d)(v) and (vi), the total cash profile for the PSSI is \$741.3 million over five years. Budget 2021 announced \$647.1 million over five years, as well as \$98.9 million in amortization funds for the PSSI. The resulting \$746 million included \$4.7 million in revenues that have been lost as a result of reduced revenues from fishing licences, hence \$741.3 million. The current projected total cost for the PSSI is \$741.3 million over five years.

(vii) PSSI is funded until March 31, 2026.

Question No. 1937—**Mr. Brad Vis:**

With regard to the Canada Emergency Business Account (CEBA): (a) as of October 25, 2023, in total, how many businesses that received CEBA funding have repaid their loan in full; and (b) what is the total dollar amount owing on the principal balance of outstanding loans?

Mr. Maninder Sidhu (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Export Promotion, International Trade and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to part (a), as of August 31, 2023, a total of 176,353 businesses that received CEBA funding have repaid their loan in full.

The numbers are not available as of October 25, 2023. There is a reporting lag as businesses repay their financial institutions and the financial institutions remit to us.

With regard to part (b), \$38.669 million is the total dollar amount owing on the principal balance of outstanding loans.

Question No. 1938—**Ms. Kerry-Lynne D. Findlay:**

With regard to the government's Rapid Response Mechanism and the reaction to the Spamouflage campaign: (a) which members of Parliament were targeted; (b) which other elected officials, including at a provincial, territorial, or local level were targeted; (c) which unelected officials or individuals were targeted; (d) on what date did the government first become aware of the program; and (e) for each individual in (a) through (c), on what date did the government (i) become aware that that individual was targeted, (ii) notify that individual that they were being targeted?

Hon. Robert Oliphant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to part (a), 47 members of Parliament were targeted across the political spectrum and all geographic regions of Canada. All those targeted parliamentarians have been notified. Parliamentarians affected by this “spamouflage” campaign have been offered a briefing by rapid response mechanism Canada, RRM, on the findings of the report. It has also been made clear to them that nothing observed in this activity represents a threat to their safety or that of their family.

With regard to part (b), Global Affairs Canada is currently aware of one other provincial, territorial or local-level official having been targeted. The individual has also been notified and their identity will be kept confidential for privacy reasons. It is conceivable that additional elected officials at other levels of government may have also been targeted.

With regard to part (c), RRM Canada has a mandate to monitor and counter foreign information operations that represent a direct threat to our democracy and democratic institutions. However, RRM Canada does not have the mandate, jurisdiction or capacity to monitor all activity online affecting individuals and society at large. RRM Canada is continuing to monitor the digital environment for “spamouflage” targeting democratic institutions.

With regard to parts (d) and (e), RRM Canada first became aware of some of this activity on September 5, 2023, and launched a broader investigation. RRM Canada became aware of the full extent of the campaign by September 20, 2023. RRM Canada then conducted due diligence through consultations with other government departments; a partner of the Five Eyes, the intelligence alliance comprising Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and the United States; and external experts such as the Australian Strategic Policy Institute, before finalizing conclusions and beginning the notification of targeted individuals on October 23, 2023.

Question No. 1942—**Mr. Alex Ruff:**

With regard to Sustainable Development Technology Canada (SDTC): (a) is the independent impartial report completed by Raymond Chabot Grant Thornton regarding the allegations of mismanagement of SDTC and provided to the minister available to the public; (b) if the report in (a) is published, where is it published on a government of Canada website; (c) if the report in (a) is not published, when and where will it be published on a government of Canada website; (d) when and where will the government publish its action plan to correct any reported deficiencies; and (e) what further additional oversight will be implemented to ensure that SDTC is delivering on expected outcomes and provides value added investment of public funds?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to parts (a), (b), (c) and (d), the report and action plan have been made available to interested parties upon request through the access to information request process. Those seeking a copy can make a request by email to the Department of Innovation, Science and Economic Development’s access to information and privacy team at ic.atip-aiirpa.ic@ised-isde.gc.ca.

With regard to part (e), the findings of the report are being actioned as follows. Sustainable Development Technology Canada, SDTC, received a detailed management response and action plan, MRAP, to address the issues identified in the report. The MRAP is to be implemented no later than December 31, 2023. Innovation,

Routine Proceedings

Science and Economic Development Canada, ISED, temporarily suspended the funding for new projects until the corrective measures are in place. The Auditor General will be conducting an audit of sustainable development technologies in Canada, which will provide the opportunity for a more comprehensive review of SDTC. With SDTC consent, ISED is conducting an independent review via a third party law firm that will report its findings to the minister.

Any future potential additional measures will be informed by due process and due diligence.

* * *

[English]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, if the government's responses to Questions Nos. 1862, 1865, 1866, 1870 to 1878, 1880 to 1883, 1885, 1887 to 1890, 1893 to 1895, 1897 to 1900, 1902, 1904, 1906 to 1908, 1910 to 1914, 1916 to 1918, 1920, 1921, 1924, 1926, 1928 to 1932, 1934, 1935, 1939, 1940 and 1941 could be made orders for return, these returns would be tabled in an electronic format.

[Translation]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Is it agreed?

[English]

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Text]

Question No. 1862—**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant:**

With regard to Public Safety Canada’s Firearms Buyback Program for recently prohibited firearms: (a) how much was spent to develop the information technology required to administer the program; and (b) what are the details of all contracts signed in relation to the program, including, for each, (i) the date, (ii) the vendor, (iii) the amount, (iv) a description of the goods or services, (v) the duration, (vi) whether the contract was awarded through a competitive bid or sole-source process?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1865—**Ms. Kirsty Duncan:**

With regard to the Dimensions program: (a) what is the size of the current team that leads the program; (b) what are the details of the team that leads the program, including (i) the name of all the positions of the current team, (ii) whether any positions have been cut since its inception, (iii) the dates for any positions that were cut; (c) what are the details of the program’s financing, including (i) the cost to administer the program annually, (ii) whether there have been any financial cuts to the program since its inception, (iii) the dates of any cuts, if any; (d) what are all of the accomplishments of the program since its inception; (e) what third-party international organizations have recognized the program since its inception; and (f) what are the details of any external reviews of the program, including (i) the start date of the review, (ii) the end date of the review, (iii) who led the review, (iv) the structure of the review, (v) who specifically was consulted in the review, including, but not limited to, the Chief Science Advisor, granting councils, research networks, research organizations, and all researchers or experts?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 1866—Mr. Scott Aitchison:**

With regard to military housing and the Canadian Forces Housing Agency, in total and broken down by location: (a) what is the total number of rental housing units of military housing; (b) how many units are currently (i) occupied, (ii) unoccupied and available for rent, (iii) unoccupied and unavailable for rent; (c) outside of routine maintenance, how many units are currently in need of repairs, renovations or upgrades; (d) what are the details of the actions required in (c), including, for each, the description of what is needed and the projected completion date; (e) how many units are currently considered to be in disrepair; and (f) how many of the units in disrepair are currently (i) occupied, (ii) available for rent, (iii) unoccupied and unavailable for rent?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1870—Mr. Daniel Blaikie:

With regard to the Canada Dental Benefit, broken down by federal electoral district since the program's inception: (a) what is the total number of applications (i) received, (ii) approved; (b) what is the total dollar value of payments delivered to eligible applicants; and (c) how many children, in total, have been helped by the program?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1871—Mr. Daniel Blaikie:

With regard to the measures in Bill C-30, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act (temporary enhancement to the Goods and Services Tax/Harmonized Sales Tax credit), concerning GST credits, broken down by federal electoral district: (a) what is the total number of eligible Canadians who saw their GST credits double; and (b) what is the total dollar value of additional GST payments delivered to payees in (a)?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1872—Ms. Leslyn Lewis:

With regard to Canada's participation in the World Health Organization's (WHO) proposed international treaty on pandemic prevention, preparedness, and response: (a) what is the government's formal position with regard to a proposed legally binding international treaty, and why; (b) what are the details of all documents the government has provided to the WHO or the World Health Assembly (WHA) related to the treaty or the International Health Regulations since July 2022, including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) sender, (iii) recipient, (iv) title, (v) subject matter, (vi) summary of contents, (vii) file number; (c) what are the details of Canada's submission or contribution to the 76th WHA meeting with regard to strengthening WHO preparedness for and response to health emergencies; (d) which elected and unelected officials led Canada's delegation at the 2023 WHA meeting, including the number of people in the delegations and their titles and positions; (e) what are the details of Canada's contributions to the WHO's Executive Board since May 2022, including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) sender, (iii) recipient, (iv) title, (v) subject matter, (vi) summary of contents, (vii) file number; (f) what meetings, including the Global Affairs Canada call on July 11, 2022, have been and will be scheduled for public consultation with Canadians; (g) for each public consultation meeting in (f), what are the details of the meetings, including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) names and titles of the attendees, (iii) purpose of the meeting, (iv) agenda items, (v) summary of what occurred at the meeting, including anything that was agreed to; (h) does the government have any plans to undertake a formal and public review of Canada's whole-of-government pandemic response to inform future national pandemic planning, and, if so, what are the details; (i) what input fed into and/or informed the government's rationale for recommending that the WHO include "other global health threats", including climate change impacts in the scope of a pandemic instrument; and (j) what criteria did the government envision the WHO would use to determine when climate change impacts would reach a pandemic threshold?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1873—Ms. Leslyn Lewis:

With regard to Canada's participation in the First Movers Coalition (FMC): (a) what will be the specific obligations and actions undertaken to fulfill its commitments as a partner of the FMC; (b) what are the projected annual expenditures or costs to the government as a result of the government's participation in the (i) current fiscal year, (ii) next fiscal year; (c) what are the details of any policy measures that have been or will be implemented as part of the FMC; (d) what private sector consultation or engagement has the government undertaken thus far, and what are the results of that consultation; (e) has the government signed any contracts or agreements related to its FMC membership or FMC-related commitments, and, if so, what are the details of any such contracts or agreements, including, for each, the

(i) date, (ii) summary of terms, (iii) vendor, if applicable, (iv) financial value, if applicable, (v) titles of signatories to the agreement or contract; and (f) what FMC meetings have taken place or are currently planned, including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) list of invitees, (iii) meeting purpose, (iv) location, (v) agenda?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1874—Mr. Michael D. Chong:

With regard to Canadian Armed Forces Reconstitution Directive released in October 2022: what are the details of all briefing notes, placemats, or analysis reports the government has in relation to the directive, including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) type of document, (iii) title, (iv) sender, (v) recipient, (vi) file number?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1875—Mr. Mike Morrice:

With regard to bi-annual compliance reporting required by Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada (IRCC) since April 2015, for each Designated Learning Institution (DLI) in Canada, excluding those located in Quebec: (a) what is the total number of international students reported, broken down by DLI, bi-annual reporting period, and student status (i.e. academic break, academic suspension, authorized leave, deferred enrolment, full-time studies, no longer registered/enrolled, no show, not started, part-time studies, program/degree completed, unknown/no record); (b) has IRCC identified any non-genuine or non-compliant international students as a result of the information collected through DLI's bi-annual compliance reporting; and (c) if the answer to (b) is affirmative, what is the total number of instances of non-genuine or non-compliant international students identified, broken down by DLI and bi-annual reporting period?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1876—Mr. Arpan Khanna:

With regard to funding provided by the government to organizations for the purpose of advocacy, since 2019, and broken down by department, agency, or other government entity: (a) what was the total amount of funding on advocacy, broken down by year; (b) what are the details of all government programs that fund advocacy or similar activities, such as lobbying, including, for each, the (i) name of the program, (ii) purpose, (iii) annual budget; (c) what are the details of all funding provided through the programs in (b), including, for each, the (i) recipient, (ii) amount, (iii) date, (iv) purpose of the funding; and (d) what are the details of all funding for advocacy or similar types of activities that were not included in the response to (c), including, for each, the (i) recipient, (ii) amount, (iii) date, (iv) purpose of the funding, (v) program under which funding was provided?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1877—Mr. Damien C. Kurek:

With regard to the ban on the use of TikTok on government devices: (a) what evidence was used as the basis for the ban; (b) who approved the ban; (c) how many security breaches involving TikTok is the government aware of, and what are the details of each breach, including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) summary; and (d) what is the timeline for when the ban will either expire or be up for renewal?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1878—Mr. Damien C. Kurek:

With regard to the travel by the Minister of Environment and Climate Change and the accompanying delegation to the China Council for International Cooperation on Environment and Development in late August 2023: (a) what are the details of the trip, including the (i) names and titles of all attendees, (ii) costs associated with the trip, in total, and broken down by each individual that incurred expenses and the type of expense; and (b) what are the details of each meeting attended by the minister or any member of the Canadian delegation, including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) location, (iii) names and titles of attendees, (iv) purpose of the meeting?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 1880—Mr. Ron Liepert:**

With regard to the Canadian Forces Housing Agency (CFHA): (a) how many people have applied for, but have not yet been placed into, military housing, as of October 24, 2023; (b) within the current 2023-24 fiscal year, how many applicants to the CFHA waited (i) between one and 30 days, (ii) between 31 and 60 days, (iii) between 61 and 90 days, (iv) more than 90 days, between the date of application and the date of placement into military housing; and (c) during the (i) 2020-21, (ii) 2021-22, (iii) 2022-23, fiscal years, what was the greatest number of applicants on the waiting list on any one specific date?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1881—Mr. Ron Liepert:

With regard to violent crimes and the firearms ban that prohibited certain firearms as of May 1, 2020: (a) in the last fiscal year, how many violent crimes, defined by Statistics Canada as “Crimes against the person involve the use or threatened use of violence against a person, including homicide, attempted murder, assault, sexual assault and robbery”, involving firearms were committed with firearms that were included in the 2020 ban; (b) of the firearms in (a), (i) how many of the guns' origins could be traced via a serial number, (ii) how many guns' origins were traced back to the United States; and (c) how many violent crimes committed with firearms in the last fiscal year were committed by individuals without proper firearms licensing?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1882—Mr. Ron Liepert:

With regard to Parks Canada expenditures: (a) how much money did Parks Canada spend on (i) gasoline, (ii) diesel fuel, in the last fiscal year; (b) what portion of the total in (a), in dollar amounts, was spent on (i) federal carbon taxes, (ii) provincial carbon taxes; (c) how much money did Parks Canada spend on building heating in the last fiscal year; (d) what portion of the total in (c), in dollar amounts, was spent on (i) federal carbon taxes, (ii) provincial carbon taxes; and (e) what are Parks Canada's projections on how much more money the clean fuel regulations will add to their total expenditures on (i) gasoline, (ii) diesel fuel, (iii) building heating?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1883—Mr. Arpan Khanna:

With regard to the Mortgage Loan Insurance Select program offered by the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, since 2016: (a) what are the details of all projects completed as a result of the program, including, for each, the (i) location, (ii) number of units, (iii) value of the project, (iv) date of application, (v) date of approval; and (b) what was the number of units completed each year as a result of the program, including the current year to date?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1885—Mr. Tako Van Popta:

With regard to expenditures by the government on cannabis intended for veterans: (a) what were the total expenditures on cannabis intended for veterans, broken down by year for the past five years; and (b) what are the details of all contracts that the government has for cannabis intended for veterans since 2018, including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) vendor, (iii) value, (iv) amount of cannabis provided?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1887—Ms. Rachel Blaney:

With regard to the design selection of the National Monument to Canada's Mission in Afghanistan: (a) what surveys did the government conduct to solicit feedback on the monument's design that were conducted (i) online, (ii) in-person, (iii) by mail; (b) on what date was each survey in (a) conducted; (c) how many respondents to surveys in (a) were (i) veterans of Canada's mission in Afghanistan, (ii) Canadian veterans, (iii) active service members in the Canadian Armed Forces (CAF), (iv) family members of CAF members or veterans, (v) family members of veterans who served in Canada's mission in Afghanistan, (vi) members of the general public; (d) how was each survey in (a) communicated with potential respondents, especially with veterans of Canada's Mission in Afghanistan, their families, and current CAF members; (e) what were the costs associated with each survey in (a), broken down by survey; and (f) what was the reason given by the government as to why survey results would be used to select the monument over the advice of the commemorative advisory committee?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1888—Ms. Rachel Blaney:

With regard to sexual misconduct complaints within the Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) for calendar years 2022 and 2023: (a) what is the current total number of complaints received by the (i) chain of command, (ii) Military Police, (iii) Military Police Complaints Commission; (b) of the complaints received in (a), what specific administrative actions were taken, including the (i) initial counselling, (ii) recorded warning, (iii) counselling and probation, (iv) release from the CAF; (c) how many complaints are before a military tribunal; (d) broken down by province or territory, what is the total number of cases that have been transferred to (i) the RCMP, (ii) provincial police forces, (iii) municipal police forces; (e) what is the total number of cases that have been declined or sent back to the military; and (f) of the cases in (d) and (e), what is the average number of days for the relevant jurisdiction to accept or reject the case?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1889—Ms. Leslyn Lewis:

With regard to the Canada Infrastructure Bank (CIB): (a) since 2017, what are the total expenditures by the CIB on projects that were not completed, indefinitely delayed or otherwise abandoned, including projects announced that never reached the Financial Close stage; (b) what is the breakdown of the expenditures in (a) by (i) project name and project partners, (ii) category and type of expenditure; (c) to date, how many (i) unsolicited project proposals has the CIB received, (ii) solicited proposals has the CIB proactively pursued; and (d) of the projects announced to date, how many of those were the result of (i) the CIB seeking those investments out, (ii) unsolicited proposals in which partners sought out CIB investment in their project?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1890—Mr. Alex Ruff:

With regard to Canada's census of agriculture and government information about farmland in Canada: (a) how many farm properties exist, broken down by federal electoral district; (b) how many different entities own agricultural land, broken down by federal electoral district; (c) how many different farm businesses are located in each federal electoral district; (d) what is the total number of acres of farmland in each federal electoral district; and (e) what is the average size of farms, in acres, in each federal electoral district?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1893—Mr. Tim Uppal:

With regard to the Federal Skilled Worker Program, in the past five years: (a) how many and what percentage of applications exceeded the six months service standard for processing; and (b) of the applications in (a), how many and what percentage took (i) six months to nine months, (ii) nine months to one year, (iii) one year to 18 months, (iv) 18 months to five years, (v) more than five years, to be processed?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1894—Mr. Richard Bragdon:

With regard to the Auditor General's report entitled “Modernizing Information Technology Systems”, in section 7.44: (a) what are details of the 22 high-risk projects monitored by the Treasury Board Secretariat (TBS), including, for each, the (i) name of the department or agency overseeing the project, (ii) project name, (iii) description, (iv) action taken by the government to address the concerns raised in the report; and (b) what are the total expenditures to date, and the project future expenditures of each of the 22-high risk projects monitored by the TBS?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 1895—Mr. Richard Bragdon:**

With regard to the Auditor General's report entitled "Modernizing Information Technology Systems", in section 7.50: (a) which departments or agencies have requested funding for "modernization needs" and how much has each one requested; and (b) which departments or agencies were represented by the 83% of Chief Technology Officers that expressed they were not satisfied with the available mechanisms for funding modernization projects?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1897—Mr. Charlie Angus:

With regard to the Aboriginal Head Start in Urban and Northern Communities program, broken down by fiscal year and province or territory, since November 2015: (a) what is the annual budget of this program; (b) what are the details of all activities funded by this program, including the (i) community or First Nation that received funding, (ii) amount of funding received, (iii) number of children expected to benefit; (c) how many proposals for funding were denied funding; and (d) what is the total amount of lapsed spending by this program?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1898—Mr. Charlie Angus:

With regard to the Nutrition North program, broken down by province or territory and fiscal year since 2015-16: (a) what is the total amount of funding directed towards culturally appropriate retail and community-based nutrition education activities; (b) how many initiatives received funding for the purpose of (i) nutrition workshops, (ii) healthy cooking classes, (iii) in-store sampling of healthy food, (iv) knowledge and skill building related to traditional or country food harvesting and preparation, (v) gardening, (vi) training of community workers, (vii) the development of local nutrition education materials; and (c) what are the details of all initiatives in (b), including the (i) name of the community, organization, or company that received funding, (ii) date the funding was received, (iii) amount of funding?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1899—Ms. Bonita Zarrillo:

With regard to the Canada Emergency Response Benefit and the Canada Recovery Benefit: (a) how much does the government estimate is owed in repayments; (b) how many individuals owe repayments; (c) how many individuals in (b) reported an income below the low-income cut off on their 2022 income tax return; (d) what is the lowest amount owed; (e) what is the highest amount owed; (f) what is the average amount owed; (g) of the individuals owing money, how many does the government estimate were victims of fraud; (h) of the total estimate amount owed, how much does the government expect to (i) successfully recover, (ii) recover from those whose income is below the low-income cut-off; and (i) how much does the government intend to spend on staff time and resources to recover these debts, broken down by department, agency or other government entity?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1900—Ms. Bonita Zarrillo:

With regard to the Canada Emergency Response Benefit (CERB) and the Canada Recovery Benefit (CRB): (a) broken down by province or territory, what is the total number of individuals who have had their government benefits or credits applied to outstanding CERB or CRB debt; (b) of the individuals in (a), what is the total number who have had tax refunds or benefit payments offset to recover debt, broken down by costs recovered from (i) individual tax returns, (ii) the Canada Child benefit, (iii) provincial or territorial child benefits, (iv) GST or HST credits, (v) Canada Disability Benefits, (vi) Climate Action incentive?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1902—Mr. Garnett Genuis:

With regard to the government's response to the situation in Sudan: (a) how many people have been evacuated from Sudan who are (i) Canadian citizens, (ii) Canadian permanent residents, (iii) family members of Canadian citizens or permanent residents, since April 1, 2023; (b) what special immigration measures has the government implemented for people leaving Sudan; (c) what additional special immigration measures is the government examining or considering for people leaving Sudan; (d) is the government investigating allegations against any Canadian firms relating to their relationships with Sudanese military or paramilitary groups, and, if so, which firms are under investigation; (e) what is the government's position regarding (i) the presence of the Wagner Group in Sudan, (ii) calls for the listing of the Wagner Group as a terrorist entity?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1904—Mr. Garnett Genuis:

With regard to members of the Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) posted in Europe: are members of the CAF still being asked to pay for their own meals upfront and then seek reimbursements, and, if so, how many are currently required to do this, in total, and broken down by rank and location of service?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1906—Mr. Garnett Genuis:

With regard to Canadian citizens detained or incarcerated abroad, in total, and broken down by country of detention or incarceration: (a) how many citizens are detained or incarcerated; (b) how many citizens are detained in circumstances that violate their human rights; (c) how many citizens are detained for offenses that would not be considered offenses if committed in Canada; and (d) how many Canadian detainees is the government seeking to have released?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1907—Mr. Taylor Bachrach:

With regard to the Northern Residents Tax Deduction: (a) what is the total number of claimants and the total amount of residency deduction claimed between 2018 and 2022, broken down by province; and (b) what is the total number of claimants and the total amount of residency deduction claimed by residents of Haida Gwaii between 2018 and 2022?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1908—Mr. Taylor Bachrach:

With regard to federally owned lands in British Columbia: (a) what federally owned lands fall within the municipal boundaries of the (i) City of Terrace, (ii) the District of Kitimat, (iii) Town of Smithers, (iv) City of Prince Rupert; and (b) for each parcel in (a), what is the (i) size in hectares, (ii) current use?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1910—Mr. Don Davies:

With regard to Health Canada's authorization of the Comirnaty Omicron XBB.1.5 and Spikevax XBB.1.5 vaccines: (a) is there any clinical data demonstrating efficacy of these vaccines, and, if so, what data; (b) is there any clinical data demonstrating safety of these vaccines, and, if so, what data; (c) is there any data suggesting that previously authorized messenger ribonucleic acid (mRNA) vaccines are outdated with respect to currently circulating variants of the SARS-CoV-2 virus; (d) is there any concern that currently authorized mRNA vaccines will help select for more successful variants of the SARS-CoV-2 virus; (e) is there any data suggesting that disease-induced immunity is stronger than vaccine-induced immunity from authorized mRNA vaccines for COVID-19; (f) do currently authorized mRNA vaccines prevent COVID-19 infection; (g) do currently authorized mRNA vaccines prevent COVID-19 transmission; and (h) what positive health impact do currently authorized mRNA vaccines have on recipients?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 1911—Mr. Adam Chambers:**

With regard to the government's policies governing information technology (IT) projects, delivery, and contracting: (a) what policies and procedures are in place to ensure independent assessment and oversight, as well as ensuring value-for-money, on IT projects over \$2.5 million; (b) what contract vehicles are in place for departments and agencies to secure the resources needed to perform the procedures in (a); (c) what are the details of each contract related to (b), including, for each, the (i) date the contract came into force, (ii) vendor, (iii) amount, (iv) description of goods or services provided; and (d) what were the total expenditures on federal IT (i) infrastructure, (ii) software, (iii) services, (iv) consultants, in each of the last three years, in total and broken down by department or agency?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1912—Mr. Adam Chambers:

With regard to the government's approach to information technology (IT): (a) what were the total expenditures on (i) research or IT database subscription services, (ii) benchmarking, (iii) value-assurance services for IT, in total, and broken down by department or agency and by each client department of Shared Services Canada; (b) which companies or stakeholders were consulted when Public Services and Procurement Canada made the decision to eliminate the National Master Standing Offers for Research (IT database subscription services) and Benchmarking for IT services that was previously in place for research and benchmarking services; (c) what are the details of the consultations in (b), including, for each, (i) the date, (ii) who was consulted, (iii) the feedback received; (d) what are the details of any outside consultants or service providers that have been involved in the development of a new contracting vehicle for these services, and what are the details of each, including the (i) name of the individual or firm, (ii) contract value, (iii) date of the contract, (iv) description of the goods or services provided; (e) how many government employees or full-time equivalents worked on the redesign and consultations; (f) what are the (i) travel, (ii) hospitality, costs associated with the redesign and consultations incurred to date, in total, and broken down by year and type of expense; (g) how many suppliers does the government use for research (IT database subscription services), benchmarking and value-assurance services relating to IT, and who are the suppliers; (h) how many of the suppliers in (g) include retired civil servants from the government; (i) what steps does the government take to ensure these service providers aren't conflicted through partnerships, alliances, downstream implementation conflicts and other contractual arrangements; (j) how many and which departments and agencies use research (IT database subscription services), benchmarking and value-assurance services; and (k) for each department or agency in (j), what service providers are contracted to provide these services?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1913—Mr. John Williamson:

With regard to government funding provided to Greenfield Construction or its subsidiaries: what are the details of all funding, since November 4, 2015, broken down by department or agency, including, for each, (i) the date, (ii) the amount, (iii) the type of funding (i.e. repayable loan, grant, contract), (iv) the purpose of funding or the project description, (v) the repayment terms, if applicable, (vi) whether there has been a change order associated with the funding, and, if so, what are the details, including the revised amount of the change order?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1914—Mr. John Williamson:

With regard to government funding provided for projects at or in the vicinity of North Head Harbour on Grand Manan Island, New Brunswick: what are the details of all funding, since November 4, 2015, broken down by department or agency, including, for each, (i) the date, (ii) the amount, (iii) the type of funding (i.e. repayable loan, grant, contract), (iv) the purpose of funding or the project description, (v) the repayment terms, if applicable, (vi) whether there has been a change order associated with the funding, and, if so, what are the details, including the revised amount of the change order?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1916—Mr. John Nater:

With regard to VIA Rail Canada: what are the details of all meetings involving the current President and CEO and one or more government officials not employed by VIA Rail Canada, including elected and non-elected officials of all federal, provincial, and municipal governments, including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) location, including if the meeting was in person or virtual, (iii) names and titles of the attendees, (iv) purpose of the meeting?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1917—Mr. Shuvaloy Majumdar:

With regard to Global Affairs Canada and foreign aid funding: (a) what are the details of how much funding was received by (i) the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs funding, (ii) the United Nations Development Programme, (iii) the World Health Organization, (iv) the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, (v) the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women, (vi) the World Food Programme, (vii) any other organization that received over \$1 million in foreign aid funding in the last fiscal year; (b) for each organization in (a), on what date were they last audited to ensure that their funding was being spent appropriately; and (c) what were the findings of each audit in (b)?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1918—Mr. Mel Arnold:

With regard to efforts by the government to combat illegal fishing by vessels off the British Columbia coast, broken down by year since 2019: (a) how many boats were intercepted for allegedly engaging in illegal fishing; and (b) what are the details of each incident where a vessel was intercepted, including, for each, the (i) name, (ii) country of origin, (iii) location where the vessel was intercepted, (iv) type of alleged illegal fishing, (v) resulting action (i.e. fine, seizure, criminal charges, etc.), (vi) quantity of illegal fish caught, broken down by species?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1920—Mr. Scot Davidson:

With regard to government expenditures on aircraft rentals or charters since December 1, 2020, broken down by department, agency, Crown corporation and other government entity: (a) what is the total amount spent on the rental of aircraft; and (b) what are the details of each expenditure, including the (i) amount, (ii) vendor, (iii) dates of rental, (iv) type of aircraft, (v) purpose of the trip, (vi) origin and the destination of flights, (vii) titles of passengers, including which passengers were on which segments of each trip?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1921—Mr. Scot Davidson:

With regard to Indigenous Services Canada's funding of the seasonal ferry Aazhaawe that travels between Virginia Beach, Ontario, to the Chippewas of Georgina Island First Nation on Lake Simcoe: (a) how much funding has been provided related to the ferry by Indigenous Services Canada, broken down by year for each of the last five years; and (b) what costs are covered by this funding, including whether (i) fuel costs, (ii) maintenance and repair costs, (iii) operations costs, (iv) other costs, broken down by type, are covered?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1924—Mr. Clifford Small:

With regard to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans: (a) what was the average hourly catch rate, per net, of northern cod, broken down by area for fishing areas 2J, 3K and 3L, in 1988, 2015, 2017, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023, for the commercial and stewardship fisheries; (b) what was the average catch rate, per net, of northern cod, broken down by area for fishing areas 2J, 3K, and 3L, in 1994, 2005, 2010, 2015, 2017, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023, in the sentinel fishery program; and (c) what is the annual cost to carry out the sentinel cod fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador in 1994, 2005, 2015, 2020 and 2022?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 1926—Mr. Corey Tochor:**

With regard to the Auditor General's report entitled "The Benefits Delivery Modernization Programme": (a) what were the total expenditures associated with the June 2022 review by the Treasury Board Secretariat; (b) what is the breakdown of (a) by line item and type of expense; (c) what were the total expenditures associated with the March 2021 schedule review; (d) what is the breakdown of (c) by line item and type of expense; and (e) what were the costs associated with the delays associated with the March 2021 schedule review?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1928—Mr. Dan Albas:

With regard to the export of Canada's plastic waste under the Basel Convention: (a) what measures are in place to ensure that plastic waste exported without a permit is clean, sorted, and intended for recycling; (b) how many times since January 1, 2021, has the government imposed punitive measures on companies for failing to comply with these requirements; (c) does the government monitor the final country of destination for plastic waste exported to the United States, and, if so, what specific processes are in place to accomplish this; (d) does the government track the exported plastic waste that is (i) covered under export permits, (ii) exempted from the permit process, to determine if this waste is recycled or disposed of safely, and, if so, what specific processes are in place to accomplish this; (e) since November 4, 2015, has the government conducted research to evaluate the potential impact that banning the export of plastic waste would have on stimulating investments in a national circular economy, and, if so, what are the details of this research, including (i) who conducted it, (ii) its methodology, (iii) its findings; and (f) what are the details of each punitive measure in (b), including, for each, the (i) date, (ii) name of the company, (iii) type of punitive measure, including the amount fined, (iv) incident summary?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1929—Mr. Gérard Deltell:

With regard to the carbon footprint resulting from the Minister of Environment and Climate Change's air travel: (a) what are the details of all trips involving air travel taken by the minister since January 1, 2019, including, for each, the (i) dates, (ii) origin and the destination, (iii) purpose of the trip, (iv) number of travellers accompanying the minister, (v) estimated carbon footprint resulting from the minister's travel, (vi) estimated carbon footprint resulting from the delegation's travel, (vii) total expenditures related to the trip, broken down by each traveller and type of expense; and (b) for each trip in (a), were virtual or other options that did not involve air travel considered, and, if so, why were the other options not chosen?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1930—Ms. Leah Gazan:

With regard to federal spending on settlement services and newcomer housing in the electoral district of Winnipeg Centre, broken down by fiscal year since November 2019: (a) what is the amount of federal funding committed for the purpose of (i) settlement services, (ii) newcomer housing; (b) what are the details of all initiatives that received funding, including the (i) name of the organization that received funding, (ii) date the funding was received, (iii) amount of funding; and (c) what is the total amount of lapsed spending?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1931—Ms. Michelle Ferreri:

With regard to the government's response to homelessness and tent cities: (a) what are the details of all programs currently in place to deal with homelessness and tent cities; (b) for each program in (a), how much funding is allocated in (i) the current fiscal year, (ii) each of the next five fiscal years; (c) which of the programs in (a) involve funding for addiction treatment and recovery; (d) how is the funding for each program tracked, monitored and audited; and (e) does the government have any quantifiable goals for reducing the number of homeless Canadians, and, if so, what are they, nationally and broken down by region?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1932—Ms. Michelle Ferreri:

With regard to expenditures on social media influencers, including any contracts which would use social media influencers as part of a public relations campaign, since January 1, 2021: (a) what are the details of all such expenditures, including the (i) vendor, (ii) amount, (iii) campaign description, (iv) date of the contract, (v) name or handle of the influencer; and (b) for each campaign that paid an influencer,

was there a requirement to make public, as part of a disclaimer, the fact that the influencer was being paid by the government, and, if not, why not?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1934—Mr. Brian Masse:

With regard to the Great Lakes Fishery Commission's (GLFC) machinery of government interface with the government, its financing and its obligations to Canada under the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries Between the United States of America and Canada (1954): (a) from what statute(s) or Act(s) of Parliament does the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard derive the legislative authority to function as the lead minister; (b) does the existing legislative authority of the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard negate, alter or eliminate the GLFC Privileges and Immunities Order (originally made under section 3 of the Privileges and Immunities (International Organizations) Act and subsumed into section 16 of the Foreign Missions and International Organizations Act); (c) what are the primary functions and operational limitations of the ministers responsible for the interface functions pursuant to all relevant statutes and regulations; (d) does the Great Lakes Convention Act, or any other statutes, regulations or Acts of Parliament, provide any ministers with the authority to direct the commission or the commission's routine activities and programming beyond Parliament's prerogative to approve annual budget allocations to the Commission; (e) what are the implications of paragraph 10(2)(b) of the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Act for the interaction of Canada with the commission; (f) has Canada's annual financial allocation to the commission been "fenced" as described by the Department of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard (DFO) officials during their testimony on June 8, 2023, to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans (FOPO); (g) what is the precise nature, structure and limitations of the "fencing" structure described by DFO officials during testimony on June 8, 2023, to the FOPO; (h) what sources, officials, or departments would possess the authority to alter, reverse or eliminate the financial "fencing" described by DFO officials during their testimony on June 8, 2023, to the FOPO; (i) who or what body is the Canadian Contracting Party as described under Article II; (j) what is the role of Parliament with regard to supervision, directing and oversight of the activities and programming of the commission; (k) if the Contracting Party is not Parliament, what is the role of Parliament with regard to the supervision, direction and oversight of the Contracting Party; (l) does the existing legislative framework provide the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard with the authority to administer the Great Lakes Fishery Convention Act or does the legislative framework provide specific ministerial authority, and, if so, what is the precise nature and limit of that authority; (m) does the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries Between the United States of America and Canada (1954) stipulate that commissioners are representatives of the Contracting Parties, and, if so, does this stipulation provide commissioners with the authority to represent Canada at Commission meeting and events; and (n) does the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries Between the United States of America and Canada (1954) provide for a specific authority for any minister(s) to directly represent Canada at commission meetings and events?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1935—Mr. Brian Masse:

With regard to the housing crisis and affordable housing in Canada: (a) will the government commit to the recommendations of the Canadian Real Estate Association to (i) create a permanent national housing roundtable to bring together housing stakeholders in order to address the housing crisis through an inclusive, holistic approach that emphasizes collaboration, innovation and policy coordination, (ii) leverage federal infrastructure funding with municipal, provincial and territorial partners requiring the creation of more housing supply, (iii) develop a housing workforce immigration strategy to attract tradespeople from abroad while streamlining the immigration process for qualified professionals willing to work in the construction industry; and (b) how much funding for affordable housing has been distributed to the City of Windsor, Ontario, through federal government programs over the last five years, from January 1, 2018, through present, including (i) what federal funding programs were applied for, (ii) the amount of funding distributed, (iii) the list of specific projects funded, (iv) whether the funding was in the form of grants or loans?

(Return tabled)

*Points of Order***Question No. 1939—Mr. Blake Desjarlais:**

With regard to Canada Mortgage Housing Corporation (CMHC) funding for Indigenous housing in Edmonton, broken down by fiscal year since 2015-16: (a) what are the details of all funding applications received, including the (i) name of the requester, (ii) amount requested, (iii) status of the application, (iv) amount of funding granted, (v) progress on the project; (b) what actions has the CMHC undertaken to make it easier for Indigenous housing providers to apply for funding; (c) does the CMHC record data on potential applications who have abandoned projects because of burdensome or overly complicated application procedures, and, if so, what indicators does the CMHC use to make the process easier; and (d) what is the CMHC doing to ensure that Indigenous housing providers, such as Tribal Chiefs Ventures Inc., are not encumbered by debt when co-investing in Indigenous housing?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1940—Mr. Blake Desjarlais:

With regard to the Post-Secondary Student Support Program, broken down by fiscal year since 2008-09 and by province or territory: (a) what are the details of all funding arrangements made with Indigenous governments and organizations concerning this program, including the (i) name of the First Nations or First Nations-designated organization, (ii) amount of funding to cover eligible expenses for students, (iii) number of students who received support; and (b) what is the total annual expenditure by the government on this program?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1941—Mr. Matthew Green:

With regard to contract work performed for the Canadian Border Services Agency, since November 2015, and broken down by fiscal year: (a) what is the total number of contracts awarded to (i) GCStrategies, (ii) Dalian Enterprises Inc., (iii) Coradix Technology Consulting, (iv) Moravej Inc., (v) 10583308 Canada Inc.; (b) what are the details of all contracts in (a), including the (i) date the contract was awarded, (ii) value of the contract, (iii) number of amendments to the initial contract; and (c) what is the total number of government employees who reviewed, processed and approved each contract in (a)?

(Return tabled)

[English]

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

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

BILL C-59—PROPOSAL TO APPLY STANDING ORDER 69.1

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order pursuant to Standing Order 69.1, to ask that you treat Bill C-59, an act to implement certain provisions of the fall economic statement tabled in Parliament on November 21, 2023 and certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 28, 2023, as an omnibus bill, and divide it for voting purposes at the second and third reading stages.

This argument is, of course, without prejudice to the arguments which were made last week by me in respect of the rule against anticipation and Ways and Means Motion No. 19, which preceded the introduction of Bill C-59, for which the House is still awaiting a ruling from the Speaker.

Section (1) of Standing Order 69.1 provides that “In the case where a government bill seeks to repeal, amend or enact more than one act, and where there is not a common element connecting the various provisions or where unrelated matters are linked, the

Speaker shall have the power to divide the questions, for the purposes of voting”. Section (2) of the same standing order makes an exception for budget implementation bills, stating, “if the bill has as its main purpose the implementation of a budget and contains only provisions that were announced in the budget presentation”.

As Speaker Regan ruled on November 8, 2017, at page 15143 of the Debates, where a budget bill contains measures which were not part of the budget, this budget bill exemption applies only to those elements which were in the budget itself. The non-budget elements can be divided under the provisions of Standing Order 69.1(1).

In the case of Bill C-59, calling it a budget implementation bill would be exceedingly generous. While reference to the March budget can be found in the long title, the short title ignores this, calling the bill the “fall economic statement implementation act, 2023”. Not even the government House leader, the manager of the government's parliamentary program, used it as a budget implementation bill, judging by her remarks in the last two weekly business statements. On November 23, she told the House, “it is the intention of the government to commence debate next week concerning the bill relating to the fall economic statement”. This past Thursday, she said that priority will be given to the second reading of Bill C-59, an act to implement certain provisions of the fall economic statement. Therefore, I would argue that the evident treatment given to Bill C-59 by its own proponents, would mean that its main purpose is, indeed, not the implementation of a budget. Accordingly, it would follow that the exemption found in Standing Order 69.1(2) cannot apply here.

I would further argue that Speaker Regan's November 2017 ruling can be distinguished from the facts at hand today, namely that he dealt with a budget bill with a few extra add-ons. Here, we have a bill that is not even being treated, in the main, as a budget implementation bill and that, therefore, cannot even benefit from a partial exemption, since the main purpose of Bill C-59 is not to implement a budget.

Having addressed that matter, I now wish to turn to the matter of treating the bill as an omnibus one, “where there is not a common element connecting the various provisions or where unrelated matters are linked”. In my respectful view, the fact that a series of measures may have been previewed in a fall economic statement does not amount to a so-called common element. Given that fall economic statements are often popularly dubbed “mini-budgets” and that the House itself recognizes that budgets often string together otherwise unrelated things by creating the budget implementation bill exemption in Standing Order 69.1, it is my submission that the mere inclusion of an item in a fall economic statement cannot be sufficient to overcome the treatment required for an omnibus bill.

Government Orders

Even if the Chair might be persuaded that all of the measures are, in one form or another, a matter of broad economic policy, I would refer you to Speaker Regan's March 1, 2018, ruling at page 17551 of the Debates:

In presenting arguments relating to Bill C-63, the hon. member for Calgary Shepard raised an interesting concept from the practice in the Quebec National Assembly. Quoting from page 400 of *Parliamentary Procedure in Québec*, he stated:

"The principle or principles contained in a bill must not be confused with the field it concerns. To frame the concept of principle in that way would prevent the division of most bills, because they apply to a specific field."

While their procedure for dividing bills is quite different from ours, the idea of distinguishing the principles of a bill from its field has stayed with me. While each bill is different and so too each case, I believe that Standing Order 69.1 can indeed be applied to a bill where all of the initiatives relate to a specific policy area, if those initiatives are sufficiently distinct to warrant a separate decision of the House.

In this particular instance, I have no trouble agreeing that all of the measures contained in Bill C-69 relate to environmental protection. However, I believe there are distinct initiatives that are sufficiently unrelated that they warrant multiple votes.

• (1035)

Deputy Speaker Bruce Stanton dealt with another similar situation when he ruled on June 18, 2018, at page 21163 of the Debates, in respect of a former Bill C-59, stating it:

...does clearly contain several different initiatives. It establishes new agencies and mechanisms for oversight of national security agencies and deals with information collection and sharing as well as criminal offences relating to terrorism. That said, one could argue, as the parliamentary secretary did, that since these are all matters related to national security, there is, indeed, a common thread between them. However, the question the Chair must ask itself is whether these specific measures should be subjected to separate votes.

He goes on to state, "In this particular case, while the Chair has no trouble agreeing that all of the measures contained in Bill C-59 relate to national security, it is the Chair's view that there are distinct initiatives that are sufficiently unrelated as to warrant dividing the question."

Therefore, I would suggest that today's bill, Bill C-59, should also be divided for voting purposes at second reading and, if necessary, at third reading.

After a brief review and analysis of the bill's contents, it seems that it could actually be divided into several groupings: clauses 1 to 95, proposing amendments to the Income Tax Act and consequential amendments to other enactments, as well as the bill's short title; clauses 96 to 128, proposing the creation of a digital services tax; clauses 129 to 136, 138 to 143 and 145 to 167, proposing amendments concerning the excise tax, other than the exemption of GST for mental health services, which is also contained in Bill C-323, a matter to which I will return later; clauses 168 to 196, proposing amendments to the laws governing financial institutions; clauses 197 to 208, proposing to create a leave entitlement related to pregnancy loss and to amend the law concerning bereavement leave; clauses 209 to 216, proposing the creation of a Canada water agency; clauses 217 and 218, proposing amendments to the Tobacco and Vaping Products Act; clauses 219 to 230, proposing amendments to the Canadian Payments Act; clauses 231 to 272 proposing various amendments to competition law; clauses 273 to 277, proposing amendments exempting post-secondary schools from the laws concerning bankruptcy and insolvency; clauses 278 to 317, proposing various legislative amendments concerning money laundering, terrorist financing and sanctions evasions; clauses 318 and 319, con-

cerning the information which is published by the government respecting certain transfer payments to the provinces; clauses 320 to 322, proposing amendments concerning the Public Sector Pension Investment Board; and clauses 323 to 341, proposing the creation of a department of housing, infrastructure and communities.

Additionally, I would propose that clauses 137 and 144, concerning the exemption of GST for mental health services, mirroring the provisions of Bill C-323, as well as clauses 342 to 365, creating employment insurance and job protection benefits for adoptive and surrogate parents, replicating the substance of Bill C-318, should also be separated out from Bill C-59. However, in this instance, I would suggest that, instead of a separate vote, these provisions would simply not proceed further given that the House has already taken a decision on the principle of those matters when it adopted the common-sense Conservative private members' bills at second reading.

Approaching it in this fashion might be an elegant solution to squaring the circle in the ruling that remains pending on Ways and Means Motion No. 19.

In short, Bill C-59, the fall economic statement implementation bill, is an omnibus bill under Standing Order 69.1. It qualifies in no way for the budget bill exemption in that rule. It can and should be divided into separate votes, about 14 or so based on the thematic groupings of the bill's clauses. It would, if so divided, offer an elegant solution for a pending Speaker's ruling to reconcile the long-standing rules and precedents of the House respecting multiple decisions on the same question that, for reasons we are awaiting, did not apply to Ways and Means Motion No. 19 and that saw the House vote, yet again, on the principles found in two Conservative private members' bills that had already been adopted at second reading.

• (1040)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I thank the hon. member for all of the elements brought forth. They will be taken into consideration.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CANADA-UKRAINE FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2023

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-57, An Act to implement the 2023 Free Trade Agreement between Canada and Ukraine, as reported (with amendment) from the committee.

[English]

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The sponsor of the motion and the member who had submitted an identical notice have indicated to the Chair that they do not wish to proceed with Motion No. 1.

[Translation]

Accordingly, the House will now proceed, without debate, to the putting of the question on the motion to concur in the bill at report stage.

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (for the Minister of Export Promotion, International Trade and Economic Development) moved that the bill be concurred in.

[English]

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

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

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, I am very glad to see that the Conservatives chose not to debate the short title. I would ask for a recorded division.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Call in the members.

• (1125)

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

(Division No. 607)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Barron
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bendayan	Bennett
Bergeron	Bérubé
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney
Blois	Boissonnault
Boulerice	Bradford
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe
Cannings	Carr
Casey	Chabot
Chagger	Chahal
Champagne	Champoux
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Collins (Victoria)	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens

Government Orders

Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Dong
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Gaheer	Gainey
Garon	Garrison
Gaudreau	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gill
Gould	Green
Hajdu	Hanley
Hardie	Hepfner
Holland	Housefather
Hughes	Hutchings
Idlout	Ien
Jaczek	Johns
Joly	Jowhari
Julian	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Khera	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Larouche
Lattanzio	Lauzon
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Lemire	Lightbound
Long	Longfield
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Martinez Ferrada	Masse
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod	McPherson
Mendès	Mendicino
Miao	Miller
Morrice	Morrissey
Murray	Naqvi
Ng	Noormohamed
Normandin	O'Connell
Oliphant	O'Regan
Pauzé	Perron
Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon
Powlowski	Qualtrough
Rayes	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Rota
Sahota	Sajjan
Saks	Samson
Sarai	Savard-Tremblay
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
Sorbara	Sousa
Ste-Marie	St-Onge
Sudds	Tassi
Taylor Roy	Thériault
Therrien	Thomas
Thompson	Trudeau
Trudel	Turnbull
Valdez	Van Bynen
van Koevorden	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vignola

Government Orders

Villemure
Vuong
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi — 209

Virani
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

NAYS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Berthold	Bezan
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chambers
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Davidson
Deltell	Doherty
Dowdall	Dreeschen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Ferreri	Gallant
Généreux	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Hoback	Jeneroux
Kelly	Khanna
Kitchen	Kmiec
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kurek	Kusie
Lake	Lantsman
Lawrence	Lehoux
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Maguire	Majumdar
Martel	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Melillo	Moore
Morantz	Morrison
Motz	Muys
Nater	Patzer
Paul-Hus	Perkins
Poillievre	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Richards	Roberts
Rood	Ruff
Scheer	Schmale
Seeback	Shields
Shipley	Small
Soroka	Steinley
Stewart	Strahl
Tochor	Tolmie
Uppal	Van Popta
Vecchio	Vidal
Vien	Viersen
Vis	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Williams
Williamson	Zimmer — 112

PAIRED

Members

Deltell	Guilbeault
Hussen	Michaud — 4

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Hon. Mary Ng moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the words that come to my mind right away are “all MA-GA, all the time”. To me, that is what this vote was all about. I think the vast majority of Canadians truly understand what we just witnessed, and this is not the first time. The Conservative Party today has gone so far to the right—

Mr. James Bezan: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe the Standing Orders say we are not allowed to reflect on a vote that has been taken in this House, and the parliamentary secretary is doing that.

Also, the parliamentary secretary consistently rises in this place and extols very toxic rhetoric. We have the Minister of Trade sitting right here. Should she not be addressing this instead of the parliamentary secretary?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): That is definitely not up to the opposition to decide.

The hon. member for Kingston and Islands, on the same point of order.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, the issue of reflecting on a vote and talking about how one has voted previously is something we all do in this House all the time. I do not know where the member is coming from, other than the fact that he does not want to hear the truth about—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): We are not going to get into a debate on this. I will make sure this is the case in just a moment.

Standing Order 18, on page 12, says, “No member may reflect upon any vote of the House, except for the purpose of moving that such vote be rescinded.” This is in the Standing Orders, and I would ask the hon. parliamentary secretary to retract.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I am going to continue to reflect on the behaviour of the Conservative Party when the Conservative Party consistently votes against Ukraine.

● (1130)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member was told that is not allowed by the Standing Orders.

The hon. member for Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon.

Mr. Brad Vis: Madam Speaker, on that point of order, not only do I take great offence to the fact that he referred to the Conservative Party as far right, but I would also note that according to the Standing Orders, that is not the subject of the debate at hand today.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Yes, and I have reminded the hon. member that we shall not refer to votes taken in the House.

Government Orders

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I can appreciate that the Conservative Party is a little sensitive right now, because at the end of the day, more and more Canadians are going to come to the realization that the Conservative Party of today is far to the right. It is a pattern we have seen now for months, where the Conservative Party is becoming, as much as possible, the extreme right. I think it is appropriate to point—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon has a point of order.

Mr. Brad Vis: Madam Speaker, we all know that Liberal Party members do not like to participate in debate. They defer to the member for Winnipeg North to do their dirty work—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): We are not going to enter into that debate.

The hon. member for Kingston and the Islands has a point of order.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, we have seen this happen before, and it is about the procedure in this House. I know sometimes when this member speaks and sometimes when I speak, there is a coordinated effort among Conservative members to stand up on points of order that quite often are not anywhere near points of order, as the member just did.

I am looking to you for guidance, Madam Speaker, as to how you will deal with this procedurally if they continually get up on points of order, especially when they are not relevant or not real points of order. How will you ensure that the member has the opportunity to properly debate in this House?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Absolutely.

The hon. member for Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, on the same point of order.

Mr. James Bezan: Madam Speaker, my point of order was on Standing Order 18, which you definitely ruled on. I have still not heard the member for Winnipeg North retract his inflammatory statements.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, on that point of order, I have been a parliamentarian for 30 years, and if we say that a member cannot reflect on a vote, one has to take a look at the traditions. It is not just what is in the book but also the traditions, and traditionally—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. parliamentary secretary knows that if another member feels something is disruptive or offensive, we have to act on it. The standing order does say that we do not reflect on votes, so I would ask the hon. parliamentary secretary to retract.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I am looking for clarity on the issue, because I think this is really important.

At the end of the day, I cannot imagine how a member of Parliament or any parliamentarian would not be able to challenge a member for the manner in which their caucus is voting. I cannot imagine a world where it would be unparliamentary to do that. Every politi-

cal party that I am aware of has done that throughout my 30 years in Parliament, whether it is here or at the Manitoba legislature.

I would ask, with all due respect, that we reflect on the traditions of the House. Just because one opposition party is sensitive to the truth, I should not be censored from being able to express the reality on the floor of the House of Commons in Canada today.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): While the hon. parliamentary secretary may be right in terms of traditions, I have to refer to the Standing Orders as they stand. The hon. member for Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman rose on a point of order, and there is a standing order reflecting that we cannot refer to votes, so I have to apply it. I ask the hon. parliamentary secretary to retract.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I suspect that if we were to go through the Standing Orders today, we would find a number of Standing Orders that are somewhat redundant and do not necessarily have value. I would suggest this is one of those Standing Orders, and I would ask—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I would agree with the hon. member, but it is not up to me. I am not the one to change Standing Orders as we go. We have a process for that.

The hon. member for Kingston and the Islands.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, there is another Standing Order that says we are not allowed to sing in the House, yet the member for Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon, when introducing a petition earlier today, was singing. I think it would only be appropriate that the petition be removed from the record, because he presented it in a way that goes against our Standing Orders. As a member, I would like to call that out.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

• (1135)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Nobody raised it at the time so it passed.

The hon. member for Brandon—Souris, on the same point of order, I presume.

Mr. Larry Maguire: Madam Speaker, yes, but I will get to my point in a moment. If the member who just spoke is calling out the member for Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon for singing today, he is pretty loose with what he calls singing.

I just want to say—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): We are judging artistic capacity here.

The hon. member for Brandon—Souris has the floor.

Mr. Larry Maguire: Madam Speaker, the member across the way for Winnipeg North has challenged the Speaker's ruling.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I think the hon. member was trying to see if tradition overrides the Standing Orders, if I understand correctly the point the hon. parliamentary secretary was making.

*Government Orders***POINTS OF ORDER**

ALLEGED BREACH OF STANDING ORDER 18

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I talk about traditions, and all one needs to do is take a look at question periods. In the debates I have witnessed, the way in which members have voted is constantly being reflected on.

All I am asking is for some clarity, and I do not think clarity can be decided instantaneously. It is something that should be brought back and thought through, because it is a very important ruling you need to make, Madam Speaker, given the very nature of what I am asking for.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): It will be taken under advisement because it has been raised.

The hon. member for Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon.

Mr. Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon, CPC): Madam Speaker, Standing Order 11(b) says, “In the event of a member disregarding an order of the Chair made pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section, the Speaker shall order the removal of the member.”

Not only did the member for Winnipeg North disregard your order, but he then went on to state that the Standing Orders were not relevant. The Standing Orders under the Parliament of Canada Act are the rules by which we govern democracy in Canada. They are relevant.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I take the hon. member's point. That is exactly why I stated what I did.

I invite the hon. parliamentary secretary to go back to his speech and avoid creating more dissension.

Mr. Ben Lobb: Madam Speaker, I would ask the parliamentary secretary to retract his comments and apologize. If he does not want to, then I suggest we move on to the next speaker and continue debate.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Since we are taking his comments on the standing order under advisement, I will not be able to proceed with that, but I did invite the hon. member to retract his comments.

* * *

**CANADA-UKRAINE FREE TRADE AGREEMENT
IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2023**

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-57, An Act to implement the 2023 Free Trade Agreement between Canada and Ukraine, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, if at any point it was interpreted that I was challenging the ruling of the Chair, I apologize for that.

I am glad the Speaker has recognized the very serious nature of what the Conservatives are suggesting by implementing that standing order because it will have a very profound effect on many speeches, not only today but well into the future. I suspect it will be

referred to well into the future until the rule is changed. I suggest it is a dated rule and one taken out of context only because members opposite are against the Canada-Ukraine free trade agreement, which is not a reflection on the vote. It is very clear that the Conservatives do not support the Canada-Ukraine free trade agreement.

We remember the voting marathon and voting line by line. We also remember the leader of the Conservative Party saying last week that Conservatives were going to keep the government working until Christmas, that they were going to fight the government over the price on pollution and keep Liberals voting endlessly. There were 30-plus hours of voting. That was the energy of the leader of the Conservative Party.

What ended up happening? When midnight approached, a good portion of Conservatives decided to have a nap and did not necessarily participate in the proceedings. Some caused a great deal of concern. When we voted line by line, we saw the true colours of the Conservative Party on a couple of motions. One was on funding to reinforce Canada's support for Ukraine, better known as Operation Unifier. Canadians would have been shocked to see the manner in which the Conservatives dealt with that particular issue. People would be shocked—

● (1140)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, a moment ago the member was reflecting on the presence or absence of members at the end of last week. That is very clearly against the rules. The member is not new and knows that reflecting on the presence or absence of particular members is against the rules. I hope he will bring himself to order.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I would remind the hon. member that referring to the presence or absence of members is against the rules.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, for clarification, if one were to say that 40% of the Conservative caucus was not present for 45% of the votes, would that be against the rules, as I am not talking about an individual?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): It is saying indirectly what members cannot say directly, so I would remind the hon. member that he cannot make those implications.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I apologize for having an effect on the sensitivities of the Conservatives on this issue.

As I said, Canadians would be very surprised and disappointed because of what we have witnessed, not only today but also the other day during the voting marathon, of the Conservative Party being influenced by MAGA from the deep south in the United States, where there is a movement that is very real and tangible and is being ushered into Canada through the leader of the Conservative Party. We see that the positions Conservatives are taking are now starting to impact Canadian public policy, to the degree that they are detrimental to our communities.

Government Orders

Mr. Brad Vis: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, it goes without saying that Canada is a sovereign nation. For a member to suggest that we are influenced by certain—

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Debate.

Mr. Brad Vis: No.

Madam Speaker, when the member brings into question whether Canada is being influenced by a foreign government on certain policies—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): That is debate.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, on the point of order, I am concerned that, through points of order, the Conservative Party of Canada, the so-called freedom party, is trying to limit and censor what I am saying in the House. I find that—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): That is debate.

I invite the hon. parliamentary secretary to continue his speech.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I was explaining that we have the MAGA Conservative who has actually infiltrated the leader of the Conservative Party's office. We see that—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I have another point of order from the hon. member for Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon.

Mr. Brad Vis: Madam Speaker, under Standing Order 18, I would consider that to be disrespectful and offensive language. I am not MAGA. I do not refer to myself—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): That is another point of debate.

The hon. parliamentary secretary may continue his speech.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, they are a little sensitive on the other side. At the end of the day, they should take responsibility for their behaviour. The Conservatives, on one hand, want to take certain actions, but when they get called out on it, they get a little sensitive. They say they do not want the member from Winnipeg North to be talking about this, and they do not want the member from Winnipeg North to be talking about that. They are trying to censor what I say.

This is the first time in 30 years I have heard people say we cannot tell people how we voted. I have news for them, despite their trying to prevent me from talking about how they voted inside in the chamber. They may have limited success inside the chamber, but I am going to let people know about the behaviour of members of the Conservative Party of Canada and how they are being influenced by the MAGA movement from the United States coming into Canada. It is very serious stuff. They are not going to stop me from talking about that issue.

It is shameful the way members of the Conservative Party today are playing a destructive force, not only on the floor of the House of Commons in preventing legislation from passing, but also in their behaviour, which other people as well as myself have witnessed, in limiting the types of things that can actually be said.

Members can think about it. They do not want me, from the floor of the House of Commons, telling Canadians how they voted on legislation because they are embarrassed. I am not talking about any specific piece of legislation. I am talking about the principle of my being able to tell Canadians through this platform how they behave inside this chamber. They will not allow me to say that the Conservative Party voted x on any piece of legislation or any motion. That is what they do not want me to say—

● (1145)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Brad Vis: Madam Speaker, it is not the Conservative members or the official opposition. It is Standing Order 18, which states, “No member may reflect upon any vote of the House, except”—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Yes. I did remind the hon. parliamentary secretary of that. The hon. parliamentary secretary is making very broad comments on voting history.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, to the member opposite, cry me a river. At the end of the day, he can cry all he wants, but Canadians are going to know how the Conservative Party is behaving within the House of Commons. They are going to know how its members are trying to limit debate and the freedom of individuals like me to tell Canadians specifically how the Conservative Party is voting within the House of Commons.

Conservatives find a standing order. For the first time in 30 years, I see an opposition party that is so scared to be pointed out and told how its members are behaving. It is because they do not like what they are hearing. I believe there is a number of members in the Conservative caucus who feel very uncomfortable with the manner in which they have been forced to vote.

Let me talk about some of the issues. The Conservative Party of Canada demonstrates very clearly the degree to which the MAGA movement in the United States has influenced its members. On the Ukraine trade agreement, there is no other trade agreement I can recall that the Conservatives were in opposition to. This is the only trade agreement they seem to be in opposition to. I am being very generous when I say “seem to be in opposition” because their actions over the last number of weeks, and in fact months, clearly show they have taken that far right stand in support of Russia and against Ukraine.

All one needs to do is take a look at the voting marathon, when the Conservative caucus said it was going to challenge the government of the day. We went line by line, and discussions and votes occurred, as we went line by line. I will not say how the Conservatives voted because, after all, they do not want Canadians to know how they voted, but Canadians would be very disappointed. It is consistent with what we saw today on this particular legislation.

On the issue of funding to reinforce Canada's support of Ukraine, which is better known as Operation Unifier, Canadians would be very disappointed to see how the Conservatives voted. I cannot tell the House because apparently the Conservatives are super sensitive. They do not want Canadians to know.

Government Orders

An hon. member: They didn't vote the same way we did.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Well, I do not know if I can say that. They might jump up.

An hon. member: I voted no. You can comment on that.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, one member says that I can say that he voted no. I do not want to be called out for being out of order, but it was a Conservative member who said I could say that, so I had permission to say it.

At the end of the day, Operation Unifier is something that supports Ukraine in a very real and tangible way. When one takes—

• (1150)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I need to interrupt the hon. member.

The hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, you have very clearly made a ruling with respect to a standing order on reflecting on a vote. This is not a matter of what individual members want or prefer, it is simply a matter of enforcement of the ruling you made.

This member is continuing to show disrespect for the Chair, which is against another standing order, by doing everything he can to make a point that the Speaker has said he cannot make. It is not for me to say what the standing order should or should not be or what the Chair should or should not have ruled, but this member is showing profound disrespect to—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I will refer to our book, the Bosc and Gagnon book on procedure. On page 590, chapter 12. It reads:

It is not in order for Members to “reflect” upon (i.e., to reconsider or comment upon) votes of the House, and when this has occurred, the Chair has been quick to call attention to it. Members have also occasionally called attention to the rule.

I will remind the hon. parliamentary secretary that it is not only a standing order but has also been addressed in *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I look forward to the report back from the Chair.

On that particular point, and I am rising on a point of order, I would like to use the member for Louis-Saint-Laurent as an example, when he stood up and indicated:

The Liberals voted against that request and even the Bloc Québécois voted against. It is outrageous.

The Bloc Québécois voted in favour of Bill C-234, but it voted against asking the Senate to adopt it.

We find endless examples like this one, and that is the reason it is important that we—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I agree with the hon. member. There have been many examples of references to votes but today, the standing order was invoked. That is what we are dealing with. Until such time as the Chair comes back with a decision, I think we have to abide by it.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I was going through what had taken place during the voting marathon in which the Con-

servative Party continued to demonstrate its lack of support for Ukraine.

When one thinks of Operation Unifier, that is something that literally trained tens of thousands of Ukrainian soldiers and contributed positively to the war. The way in which Canada contributes can be found in many different ways. One of those was on that particular vote and that was actually Motion No. 54. I would encourage Canadians who want to find out exactly how the Conservatives voted to look it up.

Another vote was on funding to reinforce Canada's support for Ukraine, which, again, complemented Unifier. That was on Motion No. 55. Again, I will not say how parties voted, but I would indicate that Canadians might want to take a look at the votes and proceedings, to see how the Conservative Party voted.

Motion No. 56 was on funding for military aid. Think about that: military aid for Ukraine. This item received funding from the Treasury Board vote 5, which is government contingency funding, for the expanded contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which is budget 2023, funding to reinforce Canada's support for Ukraine.

If those who are following the debate want to understand why I have said what I have said and have expressed my disappointment in today's Conservative Party, all they need to do is look at the voting record on those motions and, I would suggest, the report stage of the Canada-Ukraine trade agreement bill. A lot of Canadians would be very disappointed in the official opposition.

I would suggest that the reason we have seen that voting pattern by the Conservative Party is the MAGA right movement in the United States of America and how that movement is coming north. It is being jumped on by the leader of the official opposition.

In fact, as I have suggested in the past, we need to be concerned about patterns. One of the patterns that I have witnessed coming from the leader of the official opposition's office is the misinformation and how the official opposition is using that style of politics of MAGA right in order to generate the type of attention that the Conservatives want. They will do it at all costs.

Ukraine is but one—

• (1155)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Brad Vis: Madam Speaker, I continue to rise on points of order because the language we are hearing from the member from Winnipeg is contrary to Standing Order 18. It is implying that the Conservative Party of Canada is breaking laws related to treason in Canada.

As a member of Parliament, I find that offensive to assume that we are influenced by a foreign government—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I do not think the hon. member was implying such a thing. He was referring to influences, not necessarily to being treasonous.

The hon. parliamentary secretary is rising on a point of order.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Madam Speaker, on the same point of order, I would point out that the Conservatives often make false claims about associations and such—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): We are not going to start a debate on this.

The hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, I think my colleague knows well the rules about accusing people of lying or being liars in the House—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I do not think the hon. member did such a thing. She said that people on both sides accuse each other of different things.

I will let the hon. parliamentary secretary continue.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, guilt is a wonderful thing at times. When I look across the way, I see a lot of heads that are down and those members look somewhat depressed. I suspect it might have to do with something that has taken place in terms of their behaviour with respect to Ukraine. Canadians have unified and understood the importance of what is taking place in Ukraine today, but they are disappointed in what they have witnessed coming from the Conservative Party.

The President of Ukraine, at a time of war, came to Canada. While in Canada, he signed a trade agreement that is very meaningful not only for economic purposes, but also for morale and making a strong political statement to countries like Russia. It shows that Ukraine is building relationships with the European Union and North America, because Ukraine wants to be able to expand its economy and its relationships through trade agreements.

The president, during a time of war, took the time to come here. Let us go back to when we first introduced the bill. In September, he was here. A couple of months later, we are actually dealing with the legislation.

If we look at the comments that I put on the record back then, I said I suspect that all members of the House would be glad to see the legislation pass and how wonderful it would be to pass the legislation before Christmas. When I said “pass”, I meant that it had to go through the entire process, including in the Senate. The House will rise in a couple of days, and we have not even got out of third reading.

The solidarity for Ukraine is not there because the Conservative Party of today has made the decision to do what it can to deny the unanimous support that is required to get this legislation through. What we have seen today is the Conservative Party does not want us to tell anyone how it is actually voting because the Conservatives feel ashamed about it. That is why.

Never before have I been limited in any way, which is why I am very anxious to hear the ruling on being able to tell Canadians how another entity or individual in the House voted. However, I will respect what you have said, Madam Speaker, in the hope that we will get clarity on the issue. I suspect there are many people in this chamber who want to be able to ask the Conservative Party why and challenge it on its actions.

Government Orders

The best excuse the Conservatives have come up with is the issue of the price on pollution. That is a red herring. That is all that is. The Conservatives say the reason they are uncomfortable with the legislation is that it has a price on pollution. What they do not recognize is that Ukraine already has a price on pollution. It has had one for over a decade. The whole European Union is moving toward a price on pollution.

Only the leader of the Conservative Party here in Canada believes that there is no need for a price on pollution and that there is no need to have a plan for Canada's environment.

• (1200)

I heard one of my colleagues say that it is going back to the Stone Age. I can appreciate why she would say that. They have climate deniers. They do not recognize it. They feel that all they have to do is one thing, but I am scared that if I say the word “mislead”, they will jump up like beans saying that I cannot say that.

Let us think about it. Here is what the Conservatives actually say, coast to coast to coast. Conservatives with their shiny-new leader say they are going to cut the tax, that they are going to garbage the price on pollution, and that they are going to make life more affordable. That is what we see today from the Conservative right.

I could provide a 20-minute comment in regard to their lack of respect for the whole issue of the environment, but rather, what I would like to point to is just the degree to which they are misleading Canadians. In essence, they are saying that they are going to get rid of the price on pollution for the residents of Winnipeg North, and that means they are going to axe the tax. That is what, in essence, the Conservatives are saying. They are saying that they would be making life more affordable. I say balderdash. At the end of the day, the Conservatives would actually take money out of the pockets of my constituents because 80-plus per cent get more money back in the rebates than they pay into the price on pollution. That tells me that the Conservatives would take money away from Canadians, but they do not tell Canadians that, because that is not part of the MAGA movement.

The MAGA movement says to mislead, and that is what the Conservatives are doing to Canadians from coast to coast to coast. They are deceiving real people. They are hurting Canadians. They are not helping on the affordability file—

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

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Dufferin—Caledon.

Mr. Kyle Seeback (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): Madam Speaker, opposition parties oppose, and they oppose legislation that they think is bad. That does not cause harm to anyone. The parliamentary secretary's argument that somehow voting against a bill is bad makes no sense. However, something that was bad was the current government's granting—

Points of Order

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, the member just told Canadians, on the floor of the House of Commons, that the opposition party voted against a bill and that was just—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I am sorry, but that is not a point of order. That is a point of debate.

The hon. member for Dufferin—Caledon.

• (1205)

Mr. Kyle Seeback: Madam Speaker, with respect to that point of order, the—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): It was not a point of order.

The hon. member for Dufferin—Caledon, on the question.

Mr. Kyle Seeback: Madam Speaker, what actually has harmed Ukraine was the government's decision to grant a waiver to export a gas turbine. It is interesting. The Liberals use President Zelenskyy's name all the time in support of their cause to try to score cheap political points. President Zelenskyy had a few things to say about that waiver.

If a terrorist state can squeeze out such an exemption to sanctions, what exemptions would it want? Moreover, it is dangerous not only for Ukraine but for all countries of the democratic world. Zelenskyy called on the Canadian government to reverse that decision. The Ukrainian ambassador went on to say that Russia is using energy as a weapon in Europe and all over the world and this money and fuel were going to support the war in Ukraine. Do the Liberals regret that they actually aided President Putin in his war by exporting that gas turbine?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, as the member tries to change the channel, we need to recognize the reality of today. The reality of today is that there is one political entity, better known as the Conservative Party of Canada, that seems to want to take the side of Russia over Ukraine. That has been clearly demonstrated—

Mr. Kyle Seeback: No, giving the turbine to Russia—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. The hon. member had an opportunity to ask his question. Now, whether he likes the answer or not, he needs to take the opportunity to listen. If he has other questions, he can wait until I ask for questions and comments.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): On a point of order, the hon. member for Dufferin—Caledon.

Mr. Kyle Seeback: Madam Speaker, for the member to suggest that I support Russia is despicable and—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Actually, the hon. member's question seemed to indicate that on the other side as well. I would ask members to please refrain from doing that. We know that everybody in this House does not support Russia. That has been reaffirmed in the House. I would ask members to please refrain from saying that during their questions and during their comments.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I see some individuals on the other side, just as they should well be, are very ashamed of the way they have conducted themselves when it comes to issues with respect to Ukraine. Where there should have been unanimous support for Ukraine at a very difficult time in its history, we see the Conservative Party under its current leadership looking south to be inspired by MAGA politics. That is to the detriment of Ukraine. The Conservatives have to take responsibility for their actions, and by that I mean their votes, and not try to hide behind the Speaker's back.

* * *

OFFICIAL REPORT

Mr. Marc Dalton (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, CPC): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to seek unanimous consent from the House to change my vote from last night on Bill C-56, Division No. 606, from nay to yea. I ran out of time and was unable to make that change then. I hope the House will allow me to change my vote.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

[Translation]

POINTS OF ORDER**ALLEGED BREACH OF STANDING ORDER 18**

Mr. Alain Therrien (La Prairie, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to comment on the remarks made by the member for Winnipeg North, who referred to the nature of the Conservatives' vote on one of the aspects of the many votes that were held in the House on Friday. He simply mentioned the Conservatives' vote.

The Conservatives mentioned Standing Order 18, which says that no member may—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The member needs to get to the reason he is rising on a point of order, because, for now, this seems to be a matter of debate.

Mr. Alain Therrien: Madam Speaker, I would have liked to be part of the debate on the earlier point of order to talk about Standing Order 18, which the Conservatives mentioned and which, according to them, prevents members from reflecting on a vote.

We cannot criticize a vote, but we can talk about it. We can talk about the position a member took during a vote. The member for Winnipeg North did not criticize the vote. He simply pointed out that the Conservative Party took a particular position on a particular vote.

The House should not oppose what the member for Winnipeg North said. That is why I am rising. I want to add my voice to what was said earlier about the standing order the Conservatives mentioned.

• (1210)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The Chair will take this intervention under advisement and get back to the House with an answer if necessary.

* * *

CANADA-UKRAINE FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2023

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-57, An Act to implement the 2023 Free Trade Agreement between Canada and Ukraine, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Madam Speaker, it would be worth our while to discuss this bill. I would like the member for Winnipeg North to tell me about his vision for the free trade agreement with Ukraine. We obviously agree on the bill, though it still has some shortcomings. The Bloc Québécois has long objected to the fact that private companies can sue governments under free trade agreements by claiming that a government's legislation is detrimental to a company's trade. We see this as a mistake that needs to be corrected.

Is my colleague willing to study this issue and make improvements?

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, as the member is likely aware, there are very serious limitations as to what we can do with respect to making changes. The simple reason for this is that we have an agreement that is signed off on, and it is more of a ratification process. I do not know the details of what kind of modifications would, in fact, be acceptable without having to sign a different agreement.

Having said that, the real benefits of the agreement for both Canada and Ukraine deal with everything from infrastructure to high-tech companies, as well as many agricultural benefits. In essence, it enhances opportunities for both countries to be able to develop stronger and healthier trade links.

Ms. Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): *Uqaqtittiji*, the other thing I very much appreciate about this trade agreement is the chapter that talks about trade and indigenous peoples. I understand that modernizing the agreement is important, and ensuring that indigenous peoples are allowed economic opportunities through this trade agreement is particularly important.

Will the member make sure that, when his party is creating the bilateral committee, it will include indigenous representation from all indigenous groups?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I am confident in knowing that, when we talk about trade agreements, economic development and the social impacts of these agreements, a wide spectrum of things are considered. These include the absolutely critical role, as the Prime Minister himself has indicated, of ensuring that we operate as two governments, making sure that indigenous and Canadian interests are being served well.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovern-

Government Orders

mental Affairs (Cybersecurity), Lib.): Madam Speaker, my hon. colleague spoke about the obsession that the Conservatives have around pricing pollution, which will actually take money out of the pockets of his constituents. He also spoke about the influences from the Trumpist MAGA Republicans in the U.S. Is the member at all concerned that the Conservatives seem to be advocating for the far right in this country, which supports Russia, as well as big oil instead of constituents?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I appreciate the question, and that is the reason I would reference a pattern. What we have actually seen is that the Conservative Party of today is not the same Conservative Party even of Stephen Harper. Under the current leadership, it continues to move farther to the right.

The MAGA right is very real. It is a movement that is in the United States, and it is coming north. The one who is selling it the most today is the leader of the Conservative Party, and the price on pollution is an excellent example of that.

A bunch of Conservatives travel the country saying that they are going to get rid of the price on pollution and make things more affordable; in fact, it is just not true. A vast majority of Canadians would actually have less disposable income as a direct result of the Conservatives' policy, yet they would not know that from what they are being told by the Conservative movement today. Canadians need to be made aware of it. American-style politics is coming north through the leader of the official opposition.

• (1215)

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, of course, different sovereign states disagree from time to time about policy. Last summer, the Canadian ambassador to Ukraine was actually summoned, and the President of Ukraine publicly and repeatedly expressed his extreme displeasure over the fact that this government granted a sanctions waiver for a turbine that was to facilitate the export of Russian gas. This was a very serious issue for the Government of Ukraine. One does not summon an ambassador lightly, but that is what the Ukrainian government did.

The member is sort of on his high horse about how, somehow, we should never disagree with a country that we are friends with. Of course, Canada supports Ukraine; Conservatives support Ukraine. However, this member is now saying that we should do exactly what the government wants.

I want to ask the member: Where was he last summer? Did he make any statements about the sanctions waiver? What, if anything, did he have to say when the Canadian ambassador to Ukraine was summoned by President Zelenskyy to express his displeasure?

Government Orders

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I am not going to accept the changing of the channel. At the end of the day, whether it is the President of Ukraine, the Ukrainian ambassador to Canada or the Canadian Ukrainian Congress, not to mention millions of Canadians, they can see the behaviour of the Conservative Party today when it comes to the Canada-Ukraine agreement and the line-by-line allotments of support to Ukraine. The Conservative Party has been nothing but a disappointment; the far right has taken over the party on certain policies, and this is one of them.

I say shame on the Conservative Party for not getting behind this and continuing to have that unanimous support. Rather, it caters to the far right. I think that does a disservice to all of Canada.

Mr. Kyle Seeback (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): Madam Speaker, as I rise for this third reading debate, I have to express my deep disappointment at the inflammatory rhetoric that we hear from the Liberal government. Its members are desperately trying to change the channel from the misery that they have brought to Canadians, whether in terms of the millions of Canadians visiting food banks or the 800,000 people in Ontario who have to rely on a food bank now. This would be the same as the fourth-largest city in Ontario being completely dependent on the food bank to survive. That is the result after eight years of the Liberal government.

Liberals try to change the channel about a principled decision by the Conservative Party to vote against this free trade agreement. There are many reasons to do so. Of course, we have talked about the fact that there is a reference to carbon pricing and carbon leakage. There is also, as the Liberals like to call it, the polluter pays principle, with policies that those who pollute the environment should bear the cost of that pollution. Most Liberals say that emitting carbon is pollution. Therefore, as Ukrainians are in the middle of a war and are trying to heat their homes, the Liberal government is saying that they are polluters, because most Ukrainians use carbon-based fuels for heating.

We get to have a principled objection to this free trade agreement on that basis alone. There are many other reasons we would be opposed to it that we have not debated in great detail. Opposition parties get to vote against what they consider to be bad legislation. The Liberals say it is no big deal that there are some references to carbon pricing and carbon leakage. However, what will they do in the next trade agreement they try to sign? This is the first time carbon pricing and carbon leakage have ever been in a trade agreement. Is it in the free trade agreement with the European Union, the CPTPP, our trade agreement with the United States or any other trade agreement that Canada has ever signed? No, it is not.

This is the first time Liberals have put it into a trade agreement. What will it be the next time? Will Liberals mandate a certain carbon tax within a trade agreement? That is what they are trying to do. The Liberals are desperately trying to entrench the carbon tax and their version of carbon pricing into international trade agreements. What will be the next step they take on that?

We get to oppose that on principle. The really despicable thing that has happened as a result of this is that the Liberals suggest that this is the Conservative Party not supporting Ukraine and, in fact, somehow supporting Vladimir Putin and Russia. That kind of toxic rhetoric is actually quite despicable. The Liberals should be

ashamed that they are using it on the very principled position that Conservatives have taken on this free trade agreement.

As we know, there are two other parties in the House that have supported this free trade agreement, so this is actually going to pass. Our vote will cause no harm to Ukraine as we voice our principled opposition to the Liberal government's obsession with carbon taxes and carbon pricing.

When we look at—

• (1220)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader on a point of order.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, the member is, if not directly, then indirectly, talking about how the Conservative Party has voted. It was ruled earlier that we cannot do that.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. These far left, mega disruptive tactics from this member have no place in the House. He should be ashamed of himself.

The member in question was talking about his own decisions, which the other member has done, and he says this should be allowed.

Again, I encourage these far left-importing tactics—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): From what I can see, we are starting to go down that road again that was ruled on earlier this morning based on all the points of order that were being raised. I would recommend that members go back and look at the rules of order we already have in place. If they have a point of order, members should make sure it fits within those rules, one that we can actually take in.

Mr. Kyle Seeback: Madam Speaker, the party that complains that points of order are disruptive makes a ridiculous point of order.

I will go back to my point, which is that my decision as a Conservative to vote against this agreement is a principled decision. I will not stand for trade agreements having carbon pricing or taxes, because who knows what the Liberals are going to do next time. I get to do that. As we know, this legislation is going to pass, so there is no harm being caused by that.

When we look, for instance, at what happened with the waiver of the export permit that the government granted for a gas turbine, that caused significant harm to Ukraine. President Zelenskyy said, "If a terrorist state can squeeze out such an exception to sanctions, what exceptions will it want tomorrow or the day after tomorrow? ...it is dangerous not only for Ukraine, but also for all countries of the democratic world." President Zelenskyy called on the Liberal government to change its decision.

The Liberals say we should listen to President Zelenskyy on the trade agreement, but Conservatives get to disagree with them on that. We think it is not a good trade deal. It is not good for Ukraine and not good for Canada. However, President Zelenskyy saying that the Liberal government should not grant the export waiver that is aiding Russia is somehow no big deal, there is nothing to see here. Their hypocrisy on this is really astounding.

Then the government turns a principled vote in the House of Commons against including carbon taxes, carbon leakage or carbon pricing in a trade agreement for the first time ever into somehow aiding Russia or Vladimir Putin. Not only is that language despicable, it is completely unhelpful to the debate. Liberals saying Conservatives are supporting Russia is giving Russia some kind of a win.

Conservatives, of course, are not saying that. We are saying it is a terrible decision and the decision helped Russia pump gas, which has helped fuelled its war. President Zelenskyy and the Ukrainian ambassador said that. Those are their words, not ours.

If we look at who is actually causing harm to Ukraine, it is the Liberal government in its decision to grant that export waiver. Many Liberal members stand and claim that Conservatives are doing terrible things to Ukraine as a result of our principled decision. Where were they on this decision? They are not there, which, to me, is deeply hypocritical. Ukrainian Canadians know exactly which party supported the export of that gas turbine. If that was all, I would say that is pretty bad, but not absolutely awful.

However, let us look at what else has happened. There are now media reports that Canadian detonators are in Russian mines. That is a complete lack of export control by the government. We know that Liberals are not very good at doing much, but to allow Canadian detonators to find their way, as the media has reported, into Russian mines is inexcusable. They say our principled vote against the bad things they put in this trade agreement is somehow aiding Russia and Vladimir Putin, but they exported a gas turbine used to pump Russian gas to fund the war and Canadian detonators have found their way into Russian mines that are used during the war. If we compare these things, some things are desperately harmful to Ukraine and other things do not cause any damage whatsoever.

If that was all, Conservatives would say it is terrible, though not absolutely awful, but there is more. Canada is the only G7 country that is not offering wartime insurance to businesses. Liberals say Canada is there to help rebuild Ukraine, but they will not put wartime insurance in place for businesses right now. Therefore, any businesses in Canada that want to help Ukraine during the war do not have wartime insurance. Every other G7 country has it. This causes real damage to Ukraine and they have the audacity to say that our principled vote against the trade agreement is somehow aiding Vladimir Putin. These three decisions the Liberals made are aiding the Russian war effort, so their hypocrisy on this is really stunning.

• (1225)

At committee, we tried to improve the trade agreement. The Ukrainian ambassador said recently that they could use, in the future, co-operation on energy security. As we pointed out at the com-

mittee, there is nothing in this trade agreement on energy security. It is shocking.

Ukraine needs energy security. Why would we not include a chapter on energy security? I know the Liberals and all their proxies say that has never been in a trade agreement before, so we cannot put it in. Carbon pricing and carbon leakage were never in a trade agreement before either. Clearly, we can put things into trade agreements that have never been in them before.

They are going to ask why it is not in there. It is because when we negotiate a trade agreement, two sides decide what they are going to put in them. The Liberal government's priority was carbon taxes, carbon pricing and carbon leakage. We know the Ukrainians want energy security. The ambassador just said it recently on the news. Why was there not a chapter on energy security in the trade agreement? We can only conclude it is because the Liberal government did not want to put anything in the trade agreement on energy security. We can come to no other conclusion.

The Conservatives tried to fix that. We brought forward a motion at committee to expand the scope of what could be included in the review of this trade agreement to allow for energy security. Every single Liberal member on that committee voted no, which is the exact opposite of what the Ukrainian ambassador was just asking for.

When we talk about what is causing harm, there is only one wrecking ball going through this and it is the wrecking ball of the Liberals because they exported the gas turbine, they will not grant wartime insurance and Canadian detonators are somehow finding their way into Russian mines. I ascribe all of that to gross incompetence because we see gross incompetence from the Liberals on virtually every single thing they touch right now here in Canada.

If that was all, we could say that it is not such a big deal. However, there were eight amendments at committee that we tried to use to improve the free trade agreement so we could actually find a way to support it. One of the amendments that I put forward would have delayed the coming into force of the agreement until the references to carbon pricing and carbon leakage were removed. If that had been done, I would have found a way to vote in favour of it, but that was voted down like every single amendment was voted down that we put forward to make this trade agreement better.

This included an amendment to strengthen co-operation on matters relating to nuclear technology, including the export of Canadian nuclear equipment, expertise and uranium to Ukraine. Ukraine has lost 50% of its electricity-generating capacity as a result of this war from Russian bombing. Would it not have been great to put in this free trade agreement co-operation on expanding nuclear capacity?

Government Orders

I know, everyone is saying surely the Liberals voted for that. It is what Ukraine needs, it is what the Ukrainian ambassador asked for. No, people would be wrong. Liberals voted against it. They want to include their ideological obsession with carbon pricing and carbon leakage, but they do not want to vote for co-operation in nuclear technology, and co-operation on energy to provide energy security.

The other issue is this: There could have been co-operation on LNG capacity in Ukraine and increasing Canadian LNG exports. As everyone knows, Russia's war machine is primarily funded by the exports of gas.

Ukraine is sitting on the third-largest proven reserves of LNG in all of Europe. Imagine a Europe that is getting its LNG exclusively from Ukraine, as opposed to getting LNG from Russia. Imagine if Ukraine got the revenues from being able to export LNG to Europe and to other parts of the world to help it fight the Russian invasion. This would be a double win. It would cut off the blood money that is going to Russia and it would increase the revenues of Ukraine. It would have more money to fight the war.

• (1230)

Surely, Liberals voted for the trade agreement to include LNG co-operation, right? It would be a win-win for everyone. No, they did not; they voted against it, because the Prime Minister and the Liberal Party have an ideological obsession with carbon taxes, carbon prices and carbon emissions.

Even to the detriment of a country in the middle of war, a country fighting for its very survival, what is the most important thing for the Liberal government? It is carbon tax, carbon price and carbon leakage. Even in this context, Liberals cannot get out of their obsession with the carbon tax, which is something that absolutely would have helped Ukraine.

I will move on to some of the amendments that were put forward. We put forward an amendment on the donation of Canadian military equipment because we have equipment somewhat past its functional life but not completely unusable. This could be exported to Ukraine and refurbished so it could have more Canadian military equipment to help in its war. Again, surely Liberals voted for that because it would be a direct benefit to Ukraine. No, they did not. Then they have the audacity to say to us that if we vote against this free trade agreement somehow it is a win for Russia and Vladimir Putin. The hypocrisy is really unbelievable.

There are more and more amendments that were put forward—

• (1235)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order, only because I do think it is important we get some sort of a ruling sooner as opposed to later. The member has now, on a couple of occasions, been reflecting on votes, whether they were in committee or here, which is a concern all members should be having.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Madam Speaker, on the same point of order, on what the parliamentary secretary just said, a member is allowed to reflect on their own votes. I do not believe the Standing Orders in the House of Commons directly affect how committees vote. I do not believe it has ever been part of the rules directly.

Votes cannot be referred to in the House that are taken here. Part of the ruling that is made should also include whether we can refer to votes taken at committee, especially a member's own vote, which a member is allowed to reflect on because it is part of the public record. It should be public and they can refer to it when speaking to constituents and speaking in the House on it. That is what the member for Dufferin—Caledon was doing. If not for the interruption by the parliamentary secretary, I am sure he would have finished by now.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I will read very specifically from the standing order I think the member is trying to refer to. This is Standing Order 18, the second half of it, which reads:

No member may reflect upon any vote of the House, except for the purpose of moving that such vote be rescinded.

That makes fairly clear that reflecting on a vote of committee is not covered by the standing order.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): As indicated before, I appreciate the additional information the hon. members have put forward. I will come back to the House, if need be.

I want to remind members that, according to the Standing Orders, they are not to reflect on how other members have voted in votes that have been held in the House.

I will allow the hon. member for Dufferin—Caledon to continue his speech.

Mr. Kyle Seebach: Madam Speaker, it is amazing to me that the member who complained about points of order during his speech continues to rise to interrupt me when I am giving my speech about continuing to talk about motions that were brought forward to try to make the trade agreement better.

Again, a motion was brought at committee for expanded munitions productions in Canada to increase munitions exports to Ukraine and to support the development of weapons and ammunition manufacturing capabilities in Ukraine by Canadian industry. A country in the middle of a war and using thousands of shells a day needs expanded munitions, so, of course, we brought forward the motion to say that we want to directly support Ukraine, because, despite the desperate attempts by the Liberal government and its members to say we do not support Ukraine, we absolutely do. Of course, the motion was defeated, with all Liberal members at the committee voting against it.

We try to talk about actual support for Ukraine, and Conservatives have put forward real motions, real amendments to improve the trade agreement to help Ukraine. We have done that. What the Liberal government has done is export a gas turbine and be so incompetent and negligent as to allow Canadian detonators to end up in Russian mines. It has not provided wartime insurance for Canadian businesses to help rebuild Ukraine. We are the only country in the G7 not to do that. Liberals then have had the audacity to stand here and somehow suggest that we are supporting Vladimir Putin. That is a disgraceful comment to make. They should be ashamed of themselves for making it, but—

Mr. Charlie Angus: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think it would be really shocking if the Liberals accused the Conservatives of supporting Vladimir Putin, but I think the issue was that they voted against Operation Unifier on three separate occasions.

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

The hon. member for Dufferin—Caledon.

Mr. Kyle Seeback: Madam Speaker, what we find is that the hyperbole coming from the Liberals does not match reality. Their criticism is deeply hypocritical. We all know it. They have done things that have directly harmed and continue to directly harm Ukraine with their decisions. They have become the party of disinformation by suggesting that we do not support Ukraine, disinformation that somehow our opposition to the free trade agreement means not supporting Ukraine. We tried to make the trade agreement better so we could support the agreement and, of course, Ukraine. The Liberal government did everything it could to make sure that was not possible. Why did it? It is because it wants to use the trade agreement in a desperate attempt to score cheap political points here in Canada with an incredibly false narrative.

I move:

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

“Bill C-57, An Act to implement the 2023 Free Trade Agreement between Canada and Ukraine, be not now read a third time, but be referred back to the Standing Committee on International Trade with the view to amend the coming into force provision to allow it to be fixed by order of the Governor in Council after the removal of all references to carbon pricing and carbon leakage.”

• (1240)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The amendment is in order.

Mr. Marcus Powlowski (Thunder Bay—Rainy River, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the member spoke of the principled approach of the Conservative Party to the agreement, so let us talk about principles.

This is not about the carbon tax, but today the Ukrainians are running out of ammunition. Today, President Zelenskyy is in Washington, D.C., desperate to get military support from the United States that is being blocked by the American far right. Today, more than ever, is a day when Ukraine needs the political support, and where is the Conservative Party? Conservatives voted against the free trade agreement today. On Friday, they voted against any military assistance to Ukraine. Today, of all days, is a day when

Government Orders

Ukraine really needs political support around the world. Why do they continue to oppose support for Ukraine?

Mr. Kyle Seeback: Madam Speaker, of course we support Ukraine; that is absolutely true. We voted against the fall economic statement because we have absolutely no confidence in the incompetent, corrupt Liberal government.

The member is talking about munitions. That is great; good for him. We had a motion at committee to support expanded munitions productions in Canada, increase munitions exports to Ukraine and support the delivery of weapons and munitions manufacturing capabilities in Ukraine by Canadian industry. How did Liberal members of the committee vote? They voted against it. The member should perhaps get off of his PMO talking points that he just read to the House and actually understand what his party has done with respect to munitions.

• (1245)

[Translation]

Mr. Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Madam Speaker, my colleague referred to the amendments to the treaty that the Conservative Party proposed in committee. We disagree with most of those amendments, but we still think that we should have had an opportunity to debate them, because we are in a parliamentary system and a democracy.

However, the way treaties are negotiated in Canada is unique. The government negotiates them behind Parliament's back in a way. The government decides on the content of the treaty, which means that parliamentarians are deprived of all their democratic tools and cannot debate or amend the treaty either in committee or in the House. The only thing they have a say in is the treaty's rules of application. That seems undemocratic to me and it is at odds with what is done in the United States and Europe. The Canadian approach seems very undemocratic to me.

I would like to know what my colleague thinks about the undemocratic way that Canada negotiates treaties and prevents Parliament from debating amendments.

[English]

Mr. Kyle Seeback: Madam Speaker, coming to Parliament, table-dropping a 700-page trade agreement and expecting Parliament to just immediately rubber-stamp it is the kind of arrogance one gets with the Liberal government. It believes that, somehow, it is so infallible, so perfect, that it has brought to us, as we approach Christmas, something like the birth of Christ. Here it is: the perfect child.

In fact, we get to have real criticisms of the bill. Yes, the challenge is, of course, this: There is a process to bring treaties and trade agreements to members so they have an opportunity to have input. The Liberals did none of that. They brought it here and said it is perfect, and now they are criticizing people for criticizing it. It is an embarrassing way for them to behave.

Government Orders

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to thank our shadow minister for trade for his very thoughtful and well-articulated concerns about the Canada-Ukraine free trade agreement. I think he was very clear that Conservatives support Ukraine. Conservatives are the party of free trade.

Unfortunately, the Liberals have stuck carbon taxes into the trade agreement. This is the first time in history. It is unprecedented, and we cannot accept it when we are the party that is opposed to carbon taxes.

I know that the hon. member has already reflected on this, but we have been calling on the government since 2018 to provide lethal weapons to Ukraine. It did not wait four weeks to send lethal weapons. It did not wait four months. It waited four years, until the hot, full-scale invasion happened in Ukraine. The member was very clear to say that we have been asking for the government to do more in support of Ukraine. The free trade agreement would not provide the opportunity for the Canadian defence industry to do business in Ukraine. There would be no war insurance provided.

Right now, the Canadian Armed Forces is decommissioning old light armoured vehicles: Bisons, Coyotes and tracked LAVs, the M113s. Why are the Liberals sitting around? We have been asking since March of last year to actually export the vehicles, to send them to Ukraine in the fight against Russia. They have not. Why have they not?

Mr. Kyle Seeback: Madam Speaker, it is a great question. This is actually where we get to where the rubber hits the road. There are real and concrete things that the Liberal government could have done and could be doing to help Ukraine. Instead, it has wrapped itself in the free trade agreement to somehow suggest that this is the only way one can support Ukraine. Of course, it put a poison pill in it. It knew that the Conservatives could not support carbon pricing and carbon leakage.

However, there are real, measurable things that would have made a difference. There was a motion on the exact issue that the member has just raised, to do that. Of course, it was defeated.

Exporting a gas turbine to Russia, the Canadian detonators in Russian mines, no wartime insurance, not sending the armoured vehicle and not increasing munitions production are things that are actually harming Ukraine. Our vote does not harm it. The Liberals should stop talking the way they are. It is disgraceful.

Mr. Yvan Baker (Etobicoke Centre, Lib.): Madam Speaker, in his remarks, the member spoke about why all Conservatives oppose the Canada-Ukraine free trade agreement. He cited two things. First, there is the mention of carbon pricing in it, which, of course, is not a legitimate reason, because Ukraine has already had carbon pricing since 2011 and needs carbon pricing to enter the EU, which it is desperately trying to do. The agreement would not even force Ukraine to do anything on carbon pricing, so that is not a reason to oppose the agreement. We already know that.

The other reason he gave was that the government is somehow imposing language about carbon pricing on Ukraine, or imposing something on it that it does not want. However, President Zelenskyy signed the agreement; he came to Canada to do that. He asked all parliamentarians to vote for it. The Ukrainian ambassador asked

all parliamentarians to vote for it. The Ukrainian Canadian Congress asked all parliamentarians to vote for it. Ukraine MPs who were visiting Canada asked all parliamentarians to vote for it. Conservatives seem to believe that they know better than Ukrainians themselves do what Ukrainians want.

My question for the member is this: Why are Conservatives and Vladimir Putin the only people out there who seem to think they know better than Ukrainians themselves what Ukrainians want or need?

● (1250)

Mr. Kyle Seeback: Madam Speaker, the logical gymnastics the member just had to do are something that could probably have won him a gold medal at an Olympic gymnastics competition.

President Zelenskyy actually asked the Liberals to not send the gas turbine. Did the member stand up against his government and say that it should not happen? No, he did not. There are currently no export controls in place to stop Canadian detonators from getting into Russian land mines. Has he stood up to criticize his government for doing that? No, he has not. However, somehow, voting against a trade agreement is one of the cardinal sins, one of the seven deadly sins. It is ridiculous and pathetic.

The Liberals should be stopping the things I have raised. They should be including the things I have raised. That is how to show support for Ukraine, not this fake straw-man argument they are building up about voting against a trade agreement that includes language that we would never support, because in the next trade agreement, they will mandate a carbon price if we let them get away with it this time.

Canadians know the misery of the carbon tax. We are against it in Canada and we are against it in trade agreements. We will be against it forever.

Mr. Larry Maguire (Brandon—Souris, CPC): Madam Speaker, there is no doubt that we are in favour of Ukraine. I want to go back to December 2, 1991, when former prime minister Brian Mulroney made us the first country in the world to recognize the independence of Ukraine.

I would ask my colleague to elaborate on the kind of dedication this country has provided to our Ukrainian cohorts, friends and families in Ukraine today, to justify some of the great comments my colleagues have made and to further denigrate what the Liberal government has done with respect to putting a carbon tax into a trade agreement with a country that is at war.

Mr. Kyle Seeback: Madam Speaker, this could be a meme.

Liberals think that sending a gas turbine that Russia uses to pump gas and make money to fund the war is no big deal, that allowing Canadian detonators to end up in Russian land mines that are killing Ukrainian soldiers is no big deal and that not giving businesses war risk insurance is no big deal. None of that is a big deal, but if we vote against a free trade agreement that we think is a bad trade agreement, they say, “Oh my God, you are supporting Vladimir Putin.” Their arguments on this are pathetic and embarrassing.

Canadians have always supported Ukraine. Conservatives have always supported Ukraine, just like when we were almost the first country in the world to recognize an independent Ukraine. I think Poland beat us by something like 25 minutes. That is the Conservative record. We support Ukraine, so members should not listen to the misinformation and disinformation the despicable Liberals are trying to spread.

[Translation]

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Madam Speaker, we are already debating third reading of Bill C-57, the Canada-Ukraine free trade agreement implementation act, 2023, which the Standing Committee on International Trade had the opportunity to study. Several of my colleagues here were present during the committee study.

Fundamentally, not much has changed about the reasons for our support. This time, the agreement puts some meat on the bones. The old version was pretty skeletal. This agreement will not make Ukraine a major trading partner for Quebec and Canada, of course. I would say Ukraine will remain a minor, not to say marginal, partner. However, this agreement does put meat on the bones. It is a real trade agreement, whereas the previous version was essentially a declaration of friendship.

We note that there are some promising opportunities for Quebec. Our pork producers will be able to export more to that country. Also, since Quebec is home to many highly reputable engineering firms, there could be some very attractive contracts for them when Ukraine rebuilds. This will also benefit Ukraine economically, and we hope that the rebuilding takes place as soon as possible and that peace is restored quickly.

However, I do want to point out that there is one clause I voted against in committee. I asked that it not be agreed to on division, like most of the clauses, and that we proceed to a recorded division. It is the clause concerning investor-state dispute settlement. I do not understand why, after removing this from the North American Free Trade Agreement, or NAFTA, Canada would go back to negotiating agreements that include such provisions, which place multinationals on the same footing as governments.

Yes, it is written very cautiously. There are exceptions, and it is written far more cautiously than the infamous chapter 11 of the former NAFTA agreement, but the fact remains that this still allows multinationals to take states to court when government measures run counter to the company's right to make a profit.

Take the following case, for example. Ukraine seized property from Ukrainian citizens who were financing and supporting the Russian side. Under the guise of protecting foreign investors, this

Government Orders

agreement would make it very difficult for Canada to do the same thing, that is, seize the assets and property of Ukrainian citizens here who support Russia. Our country could expose itself to lawsuits against public property, against the Canadian government, from these investors.

This is unacceptable. We do not understand why it is still in there. When I asked for a recorded vote on this clause, which is in itself undemocratic because it limits the power of the states to legislate and make political decisions, only my NDP colleague, the member for South Okanagan—West Kootenay, voted with me. The Liberals and Conservatives were quick to vote to keep this clause in the bill. The last thing they wanted to do was upset their buddies at the big multinational corporations, of course.

I should also point out that one chapter in the agreement is full of lofty principles that the government likes to brag about. These lofty principles include the fact that companies will now behave responsibly and Canadian companies will behave properly, so there is nothing to worry about. However, these are nothing but lofty principles. Of course, this refers to international concepts, and it is in no way binding. That is why I am very proud to say that the only amendment that was adopted was the one I proposed, the Bloc Québécois's amendment. I will read it:

That Bill C-57 be amended by adding after line 11 on page 6 the following new clause:

“Compliance with principles and guidelines — Canadian companies

15.1 (1) The Minister must ensure that Canadian companies operating in Ukraine comply with the principles and guidelines referred to in article 15.14 of the Agreement.

(2) The Minister must establish a process for receiving and responding to complaints of non-compliance with those principles and guidelines.

(3) On or before January 1st of each year starting in 2025, the Minister must prepare a report that summarizes activities carried out in relation to the Minister's obligations under this section.

(4) The Minister must table a copy of the report in each House of Parliament on any of the first 30 days on which that House is sitting after the report is completed.”

• (1255)

Thanks to the Bloc Québécois's work in committee, there has been a shift from lofty principles to an obligation of political accountability that is written into the bill. I think that we can be very proud of the work we have done.

That being said, allow me to digress. The issue of Canadian companies respecting all human rights abroad is far from resolved. I want to read an excerpt from budget 2023. It is not partisan, I will read verbatim what is written:

Budget 2023 announces the federal government's intention to introduce legislation by 2024 to eradicate forced labour from Canadian supply chains to strengthen the import ban on goods produced using forced labour. The government will also work to ensure existing legislation fits within the government's overall framework to safeguard our supply chains.

The budget was presented in March 2023. It says “by 2024”.

Government Orders

May I remind the government that it has three days left to keep its promise to introduce legislation before the House adjourns, three days from now? May I remind the government of this, or will it add this to its long list of broken promises?

At the Standing Committee on International Trade, I also moved a motion to send the Minister of Labour a letter to remind him of the commitment in his mandate letter. My motion was adopted, with all my colleagues, including the Liberals, voting in favour. The letter was sent. I am glad. I am looking forward to seeing the government's response. Perhaps we will get a nice surprise. Perhaps when we wake up tomorrow morning, the bill will miraculously be introduced and the government will keep its promise. I just want to remind it that it has three days left.

Of course, the government may say that there was Bill S-211. That bill requires Canadian companies to prepare an annual report. It does not have much to do with respecting human rights. It only deals with forced labour. It does not cover human rights, which, according to international conventions, are indivisible. We are far from that. Under Bill S-211, a company could comply just by reporting that it took no due diligence measures. All it has to do is submit a report in which it says it did nothing, and it will meet the requirement. The only consequences, the only fines, are for companies that fail to submit a report or that make false statements. Therefore, if the company reports that it did no due diligence, the government would say, "That is fine, thank you, good night", and move on to the next company. Only companies with more than 250 employees that generate significant active revenue are covered.

Instead, I urge the government to move forward with Bill C-262, which was introduced by the NDP, but which I am co-sponsoring and supporting. It covers companies of all sizes, gets the affected communities involved, encompasses all human rights and, above all, provides meaningful recourse for victims.

• (1300)

[English]

Mr. James Bezan: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I believe the member inadvertently referred to the Prime Minister by his name.

[Translation]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I do not know. I did not hear it.

Did the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot mention the Prime Minister's name?

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Madam Speaker, I did not mention the Prime Minister in my speech at all. I am going to ask that my colleague listen before he raises points of order. He might find that useful later on during question period.

That brings me to the matter of returning to the agreement. I have consistently said that I oppose it. Let us keep in mind that all of the Conservatives' amendments were ruled out of order. I was against all of them. Some of what they contained was totally irresponsible and dangerous, such as including the sale of weapons in a trade agreement. We want this to be an agreement for reconstruction and peace, not for what its wording implies, an agreement for perpetual warfare. It made no sense. However, every time that the

amendments brought forward were ruled out of order, I voted with the Conservatives so that the amendments could be debated and heard.

The definition of trade agreements has a major transparency problem. Something makes no sense. I intend to talk about it.

Ottawa is not being transparent with its own MPs even though they are the ones chosen by the people to represent them in the House. No matter the issue or the party in power, governments do not like their opponents scrutinizing their actions too closely. When it comes to trade agreements, Canada's monarchical culture demands secrecy. Canada clings to that monarchical tradition, keeping its trade agreements hidden in the shadows lest they perish like vampires in the sun.

As an MP, I have experienced this on several occasions, including in November and December 2020, when the Standing Committee on International Trade was supposed to study the transitional Canada-UK free trade agreement without actually seeing it. It was a genuine theatre of the absurd. We heard witnesses, experts who told us what they liked and did not like, and who encouraged us to vote for or against certain parts of it. Not one of those people had seen the agreement, not even the MPs who were supposed to study it. What was the point?

When Canada's Department of External Affairs was created in 1909, the Secretary of State presiding over it was required to provide an annual report to Parliament on the department's activities. Logically, this included a report on Canada's international discussions and commitments. In 1995, at the height of globalization, the department's act was amended to give it a freer hand by granting it jurisdiction over international trade, to the detriment of Parliament. The requirement for an annual report was abolished at that time.

However, in 1926, the House of Commons passed a resolution stating the following:

...before His Majesty's Canadian Ministers advise ratification of a treaty or convention affecting Canada, or signify acceptance of any treaty, convention or agreement involving military or economic sanctions, the approval of the parliament of Canada should be secured.

In actual fact, this practice was applied unevenly for 40 years until it was finally abandoned in 1966. A parliament worthy of the name should adopt procedures aimed at increasing the level of democratic control over agreements.

My political party, the Bloc Québécois, introduced seven bills on the procedure for reaching agreements between 1999 and 2004, requiring the minister responsible for the ratification of an agreement to table it in Parliament, along with an explanatory memorandum, within a reasonable time frame, and requiring the approval of members of Parliament before any ratification. As a result of the Bloc Québécois's efforts, it is now policy that an explanatory memorandum be submitted within a reasonable time before an agreement is ratified by elected members. There is currently a policy in place, but no government has had the courage to create binding legislation. That is not the same thing.

As a result, the government can act arbitrarily. We are certainly not a British regime where Parliament is supposed to have partial veto rights over ratifications. Also, this process, while desirable in itself but ridiculously inadequate, consisting in asking members what they think after the fact, could be a means of controlling Parliament. Rather than really involving members in the drafting of international agreements, this policy is merely an instrument to sound out the opposition parties' position.

• (1305)

Some parliaments around the world even consult elected members before starting negotiations to obtain mandates on sectors to be promoted or protected. The United States, for example, has a law that protects the sugar sector. It is written down. The European Union has members vote before starting negotiations. It asks them which mandates they wish to give negotiators.

The principle makes sense. Members of Parliament are elected by the public to represent the interests and values of their constituents. Given its lack of transparency before, during and after trade negotiations, Canada has a long way to go when it comes to involving members of Parliament in the process.

We might have hoped for progress when yet another agreement was reached between the Liberal Party and the New Democratic Party in 2020. We would have thought there would be more transparency in the process. I remember that we were studying the Canada-United States-Mexico Agreement, or CUSMA, in the Standing Committee on International Trade. Before CUSMA was adopted, the NDP reached an agreement with the Liberal Party, agreeing to accelerate the adoption of CUSMA in exchange for the government's commitment to increase transparency in trade agreements. There would be less transparency at the time, because there was less time to study CUSMA but, in exchange, there would be more transparency in the future.

What happened? The next agreement, with the United Kingdom, was referred for consideration for several weeks without us having any text. This tells us how successful the agreement was. Now, there are talks with Indonesia. There were talks with India until not long ago. There are talks with the whole Indo-Pacific region and with the Association of Southeast Asian Nations. There are talks with the United Kingdom for a transitional agreement. Eventually, there will be talks with Mercosur. We know absolutely nothing about any of these. The meetings of the Standing Committee on International Trade, even when we hear from Canadian negotiators, tell us very little.

Government Orders

That agreement between the NDP and the Liberal Party of Canada yielded negligible results, which does not seem to have discouraged the NDP from continuing to forge alliances with them. Good for them, but when it comes to transparency, I wish them better luck next time.

I would also like to talk about transparency toward the provinces. There is nothing in Canadian federalism—and this is a misnomer, since there is no longer any federalism; we are on the road to a centralized unitary state—that requires consultation with the provinces.

There was one sole exception. It was for an agreement with Europe, when Quebec was allowed one negotiator. However, that negotiator had no seat at the negotiations table. The chief negotiator for Quebec, former premier Pierre Marc Johnson, has said that he was there just to be a cheerleader for the Canadian delegation, which essentially engaged in backroom negotiations. In contrast, Wallonia nearly scuttled that whole agreement, because it disagreed with one provision, and because that is how the Belgian system works. Perhaps there is something here for Canada to learn, in terms of how it operates. That would be showing real respect for the provinces.

It is a proposal for reform, but it is not my preferred solution. My preference would be for Quebec to be at the negotiating table as an independent country.

I would add that, if the federal government is to represent all Canadians in international agreements and we cannot even manage to enjoy the benefits, Quebec is becoming an increasingly negligible quantity in Parliament. How can we ever gain the smallest advantage if year after year, electoral reform after electoral reform, we are losing more and more ground?

We are going to become a more and more insignificant minority in this Parliament. When I say “we”, I mean the Quebec nation. With the new electoral map coming into effect shortly, Quebec will have 70 seats out of 341 instead of out of 338. Since votes in Parliament are often close, Quebec's political weight will be reduced, accounting for around 22% of the total number of members. The trend is clear. As Quebec's demographic weight decreases, its power in the House of Commons will become increasingly insignificant.

• (1310)

Beyond the numbers, continuously reducing Quebec's importance within the institution that makes the laws in this country will have real consequences, because Quebec will have less and less say. Its interests and values will be more and more diluted to the benefit of the interests and values of the rest of Canada. Is that not the real consequence of our presence in this regime, which seems to be designed to perpetually marginalize us?

Before the creation of the poorly named Confederation, when French Canadians were more numerous than English Canadians, we had the right to equal representation. We were two peoples unequal in number but with the same number of representatives, for as long as French Canadians were in the minority. Once we became less numerous, the regime magically switched to proportional representation. It is handy when the conqueror decides what kind of system to set up.

Government Orders

I will conclude my speech by repeating that we are in favour of the agreement, but that we would have preferred a much different process in which the provinces and elected members could have taken part in the negotiations.

Mr. Yvan Baker (Etobicoke Centre, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the member for his speech, his comments, and his and his party's support for the Canada-Ukraine free trade agreement. I would like to ask him why he thinks this agreement is important for Canada and Ukraine.

• (1315)

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Madam Speaker, as I mentioned, this agreement will certainly be good for the economy. For Quebec, I think that there are interesting prospects in the sports and engineering industries. Of course, the agreement will also promote trade, which will also be good for Ukrainians and their country.

However, I will reiterate that I do not understand why Canada elevated multinationals to the status of sovereign powers. Since the North American Free Trade Agreement was replaced by the Canada-United States-Mexico Agreement, there is no reason for this. That is why I asked that we vote separately on that particular aspect. I voted against that aspect.

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the member for his speech about the free trade agreement and the bill, which will implement it in Canada. I travelled with him several times to Washington, and I must say that he is a champion of workers' interests in the labour and battery sectors. Every time we met with the Americans, he would talk about that, trying to convince them.

I think there is something that is very difficult for us when it comes to free trade agreements, even with our closest allies, including the U.S. We need to convince them that Canada can bring something to the table to help them. I think that our trade in goods and services with Ukraine is worth about \$1 billion.

In committee, we Conservatives proposed eight amendments to the free trade agreement to try to broaden its scope. I will try to summarize the member's statements. He says that he wants a free trade system to promote peace. However, Ukraine is at war, having been invaded by Russia under Vladimir Putin. It needs weapons and it needs to be able to manufacture weapons within its borders.

Would it not be preferable to include that in the free trade agreement?

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, who did travel with me.

He also defended his region's interests quite vigorously in meetings we had with U.S. elected officials. This being said, it is the prerogative of all sovereign states to sell or donate weapons. Of course, there are ways of doing so, and this is regulated by conventions. However, it is the prerogative of a state to support one of the parties in a conflict.

Still, should this be included in an agreement that is intended to remain in effect for many years? That is where I have a problem.

In the interest of transparency, I want to say something. Although I was radically opposed to every amendment proposed by the Conservatives, I agreed that they should have been ruled in order for debate. I find it sad to have an agreement thrust upon us and not be able to change it later.

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, the member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, for his speech.

[English]

I would also like to thank him for his support at committee during the discussions on the investor-state dispute mechanism question. I would like to give him some more time to expand on that. He mentioned that the ISDS gives corporations the status of sovereign nations. It puts them above Canadian corporations here in Canada. It brings up the possibility that Ukraine would be on the hook for huge settlements if one of these disputes was made against Ukraine by a Canadian company.

I am wondering if the member could comment on that and comment on why the world is moving away from ISDS agreements while Canada seems stuck in that lane.

[Translation]

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Madam Speaker, I do not understand why this keeps getting brought up even though it was removed from the Canada-United States-Mexico Agreement. It is a non-issue.

That said, in terms of the general consequences, the investor-state dispute settlement mechanisms allow litigation based on the right to profit.

Early on, in the old North American Free Trade Agreement, this was called "expropriation" or "equivalent to expropriation". That is the vague term that opened the way to every possible kind of abuse. It justified countries being sued for increasing minimum wage, for cancelling certain offshore petroleum developments, and for banning the use of chemicals in certain lawn care products. It was really a step backwards for democracy. According to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, political will declined partly or completely in 60% of cases. In other words, it was a victory for multinationals or out-of-court settlements.

• (1320)

Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his brilliant speech and for his continued, meaningful defence of Quebec's interests.

Government Orders

I would like him to elaborate further because, before he arrived in the House earlier, I asked a question regarding that same issue. The parliamentary secretary replied that we were only approving the agreement and could not change it. That is exactly what my colleague has just demonstrated in his speech.

What must we do for this not to be the case in subsequent international agreements? How can we change the way that we reach international agreements?

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Madam Speaker, the entire culture needs to be changed. We heard some pretty amazing things in the debate on our supply management bill, which my colleague and I sponsored and for which we toured Quebec twice, virtually in 2021 and in person this year.

We heard some pretty amazing things, like Parliament should not have anything to say on the matter, because it would interfere with negotiators' methods. We live in a democracy. The first idea we need to adopt in our culture and our way of doing things is that debates should take place before the negotiators get to work. That is the first thing.

Then, through legislation rather than policy, there should be time built in to make amendments to the agreement and to produce an explanatory memorandum. We do not need a policy, we need a law. I emphasize this point.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, when we talk about the Canada-Ukraine free trade agreement, a great deal of interest goes well beyond this chamber, whether it is from the Ukrainian ambassador to Canada or President Zelenskyy.

A letter that I received from the Ukrainian Canadian Congress was sent to the leader of the Conservative Party. The letter says, "The UCC therefore asks that the Official Opposition revisit their position on Bill C-57 and vote to support the Bill". I think that would be in our best interests. At one point, it seemed that everyone inside this chamber was behind Ukraine and showed Ukrainian solidarity given what is taking place in Europe. The trade agreement is sound and solid.

I wonder if the member could provide his thoughts in regard to the Conservative Party rethinking its position so we can get unanimous support for this trade agreement.

[Translation]

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Madam Speaker, I would also invite the Conservatives to rethink their position. I radically disagree with their arguments. I think a lot of them could easily be disproved by the facts.

That being said, let us be clear about one thing: A trade agreement is not a religion. It is reasonable to raise questions and to disagree with certain aspects. If they are fundamentally opposed to most of them, they can oppose them. I do not want to send them to the stake for opposing those things. They are entitled to disagree.

That being said, of course, their argument has obvious weaknesses. For that reason, I also invite them to rethink their position.

[English]

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am proud to rise today to once again speak to Bill C-57, the new Canada-Ukraine free trade agreement, this time at third reading, the final stage of debate.

The Canada-Ukraine friendship is very special. Over one million Canadians are very proud of their Ukrainian heritage. In fact, when Ukraine declared its independence from the Soviet Union in 1991, Canada was the first western country to recognize that act. Shortly after that recognition, in 1995, Canada signed an early foreign investment protection agreement, or FIPA, with Ukraine, so we have always supported attempts to strengthen our trade with Ukraine.

In 2017, Canada signed the first version of this free trade agreement. Let us remember that, at that time, Ukraine was already involved in conflicts with Russia. It was recognized that a broader, more complete agreement would be needed. The two countries agreed in 2019 to begin the process of creating this new agreement. That treaty was completed early in 2023 and signed at the end of September when President Zelenskyy visited Ottawa.

The text of the treaty, however, was not released until this implementation bill, Bill C-57, was tabled on October 17. Debate on the bill began only a few days later. The compressed timeline of parliamentary debate on this agreement is problematic, and I will speak to that later.

Ukraine is now literally fighting for its life in an illegal war instigated by the Russian invasion in 2022. Canada has been providing aid in many forms to Ukraine since that war began. With respect to trade, Canada issued remission orders to temporarily open up trade with Ukraine, allowing supply-managed products such as poultry to enter Canada. We have heard some concerns about these remission orders in the international trade and agriculture committees, but it is fair to say that most Canadians are happy to help Ukraine in any way during this horrific time in their struggles.

I mentioned the FIPA that predated the free trade agreements with Ukraine, an agreement signed in 1995. FIPAs allow foreign corporations to sue Canadian governments if they feel the new laws or regulations in Canada impact their profit. The most famous of these in Canada is the FIPA that Stephen Harper signed with China in 2012 without any debate in this place. That still haunts us to this day.

Government Orders

FIPAs now find their way into broader free trade agreements in the form of investor-state dispute systems, or ISDS. It is no secret that New Democrats are not a fan of ISDS. When we have voted against free trade agreements in the past, whether it was the CETA with the EU or the CPTPP agreement with Pacific nations, it was almost always because those agreements included ISDS clauses.

New Democrats were happy when the new CUSMA agreement with the United States and Mexico eliminated the ISDS provisions that had been included in the original NAFTA, so we are very disappointed that this new agreement with Ukraine has inserted ISDS provisions in its investment chapter. It basically rolls the old FIPA conditions into this treaty with some updated language. We joined the Bloc Québécois member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot in committee to try to remove the ISDS implementation in this agreement, but we were voted down by the Liberals and Conservatives.

The world is moving away from ISDS language in trade agreements. Canada should be at the forefront of that trend, not a laggard trying to catch up. Australia and New Zealand have negotiated side letters with the United Kingdom taking out ISDS language in the CPTPP agreement as part of the U.K.'s accession process to that agreement. The U.K. Parliament is actively debating whether it wants to include ISDS provisions in future trade deals. The European Union is moving away from ISDS, and Canada should do the same.

• (1325)

Bill C-57 passed second reading on November 21. Surprisingly, the Conservatives voted against it. They voted against a trade agreement that Ukraine very much wanted full support for. Why? The Conservatives found very deep in the environment chapter the words “carbon pricing”. They concocted a scenario of Canada forcing Ukraine in its time of need to agree to support carbon pricing.

The fact is that Ukraine has had carbon pricing since 2011, long before Canada put the carbon tax in place. Ukraine strengthened that resolve in 2018 as part of its efforts to join the European Union. If anything, Ukraine has been leading Canada in the carbon pricing scenario. The mention of carbon pricing in this agreement in no way obliges either Canada or Ukraine to implement or continue carbon pricing.

Ukraine and Ukrainian Canadians noticed that the Conservatives voted against the agreement. They pleaded for unanimity. What did the Conservatives do in response to Ukraine's concerns? Well, they voted against funding for Ukraine aid in the supplementary estimates last week. They voted against funding for Operation Unifier as well. The Ukrainian Canadian Congress commented online, “For the second time this month, Conservative MPs undermine support for Ukraine by voting against funding for Operation Unifier and other support for Ukraine in the supplementary estimates. Canada's support for Ukraine should be unanimous and beyond political games.”

Just a few minutes ago, the Conservatives doubled-down and once again voted against the Ukraine free trade agreement at report stage. Then they added an amendment to send the bill back to committee, further delaying a bill that the Ukrainian government has asked us to pass without delay. We cannot make this stuff up.

I would like to turn back to the issue of how we debate free trade agreements in this Parliament. Too often in the past, we have barely known that a trade agreement was being negotiated before it was presented with a signed agreement that we were asked to ratify, a *fait accompli*. The NDP thinks it is important that Parliament have input into trade negotiations before they begin. When the government negotiated CETA and CPTPP, Canadians were kept in the dark about what was being negotiated. When we finally learned what was on the table, the deals were already finalized, and the government said there was absolutely no way to change anything at that point. It is not too much to ask for input on these important policies. The United States Congress has the right and ability to debate what priorities its country will have before entering into free trade negotiations.

The member for Elmwood—Transcona wrote a letter in December 2019 to the Minister of International Trade, who is now the Minister of Finance, regarding increased transparency around the negotiations for the new Canada-United States-Mexico Free Trade Agreement. In response to that letter, the minister agreed, on February 19, 2020, to change the policy on tabling treaties in Parliament. Those changes were to “require that a notice of intent to enter into negotiations toward a new free trade agreement be tabled in the House of Commons at least 90 calendar days prior to the commencement of negotiations.” That is three months. Under normal parliamentary procedures, the notice of intent would be referred to the committee on international trade. The second one was to “require that the objectives for negotiations toward the new free agreement be tabled in the House of Commons at least 30 calendar days prior to the commencement of negotiations.” Under normal parliamentary procedures, those objectives would be referred to the committee on international trade.

As I mentioned previously, there were discussions with some stakeholders around the scope of changes to this free trade agreement in the winter of 2020, but the international trade committee was only able to provide input well after negotiations had begun. It is also important to allow ample notice once the treaties are signed for debate in this place before they are ratified. We should know what the treaty contains as soon as it is signed.

• (1330)

The standing policy of this place is there should be 21 sitting days between the tabling of treaties and the tabling of implementing legislation. At the same time, the government must table an explanatory memorandum and a final environmental assessment.

When the first Canada-Ukraine Free Trade Agreement was tabled in 2017, the government followed that policy, but that did not happen at all with this agreement. The treaty and the implementing legislation were tabled on the same day with the memorandum. On top of that, the minister tabled the legislation on a Tuesday, and we began debate the following Monday. As the Conservative member mentioned, it is hardly enough time to read a very large agreement, find out what it is all about and really make meaningful debate in this House to properly discuss the ramifications of these treaties that mean a lot to Canadian companies and Canadians.

This has to change. MPs should have the opportunity to debate the priorities of free trade negotiations before they begin and should have ample opportunity to debate the implementation of treaties after they are signed. I urge the minister and her government to follow the standard policies on how to introduce treaties and implement legislation before Parliament. These are not minor details. They are important points on how Canadians expect us here in this place to hold the government to account.

To conclude, the NDP is very much in favour of free trade. We supported the original version of this agreement with Ukraine in 2017. Our main caveat for free trade agreements in general is that they must be designed to protect and create Canadian jobs and protect the ability of Canadian governments at all levels to care for our environment and promote the well-being of all citizens.

The measure of success of free trade deals must not be just the profits made by Canadian corporations. They must include measures of good labour agreements both here and in the countries we are making deals with and measures of good environmental and human rights laws on both sides as well. These agreements must be beneficial to the people of both countries involved.

This new agreement with Ukraine and the bill before us which would implement this agreement seem to do a good job in that direction. We must do everything we can to support Ukraine and to prepare for the rebuilding of Ukraine after its victory over Russia.

• (1335)

Mr. Yvan Baker (Etobicoke Centre, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I hear the member's points about the process in negotiating free trade agreements and have taken that under advisement and to heart.

One of the things he did speak about was that the carbon tax purportedly is the reason the Conservative Party has voted against this agreement and does not support this agreement. I am wondering if he could share with the House and with Canadians what his point of view is on the Conservatives' rationale for opposing this free trade agreement.

Mr. Richard Cannings: Madam Speaker, I cannot speak for the Conservatives, and I really cannot understand their position here. We have mentioned in this agreement carbon pricing in a way that would not hold either Canada or Ukraine to having a carbon price, or increasing it or promoting it. It simply talks about this in a broad list of environmental objectives.

As I mentioned, Ukraine already has a carbon price. It has had one for 12 years, which is much longer than Canada. We heard in debate here today the Conservatives think that this is some kind of

Government Orders

poison pill. I cannot imagine Volodymyr Zelenskyy would sign an agreement that had a poison pill in it. It is the height of illogical thinking that Canada would put a poison pill in a free trade agreement so the Conservatives would vote against it. It simply does not make any sense at all, and so I am baffled. The member should ask the Conservatives that question.

Mr. Kyle Seebach (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): Madam Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's fair criticism of the decisions that the Conservatives have made on this, unlike the hyperpartisan rhetoric that we hear from the Liberal government. He talked about how President Zelenskyy signed this agreement and wants Canada to go forward with it, so he accepts that what President Zelenskyy says means something.

I am wondering if he wants to comment on President Zelenskyy's comments about how this Liberal government allowed a gas turbine to be exported from Canada to pump Russian gas, to actually help fund Putin's illegal war in Ukraine.

President Zelenskyy said, "Moreover, it is dangerous not only for Ukraine, but also [dangerous] for all countries of the democratic world." President Zelenskyy called on the Canadian government to reverse the decision. The Canadian ambassador said, "Russia is using energy as a weapon, in Europe and all over the world. This money and fuel are going to support the war in Ukraine."

Does the member also agree with President Zelenskyy that this was a terrible decision by the Liberal government that actually helped fund Putin's war machine?

• (1340)

Mr. Richard Cannings: Madam Speaker, yes, I think it was the wrong decision, for all of the reasons he mentioned.

Ms. Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): *Uqaqtittiji*, I have always appreciated the hon. member's solidarity with indigenous peoples and the work that he does to meet the needs of his constituents.

One of the things that seems quite important about this particular modernization of this free trade agreement is the chapter on indigenous peoples and trade.

I think that these are important acknowledgements about what we need to do for indigenous peoples. Unfortunately, we have been hearing about causes trumping these kinds of important issues. I wonder if the member can speak to what the difference is, in terms of advocating for human rights, indigenous rights, as well as how fighting for a cause might not be as effective as what we are seeing today.

Mr. Richard Cannings: Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Nunavut for her important and wonderful voice here in this Parliament, constantly reminding us about the rights of indigenous people. It gives more than just words and thoughts to their rights, and actually puts those rights into action in our agreements and our laws.

Government Orders

Yes, I am very happy that we have a chapter here on indigenous rights in this agreement. It speaks to the Tatar people of Ukraine, as well as the indigenous people here in Canada, and that these types of chapters will be in further agreements.

We had the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, which we have recognized here in Canada. British Columbia has laws. We have to make sure that, every day, we think of what those rights mean and how we make our laws and decisions here to uphold those rights.

Hon. Judy A. Sgro (Humber River—Black Creek, Lib.): Madam Speaker, my colleague is a wonderful member of the international trade committee, who contributes very significantly to whatever the discussion or debate is in a very comprehensive and thoughtful way. I understand, after the next election, he is not going to be returning to the House, which I think is a real loss for the House of Commons, because he adds a tremendous amount in the House and at the committee level.

I would like to ask my hon. colleague about the concerns of the Ukrainian Canadian Congress and so many other organizations that have echoed their support for this. President Zelenskyy sat right in front of me and urged us to pass this free trade agreement very quickly.

Was my hon. colleague concerned with the amount of opposition that was led by the Conservative Party of Canada?

Mr. Richard Cannings: Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Humber River—Black for those warm regards and for being a wonderful chair of the international trade committee.

Yes, as I said before in answer to a previous question, I am surprised at the Conservative response to this agreement. The Conservatives seem to have reacted to a couple of words in the agreement and used that to vote against it when Ukraine and Ukrainian Canadians have been very vocal in calling them out on this decision. We should be unanimous in our support for Ukraine. I was surprised that the Conservatives doubled down today and have done a couple more things to try to slow down this bill, when Ukraine wants it passed right now.

• (1345)

Mr. Kyle Seebach: Madam Speaker, the point of this trade agreement, or part of it, is allegedly to help rebuild Ukraine. That is some of the rhetoric that we hear from the Liberal Party. However, one thing that actually is a problem is that Canada is the only G7 country that has not offered wartime insurance to Canadian business operators who want to rebuild in Ukraine. That means that the projects that they undertake are subject to enormous risk because, of course, it is a war. Every other G7 country has recognized this risk and has provided wartime insurance to business operators. Canada has not. Was the member aware of that, and does he think that is another major failure of the current Liberal government?

Mr. Richard Cannings: Madam Speaker, the member is a valuable member of the international trade committee. This issue of wartime insurance for Canadian companies is important. I do not believe it belongs in a free trade agreement, just as I do not believe that calls for more munitions to Ukraine or natural gas to Ukraine belong in a free trade agreement. These agreements are about tak-

ing tariffs off things and not about trying to promote one thing or the other.

This is something that the government should be looking into. This is an agreement that is supposed to help rebuild Ukraine and right now we are talking about issues within the war experience.

Mr. Yvan Baker (Etobicoke Centre, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Humber River—Black Creek.

As we speak, the Ukrainian people are risking their lives and sacrificing their lives to defend their homeland. Notwithstanding the courage and resolve of the Ukrainian people, the situation in Ukraine is dire. There are millions of refugees inside and outside Ukraine. Russia is committing genocide in Ukraine every day. We have heard about many forms of war crimes, including the deportation of Ukrainian children to Russia, as one example.

There are hundreds of millions of people in the global south who are facing food shortages and famine because of Russia's invasion and blockade of Ukrainian ports. The war is the primary reason for food and energy price inflation around the world, including here in Canada. When Canadians pay higher prices at the pumps and the grocery store, the primary reason for that is Russia's invasion of Ukraine.

This is an existential threat to global security and to Canada's security. It is critical that Ukraine win this war, not just for the sake of the Ukrainian people and not just because it is the right thing to do, but because it is important to us. Ukrainian people are not just fighting for themselves, but they are also fighting for us. I believe we should be fighting for them.

The Government of Canada has been fighting for them. Canada has been a leading country in supporting Ukraine. We have provided over \$5 billion in financial aid to Ukraine. That is the largest amount of financial aid per capita of any country in the world.

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

Mr. Yvan Baker: Madam Speaker, my Conservative colleague is heckling me as I speak, so clearly he does not support that.

We have provided about \$2.4 billion in military support that is going to help the Ukrainian Armed Forces on the front line fight against this invasion. There has been over \$350 million in humanitarian assistance, \$127 million in development assistance, and over \$102 million in security and stabilization assistance. We have the implementation of the CUAET visa program that has allowed about 200,000 Ukrainians fleeing the war to come here for temporary refuge in Canada.

We have been a leader in supporting Ukraine's entry into NATO. We have been advocating for Ukraine's entry into the EU. There was some talk earlier in this debate about what we can do to help Ukraine rebuild. The reality is that Canada is a leading country. We are making sure that we are seizing Russian assets here in Canada, and other countries are looking to our leadership on that, to make sure that we can sanction Russian assets here in Canada and use them to help rebuild Ukraine.

We are leading in terms of working with Ukraine, the International Criminal Court and others to make sure that Russia's war crimes are prosecuted. We have trained 40,000 members of the Ukrainian Armed Forces through Operation Unifier. Let us just imagine 40,000 Ukrainian men and women fighting and giving everything to defend their homeland, and they were trained by Canada. I think that is something that, as Canadians, we can be very proud of.

One of the things we can be very proud of is the Canada-Ukraine free trade agreement, which I would note was negotiated in record time at the request of the Ukrainian government while it was under attack by Russia. These are steps that we can be very proud of. These are important, material steps to help Ukraine win the war.

The reality is that this will not be enough until Ukraine achieves a decisive victory. To me, a decisive victory means it wins the war, but it also wins the peace. Winning the war means they recapture all of their territory, and that includes Eastern Ukraine, Donetsk, Luhansk and Crimea.

Winning the peace, to me, means many things. It means that Ukraine is secure as a member of NATO, that we secure reparations from Russia to help rebuild Ukraine, that there is justice for Russian war crimes and that we help rebuild Ukraine's economy. That means not just helping to rebuild the physical infrastructure that has been destroyed in Ukraine, but it also means helping Ukraine's economy rebuild so it can be prosperous and so the Ukrainian people can achieve the freedom, the democracy, but also the prosperity that they are fighting for every minute of every day, and that tens of thousands of Ukrainians have given their lives to defend.

That is where this Canada-Ukraine free trade agreement comes in. It is actually incredibly important, not just to Canada's economy, but also to Ukraine's economy. Ukraine's economy, since the invasion started, has declined by over 30%. Let us imagine a 30% decline in a country's economy. The reality is that is why signing free trade agreements, with countries like Canada that are interested in not only trade, but also investing in Ukraine, is so critical, especially at this time.

• (1350)

If Ukraine is going to fight this war, it will need an economy that is functioning, that is allowing it to fund the war by collecting taxes to pay for munitions and everything else it needs to pay for. I think it is very important that we appreciate the importance of this agreement for that purpose.

The other reason this agreement is important is that the Canada-Ukraine free trade agreement we currently have in place covers goods. It covers the trade of physical material, physical stuff, that goes back and forth, which is very important. However, the bigger

Government Orders

economic opportunity is in trade and services and allowing investment to flow between our countries.

Just from a purely Canadian perspective, it is good for Canada to have this trade agreement with Ukraine. It is an economic opportunity for our workers and our business people, so it should be unanimously supported. It is equally important for Ukraine from an economic perspective to trade services and allow investment to flow. It is critical and urgent for Ukraine, not just because we need to help Ukraine's economy but because the flow of investment is critical to helping Ukraine rebuild. Ukraine cannot rebuild without investment from individuals and businesses who want to invest to build businesses and help rebuild Ukraine.

This trade agreement was asked for and signed by President Zelenskyy and the Prime Minister. It is supported by the Ukrainian Canadian Congress. It is supported by the Ukrainian ambassador. Ukrainian MPs have travelled to Canada to ask MPs of all parties to support it. It is widely supported. It is beneficial to Ukraine and is beneficial to Canada, but there is a problem: Every single Conservative MP continuously votes against it. They just voted against it an hour or two ago here in this House again.

The argument they have put forward is that there is mention of a carbon price in the agreement. First of all, the mention of a carbon price does not require Ukraine to do anything. It is just a mention. The second thing is that Ukraine has had a carbon price in place since 2011. It had a carbon price before Canada had one. It needs one to join the EU. Ukraine committed to a carbon price long ago and has committed to a carbon price for the future, so nothing here is being imposed on Ukraine.

The other thing that is a little odd is the suggestion that Canada somehow imposed this on Ukraine. This is the government, its leader and the people fighting to defend themselves from the second-largest military in the world and somehow Canada imposed something on them. I have never heard a more ridiculous argument in my life from the Conservatives.

The Conservatives have argued here in this debate that they know better than President Zelenskyy and the Ukrainian government what Ukraine needs. They have said we should delay this agreement, we should amend this agreement and we should remove segments of the agreement, all of those things because this would be better for Ukraine. Do members know who knows better what Ukraine needs? Ukrainians do. We should be listening to them. They have asked us to pass this agreement. We should respect their decision and respect the fact that they want this agreement signed and need it urgently.

Unfortunately, this is part of a pattern now that has emerged since the member for Carleton became leader of the Conservative Party of Canada. The Conservatives talk about what Brian Mulroney and Diefenbaker did. That is great, but we are not talking about them because those folks are not sitting in the House today.

Statements by Members

The member for Carleton is the leader of the Conservative Party, and since he has become the leader, members of the Conservative Party and he specifically have never advocated for more military, financial or humanitarian support for Ukraine. He has been silent on Russia's acts of genocide against the Ukrainian people. He has echoed the false narratives that the war in Ukraine does not affect inflation around the world when expert after expert tells us it does. The other day on—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

• (1355)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): There will be an opportunity for questions and comments. If members are not in agreement with what the hon. member says, they can raise it during questions and comments.

The hon. member for Etobicoke Centre has a little over a minute.

Mr. Yvan Baker: Madam Speaker, the leader of the Conservative Party has echoed false narratives about the war, suggesting the war does not affect us and does not affect inflation in Canada. He has said that in this House multiple times, which is of course not true. We know that not to be true.

The Conservatives specifically challenged spending in our budget and voted to cut Operation Unifier, Canada's training mission of Ukrainian soldiers, through which we have trained 40,000 of them. They voted to cut military aid to Ukraine on Friday. Now they have voted again against the Canada-Ukraine free trade agreement. Every single Conservative MP did that.

This is part of a pattern. The Conservative Party under its leader does not support Ukraine. It is very obvious and apparent. I think it is important that we all support Ukraine. Ukrainians are fighting for themselves but they are also fighting for us.

Let us unify. Let us support Ukraine. *Slava Ukraini.*

Mr. Kyle Seeback (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): Madam Speaker, the hypocrisy of the member is astounding. He says we should listen to President Zelenskyy. Well, what he said on Canada exporting gas turbines is that it was “absolutely unacceptable”. “Moreover, it is dangerous not only for Ukraine, but also for all countries of the democratic world.”

President Zelenskyy called on the Canadian government to reverse the decision. Where was the member when that was going on? Was he condemning his government? Was he standing up and saying that we have to listen to President Zelenskyy? No. The member was quiet as a church mouse on an issue that is serious: a gas turbine being used to pump Russian gas to fund the war in Ukraine.

He did not listen to President Zelenskyy then, but somehow it is outrageous that we disagree with President Zelenskyy on a trade agreement. How does the member square his hypocrisy?

Mr. Yvan Baker: Madam Speaker, during this debate and during their consistent opposition to measures that help Ukraine over the last few weeks especially, Conservatives focus on the past, on nostalgia: what Mulroney did, what Diefenbaker did, what somebody did 10 years ago, what somebody did two years ago.

What the Ukrainian people need is not nostalgia. They need help. They are fighting for their lives, and they are fighting for us. The members opposite should stop focusing on what happened 10 or 20 years ago and focus on today.

Today, President Zelenskyy is asking us to pass this free trade agreement because it is vital to Ukraine winning this war. Let us support them. *Slava Ukraini.*

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. I want to remind members they had an opportunity to ask a question. They were not disturbed while they were asking the question and should return that respect when they are listening to the answer. If they are not in agreement with the answer, they should wait for questions and comments.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Humber River—Black Creek.

Hon. Judy A. Sgro (Humber River—Black Creek, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to applaud the efforts of my colleague, along with many other members of the House of Commons, to advance this free trade agreement between Canada and Ukraine and the importance of it.

We know Ukrainians are fighting an illegal Russian aggression against them. I would like to know what else the hon. member suggests we could be doing to advance and promote the free trade agreement with Ukraine.

Mr. Yvan Baker: Madam Speaker, it is critical that we continue to work with our allies and encourage them to support Ukraine until it wins. That is a critical step.

We have seen some wavering of support among some in the United States. It is important that we buffer that support. Canada can help Ukraine by continuing to send military aid to Ukraine, by continuing to train the Ukrainian armed forces and by continuing to send humanitarian aid. Also, let us expand our economic relationship with Ukraine and work toward Ukraine's rebuilding after the victory.

If we stay resolved and work with our allies to stay resolved, Ukraine will win. If Ukraine wins, we all win.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

• (1400)

[English]

CHILD CARE

Ms. Valerie Bradford (Kitchener South—Hespeler, Lib.): Madam Speaker, last week, the Conservatives tried to cut funding for over 30 critical programs for Canadian families, specifically child care. Every child deserves a chance to dream big and every parent deserves the opportunity to build their careers without worrying about child care costs.

Statements by Members

We have heard the struggles, felt the worries and understood the juggle of balancing work and raising children. I personally experienced that myself as a single mother raising three children on my own. That is why I am glad our government committed to reducing child care fees by an average of 50% this year, with a goal of just \$10 a day by 2025. Child care empowers parents, especially mothers, to realize their full potential, promotes gender equality and increases the size of the workforce.

The Conservatives talk a big game about having Canadians' backs, especially when it comes to Canadian families, but when it comes to supporting mothers and our children, they do not believe in it. Our government will continue to fight for children, mothers and families all across Canada.

* * *

LEADER OF THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY OF CANADA

Mr. Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Madam Speaker,

'Twas the week before Christmas, just before the House break,
Eight long years with a government on the take.
The economy was stalled, Liberal spending was high,
Canadians were struggling just to get by.
No one could afford a house or pay rent,
The carbon tax quadrupled is making a dent.
Canadians struggling and having to choose,
Between heating and eating, it was only bad news.
For families lined up at the food banks to eat,
The costly coalition was making Christmas look bleak.
But alas there was hope, from the opposition side,
A new Conservative leader was sure to provide.
With a common-sense plan geared for all people,
He would axe the tax and end the upheaval.
His housing policy would fix what the Liberals had broken,
He would ensure there would be no need for food tokens.
After eight long years of wasteful spending,
He would stop the debt from ever ascending.
The member for Carleton will soon be PM,
And this costly coalition will come to an end.
I heard him exclaim as he rode out of sight,
Your home, my home, our home, let us bring it home and to all a good night.

* * *

[Translation]

WOMEN AND GENDER EQUALITY

Mrs. Sophie Chatel (Pontiac, Lib.): Madam Speaker, supporting women so they can claim their full and proper place in the economy is not just the right thing to do, it is the smart thing to do. Are members aware that, by promoting women's participation in the economy, we could increase our GDP by \$150 billion?

Unfortunately, only 17% of SMEs are currently owned by women. That is why I was so proud to vote in favour of the women entrepreneurship strategy. Of course, that vote took place in the middle of the night, while half the Conservatives were tucked away in their beds. The other half of the Conservatives voted against it. Am I surprised? No, because a party made up of only 18% women cannot represent women in Canada.

CARREFOUR JEUNESSE-EMPLOI MONTMORENCY

Mrs. Julie Vignola (Beauport—Limoilou, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Carrefour jeunesse-emploi Montmorency, or CJE Montmorency, is celebrating its 25th anniversary. This organization in Beauport has become indispensable for young people between the ages of 15 and 35.

CJE Montmorency provides a wide range of free services to these youths to help and support them as they look for work, go back to school or even start their own business. In 25 years, thousands of young people have benefited from the entire team's extraordinary work.

At the head of this team is an incredible woman, the CEO, Sonia Noël. Sonia is frank, open, direct and creative. She is amazing. She does a masterful job of keeping the organization running. Through her understanding, empathy and determination, CJE Montmorency has been able to grow and expand its activities.

I want to say congratulations to the entire team and thank them on behalf of our young people.

* * *

● (1405)

[English]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Toronto has always been a safe city, yet over the last year there has been a marked increase of stabbings and shootings. In my riding of Davenport, residents have really begun to worry about their safety and the safety of their children.

After meeting with a number of local police superintendents, one thing they asked is for us to continue to focus on stopping guns from illegally entering our country. Our Liberal government has stepped up with more funding to keep Canadians safe, yet last week the Conservatives voted no to funding that would crack down on firearms from illegally entering Canada, no to additional dollars to keep the Canadian border secure and no to enhancing the RCMP's work to combat gun and gang violence.

On this side of the House, we will continue the important work to keep Toronto and all Canadian cities safe, while the Conservatives continue to play partisan games and obstruct important legislation. They are not worth the risk.

* * *

PETER ELZINGA

Mr. Matt Jeneroux (Edmonton Riverbend, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Alberta and Canada lost a giant recently, a man who was known around these halls, during his time as a member of Parliament for 12 years, and certainly around the Alberta legislature, as a member of the Legislative Assembly from 1986 to 1993 and then chief of staff to former premier Ralph Klein.

Although Peter Elzinga has left us in person, many of us are certainly better off for having known him.

Statements by Members

Remarkably, he left his life in government to donate a kidney to his friend, which characterizes the spirit of Peter and his public life. He was always filled with generosity and kindness, and I will cherish my many conversations with him and his committed guidance to me during my time in public life.

He is lovingly remembered by his wife, Patricia; sons Gregory, Roger and Peter-Burl; five grandchildren; and three great-grandchildren.

May Peter rest in peace. He served Canada with distinction, and, as a country, it is better off.

* * *

MENSTRUAL EQUITY FUND

Ms. Lisa Hepfner (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for most of our history, people who menstruate have been expected to fend for themselves and always carry hygienic supplies in case their “monthly visitor” arrives by surprise.

There are plenty of euphemisms for menstruation, because we have been taught this bodily function is somehow embarrassing. In consequence, those who experience period poverty have an exacerbated inability to access menstrual products. They face more inequity at school and work; in some cases, they decline to participate in society. That is why so many celebrated the \$18-million investment to distribute menstrual products to our most vulnerable through Food Banks Canada, as announced by the Minister for Women and Gender Equality. This is the kind of forward-thinking policy we get when women are in positions of power.

Conservatives voted against the menstrual equity fund last week, against helping more than 570,000 people access free menstrual products every month. Conservatives are not worth the risk to all we have accomplished for women's equity.

* * *

CONSERVATIVE PARTY OF CANADA

Ms. Joanne Thompson (St. John's East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, leading the country takes stamina. That is why our team, cabinet and leader were here, vote after vote, for 30-plus hours last week. Meanwhile, the opposition members could barely fill their benches, and their leader could barely show his face. When they did vote, they voted against our plan to help Canadians, including innovative Atlantic Canadian businesses, communities and businesses recovering from hurricane Fiona, Atlantic Canada's growing bioscience sector and marine conservation.

The fall economic statement is a plan that will support people in St. John's East and across the country. If we wanted to compare the opposition's plan, it is nowhere to be found; there are only cuts and political stunts.

Conservatives' true colours were on display last week as they voted against 100 measures to help this country.

HOUSING

Mr. Dan Muys (Flamborough—Glanbrook, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after eight years of the NDP-Liberal government, the dream of home ownership has become a nightmare. Today, mortgages have become unmanageable, devouring two-thirds of the average Canadian's monthly income for a typical Canadian home. I have heard from far too many families in Waterdown and Binbrook that are now teetering on the brink, because their monthly payments are up thousands. It is all because of the Liberals' reckless spending and deficits.

Young Canadians who are not yet in the market have totally given up. Saving for a down payment used to be achievable with a few years of hard work, but now it takes 25 years, which is what it used to take to pay off the entire home. This proves once again that the Prime Minister is not worth the cost.

Rents, mortgages and down payments have doubled. It is double trouble.

However, hope is on the way. Common-sense Conservatives have a plan to build homes, not bureaucracy, and restore the dream of home ownership for Canadians once again. Let us bring it home.

* * *

● (1410)

HOUSING

Hon. Joyce Murray (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government is continuing to invest in affordable housing.

In 2017, our Prime Minister launched a badly needed \$80-billion national housing strategy to fill the big gaps left by the previous Conservative government's denial of federal responsibility for housing. Countless Canadians remember what life was like during Prime Minister Harper's “decade of darkness”.

Last week showed that today's Conservative leader is cut from the same cloth. On Thursday and Friday, Conservative MPs voted against funding indigenous housing, funding 15,000 permanent affordable homes, constructing 71,000 rental homes and so much more.

Our government is working to strengthen the economy by supporting the middle class and those seeking to join it. While in Mr. Harper's cabinet, today's Conservative leader worked to undermine Canada's electoral democracy and shred our social safety net.

The Conservative leader is simply not worth the risk.

[Translation]

CARBON TAX

Mr. Richard Lehoux (Beauce, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after eight years under this government, food, housing and gas prices have never been higher, and with the governing Bloc-Liberal coalition intent on drastically increasing the carbon tax, prices are only going to go up.

I am so sick and tired of hearing these two parties say that the carbon tax does not impact Quebec. The second carbon tax will increase the price of gasoline by 17¢ per litre. Quebecers also have to pay higher prices on products brought in from other provinces, because the price of the carbon tax is passed on indirectly.

The Conservatives want the carbon tax to be eliminated in all provinces and territories. We knew right from the start that this was not an environmental plan, but a tax plan. Our party put forward motion after motion, but the Bloc-Liberal coalition opposed every single one.

Conservatives will continue to fight to remove the carbon tax on farmers and Canadian families, restore common sense in the next election and show these two parties what Canadians really want: affordable housing and a well-stocked fridge.

* * *

[English]

CARBON TAX

Mr. Randy Hoback (Prince Albert, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians hate the carbon tax. We see premiers suing the government, first nations taking the government to court and people lined up in breadlines at the food bank, because they cannot afford to eat.

Farmers feed this country. They do not understand why the Prime Minister continues to tax the inputs they must purchase to grow food. They are taxes that their competitors do not pay, yet the Liberal rural affairs minister has just made a spectacle of herself, stating that the country needs to vote for more Liberals if people want an exemption to this unfair tax.

The Prime Minister has instructed his appointed senators to gut the Conservative bill to remove carbon taxes on farmers, and we have the NDP leader willing to vote against farmers in the House of Commons to keep the Prime Minister in power. Canadians agree: The Prime Minister and the NDP-Liberal government are just not worth the cost.

* * *

MENTAL HEALTH AND ADDICTIONS

Ms. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week's 30-hour circus put on by the Conservatives cost Canadian taxpayers nearly \$2 million. While I was happy to sit in the House with my colleagues to ensure that the services that Canadians need most were passed and protected, Conservatives spent their night voting against Canadians.

Let me tell members one of their most shocking votes against communities such as my riding of London West. Conservatives voted to cut the funding to combat the toxic drug overdose crisis. They

Statements by Members

voted against substance use prevention programs for youth and the new national suicide crisis hotline.

The toxic drug crisis has claimed too many Canadian lives, and the risk that the opposition will cause an already struggling population to plunge into crisis is too high. Cutting a bilingual, trauma-informed and culturally appropriate support for suicide prevention would be a risk that Canadians cannot afford to take right now.

On this side of the House, we are going to keep fighting to make sure that Canadians have access to the mental health and addictions support that they need most, when they need it.

* * *

● (1415)

[Translation]

FOOD SECURITY

Mrs. Carol Hughes (Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapuskasing, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are suffering from a food insecurity crisis that is jeopardizing our constituents' fundamental right to food.

The pillars of that right, namely availability, adequacy and accessibility, are compromised not only in my riding, Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapuskasing, but also across the country.

[English]

Food insecurity in Ontario has been steadily increasing, from 7.8% in 2008 to 18% in 2022. Feed Ontario reports a 36% rise in food bank visits last year, soaring by 101% compared to pre-pandemic levels.

Among the most affected are 41.7% of first nations on-reserve households, followed by single mothers, at a distressing 41%. Moreover, over one-third of food bank users are children.

Parliament needs to implement a national school lunch program and a guaranteed livable basic income, as well as to crack down on corporate greed. Let us all affirm our commitment to a society where every citizen lives in dignity, free from the spectre of food insecurity.

*Oral Questions**[Translation]***DANIELLE GAMELIN**

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Bécancour—Nicolet—Saurel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, allow me to take a few moments to pay tribute to Danielle Gamelin, director general of Fondation Santé Bécancour—Nicolet—Yamaska.

From the time she started running that organization eight years ago, she proceeded to restructuring internal operations to improve efficiency and organizing fundraisers to stabilize the organization's financial health. What is more, she has reached out many times to the municipalities, the two RCMs, the chamber of commerce and every organization that offers health care services or community services so that the foundation can effectively meet their needs.

Ms. Gamelin is a woman of conviction. She is persuasive, inspiring, genuine, audacious and extremely disciplined. May she stay at the head of the Fondation Santé Bécancour—Nicolet—Yamaska for a long time to come. This entire beautiful region thanks her very much.

* * *

*[English]***INNOVATION, SCIENCE AND INDUSTRY**

Mr. Gerald Soroka (Yellowhead, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last night, the industry committee heard from a former employee of the Prime Minister's green slush fund about \$150 million of taxpayer money being misappropriated. Canadian tax dollars were funnelled to companies with Liberal insiders.

The witness said, “[an] embarrassing lack of oversight...allowed these problems to persist”, and there was an “egregious cover-up of the truth.” There were “breaches of...conflict of interest.”

Millions were approved for companies owned or operated by board members. A staggering level of incompetence, willful ignorance and corruption was shown. The minister and the Privy Council Office actively engaged with altering memos before they were sent.

After eight years of the NDP-Liberal government, it is obvious that they are not worth the cost. The Liberals will take care of their friends; Conservatives will continue to push for accountability and answers. When will Canadians get back the missing millions from Liberal insiders?

* * *

JIM CARR

Mr. Ben Carr (Winnipeg South Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today marks one year since the death of my father, Jim Carr. My dad had a deep respect for our institutions. He believed in the possibility borne from civil, yet rigorous debate; hard work; and confidence in what we can accomplish when working together.

His morals and values were guided by a faith in people. The proudest of his accomplishments was the last one: In his final days, he stood in this chamber, just a few seats from the one I occupy today, to advance the greening of the Prairie economy. He said during debate on the bill that, if he had a favourite part, it was that which

required a report back to Parliament. Yesterday, the bill's framework was tabled in the House.

Dad's final moments here saw him surrounded by people he loved, in a place he loved, working to improve the well-being of everyone from the region he loved. He lived by what our dear Auntie Fran would say, that it all comes down to attitude. She would say that “the glass always had to be half-full” and that one should be full of life. That he was.

Whenever the time may come that I look back at my own parliamentary career and judge its successes and shortcomings, I hope that I will be able to genuinely say that I have lived up to the standard that he set for us all. We miss him.

ORAL QUESTIONS

● (1420)

*[Translation]***INNOVATION, SCIENCE AND INDUSTRY**

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is inflating grocery prices and forcing 28,000 young Quebecers to write letters to Opération Père Noël asking for food instead of gifts. Meanwhile, he is also spending \$1 billion on a green slush fund where public servants are saying that the money is being given to friends and wasted.

Now, a whistle-blower and former employee is saying that the minister lied to the committee about the scandal.

Why did this minister cover up the scandal and Liberal waste?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative leader's plan to shut down Parliament last week failed. All his 30-hour temper tantrum achieved was to show Canadians his party's true colours and cost taxpayers \$2 million in wasteful spending.

The Conservative Party tried to reduce access to affordable child care, cut construction of affordable housing and make cuts to the police and the Canadian Armed Forces.

The Conservatives want to bring us back to the Stone Age, but we are going to meet Canadians' needs.

[English]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the question was about the Prime Minister's billion-dollar green slush fund scandal. We already know that, while he is forcing two million Canadians to a food bank, doubling housing costs and quadrupling the carbon tax, he has a billion-dollar fund that its own bureaucrats say reminds them of the sponsorship scandal and where its executives were giving money to their own companies.

Yesterday, a courageous whistle-blower testified the Prime Minister's innovation minister "lied" to the committee. Why are the minister and his boss, the Prime Minister, covering up this scandal and waste of Canadian tax dollars?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is not surprising that the Conservative leader does not want to talk about his failed Republican-style plan to shut down Parliament last week. All his 30-hour temper tantrum achieved was to show Canadians the party's true colours and cost Canadians \$2 million in wasteful spending.

The Conservative Party tried to cut affordable child care, cut construction of affordable housing, defund the police and defund Canada's armed forces. While they want to bring us back to the Stone Age, we will stay focused on Canadians.

CARBON PRICING

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians will be forced to eat stone soup this winter after the Prime Minister gave us the worst food price inflation in 40 years, and we have two million Canadians, a record-smashing number, lined up at food banks. I know the Prime Minister is desperate to avoid defending his own track record, or worse yet, his quadrupling of the carbon tax.

There is a common-sense Conservative bill, Bill C-234, in the Senate up for the vote today. Will the Prime Minister stop blocking the bill and axe the tax so our farmers can feed families?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party of Canada had the opportunity to support affordability measures for Canadians, but instead, its members chose to take 30 hours attacking the most vulnerable. During the Conservative leader's \$2-million temper tantrum, they gladly stood against veterans experiencing homelessness, against emergency shelters for women and girls, against indigenous housing, and against rapid affordable housing construction. They even tried to prevent support for those who lost their homes in hurricane Fiona. That leader is reckless and should be ashamed.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the truth is that the Prime Minister is not spending money on any of those things. He has a food program that does not feed kids. It feeds bureaucracies and creates frameworks that kids cannot eat. He has a housing affordability program that doubles the cost of housing, a housing accelerator that has not built a single house and a carbon tax that has not reduced emissions.

Oral Questions

Instead of spending billions on programs that cause inflation and do nothing but sound pretty, why will he not axe the tax on our farmers so they can feed Canadians this winter?

• (1425)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, whether the Leader of the Opposition makes a homemade video about it or not, a key factor contributing to food inflation around the world is Putin's illegal war in Ukraine. That party has been playing right into the Kremlin's hands by voting against Operation Unifier, by voting against funding for military aid to Ukraine and by voting at every opportunity, including again this morning, against the Canada-Ukraine free trade agreement that Ukrainians have been asking for. We will never abandon Ukraine, unlike the Conservative leader, who showed Canadians—

The Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is desperate to distract from the misery he has caused here at home. I wonder if he could, just for once, think about Canadians instead of thinking about himself.

We have two million Canadians lined up for food banks, which is a record-smashing number. He has doubled the cost of housing. He wants to quadruple the carbon tax. Nine in 10 young people say that they will never be able to afford a home. We understand that, with this miserable record, he does not want to talk about Canada or Canadians. He would rather spread falsehoods about faraway foreign lands. Will he not stand up for once for Canada? Will he not axe the tax so our families can—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: The right hon. Prime Minister.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative leader's partisan vitriol and performance games are hurting Canadians. Let us talk about the Conservatives' record directly.

When it came to 988, the suicide crisis help line, how did they vote? They voted against it.

When it came to the Lac-Mégantic rail bypass, how did they vote? They voted against it.

When it came to the new Montreal Holocaust Museum on the first night of Hanukkah, how did they vote? They voted against it.

There is clearly nothing this Conservative leader will not compromise.

*Oral Questions**[Translation]***DENTAL CARE**

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I tried to understand the government's new dental care program, but it is not simple. There are three types of dental insurance: private insurance for those who have it, the federal program and Quebec's program. However, there is only one jurisdiction, and that belongs to Quebec.

Since it should be easy to explain if it is simple, and since the Liberal government keeps compulsively tossing candy to the NDP to try to keep its government going a little longer, can the Prime Minister at least explain his hodgepodge of a dental program to us?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is funny that the Bloc Québécois leader mentions candy, because we have a dental plan to help children who have cavities. We have brought in a plan that will help families across the country who are unable to send their children to the dentist right now. Starting next year, we will be there for seniors with dental care. We will be there for young people under 18 who need dental care and cannot afford it. Eventually, we will cover all Canadians who cannot afford to pay for dental care.

We know that oral health is important for overall health, and we are there to help families.

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, that is pretty much what we were told about dental health back in grade three, but that does not explain the program. However, I get that it is hard to explain.

The government announced a slapdash program that puts the private sector front and centre, which is surprising coming from the NDP, and that interferes in an area under Quebec's jurisdiction, although that part is no shocker coming from either the Liberals or the NDP.

When the Prime Minister authorized the announcement of the dental care program, was it the health of Canadians he had in mind, or the strength, survival and ideology of his alliance with the NDP?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know that too many Canadians have no access to dental care. We are a government that has always been there to invest in Canadians and to help them socially and economically. We know that many families that have to pay for their own dental care end up going without other things, such as groceries or rent.

Now, we are making sure that Canadians will no longer have to make hard choices when it comes to dental care, because we are there to help them. It is something that matters to Canadians, and we are there for them.

* * *

● (1430)

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, to date, 20,000 Palestinian civilians have been killed in Gaza, more than half of whom are women and children. Despite this, the Liberals and the Conservatives refuse to call for a

ceasefire. It is appalling. It is inhumane. The NDP has been calling for a ceasefire and the release of all hostages for the past two months.

An important vote is taking place today at the UN. We know that the Liberals refuse to listen to those who have lost their families, but perhaps they will listen to their donors, who are starting to turn their backs on the party.

At the UN today, will Canada vote for a ceasefire, yes or no?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for the past nine weeks, the Government of Canada has taken a responsible stance in defending civilians and seeking a two-state solution with Israelis and Palestinians, so that they can live in safety and security, in countries recognized by the international community. We will do everything we can to ensure that Canadians are united and to curb the rise in hate, Islamophobia and anti-Semitism that we are experiencing. This government will continue to be there for everyone.

[English]

Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal position is appalling, not responsible. For two months, this government sat and watched while 18,000 innocent civilians lost their lives, and it has refused to call for a ceasefire. We need a ceasefire. We need the hostages removed.

Last week, it was reported that Liberal donors were withholding support because of the moral failure of the Liberals. Today, there is an important vote at the United Nations. The Liberals have failed to listen to the Palestinian people and to Canadian Palestinians. Will they at least listen to their fundraisers and vote for a ceasefire today?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since October 7, we have recognized the terrorist attack by Hamas that killed well over 1,000 innocent Israelis, and we have recognized Israel's right to defend itself. At the same time, the cost of justice cannot be the continued suffering of all Palestinian civilians.

That is why we are continuing to put forward, including today, in a statement with Australia and New Zealand, a strong and clear Canadian position that we will continue to work with allies around the world on moving toward a two-state solution, with peace for Israelis and peace for Palestinians, living side by side.

* * *

INNOVATION, SCIENCE AND INDUSTRY

Mr. Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there has been explosive testimony made by a whistle-blower on the Prime Minister's billion-dollar green slush fund, which has seen \$150 million misappropriated to Liberal insiders. Senior NDP-Liberal government officials have said that there is no plan to get Canadians back their missing millions.

After eight years of the Prime Minister, it is clear that he is not worth the cost. It is probably why he would not even stick around.

Will the Prime Minister shut down the slush fund and get Canadians back their money?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is shocking but not surprising to see the Conservative ideology on full display.

We are seeing that Conservatives are willing to attack anyone and any institution that would fight climate change, even institutions that were voted for by the Parliament in 2001. Now the Conservatives are calling into question the integrity of one of the top accounting firms in the country.

We will fight for Canadians. We will fight climate change, and we will restore governance in that institution.

Mr. Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, we are fighting Liberal corruption. We will keep doing that. This minister and his chief of staff, although they say it did not happen, were briefed on what was going on at SDTC. It was done orally, so they would not be subject to ATIP rules.

There are 150 million missing dollars, given outside the funding agreement, and we have two Liberal-appointed board members who are under investigation by the Ethics Commissioner. We have an Auditor General investigation, and we have whistle-blowers blowing the lid off this thing, which shows that this minister and the Prime Minister do not have the courage to fight for Canadian tax dollars.

Where are the missing millions? Who got rich?

• (1435)

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, we will fight for Canadians every day. Let us be very clear. We are seeing, again, for Canadians who are watching at home to not be fooled, the Conservative ideology to fight against anyone, any institution, even one they voted for in this House in 2001, that would fight climate change.

We suspended the funding of the organization. We called for an investigation. The leadership has resigned. We will get to the bottom of this.

Mr. Rick Perkins (South Shore—St. Margarets, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the minister will not tell us which Liberals got rich. Government officials, last night, admitted that they were in every single board meeting where this happened in the Liberal green slush fund.

According to the whistle-blower, the former chair and directors took over \$150 million of taxpayer money to their own companies. Government officials were present during these meetings and allowed it to happen.

Why did the minister not fire these corrupt Liberal directors?

Hon. Gudie Hutchings (Minister of Rural Economic Development and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is great to see my hon. col-

league from Atlantic Canada stand up. I wish he and his seven other colleagues had stood up last week.

Oral Questions

On this side of the House, we know the great work that the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency does for communities, for not-for-profits and for businesses. If the member truly believed in the great work of ACOA, he would have done what his colleague from Cariboo—Prince George did, who abstained on his beliefs.

What is he going to say to the people of South Shore—St. Margarets and the 108 projects that ACOA funds in his riding? I am going to tell them we have their backs.

Mr. Rick Perkins (South Shore—St. Margarets, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is just not good enough that they will not deal with Liberal corruption at the green Liberal slush fund. In fact, it took the minister 35 months under his watch to suspend the green slush fund when his own officials were in the meeting. The whistle-blower testified last night that the chair of the green slush fund tried to get \$2.2 million from the fund into her own vanity project, the Verschuren Centre, a direct conflict of interest.

Since industry officials were in the meeting, why did the minister not fire this Liberal corrupt director the minute that happened?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we will take no lessons from the Conservatives. Just last week, Canadians saw them vote against CSIS. They voted against funding for affordable child care in this country. They voted to cut the Canadian dental care program.

On this side of the House, we will stand up for Canadians. We will stand up for growth, and we will continue to fight for Canadians at every step of the way.

[Translation]

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the billion-dollar Liberal green fund paid out \$150 million in subsidies to Liberal cronies over a period of months, despite the fact that government officials, his eyes and ears on the green fund board, attended meetings during which Liberal friends lined their pockets.

After eight years, the Prime Minister is not worth the cost. Instead of continuing his cover-up, can the Prime Minister tell us when his Liberal friends will return their ill-gotten gains to Canadians?

Oral Questions

Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives are all about “chop, chop, chop”. Last week, the Conservative leader ordered his far-right caucus to cut funding for the Canadian Coast Guard's search and rescue activities. The Coast Guard saves lives. The Conservatives stood up 120 times to vote against measures that support Canadians. Shame on them.

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this costly NDP-Liberal government learned in May that Liberal friends it had appointed to the Liberal green fund board had dipped into the \$1-billion fund to further their own interests. What did the minister do about it? Nothing.

It gets worse. The minister “lied”, to quote a whistle-blower who testified at committee. He let it happen, and Liberal friends continued to line their pockets with more money. After eight years, this Prime Minister is not worth the cost of all the payouts to his cronies. When will Canadians get their money back?

• (1440)

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the minister has already adequately answered this question.

What we do not know is why the opposition member, just a few days ago, voted against the dental plan that was announced yesterday. In his riding, nearly 30,000 people will be eligible for this dental plan by 2025. Without this plan, they would not be able to go to the dentist or dental hygienist, which would create the kinds of serious health problems that often land people in the ER or hospital.

Why did the member betray the interests of 30,000 people in his riding?

* * *

CBC/RADIO-CANADA

Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, when people are calling for someone's resignation, it is probably not a good time for them to go on an overseas trip. However, CBC/Radio Canada's CEO, Catherine Tait, left for Australia shortly after announcing that 600 CBC/Radio-Canada employees are being let go. I am sure everyone will agree that that shows a lack of judgment.

Does the Minister of Canadian Heritage still have confidence in Catherine Tait? Does she approve of the CEO's decision to go ahead with these layoffs?

Hon. Pascale St-Onge (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the term of CBC/Radio-Canada's CEO ends at the beginning of 2025. Starting in early 2024, I will be striking a committee to search for the best candidates in the country to lead this organization, which is absolutely essential to Canadian democracy.

On this side of the House, we believe in a strong public broadcaster that provides services to Canadians from east to west, in French, English and eight indigenous languages. We will continue to defend our public broadcaster.

NEWS MEDIA INDUSTRY

Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in the recent economic update, the government announced that it would increase the tax credit for newsrooms from 25% to 35%, which is very good. Even if that does not solve the media crisis, we know that it will help.

It will help, but only print media. Unfortunately, television and radio journalists are not eligible.

It is clear to us that Bell Media, Quebecor and Cogeco are struggling too. Electronic media outlets are all struggling.

Will the minister make the tax credit for newsrooms available to electronic media as well?

Hon. Pascale St-Onge (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I must begin by congratulating and thanking my colleague from the Bloc Québécois for being an advocate for newsrooms, for democracy and for journalism, which the Conservatives, unfortunately, try to destroy every chance they get.

As my colleague knows, we have modernized the Broadcasting Act, giving the CRTC the authority to lighten the regulatory burden on our broadcasters, which are indeed struggling right now. The CRTC will also be able to decide whether to create a new fund to support the news across Canada.

We will continue to work with the entire sector to deal with the media crisis.

* * *

SPORT

Mr. Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are abandoning victims of sexual misconduct in sport. They promised an independent public inquiry. The victims want sport organizations to clean house.

Yesterday, the Liberals backed down. They proposed a voluntary commission. A voluntary commission has no power to compel sports federations or abusers to appear. A voluntary commission has no power to compel documents. A voluntary commission does not have the power to clean house or to force changes within Sport Canada.

Why are the Liberals protecting the federations instead of protecting victims?

Hon. Carla Qualtrough (Minister of Sport and Physical Activity, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday we announced a commission on the future of sport in Canada that is trauma-informed and focuses on the victims. It is looking to determine the future of sport in our country.

My priority is athletes, victims, survivors and safe sport in Canada.

[English]

CARBON PRICING

Mr. Kyle Seeback (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Premier of the Northwest Territories wants to axe the tax. Other premiers are saying they will not collect the carbon tax. First nations are suing the government because of the carbon tax. We have a coast to coast to coast revolt against the carbon tax led by Conservatives.

As a result of the carbon tax, 40% more Ontarians have to use a food bank. The Liberal Prime Minister is not worth the cost. Will he cancel his plans to quadruple the carbon tax on farmers, families and first nations for good?

• (1445)

Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when this government came into power after 10 years of Stephen Harper and the member for Carleton, emissions in this country were projected to go up by 15% versus 2005 levels by 2030.

Last week, we released the emissions reduction plan update for Canada. It shows that we have far exceeded the Harper target. We raised the target. We will achieve the interim objective in 2026. We will achieve the 2030 objective of a 40% reduction.

We have a climate plan that is working. Where is his climate plan?

Mr. Kyle Seeback (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the only thing the Liberals have achieved is 800,000 Ontarians going to the food bank. Let us think about that. That would be the third-largest city in all of Ontario completely dependent on using the food bank to exist.

According to Feed Ontario's CEO, it used to be that having a job meant one did not have to access a food bank, but after eight years of these incompetent Liberals, that is the new reality here in Canada.

Why do the Liberals care so little about Canadians? Will they axe the tax so Canadians can feed themselves?

Hon. Jenna Sudds (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the Conservatives actually do care about supporting families, their actions last week speak differently, and actions speak louder than words.

The Conservatives voted against much-needed investments to increase access to child care in underserved communities. They voted against moving forward with a framework to create a national school food policy, which would put food back into schools for children who need it. The Conservatives are just not worth the risk.

[Translation]

Mrs. Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, inflation is shattering the dreams of Quebecers from age 18 to 45. In fact, 75% of them are postponing or abandoning their plans to buy a home or start a family. The costly Bloc-Liberal coalition that wants to radically increase the inflationary carbon tax is simply making life impossible.

Oral Questions

Will the Prime Minister axe the tax and the inflationary deficits so that Quebecers can achieve their dreams?

Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I must say that it is especially painful to see my Conservative colleagues from Quebec show so much wilful blindness.

What many of them defended at the National Assembly, whether for the benefit of battered women or for environmental protection, among other things, is now taboo under their leader. They keep turning their backs on their values, turning their backs on Quebecers, turning their backs on the measures that could help Canadians and Quebecers.

It is incredibly sad.

Mrs. Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am wondering who is actually turning their back on who.

Recently, we learned that, next year, a family of four will have to pay \$700 more just for groceries. That is the unfortunate consequence of the costly Bloc-Liberal coalition and its carbon tax, which is having a real impact in Quebec. This comes after the largest increase in grocery prices in 40 years.

Will the Prime Minister finally take action so that Quebecers can have enough to eat, especially at Christmas?

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when Quebecers sit down at the dinner table this Christmas, they will be wondering why the Conservatives voted against the dental insurance program. Why did they vote against the child care program? Why did they vote against the high-frequency train? Why did they vote against the rail bypass in Lac-Mégantic? Why did they vote against the festival in St-Tite? What have they got against that festival? We like going there.

* * *

[English]

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Ms. Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government voted to recognize missing and murdered indigenous women, girls and two-spirit people as a Canada-wide emergency. The Prime Minister acknowledged it as an ongoing genocide.

Four years after the release of the national inquiry's 231 calls for justice, how many have been completed? Just two. At this rate, it will take 462 years to implement all of the calls for justice.

Oral Questions

When will the Liberals start treating this national emergency with the urgency that it deserves?

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, addressing the ongoing violence against indigenous women, girls and 2SLGBTQ+ people is a whole-of-government approach which requires living up to our moral obligations as a country on the calls to justice. That is why, in budget 2023, we have invested \$125 million to implement the national action plan for MMIWG, ensuring accountability by establishing an oversight mechanism and support for the National Family and Survivors Circle.

We will continue to work with families to ensure that the tragedy of missing and murdered indigenous women and girls—

• (1450)

The Speaker: The hon. member for Timmins—James Bay.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals announced legislation for clean water on reserve, but they made no mention of the Neskantaga First Nation which has gone 28 years without access to clean water.

At the same time, the leader of the Conservative Party ordered his caucus to try to cut funding for both the suicide hotline and for first nation clean water projects. His indifference is deeply disturbing, but it is not surprising.

As for the Liberals, Neskantaga First Nation has reached out time and time again. Why is the Liberal government continuing to fail the people of Neskantaga First Nation?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Indigenous Services and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have been meeting on a quarterly basis with Neskantaga to solve the current crisis that Neskantaga has been undergoing. Despite the renovation of their plant, the water is still not testing clean. We are working together to make sure that happens.

In regard to the legislation, Neskantaga was one of the litigant communities that were deeply involved in the drafting of the legislation. We look forward to continuing to hear their perspectives.

HEALTH

Ms. Emmanuella Lambropoulos (Saint-Laurent, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, every day, approximately 12 people die by suicide in Canada. Each life lost by suicide can have far-reaching effects, whether it is families grappling with the loss of a loved one or the effects that are felt within communities. Last week, I was disappointed to see the Conservatives vote against funding to support the implementation of the new suicide crisis helpline. Can the Minister of Mental Health and Addictions tell us how our government is bringing 988 to Canadians, no matter where they live?

Hon. Ya'ara Saks (Minister of Mental Health and Addictions and Associate Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for being such a strong advocate for mental health. Our hearts go out to all those who have lost a loved one to suicide. To those struggling with suicidal thoughts, we want to say clearly, "We are here for them; they are not alone".

Last week, it was despicable to see Conservatives vote against or abstaining on funding for the new 988 suicide prevention helpline, including the member for Cariboo—Prince George, who abstained on his own motion.

The Conservatives' risky and reckless behaviour has real consequences. We will not pit mental health against climate change.

CARBON PRICING

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's Christmas gift to Canadians is two costly carbon taxes, driving up the cost of food, fuel and home heating. However, premiers and first nations across this country are demanding that he axe the carbon tax because they know that this Prime Minister is not worth the cost. They are joining Conservatives in opposing this punitive carbon tax because Canadians cannot afford Christmas dinner.

Every month, two million Canadians are lined up at food banks because they cannot afford to feed their families. When the Prime Minister increases taxes on farmers, those numbers get worse. Will the Prime Minister cancel his plans to quadruple the carbon tax on families, first nations and farmers?

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs (Cybersecurity), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if they want to talk about food affordability, we should talk about Ukraine as the breadbasket of the world. What I found interesting is something that the Leader of the Opposition said today in response to the Prime Minister's calling out the Conservatives' vote against Ukraine. He used the term "faraway lands". That reminded me of something: "We will no longer use American military might to construct democracies in faraway lands".

Donald Trump said that. Why are Conservatives repeating MAGA lines?

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is merry Christmas and I guess the member opposite does not realize what country she is in, but the merry Christmas gift from this Prime Minister to farmers is what? It is a billion-dollar carbon tax bill in their stocking, quadrupling that carbon tax under the tree; and the gift from the Prime Minister's Liberal loyalists in the Senate is to cancel Bill C-234, preventing a carbon-tax carve-out for farmers.

When we have two million Canadians lined up at food banks every month and those numbers only getting worse when they increase taxes on farmers, why was the Prime Minister cancelling Christmas instead of cancelling the quadrupling of his carbon tax on farmers, families and first nations?

• (1455)

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative leader inadvertently showed his true colours a moment ago. He could not bring himself to say the word Ukraine, so instead he dismissively called it a faraway land. Do members know who notoriously used that term? It was Neville Chamberlain in 1938 when he infamously described Germany's invasion of Czechoslovakia as "a quarrel in a far away country between people of whom we know nothing". Shame on them for using the language of appeasement and dissolution.

Mrs. Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after eight years of the Liberal-NDP government, it is evident Canadians despise the carbon tax. Premiers are suing the government, first nations are taking the government to court and people are lined up at food banks because they cannot afford this Prime Minister's inflationary carbon tax.

This Prime Minister has ruined Christmas for Canadians by keeping his punitive carbon tax that raises the price of food we buy. This Prime Minister is not worth the cost of the lost hope that Canadians should feel around the holidays. Therefore, will the Prime Minister cancel his plan to quadruple the tax on families, first nations and farmers for good?

Hon. Randy Boissonnault (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that as the holiday season approaches, the Conservative members in this House thought that Christmas was coming early because it seems that Tucker Carlson is coming to Calgary to host Danielle Smith, and that does not stop there. It is going to be Rex Murphy, Tucker Carlson and Conrad Black in Edmonton just after. The question is, will that member pay for her ticket individually or is there a group discount for Conservative MPs?

Mrs. Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC): Mr. Speaker, can he stand with Albertans and stop gaslighting Canadians?

Yesterday, CTV reported that basic necessities cost more in Calgary than any other major Canadian city. One Calgarian said, "It's really difficult if you're sacrificing your own meals so that your children can eat because grocery prices are expensive, or if you're rationing on things like heat for your home."

After eight years of this Liberal-NDP government, families are struggling to meet their basic needs, feed themselves and heat their homes because of this cruel carbon tax. Will the Prime Minister cancel his carbon tax or will he continue his plan to ruin Christmas for all Albertans and all Canadians?

Hon. Randy Boissonnault (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that member has clearly found her voice today, but it has been months that she and the Alberta Conservatives have been silent on defending Albertans when it comes to Danielle Smith's risky and reckless approach to taking Albertans out of the CPP. Maybe she agrees with her leader that Ukraine is some far-flung foreign land.

Oral Questions

Ukraine matters to Canadians, it matters to Albertans and it matters to Ukrainian Canadians. They and she should be ashamed.

* * *

[Translation]

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Mr. Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, things are happening with the \$460 million the federal government has to give back to Quebecers for asylum seekers. Yesterday, the minister confirmed that the ball is in the Minister of Finance's court. That is why we are asking her about this today, but there is information she may be unaware of.

For starters, asylum seekers are a federal responsibility. Even so, Quebec takes in 48% of all those seeking asylum in Canada, at Quebecers' expense, with no help from the provinces. Basically, we do all the work and we foot the bill. Will the government pay Quebecers back?

Hon. Marc Miller (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member may be disappointed to learn that we have a good relationship with Quebec. Last week, we spoke in a reasoned and reasonable way about reasoned and reasonable immigration to Quebec within the context of the Canada-Quebec accord that gives Quebec more than \$700 million to do the work that falls within its jurisdiction, which is to take in immigrants, especially French-speaking immigrants.

Asylum seekers are a shared responsibility. We have to work on this together, because it is a challenge for all western societies. Canada and Quebec are ready to take up the challenge.

Mr. Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we are addressing the Minister of Finance, because right now, the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship is the problem. He is the one who is preventing this file from being resolved. We want a conversation between serious-minded people. Quebec takes in 48% of all asylum seekers across Canada as a whole and pays 100% of the bill. The Minister of Finance can clearly see that this is not fair or equitable. Quebec is simply asking for everyone to do their part.

Will the Minister of Finance do her fair share, take the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship off this file and pay Quebec back?

Oral Questions

● (1500)

Hon. Marc Miller (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will give the Bloc Québécois the time to speak. I think it has time to listen to my answer as well. First, I commend the hon. member for his superhuman effort to reinvent and rephrase his question. While I am at it, I will repeat the same answer: Canada is not an ATM for the provinces. It takes a reasoned and reasonable discussion, a good discussion like the one we are having with Quebec. I look forward to continuing that conversation.

* * *

[English]

CARBON PRICING

Mr. Stephen Ellis (Cumberland—Colchester, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadian premiers and first nations are suing the federal government over its unjust carbon tax, and Canadians cannot afford to eat, heat or house themselves. After eight years of this NDP-Liberal government, indeed it is a weary world.

Back home, there are over 1,800 on the roster for our local food bank, and over two million Canadians across this great country are visiting their local food banks so they can afford to eat. The Prime Minister is not worth the cost.

On behalf of all Canadians, will the Prime Minister cancel his plan to quadruple his tax on families, first nations and farmers?

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs (Cybersecurity), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting that the member opposite brings up the misery in the world, and part of that is what Ukrainians are facing right now defending their democracy.

Let me read from Trump's "America First". It says, "we will no longer use American military might to construct democracies in faraway lands, or try to rebuild other countries in our own image."

Is that why Conservatives vote against the Canada-Ukraine free trade agreement, because they are taking their lessons from Donald Trump and do not support the rebuilding of Ukraine and democracies around this world?

Mr. Stephen Ellis (Cumberland—Colchester, CPC): Mr. Speaker, clearly, according to that member, Canadians have never had it so good. Sadly, every day we hear from Canadians who are selling their homes because they cannot afford their mortgages, who are visiting food banks because they cannot afford to eat and who are spending most of the day in bed with the covers pulled up because they cannot afford home heating fuel. After eight years of the NDP-Liberal government, this is the situation for Canadians in our great country. The Prime Minister and that member are not worth the cost.

Once again, on behalf of all Canadians, will the Prime Minister cancel his plan to quadruple the tax on families, first nations and farmers forever?

Hon. Gудie Hutchings (Minister of Rural Economic Development and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I love to see another member

from Atlantic Canada stand up because, again, he voted against ACOA funding last week. Also, does he not realize that that is jobs, that is communities and that was 95 projects in his riding with over \$60 million in jobs, helping to grow the economy and putting food on people's tables?

That is what we do on this side of the House. We support business. We support people and help them through these trying times.

Mr. Clifford Small (Coast of Bays—Central—Notre Dame, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will tell this House what she supports. She supports seals in rivers. She did not vote for Bill C-251.

Food bank usage at Memorial University in St. John's has nearly tripled since last year. Groceries have increased. Students and families cannot afford them, thanks to the carbon tax. Christmas is not far away and many folks cannot afford Christmas dinner this year. After eight years, the NDP-Liberal government is not worth the cost.

Will the Prime Minister cancel his plan to quadruple the tax on families, first nations and farmers?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, sadly, the official opposition voted against all agricultural programs last Thursday evening. Again, Conservatives showed their true colours on how they feel about Atlantic Canada and Prince Edward Island when they voted against the funding for the replacement vessel for the Wood Islands and Caribou ferry service, a vital link between Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia.

I can assure Prince Edward Islanders and Nova Scotians that this government will continue to support a two-vessel system for that vitally important service.

* * *

[Translation]

FINANCE

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan (Châteauguay—Lacolle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance. I wonder if she could tell the House about our plan to develop the middle class, our plan to deliver services and programs for our country, a plan that the Conservatives tried to scrap last week. They showed their true colours by voting against the programs and services that Canadians depend on. Fortunately for Canada, their efforts failed.

Can the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance tell the House about the Liberal plan?

• (1505)

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives showed their true colours last week. For 24 hours, the Conservative leader and his entire party voted in favour of cuts to our plan to support and grow the middle class. They voted against the Canadian dental care plan. They voted against programs to build homes. They voted against funding for our \$10-a-day child care plan. They even voted against—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Cypress Hills—Grasslands.

* * *

[English]

CARBON PRICING

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after eight years of the Liberal-NDP government, the cost of taking over a family farm is becoming insurmountable. A family in Elrose has passed their family farm down to the next generation. Over the past year, the carbon tax on natural gas alone has cost this young family over \$3,000 and the Prime Minister's Christmas gift to them is to quadruple the carbon tax. This is just insane.

Since the Prime Minister will not axe the tax before Christmas, does he truly believe a new generation of farmers should pay these ridiculous costs, or has making farming unaffordable been his goal all along?

Hon. Seamus O'Regan (Minister of Labour and Seniors, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, are we meant to believe that on the other side of the House, in their zeal to vote against a carbon tax that they see as harming farmers, they would vote against all funding for Canada's poultry, egg and dairy farmers? Is that a way to support farmers? Is the way to support first nations to cut all housing for new housing on reserve for first nations? Is the way to help families to cut affordable child care and affordable dental care? No one believes them.

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this Christmas, Canadians are shouldering the weight of the NDP-Liberal government's costly carbon tax. Every gift under the tree, every family visit and every meal prepared will come at an additional cost. The Prime Minister's punishing carbon tax is ruining Christmas. After eight years of the NDP-Liberal government, Canadian families are tired of making the unimaginable sacrifices. The NDP-Liberal government is not worth the cost.

Will the Prime Minister allow his heart to grow three sizes and axe the carbon tax on families, first nations and farmers?

Mr. Adam van Koeverden (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change and to the Minister of Sport and Physical Activity, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question from my hon. colleague, but Canadians have some questions for the Conservative Party after its leader's \$2-million temper tantrum last week.

The first question is, since an average family of four in Ontario receives more than \$300 back from the climate action incentive, why are the Conservatives so hell-bent on taking money from lower- and middle-income Canadian families?

Oral Questions

The second question is this: Why are they so hell-bent on betraying Ukraine?

My third question for the member for Battlefords—Lloydminster is, why is she so against the farms in her riding that received over \$120,000 in climate action rebates?

* * *

[Translation]

CBC/RADIO-CANADA

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the president of the CBC is completely out of touch with reality. A month ago, she hired a Paris-based company to translate a podcast, rather than hiring Quebecers, because she did not like our accent.

Now, when hundreds of employees are wondering whether they will still have a job after Christmas, she has decided to head off to Australia for a good time, even though she is supposed to be deciding whether she should follow through with her plans to give her executives bonuses.

Does the Minister of Canadian Heritage still have confidence in the president of the CBC, Catherine Tait, to lead Radio-Canada?

Hon. Pascale St-Onge (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question, because it gives me an opportunity to remind everyone in the House, as well as all Quebecers, that the last time the Conservative Party was in power, it made cuts to CBC/Radio-Canada that jeopardized the public broadcaster's future. Still today, the Conservatives want to destroy the CBC, even though they are saying that they will protect Radio-Canada, as if that were doable.

All the Conservatives want is to no longer have a public broadcaster and to undermine Canadian democracy. That is shameful. Once again, we are seeing their true colours.

* * *

• (1510)

[English]

DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION

Ms. Leah Taylor Roy (Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know governments that have strong representation by women and strong women leaders invest more in people.

Just last week we saw the Conservative Party, which has a caucus that is only 17% women and lacks diverse representation, oppose program after program that invests in Canadians. In fact, Conservatives voted 120 times “no” to investing in Canadians.

Oral Questions

Could the President of the Treasury Board share with us how the reckless Conservatives would have greatly hurt the very Canadians we are working so hard to support?

Hon. Anita Anand (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week, parliamentarians voted on 120 measures to support Canadians, especially vulnerable Canadians. These included supports to the Canadian Armed Forces and supports for families for affordable child care, as well as supports for more affordable housing.

Canadians deserve opportunities to succeed, yet on 120 occasions, Conservatives voted against Canadians. We will stand shoulder to shoulder with Canadians every single time.

* * *

HOUSING

Mr. Blake Desjarlais (Edmonton Griesbach, NDP): Mr. Speaker, by 2026, nearly 60,000 households in Edmonton will live in unsuitable housing or will not be able to afford rent because of the government's failure to build affordable homes. Corporate Conservatives and delay Liberals continue to play cover for rich developers and billionaires as they renovict my constituents. Last year, 156 people died in Edmonton because they were homeless. These were deaths that could have been prevented had the government acted sooner.

Again, when will the government get the money out the door to build social and co-op housing now?

Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his advocacy to continue to invest in affordable housing, including co-operative housing. I would point him to the recent fall economic statement, which increased grant funding to co-operative housing by more than \$300 million, and we will be rolling out a program worth more than \$1.5 billion beginning early in the new year.

I do agree with him on one point of his question, however, which is the Conservatives' dedication to opposing funding for affordable housing. In fact, just last week, when they had an opportunity to put their position on the record in the chamber, they voted against supports for affordable housing. They voted against emergency transition shelters for women and children, and they voted against supports for veterans living through homelessness. It is the—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Nanaimo—Ladysmith.

* * *

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Ms. Lisa Marie Barron (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, open-net fish farms pollute our waters and impact food security. In 2022 alone, more than 800,000 herring were killed because of open-net fish farm activity. Now, the B.C. premier says the social licence for these fish farms has expired.

The Liberals promised to get these farms out of the water by 2025 with a real jobs plan, yet so far there has been nothing, so I will ask again, where is the plan so coastal communities, workers and first nations are not left behind?

Hon. Diane Lebovillier (Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government remains committed to developing a responsible transition plan for open-net pen aquaculture. We continue to work on a transition plan that protects Pacific salmon while providing support to workers and their communities and advancing reconciliation. Fisheries and Oceans Canada, along with my office, continues to have constructive conversations with stakeholders regarding next steps.

* * *

JOURNALIST IMPRISONED IN HONG KONG

Hon. Judy A. Sgro (Humber River—Black Creek, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among the parties, and if you seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent to adopt the following motion.

I move:

Whereas Jimmy Lai stands for so many of the values championed by Canadians, most importantly, media freedom, respect for the rule of law and standing up for what is right;

Whereas Mr. Lai is a peaceful pro-democracy campaigner and publisher whose usually popular newspaper, Apple Daily, was shut down for political reasons in 2021;

Whereas Mr. Lai has just spent his 76th birthday in prison, where he has been for the last three years on charges brought under the national security law whose provisions are inconsistent with international human rights law;

Whereas Mr. Lai is about to face trial on yet further charges arising from his pro-democracy writing and campaigning that could see him spend the rest of his life behind bars;

Therefore, the House resolves to call upon the Hong Kong authorities to release Jimmy Lai and cease prosecuting him and others charged under the national security law and the House reaffirms journalists and media workers everywhere have the right to operate in an environment free from intimidation and harassment by state authorities.

● (1515)

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

It is agreed.

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

(Motion agreed to)

Ms. Marilyn Gladu: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Today is Christmas on the Hill. There have been discussions among the parties, and if you seek it, I believe you will find unanimous consent for the following motion. I move that the House designate December as Christian heritage month.

An hon. member: No.

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I want to draw attention to the fact that responses on the other side of the House today made Canadians feel very blue because they know Conservatives voted non-confidence in the government.

The Speaker: That is not a point of order.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

The House resumed from December 11 consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: It being 3:17 p.m., the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion to concur in the 12th report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights.

Call in the members.

• (1530)

[*Translation*]

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

(*Division No. 608*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Aldag
Alghabra	Ali
Allison	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arnold	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Atwin	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Baldinelli	Barlow
Barrett	Barron
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bendayan	Bennett
Bergeron	Berthold
Bérubé	Bezan
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney
Block	Blois
Boissonnault	Boulerice
Bradford	Bragdon
Brassard	Brière
Brock	Brunelle-Duceppe
Calkins	Cannings
Caputo	Carr
Carrie	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Chambers
Champagne	Champoux
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Chong
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cooper	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin

Routine Proceedings

Dalton	Damoff
Davidson	Davies
DeBellefeuille	d'Entremont
Desbiens	Desilets
Desjarlais	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Doherty	Dong
Dowdall	Dreeshen
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Epp
Erskine-Smith	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Ferreri	Fillmore
Findlay	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Gaheer
Gainey	Gallant
Garon	Garrison
Gaudreau	Gazan
Généreux	Genuis
Gerretsen	Gill
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gould
Gourde	Gray
Green	Hajdu
Hallan	Hanley
Hardie	Hepfner
Hoback	Holland
Housefather	Hughes
Hutchings	Iacono
Idlout	Ien
Jaczek	Jeneroux
Johns	Joly
Jones	Jowhari
Julian	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Kelly
Khalid	Khanna
Khera	Kitchen
Kmiec	Koutrakis
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kurek	Kusie
Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Lake	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lantsman
Lapointe	Larouche
Lattanzio	Lauzon
Lawrence	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lehoux
Lemire	Leslie
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Liepert	Lightbound
Lloyd	Lobb
Long	Longfield
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maguire
Majumdar	Maloney
Martel	Martinez Ferrada
Masse	Mathysen
May (Cambridge)	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McDonald (Avalon)
McGuinty	McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLean
McLeod	McPherson
Melillo	Mendès
Mendicino	Miao
Miller	Moore

Speaker's Ruling

Morantz	Morrice
Morrison	Morrissey
Motz	Murray
Muys	Naqvi
Nater	Ng
Noormohamed	Normandin
O'Connell	Oliphant
O'Regan	Patzer
Paul-Hus	Pauzé
Perkins	Perron
Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon
Poilievre	Powlowski
Qualtrough	Rayes
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Roberts	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Rood
Ruff	Sahota
Sajjan	Saks
Samson	Sarai
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia
Scheer	Schiefke
Schmale	Seeback
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Shields
Shiple	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
Sinclair-Desgagné	Small
Sorbara	Soroka
Sousa	Steinley
Ste-Marie	Stewart
St-Onge	Strahl
Stubbs	Sudds
Tassi	Taylor Roy
Thériault	Therrien
Thomas	Thompson
Tochor	Tolmie
Trudeau	Trudel
Turnbull	Uppal
Valdez	Van Bynen
van Koeverden	Van Popta
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vecchio	Vidal
Vien	Viersen
Vignola	Villemure
Virani	Vis
Vuong	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Weiler
Wilkinson	Williams
Williamson	Yip
Zahid	Zarrillo
Zimmer	Zuberi — 324

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Members

Deltell	Guilbeault
Hussen	Michaud — 4

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.*[English]*

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

POINTS OF ORDER

WAYS AND MEANS MOTION NO. 19—SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: I am now ready to provide the House with an explanatory ruling on the admissibility of Ways and Means Motion No. 19. On November 29, 2023, I ruled that the order for consideration of the motion, and the subsequent bill based thereon, be allowed to proceed further.

On November 28, 2023, the House leader of the official opposition challenged the admissibility of the motion. He pointed out that Bill C-318, an act to amend the Employment Insurance Act and the Canada Labour Code (adoptive and intended parents), and Bill C-323, an act to amend the Excise Tax Act (mental health services), both currently in committee, were substantially the same as provisions covered in Ways and Means Motion No. 19, tabled earlier that day.

[Translation]

Concurrence in a ways and means motion constitutes an order to bring in a bill based on the provisions of the motion. This is indeed what happened with the subsequent introduction of Bill C-59, an act to implement certain provisions of the fall economic statement tabled in Parliament on November 21, 2023 and certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 28, 2023.

[English]

The House leader argued that the two private members' bills had already been the subject of decisions of the House at second reading. The ways and means motion and Bill C-59 would violate a procedural concept, the rule of anticipation, which he described as the "same question rule". Quoting from *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, at page 568, the member seemed to suggest that a ways and means motion could not anticipate a matter already standing on the Order Paper and which was contained in another form of proceeding. He asserted that Bill C-318 and Bill C-323 were more effective tools to accomplish the desired intent than Ways and Means Motion No. 19. As such, both these bills should have priority over the motion.

[Translation]

He also cited precedents in relation to bills that could or could not proceed further, based on the fundamental principle that the same question cannot be decided twice within a session.

The member further suggested that Ways and Means Motion No. 19 be put in abeyance pending the outcome of Bill C-318 and Bill C-323, based on the rule of anticipation.

[English]

For his part, the parliamentary secretary to the government House leader countered that further consideration of Ways and Means Motion No. 19, as well as subsequent proceedings on an associated bill, was in order. He referenced past precedents about similar bills. He made the point that the provisions in Ways and Means Motion No. 19 contained numerous elements that are not found in Bill C-318 and Bill C-323, which indicates that the principle and scope of the ways and means motion are broader than what is found in either of the bills. As such, Ways and Means Motion No. 19, and the bill based thereon, constituted different questions.

[Translation]

In his intervention, the House leader of the official opposition quoted from page 568 of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, on the rule of anticipation. The Chair would like to read, from the same page, prior to the quoted passage. It states:

The moving of a motion was formerly subject to the ancient “rule of anticipation” which is no longer strictly observed.

• (1535)

[English]

Further down on the same page it says, “While the rule of anticipation is part of the Standing Orders in the British House of Commons, it has never been so in the Canadian House of Commons. Furthermore, references to past attempts to apply this British rule to Canadian practice are inconclusive.”

[Translation]

Even though the notion of anticipation is described in our procedural authorities, and the expression is sometimes colloquially used in points of order and even some past rulings dealing with similar items, it is indeed a very difficult concept to apply in our context.

Establishing a hierarchy between bills and motions, or between categories of bills, and giving precedence to some, may prove difficult, except in very specific cases, detailed in *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*. Bills and motions are different by nature and achieve different ends.

[English]

What the Chair is seized with in reviewing the current matter is the rule forbidding the same question from being decided twice in the same session. It is different from the concept of anticipation and, in the view of the Chair, the one that should apply.

In his submission, the House leader of the official opposition cited various recent precedents, and the Chair thinks it pertinent to describe some of their procedural subtleties.

[Translation]

The first example, from the last Parliament, pertained to two bills not identical, but substantially similar: Bill C-218, an act to amend the Criminal Code regarding sports betting, a private members' bill, and Bill C-13, an act to amend the Criminal Code regarding single event sport betting, a government bill. Both were at second reading and both were very short bills touching the same section of the Criminal Code.

By adopting Bill C-218 at second reading, the House had agreed to the larger principle of repealing the very portion of the Criminal Code that Bill C-13 also sought to amend. This sequencing left the House with a situation where Bill C-13 could not move forward as long as Bill C-218 continued its course.

[English]

The second example, from earlier this session, described a budget implementation bill, Bill C-19, and a votable private members' bill amending the Criminal Code regarding the promotion of anti-Semitism, Bill C-250. The latter, introduced on February 9, 2022, contained provisions that were subsequently included in Bill C-19,

Speaker's Ruling

introduced on April 28, 2022. However, of the two bills, the government bill was the first to be adopted at second reading and referred to committee. One of the key differences was that the two bills were not substantially identical. Bill C-19 was much broader in scope than Bill C-250. By agreeing to Bill C-19, the House de facto agreed with the principles presented in C-250. No decision having yet been made on Bill C-250, the Chair ordered that it be held as pending business until such time as royal assent be granted to Bill C-19.

Finally, the member referenced rulings dealing with two votable Private Members' Business items, Bill C-243, an act respecting the elimination of the use of forced labour and child labour in supply chains, and Bill S-211, an act to enact the Fighting Against Forced Labour and Child Labour in Supply Chains Act and to amend the Customs Tariff. The two bills had the same objective and only one was allowed to proceed further. The Chair indicated at the time that the case involved an unusual set of circumstances, since normally one of them could have been designated as non-votable by the Subcommittee on Private Members' Business had the sequence of events been different.

[Translation]

The House leader's main argument hinged on the question of whether provisions contained in Ways and Means Motion No. 19 and therefore Bill C-59 are similar or identical to Bills C-318 and C-323.

Bills C-318 and C-323 have been both read a second time and referred to committee, while no decision has yet been made on Bill C-59. An exhaustive review of its provisions shows that it does contain some similar provisions found in the two aforementioned private members' bills. However, Bill C-59 cannot be described as substantially similar or identical to them.

• (1540)

Its scope is vastly broader, containing many more elements than what is included in Bills C-318 and C-323, including taxation legislation and provisions requiring a royal recommendation

[English]

The bills are similar in part, but are not substantially the same. The principles of Bill C-318 and Bill C-323, as adopted at second reading, are indeed included in the broader Bill C-59, but the reverse is not true. Therefore, the decision the House will take on Bill C-59 will not be the same. Accordingly, there is no procedural reason to stop the bill from continuing its journey through the legislative process.

Government Orders

To be clear, when a government bill and a private member's bill or when two private members' bills are substantially similar, only one of them may proceed and be voted on. Once one of the two has passed second reading, a decision cannot be taken on the other within the same session. Where bills are only similar in part, the effect of adopting one might have a different impact on the other depending on their principle, scope and, of course, which bill is adopted first.

I note that the House leader of the official opposition rose earlier today on a different point of order considering the application of Standing Order 69.1 to Bill C-59. I wish to inform the member and the House that I am reviewing the matter closely and I do intend to come back with a ruling in a timely manner.

Nonetheless, for the time being, the Chair sees no reason to rule that Bill C-59 be put in abeyance. As for the two Private Members' Business items currently in committee, it seems premature for the Chair to intervene at this time.

I thank all members for their attention.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

FALL ECONOMIC STATEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2023

Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (for the Minister of Finance) moved that Bill C-59, An Act to implement certain provisions of the fall economic statement tabled in Parliament on November 21, 2023 and certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 28, 2023, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

[Translation]

Hon. Carolyn Bennett (Toronto—St. Paul's, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I rise in the House for the last time, I want to begin by acknowledging that we are gathered on the traditional unceded territory of the Algonquin people.

I hope that territorial recognition will soon be included at the opening of the House every day.

[English]

Some members, especially my karaoke friends, might have thought that I would start by singing my best karaoke version of *Wind Beneath My Wings* and then dedicate it to all the staff, volunteers and colleagues, or maybe I would just reiterate my advice to women in politics: no high heels and never check a bag. I hope members are not disappointed.

I have now represented the engaged citizens of Toronto—St. Paul's for more than 26 years. It is longer than I practised medicine, and next year will be my 50th anniversary of graduating from medicine, “class of 7T4”, U of T. When I got to my 18th year in Parliament, I joked that the over 2,000 babies I had delivered could now all vote. I promise that was never the long-term strategy of “the doctor delivers”.

After being a family doctor for over 20 years and our successful fight for the independence of Women's College Hospital, I had an unsuccessful run in provincial politics in 1995. I remember that when I was first asked to run, I answered that I know nothing about politics. The response was, “What do you think you just did? Saving Women's College Hospital was politics.”

Whenever I visit the grade 5 classrooms, I ask the students why anyone would leave the respected profession of medicine to become a politician, which is one of the least-respected callings there is. Sometimes after much discussion, there is an answer that makes me smile: “You wanted to make a difference. You wanted to help more people.” As difficult as it was to make a decision to leave my patients, I have never regretted the choice.

I have loved the work here in Parliament, but also the inspiration of the Toronto—St. Paul's community: the farmers' markets at Wychwood Barns and Little Jamaica; the transformation of the Spadina Museum and Casa Loma to better reflect the diversity of Toronto, ensuring that everyone feels included. I love walking in the ravines, along the Beltline Trail and being stopped by neighbours with great suggestions for building a better and fairer community, country and a sustainable planet; working on the Toronto—St. Paul's summits with Josh Matlow and Shelley Laskin; and conspiring at Aroma with my Yonge and Eglinton MP neighbours, the member for Don Valley West and the member for Eglinton—Lawrence. I am grateful to William Watson, who has been my riding president for over a decade, for his leadership, friendship and invaluable editorial skills, especially grammar and punctuation.

As an MP, like a doctor, every day we are learning something new and helping people. In 1995, when introducing Liberal leader Lyn McLeod at a campaign event in downtown Toronto, I defined leadership as vision, values and risk-taking. I still believe that. Leadership is not defending the status quo. We have all come to this place to build an even better Canada. I am proud that from the very first day I stepped onto Parliament Hill as an MP, I have profoundly understood the responsibility and the privilege of being part of a small group of Canadians who steer the direction of the best country in the world. That has not changed in over 26 years. Every day, I come to this place still acutely aware of my responsibility to do the best I can to support the policies that are good for the most people or the people who need it most.

In 1997, I knew that I had been elected in a bellwether riding: Roland Michener, Ian Wahn, Ron Atkey, John Roberts, again Ron Atkey, John Roberts, Barbara McDougall and Barry Campbell.

I decided that I needed to take my family doctor's understanding of patient as partner into my new role as an elected representative and have it shape a respectful two-way relationship with the people I was representing. The parallel was important. As a doctor, I would ask what was wrong, I would listen and then together with the patient we would make a plan. The patient knew their body best. I knew the system best. It was a partnership, with the sum greater than the parts.

From the beginning, it was clear that the people I represented knew what was working and what was not, and they so often had impressive advice and solutions.

• (1545)

I took Jane Jacobs' advice that good public policy comes when the decision-makers can keep in their mind's eye the people affected.

I also learned from Professor Stephen Coleman, the British expert on citizen engagement, that citizens do not want to govern, but they do want to know that they have been heard. I learned from my friend Richard Allan, now in the Lords at Westminster, on the potential of e-democracy.

Over the past few months, I have been sorting through many boxes. There are boxes from my early years in this House as chair of the subcommittee on persons with disabilities, chair of the Canada-Israel parliamentary friendship group, chair of the women's caucus twice, minister of state for public health, and in opposition, my various critic roles. From 2011 to 2015 was a life-changing experience, as Bob Rae appointed me the critic for indigenous affairs. There were boxes from my cabinet roles in this government.

I found that the biggest box by far dealt with the ongoing theme of democratic reform. Democratic reform to me has always included four things: parliamentary reform, party reform, electoral reform and meaningful citizen engagement. The last one I call democracy between elections. It became my brand. I actually found another box at the cottage. It was research and outline for a book I began 10 years ago, "Democracy between elections: a politician's guide to listening and a citizen's guide to being heard". I may have to get back to that.

I have had the benefit of a posse of inspiring feminists who have kept the titanium in my spine: the late Doris Anderson, Ursula Franklin and Monique Bégin. The status quo was not okay.

Ursula helped me understand that government must be fair, transparent and take people seriously. She warned that if we were not fair, transparent and respectful of what people had to say in our small organizations and in our political parties, why would anybody think we would govern in a serious representative democracy?

Doris, who was chair of Fair Vote Canada, often asked if my support for electoral reform was a career-limiting move.

Monique and my constituent, the late John Turner, were always in our corners as MPs to make sure our voices were heard. As we know, Monique and her posse of *députés* had been responsible for getting MPs offices in their ridings instead of just on Parliament Hill.

Government Orders

In 2006, I ran for the party leadership on a platform of the urgent need for party reform. I said that we had to do things differently. No longer could we act as though we were the natural governing party. I was proud when the late *Star* journalist, Jim Travers, characterized my candidacy as "the reformer".

We need to remove the barriers to women in politics, the nomination processes and fundraising. We need to listen to the riding associations from coast to coast to coast, not just in those ridings that are considered to be winnable. Parliamentary reform will require MPs to take a less partisan approach, especially at parliamentary committees.

The analysts at the Library of Parliament do an amazing job. We need to do everything we can to have unanimous reports, as Bill Young did with us when we had the subcommittee on persons with disabilities. Unanimous reports inform government of a consensus reached because all the members listened to the witnesses and were able to distill recommendations that would chart a way forward.

Committees need to travel more. They need to get out across the country to be available to hear first-hand the points of view of the regions. In my experience, committee travel was where colleagues in Parliament got to know one another across party lines and find out that we actually liked one another, with maybe a few exceptions.

Committee travel is also where we hear the stories we need to know and harvest solutions to the problems Canadians face every day. We also must insist on proper disaggregated data in all formal policy-making exercises. Stories and data; we need them both in order to deliver in our work Canada's core value: fairness.

I hope that wherever the privilege of being an MP has taken me, I have been there to listen and learn. In order to do the best for Canada, MPs can not only represent their own ridings and understand their own regions; they also need to understand the challenges we face from coast to coast to coast. From Cape Spear to Haida Gwaii, and from Grise Fiord to Point Pelee, our complex federal system requires MPs to have a deep understanding of the needs and aspirations of every region of this country.

Government Orders

I used to think that inclusive decision-making was a feminist value. I later learned that it was actually indigenous. Haudenosaunee women advised the first wave of North American feminists about the principles of indigenous leadership of asking, not telling, and how to work in a circle where everyone gets to speak.

● (1550)

People may find that there is already a consensus or that people are asking for more information before they are prepared to weigh in on a decision.

I have learned so much from extraordinary indigenous women. My fondest memories are of berry picking with Mary Simon in Kuujuaq, tea with Maria Campbell at Gabriel's Crossing in Saskatchewan and ceremony with Sylvia Maracle at her office in Toronto. So many first nations, Inuit and Métis leaders and young people have been there to teach and correct my mistakes.

I have described seven settler learnings, which could help all of us join on the journey of humility and reconciliation. What if we had listened to the first peoples and respected their imperative of protecting mother earth, thinking seven generations out? What if we understood the important teachings of the medicine wheel, focused on keeping people well, physically, mentally, emotionally and spiritually, rather than relying on the medical repair shop model that I was taught in medical school? What if we were to practise the indigenous pedagogy of learning by doing, so that the land and the water themselves were the teachers of biology, chemistry and physics? What if we respected our elders instead of dismissing the elderly, if we listened to wise women and if we put children first in all decisions? What if we practised the indigenous leadership of asking, not telling? We can imagine these things.

The foundation of our democracy is that great people will run for public office. I have had the privilege of persuading many great women and indigenous people to run. Some were elected. All affirmed the importance of our democratic institutions by leaving jobs they loved and spending time away from their families in order to campaign for the opportunity to contribute to making this country even better than it is now.

I am a feminist and a politician. I look forward to a day where neither "feminist" nor "politician" is treated like a four-letter word. I am so proud to have served under this feminist Prime Minister, whose vision and values inspire us all. He has always been a leader, not a boss. He has always demonstrated that he knows that good ideas can come from many places. He is curious. He listens. He walks the talk of hope and hard work. He has always had my back. Every day, he shows us that better is indeed always possible.

In election campaigns, it has been important for me to explain that the Prime Minister is a true leader, not a boss. Leaders see themselves at the centre of a circle. Bosses see themselves at the top of a pyramid, barking orders, in their singular view, to those below. "Father knows best" has never worked. The Prime Minister has vision and values, and he can take risks. I am proud that we have been able to implement the ambitious risk-taking platform of 2015, even the legalization of cannabis.

We have changed history, but I am worried. Cynicism is at an all-time high. Voter turnout is down. The safety of parliamentarians is

under threat. I truly believe that it is essential for us to re-engage in a meaningful way with citizens. Consultation that is shallow or not genuine is bad for democracy. It fuels cynicism. People are turned off by it, and then they tune out. People either believe that we get better policy when we include the views of those who will be affected by the policy, or they do not. If they do not, if they already think they know everything, then they should not waste people's time. Cynicism is also being fuelled by the ideology that proclaims that all government is bad and all politicians are bad or useless; it asks, "Why bother to vote at all?" It is wise to remember that the perma-mad people always vote.

We need to acknowledge that democracy is fragile. We should tackle, as a priority, the proliferation of mis- and disinformation, as well as the toxicity and anonymity of social media. There are ways to protect or immunize people from the onslaught of mis- and disinformation. People's ability to perform critical appraisal is heightened by greater civic literacy, health literacy, mental health literacy and digital literacy.

However, we must be concerned about more than mis- and disinformation. We cannot ignore that those who were once only keyboard warriors are now actually throwing stones and vandalizing, as well as threatening people in person. The safety of parliamentarians and those groups that are most often victims of hate and discrimination is at risk. At this dangerous time for democracy, it is important to remember the teaching of Ursula Franklin: Good government must be "fair, transparent and take people seriously."

● (1555)

People are truly worried about so many aspects of our world today: the economy, the environment, their future and their children's well-being and opportunity. We need to let people know their concerns are being heard and taken into account, and we need to explain government decision-making in ways that will make sense.

As I look back, I remember how devastated I was in 2006 when we lost. We lost Kyoto, kids and Kelowna. The progress on climate change, child care and reconciliation were instantly rolled back. We had to fight back, and we did. I am proud now that Canada has made serious advances on climate change, child care and reconciliation.

As minister responsible for public health, the TRC calls to action, MMIWG and later mental health and addictions, I hope I have been able to help government bust through the silos and address complex issues across all government departments. I believe there is a role for government in people's lives. Our complex federal system requires real relationships among all orders of government, municipal, provincial and territorial, federal and indigenous, in order to deliver effective supports and services to the people who need them most.

In closing, I want to thank Barry Campbell for asking me to run in 1997. I want to thank the wind beneath my wings for 26 years, the EAs: Michael Spowart, Rob White and Tricia Geddes. They all came back to work in my office when I was minister of state for public health in 2003. Lynne Steele, Rick Theis, Sarah Welch and Carlene Campbell put together teams that shared our vision and values of accessibility and democracy between elections. They were always able to give fearless advice.

These are amazing teams, and I want to thank every single one of them. They continue to work on this truly important project of democracy. Thank yous are dangerous; I do not want to leave people out. Today I wanted to thank those who have travelled with me for almost a quarter century: Mary Eberts, Bill Young, Philippe Bussy, Michel Amar, Frank Graves, Jim Anderson, Robin Sears, Susan Delacourt, Don Lenihan, Anna and Paul Brehl, Constance Backhouse, Karen Breeck, Nora Spinks, Terry Hancock, Margo Greenwood, Will Falk, Stan Kutcher and, of course, Paul Martin and Bob Rae.

Today especially, I miss Bill Graham and Andy Scott.

I am so grateful to all my colleagues here. Many of my friends outside politics have paid me the biggest compliment, saying that being elected did not change me. I am still Carolyn, or Dr. Carolyn to some.

• (1600)

[Translation]

I want to thank my French teachers Géraldine, here in Ottawa, and Michel and Huguette from Logibec, in Quebec City, as well as my host family, René Courchesne and Claro Picard.

Their love for the beauty of the French language and culture was absolutely contagious.

[English]

Peter O'Brian is the best political spouse in the world. When graduating from college, he put "support a politician" on his bucket list. I am not sure he meant sharing these decades of ups and downs. Once, while canvassing, he asked at the door of a household in our neighbourhood if the resident wished to meet the candidate. He was told, "I would rather have my eyeballs taken out with fish hooks." He quickly moved to become sign chair.

As all my colleagues in the House present and past know all too well, an MP's family has lots of these fish-hook moments over the years, of all different types, intensities and durations. I am grateful for the love of my sons, Jack and Ben, and the sacrifices they have made, happily and unhappily, to allow me to serve Canada as I have for over a quarter century.

Government Orders

For 26 years, I have been able to honestly reply to the critics with a question: "What country would you rather live in?" For 26 years, the answer has been the same, which is a moment of silence and then an acknowledgement that as much work as there still is to do, we are proud Canadians. I have never heard one word of other country envy.

I will miss my amazing parliamentary colleagues. I think we remember that moment in the House this fall when President Zelenskyy from Ukraine quoted Governor General Mary Simon with a word in Inuktitut: "*ajuinnata*". As he said, it means "Don't give up. Stay strong against all odds".

In these difficult times, I have every confidence that we will continue to fight together to make the best country in the world even better.

Merci. Meegwetech. Thank you. Ajuinnata.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to ask a question of my friend from St. Paul's for the last time in this House. For 15 years, we have served together in various corners of the House. For 15 years and more, she has been a source of inspiration and sound advice to me on how to be a better feminist, how to recruit extraordinary women from across this country to build the kind of government that Canada deserves and how to move forward on reconciliation.

As Canada's first minister of Crown and indigenous relations, she blazed a trail in deepening the relationship that matters so much to all Canadians and to the future of our country. As the very first minister for mental health and addictions, she demonstrated the compassion, the perseverance and the drive that carried her through a storied career as a family doctor to have an impact on Canadians from coast to coast to coast. Even during the depths of the pandemic, I had the benefit of turning to the very first minister of state for public health and the creator of the Public Health Agency of Canada for advice on how to handle a once-in-a-century event for Canada.

I look forward to continuing to draw on her advice in many ways, but right now, given all the things that she spoke about and all the pieces of advice that she has given to us, I guess my last question for her would be this: How do we make sure that the House has more like her, more people dedicated to this country, more young women growing up and seeing a place for themselves here and the responsibility and, therefore, the opportunity to shape this country for the better? What are the best pieces of advice that we should carry with us as we reach out to find even more extraordinary women to sit in this House, to lead and serve this country?

Government Orders

• (1605)

Hon. Carolyn Bennett: Mr. Speaker, with your help, I think we have to make sure that teachers will feel that they can bring their students in here again and not just come to pick up bad habits. I also think that we all do the country a great service by getting into the grade five classrooms and putting a human face on what a politician is.

I hope that we can move to make sure of the diversity of this place, so people can see themselves here. I think it is also similar to Equal Voice's, "Be Her or Support Her" campaign, the idea that someone does not have to actually run, but they can help with policy, fundraising or organization. There are many ways, but the project of democracy cannot be taken for granted.

Mr. Adam Chambers (Simcoe North, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for her many years of service. It gives me great pleasure to comment on her very long career. As the member and I share a great love of Georgian Bay, I expect to see her spending more time there, perhaps finishing her book on democracy, which we will all take great lessons from.

When I was first elected, I was provided advice by many people, and someone said I should get to know members in all parties. Shortly after being elected, when the member was the then minister of mental health and addictions, she reached out to me. She said I had a mental health hospital in my riding and she would love to visit it with me, which we did this past summer. We have heard the member talk about the things that she is passionate about. She has dedicated her life of public service to indigenous reconciliation, of course, as well as mental health and increasing the number of women in politics and getting women involved in politics at all different levels.

The member had an opportunity to continue serving her community well as a doctor, but she put that aside to make thousands of Canadians' lives better through her 26 years of public service. I will not say what I was doing in 1997, or my age then, but I was not quite yet in high school. This is the length of the member's dedication to public service.

While we may disagree on ways to make this country better, we do agree that we live in the best country on this planet and that we can work together to make it better. As I said, when opportunities arise that allow us to work together, visit institutions or work on a file, we can do great things for Canadians.

I look forward to what is to come for the member. I know her life of service will not be over. I am sure she has other things planned to continue serving in different ways. I and all my colleagues wish the member good luck and thank her for her service.

Hon. Carolyn Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I thank my member of Parliament in Georgian Bay. There will be many more trips on the Georgian Bay, and I will continue to conspire with the member for his wise advice.

• (1610)

[Translation]

Ms. Andr  anne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for her speech and her years of service.

I see that she, like me, has a passion for karaoke. Maybe we could go do karaoke together sometime and have some fun. I will take her advice about high heels to heart. In fact, I lost one of mine on the stairs earlier. We can chat about that later too.

On a more serious note, I would like to congratulate her on her years of service. I was not very old in 1997 either, but if not for the women who came before me in politics, I would not be here today. There are still so many glass ceilings to break in this boys' club.

I also see that we also share an obsession with democracy. I look forward to seeing what she does next. Maybe, in response to my question, she can tell me a bit more about how she perceives the issue of disinformation in our time. I would like her to tell us how this contributes to diminishing democracy, how social media and online hate sometimes contribute to deterring women from entering politics, and how excessive partisanship and petty politics can put women off a career in politics. We have a vision that is much less partisan and much more collaborative.

Perhaps she can advise us on how women can make a greater contribution to our democracy. She may also be able to tell me how, as parliamentarians, we can help halt the further erosion of democracy. What is happening now is very worrisome.

Hon. Carolyn Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I hope the future will bring opportunities to improve civic literacy as well as physical and mental health literacy. The ability to ascertain the truth is very important. It is foundational for every young person. It is important to truly hear people's concerns and, I believe, to truly hear women.

[English]

Ms. Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my hon. colleague from Toronto—St. Paul's for her years of service.

I did not know until today that she loves karaoke. I too love karaoke. Perhaps we could have had a Broadway kickoff at a local karaoke club in Ottawa, but I am sure we will have time to do that in the coming years.

I really appreciated the hon. member's acknowledgement of the importance of territorial recognition, the understanding that we all sit on lands that were dispossessed from indigenous peoples. I think it is foundational to reconciliation in this country to recognize the privileges that have been borne on the backs of indigenous peoples. I truly respect that.

I thank her, as well, for the barriers she broke down for women in politics. We still do not have enough women in politics, but it is folks like the member for Toronto—St. Paul's who really broke those glass ceilings to even let us have a space in here. As we work within a new trajectory of intersectionalities, I hope, one day, to be an example, just as the member for Toronto—St. Paul's is for women, for other indigenous women who are trying to find space in a place that was never supposed to house us. I thank the member for her sacrifice.

I am also a proud feminist. At a time when we see women's reproductive rights under threat, even in this House, with bills trying to be passed that attack women's reproductive rights, I thank her for bringing up the discussion about women's right to bodily autonomy before it was even a discussion.

I share her concern for the threat to democracy with populist, extreme right-wing politics and a rise of white supremacy in this country, which is not just flourishing outside these walls but within these walls as well, in the House of Commons. For people who have already been marginalized by systems, that is very scary.

I wanted to take this opportunity to thank the member for doing her best to be such a good ally to indigenous peoples through the years, taking the time to learn when needed. I want to thank her for that.

I also want to take this opportunity to ask the member for her wisdom on how we protect democracy at a time of rising hate and what we can do to ensure that we can protect the rights of all people living in Canada going forward.

● (1615)

Hon. Carolyn Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for the ability to work with her in her riding on all of the things she cares about.

I also thank her because, in my comments I said that thanking people was dangerous, and I now realize I forgot some of my best coaches, such as Cynthia Wesley-Esquimaux, Steve Koptie and Michèle Audette, who should have been there in the top rung of all of this, but they have always been. Even though Cynthia ran against the distinguished members for York—Simcoe and Simcoe North, my two colleagues here, she has never stopped being there to support me and give me wise counsel.

I think part of it is to be able to instill that coaching from the very youngest age. There is a grade one teacher in my riding, just at the end of my street, who has a unit on leadership. I think that we cannot start early enough in teaching people to understand how to do a critical appraisal and what civic literacy is.

I think of the amazing Ilona Kickbusch at the WHO, and some others who are really focused on digital literacy so that people can sort out what is true, what is not and what a bot is. How do we help people seek out those kinds of advice and truths? I am a doctor so I always talk about immunization, but we have to immunize people against this really evil threat.

Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP): Mr. Speaker, I wish it did not take a great parliamentarian to retire to turn down the partisan temperature in this place, but it may be fitting because,

Government Orders

in the short time I have been here, it is everything I have known of the hon. member for Toronto—St. Paul's.

When she was the minister of mental health and addictions, she was keen to hear from me about advice on the upcoming budget and to push for a really critical program, the substance use and addictions program.

When it came to announcing funding on behalf of the Government of Canada, when she arrived in my community, she was keen to ensure that all parliamentarians from this place were represented and supportive there. We heard it from her again this afternoon. I join colleagues in thanking her for her service to this country over the last 26 years. We are all better for it.

One aspect of her advocacy I particularly appreciated was her advocacy for improving our democracy through electoral reform. As a parting thought, I would love to hear more from her, if she would be open to sharing with us her reflections, on how to continue to move forward on electoral reform.

Hon. Carolyn Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for the push on electoral reform. I think we are learning, as we choose our leaders and so many things on ranked ballots, that it is a good way to start in municipal politics. I have always thought, on electoral reform, that we have to start by having citizens understand it.

In 1993, Conservatives were able to get 20-something per cent of the vote and two members, and we see that we could get a separatist government in the Province of Quebec with really less than a majority, so I think there is a risk. We have to teach that first, and then we move on to what would be the best thing to do in this huge country, from coast to coast to coast, where the land and the people are important.

● (1620)

The Deputy Speaker: I thank everyone for their interventions for the hon. member.

It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, Automotive Industry, the hon. member for Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Carbon Pricing, and the hon. member for Battle River—Crowfoot, Carbon Pricing.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am rising in the House of Commons to talk about the \$23 billion in inflationary deficits added by this bill alone. Here is yet another example of a Prime Minister who, after eight years, is not worth the cost.

Government Orders

When I say that he is not worth the cost, I am talking about his false advertising. Normally, in the private sector, false advertising is a criminal offence. If, for example, a business advertises a product at a certain price and does not deliver the promised product, that business may have to face criminal charges in court. Governments do it all the time. They ask for money to deliver a product to Canadians. We see the Prime Minister do that all the time.

For example, in very general terms, take his program to help the middle class. Eight years down the road, nine out of 10 middle-class young people are unable to afford a house and believe that will never change. Eight years on, the number of employed Ontarians using food banks has increased by 86%. These are middle-class people. They are suffering. They never needed to use food banks before, but eight years after the government floated the idea of helping the middle class, they need it now.

We have a Prime Minister who promised to help the media by giving them big subsidies to buy their love. How did that turn out? Media articles are now being erased from social networks.

There is also talk about a program to help kids get lunch at school. However, if we read the bill to find out what the program is about, no food is included. The money is for two federal ministers to hold consultations with provincial ministers and interest groups and write a report about a plan to create a policy to someday feed children. Here is just another example of a government that says it is going to feed kids, but then turns around and feeds bureaucracies instead.

Now let us move on to housing. While criticizing Jean Chrétien for eliminating housing bureaucracy at the federal level, the Prime Minister announced that the feds would once again fund housing by setting up major, \$87-billion programs for affordable housing. Eight years later, what has happened? Housing prices have doubled. The cost of a mortgage on an average home has more than doubled, with payments increasing from \$1,400 to nearly \$3,500 a month. The cost of a one-bedroom apartment has risen from an average of \$900 to almost \$2,000, and the down payment for the average home in this country has increased from \$20,000 to more than \$50,000.

The program proposes spending billions and billions of dollars on affordable homes and apartments. The result is that costs have doubled. That is exactly the opposite of what the ads said. Unfortunately, these ads sometimes appear in documents voted on in the House of Commons. For example, there are affordable housing programs that increase the price of homes, and millions or billions of dollars are provided to fund them.

• (1625)

In the private sector, charging money for a product and then failing to deliver that product would land a CEO in jail. The Prime Minister does that all the time, but he keeps his privileges while the population suffers.

That is why I created a monumental documentary on the housing hell that this Prime Minister has caused. The bought-and-paid-for media had a meltdown. They had a meltdown across the country, but they had a problem. They could not find a single error in any of the facts that were presented. I presented around 55 facts. The doc-

umentary introduces a new fact roughly every 20 seconds. There is not a single journalist who could find one factual error.

Let me review some of these facts. I found many of these facts in articles published by the media that attacked me for my documentary. They published those same facts. That is the problem. They published facts about the housing crisis, but failed to mention the Prime Minister who caused this housing crisis, who is in power and who has seen prices double.

Here are the facts.

First, nine out of 10 Canadians believe that they will never own a home. The journalist who wrote that is Shazia Nazir from Milton, Ontario. That is a fact. There is no denying it. Which Prime Minister created this phenomenon, which had never been seen before in our history? It is this Liberal Prime Minister.

Second, I demonstrated that it takes 66% of an average paycheck to make the monthly payments on the average single-family home. A Radio-Canada journalist said that figure was made up, but it comes from the Royal Bank of Canada. It is published on the RBC website. Radio-Canada could have found it, if its journalists had wanted to share the truth. It takes 66% of an average paycheck to make the average payments for an average home in Canada. The remaining 34% is needed to pay taxes, leaving nothing after that. People will not be able to buy groceries, do anything fun or go on vacation. They will have barely enough money to pay their mortgage. This is compared to 39% when I was the minister responsible for housing. Eight years ago, it took 39% of an average family's paycheck to buy an average home and pay the monthly expenses. That means the percentage of a family's monthly income needed to afford an average home has increased by half. That is after eight years under this Prime Minister, and it is a record. It has never been the case before now.

A 57-year-old grandmother had to live in her van because of the housing crisis caused by this Prime Minister. Refugees have to live in the streets because the shelters are full. After eight years of this Prime Minister, there is no more room. Eight years ago, the average price of a house in Canada was \$454,000. Now, it is about \$700,000. With the higher interest rates, monthly payments are even worse.

The Liberals and their bought-and-paid-for media are trying to blame a global phenomenon, but that is not going to fly. Other countries are not experiencing the same crisis as we are here, in Canada.

• (1630)

All the international data show that prices in Canada have gone up much faster than in nearly every other country. Housing costs in Canada have outpaced wage growth faster than in all but one OECD country. On affordability, Canada ranks next to last out of almost 40 industrialized countries for the period from 2015 to 2023. Interestingly, the Prime Minister has been in power that entire time.

According to UBS Bank, Toronto has the worst housing bubble in the world. This is not a phenomenon observed in all of the world's biggest cities; it is just in Toronto. Moreover, Vancouver ranks sixth. According to UBS, these two markets were reasonably priced 10 years ago. That is another fact that the Prime Minister's bought-and-paid-for media tried to contradict, but they failed.

Houses near the border on the Canadian side can be three times more expensive than those on the U.S. side. How does that make sense if it is an international phenomenon? In general, prices in the United States are 25% to 40% lower than in Canada, even though the U.S. population is eight times the Canadian population and their land mass is smaller. After eight years of this Prime Minister, people can buy a Swedish castle for less than it costs to buy a two-bedroom house in Kitchener.

Of all the G7 countries, ours is the largest by landmass. A Radio-Canada reporter who was trying to save the Prime Minister's reputation said that that argument was ridiculous because people cannot live in Canada's far north, for example. He was suggesting that the only land available in Canada is in the far north. That is what is ridiculous. There is plenty of land around our big cities. If those claims are true, then why is the U.S. able to provide housing at a much lower cost, even though its population is concentrated in New York, Chicago, Houston, Los Angeles and other large cities?

Even if the population is concentrated in big cities, houses are a lot less expensive in the U.S. than they are in Canada after eight years of this Prime Minister. Those who say it is irrelevant to talk about the amount of land that we have to provide Canadians with property are forgetting that the reality is that supply and demand always determine the price. Prices should be very low in Canada because there is land available around cities, in southern Canada, western Canada, eastern Canada and even northern Canada, land on which we could be building housing, if we could cut through all the red tape put in place by governments at all levels.

The fact is, since this Prime Minister came to power, there are fewer houses per capita than before. Of all the G7 countries, Canada has the fewest houses per capita, even though it has the largest landmass available for housing. I find it very interesting that there were more houses per capita eight years ago, when there were no bureaucratic programs to make properties more affordable. Do my colleagues not find that interesting?

● (1635)

According to the Prime Minister, \$87 billion was spent on building affordable homes. However, eight years later, there are fewer houses per capita. It is unbelievable. It is like being in a restaurant, ordering something that tastes terrible, getting the wrong order and terrible service, and then being told it is going to cost \$500. Then we turn around and say it was a great meal because it cost so much. That is the Prime Minister's argument. His programs are expensive, so they must be good.

He just attacked us for voting against the money allocated for programs because he believes that money equals results, even if that spending results in the opposite of what the programs promise. He criticizes me for not having spent enough on housing. I delivered affordable homes and apartments when I was minister at a lower cost to taxpayers. That is good, common sense: lower costs

Government Orders

for taxpayers and lower costs for those buying or renting homes. That is what it means to know the value of money. The Prime Minister does not understand that because he has never had to work in his life. He inherited his wealth and kept his wealth in a tax-sheltered trust fund. I understand why it is hard for him to grasp the value of money.

I will give an example. In 1972, 232,000 housing units were built in Canada. In 2022, 219,000 homes were built in Canada. In 1972, there were 22 million Canadians. Last year, there were 39 million. The Canadian population has practically doubled, but fewer houses are being built after eight years of this Prime Minister and after \$87 billion of government spending to build more. This government spends more to build less at a higher price. That is its approach.

What is the highest cost of building a home today in Vancouver, for example? Is it lumber, the workers' wages, the land? No, it is not even the construction company's profits. It is government fees and red tape. Yes, the red tape is local. It comes mainly from local governments, but it is funded by the federal government.

The Prime Minister boasts about the fact that he is sending bigger cheques to municipal politicians to build a bigger bureaucracy to prevent construction in the name of affordable housing. In Nova Scotia, after completely failing to provide a decent quality of life for people in Halifax, after 30 homeless encampments cropped up around the city, the housing minister came along with money from the housing accelerator fund and gave millions of dollars to his friend, the Liberal mayor of Halifax. He said that it would speed up housing construction.

We later learned what that money will be used for. It is going to be used to hire more public servants, the same public servants who are preventing construction in Halifax. There is going to be more red tape thanks to the money the federal government is sending. The Prime Minister has learned absolutely nothing. That is why we need to make a common-sense change that will build houses, not bureaucracy. That is our approach.

● (1640)

Some people have criticized my monumental documentary. According to them, nothing can be built because there is not enough land in places where people want to live.

Government Orders

The Squamish people have proven otherwise. In Vancouver, the Squamish are building 6,000 apartments on a 10-acre property. On 10 acres, they are building an unbelievable 6,000 apartments. That means they are building 600 apartments per acre. These are outstanding results. This would have never happened if they had been forced to listen to the bureaucrats in downtown Vancouver. On their traditional land, a traditional reserve of their people, they did not need permits from local bureaucrats. That enabled them to build housing.

This proves that if we could cut out the bureaucracy, we could build more large apartments downtown and more houses in the suburbs at the same time. That is exactly the opposite of what the Prime Minister is doing right now.

I have heard other excuses from staunch defenders of the Prime Minister, who set up a huge fund to financially support the media and buy their loyalty. They say it is not the Prime Minister's fault that the cost of housing has doubled, because it was COVID-19 that drove up housing prices.

A Journal de Montréal columnist I admire said that COVID-19 has become a scapegoat. COVID-19 should have lowered housing prices, because there was less immigration during COVID-19. The immigration system was practically shut down for nine or 10 months, and it slowed down for another nine or 10 months after that. The figures show that there was less immigration, fewer jobs and lower wages.

All these factors would normally reduce demand in the real estate market. I am not the only one saying this. In spring 2020, the federal government's housing agency predicted that housing prices would drop by 32% because of COVID-19. They were wrong, but it is understandable why they predicted that prices would fall. When the country loses jobs and wages and closes its doors to immigration, the results are lower prices and less demand. However, prices have gone up. Why did prices rise in the two years following COVID-19? Because the central bank printed \$600 billion. Money was created out of thin air.

The media said that that was not true and had nothing to do with it, but my documentary includes a Bank of Canada graph that shows the number of houses bought by investors doubled. It started in the spring of 2020, right when the Bank of Canada started printing money and buying bonds from banks and financial institutions, which flooded the financial system. All that money was loaned to investors that have relationships with the bankers. They are the ones who helped double the amount invested. Prices jumped by 50% after that massive injection of newly printed money. It was not COVID-19. It was the sense that people had money that caused a sudden spike in housing prices.

• (1645)

In fact, the Liberals and their supporters in the bought-off media will say that all that government spending was necessary because of COVID-19. Is that really true?

There was a \$100-billion deficit before the first case of COVID-19. According to the Parliamentary Budget Officer, 40% of new spending during the COVID-19 pandemic had nothing to do with COVID-19. The pandemic has been over for a year or two, but

the deficits continue. The government can no longer blame COVID-19 and say that COVID-19 ate its homework, when the deficits were there before COVID-19, the deficits during COVID-19 were not related to the pandemic, and the deficits after COVID-19, in some cases, are increasing. Although COVID-19 is disappearing in the rear-view mirror, deficits continue to increase. We cannot accept the Prime Minister's excuse that the dog ate his homework. Printing money to spend recklessly was an irresponsible decision, and I warned against it. That is continuing to this day and it is driving up interest rates.

It just goes to show, once again, that every time this Prime Minister stands up in the House of Commons and says he has no other choice, he is spending money on all kinds of slogans. However, when we look at the results behind those slogans, it is the exact opposite of what has been promised. It is false advertising. That is why we often vote against spending that, according to the slogans, sounds great, but in reality does exactly the opposite of what the slogans promise. That is why we need a common-sense government. That is what I can offer as Canada's future prime minister.

A few months ago, the Bloc Québécois asked me what common sense actually is. I admire their humility in admitting that they have no idea what common sense is. I was able to help them by defining common sense. It struck them as a strange idea, because they live in a utopia. They are here in the House of Commons to make life more miserable, arguing that Canada should be split up into pieces. Again, to help the Bloc Québécois, common sense actually means many things.

First, we need to bring back lower prices. How do we do that? We do that by axing the carbon tax that is increasing the price of everything. I know that the government wants to quadruple the carbon tax on farmers who produce food, on fuel and on all our industries. I know that the Bloc Québécois wants to radically increase the carbon tax. I know that there is a second carbon tax under the name fuel regulations. However, the Bloc Québécois is not satisfied. It wants to radically increase it. Only the Conservative Party will axe the tax on carbon to reduce the price of energy for all Canadians.

We will rely on technology to fight climate change. I know that the Bloc Québécois is against technology. For example, it is against the nuclear energy that France uses to produce electricity without any greenhouse gas emissions. The Bloc Québécois is against that. It is so ideologically radical. It is against nuclear energy and other sources of energy that do not produce carbon emissions. We will use these technologies instead of taxing F-150s in Saguenay or in Trois-Rivières, where workers and farmers need their truck for work. These are good people. They work hard, and we are the only party for the vast regions of Quebec. That is all. That is the truth.

• (1650)

Another common-sense solution is to control spending. I find the Bloc Québécois funny. It always wants the federal government to do more. It is strange. The Bloc says that it wants to get rid of the federal government, but at the same time, it is always voting to increase the federal government's costs at Quebecers' expense. The Bloc voted for all the spending increases that the Liberal government proposed. It voted against the financial discipline that we are proposing.

The common-sense idea I am proposing is a dollar-for-dollar law, which says that if we spend a dollar on one thing, then we need to save a dollar somewhere else. A law like that existed during the Clinton administration in the 1990s. It enabled the Democratic president to balance the budget and eliminate \$400 billion in debt. That resulted in an enormous increase in jobs and wages, an increase in the stock market and plenty of other things. However, just after the law expired, the U.S. plunged back into a deficit and they are still in that situation today. That shows that politicians need a legal limit to control their spending. We are going to do things the same way that single mothers, small businesses and families do them. Every time a Canadian with common sense increases their spending in one area, they find a way to decrease it in another so that they can pay the bills, instead of just continuing to add expenses to their credit card. That is how we are going to impose discipline.

We will also eliminate waste. The Canada Infrastructure Bank costs \$35 billion and has not delivered one single infrastructure project. We will get rid of ArriveCAN. We will get rid of the Asian Infrastructure Bank, which sends our money to China to build pipelines. We are building pipelines in China and banning them here in Canada. That makes no sense. We are not here to build the ancient Chinese empire. We are here to build a good quality of life for Canadians here at home. That is common sense.

We will tell municipalities that, if they want infrastructure money, they have to approve more housing construction. The reason we do not have enough homes is that there is too much bureaucracy getting in the way of construction. Canada is the second-slowest OECD country when it comes to granting construction permits. How will we get municipalities to speed up the permitting process? We will say that the amount of infrastructure money they are going to get is tied to the number of houses built. It will be based on results. I will tell every municipality to allow 15% more construction. If they do more, they will get bonuses. If they do less, they will lose money. Those bureaucrats will be paid like realtors. Realtors get paid according to how much they sell. The federal government will pay municipal bureaucrats according to how much construction they allow. We will demand that every public transit station be surrounded by apartments. The money will flow once those apartments are built and occupied by people.

We are going to sell off 6,000 federal government buildings and thousands of acres of federal land to build new homes. We are going to ask the federal agency that approves financing for apartments do so in two months instead of two years, or else we will fire their executives. It is easy. If you work in a senior position in my government and you do not keep your commitments, you will be fired. That is life. That is the real world. That is how life works for a car-

Government Orders

penter or a mechanic. That is also how it will work for executives in my government. Eventually, this will speed up construction, after eight years of delays and people finding they can no longer buy houses.

• (1655)

Common sense also means putting real repeat offenders in prison instead of allowing them to commit the same acts of violence against Canadians over and over again.

We understand that some young people make mistakes. I get that, and we are going to rehabilitate them. However, we are not going to let people commit 40, 50 or 60 crimes over and over, each one more violent than the last, by releasing them, like the Bloc Québécois and the Liberals want to do. We want these criminals to go to prison. We do not want to let them out on bail or stay at home. We are going to offer treatment to people who are addicted to drugs, and we are going to stop targeting hunters and sport shooters.

The Bloc Québécois tried to help the Liberals ban hunting rifles. When the Liberals published 300 pages of hunting rifles that they wanted to ban, the Bloc member was there. It is on the video. They can deny it if they want, but there is video evidence. He was there and even said that it was his dream to see 300 pages of hunting rifles banned. Then all of a sudden, the Bloc members realized that there were hunters in the regions in Quebec.

That was quite a realization for the Bloc members, who spend most of their time with the lefties in Plateau-Mont-Royal, so it never occurred to them that there were hunters in Quebec. Like the Prime Minister, the Bloc Québécois had to back down because of Conservative pressure. The Bloc had to apologize and say that they would not try to ban hunting rifles after all, after hearing the Conservatives' strong arguments. Now that is common sense.

We know that this radical coalition will once again try to ban our hunters. People in the regions of Quebec will have to depend on the Conservative Party to protect their traditions, which have existed in Canada for thousands of years among indigenous peoples. I want to thank first nations for defending their right to hunt and opposing the Prime Minister's plan to ban their hunting rifles.

We are the only party that believes we should instead invest money in tightening the border against illegal guns. At the same time, we will put the real criminals in jail, while respecting hunters and sport shooters. That is common sense. Common sense is such a strange concept to our Bloc Québécois friends.

Government Orders

Common sense also means protecting our freedom. The Conservative Party is still the only party that voted against the censorship law. The Bloc Québécois voted to give Canada's federal bureaucrats in Ottawa the power to prevent Quebecers from watching certain things online. Imagine a supposed sovereignist from Quebec saying that an official from a woke agency in Ottawa should be able to control what Quebecers see and say on the Internet. We will never agree to that. The Conservative Party is the only party that will defend freedom of expression. Accordingly, we will scrap Bill C-11.

We cannot have freedom of expression without national freedom. That is why the Conservative Party is going to rebuild our army. This Prime Minister has wasted so much money by bungling procurement and delaying the F-35 aircraft replacement, for example. We are going to wipe out incompetence and waste and invest in helping our soldiers and rebuilding our army. We will stop giving money to dictatorships, terrorists and international bureaucracies and bring that money back here to Canada to rebuild our armed forces. We will defend our freedom by defending our military.

● (1700)

In conclusion, I know that, for most Canadians, things are miserable in Canada right now. Everything is broken. Do not take it from me. That is coming from two-thirds of Canadians polled. We have a Prime Minister who always wants to promote negativity. He is always negative. He tries to divide people.

I am here with a positive message, a common-sense message that gives hope to Canadians across the country. Yes, the future will be better than the eight years we have just gone through. Yes, we can have a country where people are free to earn big paycheques to buy food, fuel and affordable homes in safe communities. That is the goal of the Conservative Party. That is the goal of bringing home common sense.

[English]

Some hon. members: More, more.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, I can only go where my caucus leads, and they are asking me to continue speaking. I can do no other. I am but their humble servant. The member across the way is also very humble, and he has much to be humble about, indeed, as does his entire government.

Today, I rise to speak about false Liberal advertising. What we have in the private sector are laws that could lead to the criminal prosecution of any business that advertises one thing and delivers the opposite. If somebody goes on television, tries to sell a product and then fails to deliver it after collecting payment, they can be sued civilly and maybe even charged criminally.

Weirdly, in politics, we call it law-making. We have a Prime Minister who literally brings programs before the House of Commons that do exactly the opposite of what they say. For example, he said he was going to spend millions of dollars buying back hunting rifles. What has this resulted in? A 100% increase in violent crime. He has a program that he says will help protect the media that has actually removed the media from social networks. We have a Prime Minister who has an \$87-billion affordable housing program that has doubled the cost of housing. This the exact opposite of what he

promised, and yet he took billions of dollars from Canadians in order to pay for it.

The Liberals were trumpeting their idea of an affordable food program for kids, and then we found out that there is no food in the program. We found that the program does not provide a single dollar for food. Here is what it does, and I have it right from the bill:

The Minister must, in consultation with the Minister of Health, representatives of the provincial governments responsible for health and education, other relevant stakeholders in those fields and representatives of Indigenous governing bodies, develop a national framework to establish a school food program

Let us just walk through all the steps, because we know that normally, in the real world, the shortest distance between two points is a straight line, but there were many points that were unrelated to kids actually having food in their belly. One minister would consult with another federal minister, who would consult with provincial ministers, who would consult with stakeholders, which is code for lobbyists, who would then develop a national framework to establish a school food program.

I note that the bill actually did not provide a single dollar to source anything of nutritional value, not a single calorie of nutrition is funded by the bill. It does not feed kids, it feeds bureaucracy.

● (1705)

This is an example of all of the wonderful labels and slogans Liberals put on their spending that actually does not deliver anything to the end-user. It is more self-service, not public service but self-service, of the bigger and fatter bureaucracy and the ecosystem of lobbyists, interest groups, researchers, bureaucrats, Crown CEOs and contractors who feast off all of the money that is hidden under these beautiful and unimpeachable slogans. There is the beautiful "Let's Protect Innocent Kittens Act". Liberals will spend a billion dollars on that, but they will hire a bureaucrat who will create a department that will consult with paid interest groups, which will contract out their report writing to those who have expertise in PowerPoint. They will have hundreds of people feeding off this program, and the poor little kittens will be forgotten about in the end. Who thinks of the kittens? They do not actually get anything, not even a little bit of milk, because Liberals will carbon tax that as well.

That is the system of the government: It spends more to achieve less. As I said, there is an \$87-billion housing program that is supposed to make housing affordable but that has doubled the cost of housing, doubled the rent, doubled the mortgage payment and doubled the needed down payment. Let us go through the numbers. When I was housing minister, the average rent for a one-bedroom apartment was about \$950 a month; now it is just under \$2,000 a month. The average mortgage payment on an average home, newly purchased, was \$1,400; today it is \$3,500. The average down payment for a newly purchased standard-price home was \$20,000. Imagine that. We almost cannot imagine it. The \$20,000 amount for a down payment almost seems quaint. That was only eight years ago. Now, it is over \$50,000.

The Prime Minister's main criticism of me is that I did not have big enough bureaucracies at the same time as I was making housing affordable. His measurement of success is not whether one delivers an end product to the end-user; it is whether one builds a big enough bureaucracy and line item in the budget to pay for it. Failing is bad; failing expensively is worse, and, boy, has he ever failed.

I recently produced a documentary called "Housing Hell: How we got here and how we get out". Has anybody heard of it? I see that even some random Liberals on the backbench have heard of it, and that is nice, because they do not really get put to any good use. It is good that they were able to have a quiet 15 minutes to soak in the production.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, maybe I will make a few more that will add up to an hour, and then the member will have something to do with himself when he is away on Christmas break. Maybe that will be the Christmas gift that appears under the member's tree when he wakes up and opens his phone.

We have seen an absolute meltdown by the bought-and-paid-for media. First of all, they were furious that I went around them. How dare I communicate directly with Canadians, they asked. They proceeded, with no success, to try to poke holes in the documentary, which introduces a new fact roughly every 20 or 25 seconds for the entire 15-minute period. The media was desperate to find an error or a problem, and they could not find a single factual error in the entire documentary. They tried.

Let me review some of the undisputable facts, because they are all publicly sourced, with proof to show where they come from. For example, one headline said, "Nine out of 10 Canadians believe they will never own a home, survey shows". That is right out of the *Milton Reporter* on April 25, 2022. It is so much worse now than it was back then. This headline was in *The Globe and Mail*: "This 57-year-old grandmother didn't choose the van life. The housing crisis chose it for her". That was in May 2023. Imagine the miserable life of this wonderful grandmother after eight years of the Prime Minister. Another news headline was that students are forced to live under bridges.

One might ask why I am quoting the media, of which I am critical, and it is because they fail to mention in any of these articles who the Prime Minister is who presided over the housing hell. They

Government Orders

fail to assign blame to the person who actually caused the problem in the first place.

● (1710)

CBC/Radio-Canada, desperately flailing around trying to find fault with my documentary, recently said that I had no proof that it takes 66% of an average family's monthly income to make payments on the average home. The report comes from RBC, in its quarterly housing affordability calculation. It has been doing it for 40 years, and it is now higher than it has ever been in its recorded history. That is because housing costs have not only grown but have also vastly outgrown our very poor and miserable wage growth under the Prime Minister.

CBC/Radio-Canada then went on to its next excuse, claiming that Canada's housing hell is just part of some global phenomenon. That is an easy claim to dispute and disprove because, of course, our housing hell is so much worse than that of any other country on earth. For example, Toronto is rated by UBS Bank as the worst housing bubble in the world. Vancouver is the sixth. Both of them were rated as moderately expensive only 10 years ago.

If one wants a different measure, go to Demographia, which has a very simple formula. It divides the average house price in a country or a city by the average income. Based on that measure, Vancouver is the third and Toronto the 10th most overpriced housing market in the world, worse than Manhattan; Los Angeles; Chicago; London, England; and even Singapore, a country with 2,000 times more people per square kilometre than Canada has. Look at the comparison with the United States. The average American housing prices, depending on the measurement, are 25% to 40% cheaper. In border towns, house prices on the Canadian side, 15 minutes away, are often double or even triple the prices of those south of the border.

A two-bedroom house in Kitchener now costs more than a castle in Sweden. In fact, the OECD did a measurement of the growth in house prices relative to the growth in incomes in all of the roughly 40 OECD countries, and Canada saw the second-worst deterioration of housing affordability since the Prime Minister took office in 2015. No, one cannot blame it on some global phenomenon; it is a uniquely Canadian hell and a uniquely here-and-now hell. The Prime Minister is responsible.

I find they say that the Prime Minister really has nothing to do with housing—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona is rising on a point of order.

Government Orders

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I noticed the time. Of course, the leader of the official opposition is entitled to take as much time as he wants, but some of us are beginning to wonder whether he is running out the clock so he does not have to take questions, if he is afraid to take questions from the floor, or whether he will be leaving some time for members to ask him questions about his dissertation.

* * *

PRESIDENT OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

There have been discussions among the parties and if you seek it, I think you will find unanimous consent to adopt the following motion:

That the motion standing on the Order Paper in the name of the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons related to the appointment of Marie-Chantal Girard as President of the Public Service Commission, pursuant to Standing Order 111.1, be deemed adopted.

• (1715)

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

It is agreed.

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

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

FALL ECONOMIC STATEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2023

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-59, an act to implement certain provisions of the fall economic statement tabled in Parliament on November 21, 2023 and certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 28, 2023, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we then went on to demonstrate in the documentary another indisputable fact: that Canada has the fewest homes per capita in the G7 after eight years of the Prime Minister, even though we have the most land to build on, and that we built more homes in 1972 than we built last year. In fact, in 1972, there were 22 million Canadians. Last year, there were 39 million. In other words, we have doubled the population while reducing the number of homes we are building, because of the massive bureaucracy the Prime Minister continues to build up. As a result, the number of homes relative to the number of families who need them is in stark decline.

What do colleagues think is causing the rising cost of building a home? In Vancouver, for example, what would colleagues think is the leading cost of building a home? Is it land, labour, lumber or even the profit of the builder? No, it is the government: the cost of permits, delays, consultants, red tape and taxes. All of these costs add up to more than all of the other costs combined. They add up to \$1.3 million for every newly built home. In Montreal, the city

has blocked 25,000 new homes in the last two years. In Winnipeg, the courts had to shoot down a decision by the city hall to block 2,000 homes right next to a transit station that was built for those homes. Why was that? It was because the city councillor said his constituents did not want neighbours. Many Ontario municipalities have raised development charges 900%. Have the costs of servicing communities gone up 900% over the last several decades? I would like to see why.

Granted, those decisions are municipal, but they are federally funded because the Prime Minister happily forks over billions and billions of dollars more, rewarding bureaucracies for blocking the way. For example, he has created the new housing accelerator fund. After two years and \$4 billion, it has not completed a single solitary home. Recently, the minister had a great photo op in the city of Halifax, in your province, Mr. Speaker, and boy, did we ever need a housing announcement there, because, after eight years of the Prime Minister, there are now 30 homeless encampments in that city. Can people imagine that?

Mr. Speaker, you are from Nova Scotia. Would you ever have imagined that there would be 30 homeless encampments in Halifax? Eight years ago, if I had told you that would have happened, you would not have believed me. This is after eight years of the misery and poverty that the Prime Minister has imposed on our people. We were all a little bit relieved when, all of a sudden, the minister decided he was going to show up and do something on housing. He announced millions of dollars for the Liberal mayor. What did we find out the money was for? It was for hiring more—

The Deputy Speaker: We have another point of order from the hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I asked whether the leader of the Conservative Party was trying to run and hide from the Q and A, but I did not get an answer. Will he be leaving time for us to ask him questions about his dissertation?

The Deputy Speaker: That is not a point of order, but we know that we will be moving on to the next item at about 5:42 p.m., so the hon. member does have unlimited time.

The hon. leader of the official opposition.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, not only would I be prepared to answer that member's questions, but I would also like to up the ante. I am prepared to put partisanship aside and put on a multi-party screening of my documentary, "Housing hell: How we got here and how we get out". I know that I have offered that before, but what I am prepared to do is up the offer and make myself available for an hour of questions and answers after the screening is done so the member could come and enjoy. I have only an hour. I am very busy, but I would be happy to have the member come and enjoy the documentary. We will be showing it in both official languages, of course.

[Translation]

We will show it in both official languages. The members from the Bloc Québécois can come. I know that they are allergic to common sense. It is going to be tough.

• (1720)

[English]

We do not want them to get an allergic reaction to the common sense in the documentary, but we will be inviting them all to join in the spirit of camaraderie as we build homes and reverse the housing hell that this Prime Minister, with the help of the NDP, has caused Canadians. They cannot say that I never did anything for them.

The facts of this documentary continued as we went through it to demonstrate that Canada has really no excuse to have a housing crisis. We have the second-biggest land mass in the world. We have by far, by many orders of magnitude, the most land per capita of any country in the G7 and the sixth-biggest supply, give or take, in the world per capita. If we spread Canadians out evenly, we would have something like 33 NFL-sized football fields for every single Canadian. It would be the perfect place to be a hermit. People would never see another person because we have so much land.

Obviously, critics will say, “Well of course we have all this land that is far away and nobody can live there.” That is nonsense. We have land all around and even inside our big cities. We have land right along the strip of the Canada-U.S. border. People can take a drive around Ottawa and see all of the land that is undeveloped, or the tiny government buildings on thousands of square metres of land that is unused, which could be used for housing if the federal government would unlock it. There is no excuse. The only thing stopping the construction of housing is the government.

By the way, if members doubt this, they can explain this to me. The United States has most of its population concentrated in large metropolis centres like New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Houston, etc., and yet somehow, housing is 25% to 45% cheaper there. How is it that housing in Tokyo is more affordable than it is in Vancouver, if the issue were just that we are all crunched into small metropolitan spaces? That is totally false. It is yet another excuse that government-funded media makes for government failure.

We know it is a failure that can be fixed, because look at the incredible work of the Squamish people. Because they did not have to worry about the bureaucracy at Vancouver City Hall, they were able to approve and begin building 6,000 apartments on 10 acres of land. That is 600 units per acre. If they had to go through city hall, it never would have happened, and those 6,000 wonderful families and couples would not have those homes. They have demonstrated that if they get the government out of the way and let builders build, then they have more apartments. Unfortunately, that is exactly the opposite of what this—

The Deputy Speaker: I have a point of order from the hon. member for Milton.

Mr. Adam van Koeverden: Mr. Speaker, I am also eager to ask questions, but I am also eager to point out that it was a \$1-billion CMHC loan, the largest ever from the federal government, to the Squamish Nation.

Government Orders

The Deputy Speaker: We are falling into debate. Do not forget that once the member is finished, there will be an opportunity for questions and answers.

The hon. leader of the official opposition.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, I love how when the first nations people do extraordinary things, Liberals show up to take all the credit. The member reminds me of the rooster who thought that just because he crowed when the sun came up, he made the sun come up. He did not make the sun come up; he just crowed about it. It is actually the first nations people who are building this project, and it is a shame that Liberals try to take credit for it.

If we could just get the Liberals and the government out of the way, we could do many more great things because we know that, prior to the current government, housing was affordable in this country, taking a fraction out of a family paycheque to afford a home. The good thing is that housing was not like this before this Prime Minister and it will not be like this after he is gone.

The second cause of the housing hell, which I pointed out in my documentary, was the rampant money printing that the government unleashed. While it was technically done by the Bank of Canada, it was clearly in total collaboration with the elected government and with the total support and the lack of discipline from the government to print \$600 billion. The government has created 32% more cash in a period of time when the economy has grown by 4%. In other words, the cash is growing eight times faster than the stuff the cash buys.

The Liberals did this through a program called quantitative easing, where the government sells bonds to the private sector and the Bank of Canada buys them right back at a higher price, profiting the financial institutions, freeing up easy money for government to spend, but also flooding the financial markets with easy cash that is lent out to wealthy investors.

In my documentary, I use a Bank of Canada graph demonstrating the total liftoff in the number of homes bought by investors that happened exactly—

• (1725)

The Deputy Speaker: I believe we have a point of order from the hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona, and I am hoping that it is a point of order.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give an opportunity to the member. I thought that somebody trying to be prime minister might want an opportunity to answer questions, but I see instead he is practising avoiding answering them.

The Deputy Speaker: That is not a point of order. The hon. member has unlimited time on this.

The hon. member for Jonquière.

*Government Orders**[Translation]*

Mr. Mario Simard: Mr. Speaker, I am sad to see what is happening with my NDP colleagues.

I want to hear the leader of the official opposition tell us about cryptocurrencies. I would like to hear his thoughts on that. Cryptocurrency is very interesting. It is probably in this documentary.

I would like him to share his simplistic reasoning—

The Deputy Speaker: That is also a matter of debate.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition has unlimited time to make his presentation. At 5:42 p.m. we will proceed to the next item.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

[English]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, there is no limit to my speaking time, just like there is no limit to Canada's potential, if only we had some common sense.

The reality is that when we create \$600 billion of cash and we flood it into the financial system, that money is then lent out to those who have connections to that system, and those people bid up the cost for everybody else. That is why, in the early months of the pandemic when everything was crashing, the billionaires were suddenly getting richer.

Why were they getting richer? The economy was crashing. Well, of course, all of their asset values were being inflated by insane money printing supported by every party in the House except for ours. Ours was the only one that worried that this crazy money printing would do exactly what it has done every single time it has been tried.

When I produced the evidence of this in the documentary, all of the “bought and paid for” media said, “Oh, this is an outrageous explanation”, but they have not once provided a shred of evidence that it is not true. Look at the graphs the Bank of Canada itself produced. It demonstrates there was a massive flooding of cash into the real estate market through the vector of the same financial institutions that had profited off of quantitative easing.

I find it interesting that the NDP, which claims to be so concerned about the gap between rich and poor, saw absolutely no problem with the government creating all of this cash and pumping it into a select group of financial institutions, which happen to have the privilege of being members of Payments Canada. They had been eligible to receive the cash before anyone else and before it lost its value, and saw all of their net worth explode all of the stock values artificially pumped up. Then the resulting consumer price inflation chewed up the paycheques of the working poor. It was a direct transfer of wealth from the have-nots to the have-yachts, and the NDP supported it 100%.

NDP members talk about these little, itty-bitty wealth taxes that they claim to want to bring in that amount to \$100 million here and \$1 billion there when we are talking about \$600 billion that was flooded into the financial system to the benefit of the wealthiest—

The Deputy Speaker: There is a point of order from the hon. member for Kings—Hants.

Mr. Kody Blois: Mr. Speaker, I am looking for some clarification. I have sat here intently, hoping to ask the leader of the official opposition a question.

I will get to the point. There has been a lot of actual points of order that have delayed the time for the leader of the official opposition to continue his unlimited time. However, does that time continue and extend out? When does Private Members' Business actually start?

The Deputy Speaker: As I said before, at 5:42 p.m., Private Members' Business will start, but the length of speeches pursuant to Standing Orders 43 and 74 have the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition with unlimited time.

The hon. leader of the official opposition.

• (1730)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, every time I get interrupted, I think of something else to say. It just prolongs my remarks. In fairness, maybe that is the goal of the members across the way who seem to be, in fairness and I appreciate it, quite enjoying the presentation. I thank them for being part of this today.

As I was saying, I find it incredible that the NDP, which claims always to be so concerned about the gap between rich and poor, has expressed zero concern with the central bank ballooning the asset values and the net worth of the super-rich by creating cash and burning the purchasing power of our working-class people. Taking money from wage earners to give to billionaire asset owners is not exactly what we would expect in the name of a working-class party.

[Translation]

Mr. Jean-Denis Garon: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, we know that Private Members' Business will begin at 5:42 p.m. If the leader of the official opposition continues until 5:42 p.m., I would like to know if he could come back tomorrow morning to answer questions.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): It is up to the Leader of the Opposition to decide whether to continue his intervention tomorrow when the House reconvenes.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

[English]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, the NDP was happy to see all these financial institutions and billionaires increase their wealth, not because of the invention of any new, great product, but because they had the government shovelling printed cash into their vaults.

Government Orders

We believe in entrepreneurial capitalism where someone can make money by producing goods and services that make other people better off. They believe in the state crony capitalism where someone gets rich by favours from the state. We believe that people should be able to make money. They believe that people should be able to take money. We want businesses that get ahead by having the best product. They want businesses that get ahead by having the best lobbyist. We want businesses that are obsessed with consumers. They want businesses obsessed with—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): We have a point of order from the hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Madam Speaker, I noticed the leader of the Conservative Party does not want to answer questions. He has ditched his glasses. His hair is getting more voluminous. Is he trying to replace the Prime Minister?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The member has unlimited time and it is his right.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, I can understand why the NDP is so sensitive, because their betrayal of the working-class people they have so long claimed to represent is becoming more clear the longer I speak, and they are desperate to silence that voice. Everywhere I go, I meet working-class New Democrats, people who voted for the NDP their whole lives, who say that they have been betrayed and that is why they are now standing with the common-sense Conservatives.

The reality is that when \$600 billion of cash is created, is funnelled through the financial system and is lent out to wealthy investors, they are obviously going to bid up land and housing costs, which they did. One of the critiques, of the bought-and-paid-for Liberal press gallery, of my documentary is to claim that it was COVID that caused housing prices to go up. First of all, that does not explain why they went up so much more in Canada than in all the other countries in the world, where they also had COVID.

Second, it does not make any sense. All of the phenomena related to COVID should have brought house prices down. Immigration was ground to a halt. Wages dropped. Job losses occurred. A recession happened. All of those things are typically associated with declining house prices, not rising house prices. Do not just take my word for it, CMHC predicted, in the spring of 2020, that these COVID phenomena would lead to a 32% drop in house prices. What caused the market to reverse what otherwise would have been such a serious drop and instead turned into a 50% increase in two years in house prices? Obviously, it was the massive flood of new cash into the financial system, which was lent out. We need to have accountability for that.

Why does this matter, given that the quantitative easing program seems to be over for now? We have to elect a government that would never use the central bank as a personal ATM, to print cash, to inflate costs and to destroy the purchasing power of the working class. When I am Prime Minister, we will get the central bank back to its core mandate of stable, low prices, not paying off politicians' spending. That is common sense.

What we are really talking about here is common sense. I am proposing common-sense measures that are attracting the support of Canadians across the political spectrum and in every corner of the country. Let us start with my first priority of common sense, which is to bring home lower prices. How are we going to do that? We are going to start by axing the tax.

Everything the Prime Minister said about the carbon tax has proven false. First, he said the tax would never go above \$50 a tonne. Well, it has gone above that already, and he admits he is going to quadruple it. It is going to go up to \$170 a tonne, plus there will be a second carbon tax caked on top of it, which would have the effect of quadrupling the current tax from roughly, depending on the province, 15¢ or 16¢ a litre, up to 61¢ a litre. That is his radical and insane plan, fully supported by the NDP. The NDP wants to raise taxes on working-class Canadians for the crime of heating their homes, gassing their trucks or feeding their family food grown on a farm.

That is the choice in the next election. We are going to have a carbon tax election. The Prime Minister could try to avoid it—

• (1735)

Mr. Kody Blois: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I would like to seek unanimous consent to ask the member opposite a question specific to what he is talking about right now.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, I am glad that member stood up. I know the question he was going to ask. He was going to say—

[Translation]

Mr. Martin Champoux: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am confused. The Leader of the Opposition just said that the next election would be a carbon tax election, but I would like to know what will happen in Quebec, since the carbon tax does not apply to Quebec.

I want to know what—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I am sorry, but that is a point of debate.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

[English]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, I know the member for Kings—Hants was going to ask me about the monstrous axe the tax rally I held in his community. Roughly 1,000 people crammed into that room. If I could pay the member a compliment, he represents some great people. They are wonderful, common-sense people, but I am afraid they are very unhappy with the member.

Private Members' Business

I am told that what happened is he found out about the size of the rally and the number of people who were going and had a total meltdown. He burst into tears. He called the PMO and said that, when he was growing up, he was told he would always be somebody. He was going to be an important guy, and now he was on the verge of losing his seat. He said that if the PMO did not give him a pause on the carbon tax, he was going to march out of the caucus. He then whipped up a group of Atlantic MPs, and they marched over to the Prime Minister's Office and began banging on the door and said—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The member for Kings—Hants is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Kody Blois: Madam Speaker, I seek unanimous consent to ask the member a question.

Some hon. members: No.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, all the Atlantic MPs were banging on the door. The Prime Minister was behind the door in a fetal position, sucking on his thumb and crying his eyes out, because his Liberal MPs were threatening to walk out of caucus. He walked out—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Madam Speaker, when the leader of the Conservative Party decides to get his first job outside politics, I wonder if he too will be a drama teacher.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I could not even hear what the hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona was saying, so I will ask him to repeat it.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Madam Speaker, I am sorry I was not loud enough the first time.

I was wondering aloud if, when the leader of the Conservative Party decides to get his first job outside politics, he will be a—

• (1740)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): That is not a point of order, but a point of debate.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, so says the guy who has been living off a parliamentary paycheque since he was born, because his dad was a member of Parliament. He still is.

The reality is that the member for Kings—Hants was among those Liberal MPs banging on the door, begging the Prime Minister to relent on his carbon tax.

The Prime Minister, shaking on the ground, finally agreed to relent. Out he walked to an unannounced, unscheduled press conference, without any written materials. It was not even in his itinerary moments earlier. He announced that he would put in a temporary three-year pause, but just for some people, in regions where his poll numbers were plummeting and his caucus was revolting. There is now that temporary pause on the carbon tax, a carve-out.

His environment minister said there would be no more carve-outs. There already have been. For example, there is no carbon tax

on the industrial sector in Canada. It has a carve-out. There is no carbon tax on large cement plants or concrete factories—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Jonquière is rising on a point of order.

[Translation]

Mr. Mario Simard: Madam Speaker, I do not know if there is a problem with the interpretation, but this is very confusing. The member is talking about a documentary and a carbon tax that does not apply. I do not know whether it is a problem with the interpretation, but perhaps the Leader of the Opposition could speak a little more slowly. It is difficult for the francophones to understand what he is talking about.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, this is not a language issue. It is just that the Bloc Québécois does not understand common sense. That is the problem.

[English]

Mr. Kody Blois: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, can the member for Carleton tell us if he will be continuing, so I can ask my question when he actually has a chance to re-engage on this?

[Translation]

Mr. Mario Simard: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I would ask for the unanimous consent of the House to let the leader of the official opposition finish this wonderful speech, which is teaching us such great and marvellous things.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Does the hon. member have unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: No.

[English]

Mr. Scot Davidson: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I truly believe if you ask again, people would be so excited to hear the end of the story from the member for Kings—Hants.

Some hon. members: No.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

CANADIAN AVIATION REGULATIONS

The House resumed from October 25 consideration of the motion.

Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am glad to rise on Motion No. 96.

I would not mind ceding my time to the hon. Leader of the Opposition so I could hear him speak more about the fall economic statement, but we are in Private Members' Business, and I do need to speak to this.

The last time I spoke to this, I spoke to the goodwill and good nature of what this motion represents. I also mentioned I met with the International Association of Fire Fighters. This is an issue. It is an issue that needs to be addressed, but what I spoke about is the need to get this to committee, which is how we make decisions around this place.

Private Members' Business, even with a motion as good-natured and as good willed as this, really does not have the effect or authority that committee business would have. What I mean by that is that we would get everybody in. The committee could, through its work, have stakeholders come in, including the International Association of Fire Fighters, the Canadian Airports Council and the International Civil Aviation Organization so we could all get as much information as we could to make an informed decision, not only on the status of current firefighting capabilities at airports, and how that relates to safety and other issues, but also on what the impact of that would be on costs.

A critical component to this is getting all sides of this issue to the committee table and having a proper and informed debate with lots of opportunities to ask questions and get answers. This is a critical component to where we want to go with this.

In fact, yesterday at the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, our shadow minister for transport, the hon. member for Chilliwack—Hope, presented a motion to committee to study this very issue. I will read into the record what his motion proposes.

He moved:

That the committee undertake a study on Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting at Airports and Aerodromes (Canadian Aviation Regulations, Section 303) allocating a minimum of three meetings to this study to hear from witnesses that include the International Association of Firefighters, the Canadian Airports Council and other interested parties, and that the Committee report its findings to the House.

That would be the proper format and venue for this issue to be studied. The member for Chilliwack—Hope is proposing to committee that we have up to three meetings and invite all of the stakeholders in, including the IFF, of which I am a former member, and the Airports Council. I would suggest having the International Civil Aviation Organization come in to talk about safety. We could have Transport Canada at that meeting. We could have government officials at those meetings to really properly vet this out and hear from all sides and, therefore, make an informed decisions.

Private Members' Business is an opportunity for members to propose legislation and propose motions. While I certainly see the value in what the member is proposing in his motion, it requires study. I do not think one would find an argument from the International Association of Fire Fighters, the Airports Council or other stakeholders such as the International Civil Aviation Organization that this issue needs to be properly studied.

I know the International Association of Fire Fighters has done a study on this. At committee, it could come in front of committee to argue its points. We would then have committee members write a report that would come back to Parliament to be endorsed by Parliament in its entirety. Only then, when all of the stakeholders have been to the table and all of that information has been proposed, and a report has been written by our eminently qualified analysts, could

Private Members' Business

a suggestion of this magnitude and recommendations of this magnitude be made, knowing all of the facts.

While I appreciate and respect the work the International Association of Fire Fighters has done on this, we do need to hear from others and hear about the impact this is going to have on not only service but also costs. We have talked about that.

• (1745)

I know there is a number floating around that it could work out to a few dollars per airline ticket as a surcharge, and I would submit we may even have the airlines come in to talk about the impact that might have. I know there have been recent reports through the UN and International Civil Aviation Organization that suggest that safety at Canada's airports is not as robust as it should be. Perhaps we could have the authors of those reports come to committee as well.

I do think it does require a more fulsome study, other than just passing a motion here in the House of Commons. Yesterday, the member for Chilliwack—Hope proposed a motion at the transport committee. I hope every single member of the transport committee would look at that motion and understand what the intent is. It is to have everybody come in, talk about this and provide their input, and then have that committee issue a report to Parliament, which we could debate in a more fulsome manner.

Sometimes, through private members' business, we see a lot of different motions come forward. If we want something that is going to have some teeth, if we want something that is truly going to put forward the safety issues that the firefighters have identified, then we need a committee to study this further and bring all these parties to the table.

I appreciate the work everybody has done.

• (1750)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Louise Chabot (Thérèse-De Blainville, BQ): Madam Speaker, we are considering Motion No. 96 today because there are some very significant shortfalls in Canada's firefighting regulations. I would like to name two of them, which are cited in the motion.

The regulations fail “to specify rescue as a required function of airport fire fighters”. The regulations require “only that fire fighters must reach the mid-point of the furthest runway in three minutes rather than all points on operational runways within that time period”.

The motion is clear.

[I]n the opinion of the House, the government should, without delay, ensure that the Canadian Aviation Regulations reflect airport rescue and firefighting standards published by the International Civil Aviation Organization, specifically by

(i) giving fire fighters at Canada's major airports the mandate and resources necessary to reach the site of a fire or mishap anywhere on an operational runway in three minutes or less,

Private Members' Business

- (ii) specifying that a required function of fire fighters be the rescue of passengers.

It is about the recognition of rescue.

This is an important motion. We are in the second hour, and this motion will have to be voted on. The important thing to remember is that we must act without delay to resolve these situations and comply with standards.

It is too bad that the parliamentary rules do not allow us to acknowledge the presence and birthday of Alexandre Bertrand from the Aéroports de Montréal Fire Service, who is here with us in the House today.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I am sorry, but I must remind the hon. member that we cannot mention the presence of other people in the House.

Ms. Louise Chabot: Madam Speaker, I broke the rules. I wanted to acknowledge him because the Aéroports de Montréal Fire Service recognizes in this motion a unanimous desire to modernize the Canadian aviation regulations. It is urgent. They say this is a sincere and shared desire to improve safety for both firefighters and passengers. I also want to acknowledge my colleague from Mirabel for his work on this file and for his exemplary representation in a horrific tragedy that unfolded at the Mirabel airport. I think it is high time the federal government aligned the Canadian aviation regulations with international standards when it comes to rescue and firefighting at airports.

Yes, the motion reiterates the International Association of Fire Fighters' demand. Their position is based on ICAO standards, which recommend that all points on airport grounds be reachable within three minutes. The motion would also authorize intervention right in an aircraft, which is not currently allowed. Like a tragedy, this motion shows passengers and the public just how out of date the standards are and the extent to which existing rules in Canadian airports are unsafe and not in compliance with the regulations. The Montreal airport firefighters made that abundantly clear. It is time to take action.

The International Civil Aviation Organization, ICAO, is a United Nations agency that enables member states to co-operate on international civil aviation matters. ICAO's head office is in Montreal, Quebec. The organization really puts Quebec on the map. This is interesting because, as the organization's headquarters, Montreal should be a model of air transportation safety, not an example of obsolete federal regulations. Fire fighting services are key to an airport's safety program. An airport is only as good as its focus on safety.

According to the Aéroports de Montréal firefighting unit, three minutes is how long a plane can withstand a fire before it melts the fuselage and spreads from one end to the other on the inside. At the moment, regulations require airport firefighters to reach the middle of the furthest runway within three minutes. Clearly, this cannot work. If the core mission is to save lives and ensure safety, we are far from achieving that goal. It is high time that things changed. Just imagine for a moment being a passenger. Many of us in the House have to travel by air regularly. Let us imagine that our plane is on fire. What do we expect? We expect to be rescued immediately

and kept safe. That is also what firefighters want. That is what they are supposed to do.

It is unconscionable that firefighters at an airport like Montreal's cannot perform the initial rescue on board an aircraft. This is currently the case under federal regulations. There is no valid reason why firefighters at major Canadian airports should not be responsible for performing this rescue. I would go even further in this debate. I would say that it is a problem that relates to recognizing the work of airport firefighters, a problem recognizing that firefighters have the skills, the qualifications and the mission to do their job. I would say they are heroes. The Bloc Québécois will certainly support this motion because it is time to modernize Canada's aviation regulations, which date back to 1996.

• (1755)

The regulations have not been reviewed in 30 years. We should not have yet another example of federal regulations—because there are other situations where regulations have not been reviewed in other fields for many years—where outdated rules from a long-gone era are still being used and fail to support the vital security and rescue mission we have at our airports.

I think the time has come to listen to the firefighters. The regulatory amendments they want are simple and, above all, essential. It is high time we took action to improve everyone's safety.

Something is wrong when firefighters have to fight for this. Hours and hours are spent on ensuring that the regulations are followed. Hours are spent on promoting accepted safety rules. Many situations are unsafe. It takes a lot of reading. They are unsafe in terms of the number of personnel who seriously fail to meet mission requirements, and in terms of equipment and lack of training. It comes down to a failure to recognize this work. This situation absolutely must be corrected. It is clear that more vehicles, more response force provisions, more buildings to accommodate vehicles and, above all, more firefighters will be needed to respond to disasters and meet current needs.

In conclusion, I think that there are many arguments in favour of acting efficiently and effectively. It is great that a committee decided to move a motion to study the issue more thoroughly, but there needs to be action.

Madam Speaker, there have been consultations among the parties and if you seek it I believe you will find unanimous consent for me to table, in both official languages, the following document: a report on the unsafe situations at the Montreal airports. This document was produced by the Aéroports de Montréal Fire Service.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: No.

Private Members' Business

[English]

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to be rising today to give my thoughts on Motion No. 96, which was introduced by a fellow British Columbian, the member for Fleetwood—Port Kells. I would like to thank him, because it is not every day that the House of Commons gets to take a deep dive into the Canadian aviation regulations. I say that as someone who, like many members of Parliament, has spent many hours of my life in this job on an airplane.

Actually, I rarely give any thought to this particular issue, because I think that we in Canada enjoy one of the safest airline usages in the world. I have a lot of trust in the ground crew, the pilots and everyone who is involved in the safe operation of an aircraft. As my riding is about as far away from Ottawa as one can get, it allows me to fly on those aircraft without a second thought, but this is an interesting topic.

For members back at home who are watching this debate, essentially what the House of Commons is looking at is a motion brought forward by the member for Fleetwood—Port Kells that is asking the House of Commons to recognize that there are some significant shortfalls in the Canadian aviation regulations, and to recognize, essentially, that there is a requirement that firefighters at an airport must reach the midpoint of the furthest runway in three minutes rather than all points on operational runways within that time period. In recognizing that some of these facts exist, the motion is asking for the opinion of the House, that the Canadian aviation regulations should reflect airport rescue and firefighting standards published by the International Civil Aviation Organization, specifically by giving firefighters at our major airports the mandate and resources necessary to reach the site of a fire anywhere on an operational runway in three minutes or less, and specifying that the required function of those firefighters be the rescue of passengers.

I have had a fair amount of experience as a member of Parliament with the Canadian aviation regulations, but in other areas. Those regulations exist under the authority of the Aeronautics Act, and if one looks at the regulatory powers conferred to the minister in the Aeronautics Act, we can see that the minister, or the Governor in Council, has been given quite a wide latitude.

I represent a fairly rural riding that has a fairly big chunk of airspace that has been designated for flight training. Many of my constituents are now quite concerned, because that area is not as rural as it once was. We have more and more people moving to Vancouver Island and previously empty farm fields now have neighbourhoods starting to develop in them. People are becoming quite concerned that the airspace in this one particular area, over the Westholme and Chemainus areas of my riding, is being buzzed in the summer constantly by low-flying planes practising flight manoeuvres. What that allowed me to do, as their member of Parliament, was to take a deep dive into the Canadian aviation regulations and to also look at the Aeronautics Act and become somewhat familiar with the wide-ranging powers that the minister has. Essentially, what I hope is the result of the passage of Motion No. 96 is that the minister will take it upon himself to finally act where previous governments have not, because this has been a long-standing issue.

The International Association of Fire Fighters has concluded that there are significant regulatory shortfalls. A study by that association found that regulations regarding emergency response at airports do not meet international standards set out by the International Civil Aviation Organization in terms of making rescue a required function of airport firefighters or mandating a three-minute response time to reach all points on the runway. Essentially, this is a motion that is aiming to make sure that those regulations meet that standard.

• (1800)

This motion was likely influenced by the IAFF's legislative conference, which happened in March of this year. It definitely did advocate for those changes. I am proud to say that our NDP leader, the member for Burnaby South, spoke at that conference. He expressed his support for the IAFF's position and for improving, generally, Canada's aviation regulations to meet international standards.

I am here to say that the NDP supports this motion because we firmly believe that the safety of passengers should always be of paramount importance in the event of an emergency at Canadian airports. We should meet international standards for safety and should make sure the government is providing our firefighters the proper resources to accomplish that goal. Something we always have to keep in mind when we are changing these regulations and requiring firefighters to take on new duties is that they must always have the proper resources and equipment to fulfill the tasks we ask them to do. For firefighters who are willing at a moment's notice to put their life on the line for others, I think this is of paramount importance.

I respect the right of every member of this House to bring forward a motion or a private member's bill of their choice, but I find this interesting because regulations, especially when we look at the area covered under the Aeronautics Act, can be gazetted quite quickly. I wonder why we have to resort to a motion to call on the government to do something that I think there is a lot of evidence for it to have already done a long time ago.

I think it is a noble motion, but the changes being called for are far too late and should have been adopted decades ago. Those in the industry, especially the International Association of Fire Fighters and pilot unions, have been raising the alarm on these deficiencies in the Canadian aviation regulations since their inception in 1996.

We know the Senate has looked at this issue. It made a report in 1999. The amount of time that has passed, it now being 2023, goes to show that successive Liberal and Conservative governments in that time really dropped the ball on what I think is a rather simple and quick fix. The consequence of this is that our country, with a very valued and high safety threshold, is being left behind by the rest of the world when it comes to response times. We owe it to Canadians to really step up to the plate and make sure that those standards are fully included.

Private Members' Business

We know that Canadian and U.S. militaries have adopted these standards, but Canadian commercial aviation continues to lag behind. Why is this particularly important? According to the Transportation Safety Board, 56% of airplane accidents happen during the landing phase and 24% occur during takeoff, so being in the air at cruising altitude is not when most accidents happen. Rather, it is usually when the pilot puts on autopilot and the plane flies itself. When pilots are making the approach to land or are taking off, the stats show that is the most dangerous time for both the aircrew and the passengers on board. Accidents are always happening at airports, and this important change to the Canadian aviation regulations is needed so we have faster response times, so firefighters are well aware of the mandate they are expected to follow and, most importantly, so they have the equipment necessary to do their job.

I know I am coming rapidly to the end of my time on this. I would like to end by saying that Canadian air passengers should be able to count on fire service in the event of a fire on an aircraft. I think the firefighters themselves have voiced their strong support for this change in the measure.

I think this is a good motion for raising public awareness on this issue. I would like to commend the member for Fleetwood—Port Kells for bringing it forward. I hope that not only through this motion but through the very fact that he gets to share a caucus meeting with the Minister of Transport every single Wednesday, we will see this very noble gesture turn quickly into actual action.

• (1805)

Mr. Chris Lewis (Essex, CPC): Madam Speaker, as always, it is an honour to stand in this House to represent the amazing folks of Essex. I always give, and will always continue to give, all honour to my lord and saviour, to God, for the opportunity to do this. Without him, nothing is possible. I want to say to the folks of Essex, if it is the last time I get a chance to speak in the House before Christmas, merry Christmas to them.

One week from today will be a pretty monumental day. It will be 25 years of marriage to the love of my life, an amazing woman named Allison. I am kind of surprised she is still with me. She is one of the most remarkable human beings on this earth, someone who cares deeply. She has stood by me through thick and thin. She is an amazing mother of three and a remarkable grandma to Levi, our grandson, who is two and a half years old. Although, in this House, we cannot acknowledge anyone in the gallery, if she were here, I would say that I love her dearly and that I need her now more than ever. I would say that reaching 25 years is pretty darn special. Thank you, Madam Speaker, for allowing me that time.

Any time we give a politician who loves labour and loves firefighting an opportunity to speak about labour and firefighting, it can be kind of dangerous. However, I think it is a pretty awesome and unique opportunity here for me tonight. I am going to speak to Motion No. 96.

I served in the fire department in Kingsville for seven and a half years, from 1998 to 2005. It was one of the most critical and unique times in my life. It brings me back to one of the most unfortunate events that I had to go to. It was a plane crash off Pelee Island. There were eight souls and two dogs coming over from a pheasant trip. The plane went down in the icy waters of Lake Erie shortly af-

ter takeoff, and they were lost. I was part of the recovery rescue team.

This motion speaks to a lot of opportunities that we have, but it does not really get down to the granular issues of each and every airport. I think about the Windsor airport. Quite frankly, I do not believe that this motion would encapsulate the Windsor airport, which is right next to an incredibly busy airport, the Detroit airport. It occupies much of the same space as the Detroit Metropolitan Airport.

About a month and a half or two months ago, I visited the control tower in Windsor. I listened to stories about the difficulties of talking to and working with the Detroit Metropolitan Airport control towers. I listened to how the control space, the area around Windsor, is much different than the areas around many other airports across the country.

Because of that conversation, I am now realizing that Motion No. 96 may fall slightly short of exactly what needs to get done. I want to thank the member for introducing Motion No. 96. I think its intentions are correct, but I believe it needs to be studied at committee.

• (1810)

About a month and a half ago, maybe a couple of months ago, I had an opportunity to speak with the firefighters from the Ottawa airport. They were in my office at the Justice Building. We had a really good conversation. I said to them at the end of the conversation, and it is easy to speak to firefighters when one was a firefighter, that I would bring this to the transport committee, have a conversation at the transport committee and figure out the best way to move forward with this dialogue around potential legislation, which is what this should be, in my opinion. They were, I would suggest, ecstatic, to say the very least.

We could talk about the cost of this, easily. We are hearing anywhere from \$1.50 to \$2.50 per plane ticket, per individual, for each airport. We also understand, and I believe it to be true, that any airport that does not fly 180,000 flights per year does not fall under this motion. Just as a firefighter is a firefighter is a firefighter, a human being is a human being is a human being.

Somebody flying out of Toronto or Vancouver or Montreal should be the same as those flying out of the ones that are discussed at committee, whether they are at the Windsor airport, the Pelee Island Airport or the Greater Sudbury Airport. It is really vital that we bring this to committee to be studied.

I sit on the transport committee, and last night at transport committee, my colleague from Chilliwack—Hope introduced a notice of motion. I would like to read that into the record. He moved:

That the committee undertake a comparative study on the cost of federal taxes, fees and regulations on the price of airline tickets in Canada and the United States, allocating a minimum of 4 meetings to this study to hear from witnesses from Canadian and US airlines, Canadian and US airport authorities, and other interested parties, and that the Committee report its findings to the House.

There was debate on this last night. I think this is the route the House needs to take.

Private Members' Business

I suppose, if we were to take it one step further, we would talk about labour and training. As I criss-cross the country, from coast to coast to coast, I continue to hear that people are struggling to find labour. They are struggling to find skilled trades. In my own municipality, in my own riding, I know how hard it is to get firefighters these days. Back when I was lucky enough to become a firefighter, it took a long time. Now they are screaming for firefighters. I am not so sure, without studying this at length, even if this motion were to pass, we would have the firefighters to fulfill these roles.

It has only ever been about service for me. It has only ever, and will only ever, be about service. I believe the service we are doing in the House tonight discussing Motion No. 96, and I thank the hon. member for introducing this motion, we are doing not only for the passengers of airlines but also for the firefighters. I want to be part of the solution, not part of the problem. I would strongly suggest that this is sent to transport committee, and that we can come up with a solution that works for the passengers, the firefighters and all Canadians.

• (1815)

[Translation]

Mr. Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Madam Speaker, anyone who has experienced a major fire knows how vital firefighters' expertise and specialized equipment are in situations where, often, every second counts. That is why it is not surprising to learn that, according to a 2021 Leger poll, firefighter is the most trustworthy profession, trusted by 95% of respondents. Politicians are trusted by only 31% of the population.

All of the members here will agree that all air travellers deserve safe landings at Quebec and Canadian airports. However, according to the Union of Canadian Transportation Employees, over the years, Transport Canada has allowed airports to reduce service standards to the bare minimum. In some instances, there are only one or two firefighters on call while planes carrying hundreds of passengers are taking off and landing. Transport Canada has been warned about this many times over the years. Unfortunately, those warnings have gone unheeded until now. When the Union of Canadian Transportation Employees shared its concerns about the problems with the regulations that impact airport firefighting, Transport Canada advised that their primary concern is the financial viability of the airports.

The International Association of Fire Fighters, which represents over 23,000 professional firefighters, concluded that significant regulatory shortfalls concerning emergency responses at Canada's major airports are needlessly putting the safety of the flying public at risk. Of note is the fact that the regulations fail to specify rescue as a required function of airport firefighters.

The Canadian aviation regulations, or CARs, require only that firefighters reach the midpoint of the furthest runway in three minutes rather than all points on operational runways within that time period. That means the response time for an accident at the end of a runway will be a lot longer. The CARs do not take into account certain rescue and firefighting standards published by the International Civil Aviation Organization, or ICAO, a United Nations agency that helps 193 countries.

ICAO is the global forum of states for international civil aviation. It develops policies and standards, undertakes compliance audits, and performs studies and analyses. It provides assistance and builds aviation capacity through the co-operation of its member states and stakeholders. Its head office is in Montreal. According to ICAO, firefighters at major Canadian airports should have the resources they need, as has already been mentioned, to reach the site of a fire or mishap anywhere on a runway in three minutes or less. As my colleague said earlier, three minutes is how long a plane can withstand flames before they melt the fuselage and spread everywhere, from one end to the other. Let us not forget that between 12,000 and 220,000 litres of fuel are stored under passengers' feet. As is the case when there is a fire in a building, the main cause of death in an aircraft fire is smoke. Airport firefighters must be able to interact directly on board the aircraft in the event of a fire.

The Bloc Québécois supports this motion because the fire safety standards set out in the CARs have not undergone a major review since the regulations took effect in 1996. We are asking Transport Canada to review the CARs, and we are supporting the demands of firefighters in order to prevent a tragedy from occurring in one of our airports. The current regulations do not specify that firefighters have a duty to attempt a rescue if a fire breaks out inside a plane. They are only obligated to extinguish the flames with water or foam in hopes that the passengers will be able to evacuate the aircraft themselves.

• (1820)

It is frankly absurd. They are supposed to wait for firefighters from neighbouring municipalities to arrive, yet municipal firefighters do not have the response times or training required to respond quickly and effectively to aircraft emergencies in restricted areas. Equipment, training and travel time requirements increase the risk of tragedy.

Moreover, simply hosing down the area, as currently prescribed, no longer meets ICAO standards. Firefighters should have the option of intervening directly, when the situation allows, obviously, by climbing aboard the aircraft to rescue passengers in difficulty and extinguishing fires at the source.

By adapting the CARs to meet ICAO standards, we will ensure that all airports meet the highest safety standards. I should note that, at present, there is nothing to stop an airport from adopting higher standards than the CARs. The result is uneven fire safety standards from one airport to the next.

Private Members' Business

For example, according to the Montreal airport, firefighters must be able to respond in less than three minutes, regardless of the location of the incident on airport property. Obviously, covering all runways in less than three minutes means more vehicles, more buildings and, of course, more firefighters, which means more resources. ICAO indicates that the regulations must establish a minimum number of firefighters on duty based on airport size, so that the travel time requirement can be met at all times.

The International Association of Fire Fighters points out that firefighters are required to carry out regular inspection and response tasks that take up part of their team's time. That is why it is imperative to properly assess firefighting personnel needs.

For example, the Montreal and Mirabel airports each have their own fire station in the immediate vicinity of the runways. Each fire station has four teams of firefighters who work in shifts to provide 24-7 protection. The Aéroports de Montréal fire service has its own training centre for conducting aircraft fire simulations and for training firefighters to respond to situations involving aircraft that contain highly explosive or flammable fuel.

According to the Aéroports de Montréal firefighting unit, the additional costs of bringing the CARs up to ICAO standards could be covered by a surcharge of less than a \$1 per passenger. A dollar per passenger is a small price to pay for safety.

Additional resources are justified because even though aviation accidents are rare, the amount of fuel and the large number of passengers that the planes carry call for higher safety standards to be imposed. It can mean the difference between a terrible tragedy and an impressive rescue.

We really need to take action and adopt this motion. We need to move quickly. It is a matter of not only recognizing firefighters, but also allowing them to have the tools they need to do their job properly.

• (1825)

[English]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Fleetwood—Port Kells has his right of reply.

Mr. Ken Hardie (Fleetwood—Port Kells, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to thank all my colleagues here in the House who have spoken on Motion No. 96. The commentary has been really thoughtful and has illuminated an issue that has been hidden it seems for at least 25 years, and that is the gap between Canada's current aviation regulations and the standards set by the International Civil Aviation Organization.

Each speaker in the first round and in this hour has basically detailed the nature of those gaps in terms of response times to any point on an operational runway versus the midpoint, which is the current Canadian standard, or the lack of a mandate to rescue people from inside an aircraft, leaving firefighters officially responsible only to make sure a pathway leads from the aircraft through the flames so if anybody can actually make it out they can save themselves.

These gaps in fire crews' mandates exist officially, but for anybody watching and now all of a sudden extremely worried about

safety when one flies and particularly at an airport, it does not mean operations at the 25 to 30 Canadian airports with more than 180,000 emplaned or deplaned passengers per year fall short of one or more of the ICAO standards.

Since we first spoke to this issue, I have heard from the two airports mentioned in my opening remarks. Senior management at the Ottawa International Airport tell me its firefighters are mandated to rescue passengers from inside an aircraft. YOW management say its response team is crewed, trained and equipped to do this. Some fire chiefs I have spoken to doubt municipal firefighters have the training to conduct these rescues, yet the International Association of Fire Fighters says that where airport crews are not trained, it is expected that municipal responders will fulfill this function.

YOW management here in Ottawa tell me that, in fact, its firefighters train municipal responders. Airport management wants us to know that other safety measures have been taken, some of which are unique, such as grooving the runway to prevent a landing aircraft from hydroplaning in wet conditions.

YVR in metro Vancouver has firefighting crews staffed, trained and equipped to rescue those inside a burning aircraft. The response time meets Canadian aviation regulations but not ICAO's. That said, YVR dedicated \$5 million to double the number of firefighters and has brought two new state-of-the-art aircraft fire rescue trucks into its fleet at an additional \$6.6 million investment.

It is quite likely the safety measures in place at other highest volume airports maybe follow the same pattern. They meet and sometimes exceed Canada's regulations, but I suspect on the whole there is great inconsistency across the country.

We cannot overlook the financial limitations some of our busiest airports face, and that is something we need to think about. There is one note in the 2003 Regulatory Impact Analysis Statement regarding the definition of "rescue" that should raise red flags for everybody in this House. It established a policy to ensure that the status quo in 2003 be maintained when it came to the types of activities included as aircraft rescue and firefighting services without imposing any additional obligations or costs.

It would not be unreasonable for the average Canadian air traveller to conclude at the very least that financial implications would be a factor in setting rescue standards. In approving Motion No. 96, we would be challenging this. We would be reinforcing the principle that if something is mandated, there would be an obligation to get it done.

By raising the question about the adequacy of and compliance with the Canadian aviation regulations, we would be opening the way for a more fulsome examination of gaps that may exist between best practices and the actual firefighting and rescue capabilities at Canada's busiest airports.

In closing, we should not doubt for a moment that airport managers and their firefighting crews adopt safety as their top priority. The consequences of Motion No. 96 and our debates should be a closer examination of the issues we have raised, and perhaps through a study at our Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, a study that leads to findings and recommendations that would reinforce public confidence in the exemplary safety record of air travel in Canada. I served on TRAN from 2015 to 2019 and this issue never came up. Now it has and now it is our obligation to see it resolved.

• (1830)

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

[Translation]

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

• (1835)

[English]

Mr. Ken Hardie: Madam Speaker, I would request a recorded division.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Pursuant to Standing Order 93, the division stands deferred until Wednesday, December 13, at the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

[English]

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, the government is spending an enormous amount of money on subsidies to various manufacturers involved in batteries here in Canada. Over \$40 billion is being spent on this particular business subsidy program. This subsidy plan will cost every single Canadian family about \$3,000.

Conservatives are committed to always standing up for workers, which is why we have asked for clarity from the government about whether there are protections for Canadian workers in the subsidy contracts that it signed with companies. Will Canadian workers actually benefit from this enormous outlay of taxpayer money? It is \$3,000 per Canadian family; Canadians would like to know, and they would like to know how much workers are going to benefit.

Adjournment Proceedings

The parliamentary secretary is clearly eager to respond. He is saying that they are going to benefit "lots".

What we have asked for, quite simply, is that the government show its work and release these contracts to the public, so we can know the impacts. The particular genesis for this demand is that we have found out that the companies involved are actually going to be hiring a large number of foreign replacement workers. Therefore, over \$40 billion in Canadian taxpayer money—

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, the parliamentary secretary seems to think this is funny. It is not.

Over \$40 billion in taxpayer money is being used not to employ Canadian workers but to hire foreign replacement workers, who are going to come to Canada to do the job. That is concerning, obviously. Did these contracts include protections for Canadian workers or guarantees for jobs for Canadians? We would like to know. If the government left that out and just said it was going to give tens of billions of dollars to these companies, and it does not know whether or how much Canadians are going to benefit, then that would be seriously troubling. This is why, again, we have insisted that we want to actually see these contracts.

Consistently, Liberals have been filibustering in the government operations committee in order to block the release of the contracts. For a while, we had all opposition parties, including Conservative, Bloc and NDP, standing together and prepared to vote in favour of ordering the production of the contracts. The Liberals were against it. They were filibustering to block their release.

Then, tragically, we had a flip-flop from the NDP. Rather than standing with workers, as they like to say they do, the New Democrats betrayed workers. They said that they do not actually need to see the contracts anymore. It is a shameful betrayal of workers from the NDP, under pressure from its colleagues in the costly and corrupt cover-up coalition. The Liberals put a bit of pressure on their friends in the NDP with a little filibustering. It was not even a very long filibuster, and I would know. Simply because of a little bit of pressure, the New Democrats buckled and betrayed workers. The only party that will stand consistently with workers in the House of Commons is the Conservative Party.

I hope we get a direct answer to my question for the parliamentary secretary, rather than more of the unrelated bluster that we often get from the government. What did the government offer the NDP members, its colleagues in the costly cover-up coalition, to get them to change their position, flip-flop and betray workers? Moreover, why will the government not release the contracts?

Adjournment Proceedings

• (1840)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I suspect that it has a lot to do with common sense. The Conservatives like to talk about common sense, and I suspect that the NDP, upon reflection and applying common sense, came to the conclusion that what the Conservative and Bloc coalition was proposing was maybe not in the best interests of workers. I think that is a possible scenario.

When the member talks about releasing contracts or the details, I think of the Volkswagen contract. As a government, we recognize the green transition. We recognize things like climate change. We recognize that in order to provide good-quality middle-class jobs, we have to be prepared to invest in certain industries in a very real and tangible way.

Ironically, we are not the only government that has made this decision, because we also see Progressive Conservative Doug Ford entering into agreements and using taxpayer dollars, as we have, to support and enhance an industry that is going to provide good middle-class careers and jobs well into the future for future generations of Canadians, something the Conservative Party opposes. I wonder if the member opposite has asked his good friend Doug Ford, the Premier of Ontario, the Progressive Conservative, for a copy of the agreement. If not, why not? I wonder if Doug Ford has provided that information to the member opposite.

I know the Conservatives are trying to find some way to be critical of everything and anything the Government of Canada does at no expense, even if it means doing the opposite of what the member just finished talking about. When he talks about workers and the best interests of workers, seriously, at the end of the day, whether it is Stellantis or Volkswagen, we are talking about thousands of jobs. How can he possibly imagine that this is not in the best interests not only of those direct jobs but of the tens of thousands of other indirect jobs?

He is concerned that the Progressive Conservative Province of Ontario and the Liberals at the national level have worked together with private industry in order to secure good, solid middle-class jobs for future generations of Canadians. The federal Conservative Party says “whoa”. That is true to form in the sense that the national Conservative Party today, as I said, is the MAGA right. We see an extreme right that believes government does not have a role to play in things of this nature. The party does not believe that government should be assisting or subsidizing, or whatever MAGA terms it wants to come up with.

We on this side of the House recognize that the climate changes, that climate change is real today and that there is a responsibility of government to think ahead. That is why we have good, sound policies to support a transition that is going to see more green types of jobs, which will attract, I would suggest, even more jobs in the future. This makes Canada well placed in the future on this issue.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, as predicted, the parliamentary secretary did not even come close to attempting to answer the question. He said this is a great deal, these are great contracts and this is a great investment. Our question is quite clear: What is in these contracts for workers? How we can know what is in these

contracts for workers is if the contracts are released. If the government thinks it has done great work, release the contracts; show the work.

What the Liberals are saying is that they did great work on these contracts and there are great opportunities for workers, but they cannot show us them. They cannot show people what is going to be in there or not in there for workers. That is, may I say, rather suspicious, which is why Conservatives are saying that we want to see what is in these contracts for workers. Release the contracts.

The Liberals have been consistent. I will give them that. They are always in favour of cover-ups. They never want the public to see anything. However, the NDP has flip-flopped and betrayed workers. Why the flip-flop—

• (1845)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, the member wants to know what is in the contract. What is in the contract is the opportunity for an industry to excel, to allow Canada to have a major footprint in the production of batteries for electric vehicles. Those on the other side need to wake up and, as many would say, smell the coffee, though I am not a coffee drinker myself.

I can tell members that a lot of good things are going to come out of this agreement between the provincial Conservative government of Ontario and the federal government in Ottawa. By having the agreement with companies such as Stellantis and Volkswagen, we are creating tens of thousands of direct jobs. There will be even more indirect jobs. The footprint we are putting in place is going to speak volumes in the potential growth of the industry.

CARBON PRICING

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC): Madam Speaker, the Liberal government is out of touch, and it is Canadians who are paying the price. That is exactly what we are seeing with the carbon tax. It has a negative effect on everyone in different ways.

I would like to focus on the farmers who grow the food. They are seeing some of the worst impacts of the carbon tax. As time goes on, farmers and ranchers face higher input costs, including on the fuel they need to use. They are getting crushed by rising fuel costs and are caught in the unfair position of absorbing costs at each and every stage of production.

That is why Conservatives brought forward a common-sense solution that we thought would receive the support of all parties. Bill C-234 would provide an exemption from the carbon tax on all on farm fuels. Everyone supported the idea and voted with us, except for the majority of the Liberal caucus, of course. Most of them voted against it, but fortunately for Canadian farmers, Bill C-234 passed in the House of Commons anyway. That was back in the spring. Eventually, the bill reached third reading in the Senate.

However, it seems that the Liberals cannot accept that their coalition partner, the NDP, supported our bill. At the last opportunity, some senators appointed by the Prime Minister have been trying to shut it down. There have been delays in passing it, and more recently, amendments have basically gutted Bill C-234. This is right in line with the Liberal approach to this bill. If they cannot stop it from passing, they want to at least make sure it will provide the least amount of benefit possible to the farmers who grow our food. We know that the activist environment minister does not want any more carve-outs to his carbon tax, no matter how much it hurts Canadians.

I originally called on the Prime Minister to tell his appointed senators to stop the blocking of Bill C-234. It seemed likely that the environment minister or the Minister of Agriculture might respond in question period, but instead, it was the Minister of Innovation, who I know is a very influential member in his caucus and cabinet. There are rumours that he might want to be the next leader soon. I hope that he will use his influence to exempt farm fuels from the carbon tax or, better yet, axe the tax altogether. I would even suggest that, if he includes that in his leadership race bid when the time comes, he might be the one to come out on top.

The situation with Bill C-234 has changed in some ways, but there is still a chance to pass it as the House of Commons intended. That needs to happen so that we can provide relief to our farmers and make a difference for Canadian families. It is not too late to fix the problem, if the Liberals really want to do that, but that is the question: What do they really want to do?

Week after week, I have been bringing up different examples of how much the carbon tax is crushing farmers and ranchers, but the Liberals are not going to support giving them some relief if they do not want it to happen. Is that part of the plan? Are they trying to make farming unaffordable, especially for the up-and-coming new generation of farmers? I hear about this regularly in my office, when I host town halls or when I am out buying groceries. It is amazing how many people talk to me about the situation with their families, with their sons or daughters wanting to take over the farm and what that is going to look like, or what the costs of that are going to be, especially after eight years of the Liberal government. The fact is that everything is costing more and more.

Is there a future for young producers? That is at the heart of this. That is at the heart of why Conservatives want to pass Bill C-234. It is to get a carve-out for all on farm fuels, for both the farmers of the present and the farmers of the future. I am wondering if the parliamentary secretary could confirm his support to repeal the carbon tax for all on farm fuels, as Bill C-234 was originally written and intended to do.

• (1850)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would tell the member that the Government of Canada has supported and continues to support our farmers in many, many different ways.

The member started off his comments by saying that the Liberal Party is out of touch. Nothing could be farther from the truth. If the member and the Conservative Party would only take a look in the

Adjournment Proceedings

mirror, we could talk about being out of touch. Listen to what Canadians have to say about things like the climate and our environment. Listen to what it is they have to say about the type of behaviour they are seeing more and more of every day. What we are witnessing inside the chamber, which I talked about earlier this morning, is a pattern coming out of the Conservative Party. The member himself spoke about it, the issue of deception.

For example, the leader of the Conservative Party has been travelling the country, telling Canadians that he is going to get rid of the price on pollution, thereby making life more affordable. That is just not true. It would not make life more affordable. In fact, it would put less disposable income into the pockets of a vast majority of Canadians. On the one hand, he is saying that it would make life more affordable, but on the other hand, in reality, it would not. What does that remind people of? It reminds me of Donald Trump and MAGA politics that are creeping in from the south, using the leader of the official opposition's office in order to be able to bring in that style of politics.

The member opposite just stood up and is saying that regular gas and diesel were impacted by the carbon tax for farmers. Is it applied?

An hon. member: In some cases it is.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, they do not qualify that, because that does not fit their agenda. That is what I mean in terms of misleading. What we have witnessed is a Conservative Party today that is more concerned about bumper-sticker politics than it is about good, solid, public policy.

Just over two years ago, every member, including the one who just spoke, actually had an election platform that said that, if they were elected, they would have a price on pollution. They said it in each of the 338 constituencies from coast to coast to coast. A new leader came in, and they did a flip-flop and started spreading misinformation. That is the type of leadership we have seen within the Conservative Party today. We got a little hint of that when the person who just finished speaking tried to give the impression that we, as a government, are not there to support farmers.

I was in opposition when Stephen Harper gave it to farmers by getting rid of the Canadian Wheat Board. Members are applauding now, but he denied them the legislative right to have a referendum on the Canadian Wheat Board. He did not think twice about getting rid of it. What about the piles of wet grain that sat on the Prairies as boats could not get into Vancouver? Where were the prairie members of Parliament then? Were they standing up for the farmers there and for the Harper government to actually stand by the laws of Canada and allow a referendum on the Canadian Wheat Board? Instead, they ditched it on their own personal political agenda. They do not stand up—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The member for Cypress Hills—Grasslands.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Madam Speaker, I can ensure people that imprisoning farmers was a Liberal idea because they simply want to have grain-marketing freedom. How absurd is that? That is the Liberal Party.

Adjournment Proceedings

Farmers have always done more for the environment than the current government would ever dream of. In fact, the parliamentary secretary admitted in his remarks that all that the carbon tax is, is an income redistribution scheme. Notice that the Liberals do not have any statistics to talk about how emissions have gone down thanks to the carbon tax. The truth is that they cannot quantify it, so the only thing they can talk about is the income redistribution scheme that the carbon tax has become.

I just want to make my final point that, again, it was farmers, not the government, who came up with zero-till technology, or just the farming practice in and of itself. It was farmers who came up with the 4R principle, and they have been practising it on their farms for the last number of decades. It was not the government's idea. Farmers have done and always will do more for the environment than the government ever will.

• (1855)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, unlike the Conservative Party, farmers recognize that climate change is real. In the rest of the world, contrary to the Conservative Party, there is a movement to have a price on pollution, whether it is Ukraine, the European Union, many American states and so forth. It is only the Conservative Party that wants to bring us back to the Stone Age. Members would think that Fred Flintstone is the leader of the Conservative Party.

At the end of the day, this is good, sound policy. The Conservatives talk about taxation, but they just do not understand it; they try to simplify it. However, at the end of the day, there is a good incentive. People will get more money net from the rebate than they will pay on the lesser amount of fossil fuels that they use, but the member does not understand that. Well, that is not my problem, it is his problem. The Conservatives can take another flip-flop—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Battle River—Crowfoot.

CARBON PRICING

Mr. Damien Kurek (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC): Madam Speaker, as always, it is an honour to be able to stand in the House to follow up on a question that I asked the Prime Minister, which fell under the agriculture file.

In my response today, I need to tell the story of a woman named Dawn who, up until recently, ran a multi-generational greenhouse called “Shirley's Greenhouse”, named after her mom. I chatted with Dawn the other day and she shared something very tragic. Due to Liberal policies, specifically the carbon tax, as well as the fact that she ran into some challenges in her life as a single mom, all of a sudden the planned resilience in her agricultural operation had evaporated following increased costs associated with the carbon tax and interest rates, both of which are a direct impact from the actions of this Liberal government. Dawn shared her tragic story with me about how, after trying to make things work as a greenhouse operator and a multi-acre vegetable crop grower, she simply could not make a go of it. She has been forced to sell, and just recently, that was finalized.

Dawn asked me to make sure that I keep fighting for farmers. She proudly told me that she did not put her logo on her trailer that she took around to farmers' markets, because she did not just pro-

mote herself. The sticker she put on her trailer and her vehicles said, “No Farmers No Food”. I could hear the emotion in Dawn's voice as she explained how the carbon tax and bad Liberal policies directly attacked her and her ability to make her operation successful, even though it was a multi-generational operation.

However, what is truly tragic is that she had another conversation with another politician. That politician was the Minister of Agriculture. In a video Zoom call, he had met with a number of farmers from across the prairies, and Dawn shared her concerns directly with him about how the carbon tax was impacting Canadians.

Now, I can get passionate in debate in this place, and there is a reason for that. Canadians like Dawn tell their stories. She described how, just days before my conversation with her this week-end, she had told her concerns to the Minister of Agriculture directly, and they fell on deaf ears.

Farmers deserve better, and what is truly tragic is that, as the Liberals are attacking farmers by their refusal to support common-sense Conservative Bill C-234, their attacks on fertilizer mandates and a whole host of other things, now the debates and discussions are ongoing about how they are going to regulate cow farts. I wish I was making this up.

As the Liberals attack agriculture, the reality is that it is Canadians who pay more. As farmers are forced to cut back, close their operations and reduce their ability to produce the world-class food that we need, it is Canadians who are forced to pay the price, and we see the direct impact of that in the cost of food.

My question is simple: Why will these Liberals not listen to farmers like Dawn—

• (1900)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would not agree with the member's conclusions; again, he tries to imply misinformation. It is just not true that the Government of Canada does not support farmers.

We can go back to the days when I was an opposition member; I just made reference to the Canadian Wheat Board, and I was on Main Street, by Portage Avenue. I can tell the member that there were hundreds of farmers out there, furious with the Stephen Harper government. They believed the government was destroying the industry and, at least in part, many of those farming industries.

We are always going to find that the Liberal government as a whole has been and continues to be exceptionally supportive of farming and rural communities. This can be found through a wide variety of measures, whether it is budgetary motions or the expansion of international trade. No government has signed off on more trade agreements than the current government has; this has enhanced all sorts of opportunities for farmers. We will find that, on agricultural products, a good percentage is actually exported outside Canada. A good example of that is the hog industry; in the province of Manitoba, that industry is doing exceptionally well. There are certain industries within our rural communities that we could give more attention to, and the government will continue to do so.

What I find somewhat sad is that the Conservative Party of Canada is trying to utilize the farming community, as they are doing with indigenous communities now, to try to win the battle of getting rid of the price on pollution. The Conservative Party needs to wake up and realize that it is only the Conservative Party of Canada that seems to want to deny that sensible approach for dealing with climate change. The world is moving towards recognizing climate change and bringing in progressive policies, such as the price on pollution.

We have to take into consideration individuals such as Dawn. When she talks about interest rates and the impact of carbon pricing, we need to listen. Where the government is in a position to take action, I believe it is doing just that. However, to use farmers such as Dawn as a political tool to get rid of the price on pollution generally is wrong.

Mr. Damien Kurek: Madam Speaker, it was Dawn who asked me to make sure that her story was told. Farmers such as Dawn are paying the price for these Liberal policies. This is not some Conservative political agenda. This is an agenda to make sure that Canadians can afford to eat, be housed and heat their homes.

Adjournment Proceedings

As that member has refused to answer Dawn's question, I would like to reference something else. A veteran shared with me a gas bill. It is a fairly straightforward thing. Many people in this place get them. In the context of the carve-out that the Liberals provided for 3% of Canadians, this constituent, a veteran on a fixed income, shared with me that his cost of gas was \$55. He lives in a rural area. The carbon tax and the GST on it was \$44.65. At a time when there is an affordability crisis—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I would like the member to consider coming out to Winnipeg North to explain why the Conservative Party is trying to say that, by getting rid of the price on pollution, life would become more affordable.

In reality, that that is misinformation; it is not true. Eighty per cent of the constituents that I represent, or more, would actually have less disposable income if the leader of the Conservative Party prevails, ignores the environment and gets rid of the price on pollution.

The hon. member talked about one or two cases, and I am sympathetic to them, but I am talking about tens of thousands of residents whom I represent. With the Conservative policy that the member is advocating, those residents would ultimately see their net disposable income go down.

● (1905)

[Translation]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 7:05 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Tuesday, December 12, 2023

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Foreign Affairs

Mr. Noormohamed 19915

Government Response to Petitions

Mr. Lamoureux 19915

Interparliamentary Delegations

Mrs. Lalonde 19915

Mr. Drouin 19915

Committees of the House

Public Safety and National Security

Mr. MacDonald 19915

Science and Research

Mr. Longfield 19915

Mr. Tochor 19915

Public Accounts

Mr. Williamson 19915

Mr. McCauley 19916

Canadian Heritage

Mr. Noormohamed 19916

Procedure and House Affairs

Ms. Chagger 19916

Petitions

Northern Residents Tax Deduction

Mr. Zimmer 19916

Firearms

Mr. Zimmer 19916

Military Chaplaincy

Mrs. Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster) 19917

Freedom of Political Expression

Mrs. Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster) 19918

Employment Insurance

Mrs. Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster) 19918

Climate Change

Ms. Blaney 19918

Expanded Polystyrene

Ms. Blaney 19918

Food Security

Mr. Gerretsen 19918

Religious Freedom

Mr. Vis 19918

Health Care Workers

Mr. Kmiec 19918

Energy Sector

Mr. Kmiec 19919

Freedom of Political Expression

Mr. Genuis 19919

Human Rights in Eritrea

Mr. Genuis 19919

Employment Insurance

Mr. Genuis 19919

Women's Shelters

Mr. Genuis 19920

Children and Families

Mr. Genuis 19920

Falun Gong

Mr. Genuis 19920

Questions on the Order Paper

Mr. Lamoureux 19920

Questions Passed as Orders for Returns

Mr. Lamoureux 19931

Points of Order

Bill C-59—Proposal to Apply Standing Order 69.1

Mr. Scheer 19937

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Canada-Ukraine Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act, 2023

Bill C-57. Report stage 19938

Speaker's Ruling

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès) 19939

Mr. Duclos (for the Minister of Export Promotion, International Trade and Economic Development) 19939

Motion for concurrence 19939

Motion agreed to 19940

Ms. Ng 19940

Third reading 19940

Mr. Lamoureux 19940

Points of Order

Alleged Breach of Standing Order 18

Mr. Lamoureux 19942

Mr. Vis 19942

Canada-Ukraine Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act, 2023

Bill C-57. Third reading 19942

Mr. Lamoureux 19942

Mr. Seebach 19945

Official Report

Mr. Dalton 19946

Points of Order**Alleged Breach of Standing Order 18**

Mr. Therrien	19946
--------------------	-------

Canada-Ukraine Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act, 2023

Bill C-57. Third reading	19947
Mr. Perron	19947
Mr. Lamoureux	19947
Ms. Idlout	19947
Ms. O'Connell	19947
Mr. Genuis	19947
Mr. Seebach	19948
Amendment	19951
Mr. Powlowski	19951
Mr. Garon	19951
Mr. Bezan	19952
Mr. Baker	19952
Mr. Maguire	19952
Mr. Savard-Tremblay	19953
Mr. Baker	19956
Mr. Kmiec	19956
Mr. Cannings	19956
Mr. Perron	19956
Mr. Lamoureux	19957
Mr. Cannings	19957
Mr. Baker	19959
Mr. Seebach	19959
Ms. Idlout	19959
Ms. Sgro	19960
Mr. Baker	19960
Mr. Seebach	19962
Ms. Sgro	19962

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS**Child Care**

Ms. Bradford	19962
--------------------	-------

Leader of the Conservative Party of Canada

Mr. Steinley	19963
--------------------	-------

Women and Gender Equality

Mrs. Chatel	19963
-------------------	-------

Carrefour Jeunesse-Emploi Montmorency

Mrs. Vignola	19963
--------------------	-------

Public Safety

Ms. Dzerowicz	19963
---------------------	-------

Peter Elzinga

Mr. Jeneroux	19963
--------------------	-------

Menstrual Equity Fund

Ms. Hepfner	19964
-------------------	-------

Conservative Party of Canada

Ms. Thompson	19964
--------------------	-------

Housing

Mr. Muys	19964
----------------	-------

Housing

Ms. Murray	19964
------------------	-------

Carbon Tax

Mr. Lehoux	19965
------------------	-------

Carbon Tax

Mr. Hoback	19965
------------------	-------

Mental Health and Addictions

Ms. Kayabaga	19965
--------------------	-------

Food Security

Mrs. Hughes	19965
-------------------	-------

Danielle Gamelin

Mr. Plamondon	19966
---------------------	-------

Innovation, Science and Industry

Mr. Soroka	19966
------------------	-------

Jim Carr

Mr. Carr	19966
----------------	-------

ORAL QUESTIONS**Innovation, Science and Industry**

Mr. Poilievre	19966
Mr. Trudeau	19966
Mr. Poilievre	19967
Mr. Trudeau	19967

Carbon Pricing

Mr. Poilievre	19967
Mr. Trudeau	19967
Mr. Poilievre	19967
Mr. Trudeau	19967
Mr. Poilievre	19967
Mr. Trudeau	19967

Dental Care

Mr. Blanchet	19968
Mr. Trudeau	19968
Mr. Blanchet	19968
Mr. Trudeau	19968

Foreign Affairs

Mr. Boulerice	19968
Mr. Trudeau	19968
Ms. McPherson	19968
Mr. Trudeau	19968

Innovation, Science and Industry

Mr. Barrett	19968
Mr. Champagne	19969
Mr. Barrett	19969
Mr. Champagne	19969
Mr. Perkins	19969
Ms. Hutchings	19969
Mr. Perkins	19969

Mr. Champagne.....	19969
Mr. Berthold.....	19969
Mrs. Lebouthillier.....	19970
Mr. Berthold.....	19970
Mr. Duclos.....	19970

CBC/Radio-Canada

Mr. Champoux.....	19970
Mrs. St-Onge.....	19970

News Media Industry

Mr. Champoux.....	19970
Mrs. St-Onge.....	19970

Sport

Mr. Lemire.....	19970
Ms. Qualtrough.....	19970

Carbon Pricing

Mr. Seeback.....	19971
Mr. Wilkinson.....	19971
Mr. Seeback.....	19971
Ms. Sudds.....	19971
Mrs. Vien.....	19971
Mrs. Lebouthillier.....	19971
Mrs. Vien.....	19971
Mr. Rodriguez.....	19971

Indigenous Affairs

Ms. Gazan.....	19971
Mr. Anandasangaree.....	19972
Mr. Angus.....	19972
Ms. Hajdu.....	19972

Health

Ms. Lambropoulos.....	19972
Ms. Saks.....	19972

Carbon Pricing

Mr. Barlow.....	19972
Ms. O'Connell.....	19972
Mr. Barlow.....	19972
Ms. Freeland.....	19973
Mrs. Kusie.....	19973
Mr. Boissonnault.....	19973
Mrs. Kusie.....	19973
Mr. Boissonnault.....	19973

Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship

Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe.....	19973
Mr. Miller.....	19973
Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe.....	19973
Mr. Miller.....	19974

Carbon Pricing

Mr. Ellis.....	19974
Ms. O'Connell.....	19974
Mr. Ellis.....	19974
Ms. Hutchings.....	19974
Mr. Small.....	19974
Mr. MacAulay.....	19974

Finance

Mrs. Shanahan.....	19974
Ms. Freeland.....	19975

Carbon Pricing

Mr. Patzer.....	19975
Mr. O'Regan.....	19975
Mrs. Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster).....	19975
Mr. van Koeverden.....	19975

CBC/Radio-Canada

Mr. Paul-Hus.....	19975
Mrs. St-Onge.....	19975

Diversity and Inclusion

Ms. Taylor Roy.....	19975
Ms. Anand.....	19976

Housing

Mr. Desjarlais.....	19976
Mr. Fraser.....	19976

Fisheries and Oceans

Ms. Barron.....	19976
Mrs. Lebouthillier.....	19976

Journalist Imprisoned in Hong Kong

Ms. Sgro.....	19976
Motion.....	19976
(Motion agreed to).....	19976

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Committees of the House

Justice and Human Rights

Motion for concurrence.....	19977
Motion agreed to.....	19978

Points of Order

Ways and Means Motion No. 19—Speaker's Ruling

The Speaker.....	19978
------------------	-------

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Fall Economic Statement Implementation Act, 2023

Mr. Wilkinson (for the Minister of Finance).....	19980
Bill C-59. Second reading.....	19980
Ms. Bennett.....	19980
Mr. Trudeau.....	19983
Mr. Chambers.....	19984
Ms. Larouche.....	19984
Ms. Gazan.....	19984
Mr. Morrice.....	19985
Mr. Poilievre.....	19985

President of the Public Service Commission

Mr. Lamoureux.....	19992
Motion.....	19992
(Motion agreed to).....	19992

Fall Economic Statement Implementation Act, 2023	
Bill C-59. Second reading	19992
Mr. Poilievre	19992

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Canadian Aviation Regulations

Motion	19996
Mr. Brassard	19996
Ms. Chabot	19997
Mr. MacGregor	19999
Mr. Lewis (Essex)	20000
Mr. Beaulieu	20001
Mr. Hardie	20002

Division on motion deferred	20003
-----------------------------------	-------

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Automotive Industry

Mr. Genuis	20003
Mr. Lamoureux	20004

Carbon Pricing

Mr. Patzer	20004
Mr. Lamoureux	20005

Carbon Pricing

Mr. Kurek	20006
Mr. Lamoureux	20006

Published under the authority of the Speaker of
the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the Copyright Act. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the Copyright Act.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: <https://www.ourcommons.ca>

Publié en conformité de l'autorité
du Président de la Chambre des communes

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la Loi sur le droit d'auteur. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre des communes.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la Loi sur le droit d'auteur.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante :
<https://www.noscommunes.ca>