



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 151 No. 319

Tuesday, May 28, 2024

Speaker: The Honourable Greg Fergus



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, May 28, 2024

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayer

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1000)

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC SECTOR INTEGRITY COMMISSIONER

The Speaker: It is my duty to lay upon the table, pursuant to subsection 38(3.3) of the Public Servants Disclosure Protection Act, a case report of the Public Sector Integrity Commissioner.

Pursuant to Standing Order 32(5), this report is deemed to have been permanently referred to the Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates.

* * *

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

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

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Mr. Ken McDonald (Avalon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 15th report of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans, entitled "Main Estimates 2024-25: Votes 1, 5 and 10 under Department of Fisheries and Oceans". I want to thank everybody for their input on the committee and the staff who helped prepare this report for the House.

HEALTH

Mr. Sean Casey (Charlottetown, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 19th report of the Standing Committee on Health, which is in relation to Bill C-64.

[*Translation*]

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

[*English*]

Because of the importance of this legislation and because of the programming motion that referred it to our committee, the level of effort given by the support team from the House of Commons and the Library of Parliament was absolutely commendable. I wish to sincerely thank them for our being able to present the report in such a timely fashion today.

* * *

SAFE HOSPITALS ACT

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay (South Surrey—White Rock, CPC) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-391, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act (possession of weapons and drugs in hospitals).

She said: Mr. Speaker, under the radical and extremist Liberal-NDP government, our hospitals, once sanctuaries of care and safety, have become infested with chaos, drugs and weapons. In B.C. specifically, we have heard countless reports from the B.C. Nurses' Union of staff being exposed to fentanyl and meth smoke in their workplace.

A nurse on Vancouver Island was exposed to hard drug smoke at work. The exposure was so bad that she required emergency care and was told to stop breastfeeding her baby. In April, five nurses on one shift all had to be treated in emergency due to fentanyl smoke exposure. This is at a time when we have an urgent shortage of nurses, patients waiting for OR time and cancer patients being sent to Washington state for treatment.

This is the reality after nine years of the NDP-Liberal government.

Doctors and nurses should feel safe at work. Vulnerable patients should not be concerned about the presence of dangerous weapons while they are receiving care in our hospitals. This is common sense.

S. O. 57

That is why I am introducing the safe hospitals act. This act would toughen sentences for criminals who bring weapons into hospitals to ensure the punishment fits the serious crime that it is. This act would also ban ministers of the Crown from granting an exemption to allow open, unsupervised and unprescribed hard drug use in hospitals. It is common-sense legislation to protect doctors, nurses and patients.

I look forward to this bill receiving the unanimous support of all parties. It will stop the crime and the chaos.

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

* * *

• (1005)

PETITIONS

GAZA

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am tabling a petition on behalf of constituents in my riding who are concerned about the horrific situation right now in Gaza, where over 73,000 Gazans have been injured and over 34,000 have died, over 70% of them women and children.

The petitioners are calling on the Government of Canada to investigate whether Canadian weapons or weapon components have been used against Palestinian civilians in the occupied Palestinian territory, including during the current war on Gaza, and to close loopholes that allow the unregulated and unreported transfer of military goods to Israel through the United States.

The petitioners are citing that the Liberals have an obligation to prevent genocide. The killings must be stopped, and Canada must do everything possible to end this conflict now, including with a two-way arms embargo, immediate sanctions and supporting the ICC and ICJ.

Both Palestinians and Israelis deserve peace, justice and safety. The petitioners are calling for the release of hostages and a cease-fire now.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

[*Translation*]

PRIVILEGE

REQUEST FOR OFFICE OF SPEAKER TO BE VACATED—MOTION THAT DEBATE BE NOT FURTHER ADJOURNED

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, in relation to the con-

sideration of the question of privilege raised by the member for Grande Prairie—Mackenzie I move, seconded by the President of the Treasury Board:

That debate be not further adjourned.

• (1010)

[*English*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Pursuant to Standing Order 67.1, there will now be a 30-minute question period.

[*Translation*]

I invite hon. members who wish to ask questions to rise in their places or use the “raise hand” function so that the Chair has some idea of the number of members who wish to participate in this question period.

[*English*]

The hon. member Saskatoon—University.

Mr. Corey Tochor (Saskatoon—University, CPC): Madam Speaker, is this concoction of closure to continue the cover-up part of the coalition agreement with the NDP?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Madam Speaker, I think the member is confused. We are trying to move back to the agenda that provides fairness for every generation and gets to debating tangible things such as pharmacare, dental care, expanding the rural rebate for the price on pollution and putting more money in the pockets of Canadians. The member wishes to instead dance on the head of a pin on procedural matters. We are trying to get back to business.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Therrien (La Prairie, BQ): Madam Speaker, this is an important debate on the fate of the Speaker, which is a must in a democracy like ours. The Liberal Party clearly wants to muzzle Parliament on this issue. That is really something else.

We have a Speaker who is rewriting the history books. Instead of muzzling Parliament, the government might win more respect from everyone here if it kindly asked the Speaker to simply step down, as the vast majority of people here think he should.

S. O. 57

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Madam Speaker, my colleague and I come from the same province. The Quebecers I speak to want Parliament to take action on things that will positively impact our constituents on a daily basis, not dwell on procedure and the Speaker of this House for the umpteenth time. Honestly, people look at this and think it is time to get down to business.

[English]

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, we have had Conservatives viciously attacking the Speaker repeatedly. We see what has happened in Saskatchewan. A conservative party is ruling in Saskatchewan, and what they did to the Speaker I will cite for the record. The Speaker, in his final statement, said:

...my experience with the [conservative] Government House Leader includes threatening gestures whenever I rule against him in the Assembly. He will start yelling at me and standing up and flashing his suit jacket. As the gestures and behaviour became more aggressive, I worried that he might be carrying a handgun. My concerns over his mental stability and his obsession with guns was only confirmed when he heckled after the passing of the motion to devolve all relevant parts of the Firearms Act to the province. He twice yelled, open carry, open carry next.

It goes on, but I think what we see taking place in conservative-held provinces, what we see with the Speaker and what we see happening federally are an attempt by conservatives to try to move aside from the agenda. Why are they doing this?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Madam Speaker, I think we watched some of the events with absolute horror. No one in Canada can imagine that a cabinet minister, a House leader of all things, would walk into a legislature in this country, threaten the presiding officer and then concoct stories, alibis and fabrications to cover that up—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I ask the hon. member to get to the relevance at hand. I understand that he is answering the question, but we would like relevance.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Madam Speaker, I am answering the question.

This culture of guns, violence and threats is something we never want to see in Parliament. While what we are seeing today is a further attempt to intimidate the Chair, the Speaker, and engage in delay and unnecessary political games, the fact is that this culture of intimidating the Chair is something we have seen in other legislatures, and I think Canadians are rightly horrified by it.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask a question specifically about the Conservative tactics here. I find it incredibly rich that Conservatives are attacking our Speaker of the House of Commons for—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

• (1015)

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

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, I regret to have to inform my colleagues that he is our Speaker. He is the House's Speaker and this is our House. Unless I have something wrong here, he is a Speaker who was elected by all of us, regardless of how members cast their votes.

This further proves my point. The irony of this is that the Conservatives are going after the Speaker of the House of Commons for an image that was added to something about a fundraiser. Meanwhile, the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle, while he was the Speaker of the House, attended a fundraiser of the member for Regina—Wascana.

Does the House leader not find it incredibly hypocritical for them to suddenly be attacking this Speaker, our Speaker, given what transpired back in the day with the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Madam Speaker, it always amazes me that the people here think Canadians are not watching. They know the facts that he just related. They know that a Speaker of the House, being a member of Parliament, must do the basics necessary to attempt to be re-elected in their constituency. They must do the basics required of them by their political party. They must do the basics required of them as a regional member of Parliament and a representative of the place they come from. The Conservatives think no one sees that, but people, of course, can understand it.

What I think troubles those watching today is what has happened to this place. It used to be that when the Speaker was elected, we moved on with our business, debating the issues of the day with a back-and-forth, the various issues that come before us. Instead, the Conservatives try every day to disrupt our work by showing disrespect. We are not allowed to stand, for example, when the Speaker is standing. However, the Conservatives, led by their leader, will stand up in defiance of the Speaker. They will speak over the Speaker. They will send insults that are entirely inappropriate in this place or in any place.

The Conservatives would do better to worry about the kinds of seeds they are sowing, because they are breaking the norms, the customs and the respect that have governed this place for centuries.

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Madam Speaker, the comments by the government House leader are so disappointing. He is not protecting the sanctity of this place. The House of Commons is our House of Commons, and that is our chair; however, the current chair occupant has proven that he is not fit to be in that chair.

We had a decision by the Deputy Speaker about the partisan activities of the Speaker. I do not know what type of baseball the Liberals play when empowered by their NDP coalition to shut down debate on a privilege motion, but the last time I looked, in baseball, it is three strikes and a player is out. On three different occasions, the Speaker has been involved in partisan activities and given partisan speeches. This is the fourth occasion. It has been found each and every time that he has violated the rules of this place.

We have a question of privilege in front of us. Turning to chapter 3 of the third edition of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, on page 150, it says:

S. O. 57

Once the motion is properly moved, seconded, and proposed to the House, it is subject to all the procedures and practices relating to debate on a substantive motion. The speeches are limited...

The House has considered all the conduct of the member, in this case, the Speaker. It goes on to say:

A privilege motion once under debate has priority over all Orders of the Day including Government Orders and Private Members' Business. However, the debate does not interfere with Routine Proceedings, Statements by Members, Question Period, Royal Assent, deferred recorded divisions or the adjournment of the House [or other] scheduled...Private Members' Business...

We have done our orders of the day, but now we have the Liberals, empowered by their NDP coalition partners, shutting down debate and moving closure on a question of privilege that relates to the very confidence that all of us in the House of Commons have in the Speaker.

The Speaker should do the honourable thing and resign. The House Leader should do that instead of forcing us to—

• (1020)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. government House Leader.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Madam Speaker, the member is an experienced member of the House. He knows that we are trying to get back to the business that affects Canadians, that will provide benefits and put food on the table for Canadians in their daily lives. He represents a riding that would benefit, for example, from the rural rebate being increased on the price on pollution. We will vote on that later today, and we will see how the member stands up for assisting people in his constituency.

The fact is, though, that the claims being made against the Speaker of the House are fake. These claims are entirely conjured in Conservative backrooms. Why is this? It is because they wish to delay and disturb the proceedings of the House. It is that simple, and we are simply trying to get us back on track.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille (Salaberry—Suroît, BQ): Madam Speaker, I find it extremely disappointing that the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons is completely disregarding the motion of privilege. The motion was introduced because there was a question of privilege. The question of privilege was analyzed by the procedural team and the Speaker, who concluded that there was a vacuum and that it was a very important question, and who allowed debate on the motion.

If the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons enjoys bashing the Conservatives for attacking the Speaker, this is a false debate. The current debate is on a motion of privilege. There is nothing more important in Parliament, in the House of Commons, than a motion of privilege, but the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons is trying to pass a closure motion to limit debate on a motion of privilege.

He can do so because, with the complicity of the NDP, he proceeded with a super motion to muzzle Parliament. This is unacceptable and is key to the current debate. Does the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons not find it curious to question the nature of the privilege motion that was received, heard and analyzed by the procedural team, which found justification for the de-

bates we are currently having? It is as though he were challenging the decision by the Speaker.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Madam Speaker, the whip of the Bloc Québécois knows full well that everything we are doing is entirely within the rules. My colleague knows that this is the umpteenth time her caucus and the Conservative caucus have attacked the Speaker of the House of Commons. She knows we wasted a full day yesterday debating this question, which was resolved several times.

We know what happened. The Liberal Party of Canada apologized to the Speaker. She knows this. What I find surprising and disappointing is that the Bloc Québécois is getting in bed with the Conservative Party, which insists on interrupting and upending the House's work. I wonder what could be worrying the Bloc Québécois in the government's proposals and bills that would cause it to act this way.

[*English*]

Mr. John Nater (Perth—Wellington, CPC): Madam Speaker, the Speaker of the House of Commons, while in his robes, did a video for a provincial Liberal partisan. While on an official junket to Washington, the Speaker relived his glory days as a partisan Liberal youth. The Speaker used Liberal talking points to attack the Leader of the Opposition in a fundraising email to Liberal partisans. Does the government House leader think these things were appropriate? Would he see the same problem if a Conservative Speaker had done it, or is there a double standard here that depends on who is in the Speaker's chair?

• (1025)

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Madam Speaker, the great thing about this place is that, soon, we will all stand up and say what we think is appropriate. First, in some of the instances mentioned by the member, the Speaker took responsibility and apologized for that, as a new Speaker.

In another of the instances he mentioned, the Liberal Party took full responsibility and apologized to the Speaker. A normal Parliament, a Parliament that was collegial, that respected the Chair and that respected the offices, would be satisfied with that. In contrast, this Conservative Party stands up in this place every day, devoid of a simple alternative and a simple idea, and simply obstructs. It tries to prevent the House from moving forward on the issues that will help Canadians today. That is the disappointing part.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, yesterday we witnessed the sad spectacle of the Conservatives, along with their allies in the Bloc Québécois, trying to block the pharmacare bill.

In Quebec, a coalition of nearly 2 million Quebeckers is calling on the Conservative Party and the Bloc Québécois to pass this law because it finds it important. The Centrale des syndicats démocratiques, the Confédération des syndicats nationaux, the Fédération des travailleurs et travailleuses du Québec and the community organizations in Quebec say that this bill should be enacted.

Now, we know that today's debate will derail this entire important discussion. Why are the Bloc Québécois and the Conservative Party insisting on blocking—

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

The hon. member for Manicouagan on a point of order.

Mrs. Marilène Gill: Madam Speaker, my colleague's comments are off topic.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): This is a very broad topic of discussion.

The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, my comments are definitely relevant because today's debate is derailing all the discussions on Bill C-64, which has just been tabled in the House at report stage.

Does my colleague think that there is a connection between the Conservative Party's and the Bloc Québécois's determination to block this bill and the fact that these two parties always want to debate the topic that we are debating today?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Madam Speaker, of course there is a connection.

Why? It is because what frightens the Bloc Québécois are bills passed by this Parliament that will help Quebeckers, measures taken by the government of Canada that will help the people in our ridings.

The Bloc knows that thousands of people walk up to me at hockey and soccer games and tell me they are so happy they qualify for the dental care plan. People with diabetes ask me what the pharmaceutical plan will do for them.

What frightens the Bloc Québécois is the fact that these programs are delivered directly to citizens by the Government of Canada. The fact that we are helping Canadians proves that the Bloc's separatist rhetoric is hollow. It keeps Canada going, and Quebeckers like it. That is what they are afraid of. They would rather debate the speakership.

[English]

Mr. Rick Perkins (South Shore—St. Margarets, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am sure the longest-serving NDP House leader in history, Stanley Knowles, is rolling over in his grave at what the House leader for the NDP just said: He thinks that one of the most fundamental principles of a parliamentary democracy, the neutrality of the Speaker, is not worthy of a privilege debate, when the Deputy Speaker has actually ruled that the Speaker pursued partisan activities, breaching his neutrality. The government House leader, who has a responsibility to enforce and uphold the rules of the House, has called that ruling of the Deputy Speaker “fake”. It is reprehensible that the government House leader would question the ruling of the Deputy Speaker on this issue.

As my colleague from Manitoba said, the government House leader has a responsibility, first and foremost, to understand that the rules say a privilege motion debate is more important than any other piece of legislation in the House. I know the NDP does not understand it. I expected more from the government House leader,

S. O. 57

yet, twice this week, he has imposed closure on issues. On every single bill, every single issue, the government imposes closure. They are cutting off democracy and debate at every turn, and he has no respect for the rules of the House.

• (1030)

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Madam Speaker, this is what it has come to, of all things. I cannot believe my ears: We have a Conservative, under the current Leader of the Opposition, quoting Stanley Knowles, who had a reverence for this place, who achieved the status of having a permanent place in the House. To compare the actions of the Conservative Party with the actions of a person who inspires us all with his reverence for our democratic institutions is something that, quite frankly, is shocking.

It is right out of the MAGA playbook, where up is down, north is south and black is white. The Conservatives have become masters in turning words around, in making base populist appeals. What they really do is stand up every day and stop earnest, honest attempts to make life better for people from becoming reality. We see it in the United States, and we see it here. They obstruct, delay, insult and, yes, disrespect our democratic institutions.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, the idea that a Speaker who is represented by individuals in their community cannot be partisan is absolutely ludicrous. I come from the riding of the longest-serving Speaker of the House of Commons, Peter Milliken. I personally attended fundraisers that Peter Milliken put on as a Liberal in our riding while he was Speaker. There is an established practice for it.

If one does not want to listen to what the longest-serving Speaker of the House of Commons did, let us just talk about his successor, the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle, who is the House leader for the Conservatives right now. While he was Speaker, he not only attended a fundraiser in his riding but also went to the neighbouring riding of Regina—Wascana and attended a fundraiser. There is documented evidence of it. I have tried to table it in the House of Commons before. There are pictures of him at that fundraiser but, of course, Conservatives would never let me do that.

It raises this question: Why are the Conservatives and the Bloc hell-bent on taking down this particular Speaker? I cannot wrap my head around it. Why are they after the current Speaker of the House of Commons?

S. O. 57

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Madam Speaker, we can only wonder why the Conservative Party will not relent in its attempts to derail the work of the House and to attack the Chair and the democratic institution that we are all so privileged to serve in. I can only explain it with the word “hypocrisy”. It is the same hypocrisy that has a member vote against a housing program and then go and announce the results in her riding. Conservative members do this all the time. They put this stuff on repeat. They come here to obstruct, delay, insult and offend, but they do not offer one single idea.

I urge those who are watching us today to watch and listen closely. Is there a single alternative offered by the Conservatives that helps them in their day-to-day life? That is what we are trying to propose. That is what we are trying to move to, so we can get to work on things such as pharmacare, dental care, expanding the rural rebate on the price of pollution; these are things that put money in the pockets of Canadians. Those are the things that we are going to be talking about later today if these Conservatives would just get out of the way.

• (1035)

[Translation]

Mrs. Marilène Gill (Manicouagan, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to make two points.

First, I would like to remind the member that we are talking about a question of privilege. I do not think that raising a question of privilege can be considered obstructing Parliament. On the contrary, that is our right as members. We need to settle this issue. That is the first point I wanted to make.

Second, the party in power keeps saying that we are unable to pass bills, yet it is the party in power that is responsible for setting the legislative agenda. It is the party in power that decided to call an election after two years. If bills are being delayed, it is not because we do not want to work. It is because we have a Speaker who is not doing his job properly and who obviously lacks judgment. In addition, he is partisan.

It is also because the Liberals decided to slow down the process by calling an election and mismanaging government business.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Madam Speaker, it is true that questions of privilege take priority in Parliament. That is why we have been debating this matter all day. However, for the umpteenth time, the Bloc Québécois is joining the opposition leader and his troops in attacking the Speaker of the House and the work that needs to be done here.

The summer adjournment is only a few weeks away. The member knows full well that we are going to address issues that are likely to please her constituents, issues like the dental care plan, initiatives like the pharmacare plan and the amounts to be transferred to the Quebec government to expand child care centres in her riding.

The member knows full well that she is obstructing Parliament, and we want to stop that obstruction so that we can finally offer her constituents and all Canadians measures that will help them in their everyday lives.

[English]

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, Canadians should be very concerned about the vicious attacks on the independent Speaker of the Saskatchewan legislature by Conservatives and about the vicious attacks that we are seeing here by Conservatives.

A former Speaker of the House, the current member for Regina—Qu'Appelle, said this: “Reflections on the character or actions of the Speaker—an allegation of bias...could be taken by the House as breaches of privilege and punished accordingly.” He urged, as the Conservative Speaker at that time, who was the Speaker representing all of us in the House of Commons, that members be judicious in the expressions they choose to use.

We have seen an unparalleled attack on the Speaker by Conservative MPs in their comments in social media. It is unbelievable. It is something that would surely make Stanley Knowles roll over in his grave, knowing that Conservatives are treating, with such disrespect, our parliamentary institutions, as they treat with disrespect our independent institutions like the Bank of Canada, the Auditor General, the PBO and so on.

My question to my colleague is simple: Why do Conservatives have so much disrespect for the institutions that govern us and our democracy?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Madam Speaker, that is a very good question, and we are seeing it all over the world. Democracies are under assault by right-wing parties. Right-wing parties seek to create chaos and to create disorder. They hope that those who are watching at home just say that it is not for them, that their votes do not matter and that they have no say in all of that.

The fact that is people do have a say. They do not have to listen to the Conservative nonsense, where what is okay for them back in the day is no longer okay. Respect for institutions must be rigidly enforced when the Conservatives are in the chair and they are in power, but respect for institutions must not be enforced at any other time. This is the playbook we are seeing across the world. It is the playbook we are seeing in the United States, and it is a shame that Conservatives are engaging in it here.

Mr. James Bezan: Madam Speaker, the comments just made by the government House leader, the member for Gatineau, are contemptuous at best.

What we are debating here right now is closure on a decision made by the Deputy Speaker that the Speaker has a prima facie case of violating the privilege of the House. Just to remind the government House leader, “The rights accorded to the House and its Members to allow them to perform their parliamentary functions unimpeded are referred to as privileges or immunities.”

On page 323 of the procedure and House affairs book, it says, “When in the Chair, the Speaker embodies the power and authority of the office, strengthened by rule and precedent. He...must at all times show, and be seen to show, the impartiality required to sustain the trust and goodwill of the House.”

The Speaker has lost the goodwill and trust of the House, and that is why the Deputy Speaker found him in contempt of Parliament and found it to be a prima facie case at that.

• (1040)

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Madam Speaker, there have been a lot of questions of privilege raised by a lot of the opposition. That has happened over the course of history. There is a way to resolve that, which is what we are proposing to move to right now. That is what we will be doing. We will do so serenely, democratically and within the rules and procedures of the House. The member should reflect on how this is going, with respect to our democratic institutions, in that right wing—

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): It is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith the question necessary to dispose of the motion now before the House.

[*English*]

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.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, we request a recorded vote, please.

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. 775*)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Battiste
Beech	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Blaney	Blois
Boissonnault	Boulerice
Bradford	Brière
Cannings	Carr
Casey	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Collins (Victoria)	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
Desjarlais	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab

Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Gaheer	Gainey
Garrison	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gould
Guilbeault	Hajdu
Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Holland
Housefather	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Idlout	Ien
Jaczek	Johns
Jones	Jowhari
Julian	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Khera	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lattanzio	Lauzon
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Lightbound	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacGregor	Maloney
Martinez Ferrada	Masse
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod	McPherson
Mendès	Medicino
Miao	Miller
Morrice	Morrissey
Murray	Naqvi
Ng	Noormohamed
O'Connell	Oliphant
O'Regan	Petitpas Taylor
Powlowski	Qualtrough
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Rota	Sahota
Sajjan	Saks
Samson	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Singh	Sorbara
Sousa	St-Onge
Sudds	Tassi
Taylor Roy	Thompson
Trudeau	Turnbull
Valdez	Van Bynen
van Koeverden	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Virani
Weiler	Wilkinson
Yip	Zahid
Zarrillo	Zuberi— 172

S. O. 57

NAYS

Members

Aitchison
Allison
Baldinelli
Barrett
Beaulieu
Berthold

Privilege

Bérubé	Bezan
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins
Carrie	Chabot
Chambers	Champoux
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	DeBellefeuille
Deltell	Desbiens
Desilets	Doherty
Dreeshen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Ellis	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Fast	Ferreri
Findlay	Garon
Gaudreau	Généreux
Genius	Gill
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Hoback	Jeneroux
Jivani	Kelly
Khanna	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Larouche
Lawrence	Lehoux
Lemire	Leslie
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	Maguire
Majumdar	Martel
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Melillo	Michaud
Moore	Morantz
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Perkins	Perron
Plamondon	Poilievre
Rayes	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Richards	Roberts
Rood	Ruff
Savard-Tremblay	Secheer
Schmale	Seeback
Shields	Shiplely
Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
Small	Soroka
Steinley	Ste-Marie
Stewart	Strahl
Stubbs	Therrien
Thomas	Tochor
Tolmie	Trudel
Uppal	Van Popta
Vecchio	Vidal
Vien	Viersen
Vignola	Villemure
Vis	Vuong
Wagantall	Warkentin
Wagh	Webber
Williams	Williamson
Zimmer— 145	

PAIRED

Members

Bendayan	Caputo
Dowdall	Drouin

Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz
Fortin	Gallant
Joly	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Normandin	Thériault— 12

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Marilène Gill: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

It is my understanding that everyone is to wear the headset approved by the House of Commons when rising during the vote. The member for Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook was not wearing his headset when he wanted to check that his vote had been recorded.

I just wanted to remind all our colleagues of that.

The Deputy Speaker: It is true that members have been sloppy about following that rule during votes. Please follow the rule next time.

The hon. member for Manicouagan on another point of order.

Mrs. Marilène Gill: Mr. Speaker, can you please tell me if a member's vote counts when they do not have their headset on. It is also for the interpreters' sake that I wanted to bring this up.

The Deputy Speaker: The vote counts even if the member does not have a headset on. We allow that during a vote.

[*English*]

RESUMING DEBATE ON THE PRIVILEGE MOTION

The House resumed from May 27 consideration of the motion.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in this place to address a question of privilege that has been raised with regard to the Speaker's public display of partisanship.

Of course, we know that the Speaker of this place occupies a position of trust. We know that within that position of trust, he is supposed to function in an impartial manner. He is supposed to apply the rules in this place equally to all members of all parties. When he functions in a partisan capacity, however, he then betrays the trust those who occupy a seat within the House of Commons. He goes beyond the scope of his role and actually uses it then for the benefit of his political party, in this case the Liberal Party of Canada.

The events that I am talking about are several in nature, but the latest one was “A Summer Evening with the Honourable [Speaker]”, said the announcement. This was a fundraiser that was hosted just across the river in Quebec, or deemed to be hosted just across the river in Quebec, and this invitation was sent out, drawing attention to the Speaker as the keynote. However, this is not the first time. This is the latest event that brings us to the House, calling for the Speaker's resignation or calling for a vote to remove him.

Before this, there was a cocktail fundraiser dinner that was hosted just a couple of months ago where, again, he was used as the keynote of this address or this function, and, of course, as Speaker, he was promoted, again in a partisan fashion, and used as an individual who could help elicit funds for the Liberal Party of Canada, and that is not all. There is a third one that I would like to draw the House's attention to, which is that the Speaker actually, in his full outfit, jet setted to Washington and addressed the audience that he was given there. He talked about his time as a young Liberal, and in a very partisan fashion, in his address to the audience that was in front of him. That is his third strike.

However, there are two more that I would like to draw the House's attention to, for a total of five within just the last few months of him being Speaker.

In this place, there was an interaction that took place between the Prime Minister and the leader of the official opposition. The Prime Minister exchanged words, or used words to accuse the official opposition of being a "spineless" leader. In retort, the Leader of the Opposition responded with words that were similar. The Speaker of the House said nothing to the Prime Minister, but then went on to kick out the member of the official opposition, again pointing to a partisan decision.

There is a fifth incident that I would like to draw attention to; that is that I myself was removed from this place. I was removed from this place because I used these words toward the Speaker. I said that he was, "acting in a disgraceful manner." I was asked by the Speaker of the House to withdraw my words, which I rose from my seat and I said, "I withdraw". However, the Speaker went on to kick me out of the House, not just for a little while but actually for the remainder of the day, therefore robbing the constituents of Lethbridge from having a vote in this place.

It is the practice of the House, and it is in fact according to the Standing Orders, that should a member stand in her place and withdraw those words, she should be allowed to stay. However, the Speaker, functioning in a partisan capacity, removed me. If those blues are looked at, it is very clear that I said, "I withdraw". It is in the official record of the House. If the audio is listened to, Madam Speaker, you can hear me say those words "I withdraw". It is clear within the audio record of the House. However, when it came to the Hansard, which is signed off by the Speaker's office, those words, "I withdraw", were conveniently removed.

Therefore, there is already another question of privilege before this place, which is to say, why were those words removed? Why did the Speaker's office sign off on official Hansard records that removed my withdrawal?

In this place, the Speaker must function in a trusted capacity. He must respect the members of this place. He must never be partisan in nature, nor should records ever be officially changed based on what is convenient for him.

Based on his conduct over these five incidents, we are asking for his resignation and if not, then we would like to remove him through a vote.

Privilege

• (1130)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, let there be no doubt that the Conservative Party is just playing a game here. This is the Conservative-right MAGA-attacks on the institution itself.

Let us be very clear that the Conservatives do have a double standard. When the Conservative House leader was the Speaker and had a fundraiser, there was no problem. Not one Conservative stood up. However, the issue that we have had before us in the last 24 hours has nothing to do with the Speaker. It was the Liberal Party of Canada that formally apologized for doing and publishing what it did. Therefore, the Conservatives are attempting to punish the wrong entity.

The question for the member and the Conservative caucus today is this. How can they continue to make a mockery of what the reality is, which is that the Speaker, in this situation, did absolutely nothing wrong?

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Madam Speaker, the member addressed exactly the problem with this place. It is the fact that Liberal members do not see anything wrong with the Speaker functioning in a partisan capacity five times in the last few months. One might be forgivable, two possibly, but not five times.

For the hon. member to say that standing up for democracy and wanting to protect the institution of Parliament is "desperate", to use his word, makes me question his commitment to democracy and the very foundations of Canada and what our forefathers fought for.

[Translation]

Mr. Denis Trudel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, BQ): Madam Speaker, I essentially agree with my colleague. I do not think that we need to provide further evidence that the Speaker has shown poor judgment multiple times in the past few months and is no longer worthy of his current office.

More generally, however, I wonder what an observer watching our debates in the House over the past few months would think about the increase in gag orders and the lack of debate on substantive issues. Our job is to help Canadians right now. I am not sure that we are doing our job properly, considering the government's many gag orders and the Conservatives' systematic filibustering. Once, we voted for 36 hours straight and, another time, for several hours. On one occasion, we voted in the House to pick which Conservative MP was going to speak instead of another. These kinds of things make absolutely no sense. This country has serious problems right now and we are not fixing them.

Does my colleague think that the average citizen watching our debates over the past few months still has confidence in Canadian democracy?

• (1135)

[English]

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Madam Speaker, the bigger question here is how Canadians can maintain confidence when half of that is true and half of that is not. There was a mix of truth and mistruth in that statement.

Privilege

In this place, we have a responsibility to hold the government accountable. That is our job as the official opposition. For us to move a question of privilege with regard to the Speaker of this place functioning in a highly partisan manner five times in the last few months is absolutely not just our prerogative as the official opposition, it is our duty to the Canadian people. I will make no apologies for that.

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Madam Speaker, it is prudent that we hold each other to account in the House. Right now, we are seeing the Conservatives use every tool and tactic to delay getting pharmacare passed so people can get life-saving medication covered.

Let us talk about what is going on in my colleague's riding of Lethbridge. It has an overdose toxic drug death rate that is triple that of British Columbia, one of the highest in the country. Instead of talking about about policies that would help save lives, like recommended by the deputy commissioner of the RCMP who said that we need more safe consumption sites, not less, the law-and-order party refuses to listen to the police.

Will my colleague meet with the RCMP? Will she try to open a safe consumption site when—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member knows that we try to keep questions relevant to the speeches made by members.

The hon. member for Lethbridge.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Madam Speaker, I would call relevance on that question. I think you, Madam Speaker, probably should have called that for me, but I will do the job.

Mr. Rick Perkins (South Shore—St. Margarets, CPC): Madam Speaker, the member for Lethbridge made a very compelling presentation, but she missed the original sin, and that is that there is a sixth incident, which is the very first incident, the one in which the Speaker, in his robes in his office, not far from this chamber, recorded a video to be played at the Liberal convention. While that privilege motion was being debated in the House, only a few days later he attended the function in Washington to which the member referred.

How many apologies and mistakes does the member think are acceptable in partisanship of the Speaker? Is it 10, 20 or one?

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Madam Speaker, according to the Standing Orders outlined by Bosc and Gagnon, on page 323, it says:

When in the Chair, the Speaker embodies the power and authority of the office, strengthened by rule and precedent. He or she must at all times show, and be seen to show, the impartiality required to sustain the trust and goodwill of the House.

Any act of partisanship is far too many, and he has done five.

Mr. Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is with a bit of concern that I rise to my feet today to talk, on behalf of the members of Regina—Lewvan, about the Speaker and his partisanship over the last few months he has been Speaker.

The Speaker's indiscretions actually started much before that. Once there is a pattern of behaviour, it is not an accident, and one

can only apologize so many times. This can even go back to some of the Speaker's actions when he was the parliamentary secretary for the Prime Minister.

I am also happy to stand on my feet today to say I will be sharing my time with the member for Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman.

To get back to the serious point at hand, we have stood in this chamber and given many speeches over the past three or four years, some that were very much unprecedented, but they all circled around one thing, which is the lack of respect for democracy the NDP-Liberal government has. I remember standing in this place during the “freedom convoy”, when the Emergencies Act was enacted, which was ruled unconstitutional. The NDP-Liberal government had zero respect for the rights of Canadians then, and now has zero respect for the institution we stand in.

The Speaker has shown time and again that he lacks the judgment to have the honourable role of being Speaker. His judgment comes from his overt partisanship. We have seen it before. After the 2015 election, we saw the Prime Minister have a tantrum because a vote was not happening. This is the amazing part. The New Democrats are holding the Speaker up when he was the apologist for the Prime Minister, as he went to the mic and defended the Prime Minister after he elbowed a female NDP member because the vote was not happening soon enough. That is unbelievable. Now they are going to be complicit in the vote trying to hold up the Speaker and to allow him to maintain his role.

We know that many times the Speaker has spoken for the Prime Minister after the countless things the Prime Minister has done that were unethical. When he wore blackface, the Speaker stood up for him as the then parliamentary secretary. His partisanship is well documented going back to when he was with the Liberal Party of Canada.

I am not saying it is not okay to be partisan, but if people know deep down that they are that partisan and they put the Liberal Party above all else, they should not apply for the role of Speaker of the House of Commons, because we know that that role is to maintain decorum and to treat every MP in this House fairly and without prejudice. That is where he has come up so very short.

The member for Lethbridge has a very well-documented case of when she was treated so unfairly. She stood up and apologized on record and on video. We could hear her withdraw her remarks. She stood up and apologized for the remarks, and the Speaker still kicked her out. Do members think that is non-partisan? Do members think that is fair? The question I would ask every member in this House is this: Would he have done that if it was a Liberal or one of his junior partners, an NDP MP? The answer is no, he would not. He kicked out the official Leader of the Opposition, and I believe this is the first time that has happened in this chamber, for making very similar remarks to those of the Prime Minister. Do members think that is non-partisan? No, it is not.

Privilege

This is not a one-time offence. The member for Winnipeg North, who has been stood up as the apologist for the Speaker, has time and again said that it was just one time and that it was the Liberal Party's fault, but let us look at "elbowgate", blackface, or wearing full Speaker garb, making a video in the Speaker's office and then sending it to the Ontario Liberal Party convention to congratulate an outgoing leader.

• (1140)

There is the cocktail fundraiser in Washington. This does not happen very often, but the current Speaker left during session to go on a cocktail tour in Washington. He abdicated his role here to talk about how great it is to be a Liberal and how Liberals are the answer to the world's problems. How does he think it is appropriate to go on a speaking tour for the Liberal Party of Canada when session is sitting? I do not recall many other Speakers taking a holiday when they are supposed to be doing their job here. Once again, it shows a lack of judgment.

Finally, there is the party fundraiser with the fellow MP, which the apologist from Winnipeg North says is the Liberal Party's fault. The Liberal Party itself often shows a lack of judgment, but this Speaker is running a close second with how many times he has shown a lack of judgment when it comes to his role as Speaker of the House of Commons.

What I find completely amazing, and I started my speech with this, is that the NDP members are going to prop up this Speaker after the elbowing incident. He was the one who justified the elbowing of a female NDP MP, and they are going to vote to keep this Speaker in the position he is in. Time and time again, this Speaker has shown a lack of judgment.

I have not even come to one of the things I find most interesting, which is one of the reasons I could not have voted for him as Speaker. He had his own ethics violation before he even took the chair as Speaker. He is the only Speaker in the history of Canada to have an ethics violation and then take on the role of Speaker. The lack of judgment from this individual can be chronicled from tip to tail of his career, and it is high time we take the right and reasonable course and vote this Speaker out, because he has dishonoured the Chair and put the very foundation of our democracy in jeopardy.

I do get emails on this. A few people, mostly friends and family, watch question period. They have asked me how the Speaker thinks the House has any faith left in him, any confidence. The simple answer is that the House does not.

The Liberal-NDP coalition continues to say it is the Conservatives who are having decorum issues. The Speaker has brought this on. He has continuously flouted the rules and not applied the rules properly. The member for Winnipeg North laughs. The Speaker, when he was first elected Speaker, said that the Speaker should be the referee and not a player in the game. He also went on to say that no one goes to a game to watch the referee.

The Speaker has made more headlines in the news than any Speaker I can remember, so he has really made this about himself. This is all about the Speaker and his wanting to make headlines, and actually continue to do the PMO's bidding. I have been in this

chamber and in the legislative chamber and have seen many Speakers. This is similar to the member for Winnipeg North, as we both served in the legislature and both served in the House of Commons. I have seen lots of Speakers in my time, and the interesting thing is that, by far, I have seen the most degradation of decorum in this House.

One thing I have learned in my life, and it is something that holds true, is that attitude reflects leadership. The Speaker is the leader of the House, and that is why some people have taken to the attitude they have, because the Speaker has no business in that chair. He has dishonoured that chair, and for that reason, it makes it an absolute mockery that the NDP members are going to prop up this Speaker as the junior coalition partner and are going to stand and defend a Speaker who defended the Prime Minister elbowing one of their female members. That is the respect the NDP now has for this place, in the House of Commons, and it is troubling.

We have seen continuous decline in this democracy, as well as in Canadians' faith after what has gone on here, and it all can be thrown at the foot of this current Speaker. I know for sure the Conservatives have lost confidence, the Bloc has lost confidence and some of the Liberals have lost confidence. They may not say it, but behind closed doors they do. It is actually unbelievable that they will continue to try to fight for this Speaker when he has dishonoured the job. It is time for him to go. He should resign before we have the vote.

• (1145)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the member a very specific question. I would really like the member to listen to my question and directly answer it without rhetoric. If he is saying we should avoid the rhetoric and everything, then he should answer my question very directly and not skate past it.

My question to him is this: Why would it be okay for the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle, when he was Speaker, to not only attend fundraisers in his riding, but to go outside of his riding to the member for Regina—Wascana's riding? There is well-documented evidence on this. It is out there. We know he did that when he was Speaker.

Why was it okay for the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle to act in a partisan manner when he was Speaker, but now suddenly it is not okay for the current Speaker? Can he please answer that question directly without skating around or using rhetoric?

Mr. Warren Steinley: Madam Speaker, that is a very easy question to answer. The member for Regina—Qu'Appelle was not the keynote speaker of the fundraiser. It was not during session. The Conservative Party of Canada did not put out a note that said he would be the one speaking.

Privilege

I think that the member is, once again, mischaracterizing what happened. Seven times the Speaker has used poor judgment. Does the member truly believe Canadians have faith that this Speaker should continue in the Chair? If he does, I would love to see him go to his constituents and tell them that he voted in favour of the Speaker because he has done a really good job.

• (1150)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I voted in favour of the Speaker, and I think he is doing a great job.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): That is not a point of order. That is a point of debate, as the hon. member well knows.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Longueuil—Saint-Hubert.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Denis Trudel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, BQ): Madam Speaker, since we are on the subject of ethics, I would like to ask a question that is not entirely related to the debate we are having today but is nevertheless important.

I would like to hear my colleague's thoughts on the Speaker's decision to eject the Leader of the Opposition for calling the Prime Minister wacko and extremist. Did he agree that the Speaker should have ejected his leader?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Regina—Lewvan is asking that the hon. member for Longueuil—Saint-Hubert repeat his question.

Mr. Denis Trudel: Madam Speaker, I will start again. It is a fundamental question of ethics, and I think it is important.

Debates here are always a bit nonsensical. However, I still think we need to follow certain rules. For example, we are not allowed to use certain expressions in this chamber. The Leader of the Opposition used language here one day that is not allowed in the House. He was ejected after repeating that he would not apologize for his choice of words.

As a parliamentarian, an elected member of Parliament, did my colleague really think his leader should have been ejected for calling the Prime Minister wacko and extremist?

[*English*]

Mr. Warren Steinley: Madam Speaker, no.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, the constant attacks by the Conservatives against the independent Speaker of the House of Commons are mirrored by the constant attacks by Conservatives in the Saskatchewan legislature. I want to read a text and ask my colleague from Saskatchewan to unequivocally apologize to Canadians.

Jeremy Harrison, a former member of the Conservative caucus, who is now the House leader for the Conservative Saskatchewan Party, did this to the independent Speaker of the Saskatchewan legislature. This is what that Speaker said about Jeremy Harrison, just a few days ago:

more disturbing is his obsession with guns and his use of intimidation both verbally and physically. His desire to get permission to carry a handgun in the legislative assembly is particularly disturbing

He would start yelling—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I have to remind the hon. member that we have a very short time for questions and comments. I have to give the hon. member an opportunity to answer before the time expires.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, does the member unequivocally apologize and condemn the actions of the Conservative Saskatchewan Party against the independent Speaker of the Saskatchewan legislature?

Mr. Warren Steinley: Madam Speaker, that is a ridiculous question. Why would I apologize for someone else's behaviour? Randy Weekes is a friend of mine. I was a colleague of his. He served honourably for 25 years. He made those comments.

I think any intimidation and harassment should be called out, like the House leader of the NDP, who tried to intimidate and harass a staffer because she made a mistake. He continued to berate that staffer and would not let her fix the mistake when we had agreement from all our caucuses. He is one of the biggest bullies in this chamber, so he should reflect on that himself.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The member has enough experience to know that the kinds of petty insults he used need to be withdrawn, and he needs to apologize.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): This is debate, but it is also true that there were some insults exchanged here, and calling someone a bully is not parliamentary.

I would invite the hon. member to withdraw the comment.

The hon. member for Regina—Lewvan.

Mr. Warren Steinley: Madam Speaker, I withdraw the bully comment, but I still think the member should do some self-reflection.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Resuming debate, the hon. member for Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman.

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Madam Speaker, I usually say I am honoured to be able to rise in this place and participate in debate, but I am discouraged and disappointed with the rhetoric and the deflection coming from members of the Liberal caucus, as well as from the NDP, their coalition cover-up partners, on this debate. We are dealing with a prima facie case of the violation of privilege in the House.

I have been here for almost 20 years. I love this institution. I am incredibly honoured and still overwhelmed that the constituents of Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman have sent me here on seven different occasions. We see the government trying to deflect and protect the Speaker, who has now been found in a prima facie case of privilege on multiple occasions, and defend that behaviour. To me, that is disappointing to say the least. I am disgusted by it.

Privilege

I am such a parliamentary nerd. I read the *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*. We are on the third edition. I started off reading when it was O'Brien and Bosc, and now I am reading Bosc and Gagnon. I make sure that I read through the book at least once every session. At the beginning of every parliamentary sitting, in the fall, I reread chapter 20 in particular, but always chapter 3 as well because of committee operations and the work that we do. I am a vice-chair and I have to sit in committees.

In chapter 3, which is on parliamentary privileges and immunity, the very first page says, "The rights accorded to the House and its Members to allow them to perform their parliamentary functions unimpeded are referred to as privileges or immunities." The Deputy Speaker found in the case of the Speaker that he has violated members' privileges, a prima facie case that he violated our privileges. What did he violate? His impartiality.

In chapter 7 titled, "The Speaker and Other Presiding Officers of the House", under "Impartiality of the Chair", on page 323, it states, "When in the Chair, the Speaker embodies the power and authority of the office, strengthened by rule and precedent. He or she must at all times show, and be seen to show, the impartiality required to sustain the trust and goodwill of the House." That is why the Speaker is now in trouble, because he has not been able to maintain that impartiality.

In fact, we have seen, on multiple occasions, we are talking six or seven times now, that the Speaker has been called out, caught and charged for not acting impartial. When it comes down to it, the Speaker is the guardian of the rights and privileges of all of us as members of the House of Commons, so that we can enjoy our free speech and other privileges that we have.

On page 317, it says, "It is the responsibility of the Speaker to act as the guardian of the rights and privileges of Members and of the House as an institution." It goes on to say the following:

Freedom of speech may be the most important of the privileges accorded to Members of Parliament; it has been described as...a fundamental right without which they would be hampered in the performance of their duties. It permits them to speak in the House without inhibition, to refer to any matter or express any opinion as they see fit, to say what they feel needs to be said in the furtherance of the national interest and the aspirations of their constituents.

When we talk about impartiality and when we talk about preserving our freedom of speech, we have the case we are dealing with right now. The Speaker held a fundraiser. It is not that he held a fundraiser that was in error because all of us, as parliamentarians, have to raise money to be able to fight elections. The Speaker has that right. The previous Speaker that the Liberals always refer to, the House leader of the Conservative Party, had that right as well.

However, what was wrong in this case is that the Speaker's electoral district association advertised this as a meeting with the Speaker and used inflammatory, partisan language against the leader of the official opposition. It said that Conservatives would propose reckless policy, and would risk our health, safety and pocket-books.

• (1155)

That is where the prima facie case of privilege was violated, because they used inflammatory language. Again, that undermines the Speaker in his ability to maintain impartiality. We know also that

he, in the issue of freedom of speech, not that long ago, threw out, first, the member for Lethbridge, who used unparliamentary language but withdrew that comment. It was in the blues. They may want to talk about it but it was in the blues and then it was edited out. We still need to get that ruling on who made that edit.

The second thing is that, following that, he then threw out the leader of the official opposition, the leader of the Conservative Party, the member of Parliament for Carleton, because of inflammatory language, but did not apply that fairly, because even though the word "wacko" was used to describe the Prime Minister, the Prime Minister also, before that, had used inflammatory language, calling the leader "spineless". There was no action, no withdrawal, no apology sought, no ejection from the chamber by the Speaker, again undermining and proving that our Speaker is not impartial.

On those occasions, we talk about freedom of speech but we also have to talk about the maintenance of being non-partisan, of being impartial. It says, again, in chapter 7, under the roles of the Speaker, on page 324, that "in order to protect the impartiality of the office, the Speaker abstains from all partisan political activity". This includes not going to caucus meetings, never mind attending Liberal fundraisers. The first time the Speaker got caught, he attended a fundraising dinner for a neighbouring Liberal. That is not allowed. He can attend his own, but he is not allowed to attend other Liberal fundraisers. He then, by video, addressed, in his robes, in full Speaker garb, the Ontario Liberal Party leadership convention.

I filed a complaint with the procedure and House affairs committee, of misuse of government resources, of House resources, to further partisan activities, of which the Speaker was found guilty, and ordered to pay a fine. Again, here we go. He is supposed to be impartial. He was not.

We also know that the Speaker went down to Washington on the taxpayer dime and gave a speech about being a young Liberal down in D.C.. The Speaker continues to do partisan activities, behaves from a partisan position when occupying the Chair, and undermines the individual rights, freedoms and immunities that all of us are supposed to enjoy. Instead of being the guardian of our rights, he has ejected Conservative members. He has given a pass to the Prime Minister. His overall, and I do not know what the appropriate term here would be, as I do not want to be unparliamentary, ongoing loyalty to the Liberal Party and not to this chamber is what has caused the situation we find ourselves in.

Privilege

Any other members in this House, from the Liberals or their coalition cover-up partners in the NDP, who stand here and say that this Speaker is impartial are sadly mistaken. I am so disappointed in the NDP. It has always stood on the grounds that they protect this institution. It is actually helping to undermine our democratic principles, the respect and honour that this chamber is supposed to hold, by continuing to support the Liberals in their ongoing reckless spending, as well as protect the Speaker, who is not up to the job.

The House is seized with a question. The government has moved the motion to limit debate. The House, under the rules, is supposed to be seized with a question of privilege and rise here and discuss this and debate it and try to convince one another that we are right or wrong. It is unfortunate that the NDP and the Liberals are working together to protect the Speaker and his unparliamentary behaviour.

I beg the Speaker: will he do the right thing and resign?

• (1200)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, for those who listened in yesterday or are tuning in today, let there be no doubt that this is nothing more than a Conservative Reform Party tactic. That is all it is.

The issue that is before us is being used to try to say something that is not true. Instead of having a debate on issues that Canadians are having to face day in and day out, the Conservatives choose to play a destructive force here on the floor of the House of Commons. We will continue to be focused on the needs of Canadians, as the Conservatives continue to play this destructive force.

When will the Conservatives get away from playing their destructive games and start focusing on what is in the best interest of Canadians and supporting the initiatives that are coming through in legislation and in budgetary measures?

• (1205)

Mr. James Bezan: Madam Speaker, the member for Winnipeg North is again up here deflecting and misleading Canadians, especially his own constituents, on the seriousness of the issue that we are grasped with.

He is contemptuous in his comments, saying that there is nothing to see here, that it is all make-believe and it is all fake, which we have heard from the other side and the Liberals throughout the day.

We are seized with a ruling by the Deputy Speaker that someone in this place violated our privilege, and that takes precedence over anything else that we are debating in this House. For the member to say, “Ha, look the other way, nothing to see here, folks” is wrong and misleading. He should be more honest when he is dealing with his own constituents, never mind the rest of Canada.

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am sorry the member is disappointed with me and my party, but that is okay. We can have that disagreement.

However, it is important to note while that the Speaker may not have done himself any favours, at the same time, he has been consistent with the practices done before.

I remember, the Conservatives mailed into my riding. They used to use their mailing privileges called “franking”. Monte Solberg mailed into my riding, saying I was not supporting the RCMP on the day they were burying three RCMP officers in Edmonton. That led to a point of privilege that actually passed and is in the system right now. It stopped the mailings that the Conservatives were doing. I was supposed to get reparations for that, but that never took place because there was no agreement about what those reparations would be. However, we won.

How can we trust the Conservatives' sincerity in this debate when their practices are not consistent with that?

Mr. James Bezan: Madam Speaker, if we want to talk about sincerity of actions, the NDP actually promised, after the last prima facie case against the Speaker's malfeasance, to ensure that they would never support the Speaker again, after his violations of participating in the Ontario Liberal leadership convention.

Yet, here we are. The New Democrats said one thing, that they would never support the Speaker again as he continues to violate our privileges in this House, and they are supporting the Liberals and the Speaker in helping cover up this egregious violation of rights and privileges here in the House of Commons.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC): Madam Speaker, I think that the Speaker learned from the best, because he was the parliamentary secretary to the Prime Minister.

As we know, the Prime Minister has three ethics violation reports in his own name. Perhaps the Speaker learned this particular type of behaviour from the Prime Minister. I am wondering what my colleague has to say about that.

Mr. James Bezan: Madam Speaker, I agree with my colleague from Saskatchewan that the Prime Minister himself, as Prime Minister, as well as before, when he was in the third party, had numerous violations and was called to account for the use of unparliamentary language, for breaching privilege in this House, for elbowing a female NDP member of Parliament and for trying to push a vote more quickly than what should have been taking place.

Instead of respecting this place, the Prime Minister has always shown contempt, and that is being emulated by our Speaker in the House of Commons, and it has to end now.

Mr. Michael Cooper (St. Albert—Edmonton, CPC): Madam Speaker, here we are again dealing with, for the second time in less than six months, a prima facie question of privilege from a ruling of the Deputy Speaker, arising from the partisan conduct of the Speaker of the House. This is truly unprecedented. When I spoke in December 2023 to the initial prima facie question of privilege, I never would have imagined that, in just a matter of months, I would be on my feet again with the Speaker's having engaged in a very similar transgression of engaging in partisan activities.

It is of fundamental importance that, in discharging the duties and responsibilities of Speaker, the Speaker not only be impartial but also be seen to be impartial. If follows, therefore, that the Speaker must refrain from partisan activities and engaging in partisan commentary both in the chamber and outside the chamber. As the leading procedural authority for this place, Bosc and Gagnon states, at pages 323 and 324, on this matter:

When in the Chair, the Speaker embodies the power and authority of the office, strengthened by rule and precedent. He or she must at all times show, and be seen to show, the impartiality required to sustain the trust and goodwill of the House....

In order to protect the impartiality of the office, the Speaker abstains from all partisan political activity....

Aside from the excerpt, I wish to elaborate on why a Speaker must be non-partisan, be seen to be non-partisan and avoid partisan activities. That is because the Speaker is, first and foremost, the Speaker of the House of Commons. He or she is the Speaker of the entire House and for all honourable members of the House, entrusted with significant powers and authority to rule not only on matters of procedure but also on matters that go to the heart of the rights and privileges of each hon. member of the august chamber.

The Speaker is like a referee or a judge. The Speaker's rulings are final. There is no appeal. As such, in order for Speakers to fulfill their responsibilities, they must retain the respect and confidence of members. In order to do so, the Speaker must rise above day-to-day partisanship.

I will add a few caveats to that. Each Speaker, generally, has arrived in this place after running for a political party. However, when they become the Speaker, they are expected to not engage in partisan activity, notwithstanding the fact that they would have had a partisan background; other than that, they continue to serve as a Liberal or Conservative MP, but not in sit in the Conservative or Liberal caucus or any political party's caucus. There is some limited flexibility for a Speaker, if they are running for re-election at election time, to run under their party's banner.

• (1210)

However, even in the context of an election, the Speaker, as has been the practice, has generally refrained from making overtly partisan statements or taking partisan positions, and has generally focused, in the context of a campaign, on local issues and the Speaker's representation as an individual member of Parliament.

With that context about why it is necessary for the Speaker to be non-partisan and to acknowledge the limited caveats to that which exist, as has been the practice, the current Speaker has repeatedly failed to fulfill the standard that is expected of the Speaker to refrain from partisanship and partisan activities. This is not a case of one lapse in judgment, a one-off, but rather is part of a pattern. Indeed, there have been at least six incidents in which the Speaker has engaged in partisan activities or made partisan comments in the eight short months that he has been Speaker, including three times between December 1 and December 5, 2023.

The first incident occurred on December 1, 2023, when the Speaker voluntarily set up an interview with Laura Stone of the Globe and Mail on the topic of the Ontario Liberal leader, John Fraser's, retiring, in which the Speaker heaped praise on the Ontario Liberal leader, a partisan figure, and referred to the Liberal Party of

Privilege

Ontario as "our party". At the very least, it demonstrated a total lack of judgment on the part of the Speaker to set up an interview with a national newspaper reporter to engage in what amounted to partisan commentary praising a partisan political figure in Ontario.

One could say that maybe that was just a one-off, an error in judgment, but it did not end there. The very next day, a video was played of the Speaker, at the ultrapartisan venue of the Ontario Liberal Party leadership convention, providing a partisan message to a partisan political figure, namely the same outgoing Ontario Liberal Party leader, John Fraser. The Speaker in his message spoke about his own years of activism in the Liberal Party and how he worked hand in hand with John Fraser to help get Dalton McGuinty elected.

To make matters worse, the Speaker shot the video from the Speaker's office in the House of Commons, used parliamentary resources to convey a partisan message to be played at a partisan political convention and wore the non-partisan robes of the Speaker, to add insult to injury. As problematic as that was, the message on the video was a message from the Speaker of the House of Commons, played at the Ontario Liberal Convention. When it was reported and when people saw the video, there was general shock that the Speaker had done something that clearly had crossed a line.

• (1215)

However, the Speaker did not have the humility even to acknowledge that he had made a mistake. He dismissed his transgression as merely one of perception. When he came before the procedure and House affairs committee, he did not accept any real responsibility, just like his friend the Prime Minister. He said that it was a big misunderstanding and that the video was intended for a smaller private gathering. I do not suppose it makes it much better that the Speaker would use House of Commons resources conveying a partisan message to be played at a smaller partisan venue of Ontario Liberals, but that is the Speaker's logic. I would say it is illogic.

The Speaker's explanation, by the way, did not add up. The explanation was outright contradicted by other witnesses who came to committee and said that the request had been made from Mr. Fraser's wife to the Speaker's chief of staff, that the video had always been intended to be played at the Ontario Liberal convention and that there was no private, intimate event that occurred or that was ever planned. However, I digress.

As the Speaker was being called out for his partisan activities of shooting a partisan video played at a partisan convention, requiring the House to be seized of a matter of the first prima facie question of privilege, the Speaker, to demonstrate his contempt, while the House was sitting and while it was seized with the matter, took off to Washington, D.C. at taxpayers' expense to hobnob with a bunch of liberal D.C. elites, where the Speaker yet again engaged in partisanship. This was while he was under fire for two partisan transgressions. It is unbelievable.

Privilege

The Speaker attended a reception for Claus Gramckow, who was retiring from the Friedrich Naumann Foundation, a foundation closely connected with the Liberal Party of Canada's sister party in Germany. During the reception, the Speaker talked about his days as a Liberal youth president. The Speaker was essentially thumbing his nose at the House and demonstrating that in his mind the rules and the standards that apply to the Speaker of the House do not apply to him.

It should be noted that the Speaker did not get off scot-free for his transgression. The procedure and House affairs committee, in a report that was adopted by the House, ordered that the Speaker reimburse the House of Commons for any costs associated with the production of the video using House of Commons resources, as well as provide an apology to the House, which the Speaker initially refused to provide.

One would think that, after that, the Speaker might have learned his lesson, but it seems he did not, because we found out shortly afterwards that the Speaker had been engaging in other partisan activities. For example, the Speaker attended a Quebec Liberal Party political reception for the Quebec Liberal MNA for Gatineau. It was then reported in the *National Post* that within weeks of being elected as Speaker of the House, the Speaker contacted a former Liberal MP to write an op-ed praising him and attacking the official opposition.

• (1220)

The Speaker took it upon himself to orchestrate an op-ed attacking the Leader of the Opposition, using a friend to do so because he knew that he could not do so publicly. That is conduct completely unbecoming of a Speaker. It was calculated partisanship by the Speaker, and he hoped that he could do it in a hidden way using his friend, a former Liberal MP. However, he was caught as a result of a report in the *National Post*.

Now we have the latest transgression by the Speaker, which is that the Speaker's Liberal riding association of Hull—Aylmer organized an event, "A Summer Evening with the [Speaker]". On its face, if it was simply an event hosted by his riding association and was simply billed as a summer evening with the hon. member, that would not be an issue. It has been the practice for Speakers to attend events in their riding, including events of their local association, and to do so in a way that is not overly partisan. However, that is not what happened in this case.

In fact, what was posted to promote the event was an ultrapartisan message. I think it is important to read that message, which was posted on the Liberal Party website for "A Summer Evening with the [Speaker]." It was an "opportunity to join fellow Liberals and talk about the ways we can continue to build a better future for all Canadians." On top of that, it says, "While [the Leader of the Opposition] and the Conservatives propose reckless policies that would risk our health, safety, and pocketbooks, our Liberal team is focused on making life more affordable for Canadians". It went on.

That is an overtly partisan message, and it is not one, two or three, but six times that the Speaker has crossed the line. It really comes down to this: How many times does this have to happen? It has happened six times in eight months. Enough is enough.

The Speaker has repeatedly fallen below the standard expected of a Speaker, a standard that has been adhered to by his predecessors. I say respectfully that if he truly had an appreciation and respect for the high office that he serves and the authority that it carries over the House, he would do the honourable thing and resign as Speaker of the House. However, seeing as he has not seen fit to do that, it leaves us no other choice, as put forward in this motion, but to vote non-confidence in the Speaker. He has lost the confidence of the official opposition and the Bloc Québécois and has demonstrated a repeated pattern of partisanship.

I urge the passage of this motion, but I hope that it does not come to that. I hope the Speaker finally does the right thing and resigns.

• (1225)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I do not think the Speaker ever had the confidence of the member, the Conservatives or the Bloc Québécois, but that is not the issue at hand.

The member spoke at great length about different activities the Speaker does in his riding. I would really appreciate it if the member answered my question directly. He has an ability to listen clearly to what I am saying. I would like him to answer my question and address it without skating off somewhere else.

The member for Regina—Qu'Appelle, when he was the Speaker of the House of Commons, not only went to fundraisers in his ridings, but went to a fundraiser in the member for Regina—Wascana's riding, who is next door to him. I am looking at a Facebook post where the member for Regina—Wascana thanks the hon. member for attending that event.

Can the member please tell me why this is so outrageous now, but it was not when the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle did it?

• (1230)

Mr. Michael Cooper: Madam Speaker, I believe the fundraiser the member for Kingston and the Islands is referring to was one the former Speaker attended but did not promote on social media and did not make remarks about. I do not even believe he was introduced, so it is a very different set of circumstances.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I seek the unanimous consent of the House to table this post, because the member is incorrect in what he is saying, and it will clarify things for him if he accepts it.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): First of all, I want to remind members not to point to items they have in their hands.

Does the hon. member have unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member knows that he is not to show any document in the House and that it is a prop. There are a variety of members who—

Privilege

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. The problem we have is that several members from different sides continue to not abide by the direction of the Chair. I ask all members to please abide by that, including the hon. member who just spoke. The House could run a lot more smoothly if individuals were to respect the decisions being made and respect each other in the House.

The hon. member for St. Albert—Edmonton has the floor.

Mr. Michael Cooper: Madam Speaker, the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle merely attended an event. This is very different from the current Speaker of the House, who posted an overtly partisan message about the Liberal Party and expressly attacked the Leader of the Opposition. It is just more smoke and mirrors from the member for Kingston and the Islands.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Louise Chabot (Thérèse-De Blainville, BQ): Madam Speaker, the Liberal Party refers to what is happening as obstruction, but I think the most serious obstruction is what we are experiencing because of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

I have heard some members say that, in any case, the Conservatives and the Bloc Québécois are not expressing confidence. However, confidence has to be earned. It has to be built and created. The Speaker of the House of Commons has not earned that confidence.

Why is the government still defending the indefensible in light of the current situation?

[*English*]

Mr. Michael Cooper: Madam Speaker, I concur with the member for Thérèse-De Blainville that the Speaker's actions at this point are indefensible. It is part of a repeated pattern in which he has exercised a lack of judgment, blinded by his long-standing partisanship. The Speaker is a partisan, pure and simple. He is a partisan Liberal, and he has been unable to separate his partisan positions, his partisan views, when discharging the high office that he holds as the Speaker of the House. In the circumstances, it is why he needs to resign.

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Madam Speaker, the Conservatives had a Speaker, who is still in the House, who used his office for a video during a nomination meeting in an electoral process and was fined an unprecedented \$500. I believe the Conservatives were part of the committee for that, and now they want something different from what was done in the past. That is what this really boils down to.

How can the Conservatives continue to propagate the stance they have when their own former Speaker paid a \$500 fine because he used his parliamentary office for a video during an electoral process to support a candidate who is now here? How can they continue this charade?

• (1235)

Mr. Michael Cooper: Madam Speaker, once again, the member for Windsor West has demonstrated that he is a member of the government caucus defending the partisan Liberal Speaker of this House by conflating unrelated matters relating to the member for

Regina—Qu'Appelle, who is not the Speaker of the House. It is more smoke and mirrors.

If the member wants to talk about consistency, I would remind him of the position that the member for New Westminster—Burnaby, the NDP House leader, took with regard to the Speaker on the very question of the Speaker's partisanship. He said, "This cannot happen moving forward." However, this has happened at least three more times since then. Two incidents happened beforehand but were reported after the fact, and now this incident. The member for New Westminster—Burnaby also said that if there was "any derogation from that", the NDP would vote "non-confidence". They have an opportunity to do so now, but again—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I am sorry, but I have to allow for other questions. I know the hon. member loves to chat on this.

The hon. member for Regina—Lewvan.

Mr. Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to take to my feet.

The Liberals doth protest too much. They are trying to conflate two different scenarios. The member for Regina—Qu'Appelle, when he was the Speaker, went to the airport to pick up a guest speaker for a fundraiser, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, drove him to the fundraiser, took a picture outside and then left. That is nothing like what the Speaker did. It is hilarious that the Liberals and their junior partners are trying to make the connection between these two events. This was a Liberal-advertised event with the Speaker, full stop, in a riding close to the Hill. There is a complete difference.

I wonder if my colleague would like to shed some light on those comments and how illogical and desperate this costly coalition looks right now.

Mr. Michael Cooper: Madam Speaker, the member for Regina—Lewvan is absolutely right. There is no connection. It is just an effort by the Liberals to sow confusion and smear the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle, all the while failing to address the issue at hand, which is the pattern of repeated partisanship displayed by the Speaker of the House. The reason they are so defensive of the Speaker is that the Speaker is a partisan Liberal who has repeatedly demonstrated that he is prepared to take direction from the Prime Minister's Office. However, that is a whole other issue.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, in essence, we are debating this issue today and did so yesterday because of an incident. That is what caused it. Here is what the Liberal Party—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member for St. Albert—Edmonton will have an opportunity to answer.

I would ask members to pretend that they are in a courthouse. As I am sure they know, it would not be acceptable in a courthouse to heckle or yell across the way. I would ask members to please be respectful.

Privilege

The hon. parliamentary secretary has about a minute to ask his question.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, the Conservative members rose on a matter of privilege based on one incident. Let me quote from a letter from the Liberal Party of Canada to the Speaker and Canadians: “The Liberal Party of Canada unequivocally apologizes to you for this mistake, and we take full responsibility.”

This is virtually laughable; it is a joke. The Conservative Party is using character assassination of the Speaker to justify the far-right reform attitudes that the Conservatives hold, while trying to demonstrate that Parliament is dysfunctional. I say shame on them. Let us get down to business, deal with the benefits that Canadians need today and start debating legislation, like the budget.

• (1240)

Mr. Michael Cooper: Madam Speaker, I would say shame on the parliamentary secretary. That is utter nonsense, even for him.

This motion arises from a *prima facie* question of privilege, a ruling of the Deputy Speaker, and the parliamentary secretary has demonstrated contempt for the Deputy Speaker by dismissing the seriousness of that matter, which has been ruled upon. Consequently, the motion has been brought forward. However, there is a broader context to the motion, and it is that this is not just one transgression, but part of a pattern of repeated transgressions of partisanship by the Speaker. It is why he needs to resign, and he needs to resign today.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ): Madam Speaker, I want to begin by saying that I will be sharing my time with the wonderful and extraordinary member for Beauport—Limoilou. That is how she asked me to introduce her.

As we know, the current Speaker of the House is still engaging in partisan behaviour, this time through his riding association. That led the opposition to raise a question of privilege. The reason why we are having this debate today is that the Speaker's office approved the request because it found cause for the question of privilege.

The question of privilege does not have to do with the fact that the Speaker organized a partisan fundraising dinner in his riding. It has to do with how the event in question was promoted. The Speaker's partisan riding association published direct attacks on the Conservatives on its website to promote this summer evening with the Speaker. The website stated the following:

While [the Leader of the Opposition] and the Conservatives propose reckless policies that would risk our health, safety, and pocketbooks our Liberal team is focused on making life more affordable for Canadians and moving forward with our bold plan to grow an economy that works for everyone, protect our environment, keep our communities safe, and so much more.

Obviously, we completely disagree with the false claims about what the Liberals are doing, but that is not the issue. The advertisement was apparently online for almost a week before the media picked up the story and the invitation to the evening event was taken down.

The Chair recently ruled not on the question of privilege involving an umpteenth incident with the Speaker, but on the lack of a clear procedure for challenging or withdrawing confidence in the Speaker's actions by some means other than a non-confidence motion. The Chair is asking the House to consider this matter.

In response, the opposition is moving the motion being debated here: That the Speaker's ongoing and repetitive partisan conduct outside of the Chamber is a betrayal of the traditions and expectations of his office and a breach of trust required to discharge his duties and responsibilities, all of which this House judges to be a serious contempt and, therefore, declares that the office of Speaker shall be vacated effective immediately before the hour of meeting on the next Monday the House sits following the day that this order is adopted and directs that the election of a Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 2(2), shall be the first order of business at that Monday's sitting of the House.

Obviously, we agree with this motion.

The Speaker's latest partisan activity adds to an already long list. Last December, at the Ontario Liberal leadership convention, the Speaker paid tribute, in a highly partisan manner, to his friend John Fraser, the party's interim leader. Wearing his Speaker's robes, he addressed a speech to him in a video called “A Message from the...Speaker, House of Commons of Canada”. He recorded the video in the Speaker's office here in the House, using House of Commons resources.

In his remarks, the Speaker said:

And boy, did we have fun. We had a lot of fun together, through the Ottawa South Liberal Association, through Liberal Party politics, by helping Dalton McGuinty get elected. This was really a seminal part of my life. And when I think of the opportunities that I have now as being Speaker of the House of Commons, it's because of people like John....

He also used the phrase “our party,” as the Speaker actually admitted in his testimony before the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

The day before this convention, the Speaker had given an interview to Laura Stone of *The Globe and Mail*, in which he paid tribute to the outgoing interim leader of the Ontario Liberal Party, John Fraser, in glowing terms, while referencing Mr. Fraser's work within the Liberal Party. This interview was published on *The Globe and Mail* website that evening and appeared in the paper's print edition the following morning.

Also last December, there was another partisan incident. In Washington on December 5, as part of an official trip he had decided to make of his own accord as Speaker of the House of Commons, just as the House was debating a question of privilege in connection with his actions, the Speaker attended a reception honouring a long-time friend with whom he shared common political affiliations. He had met this friend while running for president of the Young Liberals of Canada. The Speaker gave a public tribute to his friend.

Privilege

A third partisan incident also occurred in December in the Speaker's riding. The Speaker attended in an event billed as an activist cocktail party bringing together Liberal activists from both the provincial and federal levels. Though the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs was already looking into the Speaker's ethical lapses, donations were reportedly collected at the event. Despite this, in his testimony before the committee, the Speaker did not believe it was appropriate or honest to state that he had participated in other partisan events.

• (1245)

Here are two excerpts from *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition:

When in the Chair, the Speaker embodies the power and authority of the office, strengthened by rule and precedent. He or she must at all times show, and be seen to show, the impartiality required to sustain the trust and goodwill of the House.

In order to protect the impartiality of the office, the Speaker abstains from all partisan political activity (for example, by not attending caucus meetings), does not participate in debate and votes only in the event of an equality of voices, normally referred to as the "casting vote" of the Chair.

By all accounts, the Speaker has failed to meet his duty of care with his many partisan activities, and every party, with no exceptions, has acknowledged that to be true. He has been unable to show impartiality, despite the fact that he is a seasoned parliamentarian and that the House of Commons administration provided him with information on the duty of impartiality in writing and orally when he began his new role, as indicated in the committee report entitled "Speaker's Public Participation at an Ontario Liberal Party Event".

I also want to note that the Speaker exhibited a serious lack of judgment on several occasions, particularly when he recorded a partisan video while dressed in his Speaker robes in the offices he occupies and with the resources of the House that are at his disposal because of the responsibilities assigned to him since his election as Speaker. Furthermore, when he apologized, it was not for having engaged in partisan acts, but for how these acts had been interpreted.

During his testimony before the committee, in response to one of my questions, Eric Janse, the Speaker's top professional procedural adviser, stated that, as Clerk of the House, he would have advised against recording this video had the Speaker asked for his advice. No such request was made, however. Not only did the Speaker not take to heart the information he had received about his duty of impartiality, but he did not see fit to request advice from the appropriate professionals at his disposal in the exercise of his duties. The fact that the Speaker did not ask his top adviser for advice and that he then neglected to mention to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs that he had participated in other partisan activities demonstrates once again that the Speaker tends to lack judgment.

As we all know, the Speaker of the House is a very nice person with whom I get along really well. However, that is not the issue. To carry out his duties properly and have the support of his peers, a Speaker must have two indispensable qualities: judgment and impartiality. Unfortunately, with the latest incident, he has once again revealed that he has neither, and that is why we will be supporting the motion we are debating today.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is unfortunate that the members of the Bloc have fallen into the Conservative trap and have taken this approach to filibuster, which is what we are really witnessing, on a privilege issue. I can tell members that when we look at things within the budget, such as pharmacare, the disability program and the dental program, those are things that affect the lives of Canadians on a daily basis. We now have the Bloc playing games, in an unholy alliance with Conservatives, and continuing to push the issue to prevent things from passing into legislation.

My question is this: Why has the Bloc party gone so far to the right, in circumstances such as this, to defend Conservatives?

• (1250)

[Translation]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I do not thank my colleague for his remarks, because I find them highly disrespectful.

As we know, the Bloc Québécois is doing well in Quebec. Perhaps that explains why the Liberals are accusing us of colluding with the Conservatives and of leaning to the right, if not the far right. Meanwhile, the Conservatives say we have joined the Liberals in promoting socialism. This is what the House has been reduced to: rhetoric and caricature.

Personally, I am just trying to do my job fairly and properly. The Speaker tried to participate in yet another partisan activity, despite knowing he could not. Today we are debating a motion about the confidence we have in the Speaker and the fact that he must exhibit impartiality and judgment. This matter has moved to the top of the agenda because it is a priority. Last time, we were told that the Speaker would learn from his mistakes and would not repeat them, yet he has in fact repeated them. We need to talk about this.

I could then respond at length to the other questions, but I see that my time is up.

[English]

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Madam Speaker, I have a lot of respect for my colleague. I believe that his intention and his party's intention is not to just do this as a tactic to block pharmacare from getting to people who need help. They are genuinely concerned about the Speaker's office being used for partisan reasons. It is clear that we call on the Liberal Party to apologize for breaking the rules and for what it did.

When we look at the Conservatives and their track record, the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle got a \$500 fine for using his office for partisan reasons. When he was Speaker, he used his office as a home base for a barbecue that was partisan. There were a number of violations that the Conservatives had, and then they are here as hypocrites when they call out the Speaker of the day on issues of relevance. We know that their real intention is to block pharmacare and to block help from getting to people who need the medicine they rely on.

Privilege

Can my colleague comment on the true intentions of the Conservatives?

[Translation]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Madam Speaker, let us be clear. I am not giving a speech here to slow down or block the pharmacare program. Personally, I would like every individual and every citizen to have access to the medication that they need. That is very important, and we want that to go forward. That being said, we have serious concerns about the way that is being done, and rightly so. For example, Quebec is not being consulted, and the program is not being aligned with the existing program. The work keeps being done in layers of silos. I am not rising today to delay the passage of the bill, quite the contrary.

We are debating a fundamental issue: the partiality of the Speaker. Can he be trusted to do his job in the House? Even though I get along really well with him, we see that he is unable to be neutral and use good judgment when deciding on his activities. That is serious. Members can use sophistry and say that another Speaker before him was even worse, but that is not the issue. Today, we are looking at the actions of the current Speaker.

[English]

Mr. Rick Perkins (South Shore—St. Margarets, CPC): Madam Speaker, I would ask the member about the member for New Westminster—Burnaby's quote after the first incident. He said to the media, after the incident with the Speaker, "This cannot happen moving forward. From now on, you cannot have the Speaker engage in partisan activity". He also said, "if there is any derogation from that, in the weeks and months to come", his party would be voting "non-confidence" in the Speaker.

Can the member explain why the NDP is going back on the word of its House leader?

[Translation]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Madam Speaker, my colleague obviously needs to ask him that question directly.

I would say this to my colleague. People decide for themselves whether to believe a politician's promises and commitments. We can see how consistent some of the parliamentarians here are.

Mrs. Julie Vignola (Beauport—Limoulu, BQ): Madam Speaker, it brings us no joy to speak on a matter like the one we are seized with today, but we must do it, because the Speaker's role is important. The Speaker's job is to maintain order in the House of Commons. He must ensure members do not cross the floor to hit each other, as we have seen in other parliaments. He must make impartial decisions about the operation of the House of Commons.

Today, we are once again debating the Speaker's impartiality. I would like to provide a little historical background, if I may.

We inherited Britain's parliamentary monarchy. The first Speaker was either Sir Peter de la Mare, in 1376, or Sir Thomas Hungerford, in 1377. Back then, the Speaker was considered as much the King's man as the servant of the House. It was not until 1642 that the Speaker broke with the Crown, when Speaker William Lenthall stood up to Charles I as the King sat in the Speaker's chair, demanding the heads of five parliamentary leaders. Despite threats,

Speaker Lenthall stood up to the King, thereby cleaving his role from the Crown.

After this, the speakership was still an appointment coveted by the parties in power, since it gave them extra leverage to promote their ideas and ideals. Only in 1728, when Arthur Onslow became Speaker, was the role severed from the party in power and shifted toward impartiality with the establishment of the first standards of independence and impartiality, which are still associated with the role today.

By the time Charles Shaw-Lefevre became Speaker in 1839, the principle that the Speaker should abstain from all political activity was already firmly established. Unlike the United Kingdom, Canada was not obliged to waste much time debating the Speaker's role, since it was spelled out in the Constitution of 1867, the British North America Act. Apparently, not everything was covered, since we are now in a grey area that the rules did not account for.

Now, I would like to talk a little about the impartiality that the Speaker should show. The authority and duties of the Speaker of the House of Commons arise largely from the Constitution and the written rules of the House. Page 317 of Bosc and Gagnon's *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, reads as follows:

The duties of the Speaker of the House of Commons require the balancing of the rights and interests of the majority and minority in the House to ensure that public business is transacted efficiently and that the interests of all parts of the House are advocated and protected against the use of arbitrary authority. It is in this spirit that the Speaker, as the chief servant of the House, applies the rules. The Speaker is the servant, neither of any part of the House nor of any majority in the House, but of the entire institution and serves the best interests of the House as distilled over many generations in its practices.

Despite the considerable authority of the office, the Speaker may exercise only those powers conferred upon him or her by the House, within the limits established by the House itself. In ruling on matters of procedure, the Speaker is expected to adhere strictly to this principle, delineating the extent of the Speaker's authority and in some cases offering suggestions as to matters which the House may see fit to pursue.

Still according to Bosc and Gagnon, it states on pages 323 and 324 of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*:

When in the Chair, the Speaker embodies the power and authority of the office, strengthened by rule and precedent. He or she must at all times show, and be seen to show, the impartiality required to sustain the trust and goodwill of the House.

In order to protect the impartiality of the office, the Speaker abstains from all partisan political activity....

My colleague has already mentioned a few examples. We see there is a flaw in the Standing Orders when it comes to situations like the one we are dealing with right now, specifically, when activist and partisan activities have taken place outside the House.

• (1255)

True, six days after the activity in which the Speaker took part, the Liberal Party said that the press release was its fault and that the Speaker was in no way involved. I seriously question how this party operates and the kind of planning it does. Certainly the Speaker has a right to thank the party's volunteers. Personally, I would have waited for a time when the House was not in session, such as the Quebec's national holiday, or Saint-Jean-Baptiste Day for francophones, or even July 1. Then impartiality would have been respected.

That said, the Liberal Party sent a press release without even asking authorization from the person concerned regarding the wording. They did it without even asking the team in that riding if it was really what they wanted to disclose, if it was cautious or proper. The party sent press releases about its own MPs and, in this case, about an MP who is Speaker of the House of Commons. However, they did not inform and or consult MPs on the contents of that press release. Apparently some parties are more democratic than others, because I have always been informed about the content of press releases. When I did not agree with the content of a press release, it was changed. The same applies for all my colleagues. Perhaps this is something that needs improvement.

It is the fault of the Liberal Party, of the party organization. As I was saying, we can ask questions about the timing of the activity, about any follow-up, about how no one monitored the contents of the publication, about how the party did not consult its own MPs before publishing something and about how the team of the member for Hull—Aylmer failed to follow up to ensure that its own press release could be used instead of the party's highly partisan release. Apparently, the member for Hull—Aylmer's team did prepare a press release.

In closing, the current question pertaining to the House's confidence in the Speaker arose not only as a result of a highly partisan press release from the Liberal Party of Canada, at a time when the Speaker was still sitting, when he could have waited to do another activist activity, but also as a result of the decision that he made and that openly raises the question of partisanship. Had the same event been held when the House was not sitting, it would not have created the problems it is creating now.

An impartial Speaker is essential to the functioning of the House of Commons. The impartiality of this office must be so complete that every time the Speaker opens his or her mouth, no member should be able to recall which party the Speaker comes from. That is what full and total impartiality and neutrality look like.

As things stand now, unfortunately, that is not the case with this Speaker. When he makes a decision, between 44% and 45% of the members of the House wonder whether the decision is truly impartial. No one should ever have to wonder about that, regardless of which side of the House they sit on.

• (1300)

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I note that the member is admitting that it was an error on the part of the Liberal Party.

Privilege

Political party business is of no concern to the House of Commons. In fact, when a member rises during question period to ask a question dealing exclusively with party business, the Speaker rises to say that this is out of order in the House.

I would ask, therefore, why the member and her party want an error by a political party, whose activities fall outside the scope of the House, to thwart the will of the House that the member for Hull—Aylmer be Speaker? This was settled by a vote a few months ago.

• (1305)

Mrs. Julie Vignola: Madam Speaker, I would have liked my full remarks to be taken into account. I mentioned, and I even repeated it a few times, that the Liberal Party had erred, not just by sending a hyper-partisan release but by failing to ask the member or his team for authorization as to the content.

I also mentioned that a mistake had been made, in that no one followed up and it took six days before someone woke up.

Apologies are fine, but I will use the analogy of a Kleenex box to illustrate my point. Someone takes a pin and pokes hole after hole in the Kleenex box. At some point, someone apologizes, so each of the holes is plugged. When all is said and done, has my box of Kleenex been fixed? The answer is no. The same is true of confidence.

[*English*]

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC): Madam Speaker, it seems that the Prime Minister and the Speaker are having a personal competition to see who can break the most ethics laws and continue to get away with it. The Prime Minister has three in his name. The Speaker has one ethics violation in his name, and there are now three instances where he violated the chair with partisan activity.

Would my colleague from the Bloc agree that the time has finally come for the Speaker to do the honourable thing and resign?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Julie Vignola: Madam Speaker, I will again use an analogy to explain how apologies are no cure-all. This will be in response to my colleague's question.

If I take a sheet of paper and crumple it up, this represents all the harm, all the mistakes, all the ethics breaches and all the lack of judgment a person is guilty of. Then, each time the person apologizes, I try to flatten out the sheet of paper so that it reverts to its original shape. The paper will still be creased all the same. That is what is happening. People will remember, and here in the House, we remember that despite the 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 or 8,000 apologies and some \$500 fines here and there, the sheet of paper remains creased and the confidence is still gone.

Privilege

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, there is nothing new about the fact that reflections on the character or actions of the Speaker could be taken as breaches of privilege and punished accordingly. It is even written in our procedural bible. This evening we are going to hold a vote. An overwhelming majority of members will say that the Speaker should not be attacked, because we understand the context of this situation.

Will the Bloc Québécois accept the result of a democratic vote this time? It is going to lose. It is once again calling the Speaker's position into question when we know that the Conservatives have done everything they can to oust him and try to attack him as Speaker.

Mrs. Julie Vignola: Madam Speaker, are we attacking the Speaker personally? No. We are just trying to ensure that the person in that role is impartial and neutral and that we do not have to wonder, every time the Speaker opens his mouth, whether his decision is impartial or neutral.

This is not a personal attack. I really like the member for Hull—Aylmer. However, he is not doing so well in his current role. We are not working with the Conservatives. We respect our values and decorum.

[*English*]

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, it is my sad duty to rise in the House with another Conservative blocking motion, as the Conservatives have done for the last couple of years.

Ever since Erin O'Toole left as leader of the Conservative Party and the member for Carleton became the leader of the Conservative Party, the Conservatives have brought chaos into the House of Commons, and constant delays. We saw this with the issue of dental care, which the NDP provoked the government to put into place. So far, 100,000 seniors in the first three weeks of the program were able to access dental services, in many cases for the first time in their lives, and many of them in Conservative ridings. Two million seniors have signed up and tens of thousands are signing up each week. We know that, starting next week, people with disabilities and families with kids under 18 will be able to sign up for dental care. The Conservatives have blocked that systematically.

Now we have another procedural move by the Conservatives to try to block passage of pharmacare, which would help six million Canadians suffering from diabetes and nine million Canadians who are looking to control their own reproductive health without huge financial costs. Particularly, women's reproductive freedom is absolutely fundamental. The Conservatives have been blocking that bill since February 29. They know that it is back in the House today and instead of allowing a vote to take place, they have been steadfastly blocking this with consideration of this procedural motion that will be voted on tonight, thanks to a procedural move that was made a few hours ago. Then we will finally be able to move on to issues that are of real concern, like putting in place pharmacare for six million Canadians with diabetes and ensuring that nine million Canadians have access to contraception. This is fundamentally important.

There is also the issue of affordable housing that the NDP, the member for Burnaby South and the entire NDP caucus, has pushed the government to put into place. Therefore, we will start to see the construction of affordable housing after a dismal two decades, first under the Conservatives, when we saw housing prices and food bank lineups double. Tragically, the Liberals did the same thing, keeping in place many of the Harper-regime policies that have had such a profound detrimental impact on Canadians.

I would point out the infamous Harper tax haven treaties that cost Canadians \$30 billion each and every year, according to the PBO. It is sad beyond belief that we are unable to pay for so many important things that would make a difference in lives of people and NDP initiatives that are blocked constantly by the Conservatives. At the same time, the Conservatives seem proud of the fact that they continue to give \$30 billion a year to overseas tax havens and the very wealthy.

Those are my concerns.

We know that this is a procedural delay. It is designed to block pharmacare. However, there is an underpinning that I find extremely disquieting, which is that the Conservatives are trying to run roughshod over our independent institutions, writ large. What happened in the Saskatchewan legislature over the last few months is absolutely despicable. No Conservative has apologized. No Conservative has stepped forward and talked about what happened with a former member of the conservative Saskatchewan Party. The House leader of that party has been intimidating the independent Speaker of the Saskatchewan legislature. Not a single Conservative has stepped up and said "That is unacceptable." Saskatchewan MPs sat with that member, Jeremy Harrison, who has been both physically and mentally intimidating the independent Speaker of the Saskatchewan legislature and not a single Conservative has stood to say that it is wrong.

Therefore, this ongoing attack against the Speaker at the federal level—

• (1310)

Mr. Warren Steinley: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The member has been here a long time. I did say that harassment is wrong—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I am sorry, but the hon. member is rising on a point of debate, not a point of order. If the member is not in agreement with what the hon. member is saying, then he needs to wait until questions and comments and he can make his comment then.

Members may want to look at the procedures manual and policy manual to ensure that they are rising on proper points of order, so we can keep the House going.

I do have a point of order and I hope that it is not with respect to what I have just ruled.

The hon. member for Timmins—James Bay.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Madam Speaker, my concern is that when we are talking about someone bringing a gun into the legislature, it would be nice if the Conservatives all signed something, but they refuse to, and they continue to tacitly go along.

• (1315)

Mr. Rick Perkins: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. That hon. member knows that this is debate and not a point of order. I would ask that those kinds of interventions stop, as the deputy government House leader does.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Everything that is being said is points of debate. Again, I would ask members to please allow members to do their speech without interruptions, unless they know for sure that it is truly a point of order on which they are rising.

The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, that is exactly the point. The Conservatives threaten; they cut people off. As for the decorum in the Saskatchewan legislature, I need to read into the record what Conservatives in Saskatchewan have done to the independent Speaker, because it is very germane to the kinds of ongoing attacks against the speakership of the House of Commons. We elect a Speaker. We ensure that the Speaker continues on good behaviour.

What we have seen is the Conservatives attacking in a way that we have never seen before. I have raised constantly points of order about the social media posts that have been the most disgusting, disrespectful material possible, attacking the speakership of the House of Commons. It is unbelievable. It is something that Conservatives in the past ruled very clearly on, saying that in no circumstances was it appropriate to attack the Speaker or the speakership, yet Conservatives now do this routinely, as if destroying the speakership is some kind of childish game to them.

What happened just a few days ago in Saskatchewan is indicative of that lack of respect for our institutions that we see routinely now from the member for Carleton and the entire Conservative caucus. No members speak up. Only the member for Richmond—Arthabaska had the courage to stand and say that what was happening in the Conservative Party was unacceptable. He now sits as an independent. Thankfully, at least one Conservative was willing to do that.

I know that other members of the Conservative caucus have strong misgivings about what Conservatives are doing now in the House and the attacks that they are levying against all our institutions, whether it is the Bank of Canada, or the Parliamentary Budget Officer, or the Auditor General or the speakership of the House of Commons. There are Conservatives that have profound misgivings but they are not voicing them.

I would ask the Conservative caucus to reflect on what the member for Carleton has done and the kinds of attacks the Conservative Party and Conservative members are levying against our parliamentary institutions, our democratic institutions, our independent institutions, and speak out. It is fine to convey misgivings privately. It takes courage to speak up publicly. I would encourage them to speak publicly. What happened in Saskatchewan is happening here. We will be able to get through, with a vote this evening, this procedural game the Conservatives are playing to block pharmacare.

What happened in Saskatchewan is even more distasteful.

I will read now into the record the comments by the independent Speaker of the Saskatchewan legislature, directing his comments toward the attacks of the conservative Saskatchewan Party, includ-

Privilege

ing from ex-members of the Conservative caucus. He talks about the obsession in Saskatchewan of the government House leader, former member Jeremy Harrison, former member of the Conservative caucus, saying that what is “more disturbing is his obsession with guns and his use of intimidation both verbally and physically. His desire to get permission to carry a handgun in the legislative assembly is particularly disturbing.”

He also said:

Another incident reported by a former special constable was when the Government House Leader [Jeremy Harrison] flaunted the rules concerning weapons when he brought a hunting rifle into the Legislative Building. He owns many weapons including a .223 AR-style 4-shot clip lightweight which looks like an assault weapon. Weapons like these can be easily converted to more than four shots

As I stated before, my experience with the Government House Leader includes threatening gestures whenever I rule against him in the Assembly. He will start yelling at me and standing up and flashing his suit jacket. As the gestures and behaviour became more aggressive, I worried that he might be carrying a handgun. My concerns over his mental stability and his obsession with guns was only confirmed—

• (1320)

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member for Longueuil—Saint-Hubert is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Denis Trudel: Madam Speaker, I do not know where this is going. I have been listening to my colleague for a while. Now he is talking about the legislation of Saskatchewan. I am not sure what he is trying to prove.

Today, we are having a debate on the integrity of the Chair, but I am not sure that my colleague is on topic.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member for Longueuil—Saint-Hubert knows full well that members can discuss different things during a debate and raise different points. To be sure, the discussion has to be based on the motion that is being studied. I am sure that the hon. member will link the different elements together.

The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby.

[*English*]

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, I will finish the quote before I was so rudely interrupted. He said, “My concerns over his mental stability and his obsession with guns was only confirmed when he heckled after the passing of the motion to devolve all relevant parts of the Firearms Act to the province. He twice yelled, open carry, open carry next.”

The attacks against the Speaker of the Saskatchewan legislature by the conservative Saskatchewan Party are very similar to the attacks we are seeing now against the speakership of the House of Commons. This is not something that is innocuous or innocent. It is something that needs to be taken under consideration.

Privilege

I have repeatedly risen in the House, talking about the incessant attacks that we are seeing on social media from the Conservative Party against the speakership of the House of Commons. I will give credit where credit is due. The members of the Bloc Québécois, despite the fact that they continue to raise procedural blockages to the House of Commons, have not attacked the speakership of the House of Commons openly on social media. Why? Because it contravenes the rules of our House.

The rules of our House were set by the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle, the former Speaker of the House of Commons, the now House leader for the Conservative Party. He said, “Reflections on the character or actions of the Speaker—an allegation of bias, for example—could be taken by the House as breeches of privilege and punished accordingly.” The Speaker also said at that time, in this ruling that dates back to 2014, “I urge all members to be judicious in the expressions they choose to use.”

That was the Conservatives when they were in power, saying that there was no transgression against attacking the speakership of the House of Commons. Now we see them in opposition not doing anything that actually helps anybody. They are blocking dental care, pharmacare, affordable housing and the consumer protection provisions that the member for Burnaby South has brought forward, which would start helping Canadians against food price and gas price gouging, which has happened with corporate CEOs determining the prices and the gouging they do with impunity. Those provisions are something the NDP has been pushing for years, and finally they are coming into being. However, all of those pieces of legislation have been blocked by the incessant attacks by the Conservative caucus against the speakership of the House of Commons.

The Conservatives would have loved to have spent the next three weeks debating this, rather than getting pharmacare in place, which would help six million Canadians who have diabetes, and I will come back to that in a moment, and nine million Canadian women, who want their full reproductive rights and freedoms, to have access to contraception.

For diabetes, the Conservatives' constant blocking since February 29 of the pharmacare act that the NDP initiated, pushing in this minority Parliament to get it done, hurts people like my constituent Amber, who is paying \$1,000 a month for diabetes medication. She is paying that out of pocket. She is struggling because of the lack of affordable housing, because of the Harper government's refusal to build affordable housing and the current government's reluctance, until the NDP forced it to finally budget that. All of the other provisions that would help Canadians, the Conservatives have blocked.

We are seeing, systematically, an attack not only on the speakership of the House of Commons, but also on all our institutions. People would say, and they would be right, that the NDP MPs are the worker bees of Parliament. We get things done for people, even people in Conservative ridings. In fact, Conservative ridings have benefited from the NDP's work perhaps more than any other, because of the success of the dental care program within even the first three weeks. More Conservative ridings are benefiting from dental care, because the seniors who have signed up are finally accessing, sometimes for the first time in their lives, it. Therefore, we are the worker bees, but we are also the adults in the House of Commons.

• (1325)

We saw this last fall when the former Speaker made a choice that, to our minds, simply compelled that Speaker to step down. Members will recall that no other party was calling for the Speaker's resignation. We put it forward with dignity. We did not criticize or attack the Speaker. In fact, we thought the former Speaker had done a decent job. However, given its magnitude, we believed that what unfolded last fall necessitated the Speaker's resignation. We clearly communicated that; eventually, other parties agreed with us, and the Speaker did resign.

We went through a process that took a couple of weeks, and we elected a new Speaker. However, the new Speaker initially made a number of errors that forced the House to consider the matter and refer it to PROC, which then referred it back to the House, and we voted on that. There were a number of sanctions and some solutions that were put into place. However, since then, we have not seen the kind of behaviour that would necessitate any kind of motion such as this, quite the contrary.

The Speaker has stood up and maintained decorum, but Conservatives have not liked that. The fact is, the member for Carleton was called to order when he used an atrociously unparliamentary, disrespectful term, attacking another member of the House. He was asked to withdraw it and refused; he was then asked to withdraw for the day. That happens, and we have seen it happen with other members of Parliament. When we use unparliamentary terms, we have to ensure that we are willing to undergo the consequences that come from that. It is a question of basic personal responsibility. I know that is alien to members of at least one party in the House, but when one makes such an error, one has to be willing to accept the consequences of one's actions. However, the member for Carleton did not accept the consequences. He renewed his attacks on the Speaker.

Now, we have a situation where the Liberal Party of Canada was clearly at fault and clearly disrespected the speakership by posting something without the knowledge or the authorization of the Speaker. However, the Conservatives did not attack the Liberal Party of Canada, which is what they should have done. They love to attack, so why did they not attack the author of the error? It was only the NDP that called on the Liberal Party of Canada to fully apologize to the speakership, which is ultimately, thankfully, what members of the Liberal Party did. They should have apologized right away, but they did not. However, pressure from the NDP meant that the Liberal Party of Canada apologized, which should have closed it and ended this.

We should not be spending days talking through this procedural delay when, at the same time, we have pharmacare pending. The sooner pharmacare is approved, the sooner the benefits can go to people such as my constituent, Amber, who is paying \$1,000 every month. Conservatives do not seem to care about that, but for her, those costs are enormous, and six million Canadians like her struggle every single month. Therefore, to delay pharmacare by putting forward procedural motions that delay the adoption of the bill means that it takes that much longer to help Amber and people like her. In this case, we are seeing a deliberate attempt by Conservatives not to look at the speakership in an impartial way, in an adult way, and if an error happens, to ensure that there is the appropriate consequence. That is what happened last fall and last December. No, they now want to invent, push and expose anything they feel they can, attack the independent speakership of the House of Commons and, in a very real way, diminish our parliamentary institutions.

• (1330)

I lived through the incredibly dismal decade of the Harper regime, when Parliament was shut down and padlocked by Conservatives, when procedural things and the normal give-and-take of parliamentary debate ended, and when Conservatives forced through bills that were promptly thrown out by the courts. I do not want to live through that again. Most Canadians would not want to.

I want to get on with helping Canadians, and that is why I will be voting “no” on this motion and “yes” to getting back to the debate on pharmacare.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the manner in which the member indicated that, with respect to the incident that ultimately led to the debate we are having today, it very clearly had nothing to do with the Speaker. It was the Liberal Party, which has given a formal apology to the Speaker's office and, through that, to Canadians. This is widely known; it has been publicized.

The issue, then, is this: Why would the Conservative Party want to continue trying to punish the current Speaker when, in fact, it was the Liberal Party that made the posting? I have drawn the conclusion that it is because the Conservative Party wants to continue to play a destructive force inside the chamber, preventing the debates on important issues. The member referred to the pharmacare—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I want to make sure that the hon. member has an opportunity to answer; there are others waiting to ask questions.

The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, this is my point. The independent officers of Parliament, the Governor of the Bank of Canada, the Speaker of the House of Commons, and the independent Speaker in the Saskatchewan legislature, obviously showing too much independence for the conservative Saskatchewan Party, are all symptoms of a party that has lost its way.

The Conservative Party simply does not have the ethics, morals and scruples that it did under previous leaders, who upheld parli-

Privilege

mentary principles. We saw that in the past. We are not seeing it today, and I regret that profoundly. I think the Conservatives need to reflect on their behaviour in the House of Commons and in undermining institutions that matter to all Canadians.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Madam Speaker, the Chair has the responsibility for overseeing the House of Commons harassment policy. It is a very serious role in this place.

In 2016, the Prime Minister grabbed my late former colleague, Gord Brown, by the elbow; he also elbowed a former NDP member in the chest. The Speaker's exact words in that moment, when the member expressed that she had been injured, were, “What happened was exactly as the Prime Minister had described it.” In the Hansard, he described it as “reminiscent of a dive in the 2006 World Cup.”

Now there are three incidents of partisanship while he is in the chair. How can the NDP trust the Speaker, given his history of partisanship, to fairly adjudicate the House's harassment policy? What impact will it have on staff and MPs if he continues?

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, I am glad that the Conservatives actually brought this up, and I thank the member for London—Fanshawe for having initiated the study on harassment at PROC.

Conservatives were not initially in favour. It is important that they now recognize the importance of actually dealing with this in a non-partisan and responsible way. This is a vitally important issue. That is why we raised it and why the member for London—Fanshawe pushed to have this study.

I have been here, as has my hon. colleague, and we have seen numerous incidents, both under the previous government and the current government. We need to have a zero tolerance policy in the House of Commons and on the Hill.

I am very hopeful that we will get there.

• (1335)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Kristina Michaud (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, BQ): Madam Speaker, I have a lot of respect for my colleague, but during the events surrounding the Speaker last December, the NDP House leader said that he had confidence in the Speaker, but that a line had been drawn and it must not be crossed. We can all see that that line has been crossed several times since then. Today, the NDP is telling us that it still has confidence in the Speaker.

As the Liberal Party's farm team, how many feet is the New Democratic Party prepared to move its own line?

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, I have a lot of respect for my colleague too, but I cannot stand by while she spreads disinformation.

Privilege

The reality is that, in this case, it was the Liberal Party of Canada that was at fault and that demonstrated a lack of respect, not only toward the Speaker, but toward all members of the House of Commons. That is why we demanded that the Liberal Party of Canada apologize, which it did. It was not the Speaker's fault.

The Bloc Québécois should draw a less partisan line based more on fact. The fact is that, since December, the line has not moved or been crossed, and the Bloc Québécois should admit that.

[*English*]

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Madam Speaker, just recently, my colleague spoke about the fact that the Conservatives are blocking things, not only here in the House but also at committee. They do not want to see pharmacare advanced. Not only are they blocking pharmacare, but they are also blocking things that need to get through the Standing Committee on Health and need to get through the House.

Conservatives say they are standing up for the Canadian Health Food Association regarding natural health products, for example. These are issues that need to be looked at when it comes to regulatory changes. Gavin Mah and Matt Breech, who are both business owners, just met with me; they talked about the regulatory changes that might impact their businesses.

Can my colleague speak about how this blocking impacts everything here in this place, especially supporting small businesses that are trying to continue to support their customers?

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, I really wanted to give a shout-out to the member for Courtenay—Alberni, who has always been a strong advocate for small businesses, not only in his riding but also right across the country. He has done an extraordinarily effective job. We saw that during the pandemic, and the response to help small businesses was largely inspired by his work. He has also played a pivotal role in fighting back against the toxic drug crisis that has killed people across this country. Sadly, we have skyrocketing rates in Alberta and Saskatchewan because of the mishandling of this crisis in those two provinces; hence, we are seeing that there is even more to do. However, the member has made an impact. If the government and the official opposition listened to him more, there would be far fewer deaths happening in Canada.

Mr. Rick Perkins (South Shore—St. Margarets, CPC): Madam Speaker, in the first of six partisan incidents involving the current Speaker, coming out of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs as it was considering the question, a member of the committee said, “This cannot happen moving forward. From now on, you cannot have a Speaker engage in partisan activity.” Moreover, “if there were any derogation from that, in the weeks and months to come”, he said that his party would vote “non-confidence” in the Speaker.

Who was that member? It was the member for New Westminster—Burnaby. Was he telling the truth then or has he just become an unmitigated falsifier of veracity today?

• (1340)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I want to remind the member that he cannot say indirectly what he cannot

say directly, so I would just ask him to be very careful with how he uses his words.

On a point of order, the hon. member for Timmins—James Bay.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Madam Speaker, we just heard my colleague called a liar, but my comment is about his use of the word “veracity”. That is a big word. I think he should withdraw it; it is probably beyond the capacity of the Conservatives.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I would remind the member that I have already ruled on this and advised the hon. member.

The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby has the floor.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, I am saddened by the member's falsehoods. He is misleading the House. It is very true that, since the month of December—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I want to remind the hon. member that he just said something indirectly that he would not say directly. Again, I think it is happening on both sides. I would ask members to please stay away from that word.

The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, the insults and how Conservatives are handling this ultimately shows what their real goal is. The reality is that we have, and I said this in response to my Bloc colleague who was giving the same disinformation, one incident where it turns out it was the Liberal Party of Canada's fault. It has apologized. It never should have done that. It was disrespectful to the Speaker, to the House of Commons and to Parliament and it has apologized. Conservatives are using this as a pretext to hold up other legislation in the House and I find that untenable. The member has thousands of people who are benefiting from what the NDP has done in his riding with respect to both dental care and pharmacare. Rather than pretending they are not trying to block this legislation, they should just come clean with Canadians.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. With respect to what is acceptable parliamentary language and what is not, the term “falsehood” is used regularly because it is a description of a condition. There is a difference between someone calling someone a “falsifier”, which is a synonym for a liar, and saying that something is a falsehood. A falsehood is a parliamentary term, and I think the Speaker needs to look—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I appreciate the definition the hon. member is providing. However, when it is directed at members, that is when it crosses the line. I have already put this aside. Let us hope that we can continue to put it aside.

Again, I want to remind members to be careful as to how they use their words here in the House.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Lévis—Lotbinière.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is an honour to address the House. I would like to inform you that I will be sharing my time with the member for Cypress Hills—Grasslands.

This is a Speaker's scandal. For thousands of good people, today is another sad day, a day where our democracy is being disrespected and Canadians' confidence in the House of Commons is being put to the test. The Liberals have too often demonstrated a lack of ethics since 2015, especially when it comes to high-level positions such as Prime Minister of Canada or Speaker of the House of Commons, in the case we are discussing today.

As members know, the Speaker is supposed to be impartial, non-partisan and beyond reproach. However, the Liberal member for Hull—Aylmer is struggling to figure out the difference between the role of member and the role of Speaker, or at least, he still does not understand, despite his previous mistakes, that it is not appropriate for a Speaker to engage in Liberal partisan activity. He should have seen the position as a great opportunity in his political career, but he immediately took it for granted. It is different this time, though, because he was found guilty of not being up to the task.

This is the third time in the span of a few months that the Speaker has neglected his responsibility to remain non-partisan. Let me give a quick recap of the facts.

In recent months, the Speaker has spoken at a fundraising cocktail party for a Liberal neighbour. He has addressed an Ontario Liberal Party convention dressed in his Speaker robes, and he has flown to Washington on Canadian taxpayers' dime to deliver a speech about the good old days when he was a member of the Young Liberals of Canada. I do not know whether this is because he had never dreamed of holding such a post, but his actions are unworthy of the office of Speaker.

As members will recall, the previous Speaker of the House had to resign. We cannot question the reason for his departure, but we can salute him for having the courage to leave his post with humility. He recognized his mistakes and acted accordingly, understanding that the serious nature of our democratic institutions is worth preserving. The office must always trump personal partisan ambitions. In contrast, the current Speaker has demonstrated time and again not only his inability to remain neutral, but also his disdain for the neutrality of his post through his stubborn determination to hold onto it. His apologies are not enough. In some respects, they seem like a last-ditch attempt to salvage his chances of staying on as Speaker of the House.

Now might be a good time to take a walk down memory lane to remind ourselves of the events in question. First, the Speaker participated in a cocktail reception for party activists, for which he was fined just \$1,500, despite the unacceptable nature of the error. Although using his office and Speaker's robes in an undeniably partisan setting ought to have led to an automatic dismissal, the Liberals saw fit to buy peace. Next, he overstepped his authority as Speaker by ejecting the member for Carleton and leader of the official opposition, in an illegitimate and undeniably partisan manner, for using language that has now been accepted by all following further review.

Now we have learned that the Speaker of the House is set to take part in a clearly partisan event, which was advertised with incendiary anti-Conservative materials. I understand that the Speaker is still attached to his role as the member for Hull—Aylmer. I myself am very committed to constituency work, which must be done for

Privilege

the benefit of all citizens, even those who did not vote for us. I agree that some aspects of this work are also partisan in nature. However, the role of Speaker is so important for unity in the House and in the country that we cannot allow it to be subject to these divisive dynamics, which, in this case, played out to an unhealthy degree. The fact that the position of Speaker of the House was exploited for partisan purposes leaves a bad taste that cannot be compared or contrasted with the work of any other member.

• (1345)

The many events, particularly this last one, are pure provocation. They demonstrate an arrogance that undermines Canadians' confidence in our institutions and promotes cynicism toward politics in general.

As elected officials, our number one priority is to serve and represent our constituents. This job comes with a certain number of privileges, but it also comes with responsibilities. There are rules that hold us accountable to Canadians, as well as to the House that represents them. That responsibility is what we must always be thinking about for Canada's future.

The real reasons keeping the Speaker from resigning remain unclear. It may come down to ego, visceral partisanship or political pressure from his caucus or party. However, regardless of the reasons, I am once again asking the Speaker to resign in the interest of everyone, to ensure that the extremely important work that is done here can carry on properly. It is a matter of common sense, and I salute my colleagues in the Bloc Québécois, who, for once, have reached the same conclusion we have.

The current Speaker has shown that he does not intend to remain impartial. We have known for months that the Speaker does not intend to do his job properly or fairly. We are therefore asking the NDP to grow a spine and stand up for Canadians.

We will have to make a decision because, clearly, the Speaker of the House does not have the humility needed to step down, and the Prime Minister does not appear to think there is a problem. It is our duty to ensure that the House operates in an impartial and non-partisan manner. I am counting on my colleagues to put an end to this Speaker's scandal.

• (1350)

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, there is something that is very clear. At the beginning of the member's statement, he called this a Speaker's scandal. That it is just it with the Conservatives; they love using the word "scandal".

Character assassination is something they have made into a fine art. This is not something the Speaker has done wrong. For the incident in question, the Liberal Party gave a formal apology. It has accepted full responsibility, yet the Conservatives continue with the character assassination.

Privilege

We have so many important things Canadians are dealing with today. We have substantial legislation and budgetary measures here to support Canadians, and they need to be debated. This includes pharmacare, dental care, the disability program, housing-related issues and the economy.

There are so many things there, yet the Conservative Party continues to be focused, not on Canadians, but on make-believe scandals that—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I want to remind the member he has one minute to ask a question so I can get the answer.

The hon. member for Lévis—Lotbinière.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jacques Gourde: Madam Speaker, my colleague did not have time to ask his question because his preamble was such a broad and extremely partisan tirade against the Conservatives. He has just proven once again that there are people here who are extremely partisan. He is defending the indefensible. He is defending a partisan Speaker of the House who is not impartial. I do not understand why he is so adamant about keeping him on.

[*English*]

Mr. Rick Perkins (South Shore—St. Margarets, CPC): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the member something. We have heard a lot from the Liberals that this was an incident that the Speaker somehow knew nothing about, and he was just attending. It was an event and a fundraiser in the Speaker's own riding.

I do not know about other members, but when my EDA puts out a communication for an event, I look at it before it goes out. I cannot imagine the Liberals lack such diligence that they would not look at their own information. They are now blaming the party, rather than the Speaker's incompetence.

Does the member look at his own communication from his EDA before they go out? Do you actually believe the government that the member had nothing to do with the communication about a fundraiser in his own riding?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): That is not a question I am going to answer. I ask the hon. member to address all questions and comments through the Chair.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Lévis—Lotbinière.

Mr. Jacques Gourde: Madam Speaker, I understand my colleague's concerns here in the House. The role of Speaker is so important in this chamber. If there are doubts about the Speaker, there could be doubts about the entire institution.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, yesterday the opposition whip indicated that they, as in the entire Conservative caucus, did not support the current Speaker's being elected in the first place. The Conservative Party has a personal, vindictive attitude toward this particular Speaker. Based on that and the fact that this is something the Speaker did not have

anything to do with, the question remains: Why is the Conservative Party continuing with character assassination instead of dealing with the important issues that Canadians are facing day in and day out?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jacques Gourde: Madam Speaker, my intervention will be brief.

I would like to turn the question back to my colleague. He is considered to be the most partisan Liberal member there is in the House, given all the speeches he has made. Will the Liberals vote impartially to elect an impartial Speaker here in the House?

[*English*]

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is always an honour to stand and speak on behalf of the great people of southwest Saskatchewan.

Over the weekend, I had a great opportunity to spend some time at the ball diamonds. Baseball season is in full swing in Saskatchewan. A lot of people at the ball diamonds who came up to me have been paying attention to what is happening in the news, what is happening here in Ottawa. They will ask, "What is going on with the Speaker in the House of Commons?" They are seeing what is happening now. The reason why they are paying so much attention to this is that it is not the first time and not the second time but the third time the Speaker has engaged in partisan behaviour. Using a baseball analogy, when a player get three strikes, they are out.

Even the House leader for the NDP, after a previous violation by the Speaker, said that if this were to happen again, that would be it. If he were to renege on that now, it would basically be like the umpire's saying that a player had three strikes but that they would give the player another pitch and just see what happens. What is going to happen if there is another strike? Is it going to be the same thing, or will the NDP let the Speaker try again?

• (1355)

At what point will the NDP grow a spine and stick true to its words? It is absolutely shameful for the NDP to renege on what happened. The NDP House leader stood in front of the media and said that if it were to happen again, something would have to be done, yet here we are. The NDP is already saying it is going to vote with the government on closure on the bill. We are going to have a vote on this later tonight. It is absolutely shameful.

I was first elected in 2019. One of the first speeches I gave in the chamber was actually on the "Peschisolido Report 2020". A former Liberal member of Parliament from Steveston—Richmond East was found guilty of breaking ethics rules. Actually, the then ethics commissioner, Mr. Dion, said at the time, "Given Mr. Peschisolido's chronic failure to comply with the code's disclosure requirements, there is no doubt in my mind I would have recommended that Parliament impose appropriate sanctions".

Statements by Members

In 2023, the current Speaker of the House's title was the parliamentary secretary to the Prime Minister. If colleagues will allow me to go back to my baseball analogy, the Prime Minister of Canada himself has three reports in his own name. On the Commissioner of Ethics' website, there are three reports that bear the name of the Prime Minister of this country. Strike one, strike two, strike three, and yet here we are. The Prime Minister actually has been given another strike.

We have had a few other issues with the Prime Minister since the last report was written, so he has been given lots of pitches, lots of chances, here, and somehow he is still standing at the plate. Right now the NDP is propping up the Prime Minister and the Liberals, enabling them and allowing this to happen. When I talk to people at the ball diamonds, they ask, "How on earth do these guys get three strikes and they are not out? How does that happen?" Where is the respect for the institutions of this place?

As members of Parliament, when a member is part of the government, they are a part of the Crown. There is an "honourable" designation beside the member's name. This place is based and founded on the honour system. When a member has multiple infractions, such as the Prime Minister and the current Speaker of the House have, one would think they would have done the honourable thing by now: accepted responsibility and resigned. That would be the honourable thing to do.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

• (1400)

[*English*]

NATIONAL ACCESSABILITY WEEK

Ms. Lisa Hefner (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight the commendable work of the Canadian Council on Rehabilitation and Work, CCRW, and to recognize the significance of National AccessAbility Week, taking place from May 26 to June 1.

CCRW has been a beacon of support and empowerment for persons with disabilities in Canada's workforce, fostering meaningful and equitable employment through national partnerships, employment services, community-based research and knowledge sharing. Its unwavering commitment to disability confidence within organizations, as seen in its recently launched disability confidence tool kit, is a testament to its role as change-makers in our society.

As we celebrate National AccessAbility Week, under the theme "Forward Together: Accessibility and Inclusion for All", we acknowledge the strides we have made toward a barrier-free Canada. This week is not only a celebration but also a call to action to continue our efforts in making our nation more accessible and inclusive for all Canadians. I urge my fellow members to join me in applauding—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member for Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier.

[*Translation*]

CLAUDETTE HETHRINGTON

Mr. Joël Godin (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, CPC): Madam Speaker, in Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, kindness goes by the name of Claudette Hethrington. This extraordinary and selfless grandmother has always taken the time to help the less fortunate and people in need.

In addition to appearing on television and radio and writing cookbooks, she also owned a design company. She even dabbled in provincial politics. For roughly 15 years, people in Saint-Augustin-de-Desmaures called her Madam Saint-Vincent-de-Paul. Ms. Hethrington was always ready to help others, rain or shine, 24-7. She dedicated her life to serving others.

For the first time, I will take the liberty of calling her Claudette, and thank her, both personally and on behalf of the people of Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier. On May 14, I had the pleasure of awarding her the MP's medal in recognition of her exemplary actions on behalf of our community. Her humanity and commitment are an inspiration to us all.

Ms. Hethrington, you are amazing.

* * *

[*English*]

PACIFIC ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Patrick Weiler (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, Lib.): Madam Speaker, Canada launched the Pacific Economic Development Agency, PacifiCan, in 2021 to ensure that B.C. businesses got the support that they needed. It is one of seven regional economic development agencies that play a vital role to help local enterprises seize the opportunities to scale up production and develop new markets.

Earlier this year, PacifiCan invested over \$2.5 million in Squamish-based Quantum Technology to help the company increase its production of liquefied gases such as green hydrogen and helium. This B.C.-owned company will have the resources to invest, improve its manufacturing processes and grow its workforce to better serve the Canadian and global transport sectors to access green energies.

Simply put, the investment is helping Quantum grow into foreign markets, rather than be acquired by a company from a growing foreign market. Investments like this are helping Canada to decarbonize and to seize the unmatched opportunity in the green economy. PacifiCan is ensuring that B.C. businesses will be at the forefront.

Statements by Members

[Translation]

ALEXANDRE MCKENZIE

Mrs. Marilène Gill (Manicouagan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart, but with recognition and admiration that I pay tribute to a great Nitassinan, *utshimau* Alexandre McKenzie, who passed away on May 11.

The entire north shore is mourning the loss of this builder who has left a great legacy. We owe him for the founding of the Scheferville Airport Corporation, Tshiuetin Rail Transportation Inc., the first indigenous owned railway in Quebec, as well as the creation of the Institut Tshakapesh, guardian of the Innu-aimun language and culture.

Former chief of the Matimekush-Lac John community, to which he devoted his entire life, *utshimau* McKenzie's commitment was recognized in 2023 when he was named a Chevalier de l'Ordre national du Québec.

On behalf of the Bloc Québécois, I wish to share my deepest condolences with the loved ones of *utshimau* McKenzie and the Innu nation.

Tshinashkumitin utshimau McKenzie for making the heart of the Innu nation beat to the rhythm of your legendary *teueikan* and for continuing to make it heard from the great beyond.

* * *

● (1405)

[English]

THE ECONOMY

Mr. George Chahal (Calgary Skyview, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Alberta is known for its economic success. With an increasingly diversified economy, Alberta businesses play a big role in keeping Canada's overall economy humming. For example, in my city of Calgary, we are investing in Excir to design and operate a pilot for an electronic waste recycling plant that sustainably converts electronic waste into precious metals.

Meanwhile, at the University of Calgary, we are helping establish an aerospace innovation hub, which will help start-ups and existing small and medium-sized firms develop and test new aerospace technologies.

Conservatives want us to stop supporting Alberta businesses and growing the Prairie economy in a way that leaves no one behind. That is not common sense. That is nonsense. We will keep investing in Albertans.

* * *

AUTOMATED EXTERNAL DEFIBRILLATORS

Mr. Scott Reid (Lanark—Frontenac—Kingston, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the cheapest, easiest way to save human lives is by installing and making available automated external defibrillators, or AEDs, and by building the skills in the community that would make it possible for neighbours and families to use them quickly and efficiently. This was the conclusion reported in March by an all-party parliamentary group in the United Kingdom. It suggested a variety of policy changes that would lead to such things as defib-

rillators in newly constructed homes and buildings, training in the use of CPR and defibrillation as a part of drivers' licence testing, revising regulatory frameworks to streamline the introduction of new defibrillator technologies into the market and putting defibrillators into all police vehicles in the country.

Canada would profitably benefit from the establishment of a similar all-party parliamentary group with a similar mandate. Also, if we would take the simple and inexpensive step of putting an AED in every RCMP cruiser, we would save 300 lives per year, starting now. What are we waiting for?

* * *

[Translation]

NORTHERN ONTARIO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Marc Serré (Nickel Belt, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent northern Ontario, a region that is stronger because of its francophone communities, diversity and beautiful landscapes.

FedNor plays a key role in ensuring that municipalities, businesses and organizations, both large and small, can grow and succeed in French throughout the region. FedNor's work, alongside key partners such as the Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario du grand Sudbury and the Conseil des arts de Nipissing Ouest, is helping to protect French in Nickel Belt and greater Sudbury.

On this side of the House, we support federal economic development agencies across the country, unlike the Conservatives and their "Ottawa knows best" approach. The Conservatives cut the budgets of agencies like FedNor. We increased its funding and transformed it into a stand-alone, independent economic development agency for all of northern Ontario.

* * *

[English]

TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION IN SOUTHERN ONTARIO

Mr. Bryan May (Cambridge, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise today to speak about the good work that our government is doing through the Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario. I know that my colleagues on both sides of the House will agree that supporting small businesses and entrepreneurs leads to strong local and national economies.

We are investing in EV suppliers and innovators, like ARC Motors in Peterborough, which turns vintage cars into EVs. Our Main Streets have the opportunity to thrive once again with investments in Main Street businesses.

Statements by Members

I have visited some fantastic businesses and have met with the entrepreneurs and organizations behind them. It is amazing to see the innovation and growth that they are creating. I know that many business owners will be able to reach their potential and to unlock new possibilities for Canada with support from FedDev Ontario.

* * *

OPIOIDS

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in my province of British Columbia, overdose is now the leading cause of death for children aged 10 to 18. Think about that. This would have been unimaginable nine years ago, and now it is a new norm.

After unleashing a wave of crime, chaos and death in our streets, the government's solution to the crisis is to hand out taxpayer-funded drugs like it is candy, flooding our streets with deadly opioids. The so-called safe supply is key to the NDP-Liberal drug legalization plan, but in reality, it is anything but safe. New research reveals that 100% of British Columbians surveyed—

• (1410)

The Speaker: I hate to interrupt the hon. member.

I am going to ask all members to please keep their comments. Statements by members are important.

I am going to ask the hon. member for Cariboo—Prince George to start his statement from the top.

Mr. Todd Doherty: Mr. Speaker, in my province of British Columbia, overdose is now the leading cause of death for children aged 10 to 18. Let us think about that. This would have been unimaginable nine years ago, and now it is the new norm.

After unleashing a wave of crime, chaos and death in our streets, the government's solution to the crisis is to hand out taxpayer-funded drugs like they are candy, flooding our streets with deadly opioids. The so-called safe supply is key to the NDP-Liberal drug legalization plan, but in reality, it is anything but safe. New research reveals that 100% of British Columbians surveyed are opposed to so-called safe supply. Even recovered addicts called the radical drug policy a failure, saying that if they had been offered safe supply rather than treatment, they would not have been able to overcome their addictions.

If the Prime Minister refuses to put an end to his radical drug policies, he should step aside immediately and let common-sense Conservatives invest in treatment and recovery.

* * *

[Translation]

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF CANADA FOR THE REGIONS OF QUEBEC

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan (Châteauguay—Lacolle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec, our government is investing in our Quebec businesses.

Such investments include: in Lévis—Lotbinière, \$1 million to help J.L. Leclerc improve its productivity and transition to a green

economy; in Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, \$1 million to help Plate 2000 expand by reducing its environmental impact; in the riding of my colleague from Mégantic—L'Érable, \$2 million to help Fruit d'Or increase its cranberry and blueberry production; in Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, \$1.5 million to Diffusion Saguenay for a new immersive production.

The Conservatives want the economic development agencies to be a thing of the past. My colleagues from Quebec should be honest with the businesses in their region and tell them that they are going to slash their investments.

* * *

[English]

LEADER OF THE NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. Larry Brock (Brantford—Brant, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years, the NDP-Liberal government is simply not worth the cost. The NDP leader blames everyone but himself, yet blindly supports the Prime Minister's inflationary deficits and policies that have driven up food prices for families. Canadians deserve to know the truth. Since he started holding hands with the Liberals in 2022, food prices have risen to a 40-year high. Perhaps it is because his brother's company is Metro's top lobbyist, or is it because he voted to hike carbon taxes on families, farmers and food? Either way, the NDP leader has sold out hungry families for his pension and power.

Instead of selling out Canadians, common-sense Conservatives will cut taxes, resulting in lower food prices and a stronger economy for all, not just for those who drive a BMW or wear a Rolex. It is time for real Conservative leadership that puts families first.

* * *

[Translation]

HOUSING CONSTRUCTION

Mr. Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in the midst of the housing crisis, Quebecers are literally out on the street. Rents are too expensive, and there is a housing shortage.

Again today, in Le Journal de Montréal, we learn that delays in obtaining a building permit have more than doubled in downtown Montreal and the boroughs. It can take up to 20 months to obtain a building permit downtown. What citizens need is housing now, not in two years.

While Quebecers have to choose between groceries and paying their rent, the Bloc Québécois has voted for \$500 billion in budget appropriations. We are talking about centralizing spending that caused inflation and the housing crisis we are currently experiencing.

Statements by Members

That is why my leader has tabled a common-sense plan to build housing, not bureaucracy. The Conservatives will reward cities that build 15% more housing each year, such as in my area, the Saguenay.

The vote will take place tomorrow. I am asking the Prime Minister to allow his MPs to vote freely so that Quebeckers can keep a roof over their heads.

* * *

● (1415)

[English]

NORTHERN ECONOMY

Ms. Yvonne Jones (Labrador, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the northern economy is growing and diversifying. Through programs like the economic development corporations, CanNor and ACOA, investing in the north is helping businesses build on the strengths of northern people and their communities.

Indigenous entrepreneurs and business owners are key drivers in the northern economy, and over half of CanNor's project funding goes to indigenous-led projects across the territories. For example, in Labrador and Nunatsiavut, we have invested over \$3 million to support Inuit-led conservation and climate adaptation projects. This funding is empowering Inuit to research and to observe changes to the land, water and sea ice, as well as to create opportunities for youth in their homeland.

Those of us who live in rural communities in northern Canada know how important these programs are. Unlike the Conservatives who vote against these initiatives and programs, we continue to fund and support people—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Victoria has the floor.

* * *

DISABILITY RIGHTS CHAMPIONS

Ms. Laurel Collins (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize two disability rights champions in my community.

Lembi Buchanan has worked for over 20 years to ensure that people living with severe mental health challenges receive the supports they deserve. She has helped improve the application form for the disability tax credit to include thousands of people who were previously left behind.

Joanne Neubauer passed away this year. She worked tirelessly for nearly 50 years to establish national policies and programs that emphasize justice and self-determination. As the founder for the Action Committee of Persons with Disabilities, Joanne lived her life with true compassion. May her legacy inspire us all to continue this important work.

We need a disability benefit that will truly meet the needs of Canadians with disabilities, too many of whom are living well below the poverty line. We need legislation that removes barriers for people with disabilities. We must keep working to ensure they get the dignity and the respect they deserve.

[Translation]

VANESSA LEPAGE-JOANISSE

Ms. Marie-Hélène Gaudreau (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in the Laurentians, we have our very own Mike Tyson and Mohamed Ali. Her name is Vanessa Lepage-Joanisse and she is the pride of Mont-Laurier. On March 7, Vanessa Lepage-Joanisse became the WBC world champion in front of a jubilant crowd at the Casino de Montréal.

After suffering a setback at a world championship bout in 2017, Vanessa returned to training in full force. Her determination, drive and fighting spirit are an inspiration to us all.

This great heroine works at a day care by day, looking after our little ones, before transforming into a warrior at night. She is proof that when someone puts their mind to something, they can achieve their dreams, confidently and with pride.

We are all proud of Vanessa. She can rest assured that the whole of the Laurentians will be in her corner, every time.

* * *

[English]

HOUSING

Ms. Michelle Ferreri (Peterborough—Kawartha, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there is “not a chance” that the housing minister will reach his housing target promises. That is a direct quote from Richard Lyall, president of the Residential Construction Council of Ontario. He testified yesterday at the Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities. He went on to say, “we're staring into a pit. What we're saying is that when cranes come down, they're not going back up.”

After nine years of the Liberal-NDP Prime Minister, housing costs have doubled. Yesterday's testimony from housing experts confirmed what Conservatives have been saying, which is that “first-time homebuyers are pretty much extinct”, said Lyall. He said, “We effectively tax housing like alcohol and tobacco. It's like a sin tax. It doesn't make sense”.

Clearly, there is no chance the Prime Minister can or will help Canadians. It is time for common-sense Conservative policies, where development fees are not the highest in the continent and where we restore the dream of home ownership.

KOSOVO

Ms. Anita Vandenberg (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 25th anniversary of the arrival of the Kosovo refugees who fled the brutal conflict there in 1999. Today, the Canada-Kosovo Parliamentary Friendship Group welcomed a delegation from Kosovo to celebrate the occasion.

Twenty-five years after their arrival, we celebrate the invaluable contributions of Kosovo Canadians to our society. They are contributing as doctors, business owners, as members of the Canadian Armed Forces, in music and as cultural leaders, as scientists and so much more.

The generosity of those Canadians who welcomed and who helped them has been returned many times over. This anniversary serves as a reminder of our shared humanity and our duty of compassion toward those seeking refuge.

[Translation]

We are committed to continuing to support those fleeing war and oppression and to honour the stories of courage and resilience that inspire us to be more inclusive as a society.

ORAL QUESTIONS

• (1420)

[Translation]

HOUSING

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the incompetence of this Prime Minister and the Liberal mayor of Montreal, who is blocking construction, has caused rents to triple in Montreal.

We learned the worst today. Under the headline “Major holdup”, La Presse reported that, “since 2019, [building] permit wait times have more than doubled.”

Why is the Prime Minister continuing to send \$95 million to politicians and municipalities that are blocking construction?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, the Conservative leader's hypocrisy is on full display.

Let us talk about his housing proposal, which he has been delaying debate on for months. His proposal would not build homes fast enough, would not reach enough cities and would create unnecessary bureaucracy. The Conservative leader would also rip up the 179 housing agreements and put the GST back on apartment construction. His clear lack of ambition on housing is how we ended up here in the first place.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, everything the Prime Minister said is false.

When I was the minister responsible for housing, we built 200,000 new housing units. In Montreal, the average rent was \$700 a month. Now it is \$2,000. What is more, the wait time for construction permits has more than doubled.

Oral Questions

Why does the Prime Minister not follow my common-sense plan, which involves penalizing Montreal politicians by giving that money back to Quebec municipalities that are accelerating housing construction?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative leader is preying on Canadians' genuine concerns.

When the Conservative leader was the minister responsible for housing, he withdrew the government from co-operative housing. He supported the construction of zero new apartments and he gutted affordable housing initiatives.

Today, his housing proposal continues to fall short. The Conservative leader is all about slogans, not real solutions.

[English]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, because of the incompetence of the Prime Minister and the Liberal City Hall in Toronto, rent there has more than doubled over the last nine years. What is worse is that the Prime Minister's so-called housing accelerator fund has given half a billion dollars to Toronto, and only months later, the politicians in that city hiked up homebuilding taxes by 20%. Now 30% of all homebuilding costs are government taxes alone.

Why does the Prime Minister keep sending our money to build bureaucracies that block homes?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we see the Conservative leader's hypocrisy on full display.

Let us talk about their housing proposal, which the Conservative leader has been delaying debate on for months because he knows it's not ambitious enough. His proposal will not build homes fast enough, does not reach enough cities and creates unnecessary bureaucracy. The Conservative leader would also rip up the 179 housing accelerator agreements and put the GST back on apartment construction. His clear lack of ambition on housing is partly how we ended up here in the first place.

• (1425)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when I was housing minister, we built 200,000 homes in one year, rent was only \$900 and mortgage payments were half of what they are today.

Fast-forward to the present, and the Prime Minister has given half a billion dollars to Toronto City Hall to jack up new taxes on homebuilding. It is no wonder. When the president of the Residential Construction Council of Ontario, Richard Lyall, was asked whether the Prime Minister would keep his promise for 3.9 million new homes by the end of the decade, he said, “Not a chance.”

Why does the Prime Minister not stop funding bureaucracy so that we can get out of the way and build homes?

Oral Questions

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is shameful that the Conservative leader continues to exploit the very real anxieties of Canadians.

As the Conservative leader was housing minister, let us talk about his record. He withdrew the government from co-operative housing. He supported the construction of zero new apartments. He gutted affordable housing initiatives and created new bureaucracies.

His housing proposal today continues to fall short. The Conservative leader is simply all slogans and no answers.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my common-sense plan to build homes would reward municipalities that speed up permits and punish the politicians who get in the way. The Prime Minister's approach has not only doubled housing costs, but built up Toronto City Hall with monstrous financial transfers so that it can block construction.

There have been 50 new tent encampments added in the city of Toronto in six weeks. There are 250 tent cities in Toronto alone. Is that his plan, to block homes and put up tents?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the so-called plan that the Conservative leader has put forward on housing does absolutely nothing to address homelessness or encampments.

We are investing hundreds of millions of dollars to help municipalities across the country build more housing rapidly and create the wraparound supports necessary to support people facing homelessness. We continue to be there with the most ambitious and comprehensive housing plan this country has ever seen.

This is part of what we are doing to make up for the lost years for which he was housing minister 10 years ago, not creating housing for Canadians and not investing in our future.

* * *

[Translation]

DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, a report on foreign interference that included the 2019 and 2021 elections reveals a serious lack of coordination and rigour. I would even venture to say that the Prime Minister's Office swept everything under the rug.

The Prime Minister probably does not know the whole story, because he himself admits that he did not read the reports. He is just not interested, and that is not leadership.

How does the Prime Minister plan to stop this kind of complicity in foreign interference, particularly from his own office?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we thank the National Security and Intelligence Review Agency for its report and its diligent work, of course.

The report made a number of recommendations, and we are currently following up on them. During the various conversations and investigations into foreign interference, a number of challenges were highlighted with respect to internal communication within our intelligence agencies. We will continue to implement the recom-

mendations and proposals that will improve how we respond as a government to foreign interference.

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, those were not challenges; they were monumental failures resulting from ignorance and carelessness. All parties participated in creating the Hogue commission. Naturally, the commission is calling for information in order to remedy these failures, but the Prime Minister's Office literally withheld information and documents that the commission struggled mightily to obtain. The Hogue commission itself called for the documents, and now it has to make sense of all the pieces.

Will the Prime Minister promise to co-operate fully and unconditionally with the commission from now on?

• (1430)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government has shared more cabinet confidences with various commissions of inquiry than almost any other government in the history of our country.

We know how important it is to show Canadians that they can have confidence in our public service, our intelligence services and our government to counter foreign interference. That is why we have been transparent and open with the commissioner and with all the other commissions. We have to keep being transparent about the work this government is doing.

* * *

[English]

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the hospital in Moose Factory was built nearly 70 years ago. The wood roof is caving in. There are no elevators. Patients and staff deserve better.

For two decades, the community of James Bay has been pushing the federal government to build a new hospital. The Liberals promised funding, but in the last budget, there was not a single cent for the hospital. The province and Weeneebayko Area Health Authority are ready to go.

Will the Prime Minister finally fund the new James Bay hospital? Yes or no?

Oral Questions

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, over the past years, we have made historic investments in first nations and indigenous health care right across the country. We recognize there is more to do. We are going to continue to be there as partners to indigenous communities and provincial health authorities to make sure those investments show up for vulnerable Canadians from coast to coast to coast.

We know how much more there is to do on the path to reconciliation, but we are there to be a partner every step of the way, and we will continue to work to respond to the important needs of first nations communities around health care.

* * *

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister continues to break his promise to the community and needs to build that hospital.

[*Translation*]

Montreal's public transit system is in crisis. The experts are clear: There is not enough money.

The longer this crisis goes on, the more people will lose public transit. This government is doing nothing. The Liberals are turning their backs on Montrealers.

What is the point of having Liberal MPs in Montreal if none of them are fighting for their city?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is pure nonsense. Our government has been there to invest in public transit more than any other government.

As a proud Montreal MP, I can say that our actions in support of the blue line and the REM and of continued investment in public transit in Montreal, Quebec City and across the country are not going to stop.

We set up an infrastructure program to invest in public transit on a permanent and ongoing basis for decades to come. We will continue to be there for Montreal, for Montrealers and for all Quebecers and Canadians when it comes to public transit.

* * *

[*English*]

HOUSING

Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of the NDP-Liberal government, Canada's housing crisis is only getting worse. The Liberals claim, in budget 2024, that they are going to build 3.87 million homes by 2031. That would mean a new home completed every 57 seconds, every day. At the housing committee, I asked Richard Lyall, a home-building expert, if this was realistic, and he said not a chance. The Prime Minister is not worth the cost of housing.

Will the Prime Minister stop funding photo ops and start building the homes that Canadians desperately need?

Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with the recent housing plan,

we have set out to build the number of homes actually required to solve the housing crisis. With respect, it is disappointing in the extreme that Conservatives will not even set a goal that will solve the problem.

What is more interesting is that the member who posed the question has had her community benefit with a \$31.5-million investment to build more homes in Kelowna. She is advocating for that money to be taken away from her city and replaced with a program for which Kelowna is ineligible. Most MPs advocate for investments in their community. It is disappointing that my colleague is doing the opposite.

Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it was announced just this morning that, in fact, housing starts are down in my community and across the country.

In 2015, people could actually afford a home. Nine years of the NDP-Liberal government has only brought us a housing crisis.

The head of the Residential Construction Council of Ontario said that construction is down there. We are seeing this across the entire country. He said that high financing costs and development charges mean homebuilders are sitting at home instead of building homes.

Since the Prime Minister has no meaningful plan, will the Liberals vote for our housing bill put forward by the Conservative opposition leader to build the homes, not bureaucracy?

• (1435)

Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the member argues that housing starts in her community are down, why is her solution to cut funding for housing in her community? It is endemic to the Conservative approach. When we look at the plan that Conservatives have put forward, it includes a tax hike on new apartment construction. It includes cuts to the programs that fund affordable housing, that fund cities to build housing and that allow young people to get into the market for the first time. The cuts are so extreme, even Conservative premiers are crying out, threatening to call snap elections in order to avoid the prospect of Conservative cuts. Cuts will not build homes.

Mr. Richard Bragdon (Tobique—Mactaquac, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of the NDP-Liberal government, Canadians are hungry and homeless. Yesterday, it was confirmed at committee what Conservatives have been saying all along, that the housing minister will never meet his targets.

Oral Questions

In Saint John, New Brunswick, the lack of housing options is leaving a family in a leaky, mouldy apartment. Cory Hamilton, the father of four, is worried about the health and safety of his family. Ten new people a week are going homeless in Halifax in the minister's own backyard.

When will the Liberals stop funding photo ops and start building the homes Canadians desperately need?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, even Conservative premiers recognize the damage these cost-cutting, austerity Conservatives would wreak on our country. The only thing Conservatives know how to do is cut. They want to cut the first home savings account that has allowed more than 750,000 young Canadians to save up for their first home. They want to cut support for the infrastructure that is allowing municipalities to build homes. They want to tear Canada down, but we will not let them.

Mr. Richard Bragdon (Tobique—Mactaquac, CPC): Mr. Speaker, all the current federal Liberal government wants to do is blame and pass the buck. That non-answer will do absolutely nothing for the Hamilton family in Saint John who are in desperate need of alternatives for housing.

Since the Prime Minister has no plan and the Liberals have no chance to build the homes tomorrow and all they want to do is continue to build bureaucracy, why do they not give all of their members a chance to vote freely on the Conservative leader's plan for housing? Let us have a free vote on that tomorrow.

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is not only Conservative premiers who understand the terrible damage Conservative cuts would do to our country, but Canada's mayors get it too. That is why it was so shameful to hear the progressive mayors of two great Canadian cities, Toronto and Montreal, be vilified by the Conservative leader today.

We believe in working with our municipal partners and our provincial ones. That is how we build Canada.

[Translation]

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the cat is out of the bag.

After nine years of inflationary spending, supported by the Bloc Québécois, which has tripled the cost of rent in Montreal, a detailed report in today's edition of *La Presse* confirms that wait times for construction permits in Montreal are endless. It takes 540 days to get a permit to build a home in the mayor's own borough of Ville-Marie.

Will the Prime Minister stop rewarding bureaucratic bungling and start rewarding municipalities that are accelerating the construction of housing, as the Leader of the Opposition's common-sense bill proposes to do?

Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member is unbelievable.

Today, he is asking a question about housing issues, but tomorrow the leader of the Conservative Party plans to introduce a bill that will do away with affordable housing measures, do away with

the measures to support communities that build housing and do away with measures that support first-time home buyers.

The Conservative Party's plan is not a good thing for Canadians. It is a disaster.

● (1440)

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, do people realize what is happening as a result of the housing minister's measures after nine years? More and more Quebeckers are living in tents in Montreal because of the incompetence of this minister and the Prime Minister.

Will the Prime Minister accept our plan so that Canada and Quebec can reach a common-sense agreement to encourage housing construction in Montreal? This agreement will give bonuses to the municipalities that are competent and penalize the municipalities that do not build housing.

Will the Prime Minister at least allow a free vote for his MPs to support a bill to build homes, not bureaucracy?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member is talking about building housing. Do members know how many homes the Conservative leader built when he was the minister responsible for housing? It was not 10 units. It was not nine units. It was not eight or seven units. The Conservative leader built six affordable housing units across the country during his entire term as the minister responsible for housing. Municipalities in Quebec are currently building 8,000 affordable housing units with the support of the Canadian government.

Let us compare the 8,000 housing units being built in Quebec's so-called incompetent municipalities with the six housing units built by the Conservative leader.

* * *

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Mr. Speaker, let us talk about the report from the Office québécois de la langue française. When it comes to upholding the right to work in French, the federal public service ranks dead last across all economic sectors.

We asked the Commissioner of Official Languages about this yesterday. He noted that the number of complaints related to language of work has gone up, not down. In fact, the national capital region has the highest number of complaints in the entire federal government.

When will the Liberals end their federal public service's drive to anglicize everything?

Hon. Anita Anand (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is not at all true.

We know that a more bilingual public service is what will best meet the needs of Canadians. Receiving government services in either official language is a fundamental right.

We continue to protect and promote the French language. We are determined to foster a work environment that is conducive to the use of French and English.

Mr. Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Mr. Speaker, why is the federal government Quebec's worst employer when it comes to French? It is because the Liberals lack political will.

By overhauling the Official Languages Act, the Liberals were supposed to impose a regulatory framework that ensured equality between French and English in federal institutions. We are still waiting. The Commissioner of Official Languages said that there needs to be a renewed commitment, and that starts with leadership from ministers.

When will we see a regulatory framework and political will from ministers?

Hon. Anita Anand (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am also speaking with the commissioner. I have held discussions with him, with everyone in our government and in our country to tell them that, as President of the Treasury Board, I am committed to implementing parts IV, V and VI of the Official Languages Act in federal institutions. It is very important work.

As I said, we are committed to fostering a work environment conducive to the use of English and French in the public service.

Mr. René Villemure (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we will not be lectured to by the party opposite. We know the Liberals. They keep saying that we need to protect the French language, when in fact the federal government is the worst employer in Quebec as far as the use of French in the workplace goes.

Are the Liberals tightening the screws on their own administration to make that stop? No. Are they making regulations to mandate equal status for English and French in federal institutions? No. Are they setting an example by requiring proficiency in French from their own appointees, like the Governor General? No. The bad example is coming from the top.

Would the government agree that, as the old saying goes, a fish rots from the head down?

Hon. Anita Anand (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am an anglophone, but I speak French.

What did he say? I can speak French in the House and I can speak with all representatives of public services in French or English.

I am going to continue trying to implement parts IV, V and VI of the Official Languages Act. That is my responsibility and our priority.

Oral Questions

• (1445)

[English]

TAXATION

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years, the NDP-Liberal Prime Minister is not worth the homelessness or the hunger. The carbon tax coalition increased the carbon tax 23%, driving grocery prices up \$700 per family, and a quarter of Canadians are relying on food banks. They cannot afford the basic necessities, let alone a summer vacation.

Conservatives have a common-sense plan to eliminate all federal gas taxes until Labour Day. This would save Alberta families \$955.

Will the Prime Minister follow our common-sense plan and eliminate the federal gas tax, so families can afford a summer holiday?

Hon. Jenna Sudds (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I find this question very disingenuous. We will take no lessons from the Conservatives when it comes to food bank usage, when they refuse and they vote against providing food to hungry kids at school.

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, out of touch is the Liberal-NDP government that listens to bankers and bondholders who benefit from Liberal inflation. I am listening to my constituents, like Lisa, who showed me her carbon tax rebate. It was \$15. What a joke. It is not a joke for Foothills families who pay \$3,000 a year in carbon taxes and have nothing left for food or homes, let alone a summer vacation.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer is clear: Canadians pay more in the carbon tax than they get back in a rebate. Will the Prime Minister axe all federal gas tax this summer, so Lisa can take her family for a summer road trip?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives are the party of austerity. The only thing they know how to do is cut, cut, cut, so it is no surprise that they want to cut the carbon rebates that leave eight out of 10 Canadian families better off. Do members know what else they want to cut? They want to cut the national school food program. They want to cut early learning and child care. They want to cut dental care that already two million Canadians are benefiting from. They want to tear Canada down, but we will not let them.

Ms. Lianne Rood (Lambton—Kent—Middlesex, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years, the NDP-Liberal Prime Minister is not worth the hunger and homelessness.

Oral Questions

Allan and Willa, seniors from Melbourne who have worked their whole lives, have told me that they cannot even afford a small vacation because everything is too expensive. Conservatives are calling on the government to axe the tax this summer and save Ontario families nearly \$600 to help pay for food, housing and maybe a small family vacation.

Will the Prime Minister adopt our common-sense plan to axe the tax on gas this summer, so Canadians can afford a summer road trip?

Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have said a number of times in this House, it would be useful if the Conservative Party of Canada actually used facts to inform the questions that they ask. Eight out of 10 Canadian families get more money back; 300 Canadian economists have said so, and the Parliamentary Budget Officer has said so. It actually works in reverse to income, so people who live on the most modest income get the most money back, and it is part of fixing the climate crisis that threatens the future of our children.

The group across the way has no plan for affordability, and its plan for the climate is to simply let the planet burn.

Ms. Lianne Rood (Lambton—Kent—Middlesex, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we just heard the answer from the NDP-Liberal government that it wants Canadians like Allan and Willa to be poor and miserable. Canadians deserve a break. They work hard, they pay their taxes, and how does the government repay them? It increases the carbon tax by 23%.

I will ask the question again: Will the Prime Minister adopt our common-sense plan to axe the tax on gas this summer, so Canadians can afford a summer vacation?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, even Conservative premiers understand the absolute carnage that Conservative cuts would cause across our country. They understand that the only thing Conservatives want to do is cut the support Canadians urgently need. They want to cut the national school food program that 400,000 kids are going to benefit from. They want to cut dental care that two million Canadians are already benefiting from, and of course, they want to cut early learning and child care. We will not let them do any of that.

* * *

• (1450)

LABOUR

Ms. Bonita Zarrillo (Port Moody—Coquitlam, NDP): Mr. Speaker, flight attendants, who are predominantly women, work an average of 35 hours a month unpaid. No worker should have to do their job without a paycheque, but the Liberals and the Conservatives have let the big airline CEOs get away with it. The Liberals have even given these airlines millions of dollars in handouts and, recently, the Liberals told flight attendants that they should simply file complaints with those same CEOs who are ripping them off. Why are the Liberals putting the burden on workers instead of holding profitable CEOs to account?

Hon. Seamus O'Regan (Minister of Labour and Seniors, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as members are aware, Canadian airlines are

private sector companies. The government does not regulate wages in companies, aside from setting a minimum wage. Employers must pay their workers no less than the minimum wage for all hours of work performed, which is protected under the Canada Labour Code. This is an issue we take very seriously and we are monitoring it closely.

* * *

PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Mr. Taylor Bachrach (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, people with disabilities are still waiting for the government to protect their dignity and their safety when they travel with Canadian airlines. We have heard story after story about people being injured and mobility aids being broken or lost. What was the Liberals' response? They held a summit where there was yet again more talk and very little action. The only announcement from the summit was the airlines earnestly promising to do better in the future. The minister can do more than simply ask politely; he can lay down the law and set proper rules. Why does he refuse to do so?

Mr. Sameer Zuberi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Diversity, Inclusion and Persons with Disabilities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government is firm in supporting persons with disabilities, be they travelling from point A to point B by air, by land, by sea and by all means of transport. That is why we held a disability summit, gathering together the airline industry and persons with disabilities to sharpen our pencils to make sure that persons with disabilities can travel with dignity. We are doing this work. We are making sure that Canadians can travel in a dignified fashion.

* * *

ATLANTIC CANADA OPPORTUNITIES AGENCY

Ms. Lena Metlege Diab (Halifax West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have an abundance of talent in Atlantic Canada's colleges and universities. The cutting-edge research and innovation produced in my region strengthen Canada's competitive advantage and drive growth in key industries like manufacturing, clean energy and ocean sustainability. Can the Minister responsible for ACOA tell the House what our government is doing to support researchers and entrepreneurs fuelling east-coast innovation?

Hon. Gudie Hutchings (Minister of Rural Economic Development and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Atlantic Canada is just full of bright thinkers and doers. At ACOA, the past few years, we have invested \$30 million in Springboard Atlantic to get ideas from the classroom to the boardroom. Springboard has turned that funding into \$500 million in partnerships.

Oral Questions

We know ACOA investments bring long-term benefits to our communities, and yet the member for New Brunswick Southwest wrote in the National Post that ACOA and the other regional economic development agencies should be shut down. I wonder, do the other seven Atlantic Conservatives agree with him? Will they stand up for our region and support the work of ACOA? Let us hope they have a backbone. We do.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. Stephen Ellis (Cumberland—Colchester, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years, the NDP-Liberal Prime Minister is not worth the hunger or the homelessness. The pain of the Liberals' financial mismanagement is coming home to roost in my hometown, where they came to visit. However, what they did not know is that the Colchester Food Bank is serving 148 more households than it did the year before. These are real people, not statistics, and they deserve better.

I asked this question on Friday and did not really get much of an answer, but maybe I will get one today: When will the Prime Minister axe the tax so Canadians can afford to eat again?

Hon. Jenna Sudds (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we all suffer when we see fellow Canadians suffering, which is why we set concrete poverty reduction targets. We set a target to reduce poverty by 50% by 2030. There are 1.3 million fewer Canadians living in poverty today than there were when the Conservatives were in government, and this includes hundreds of thousands of children. That said, more work needs to be done, which is exactly why budget 2024 brings forward additional measures to strengthen our social security net.

• (1455)

Mr. Stephen Ellis (Cumberland—Colchester, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite is avoiding the question, and the answer shows us just how much we need a significant change in government.

The CBC reported last week that seniors in Louisbourg, Nova Scotia, have been going days and even weeks without a proper meal, and that some children are not attending school because they do not have any food to take for lunch.

Canadians are hurting, and their government just does not seem to care. Again, when will the Prime Minister axe the tax so Canadians can afford to feed themselves?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is the height of hypocrisy for Conservatives to claim that they care about the most vulnerable among us.

Let us talk about seniors. There are 900,000 seniors across the country who are benefiting from the GIS put in place by our government.

On children in school, I agree that it is a tragedy for a kid to go to school hungry, and that is why our national school food program will provide meals for an additional 400,000 children.

The Conservatives are opposed to both. We will take no lessons from them when it comes to this.

Mr. Dave Epp (Chatham-Kent—Leamington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years, the NDP-Liberal Prime Minister is not worth the hunger and/or homelessness.

Food Banks Canada gives Canada failing grades, as nearly half of Canadians are financially feeling the cost of living increases. Housing costs have doubled. One in four experiences food insecurity. Food bank usage is up 11% in Windsor—Essex; 61% of Canadians are using food banks, and they are the first-time users.

We believe in bringing it home. The tragedy of the current government is that people cannot afford a home, let alone food to put into it. Is this the sunny ways that the Prime Minister promised Canadians?

Hon. Mark Holland (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when the Conservatives had the opportunity to be in government, they focused no attention on those who were homeless or vulnerable.

We have not only met our targets every year to reduce poverty, but we have taken important action. What the Conservatives essentially are saying is this: "In tough global times, we're here for you to cut your dental care. We're here for you to cut your diabetes medication. We're here for you to cut your child care. We're here for you to cut the supports that you need in difficult economic times."

Canadians will see through that. They know who has their back.

Mr. Fraser Tolmie (Moose Jaw—Lake Centre—Lanigan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years, the NDP-Liberal Prime Minister is not worth the hunger or the homelessness.

Nearly half of Canadians are paying more than a third of their paycheque for food. The Moose Jaw Food Bank helped nearly 8,000 households in 2023, up 58%.

It is time to give Canadians back their dignity. Will the Prime Minister axe the tax, or will it take a common-sense Conservative government before Canadians can afford to eat?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we will take no lessons from these Conservatives when it comes to supporting the most vulnerable among us.

Since we formed government, 1.3 million Canadians have been lifted out of poverty, including hundreds of thousands of children. However, we recognize these are very challenging times in Canada and around the world, and that is why we are so glad to be putting in place a national school food program: 400,000 kids will get meals because of it.

Oral Questions

How can the Conservatives vote against that? Do members know how? It is because they only believe in cuts and austerity.

[English]

* * *

[Translation]

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Mr. Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday we asked the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship about the distribution of asylum seekers. He replied that we were confusing capacity and willingness. I would like to remind him that, this year alone, Quebec has opened the equivalent of more than 50 schools to provide introductory classes for the children of asylum seekers. Now that is willingness.

Meanwhile, Ottawa is not spreading out the asylum seekers among the provinces, nor is it paying Quebec back for costs incurred, while families sleep out on the streets because the shelters are too full. That is a problem of willingness. When is the minister going to deal with his willingness problem and take action?

• (1500)

Hon. Marc Miller (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to highlight the Bloc Québécois member's passion for immigration. Obviously, when we talk about a willingness to take in newcomers, we are entitled to wonder why, for example, PRAIDA, Quebec's regional program for the settlement and integration of asylum seekers, has not increased its capacity for several years.

Obviously, this responsibility is shared between Quebec and Canada. That is what we are doing. We announced weeks ago that we were going to do it. We expect to see results, but it is a positive development in our relationship.

Mr. Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, with those sorts of comments, we can more easily see why Ottawa has been asleep at the switch for months when it comes to asylum seekers.

If the minister still thinks that this problem has to do with a willingness to welcome asylum seekers rather than the capacity to do so, then he is really missing the point. Meanwhile, there are people lining up at food banks. There are people who have nowhere to stay. There are schools that were already under-resourced and are now at the end of their tether.

When will the minister realize that people, including asylum seekers, are stretched thin, that they cannot take any more because of his government's inaction?

Hon. Marc Miller (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think that Quebecers and Canadians will agree with me that we have taken action by transferring \$5.2 billion to Quebec under the Canada-Quebec accord. We are always prepared to do more.

It is also very clear that Canada, like many other countries, is dealing with historic levels of irregular migration, but I believe that we can overcome that challenge, in partnership with the provinces and territories, obviously.

MENTAL HEALTH AND ADDICTIONS

Mrs. Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years, it is clear that NDP-Liberal extremist drug policies have been a complete failure, something that everybody seems to understand except the NDP-Liberal government.

One hundred per cent of people recently polled were opposed to these dangerous drug policies that are flooding our streets with potent drugs. It said, "All believed this was a step in the wrong direction."

What will it take for the Prime Minister to cancel his deadly and dangerous taxpayer-funded drug trafficking experiment?

Hon. Ya'ara Saks (Minister of Mental Health and Addictions and Associate Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member well knows that, first and foremost, diversion is illegal in the country of any narcotics. It does not matter what they are for, such as ADHD methamphetamines or anything else of that sort. When it comes to prescribed alternatives, it is one tool of many to combat the overdose crisis in the country to save lives.

The Conservatives choose an either/or in a war on drug policy that will leave people dead in the streets rather than getting them to health care. Shame on them.

Mrs. Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of the NDP-Liberal government, the only thing that has dropped in price has been the price of hydromorphone, which, by the way, the street price has gone from \$20 a pill to \$2 a pill under the government's watch, because of the diversion it has allowed.

Police have sounded the alarm, sharing that 50% of the hydromorphone that they have seized has been from diverted taxpayer-funded drug trafficking schemes flooding the streets with potent drugs and fuelling new addiction.

The question is simple. When will the government put an end to this dangerous program?

Hon. Ya'ara Saks (Minister of Mental Health and Addictions and Associate Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will say it again. Diversion is illegal in the country. Not only that, but the Conservatives are trying to portray the fiction of our streets rather than the reality. The RCMP has made it explicitly clear about what is happening with regard to diversion. The numbers the member quoted are simply not facts. The fact is that data shows there has been no increase of hydromorphone in the past decade from drug seizures across Canada.

We are talking about saving lives. Where are they?

*Oral Questions**[Translation]*

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Journal de Montréal reported that there are people doing drugs next to an elementary school in the Saint-Henri neighbourhood of Montreal. Parents have to step over people who are shooting up in the street. They are traumatized. They are worried for their children.

Can the Prime Minister confirm that he will not accept the City of Montreal's request to legalize the use of hard drugs in public spaces?

[English]

Hon. Ya'ara Saks (Minister of Mental Health and Addictions and Associate Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yet again, the Conservatives want to play games with the lives of people who need health care. It is shameful. Decriminalization is about personal possession. It has nothing to do with the control of substances in the country.

On this side of the House, we know that people need prevention and harm reduction, which the Conservatives refuse to acknowledge. They need health care. They should stop criminalizing our loved ones and get them into health services.

* * *

● (1505)

*[Translation]***REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

Mrs. Sophie Chatel (Pontiac, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the regional economic development agencies of Quebec are very important. They contribute to the growth, productivity and innovation of Quebec companies.

That is why I was a bit upset with my Conservative colleague from New Brunswick Southwest, who said that these agencies were hurting the local economy.

Can the minister reassure Canadians, and can she also talk about how our government supports the economic development agencies of Quebec?

Hon. Soraya Martinez Ferrada (Minister of Tourism and Minister responsible for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Pontiac for her question. I am very anxious to know what the Quebec Conservatives are saying to their colleague from New Brunswick Southwest, who wants to wipe out the regional economic development agencies.

Every dollar they invest generates more than four dollars in investments. Unlike the Conservatives, we believe in investing in economic growth and job creation. They just want to make cuts. Even provincial Conservatives are terrified of their austerity plan.

* * *

*[English]***JUSTICE**

Ms. Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of the Liberal-NDP government, its catch-and-release

policies have gotten so bad that it is allowing criminal organizations to operate freely in the streets. Even after a seven-month investigation involving 26 arrests and \$33 million of stolen vehicles, at least 14 people are already out on bail. The police worked for months to catch these criminals, and days later a broken system lets them free.

When will the government finally do the right thing and keep career criminals in jail so that Canadians can keep their cars?

Hon. Arif Virani (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will start by saluting the impressive work of the Peel police force for cracking an organized criminal ring that is taking people's cars.

The second thing I want to underscore for the member and her entire caucus is that they cannot selectively listen to law enforcement. What law enforcement tells me and the Minister of Public Safety all the time is that the days of teenage joyrides are over. This is an international organized criminal effort. We need to deal with that and follow the money path.

How are we doing that? We are doing it with anti-money laundering offences and beefing up our strength on money laundering through the fall economic statement and the budget, two things Conservatives are voting against.

Ms. Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is that minister's policy that is working against the Peel police. This is coming from a guy who, in his ministry, had three cars stolen in three years. The evidence is right on his doorstep. The Liberal catch-and-release policies are not working.

After nine years of the NDP-Liberal Prime Minister, the GTA does not stand for "greater Toronto area"; it stands for "grand theft auto". Forty cars are stolen a day in Toronto, 20 in Peel. How many more is it going to take for him to do something about it?

Hon. Arif Virani (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the last three months, we have held an auto theft summit. We have invested \$170 million in addressing this issue through investments in law enforcement, through investments in CBSA scanners, through investing in information sharing through Interpol. We are working diligently to break up criminal networks.

We are not pursuing failed policies like the Conservatives' approach year after year under Stephen Harper, most of which were struck down by the Supreme Court of Canada.

Oral Questions

Mr. Arpan Khanna (Oxford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of the Liberal-NDP government's soft-on-crime policies, extortions have more than tripled in Canada. They allow criminals to terrorize our communities and businesses, because when they get arrested, they are let out on bail the same day. The Liberals talk a very big game about fighting crime, but when it matters, they are missing in action.

Our common-sense Conservative bill would have put these criminals behind bars by strengthening our extortion laws. Why did the Liberals vote against Bill C-381 to fight extortion?

Hon. Arif Virani (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, we are listening to people who are affected by extortion. We know that this is a pressing problem in parts of B.C. and in parts of my region in Ontario. What we are underscoring is that extortion is against the law. Extortion with—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

• (1510)

The Speaker: I am going to ask the hon. member for Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies to please to keep his comments to himself. I will also ask the hon. member for Cypress Hills—Grasslands to please hold his comments until he has the floor.

I am going to ask the hon. minister to start from the top.

Hon. Arif Virani: Mr. Speaker, we are listening constantly to communities that are being affected by extortion, particularly South Asians in the B.C. region and in the GTA. What we hear from them is that they need supports. We are providing those supports through aggressive responses under the Criminal Code. Extortion is against the law. Extortion with a weapon attracts a very significant penalty under Canadian criminal law.

What we also understand from them is that organized criminality, including foreign interference and organized crime, is behind these extortion attempts. That is why bills like Bill C-70 will make an important difference. So will the budget measures on money laundering and cracking down on organized crime.

* * *

REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Ben Carr (Winnipeg South Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with an energy grid that is 97% clean, a strong manufacturing and agricultural sector and a diverse population, Manitoba is a key economic driver for Canada.

In order to help realize our potential, we rely on the strengths of PrairiesCan, our regional development agency. Some members of the opposition have suggested that investments in PrairiesCan are not worthwhile.

Could the Minister for Prairies Economic Development please inform us of the important role that the agency plays in supporting the Prairie region?

Hon. Dan Vandal (Minister of Northern Affairs, Minister responsible for Prairies Economic Development Canada and Minister responsible for the Canadian Northern Economic De-

velopment Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, no matter where I go in the Prairies, the great work done by PrairiesCan is greatly appreciated.

PrairiesCan created or maintained over 150,000 jobs in over 6,300 businesses. Whether it is better positioning hydrogen in Edmonton, supporting work done by the Saskatchewan Research Council in Saskatoon or helping New Flyer build net-zero buses in Winnipeg, PrairiesCan is making necessary investments in Prairie businesses to help grow our economy.

If Conservatives understood this important work, they would not be calling to abolish it. It is simply shameful.

* * *

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, successive Liberal and Conservative governments have heavily relied on migrant workers to support Canada's economy. They are often underpaid and racialized. They can easily fall through the cracks, leaving them undocumented through no fault of their own. They live here and contribute to our communities and they pay their taxes, yet without permanent status, they are often subject to exploitation and abuse. The Liberals have been saying that they want to regularize them since 2021, but empty words will not protect workers.

Will the Prime Minister implement a broad, uncapped program to regularize undocumented workers so that their basic human rights are protected?

Hon. Marc Miller (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate and respect the member's passion in this matter, particularly for a set of people who indeed are in Canada and are subject to abuse at times. There should be regular pathways for people who are here irregularly.

I can confirm to the House that pursuant to the minister's mandate letter, we are looking at a number of options. I would say for all Canadians that there is no clear consensus as to the path forward. However, as this is work that is ongoing, I cannot comment any further.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, fire season is on us, and yet oil production in the tar sands has reached its highest peak ever. That is thanks to the Liberal government's \$34 billion to the TMX pipeline.

Now we learn that big oil is planning a 400-kilometre pipeline along the Athabasca River and it wants to be exempt from a federal environmental assessment. The government has signed a non-disclosure agreement with Pathways Alliance to keep details of this project secret.

The planet is on fire. Why is the environment minister continuing to act like a sock puppet for big oil CEOs?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have been very clear that there will be no special pathway for the Pathways project. If that project is subject to the federal Impact Assessment Act, it will be evaluated as other federal projects are evaluated. There will be no special cases made for that project.

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: I wish to draw the attention of members to the presence in the gallery of Her Excellency Donika Gërvalla-Schwarz, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs and Diaspora of the Republic of Kosovo.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1515)

[*Translation*]

FALL ECONOMIC STATEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2023

The House resumed from May 27 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 third time and passed, and of the amendment.

The Speaker: It being 3:15 p.m., the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the amendment of the hon. member for Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo to the motion for third reading of Bill C-59.

Call in the members.

• (1525)

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

(*Division No. 776*)

YEAS

Members

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

Dancho	Davidson
Deltell	d'Entremont
Doherty	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Ferreri	Findlay
Généreux	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Hoback	Jeneroux
Jivani	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	Poilievre
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Roberts	Rood
Ruff	Scheer
Schmale	Seeback
Shields	Shipley
Small	Soroka
Steinley	Stewart
Strahl	Stubbs
Thomas	Tochor
Tolmie	Uppal
Van Popta	Vecchio
Vidal	Vien
Viersen	Vis
Vuong	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Williams
Williamson	Zimmer— 116

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Bergeron
Bérubé	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney	Blois
Boissonnault	Boulerice
Bradford	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Champoux	Chatel

Government Orders

Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Dong
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Gaheer
Gainey	Garon
Garrison	Gaudreau
Gazan	Gerretsen
Gill	Gould
Guilbeault	Hajdu
Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Holland
Housefather	Hughes
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Idlout
Ien	Jaczek
Johns	Jones
Jowhari	Julian
Kayabaga	Kelloway
Khalid	Khera
Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Kwan	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Larouche
Lattanzio	Lauzon
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Lemire	Lightbound
Long	Longfield
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacGregor
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
Masse	Mathysen
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod	McPherson
Mendès	Mendicino
Miao	Michaud
Miller	Morrice
Morrissey	Murray
Naqvi	Ng
Noormohamed	O'Connell
Oliphant	O'Regan
Pauzé	Perron
Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon
Powlowski	Qualtrough
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	Singh
Sorbara	Sousa
Ste-Marie	St-Onge
Sudds	Tassi
Taylor Roy	Therrien
Thompson	Trudeau
Trudel	Turnbull

Valdez	Van Bynen
van Koevorden	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vignola
Villemure	Virani
Weiler	Wilkinson
Yip	Zahid
Zarrillo	Zuberi — 202

PAIRED

Members

Bendayan	Caputo
Dowdall	Drouin
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz
Fortin	Gallant
Joly	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Normandin	Thériault — 12

The Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

● (1530)

[*English*]

The next question is on the main motion.

[*Translation*]

Pursuant to Standing Order 69.1, the question is on clauses 1 to 136, 138 to 143, 168 to 196, 209 to 216, and 278 to 317, regarding measures appearing in the 2023 budget.

[*English*]

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

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I request a recorded vote.

● (1540)

(The House divided on clauses 1 to 136, 138 to 143, 168 to 196, 209 to 216, and 278 to 317, which were agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 777*)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Battiste
Beech	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Blaney	Blois
Boissonnault	Boulerice
Bradford	Brière
Cannings	Carr
Casey	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Collins (Victoria)	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
Desjarlais	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab

Government Orders

Dong	Dubourg	Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Duclos	Duguid	Bergeron	Berthold
Ehsassi	El-Khoury	Bérubé	Bezan
Erskine-Smith	Fillmore	Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Fisher	Fonseca	Block	Bragdon
Fortier	Fragiskatos	Brassard	Brock
Fraser	Freeland	Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins
Fry	Gaheer	Carrie	Chabot
Gainey	Garrison	Chambers	Champoux
Gazan	Gerretsen	Chong	Cooper
Gould	Guilbeault	Dalton	Dancho
Hajdu	Hanley	Davidson	DeBellefeuille
Hardie	Hepfner	Deltell	Desbiens
Holland	Housefather	Desilets	Doherty
Hughes	Hussen	Dreeschen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Hutchings	Iacono	Ellis	Epp
Idlout	Ien	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Jaczek	Johns	Fast	Ferri
Jones	Jowhari	Findlay	Garon
Julian	Kayabaga	Gaudreau	Généreux
Kelloway	Khalid	Genuis	Gill
Khera	Koutrakis	Gladu	Godin
Kusmierczyk	Kwan	Goodridge	Gourde
Lalonde	Lambropoulos	Gray	Hallan
Lamoureux	Lapointe	Hoback	Jeneroux
Lattanzio	Lauson	Jivani	Kelly
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier	Khanna	Kitchen
Lightbound	Long	Kniec	Kram
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)	Kusie	Lake
MacGregor	Maloney	Lantsman	Larouche
Martinez Ferrada	Masse	Lawrence	Lehoux
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)	Lemire	Leslie
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	McDonald (Avalon)	Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
McGuinty	McKay	Liepert	Lloyd
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod	Lobb	Maguire
McPherson	Mendès	Majumdar	Martel
Mendicino	Miao	Mazier	McCaughey (Edmonton West)
Miller	Morrice	McLean	Melillo
Morrissey	Murray	Michaud	Moore
Naqvi	Ng	Morantz	Morrison
Noormohamed	O'Connell	Motz	Muys
Oliphant	O'Regan	Nater	Patzer
Petipas Taylor	Powlowski	Paul-Hus	Pauzé
Qualtrough	Robillard	Perkins	Perron
Rodriguez	Rogers	Plamondon	Poilievre
Romanado	Rota	Redekopp	Reid
Sahota	Sajjan	Rempel Garner	Richards
Saks	Samson	Roberts	Rood
Sarai	Scarpaleggia	Ruff	Savard-Tremblay
Schiefke	Serré	Scheer	Schmale
Sgro	Shanahan	Seeback	Shields
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Shiple	Simard
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Singh	Sinclair-Desgagné	Small
Sorbara	Sousa	Soroka	Steinley
St-Onge	Sudds	Ste-Marie	Stewart
Tassi	Taylor Roy	Strahl	Stubbs
Thompson	Trudeau	Therrien	Thomas
Turnbull	Valdez	Tochor	Tolmie
Van Bynen	van Koeverden	Trudel	Uppal
Vandal	Vandenbeld	Van Popta	Vecchio
Virani	Weiler	Vidal	Vien
Wilkinson	Yip	Viersen	Vignola
Zahid	Zarrillo	Villemure	Vis
Zuberi — 175		Vuong	Wagantall
		Warkentin	Waugh
		Webber	Williams
		Williamson	Zimmer — 144

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett

PAIRED

Members

Bendayan	Caputo
----------	--------

Government Orders

Dowdall
 Duncan (Etobicoke North)
 Fortin
 Joly
 Normandin

Drouin
 Dzerowicz
 Gallant
 MacKinnon (Gatineau)
 Thériault — 12

The Deputy Speaker: I declare clauses 1 to 136, 138 to 143, 168 to 196, 209 to 216, and 278 to 317, regarding measures appearing in the 2023 budget, carried.

The next question is on clauses 137, 144, and 231 to 272, regarding measures related to affordability.

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

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I request a recorded vote, please.

• (1555)

(The House divided on clauses 137, 144 and 232 to 272, which were agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 778)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Aldag
Alghabra	Ali
Allison	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arnold	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Atwin	Bachrach
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Barron	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Bergeron
Berthold	Bérubé
Bezan	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney	Block
Blois	Boissonnault
Boulerice	Bradford
Bragdon	Brassard
Brière	Brock
Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins
Cannings	Carr
Carrie	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Chambers
Champagne	Champoux
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Chong
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cooper	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Dalton	Damoff
Dancho	Davidson
Davies	DeBellefeuille
Deltell	Desbiens
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Doherty
Dong	Dreeshen

Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Epp
Erskine-Smith	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Ferreri	Fillmore
Findlay	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Gaheer	Gainey
Garon	Garrison
Gaudreau	Gazan
Généreux	Genuis
Gerretsen	Gill
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gould
Gourde	Gray
Guilbeault	Hajdu
Hallan	Hanley
Hardie	Hepfner
Hoback	Holland
Housefather	Hughes
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Idlout
Ien	Jaczek
Jeneroux	Jivani
Johns	Jones
Jowhari	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Kelly
Khalid	Khanna
Khera	Kitchen
Kniec	Koutrakis
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kurek	Kusie
Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Lake	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	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	Maguire
Majumdar	Maloney
Martel	Martinez Ferrada
Masse	Mathysen
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Mazier	McCaughey (Edmonton West)
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLean	McLeod
McPherson	Melillo
Mendès	Mendicino
Miao	Michaud
Miller	Moore
Morantz	Morrice
Morrisson	Morrissey
Motz	Murray
Muys	Naqvi
Nater	Ng
Noormohamed	O'Connell
Oliphant	O'Regan
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Paupé	Perkins
Perron	Petitpas Taylor

Government Orders

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, we request a recorded division.

• (1605)

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

(Division No. 779)

YEAS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Aldag
Alghabra	Ali
Allison	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arnold	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Atwin	Bachrach
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Barron	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Bergeron
Berthold	Bérubé
Bezan	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney	Block
Boissonnault	Boulerice
Bradford	Bragdon
Brassard	Brière
Brock	Brunelle-Duceppe
Calkins	Cannings
Carr	Carrie
Casey	Chabot
Chagger	Chahal
Chambers	Champoux
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Chong
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cooper	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Dalton	Damoff
Dancho	Davidson
Davies	DeBellefeuille
Deltell	Desbiens
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Doherty
Dong	Dreeshen
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Epp
Erskine-Smith	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Ferri	Fillmore
Findlay	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Gaheer	Gainey
Garon	Garrison
Gaudreau	Gazan
Généreux	Genuis
Gerretsen	Gill
Gladau	Godin
Goodridge	Gould
Gourde	Gray
Guilbeault	Hajdu

Plamondon	Poilievre
Powlowski	Qualtrough
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Roberts	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Rood
Ruff	Sahota
Sajjan	Saks
Samson	Sarai
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia
Scheer	Schiefke
Schmale	Seeback
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Shields	Shipley
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
Singh	Small
Sorbara	Soroka
Sousa	Steinley
Ste-Marie	Stewart
St-Onge	Strahl
Stubbs	Sudds
Tassi	Taylor Roy
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— 316

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Members

Bendayan	Caputo
Dowdall	Drouin
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz
Fortin	Gallant
Joly	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Normandin	Thériault— 12

The Deputy Speaker: I declare clauses 137, 144, and 231 to 272 regarding measures related to affordability carried.

[Translation]

The next question is on clauses 197 to 208 and 342 to 365 regarding amendments to the Canada Labour Code.

[English]

If a member participating in person wishes that the clauses 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.

Government Orders

Hallan
 Hardie
 Hoback
 Housefather
 Hussien
 Iacono
 Ien
 Jeneroux
 Johns
 Jowhari
 Kayabaga
 Kelly
 Khanna
 Kitchen
 Koutrakis
 Kramp-Neuman
 Kusie
 Kwan
 Lalonde
 Lamoureux
 Lapointe
 Lattanzio
 Lawrence
 Lebouthillier
 Lemire
 Lewis (Essex)
 Liepert
 Lloyd
 Long
 Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
 MacDonald (Malpeque)
 Maguire
 Maloney
 Martinez Ferrada
 Mathyssen
 May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
 McCauley (Edmonton West)
 McGuinty
 McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
 McLeod
 Melillo
 Mendicino
 Michaud
 Moore
 Morrice
 Morrissey
 Murray
 Naqvi
 Ng
 O'Connell
 O'Regan
 Paul-Hus
 Perkins
 Petitpas Taylor
 Poilievre
 Qualtrough
 Reid
 Richards
 Robillard
 Rogers
 Rood
 Ruff
 Sajjan
 Samson
 Savard-Tremblay
 Scheer
 Schmale
 Serré
 Shanahan
 Shields
 Sidhu (Brampton East)
 Simard
 Singh

Hanley
 Hepfner
 Holland
 Hughes
 Hutchings
 Idlout
 Jaczek
 Jivani
 Jones
 Julian
 Kelloway
 Khalid
 Khera
 Kmiec
 Kram
 Kurek
 Kusmierczyk
 Lake
 Lambropoulos
 Lantsman
 Larouche
 Lauzon
 LeBlanc
 Lehoux
 Leslie
 Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
 Lightbound
 Lobb
 Longfield
 MacAtulay (Cardigan)
 MacGregor
 Majumdar
 Martel
 Masse
 May (Cambridge)
 Mazier
 McDonald (Avalon)
 McKay
 McLean
 McPherson
 Mendès
 Miao
 Miller
 Morantz
 Morrison
 Motz
 Muys
 Nater
 Noormohamed
 Oliphant
 Patzer
 Pauzé
 Perron
 Plamondon
 Powlowski
 Redekopp
 Rempel Garner
 Roberts
 Rodriguez
 Romanado
 Rota
 Sahota
 Saks
 Sarai
 Scarpaleggia
 Schiefke
 Seebach
 Sgro
 Sheehan
 Shipley
 Sidhu (Brampton South)
 Sinclair-Desgagné
 Small

Sorbara
 Sousa
 Ste-Marie
 St-Onge
 Stubbs
 Tassi
 Therrien
 Thompson
 Tolmie
 Trudel
 Uppal
 Van Bynen
 Van Popta
 Vandenberg
 Vidal
 Viersen
 Villemure
 Vis
 Wagantall
 Waugh
 Weiler
 Williams
 Yip
 Zarrillo
 Zuberi— 317

Soroka
 Steinley
 Stewart
 Strahl
 Sudds
 Taylor Roy
 Thomas
 Tochor
 Trudeau
 Turnbull
 Valdez
 van Koeverden
 Vandal
 Vecchio
 Vien
 Vignola
 Virani
 Vuong
 Warkentin
 Webber
 Wilkinson
 Williamson
 Zahid
 Zimmer

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Members

Bendayan
 Dowdall
 Duncan (Etobicoke North)
 Fortin
 Joly
 Normandin
 Caputo
 Drouin
 Dzerowicz
 Gallant
 MacKinnon (Gatineau)
 Thériault— 12

The Deputy Speaker: I declare clauses 197 to 208 and 342 to 365 regarding amendments to the Canada Labour Code carried.

The next question is on clauses 145 to 167, 217 and 218 regarding measures related to vaping products, cannabis and tobacco.

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

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, we request a recorded division.

● (1620)

(The House divided on clauses 145 to 167, 217 and 218, which were agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 780)

YEAS

Members

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

Government Orders

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

Government Orders

Williamson
Zahid
Zimmer

Yip
Zarrillo
Zuberi — 318

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Members

Bendayan
Dowdall
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Fortin
Joly
Normandin

Caputo
Drouin
Dzerowicz
Gallant
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Thériault — 12

The Deputy Speaker: I declare clauses 145 to 167, 217 and 218, regarding measures related to vaping products, cannabis and tobacco, carried.

The next question is on clauses 219 to 230 of the bill.

[*Translation*]

If a member participating in person wishes that these clauses 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.

[*English*]

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, we request a recorded vote.

• (1630)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on clauses 219 to 230, which were agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 781*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultarif
Albas
Ali
Anand
Angus
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Baldinelli
Barrett
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bergeron
Bérubé
Bibeau
Blair
Blanchette-Joncas
Block
Boissonnault
Bradford
Brassard
Brock
Calkins
Carr
Casey
Chagger
Chambers

Aitchison
Alghabra
Allison
Anandasangaree
Arnold
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Barlow
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Berthold
Bezan
Bittle
Blanchet
Blaney
Blois
Boulerice
Bragdon
Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe
Cannings
Carrie
Chabot
Chahal
Champagne

Champoux
Chen
Chong
Collins (Victoria)
Cormier
Dabrusin
Damoff
Davidson
DeBellefeuille
Desbiens
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Doherty
Dreeshen
Duclos
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
El-Khoury
Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser
Fry
Gainey
Garrison
Gazan
Genuis
Gill
Godin
Gould
Gray
Hajdu
Hanley
Hepfner
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Jivani
Jones
Julian
Kelloway
Khalid
Khera
Kmiec
Kram
Kurek
Kusmierczyk
Lake
Lambropoulos
Lantsman
Larouche
Lauzon
LeBlanc
Lehoux
Leslie
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lightbound
Lobb
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor
Majumdar
Martel
Masse
May (Cambridge)
Mazier
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLean

Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cooper
Coteau
Dalton
Dancho
Davies
Deltell
Desilets
Dhaliwal
Diab
Dong
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi
Ellis
Erskine-Smith
Falk (Provencher)
Ferreri
Findlay
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Garon
Gaudreau
Généreux
Gerretsen
Gladu
Goodridge
Gourde
Guilbeault
Hallan
Hardie
Hoback
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Jeneroux
Johns
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Kelly
Khanna
Kitchen
Koutrakis
Kramp-Neuman
Kusie
Kwan
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Lapointe
Lattanzio
Lawrence
Lebouthillier
Lemire
Lewis (Essex)
Liepert
Lloyd
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)
Maguire
Maloney
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod

Government Orders

The next question is on clauses 273 to 277 of the bill.

[English]

If a member participating in person wishes that these clauses 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.

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, I would like to request a recorded vote.

● (1645)

(The House divided on clauses 273 to 277, which were agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 782)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Bergeron
Bérubé	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney	Blois
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
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Dong
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Gaheer	Gainey
Garon	Garrison
Gaudreau	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gill
Gould	Guilbeault
Hajdu	Hanley
Hardie	Hepfner
Holland	Housefather
Hughes	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Idlout	Ien
Jaczek	Johns
Jones	Jowhari
Julian	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Khera	Koutrakis

McPherson	Meillo
Mendès	Medicino
Miao	Michaud
Miller	Moore
Morantz	Morrice
Morrison	Morrissey
Motz	Murray
Muys	Naqvi
Nater	Ng
Noormohamed	O'Connell
Oliphant	O'Regan
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Pauzé	Perkins
Perron	Petitpas Taylor
Plamondon	Poilievre
Powlowski	Qualtrough
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Roberts	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Rood
Rota	Ruff
Sahota	Sajjan
Saks	Samson
Sarai	Savard-Tremblay
Scarpaleggia	Scheer
Schiefke	Schmale
Seeback	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Shields
Shipley	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
Sinclair-Desgagné	Singh
Small	Sorbara
Soroka	Sousa
Steinley	Ste-Marie
Stewart	St-Onge
Strahl	Stubbs
Sudds	Tassi
Taylor Roy	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 — 318

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Members

Bendayan	Caputo
Dowdall	Drouin
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz
Fortin	Gallant
Joly	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Normandin	Thériault — 12

The Deputy Speaker: I declare clauses 219 to 230 carried.

Government Orders

Kusmierczyk	Kwan	Hallan	Hoback
Lalonde	Lambropoulos	Jeneroux	Jivani
Lamoureux	Lapointe	Kelly	Khanna
Larouche	Lattanzio	Kitchen	Kmiec
Lauzon	LeBlanc	Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Lebouthillier	Lemire	Kurek	Kusie
Lightbound	Long	Lake	Lantsman
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	Lawrence	Lehoux
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacGregor	Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Masse	Mathysen	Lobb	Maguire
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	Majumdar	Martel
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty	Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLean	Melillo
McLeod	McPherson	Moore	Morantz
Mendès	Mendicino	Morrison	Motz
Miao	Michaud	Muys	Nater
Miller	Morrice	Patzner	Paul-Hus
Morrissey	Murray	Perkins	Poilievre
Naqvi	Ng	Redekopp	Reid
Noomohamed	O'Connell	Rempel Garner	Richards
Oliphant	O'Regan	Roberts	Rood
Pauzé	Perron	Ruff	Scheer
Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon	Schmale	Seeback
Powlowski	Qualtrough	Shields	Shiple
Robillard	Rodriguez	Small	Soroka
Rogers	Romanado	Steinley	Stewart
Rota	Sahota	Strahl	Stubbs
Sajjan	Saks	Thomas	Tochor
Samson	Sarai	Tolmie	Uppal
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia	Van Popta	Vecchio
Schiefke	Serré	Vidal	Vien
Sgro	Shanahan	Viersen	Vis
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Vuong	Wagantall
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard	Warkentin	Waugh
Sinclair-Desgagné	Singh	Webber	Williams
Sorbara	Sousa	Williamson	Zimmer — 114
Ste-Marie	St-Onge		
Sudds	Tassi		
Taylor Roy	Therrien		
Thompson	Trudeau		
Trudel	Turnbull	Bendayan	Caputo
Valdez	Van Bynen	Dowdall	Drouin
van Koeverden	Vandal	Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz
Vandenbeld	Vignola	Fortin	Gallant
Villemure	Virani	Joly	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Weiler	Wilkinson	Normandin	Thériault — 12
Yip	Zahid		
Zarrillo	Zuberi — 202		

PAIRED

Members

Bendayan	Caputo
Dowdall	Drouin
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz
Fortin	Gallant
Joly	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Normandin	Thériault — 12

The Deputy Speaker: I declare clauses 273 to 277 carried.

The next question is on clauses 318 and 319 of the bill.

If a member participating in person wishes that these clauses 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.

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, I would request a recorded division.

● (1655)

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

(Division No. 783)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison	Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison	Albas	Aldag
Arnold	Baldinelli	Alghabra	Ali
Barlow	Barrett	Allison	Anand
Berthold	Bezan		
Block	Bragdon		
Brassard	Brock		
Calkins	Carrie		
Chambers	Chong		
Cooper	Dalton		
Dancho	Davidson		
Deltell	Doherty		
Dreeshen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)		
Ellis	Epp		
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)		
Fast	Ferri		
Findlay	Généreux		
Genuis	Gladu		
Godin	Goodridge		
Gourde	Gray		

Government Orders

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

Government Orders

Villemure
Vis
Wagantall
Wauh
Weiler
Williams
Yip
Zarrillo
Zuberi — 317

Virani
Vuong
Warkentin
Webber
Wilkinson
Williamson
Zahid
Zimmer

Champagne
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cooper
Coteau
Dalton
Dancho
Davies
Deltell
Desilets
Dhaliwal
Diab
Dong
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi
Ellis
Erskine-Smith
Falk (Provencher)
Ferrer
Findlay
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Garon
Gaudreau
Généreux
Gerretsen
Gladu
Goodridge
Gourde
Guilbeault
Hallan
Hardie
Hoback
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Jeneroux
Johns
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Kelly
Khanna
Kitchen
Koutrakis
Kramp-Neuman
Kusie
Kwan
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Lapointe
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Lehoux
Leslie
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lightbound
Lobb
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor
Majumdar
Martel
Masse
May (Cambridge)
Mazier
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLean

Champoux
Chen
Chong
Collins (Victoria)
Cormier
Dabrusin
Damoff
Davidson
DeBellefeuille
Desbiens
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Doherty
Dreeshen
Duclos
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
El-Khoury
Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser
Fry
Ganey
Garrison
Gazan
Genuis
Gill
Godin
Gould
Gray
Hajdu
Hanley
Hepfner
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Idlout
Jacek
Jivani
Jones
Julian
Kelloway
Khalid
Khera
Kmiec
Kram
Kurek
Kusmierczyk
Lake
Lambropoulos
Lantsman
Larouche
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Lemire
Lewis (Essex)
Liepert
Lloyd
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)
Maguire
Maloney
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Members

Bendayan
Dowdall
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Fortin
Joly
Normandin

Caputo
Drouin
Dzerowicz
Gallant
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Thériault — 12

The Deputy Speaker: I declare clauses 318 and 319 carried.

The next question is on clauses 320 to 322.

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

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, I request a recorded division.

• (1705)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on clauses 320 to 322, which were agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 784*)

YEAS

Members

Abouttaif
Albas
Alghabra
Allison
Anandasangaree
Arnold
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Barlow
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Berthold
Bezan
Bittle
Blanchet
Blaney
Blois
Boulerice
Bragdon
Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe
Cannings
Carrie
Chabot
Chahal

Aitchison
Aldag
Ali
Anand
Angus
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Baldinelli
Barrett
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bergeron
Bérubé
Bibeau
Blair
Blanchette-Joncas
Block
Boissonnault
Bradford
Brassard
Brock
Calkins
Carr
Casey
Chagger
Chambers

Government Orders

[English]

The next question is on clauses 323 to 341 of the bill.

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

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, I request a recorded division.

• (1720)

(The House divided on clauses 323 to 341, which were agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 785)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Battiste
Beech	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Blaney	Blois
Boissonnault	Boulerice
Bradford	Brière
Cannings	Carr
Casey	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Collins (Victoria)	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
Desjarlais	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Dong	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Gaheer
Gainey	Garrison
Gazan	Gerretsen
Gould	Guilbeault
Hajdu	Hanley
Hardie	Hepfner
Holland	Housefather
Hughes	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Idlout	Ien
Jaczek	Johns
Jones	Jowhari
Julian	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Khera	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lattanzio	Lauzon
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Lightbound	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)

McPherson	Melillo
Mendès	Medicino
Miao	Michaud
Miller	Moore
Morantz	Morrice
Morrison	Morrissey
Motz	Murray
Muys	Naqvi
Nater	Ng
Noormohamed	O'Connell
Oliphant	O'Regan
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Pauzé	Perkins
Perron	Petitpas Taylor
Plamondon	Poilievre
Powlowski	Qualtrough
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Roberts	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Rood
Rota	Ruff
Sahota	Sajjan
Saks	Samson
Sarai	Savard-Tremblay
Scarpaleggia	Scheer
Schiefke	Schmale
Seeback	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Shields
Shipley	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
Sinclair-Desgagné	Singh
Small	Sorbara
Soroka	Sousa
Steinley	Ste-Marie
Stewart	St-Onge
Strahl	Stubbs
Sudds	Tassi
Taylor Roy	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 — 318

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Members

Bendayan	Caputo
Dowdall	Drouin
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz
Fortin	Gallant
Joly	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Normandin	Thériault — 12

The Deputy Speaker: I declare clauses 320 to 322 carried.

Government Orders

MacGregor	Maloney	Lantsman	Larouche
Martinez Ferrada	Masse	Lawrence	Lehoux
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)	Lemire	Leslie
May (Saanic—Gulf Islands)	McDonald (Avalon)	Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
McGuinty	McKay	Liepert	Lloyd
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod	Lobb	Maguire
McPherson	Mendès	Majumdar	Martel
Mendicino	Miao	Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
Miller	Morrice	McLean	Melillo
Morrissey	Murray	Michaud	Moore
Naqvi	Ng	Morantz	Morrison
Noormohamed	O'Connell	Motz	Muys
Oliphant	O'Regan	Nater	Patzer
Petitpas Taylor	Powlowski	Paul-Hus	Pauzé
Qualtrough	Robillard	Perkins	Perron
Rodriguez	Rogers	Plamondon	Poilievre
Romanado	Rota	Redekopp	Reid
Sahota	Sajjan	Rempel Garner	Richards
Saks	Samson	Roberts	Rood
Sarai	Scarpaleggia	Ruff	Savard-Tremblay
Schiefke	Serré	Scheer	Schmale
Sgro	Shanahan	Seeback	Shields
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Shiple	Simard
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Singh	Sinclair-Desgagné	Small
Sorbara	Sousa	Soroka	Steinley
St-Onge	Sudds	Ste-Marie	Stewart
Tassi	Taylor Roy	Strahl	Stubbs
Thompson	Trudeau	Therrien	Thomas
Turnbull	Valdez	Tochor	Tolmie
Van Bynen	van Koeverden	Trudel	Uppal
Vandal	Vandenbeld	Van Popta	Vecchio
Virani	Weiler	Vidal	Vien
Wilkinson	Yip	Viersen	Vignola
Zahid	Zarrillo	Villemure	Vis
Zuberi — 175		Vuong	Wagantall
		Warkentin	Waugh
		Webber	Williams
		Williamson	Zimmer — 144

NAYS

Members

Aboultarif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Bergeron	Berthold
Bérubé	Bezan
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins
Carrie	Chabot
Chambers	Champoux
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	DeBellefeuille
Deltell	Desbiens
Desilets	Doherty
Dreeshen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Ellis	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Fast	Ferreri
Findlay	Garon
Gaudreau	Généreux
Genuis	Gill
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Hoback	Jeneroux
Jivani	Kelly
Khanna	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Lake

PAIRED

Members

Bendayan	Caputo
Dowdall	Drouin
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz
Fortin	Gallant
Joly	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Normandin	Thériault — 12

The Deputy Speaker: I declare clauses 323 to 341 carried.

The House has agreed to the entirety 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, at third reading stage.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

ORDERS OF THE DAY

[English]

PRIVILEGE

REQUEST FOR OFFICE OF SPEAKER TO BE VACATED

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC): Mr. Speaker, before question period, I was just getting into the relationship between the Speaker of the House and the Prime Minister. It is worth noting that in 2023, the Speaker was the parliamentary secretary to the Prime Minister. As I was saying, the Prime Minister himself has three ethics reports written in his own name. I was alluding to, and I asked a question of one of the Bloc members earlier concerning it, the fact that it sure seems like there is a contest or a competition between the Prime Minister and the Speaker to see how many ethics violations or breaches of trust they can have and get away with it. The NDP continues to prop them up, despite these things piling up.

Let us take a look. Since 2015, there have been no fewer than 10 Liberal ministers and parliamentary secretaries who have been found guilty of violating and breaking ethics laws of this institution. On top of that, there was a PMO staffer. There are also multiple members of the existing cabinet who are still sitting who have ethics violations. One of them happens to be the Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs. One happens to be the international trade minister, and one happens to be the minister of sport. Therefore, there seems to be a chronic problem within cabinet, which is what the Ethics Commissioner said of Joe Peschisolido, former Liberal member for Steveston—Richmond East, that there was a chronic issue.

In 2023, when the Ethics Commissioner specifically wrote about the member for Hull—Aylmer, CBC published an interesting article. In it, the Ethics Commissioner said: “After years of serving in senior government positions, [the member] should have been aware of the rules or should have sought advice. I am quite concerned that someone with the breadth of experience of [the member] would fail to recognize the possibility of a contravention”.

The Ethics Commissioner also said:

As a parliamentary secretary since 2015 and having served for several years on both the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics and the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, [he] should be well versed on the functioning of both regimes and the importance of consulting the Office. I am quite concerned that someone with the breadth of experience...would fail to recognize the possibility of a contravention.

Those are pretty damning words from the Ethics Commissioner.

What did the member for Hull—Aylmer, now the Speaker of the House, have to say at the time? He said, “I will redouble my efforts to be more diligent in the future to ensure my obligations under the act are fully met.” He has really doubled down, has he not? In fact he has tripled down, with three more violations. They are not so much ethics violations per se, but they are serious lapses in ethics by the Speaker. There is the video, a partisan video for a Liberal fundraiser, which we have talked about in the House already, in which he was wearing his Speaker's gowns in the Speaker's office, giving a speech and a video remark.

Privilege

Then he went to Washington, not just as the member of Parliament for Hull—Aylmer, but as the Speaker of the House, to talk to young Liberals in Washington. That is another one, number two. What should be strike number three and out is the new one that we are debating again here today, where the Liberal Party of Canada had on its website an invitation to have a fine evening with the Speaker of the House of Commons, and it used his name, which I cannot do.

If the Conservative Party of Canada is going to use my name on a fundraiser, it is going to ask me about it. It is going to coordinate with me about it. It is going to check with my schedule to see whether it works for me to be able to come and do the event. Of course I will have to say, “Yes, I can,” or “No, I cannot.” The fact that it got this far tells us that the Speaker said “Yes, absolutely, let us do it.” That alone should have been the first thing that came to his mind.

● (1725)

I want to finish quickly with one more baseball reference. Angel Hernandez was an umpire in major league baseball; he had been for over 30 years and is widely regarded as one of the worst umpires in major league history. He has finally retired. It is time that the Speaker of the House of Commons follows the example of Angel Hernandez and resigns.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is really quite unfortunate that the Conservatives have chosen this particular issue to incorporate as part of their theme, whether through character assassination or filibustering, trying to portray the false image that Parliament in Ottawa is dysfunctional.

My question to the member is this: Why does he believe that he should be attempting to censure the Speaker when it was the Liberal Party of Canada that has taken full responsibility for the issue in question? That means the Liberal Party should be punished, as opposed to the Speaker.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Mr. Speaker, maybe they should both be punished because, as I said in my speech, the only way the Speaker's name can actually end up on an invitation with a specific date, time and location is if he approved it. That is the only way that that could happen.

It has been a complete nightmare and disaster ever since he took the chair. Three lapses, three partisan, very deliberate incidents, have happened under his watch. The only character assassination that has gone on has been the assassination of the character of the House, the chamber that the Speaker is supposed to preside over. He has been an absolute failure. He should do the honourable thing and resign.

[Translation]

Mr. Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the speech by my colleague from Cypress Hills—Grasslands.

Privilege

In fact, I want to tell him how disappointed I am. I could see where he was heading. He started off with a metaphor when he said that, after three violations, it is time to resign. I was hoping he would use a baseball metaphor because I am a baseball fan. He ended his speech by talking about baseball and mentioning the career of a star umpire, and that got me excited. Unfortunately, he did not use the requisite metaphor for the occasion.

I am going to show him how disappointed I was and do it with a question. What happens after three strikes? I would like him to tell us.

[English]

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Mr. Speaker, absolutely, strike three and someone is out. That is what needs to happen. I hope that all parties will vote to remove the Speaker. It needs to happen. As I said before question period, it seems like “Oh, we’ll give him another pitch, let him have strike four. Oh, maybe we’ll let him have strike five.” No, strike three, he is out. It is time for him to resign, or let us vote him out.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this kind of juvenile torch-and-pitchfork attempt to undermine the office of Speaker and to undermine Parliament is something I find very disturbing.

We have seen, just recently, the same thing happening with the conservative Saskatchewan Party. The independent Speaker of the Saskatchewan Legislature has said that he was both verbally and physically intimidated by the conservative Saskatchewan Party House leader, who is a former member of the Conservative caucus, Jeremy Harrison. The Speaker of the legislature said, “[The desire of this man] to get permission to carry a handgun in the legislative assembly is particularly disturbing,” and “My concerns over his mental stability and his obsession with guns [have been] confirmed”.

This is from the independent Speaker of the Saskatchewan Legislature. Not a single member of federal Parliament from Saskatchewan from the Conservative caucus has spoken up to denounce the intimidation, to denounce the threats. I would like a member of the Saskatchewan Conservative caucus to stand up and apologize and denounce the actions that have taken place in the conservative Saskatchewan Party in the Saskatchewan Legislature.

● (1730)

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the member thinks we are standing. We are standing in Ottawa in the federal Parliament, not in the Saskatchewan legislature. I have two points on that.

First, this fall there is going to be an election in Saskatchewan at the provincial level. Maybe the member should put his name on the ballot if he is so concerned about what is happening in Saskatchewan, and see how the people of Saskatchewan like him.

Second, the member used a very important term: “independent”. The Speaker of the Saskatchewan legislature actually operated independently. The Speaker of the chamber, who is from the Liberal caucus and was propped up three times by the member right there, continues to violate the chamber as a partisan hack. The Speaker needs to resign. Shame on the member for supporting him.

[Translation]

Mrs. Marilène Gill (Manicouagan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to say that I will be sharing my time with the member for Thornhill.

To begin, I would like to convey to the House my respect for my colleague, the member for Hull—Aylmer, who is an affable, warm and cordial person and who also happens to be the Speaker of the House right now. I wanted to make the distinction because it is not the individual, the MP himself, who is being called into question, but rather the embodiment of his role as Speaker. Beyond that, as many have said yesterday and today, it is the very functioning of the House of Commons that is being called into question.

I am taking the time to reiterate this distinction, which makes perfect sense but seems to be misunderstood by government members. I listened to the debates yesterday and I am listening carefully today. It has to be said that if someone does not understand this distinction, it is difficult for them to take part in this debate, because it is the very basis on which it rests. In the same vein, since we have to make this distinction between the role of Speaker and that of member of Parliament, I would say that we must also manage, as members of the House of Commons, to distinguish between the roles we take on.

I would invite the members of the governing Liberal Party to reflect on the fact that they are not here to protect one of their own, but to protect democracy and the institution that is the House of Commons. I think we need to be mindful of the motion we are considering today, because it arises from a question of privilege. This implies that the Speaker ruled in favour of the member who raised this question of privilege. I would like to quote from the Speaker’s ruling on the question of privilege because I think it is useful.

In ruling on this matter, I would like to clarify that I am not passing judgment on the alleged facts but rather on the priority these allegations should be given. While a motion could indeed be moved during routine proceedings, such motions are subject to interruptions in proceedings that could delay a decision on them indefinitely. As for opposition motions, they depend on the allotment of a supply day.

Quite clearly, it is in the interest of the whole House to resolve this particular matter quickly and with all due seriousness. As a result, I find that a *prima facie* question of privilege exists in this case.

The Chair clearly places a great deal of importance on this question. Since yesterday, members interested in discussing it have been accused of obstructing the business of this House, which I believe to be untrue, as the Chair’s ruling shows. This debate is much needed. We are asking for a solution and for the issue to be addressed in a timely manner. When such a motion of privilege is moved, it has to take priority. I am repeating myself, but giving priority to this motion underscores the importance of the debate currently taking place in the House.

Although I said that we must, first of all, keep the motion in mind, members must also accept that we are not engaging in obstruction. Rather, we are trying to resolve an outstanding issue that is currently creating a vacuum. The question is to determine whether we still have confidence in the Speaker or not.

I spoke about the Liberal members, but I invite all members of the House to do the same thing, to adhere to the same principles the Speaker must adhere to, namely impartiality and discernment. It is worthwhile to note that the root of the word “impartiality” is “party”, so there is that notion of neutrality.

• (1735)

Once again, this is not a question of political stripe. We are talking about the very role of Speaker, which should be above all partisan considerations.

I would like to take a moment to remind the House of the highlights of the story that led to this debate that has been going on since December 2023, since the Speaker of the House participated in an event organized by the Liberal Party of Ontario. The Speaker demonstrated then that he was unable to act with the neutrality I spoke of or show good judgment. I will identify four elements. He gave a speech in the Speaker of the House's robes, gave his title as Speaker of the House, and produced a video in the Speaker of the House's office and, by extension, using the House's resources.

I am limiting myself to this portion of the story, although there are many more, since I believe that the member for Hull—Aylmer, either on this one occasion or on many others, patently demonstrated by his actions that he did not understand the obligations associated with the position of Speaker of the House. Worse yet, once he was criticized for his actions, he failed to admit that they were unacceptable. He regretted none of his actions, although they were cut and dried and, as was stated in committee, could not be interpreted any other way.

However, he did regret the video that was publicly broadcast. It is the fact that it was publicly broadcast that he regretted. He does not acknowledge his mistake, but regrets how it was interpreted. It remains a mistake, regardless of how it was subsequently interpreted. Moreover, he does not acknowledge any partisanship in his actions. He also fails to mention other, similar partisan actions he took while he was speaker. His refusal to admit his mistake supports the idea I shared earlier, that the Speaker does not understand the obligations associated with his position. Worse still, it shows his inability, whether voluntary or involuntary, to make amends. There is no change possible because he does not understand, and he refuses to apologize, understand or change his behaviour.

This incident, isolated from the ones that would follow, such as the speech in Washington, already attests to a lack of impartiality and judgment. We are now in May, but as early as last December, the Speaker demonstrated his inability to perform his duties. As we know, the legitimacy of his role is built on trust. That trust has eroded over the past few months and, as my colleague from Trois-Rivières was saying yesterday, the lack of trust turns into mistrust, and mistrust turns into defiance. Over half of the House is calling on the Speaker to step down.

When the Speaker fails to perform his duties and refuses to learn from it, when he loses the trust of the House and refuses to earn it back, when he knowingly harms the work of this institution, the House of Commons, in other words, Quebecers and Canadians, we reach a point where the Speaker could regain the esteem and respect of the entire House by doing the only honourable thing that a

Privilege

Speaker who is not discharging his duties can do, and that is to leave.

Madam Speaker, before we move on to questions and comments, I would like to seek the unanimous consent of the House to move the following motion: That, given that the House is currently debating a non-confidence motion in the Speaker of the House on which the House will have to vote, that the Speaker is usually elected through a secret ballot, and that the secret ballot prevents any attempt to influence the vote and ensures that the result represents the real will of the members of our assembly, the House defer the vote planned for today until Monday, June 3, 2024, at 3 p.m. and that the vote be conducted by secret ballot in the House.

• (1740)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the House to move the motion?

Some hon. members: No.

[*English*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Questions and comments, the hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is unfortunate that members of the Bloc have bought in, hook, line and sinker, to the Conservatives' con job in regard to what they are doing today. Here we have a Liberal Party post that appears in a social network, and we have the Conservatives and the Bloc teaming up in an unholy alliance to assassinate the character of the Speaker of the House of Commons. I find that quite shameful.

Why does the member believe that the Speaker should be censured for something he was not part of? The arguments that have been presented for the last two days seem unfair and fundamentally flawed.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Marilène Gill: Madam Speaker, the member for Winnipeg North is making it clear that he could never be the Speaker of the House of Commons because he does not understand the impartiality and discernment needed for the job. That is what he just said: He does not understand and it seems unfair to him.

We need to look beyond perceptions and really acknowledge what the role of Speaker involves. The person who occupies the chair must be able to rally all members so that we can do the work that Quebecers and Canadians are asking us to do as quickly as possible.

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for her speech. It was interesting. I think that everyone here is committed to respect for the institution and the impartiality of the Speaker of the House. The current Speaker comes from Quebec, which is rare. I think that is important to note.

Privilege

There is a bit of information that was shared: Acting in good faith, the Speaker checked with the Clerk of the House and took every step to guard against any appearance of partisanship. It was the Liberal Party that made the mistake in the end. It was neither the Speaker nor the Speaker's office. That is an important nuance.

Past Speakers have made mistakes, sometimes worse ones. Speakers like Milliken or a current Conservative member made mistakes, and they were never systematically asked to step down. Now we have a Quebecker in the chair.

Does my colleague not think that this is an anti-Quebec attack?

• (1745)

Mrs. Marilène Gill: Madam Speaker, as I said earlier, we need to rise above the fray, because it does not matter where the Speaker is from. What matters to me is that the Speaker has the skills to do his job and that he earns the trust of the entire House.

As for the anti-Quebec conspiracy, that is not what this is. Other parties are stuck on this because we are the Bloc Québécois. The fact remains that we need to settle this issue. It is not about partisanship, hence the idea of, as I said, rising above the fray.

We want this to work. This needs to work for everyone. I would ask everyone to do the same thing I am trying to do.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, we have seen much more serious transgressions. Since I have been in the House, there have been Speakers from Ontario, Saskatchewan and Nova Scotia. Each time, the Bloc Québécois always supported the Speaker, even when the Speaker made a mistake.

For the first time, we have a federalist Speaker from Quebec. Now the Bloc Québécois has changed its ways, after supporting all the previous Speakers. A Quebec MP has become Speaker, but the Bloc Québécois attacked him constantly today. That worries me.

My question to my colleague is this: Why is the Bloc Québécois attacking a Speaker who comes from Quebec?

Mrs. Marilène Gill: Madam Speaker, we are not attacking him. This term is being used by the member because he does not wish to rise above the fray.

Once again, I may be a Bloc Québécois member, but I do not care which province or territory members who aspire to become Speaker come from. We have to rise above the fray.

To answer my colleague from Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, as a Bloc Québécois MP, I make sure that I am the last person to see any communications posted about me on my Facebook, Instagram, LinkedIn or other accounts.

As elected officials, we must not shirk responsibility by saying that something is not our fault and blaming the party, which in this case was the Liberal Party of Canada. The Speaker must have approved the post. If he did not, he was failing to do his job as an MP and a partisan.

[*English*]

Ms. Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Madam Speaker, I would like to start by saying that trust is a really difficult thing to

earn, a really easy thing to lose and an incredibly difficult thing to re-establish. What we have heard in the House today, time and time again, from members of the Liberal Party and from those who support them at every opportunity, the NDP members, is that for some reason, this is a waste of time. We have heard that this is a waste of House time or that this is an attack on the institution.

In fact, it is exactly the opposite of that. It is a question of a Speaker that has brought us here, who has acted in a partisan way, not just once or twice, but three times. We are here to discuss the partisan actions of a partisan Liberal Speaker serving his partisan Liberal boss, aided and abetted by his partisan coalition members in the NDP, occupying a job and a role in this place that is distinctly supposed to be non-partisan. Since becoming Speaker of the House six months ago, he has betrayed the trust not only of the House but also of the members of the House. The impartiality of the position does not exist in his world.

I have not been here very long, but I do not remember, and I do not even remember reading in history about, a Speaker who has been so embroiled in scandal after scandal and who has been chased down the street outside of this place to answer questions about his conduct. It has only been six months. If one types in "Speaker scandal", I think the name of that chair occupant would come up as the first search term on Google. That is where we are.

Let us go back. First, the Speaker recorded a video. This is the first of the three that I will talk about, and I will probably talk about some more because it is not even three; it is more than that. First, he recorded a video that he played at a Liberal partisan convention, while appearing in Speaker's robes in his office and while using Speaker and House resources to do that. He praised an outgoing Ontario Liberal leader between segments of two former leaders at a Liberal convention. I think anybody would believe that was a partisan activity.

Then, the Speaker travelled to Washington on the taxpayers' dime, on the dime of the resources of his office, of the House, and he used his perch as Speaker to muse fondly about his years as a young Liberal. This is also, objectively, a partisan thing to do in a non-partisan job that is meant to be the referee of this place and to have the trust of the members to know he will act in a manner that will treat every single member of the House equally.

Those are two instances. Talk about tone deaf. Finally, it is the latest offence, the one that has brought us here today, of the Speaker posting a blatantly partisan fundraising message on a website, personally attacking the Leader of the Opposition, the same Leader of the Opposition who, just weeks ago, he threw out of this place for doing the exact same thing the Prime Minister did moments before and moments after. This is, of course, after he threw out another member of the Conservative caucus for asking her to withdraw a statement, which she did. It is in the blues. We are probably going to have another day when we talk about the Speaker's frank inability to be impartial in his chair. We will get to that.

In that same week, the Speaker posted an ad, and it is strange to me. I have not been an MP for very long, and I keep a fairly busy schedule. The way it works in my office is that I have a great staff, and they send me a note and ask me, "Can you do at this time? Can you be here?" I say yes or no to all of these things. In some cases, my office says yes or no to these things, knowing full well that I would want to do something and that it would fit into my schedule.

● (1750)

Therefore, it is very difficult to believe that an ad for "A Summer Evening with the Honourable [Speaker]" mentioned, who occupies the chair, with event details, such as a time, a date and a place, would not be vetted by anyone. That does not really happen. In fact, when someone appears at events, particularly at events where they sell tickets to listen to a person, in this case, delivering really partisan messages about the guy whom he just kicked out of the House for doing the same thing as the guy who put him in that chair, it would be hard to believe that nobody in his office, nobody in his orbit or he himself would not have known that he would be appearing at a certain place, at a certain time, at this event where tickets are being sold to hear him speak.

All of that is to say that one time is a mistake and two times could be a coincidence, but three times is a pattern. It is a pattern by somebody who has a deep history in the most partisan politics. We will hear from the Liberals that this is somehow an attack on the character of the Speaker, but this is exactly the opposite of that. This is talking about the role he has taken on as an impartial referee of this place, one that should treat members, as I said, equally. This is, of course, after a history of being the first Speaker with an ethics violation, so that is a historic first.

I was not here at the time, but it does not take very much to go online to see how he reacted to an incident that happened in this place, when the Prime Minister elbowed an MP in the chest. He was the first one on his feet to defend that action and to say that the MP's story or version of events was experienced differently or was an overreaction. In fact, when he was asked that today, at the very time this was being talked about in the House by my colleague and friend from Calgary Nose Hill, he actually denied rising to his feet, defending the Prime Minister and putting forward an alternative version of events, talking about an exaggeration. He said at committee today that he did not say that.

That brings me to the NDP. To see a party, which once stood for values and for the working class and which once was in opposition in the House, defend the Prime Minister at every opportunity, rather than somebody in its own caucus, is the definition of "weakness". It is one of its own members who was elbowed by the Prime Minister. There are videos of it. This is not something that Conservatives are embellishing in the House. We can see it on a screen. New Democrats are defending the guy who got up on his feet to tell people that there was a different version of events or that the member was exaggerating.

What is worse is that it is the Speaker who adjudicates the harassment policy in the House. How on earth would any member of the House feel comfortable or feel that they could get a fair trial with somebody who was on his feet, defending the Prime Minister before even seeing the tape, telling the member that she experi-

Privilege

enced it differently, that it was an exaggeration or that she somehow dove as if it was for the World Cup. I do not know what terminology was used; it was blatantly weird. It was bizarre. Someone called it wacko.

This is what we are here to talk about today. We are talking about a man who occupies an office and who should be impartial. He has not done so. If he had even a modicum of integrity in this place, he would resign before I encourage members to vote him out.

● (1755)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, just to quote the member across the way, she gets upset and says that the latest offence that brought us here today is the posting of a "blatantly" partisan fundraising message on a website. What the member is talking about is what the Liberal Party of Canada actually posted, not, and I underline the word "not", the Speaker. However, the Conservative Party members do not want to have justice; what they want is character assassination. The Conservatives know full well that it was the Liberal Party that did it, but they want to censure the Speaker. The member even said in her opening remarks that the reason we are here today is because of that posting. Does the member not see a problem with her assertion? She is trying to punish the Speaker for something he did not do. How does the member justify that?

Ms. Melissa Lantsman: Madam Speaker, I would, frankly, be embarrassed if I were the deputy House leader of the government standing up in this place, defending the indefensible. He has members of the House speaking at length about all the Speaker's transgressions as an impartial referee of the House. He cannot do the job. That is what we are talking about today. Instead, the member is deflecting and diverting from the fact that, one, he cannot get his agenda through the House because he has decided to put the Speaker in the chair, and the Speaker has decided for himself, by his actions, that we would have this day today.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to know what my colleague thinks about the questions from earlier to the effect that the Bloc Québécois should not criticize the Speaker because he is a Quebecker. I believe that where the person lives should not even come into play.

There was another incident with the president of the Assemblée parlementaire de la Francophonie. Some people were saying that the Bloc Québécois was attacking him because he is a Franco-Ontarian.

I think we have to be impartial. Whether someone is from Quebec, Ontario or elsewhere, everyone is equal.

● (1800)

[*English*]

Ms. Melissa Lantsman: Madam Speaker, I think the identity politics in this place is a disease, and I do not care if the Speaker is from Quebec, Ontario, Saskatchewan or any of the great provinces in this country. We are talking about his inability to be impartial in that chair. That is what we are talking about today, and we are going to judge him accordingly.

Privilege

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, first off, of course, we already went through the procedure and House affairs committee, and the House took a vote. Since then, there has not been anything that justifies what the Conservatives are doing today and are doing this week. The Liberal Party of Canada made, in my judgment, a despicable mistake by posting something on its website that showed disrespect to the Speaker and disrespect to the House of Commons. The Liberals should have apologized immediately. It took them a few hours, but they finally did apologize.

What we are seeing, though, is an attack against the Speaker in the same way that the Conservative Saskatchewan Party is attacking the independent Speaker of the Saskatchewan legislature as well. We have seen verbal intimidation. We have seen threats, and we have seen the use of a firearm. Not a single Conservative has condemned that. I would ask my colleague to condemn what has happened to the Speaker in the Saskatchewan legislature. Will she do it?

Ms. Melissa Lantsman: Madam Speaker, I can understand why it is very difficult to keep track of all the scandals of the Speaker. I can completely understand that because every time I see him in the news, it is a different scandal. However, the one we are talking about today is the partisan posting of a fundraising event that the Speaker is part of and that he probably, might have, most likely approved, in terms of time. It is that member over there, who is screaming over me, who has become obsessed with the Saskatchewan legislature. I would say to that member to go and run in Saskatchewan if people are not going to elect him in his seat in B.C.

Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC): Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the hon. member for Calgary Nose Hill. I am quite looking forward to her intervention on this matter.

It is actually quite incredible to me that we are in this place at this point. I have been listening to the debate today. I have been listening to the government side. I have been listening to what I now call the moderate wing of the Liberal government, which is the NDP, argue that this is somehow a character assassination. In fact, a member of the opposition, who functions in his role as an opposition member, legitimately fulfilled his constitutional obligation by rising in this place and presenting a question of privilege. This was in relation to an advertisement of a partisan event that the Speaker of the House was going to be participating in. The ad was itself a character assassination of the Leader of the Opposition.

When a member brings a question of privilege to the House, it means they feel that their privileges, or the privileges of other members, have been violated. At that point, given all the interventions that occur, the Speaker makes a ruling. In this case, the Speaker was not able to make a ruling, because he was directly implicated in this question of privilege; therefore the Deputy Speaker made a ruling. In it, he said there may have been a violation of members' privileges. That is it. The independence of the speakership was actually effective at that point in determining that a proper question of privilege had, in fact, happened.

As is the right of all members, the member for Grande Prairie—Mackenzie moved a motion based on the Deputy Speaker's ruling, which is what we are now debating. It is not as though any opposi-

tion party, be it the Conservative Party, the Bloc Québécois or any other party, wrote this ruling. This was a ruling of the independent Deputy Speaker after the Speaker recused himself. That is what we are dealing with today. We are not dealing with a character assassination; to be frank, we are dealing with a question of character.

That question of character relates to the Speaker's ability to act in an independent, non-partisan manner, to act as a referee with respect for all members and their privileges. That is, in fact, what we are dealing with today. In the short period since the Speaker was appointed as such by the House, we have not just dealt with this on one occasion; there have been two other occasions.

I know that colleagues on our side have been talking about those instances. Of course, the most famous one happened in Ontario. It was shortly after the Speaker was appointed that he felt compelled, in his Speaker's robe and using the resources of the Speaker's position, to make a video for the Ontario Liberal Party convention. I recall when I first saw that video. It was a Saturday night. I was sitting there, as a former House leader, looking at this video and thinking, What in God's name is he doing? It was partisan. I recall sending a text to our current House leader, the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle, and I asked him if he had seen it. How could the Speaker have such bad judgment, poor judgment, that he would make such a video for the Ontario Liberal convention? Of course, that was the first time that the question of privilege came up.

Then there was another incident, in Washington, D.C., where the Speaker travelled on Speaker business and ended up at a partisan event that was videotaped and broadcast on social media. There, he talked about his experiences as a Liberal Party member.

Now, of course, there is the latest incident, talking about the Speaker appearing at a fundraiser. However, within the notice for the fundraiser, there was a partisan attack on the Leader of the Opposition.

● (1805)

It calls into question not only the Speaker's ability to be non-partisan but also, in many ways, his judgment. That is the fundamental issue we are dealing with today. It did not just happen once or twice. It has happened three times at this point. I think the ability of the opposition to function in its constitutional obligation and not have confidence in the Speaker is the root of what this question is all about.

When the Speaker was elected, he promised this chamber and its members that he would act in a non-partisan way, that he would not get in the way of debate and that he would be the referee, which is his role. However, time and time again, we have seen otherwise. This was not only the case in these three incidents but also in rulings and judgments, not the least of which was removing the Leader of the Opposition from the House during question period. That is something that I have not seen in the nine years I have been here. Many members whom I have spoken to, some with a long history in this place, and some with knowledge of history, had not seen anything like that occur before.

I can say that I was here the day when that happened. I was watching the Speaker. We had started off on a Monday. It had been a pretty raucous question period. I know that the Speaker had, at his left hand, the notice of removal. Somebody was going to leave the chamber that day. I am convinced of that, and it happened. We actually had two members that left. One was the member for Lethbridge, and then that was quickly followed up by the Leader of the Opposition. The challenge right now is trust in the ability of the Speaker to conduct himself in this non-partisan way and with impartiality. That really is what this is all about. Again, this prima facie case of privilege that the member for Grande Prairie—Mackenzie brought up is what we are dealing with today. It was not written or initiated by the opposition; it is something that was initiated by the Speaker of the House.

I can say that I do a lot of events; we all do. There is a vetting process that goes on for any event that I attend by my staff to make sure that I am not using House of Commons resources and that those events that I am attending are, in fact, proper events. There is no convincing me that someone in the Speaker's office or the Speaker himself did not know what was on that invitation.

Finally, I would like to finish off with what I perceive as a decline in our democracy. I see an erosion of respect for our institutions. The fact is that the Liberals and the NDP are standing up in this place and seemingly defending the actions of the Speaker, and they have been doing it since this debate started yesterday. This speaks to a lack of respect for this institution.

If anyone had any honour or integrity at all, they could see the chaos this is creating. The fact is that their decisions and their lack of judgment, impartiality and non-partisanship is causing such disruption in this place. This speaks to a decline in our democracy and a lack of respect for our institutions.

The first time the Speaker conducted himself in this way, when he made that video for the Ontario Liberal leadership convention, I said that he should have to resign. I believe that was the appropriate time for him to resign. Now we have two other instances where the Speaker has shown this lack of judgment and lack of impartiality.

As far as I am concerned, there is no other option. Almost half of the House believes that the Speaker has acted in a way that is unbecoming in terms of his role as Speaker and that he does, in fact, need to resign.

• (1810)

I appreciate what the Bloc tried to do before, which was to bring a unanimous consent motion to have a secret ballot when this vote occurs. I believe there are still people within the Liberal Party, and perhaps some within the NDP, who conduct themselves with honour. They see the actions of the Speaker and how that is causing a lack of respect for this place. If a secret ballot were held, I believe that some of those members, other than the ones who are going to stand up as they ask their questions, would actually want to see the Speaker removed, as the motion states.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the deputy leader just spoke and said this. It is not a direct quote, but it is pretty darn close, because I had to make notes as she

Privilege

was saying it. It will show tomorrow in Hansard. She said, in regard to this partisan posting, that her conclusions were, with respect to the Speaker, that he “probably, might have, most likely approved” of it. We have a third party that has said it was fully responsible and has actually apologized for it; then we have the deputy leader of the Conservative Party saying the Speaker most likely approved of it. That is what the Conservative Party is basing its evidence on when saying the Speaker has got to go.

I think there is a lot more truth to what the member just finished saying. This is a personal thing. He said that the Speaker should have resigned long ago. Could he provide more clarification on his statement that he does not believe the Speaker should have been given one chance?

Mr. John Brassard: Madam Speaker, in the first instance, shortly after he was pronounced Speaker, the Speaker engaged in a partisan message to a partisan party convention, the Liberal Party convention. He was in his robes, using Speaker resources. There have been people in this place who have resigned or have been forced to resign, and did the right thing by resigning, for much lesser grievances than that. Therefore, yes, I do believe that the Speaker should have resigned in the first instance.

Now we have additional instances, two more, in fact, of partisan activity by the Speaker. That, to me, speaks more to his character, his lack of judgment and his inability to act in a non-partisan manner while sitting in the chair.

• (1815)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Madam Speaker, this is a question and comment period, but I am going to make a comment because I am no longer sure what questions to ask in this circus atmosphere. It is degrading for the institution we represent.

My colleague's leader would not have been ejected if he had made respectable comments in the House, comments worthy of the institution we represent.

My Liberal colleagues are defending the indefensible. It is a lesson in politics 101. I do not even understand why we are here today. As my colleague from Abitibi—Témiscamingue said, three strikes is the limit in baseball.

Trying to be the adult in the room, the Bloc Québécois moved a motion. We made a democratic proposal that a secret ballot be held. It is a completely democratic process. I could hear people in the NDP shouting that they did not want that. Frankly, what is happening right now is degrading for the institution we represent. That is my comment.

Mr. John Brassard: Madam Speaker, it will come as no surprise that I agree with many of the things the member said, including the idea of a secret ballot.

However, the circus she is talking about is the product of the Liberal-NDP coalition. That coalition is undemocratic. It is bringing our democracy down.

[*English*]

That is what I am very worried about, to be quite frank.

Privilege

[Translation]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Madam Speaker, in his speech, my Conservative Party colleague stressed respect for institutions, parliamentarians' work and everything we do here, but we must also respect the work of Parliament.

The Standing Committee on Health is currently conducting an important study on the opioid crisis. During question period, the Conservative Party leader shouted himself hoarse levelling truly vicious accusations about the crisis. Meanwhile, people are dying out there.

Right now, the Standing Committee on Health is in Montreal meeting with people who are experts on this issue. Does anyone know how many Conservative members came? Not a single one. They do not want to hear the truth. They do not want to know what community groups are dealing with. That, too, shows a lack of respect for our institutions.

Mr. John Brassard: Madam Speaker, I will answer that question in less than five seconds.

[English]

If the member had any respect for this institution and if he had any respect for our democracy, he would cut off the unholy alliance and coalition he has with the Liberals and allow Canadians to call an election so that we can get back to some sense of normalcy in this country.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Madam Speaker, this place, the House of Commons, is the seat, arguably, of democracy in Canada, one of the most important seats and, arguably, it is also the only thing that prevents Canadians from settling their disagreements through violent conflict. Our tradition in here of solving our problems through discourse is what makes Canada Canada. What makes this place this place is the Speaker's role. It is the Speaker's charge under our Standing Orders and under our traditions to maintain impartiality. That has not happened.

I want to try to implore some of my colleagues from other political parties to think about why the Speaker needs to go, in concrete terms, with regard to each of the Speaker's three roles. However, before I do that, I want to briefly comment on the deputy leader of the opposition's point that was made about trust.

The current occupant of the Speaker's chair had a big trust deficit to overcome with the House, because, historically, Parliament has never had someone who had a government appointment take on the role of Speaker in that same Parliament. Not only did he have a minor government appointment; he had the most partisan appointment of all: parliamentary secretary to the Prime Minister. That is like the Prime Minister's defence guy on any topic. So, there was a trust deficit to overcome.

What happened, now that we are on the third incident, the third case of privilege where the Speaker has demonstrated partisan behaviour, is that it is very clear that impartiality has been breached. Now it is not just about this place; it is about Canadians' faith in this place being able to fairly and neutrally function as a place where their voices can be heard, because if the Speaker is being partisan for the Liberal Party, then the 120,000 people I represent

do not have fair hearing in this House automatically. We can respect each other as partisan for our ability to be partisan, but I implore the Speaker to resign on his own accord, because his legacy is now having breached that impartiality, to the point where any decision he makes, any ruling he makes, is going to be viewed through that lens, and that degrades Canadian democracy. So, when we are talking about wasting House time, the Speaker should have resigned already. That is the right thing to do. That is what he should have done.

Now, how does this impact his three roles? First of all, "the Speaker presides over debate in the House and is responsible for enforcing and interpreting all rules...of the House." Already, the Speaker, outside of the three instances, has had to recuse himself on questions regarding the government withholding information in Order Paper questions or misleading the House. Why? It is because they were Order Paper questions he signed off on in his role as parliamentary secretary, which is problematic in and of itself. Then, with this partisanship, not just allegations, but a clear case of privilege being found, which is why we are debating this right now, when he makes the decision to remove someone, it is going to be debated through a partisan lens automatically because of this partisan finding, and he has already lost the confidence of a significant number in the House.

Many opinion columns have been written, and rightly so, asking how the Speaker can continue on in his role when two of the major political parties say that he has lost confidence. This is not something that is par for the course. This does not happen every Parliament. This is the first time it has happened. It is a remarkable decline in Parliament, and he is presiding over it. If we are going to talk about people wasting the time of the House, he should have resigned already of his own accord, which is the honourable thing that he should have done. So, he cannot do his first role as he cannot neutrally preside over the proceedings of this place.

His second duty is as the chief administrative officer of the House. I did raise this issue in committee, in PROC, today. I also raised this with the House leader of the NDP in debate today, respectfully, but he did not answer the question, which is this: Honestly, how, given these partisan allegations, can the Speaker be the presiding officer over the House of Commons' harassment policy? How is that possible?

● (1820)

Let us put everything aside for a minute. This is really serious. If we look through the transcript of the day in May 2016 when the Prime Minister elbowed former NDP MP Ruth Ellen Brosseau in the chest, I draw the attention of the House to the comments of the member for Churchill—Keewatinook Aski, as well as the member for Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke. The member for Churchill—Keewatinook Aski said, "if we apply a gendered lens, it is very important that we recognize that young women in this place need to feel safe to come here, to work here". She gave a whole detailed account of what happened.

The Speaker jumped up, right after the member for Churchill—Keewatinook Aski spoke these words, and said, “if one wants to exaggerate the situation and to make this into something that it was not, or make it reminiscent of a dive in the 2006 World Cup, perhaps we can go on.” He said, “I think [it] might have been exaggerated”. He was not only denigrating Ruth Ellen Brosseau, but he was also denigrating the account of harassment from the member for Churchill—Keewatinook Aski. Then he goes on to say, “What happened was exactly as the Prime Minister had described it.” These two women had experienced it differently.

Now, putting partisanship aside for a second, we are being asked in this place to suspend our disbelief that the Speaker can somehow magically go from that to being the neutral arbiter of the House of Commons harassment policy.

He now has three strikes of partisanship against him. How do we or any staff member know that vexatious complaints are not going to be made? How do I know that I could go there and not have that leaked to the Liberal whip and have it go to the media? He has effectively put a chill on anybody wanting to talk about harassment in this place, and yet the NDP is propping him up. Why? Again, this boggles my mind. It is fundamentally wrong.

The last thing is that the Speaker is “the representative or spokesperson for the House in its relations with authorities...outside Parliament.” Yet, the Speaker was in his robes, talking about being a young Liberal, in this capacity, in Washington, D.C. His international relation is now as a spokesperson for the Liberal Party. Come on.

He just needs to resign. That would make everything easier. I have no idea what is going on in the NDP caucus right now. It boggles my mind. I have no idea how they are supporting him. It really boggles my mind. A supply and confidence agreement with the government should not include an agreement to cover up and support the partisan activities of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Then, the deputy House leader is saying that it was the Liberal Party, and the Speaker could not have possibly known about it. I would like to quote something that the leader of the Liberal Party, the CEO, the executive-in-chief of the Liberal Party said when allegations about former justice minister Jody Wilson-Raybould and the whole SNC-Lavalin scandal came out. The first thing that the chief operating officer, the person in charge of the Liberal Party today, said was that the story in the Globe was “false”. How many times have we heard the Liberal Party, the commander-in-chief of the Liberal Party, say, “Oh no, it is false. That is not what happened.”

I have respect for every person in this House. I would like to think I actually have a good relationship with many people in this House. Out of self-respect, how can somebody stand up here and ask this of the House? How are we supposed to believe that the Speaker did not know about this, and that we are just to take the Liberal Party's word, after nine years of hearing that the story in the Globe is false.

This is just amateur hour. The Speaker should just resign. If he is watching this, he should resign. He should stop the debate and just

Privilege

resign. There are many other people in this House, not me, who could do this job in an impartial way. There are people who have stood up against their party from time to time, who have shown some independence in this place, who could do this job and respect the democratic traditions that this is based upon.

Yet here we are, for the third time, debating this. When we are talking about a waste of time, it is not a waste of time to protect Canadian democracy, but the Speaker is sure wasting the House's time, and that is a shame.

• (1825)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, sadly, the character assassination continues. I have been a parliamentarian for well over 30 years. I have seen New Democrat Speakers, Progressive Conservative Speakers, Conservative Speakers and Liberal Speakers.

I really do not appreciate when individuals across the way try to imply that they know it all when it comes to what qualifies an individual to be a Speaker. The Conservatives then twist and distort what has previously taken place. PROC came forward with a recommendation for one purpose, and that was to fit the Conservative agenda of trying to demonstrate that Parliament is dysfunctional.

When will the Conservatives give up and start looking at issues that Canadians are concerned about? Whether it is affordability, pharmacare or the dental plan, there are all sorts of issues that Canadians want us to be dealing with. Why the farce?

• (1830)

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: Madam Speaker, that was an embarrassingly amateur display of gaslighting, which is not befitting of a member of that tenure. If the member really wanted to do his role justice, he would have got up and refuted any of the just points I made. However, he did not. He gaslit me. That is what he has done to Canadians.

If the partisan Speaker wants to put his party out of its misery, he should just resign so that those sorts of embarrassing displays can stop, and we can get on with the nation's business.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Madam Speaker, in my previous intervention, I forgot to address one thing that I consider equally unacceptable and degrading for our democracy, and that is when members sink to spreading disinformation or lies or to using divide-and-conquer tactics.

Claiming that challenging the president of the Assemblée parlementaire de la Francophonie was an insult to francophones outside Quebec is a lie. It is disinformation. It is an attempt to divide and conquer. Accusing us, the Bloc Québécois, of dwelling on this matter because the Speaker is a Quebecker is a low blow. I have no words to describe how absurd this attack is. Whether or not the Speaker is a Quebecker is irrelevant.

Privilege

I heard some members of the NDP and even some Liberals accuse us of objecting to the fact that the Speaker is a Quebecker. Ultimately, all this does is divide and conquer. It helps no one in our democratic system.

[*English*]

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: Madam Speaker, I agree. There is only one qualification for the Speaker role, and that is impartiality. The Speaker has demonstrated three times that he cannot be impartial. If anybody else, in any other industry, in any other setting around the country, had failed the core competency of their job three times, what would happen? They would be fired. The Speaker should resign.

Ms. Lindsay Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Madam Speaker, I find it very difficult, within the context of what the member has put forward, to take this seriously.

I have just gone on to Hansard and did a quick search of our current Deputy Speaker, the member for West Nova. He has said so many things that are partisan as well. I could list them off. He criticizes the Liberals consistently. He was an opposition member. However, that seems to have no play in this place.

Throughout our careers, there are roles we have here. The member, herself, was on the government side. She is no longer. Our roles change. I believe her argument against the current Speaker, in the context she was using throughout her speech, is poor.

I would like to hear her response to that, considering we all have roles, and they change over time. This could be said about the current Deputy Speaker. It could be said about you, Madam Speaker. This is all applicable.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: Madam Speaker, *tu quoque* is the most obvious logical fallacy in debate. The member did it, too. If the member was going to take this logical fallacy to the end, she should have raised a question of privilege on any of those matters she just raised, but she will not. Why is that? It is because they do not meet the level of partisanship the Speaker has been found guilty of.

She knows in her heart that this man should not be Speaker. I encourage her to go to her House leader to say that this is the third time this has happened, so why are they making her vote to prop up a guy who spoke out against a woman who was elbowed in the chest by the Prime Minister?

Mr. Rick Perkins (South Shore—St. Margarets, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am rising today, as are other members, to deal with a very serious motion, the privilege motion ruled on by the Deputy Speaker and brought forward by the member for Grande Prairie—Mackenzie. It is yet another incident of the Speaker pursuing partisan elements of his personal or previous life as a partisan MP while in the neutral role of the Speaker.

It is important to note and understand why it is that the Speaker is neutral and where that comes from. It is a very ancient parliamentary tradition. For those who do not know our history, Bosc and Gagnon, the great book we use, has a very instructive history of why the Speaker is neutral.

I should mention that I will be splitting my time with the member for Calgary Rocky Ridge.

The first Speakers were appointed in the 1300s in the mother of all Parliaments, and they were essentially an agent of the king or the Crown until about 100 years later. The book notes, on page 312:

The Crown's influence over the Speaker came to an end in 1642, when King Charles I, accompanied by an armed escort, crossed the Bar of the House, sat in the Speaker's chair and demanded the surrender of five parliamentary leaders on a charge of treason. Falling to his knees, Speaker William Lenthall replied with these now famous words which have since defined the Speaker's role in relation to the House and the Crown:

May it please Your Majesty, I have neither eyes to see, nor tongue to speak in this place, but as the House is pleased to direct me, whose servant I am here; and I humbly beg Your Majesty's pardon that I cannot give any other answer than this to what Your Majesty is pleased to demand of me.

The historic element of that is that the Speaker was no longer the servant of the Crown. The Crown is the government. The current Speaker has operated his partisan breaches in the last six to eight months. I would say there are six, but the first breach occurred in October, shortly after he became Speaker, as we have talked about, when he filmed a video not far from here, in his office, which he used at the Ontario Liberal Party convention. In the video, he extolled the virtues of the outgoing leader, which was a total abuse of the neutrality of the Speaker.

I would add that, in Bosc and Gagnon, on page 323, it says:

When in the Chair, the Speaker embodies the power and authority of the office, strengthened by rule and precedent. He or she must at all times show, and be seen to show, the impartiality required to sustain the trust and goodwill of the House.

Not only must the Speaker live by the letter of the law, he has to be seen to be living by the letter of the law on neutrality. Doing a video in the Speaker's office, in his Speaker's robes and using House of Commons resources was a clear breach. He was found to have made that breach by the procedure and House affairs committee of the House and fined.

Yes, he profusely apologized to the House. Apparently, in the past, that would have resulted in a Speaker having resigned, but the House accepted a fine. However, two of the parties, the real official opposition, the Bloc and the Conservatives, because the NDP is in a coalition that jumps when the Liberals ask, with the seriousness of this, voted with the government to keep the Speaker in place.

The British still maintain this neutrality. The U.K. Parliament says, "The political impartiality of the Speaker is one of the office's most important features – and most emulated or aspired to outside the UK. Once elected, the Speaker severs all ties with his or her former party and is in all aspects of the job a completely non-partisan figure." That is not the process that our Speaker has been following in the breach.

Privilege

• (1835)

The breach we are talking about today, of course, is that we know that he put out a very partisan invitation to an event in the riding of Hull—Aylmer, which coincidentally happens to be the Speaker's own riding. The government members would have us believe that the Speaker had nothing to do with the invitation to an event in his own riding. I do not know about other members, but I always review anything my EDA sends out in my riding. I would not let them put it out. It would be irresponsible for me to let it put them out, especially to an event like that.

The Speaker, in the invitation, described a summer evening with the hon. Speaker, scheduled to be held on the evening of June 4th in the shadow of Parliament Hill at a location adjacent to the Gatineau bank on the bank of the Ottawa River, less than a kilometre from here.

The promotional material of the event used very partisan, inflammatory language concerning the Conservative Party and the leader of the official opposition. I will just read a little bit of it for members. It said, "Join us for an event in your community - you don't want to miss it! It's an opportunity to join fellow Liberals and talk about the ways we can continue to build a better future for all Canadians - because a better future starts with you."

It goes on to say, "While [the Leader of the Opposition] and the Conservatives propose reckless policies that would risk [the] health, safety and pocketbooks [of] our Liberal team" because, of course, it is all about the pocketbooks of the Liberal team. It continues that it "is focused on making life more affordable for Canadians and moving forward with our bold plan to grow an economy".

The very partisan nature of this is actually emphasized in a footnote in the rhetoric, which explains that "Team [Prime Minister] events are posted by local volunteer teams". That means that the locals in his riding posted this, not the claim that the government is making, which is that he was not responsible and that somebody else was responsible. It sounds like a six-year-old saying that their brother did it, that they did not do it, that they did not steal the chocolate bar, but their brother did.

That is unacceptable. The reason this is important is because the Speaker has to protect the interest of the opposition in challenging the Crown. The Speaker is not a mouthpiece for the Crown. The Speaker is a protector of the rights of our democracy in this place, in this chamber.

It used to be that the NDP, not so long ago, agreed with that. I will quote, if one can bear with me for a minute, the member for New Westminster—Burnaby, the NDP House leader, who said, after the first incident, when it was at the procedure and House affairs committee, "This cannot happen moving forward. From now on, you cannot have the Speaker engage in partisan activity."

• (1840)

He also said that if there was any derogation of that in the weeks and months to come, and we are only months from that, his party would join in voting non-confidence in the Speaker, and that is what we are doing today. We have a motion for the Speaker to vacate the chair. The NDP House leader said that this is what they would do if this happened again. It has happened again, but appar-

ently the NDP has been whipped by the Liberal whip into keeping its coalition alive and betraying the words that it said to the public about what it would do going forward. Some might say that NDP members were Liberal lickspittles rather than members of the official opposition holding the government to account.

Going forward, we know that, in the coalition government, one cannot depend on the NDP to protect the democratic interests of the House and the privileges of individuals. We are not suggesting that what happened to King Charles I should happen to the Speaker if the Speaker had integrity the first time, the second time, the third time, the fourth time, the sixth time, now that he has breached, in six months the partisan nature of his post.

I am partisan as well, but I do not aspire to be the neutral guy or the neutral woman sitting in that chair. I do not like to be the referee. I would rather play on a team and fight the fight. Some like to do that job. The Speaker seems to want to do both, not the Speaker who is presently in the chair, but the Speaker we are debating today, along with his future, and why he has to vacate the chair. He has to make a choice. His choice has clearly been that he is using that position for partisan purposes. That has to stop.

• (1845)

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Brampton North, Lib.): Madam Speaker, so far, what I have been hearing throughout the debate is "do as we say, not as we do". It has been indicated several times that the former Conservative Speaker also promoted and went to fundraising events.

It has been cleared up in this case that the fundraising event invitation did not go out from the Speaker or from the Speaker's office. What does the member have to say about that? I find it quite hypocritical that a previous Conservative Speaker attended fundraisers and promoted fundraisers on his social media, yet the Conservatives have wasted almost two days in the House talking about this matter when we could be talking about affordability.

Mr. Rick Perkins: Madam Speaker, I know the government finds democracy a bother, and by the way, this was an opposition day, so no government business has been lost.

In response to the question, the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle, who was Speaker at one time, was not promoting an event. It was another member of our caucus from Saskatchewan who posted the picture that has been talked about a few times. The former Speaker picked up another member of our caucus and drove him to an event, and a picture was taken outside of the event by that member and posted. Somehow, the Liberals are trying to compare that to the language used by the invitation sent out by the current Speaker, which was taking shots at the leader of the official opposition and the Conservative Party. I dare anyone on that side to find anything near comparable, with the previous Speaker, the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle, making comments publicly against the Liberals or opposition members while he was Speaker.

Privilege

I would point out to my NDP friend from earlier that she should look at the dates of the quotes she is looking at. They are from prior to when he was appointed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from South Shore—St. Margarets for his speech, in which he talked about partisanship. He said that a Speaker should rise above partisanship. That is an interesting thing to point out in this debate.

However, I wonder if he could comment on something else that we have come to expect from the Speaker, because his role is essentially to make judgment calls on what is happening in the House. It is really all about exercising judgment.

Does my colleague believe that the current Speaker has shown good judgment, and is that a quality that should be essential, along with impartiality, in the role of Speaker of the House of Commons?

[*English*]

Mr. Rick Perkins: Madam Speaker, obviously, judgment is a key part of any role in the House, and the judgment in this case, when one is Speaker, has to be to say, “No, I will not go to a partisan event; my role does not allow for that.” In fact, in the past, Speakers have left their party and sat as independent members when they became Speaker. That is a choice the current Speaker has to make in judgment, and he showed that his judgment errs on the side of partisanship, not on the side of being neutral. That is why he has to vacate the chair.

Mrs. Anna Roberts (King—Vaughan, CPC): Madam Speaker, my friend from South Shore—St. Margarets has been involved in politics for a long time.

I know you are older, but that is not what I mean. You are very experienced, so I look to you for—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member has to speak through the Chair.

Mrs. Anna Roberts: Madam Speaker, I will insult him through the Chair.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mrs. Anna Roberts: Madam Speaker, I am wondering if the member can tell the House this: In his experience, has he ever seen a Speaker as partisan as this one? Also, I am wondering if the member can share his opinion on why the NDP-Liberal government is so desperate to defend its clearly very partisan friend who is the Speaker now.

Mr. Rick Perkins: Madam Speaker, I think I should thank the member for the question, but I am not quite sure.

I was not here at the time of Sir John A.; that is a myth. However, I was here at the time of the Right Hon. Brian Mulroney during the transition from appointing Speakers to electing Speakers. Since then, I have never seen a Speaker engaged in partisan activities while Speaker and, in an overt way, criticizing members of the opposition or an opposition party while still serving in the chair. I have not seen that in 40-plus years of my very young life.

• (1850)

Mr. Pat Kelly (Calgary Rocky Ridge, CPC): Madam Speaker, this evening, participating in this debate gives me no joy whatsoever. However, it is always an honour, including at this moment, to speak in the House of Commons.

The matter before us is the the motion of the member for Grande Prairie—Mackenzie, which notes:

...the Speaker's ongoing and repetitive partisan conduct outside of the Chamber is a betrayal of the traditions and expectations of his office and a breach of the trust required to discharge his duties and responsibilities, all of which this House judges to be a serious contempt and, therefore, declares that the office of Speaker shall be vacated...

I cannot believe this is the second time in six months that this chamber has had to come to a halt to debate and ultimately rule on the fitness of the Speaker to continue. The impartiality of the Speaker is fundamental to this institution. This House is where 338 members of Parliament, elected to represent the people of Canada, come to legislate the laws of Canada. This is where vigorous debate occurs on bills proposed most of the time by the government, but also by private members and those from the other place. This is where the most powerful people in Canada are held to account. The votes in this place determine the continuation of the government. This is where, on a day-to-day basis, the most powerful people in Canada come to face an opposition. It is where their ideas have to be tested.

When bills are brought into this place, the process of debate is designed to be adversarial. It is designed to be partisan. If the government is going to propose a bill to change the laws of Canada and impose law on Canada, it has to be tested by an opposition. The only way the democratic privileges of Canadians can be protected is through an impartial Speaker whose impartiality is absolutely beyond reproach, yet here we are, for the second time in six months, debating whether that is the case with the current Speaker.

I bring members to the latest issue and question of the impartiality of the Speaker, wherein the Speaker's Liberal electoral district association advertised a “Summer Evening with the [Speaker]” and talked about “fellow Liberals” joining with the Speaker to discuss issues. I will not repeat or read the portion of this invitation that had a very aggressive attack on the Leader of the Opposition and the Conservative Party.

Anybody who read this invitation could see that this was an absolutely unpardonable departure from the norm of the Speaker's impartiality. As the member before me talked about, the impartiality of the Speaker has been well understood since the mid-17th century. This is not something new, and the entire system relies on this impartiality, so the invitation to this event alone is a departure from that.

Privilege

We have heard all day the speakers from the government say that this does not have anything to do with the Speaker at all and that this is from the Liberal Party. Really? There is a date on it. Are we left to believe that the Speaker did not know about this event that was advertised with his name on it on a particular date in his riding? Of course he had to have known about this. However, that may even be beside the point. Once a Speaker is elected, would not one of the very first things that any newly elected Speaker do be to sit down with the officials of the electoral district association for their party and tell them that they cannot advertise fundraising with the Speaker's name? They cannot do that. Everybody knows this. It is so simple. There is no excuse for it.

• (1855)

The Liberal Party may want to claim responsibility for this to deflect from the Speaker, but no reasonable person would buy that the date in question had not been communicated to the Speaker. Is the EDA really going to have a fundraiser and put the Speaker's name on it to advertise it without checking to see if he is going to be available to attend? Of course they must have done that.

The fact that this happened is why we are here today, but even if we could say this was a mistake, a one-off, by somebody who did not know better, the problem is that the Speaker has had a history of these types of events and no longer gets the benefit of the doubt. He does not get the benefit of the doubt when the House has already gone through a protracted question of privilege over his filming of a video in his Speaker's robes in the Speaker's office, which was played at a Liberal Party convention. He does not get the benefit of the doubt when this has already happened. When the debate on that earlier question was under way, the Speaker was in Washington attending another event, where he waxed nostalgic about his history of Liberal activism in a celebrity crowd of international Liberals.

I want to set that aside for a minute and ask what the Speaker was doing in Washington that week. That was a sitting week of the House of Commons. To the Speaker of the House of Commons, no other business is more important than a meeting of the House of Commons. Presiding over question period, presiding over important votes and presiding over the procedural issues that come up in Routine Proceedings each day are core responsibilities of the Speaker. There is no excuse for the Speaker to not be in the chair for these moments, other than incapacity and illness. If a Speaker is well enough to get out of bed and go out for the day, they are well enough to be in the chair when the House is sitting.

We have seen this over and over again. We have seen travel. We have seen the Speaker vacating the chair, probably, I am told, for diplomatic functions or meetings in the lounge. There is no excuse for these things. The Speaker ran on a platform to be Speaker, saying that nobody pays to see the ref; it is all about the players. However, under this Speaker, it has been about the Speaker, and that is just as offensive as the constant partisanship.

We have other examples of his partisanship. He attended an event for the Liberal member of the National Assembly in his riding. He got a former Liberal MP to write an op-ed to prop up his own standing and attack the Conservatives. Again, it is partisan attacks. The Speaker's job is not to care what the press gallery thinks

or what the school kids in the gallery think or what anybody out there thinks of their conduct. The Speaker's role is to protect the privileges of members of the House of Commons. It is about protecting members. It is about ensuring that all of the people who elected the 338 members of the House of Commons have the tools and ability to hold the government to account and express their democratic will. That is the role of the Speaker, not hanging out with diplomats, not flying off to Washington and not any of the other things.

Despite the Speaker's role of protecting members' privileges, we are still waiting for a ruling. Four weeks ago, a question of privilege was raised over the alteration of Hansard, and the Speaker still has not ruled on it. It is about time that we had a Speaker that will uphold the privileges of members of the House of Commons in an impartial fashion.

• (1900)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, we know why we are here today. It is because of the Conservatives' persistence in playing a shameful game of character assassination.

The issue arose because something was posted on social media, a website, and we have a third party saying they are the ones who did it, apologizing to the Speaker's office for doing it and taking full responsibility. However, when I posed a question to the member's deputy leader asking why the Speaker was being blamed, her response was, in essence, that he "probably, might have, most likely approved" of it.

Does the member have anything of substance to say showing that the Speaker was aware of it?

Mr. Pat Kelly: Madam Speaker, the member might have listened to my speech because I addressed this in my speech extensively. I will say that if someone already has the same history that the current Speaker has, they do not get the benefit of the doubt at this point. At this point, it is over.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, I have always known the member to be a fair person. I have enjoyed working with him. I know he believes in due process, and we have a situation where the Liberal Party of Canada screwed up and has apologized now for disrespecting both the Speaker and Parliament.

Privilege

I am concerned, and I know in his heart of hearts the member is concerned, about the ongoing attacks on the Speaker, given that we have seen as well the attacks by the conservative Saskatchewan Party in the Saskatchewan legislature, in going after an independent Speaker. We have seen violence, intimidation, and verbal and physical aggressive intimidation of the Speaker of the Saskatchewan legislature by the House leader, Jeremy Harrison, a former colleague of his and former MP from the Conservative Party. Will the member condemn unequivocally those actions in the Saskatchewan legislature, directed at the Speaker?

Mr. Pat Kelly: Madam Speaker, I am here to talk about the motion at hand. The member said, the last time we debated the partisanship of the Speaker, that if there were any further transgressions of impartiality, particularly involving Liberal and partisan action, he would vote for removal of the Speaker. Therefore, I call on him to remember his words from last December and vote accordingly.

Mr. Kevin Waugh (Saskatoon—Grasswood, CPC): Madam Speaker, here is the issue we are going to have in the hour. It is not a secret vote. We are going to stand up and vote yea or nay on the removal. Can members guess who is going to sit at home watching our vote? It will be the Speaker. Let us see what the Speaker does when he comes back.

We all know that the NDP has supported the current Liberal government. We tried today to remove the Speaker. I suspect with the vote that we are going to be unsuccessful tonight with respect to dumping the Speaker. Therefore, what happens when we come back, when the Speaker acknowledges every one of us standing up to vote nay or yea to get rid of him over his partisan shots that he has taken the last six months?

Mr. Pat Kelly: Madam Speaker, the member quite rightly points out through his question that the Speaker's position is untenable. This cannot go on and it would be best for him to resign before this vote occurs.

• (1905)

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): Madam Speaker, off the top, just so that this is not a surprise, not to you as the Chair, but to the Speaker, I want him to know that I lost confidence in him long before now.

I know I am supposed to split my time, but I usually look around to see if the member is in the chamber; he is behind me now. I was hoping to get the whole 20 minutes, but I will split my time with the member for Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry. He is deserv-ing of the time. I am sure he will make fine points, too.

Actually, the Speaker knows this, because I heckle him on a semi-regular basis that I have lost confidence in him. I do not believe he is doing a great job. He has given ample opportunity for members of this House to not believe that he is able to conduct himself in a way that takes the Speaker's position and rises above the fray of the House. He said on the very first day or second day that he was like a new car and that he was hoping to avoid having dents in it. At this point, this thing is now in the scrapyard. It is done. There is nothing more to do. There is no way to fix this vehicle and give it a second life.

There have been three events. Other members have talked about them. The Speaker provided a provincial politician with a very par-

tisan going-away video in Speaker's robes at a partisan convention. As the member for Calgary Rocky Ridge mentioned, the Speaker went to Washington, D.C. during a sitting week of the House in order to wax and wane about Liberal dogma. Now we have this latest issue of an email that was sent out inviting people in Hull—Aylmer, his riding, to an event where the Speaker was going to be. As other members, like my seatmate, the member for South Shore—St. Margarets said, it is impossible not to believe that the Speaker would not have known about that. All of us tell our EDAs what we want to know. I review every email a constituent gets from my office. If it goes out under my name, I see it automatically. It does not matter if it is EDA fundraisers sent by my EDA from the partisan emails we have. Nothing leaves my office without me seeing it. I look at those emails once my volunteers have set them up. I refuse to believe that the Speaker did not know. He can decline to take fault for it. If he wants to do that, that is fine.

In ethics, there are two things that matter: actual conflicts of interest and the perception of a conflict of interest. The same thing applies here. The perception of partisanship should be sufficient for any Speaker to say to themselves, "I am not important", just like I am not important as the member of Parliament for Calgary Shepard. None of us are. We are stewards of these seats on behalf of our constituents and for future generations.

The Speaker is the steward of that office, which is independent. We have been blessed to have had that office for hundreds of years in this country, thanks to Speaker Lenthall, as the member for South Shore—St. Margarets reminded us. I have a print of a painting in my office so that when constituents come for a visit, I can talk about how important that was. It is a depiction of when King Charles I lost his head in the Palace of Westminster. It has a beautiful brass dot on the floor. You know about this, Madam Speaker, because you saw it with me; it was a wonderful experience to see that. It shows the exact place where King Charles I was executed, partially for invading this Parliament, trying to take it over and trying to arrest members of Parliament.

The Speaker, every Speaker, needs to remember that it is not just about the pretty paintings they have in the hallway where the Speaker gets to walk around with the mace in a procession, wearing the robes, and having all of the clerks and analysts who help them do their job. Their job is literally to be a steward for the next generation, for the person who comes after them. The Speaker keeps forgetting that. It is just all about him; it has become about him. If he does not believe it is about him, in his heart of hearts, he should tell himself that his job is to protect the role and the job. The only honourable thing to do would be to resign before the vote is taken to protect that office.

I have a Yiddish proverb. I wrote it down, because I always have one when I am speaking. I went looking for it. My Yiddish-speaking Jewish friends will forgive me for my pronunciation of this proverb: “*Eyn alter fraynd iz beser vi naye tsvey.*” That means one old friend is better than two new ones. The Speaker has chosen his old friend, the Liberal Party. I find it unusual that Liberal members of Parliament are throwing the Liberal Party of Canada under the bus. Liberals are throwing Liberals under the bus, including their whole organizational structure.

● (1910)

Everybody in the party apparatus in the Liberal offices is in some way at fault for sending out a partisan email that the Speaker should have looked at. The staff in the Speaker's office should have realized it could not go out in his name under any circumstances. Obviously, they did not catch it.

I will also say that his name was not on my ballot. I refused to put him on my ballot because this particular Speaker has been very partisan in his role. I do not fault him for it. There are many partisan members here. Partisanship is part of being a member of Parliament, and I accept that. I had the names ordered in a different way, as you know, Madam Speaker. You know exactly who was my first choice on that ballot, who was my second choice and who was my third choice. You know why as well.

I have found, with Speakers in the past, and I have had a few Speakers now who have been responsible for the House, as a spectator, that Speaker Milliken was probably the best modern Speaker the House has had. I think that is a widely shared opinion. He was a Liberal member of Parliament who became the Speaker. It almost did not matter which party one was in, he was generally approved. I think even the clerks and the analysts of the different committees think so too. I have even looked at videos of his past decisions on how he behaved in the House and controlled it.

I would say that in the United Kingdom the most interesting Speaker of late was Speaker Bercow, who was renowned for trying to keep order in the House with his shouting down of members and his quips. It worked for him in his situation. However, this particular Speaker has never been able to restore confidence after the errors he has made, and he does not give me more confidence that it can get better.

I will also add that, when the member for Manicouagan tried to amend the motion we are considering to make it a secret ballot vote, just like when we elect a Speaker, she was shouted down by the member for New Westminster—Burnaby. He was the first member to start saying no over her as she was trying to read her motion. He did not even wait until she was done to say no, but did it while she was trying to add a very reasonable amendment.

The member for New Westminster—Burnaby is the same member who, when speaking to journalists on behalf of the New Democratic Party, after the review by the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs of the issue, said, “This cannot happen moving forward. From now on, you cannot have a Speaker engage in partisan activity.” He also said, “if there was any derogation from that, in the weeks and months to come”, that his party would join in voting “non-confidence” in the Speaker.

Privilege

That is essentially what we are doing right now. We want the Speaker to vacate the seat. I personally believe that is the right solution here because the Speaker has chosen his old friend, specifically the Liberal Party. I do not mean the individual caucus members here, because I am sure some of them, if allowed a free vote, would also believe that he has simply lost the confidence of the House. About half of the members here do not believe he can do the job. Any Speaker in that situation, just like any CEO or chair of a board of directors, should then say that they could not continue in their role and step down.

I have chaired Conservative caucus meetings. If members think we are rambunctious in public, wait until they see us in private and how difficult it is to chair a meeting of the Conservative caucus with our senators. I survived for two and a half years. My members knew that there were many times when I came very close to making a decision as to whether I could continue as the chair of my own caucus, so I set the limits of what was acceptable in our caucus meetings and what the rules were. This Speaker cannot do that because we do not have confidence in his ability to be non-partisan in the role. He allows emails to be sent out that are partisan in nature and then pretends he did not know about it. He travels overseas, goes to Washington, D.C., and waxes on about Liberal dogma. He made a video on behalf of Liberal politicians in Speaker's robes.

If it was just a one-time thing, I could absolve him of that sin, but he very obviously is choosing his old friend, the Liberal Party of Canada, which is now protecting him as well, instead of choosing his new friends, those of us who are looking to him to be a neutral, non-partisan referee. In his own words, he is like an unblemished car with maybe a dent or two so far. That car is now in the wrecking yard because he has chosen his old friends. He cannot continue. I invite the Speaker to resign before the vote.

● (1915)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have said this a couple of times now. I will go back to the fact that, having been a parliamentarian and witnessed Speakers of all political stripes, what I have found in this particular incident is that the grounds to justify the motion that we have before us are greatly exaggerated. I am being very kind in my words there. I would suggest that the Conservatives would have been far better off, for the sake of all Canadians, had they actually chose an issue that Canadians are concerned about today. There are many issues that are out there.

My question for the member is this: Why does he believe so passionately, virtually from the day this Speaker was elected, that he has to go? That is what we are hearing from many Conservatives on the other side of the bench.

Privilege

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Madam Speaker, let me say a few kind things about another member of Parliament, of the House, who is a former Speaker himself, the member for Nipissing—Timiskaming. He was a good Speaker. He applied the rules as best as he could and tried to control us as well as any person can control us from the chair. That member made one mistake, and he resigned honourably to protect the Speaker's job and the role that it represents. That is 600 years of history that starts from the mother Parliament and is here in our own Parliament. Now we have a Speaker who, on the second formal vote, still has not chosen to resign. I put it to—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Could I invite the hon. members on both sides to take their conversations outside the Chamber?

The hon. member for Calgary Shepard has the floor.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Madam Speaker, the member for Nipissing—Timiskaming honourably stepped down to protect the speakership and the Speaker's office from being further attacked and from further losing the confidence of members of Parliament, and he made one mistake. He was a Speaker whom I voted for, because I had the confidence that he would be neutral in his role. The current Speaker does not have my confidence.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Denis Trudel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, BQ): Madam Speaker, I spoke about that this morning. Today, we are wasting a day talking about this motion. In my opinion, the answer is clear. The Speaker should step down.

What is more, for the past several months, the atmosphere in the House has been rather toxic and difficult. Anyone who watches the debates in the House can see that members on both sides of the House call each other names and that the tone has become very aggressive and acrimonious. How does my colleague think that we can renew Canadians' confidence in our democratic system with the way that members have been speaking and debating in the House in recent months?

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Bloc Québécois member for his good question.

I am currently serving my third term in the House thanks to my constituents in Calgary Shepard, and I have to say that it is a great privilege to serve as an MP. I find that, before every election, the tone and the words that are used in the House become more intense. I think that we need an election. We need to either call an election or elect a new Speaker. That way we can reset and start fresh. Those are the only two choices: a new Speaker or an election.

[*English*]

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the member's fluent bilingualism. I also believe, and I am a little concerned that he does not share this, that there has to be due process. We have a situation where the Liberal Party of Canada made an egregious error, disrespecting the Speaker and disrespecting the House of Commons, by posting something without the authorization or the knowledge of the Speaker, and the NDP condemned the Liberal Party of Canada for doing that and demanded an apology, which was finally issued.

It seems to me that the member respects due process. He should be directing his comments to the Liberal Party of Canada, not to the Speaker, and I am concerned about, not his approach, but many of his colleagues' attacking the Speaker, when he knows that the rules of the House are such that we cannot attack the Speaker or decisions. This is something that dates back to the former Speaker, the member from Regina—Qu'Appelle, who is currently the Conservative House leader. We have also heard Conservatives attack other Speakers, like in the Saskatchewan Legislature, and the news out of Saskatchewan is appalling. Will the member condemn what happened in Saskatchewan when the conservative Saskatchewan Party directed attacks against the independent Speaker?

● (1920)

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Madam Speaker, what I did not hear the member talk about is his statement. I will remind him of it. He said, leading up to the vote, "This cannot happen [again] moving forward. From now on, you cannot have the Speaker engage in partisan activity." He said that if there were any derogation from that, in the weeks and months to come, his party would join in voting non-confidence in the Speaker. He has that opportunity now.

Mr. Eric Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry, CPC): Madam Speaker, if members think ethics and integrity are important, I think most Canadians would be stunned at the fact that we would have to say, "six strikes and he should be out". We are still here, six strikes in on the Speaker of the House, over and over again, as the Liberal MPs mock and just say, "Why not ten?" They have such a low bar they have set for themselves that we are here again today. The Speaker has been in the role for eight months, and there are numerous examples, time and time again, of his being incapable of being neutral, impartial, and non-partisan. Let me talk about the six strikes from my perspective.

We are aware of what happened late last year. The Speaker had the extremely poor judgment to record a video in the Speaker's office, in his Speaker's robes, talking at the Ontario Liberal Party convention, doing a video praising another Liberal. It is completely unacceptable. The second strike was when the Speaker did an interview, cited in his role as Speaker in *The Globe and Mail*, regarding Mr. John Fraser, to whom he paid tribute by video. He referred, in his role as Speaker, to the Ontario Liberal Party as "our party". It is completely unacceptable and just common sense not to do that as a Speaker of the House.

If that were not bad enough, right in that time frame, the Speaker decided, when the House was sitting, to take a trip to Washington, D.C. It is nearly unheard of for the Speaker of the House of Commons to leave the country when the House is sitting, let alone when under a cloud of scandal, calls for his resignation and debate about his future. It was poor judgment to leave the country, not just when the House was sitting but also when he was under a cloud of investigation, scandal, criticism, and calls for his resignation.

Privilege

One would think that would be enough, but it goes on. He gets to Washington, D.C., as Speaker, goes to a private retirement party for a friend instead of being in the House of Commons, and gets caught on video talking about his partisan, Young Liberals of Canada history and how great those times were back in the day, and celebrating his Liberal roots. This is literally while he is under calls for his resignation for time and time again not showing impartiality but showing bias and partisanship towards the Liberal Party. That is number three of the six strikes we are now at.

Number four is the photos that came out right around the time that PROC finished its investigation, showing that the Speaker attended a Quebec Liberal Party fundraiser locally, just across the river. When one is Speaker, they should not go to partisan fundraisers for political parties of any jurisdiction. That has just been the common-sense consensus of every Speaker we have had in this country for over 150 years. That is a strike again.

Now we get to where we are when the Speaker, knowing the amount of criticism that has been lobbed rightfully against him, gets caught using such partisan language on an invitation to a partisan Liberal fundraiser for himself that it would make the member for Winnipeg North blush, probably. It is not just an accident to do all of this.

Here is the thing that is interesting. After all of what I have just laid out, the Speaker promised, because the NDP propped him up, that this would never happen again. He said that he would put procedures in place to make sure that it would never happen again, and that he would be completely impartial. This was just a rough start, and he wanted a new slate to do it all over again.

One would have thought that the Speaker would have gone back to his riding association as he organized fundraisers, and thought, "Maybe we should watch the way we word our invitations." I am not one to give free political advice to anybody on the other side of the aisle, particularly when it comes to fundraising, but nobody forced the Speaker to hold the fundraiser.

He had promised to have procedures in place so this would never happen again. He could have simply mailed a letter out from the president of his riding association saying, "Our Speaker is busy being the Speaker and should be non-partisan. I am John Smith, the president of the Hull—Aylmer Liberal Association. Donate \$100 to help out our local candidate in the next election." It would have been free advice that would not have gotten him in trouble. However, it was put in an event, and here we are again. That was strike number five, and I am not done yet.

● (1925)

The sixth strike was today. I am a member of the procedure and House affairs committee. The Speaker appeared today to talk about the topic of violence and harassment prevention policies of the House, PROC, Board of Internal Economy and so forth. The member for Calgary Nose Hill had an exchange with the Speaker about his past, his judgment and his actions of being overly partisan, and that it was on the floor of the House of Commons that the Speaker wrongfully defended the Prime Minister when he was not accused of but admitted to elbowing the chest of an NDP MP.

What frustrated me as I sat in the room and listened was what the Speaker said in response to the member for Calgary Nose Hill's calling him out, saying the Speaker questioned the former member's integrity and her events of the story, literally mocked her on the floor of the House of Commons minutes later and suggested she took a dive reminiscent of something in the World Cup. He was called out for it. In the committee today, and anybody can go and watch the exchange, he said, "I can tell you that I never questioned Ruth Ellen Brosseau's accounting of the situation."

He literally stood up on the floor of the House of Commons, and it was infamous because he mocked her, and the Prime Minister had to apologize. The Speaker never did. Here he was today, when he was confronted about that situation, and I have to be careful of the words I use in the House so I do not get a point of order, and what he said in his response was completely false. People can listen to what he said that day only a few years ago, and can watch the footage from the cameras in here. That is strike number six.

In 150 years, this country has now had 38 speakers. The current speaker is the 38th. I am not saying they have all been completely innocent. There have been blemishes. There have been issues. However, to have a Speaker with so many accusations against him of being partisan, having poor judgment, showing bias, and of not being neutral and impartial, and to have a couple of strikes, is not good. Some people say, "Three strikes and you're out."

We are at six strikes. The Speaker has not been here for eight years; he has been here for eight months. We have had Speakers who have served for about 10 ten years. Peter Milliken was raised earlier. He did not have eight issues and ethical violations in a matter of 10 years. The current Speaker has six strikes against him, from what I have outlined here tonight, in eight months.

The question needs to be, "Who is the common denominator?" Liberal MPs have gone on to be Speaker before, with success in being able to balance. When the Speaker is elected, there is a tradition that the Speaker gets dragged in by the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition, dragged to the chair. That tradition is the fun part that everybody sees on TV.

Nobody forced the Speaker to run in the first place. He did not ask me for my opinion, and it is probably better that he did not. I kind of wish that he had, because I would have told him that I did not think he was the best fit for the job, because whether it was in the ethics committee or public accounts over the years, time and time again, he was constantly unflinching in his defence of the Prime Minister and the Liberal Party, no matter what. It was a recipe for disaster.

Privilege

We need to have a Speaker in the chair who can be respected, command the respect of the House and allow us to get to business. We are here tonight not because of Conservatives. We are here because the Speaker, over and over again, has violated trust and has violated the code that for 150-plus years has not resulted in issues. The simple thing I will say again is that it is time for the Speaker to resign. Let us put a new Speaker in the chair, one who can unite the House and focus on the democratic importance we have in the chamber.

• (1930)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the member does his best in terms of trying to talk about the great offences. One of the offences he talked about is the fundraising issue.

The Conservative House leader was the Speaker, and he actually—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. If members have something to contribute, they should wait until the appropriate time. I do not know how many times we have to repeat that in the House. Members have been here for a long time.

I will ask the hon. member to start over and, hopefully, he will not be interrupted.

The hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, the opposition House leader was the Speaker of the House. He not only had fundraisers for himself as Speaker, but also had fundraisers for other members, at least one that we are aware of. The Conservatives do all sorts of hokey-pokey stuff on it, but the bottom line is that we have to take into consideration the twists and turns that the Conservatives consistently use to present some sort of a picture that is not accurate.

Why do the Conservatives continue to try to demonstrate that the parliamentary precinct is dysfunctional, when the only thing that is dysfunctional is the Conservative Party of Canada, better known as the Reformers?

Mr. Eric Duncan: Madam Speaker, that is the typical Liberal response. It is everybody else's fault but theirs.

There are six strikes that I outlined in my speech: the video he made; the comment in *The Globe and Mail* about the Liberal Party being “our party”; his trip to Washington, D.C. and talking about his history in the Young Liberals of Canada; attending a Quebec Liberal Party fundraiser across the river when he was Speaker; the invitation that went out that was completely inappropriate and over the top; and then, the shameful comments he made today, completely distorting the reality of what he said and, again, attacking the integrity of an NDP MP. The NDP has no problem propping him up.

Which six of those are wrong? None of them. They all happened, and Liberals continue to give him more chances, wrongfully. He has zero reason to give up the chair, if that is going to be the attitude of the Liberal Party. The more strikes he has, the more they seem to love him.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, to say that we are going to blame the Speaker for something that was the fault of the Liberal Party of Canada, I absolutely cannot agree with that. It was a post that was done in complete disrespect—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. I know whoever is going to answer the question is very capable of doing so. That individual will not need any help.

I would again remind members, if they have questions and comments, to please wait until the appropriate time. Otherwise, it is using up some of the time that members may want to ask a question and cannot be recognized.

The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, the Liberal Party of Canada showed disrespect to the Speaker. The Liberal Party of Canada showed disrespect to the institution of Parliament. For the Conservatives to point the finger at the Speaker, when the Speaker did not authorize, and had no knowledge of, what the Liberal Party was posting on its website is passing strange. It is a denial of due process.

We know that this debate is holding up an important debate that the NDP has initiated on pharmacare. There are about 18,000 people in the member's riding that would benefit from the pharmacare provisions to help people with diabetes and about 25,000 people in his riding would be helped by the provisions around contraception. The Conservatives seem to want to prolong this debate rather than simply allow the debate on pharmacare to take place.

Will the member recognize that due process means, now that we know the facts, that the Conservatives—

• (1935)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I have been trying to give the hon. member a signal. I want to allow the hon. member to respond.

The hon. member for Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry.

Mr. Eric Duncan: Madam Speaker, I would argue that I feel I have a pretty good pulse on the thoughts of people in Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry. There are about 100,000 people who want to have an election so that Canadians can decide on all the issues the NDP keeps talking about, and more importantly, the NDP constantly propping the Liberals up.

The member who just spoke, the House leader for the NDP, was at the PROC meetings when it made the report on the first set of ethical violations and poor judgments of the Speaker. New Democrats said that they will make sure this never happens again, and if he does anything further, he is going to have to resign. He does it, and it does not count. It does count.

The Speaker knew. Was he going to randomly just show up at this fundraiser by accident the night it happened? No. The Speaker knew he was going to be at a fundraiser for his riding. He was going to be speaking at it. It was his choice to host all this, and knowing the history only months ago, he should have had better control and processes to make sure this did not happen. It was poor judgment, and he should not have done it. The NDP has to stop propping him up and giving him free rein to keep committing these multiple ethics violations.

Mr. Corey Tochor (Saskatoon—University, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is an honour to take my place here and to follow the great speaker we heard earlier. I was shocked when he outlined the six strikes. Not one or two strikes, but six strikes. There is a seventh one, with the doctoring of Hansard, which has not been ruled on for weeks by the Liberal Speaker. We need a new Speaker.

Madam Speaker, my remarks will be through you, but they are really directed to the power that is being held in this place by the NDP. We have an agent of the Crown, our Speaker, and I am most concerned about the orange portion of that Crown. The orange portion used to stand for the common man, for the common person in this place, and it has fallen so far from that position. The green carpet in this place is to represent the common people the NDP used to represent. Those people have been ignored by the NDP. Some would say they have been forgotten.

It is an interesting exercise to consider the NDP's position with all these violations. The most recent violation, not the one that we are talking about today, but the last one, is the most telling. It is due to that allegation the NDP referenced, that if the Speaker messes up one more time, then there is going to be hell to pay. Guess what? The Speaker messed up. We are here. We have yet to hear the ruling on the Hansard cover-up that is going on right now.

We are looking at seven violations, and maybe more, within eight months, and you have confidence in the Speaker?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I want to remind the hon. member he is to address all questions and comments through the Chair, so I hope he will abide by that.

The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Peter Julian: You are quite right to point this out, Madam Speaker. This is exactly how the Saskatchewan party has treated—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): That is not a point of order. That is a point of debate.

I want to remind members to please wait until it is time for questions and comments to add any additional comments. I would ask members to please not contribute, but if they want to have conversations, to please take it outside.

The hon. member for Saskatoon—University.

Mr. Corey Tochor: Madam Speaker, through you, to the members in the chamber, the disrespect that the NDP caucus shows for this place is most stunning. It is most stunning that you will not look at the facts that have been laid out. There are over six violations, and the proposal is just to let it go and to say it is the party.

Privilege

There are a lot of things we put our names to in here. Like many members have pointed out, there is nothing that goes out from your office that you are not accountable for. Whatever is in that brochure, a ten percenter or anything that has your name on it, you know the message because you are accountable for it. You are accountable because it has your name on it. It comes from—

● (1940)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Once again, I will remind the hon. member to speak through the Chair. Maybe he would prefer to look at the Speaker so that he does not address it directly to the member. Again, I want to remind the hon. member that he is to address all questions and comments through the Chair.

The hon. member for Saskatoon—University.

Mr. Corey Tochor: Madam Speaker, I have been speaking through the Speaker. I have respect for this place. I view the debate that goes on here as the most important debate in all of Canada.

Canadians from all corners of this great country send 338 people here, and when we get here, the first order of business is to elect a Speaker. It is the most crucial thing we do to start a term in this place.

I note that I will be splitting my time with the hon. member for Battlefords—Lloydminster.

An important part of our role is to elect an impartial Speaker. Obviously, we have erred. The Speaker has blind spots that are too large to paper over. The last time we had a violation of this magnitude, we talked about procedure, saying that it was going to go through a certain lens, that we were going to have certain people informed. However, there is another group. Interestingly, when I was preparing for my speech and talking to some of my colleagues, pages came up, and I started talking about the role of a page. Do members know that not a single page has been fired this term?

Pages, for the people watching at home, are the people who help us. They bring over important documents. They let us know if a guest is here. They facilitate the debate. An important role for them is to be impartial. The first thing they learn in page school is that they have to be impartial. They cannot post on social media. They cannot share an opinion publicly. If they do, they are fired. Not a single page has been fired from this place because they take their role seriously.

How this relates to the Speaker, which is an interesting twist, is that he was a page at one time. I think he knows what is right and wrong, but unfortunately he keeps picking the wrong decision, not once, not twice, but six times. We are soon to find out about a seventh time.

Privilege

To the NDP members who will be voting in this, I would say, historic vote, our debates here cannot happen without an impartial Speaker. It is one of the most important roles we have, so we need a Speaker we can trust, not one who is an agent of the Crown. That Crown, unfortunately, with the Prime Minister and his unholy alliance with the NDP, is lacking in common sense. This lack of common sense is, I think, born into these members. It is the common sense to know that if one is the referee, one cannot take part in partisan activities.

As pointed out earlier, I was once honoured to hold this position in Saskatchewan. I was the 25th Speaker of the Saskatchewan legislature. It was an honour, and it is a peak of my career that I do not know if I will ever surpass. I loved that job; I loved it with all my heart. However, there was another calling that was greater: this country. I was worried about the country that my two boys were going to inherit after the ruinous Liberal Party was done with it.

What did I do? Knowing that I could not be in a partisan role as Speaker, I put down my robes. I resigned my speakership so that I could take part in a partisan event, which was the nomination for my seat. I did that because I hold ethics, being impartial, being a referee, to a much higher role than just someone who wears a pointy hat and funny robes. However, even that is important. Madam Speaker, you wear those robes because they identify you as someone different who holds that seat in this chamber. It is something special to be identified with the uniform of a Speaker. It is therefore with a heavy heart that I ask the current Speaker to lay down his robes. He has discredited, embarrassed and tarnished the office he holds.

• (1945)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, unlike the member opposite, I was not a Speaker, but I do have a bit of experience at the provincial level. I have found Speakers of different political parties all to have their own unique characters and styles in terms of their performances inside the House. I do not see anything with regard to the substance of the motion today that justifies the type of action that the Conservatives are, in essence, saying should be taken. One of those things, for example, is that if two political parties want a Speaker to be gone, then the Speaker should step down. If Saskatchewan only has two political parties in the chamber, would it be okay to draw the assumption that, if a Speaker does not have the support of an opposition party, the Speaker should step down?

Mr. Corey Tochor: Madam Speaker, that question could only come from a member of a caucus that has a leader with three ethics violations. The corruption and rot over there go deep, and such a question highlights how much these ethical lapses have become a part of this place under these guys.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, the current Speaker of the Saskatchewan legislature actually referenced this member in his final statement to the legislature on May 16. This is in the legislature's Hansard, and the Speaker talked about the member who has just spoken. He said the following:

The signs of inappropriate behaviour by the Government House Leader took place with a former Speaker. The Government House Leader, MLA for Meadow

Lake, bragged that he could get the Speaker to rule in any way that he wanted. There is plenty of evidence that did take place. The Government House Leader would text the Speaker how he should rule on a regular basis. The Speaker resigned and ran federally.

Could the member confirm that he is the man that they are referring to, who would rule any way the government House leader wanted? How does the member explain this quote from the Speaker of the Saskatchewan legislature?

Mr. Corey Tochor: Madam Speaker, that member has been spending way too much time within the Liberal caucus; now it is just gaslighting, all the time. That is the most—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. The member has had an opportunity to ask a question, and if he has anything else to add, he can wait until the appropriate time. That goes for every member in the House. There are other members who are weighing into the debate, and I would ask them not to do so.

The hon. member for Saskatoon—University can continue.

Mr. Corey Tochor: Madam Speaker, that just highlights the importance of the role that you hold right now as a referee, and that is what we need too: a good Speaker. I am asking the Speaker to lay down his robes today.

• (1950)

Mrs. Anna Roberts (King—Vaughan, CPC): Madam Speaker, we all remember the events of April 30 when the Speaker kicked out our leader. I want to quote exactly what we heard from the previous leader of the NDP when he said, on that same date, that the Speaker should step down and that, in his career, he has “never seen such blatant partisanship” from a Speaker.

Does my colleague have comments on the former NDP leader agreeing with everyone else in the House? I would love to hear them.

Mr. Corey Tochor: Madam Speaker, that was back when the NDP was a true party. It was a socialist party. I do not agree with the New Democrats' thinking, but I knew where they came from. Now they have devolved into a power-hungry, fart-catching party of the Prime Minister. It is embarrassing to see, in questions from the New Democratic Party, that it has stooped so low.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): There is still some heckling going on, or some individuals are trying to participate in the debate. I would ask them to wait until the appropriate time.

The hon. member for Saskatoon—University has 30 seconds to wrap up.

Mr. Corey Tochor: Madam Speaker, it is so nice of you to respect the clock and give me the last 30 seconds here to just wrap up my comments.

I would like to thank everyone for helping us get here. I also want to talk directly to the people who are helping the Speaker out right now. He needs help. He has embarrassed the office of Speaker, and he needs to be convinced to resign.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Again, I just want to remind members to please hold back. If they have anything to add, they should keep it for the next questions and comments. However, now we are going to debate.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Battlefords—Lloydminster.

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster, CPC): Madam Speaker, we know that the role of the Speaker carries great responsibility in the House. It is critical to the functioning of our democratic institution. The Speaker has a duty to enforce the rules and the traditions of the House, whether written or not. The Speaker has the responsibility to maintain order and to preside over debates. The Speaker is also entrusted to safeguard the rights and the privileges of all members in the House. It is a role that carries great influence and great power, a role that requires a high level of trust in the individual that holds the office. That is why it is imperative that the Speaker carry the role of impartiality. To act otherwise is a breach of the trust that is required of the Speaker. That is where we find ourselves today: The trust between the Speaker and the members of the House has been broken.

Once again, the Speaker has shown complete disregard for the neutrality required of him in the role that he holds. The Liberal Party's advertisement of "A Summer Evening with the Honourable [Member]" was overtly partisan. There is no question about its partisan nature. It contained language and messaging that was clearly inciting about the leader of the official opposition and the Conservative Party. It is no surprise that the Liberal Party has come rushing in, trying to shield and to defend the Speaker. However, it is the Speaker who allowed his name to be used to promote the event. In doing so, he tied the office that he holds to the language and partisan messaging used in the invitation. That is unacceptable. The appropriateness of his actions are not even in question here. The Speaker did not maintain the neutrality required of him in this role.

In fact, the Deputy Speaker has now ruled that the Speaker acted in a partisan manner. Therefore, it is already decided that the Speaker acted inappropriately. His pattern of behaviour is simply unacceptable. It is my opinion that the Speaker must resign. If he does not, then he must be removed. Without the confidence of members of the House, the Speaker cannot be trusted to govern this place in a manner that is fair and that is also impartial.

Let us be clear: As has been stated over and over again this evening, this is not strike one, strike two or strike three for the Speaker. This is a pattern of behaviour. I know that all members of the House will recall when the Speaker used his official Speaker's robes, his office and his title in an unquestionably partisan video broadcast at an Ontario Liberal Party event. That he used his office and the title that he holds to further partisan efforts was a clear violation of his role. That was then followed by partisan speeches in Washington, D.C., delivered using his title as Speaker of the House of Commons, where he reminisced about his days as a young Liberal. Of course, we know that the Speaker has also spoken at neighbouring ridings' Liberal fundraising events. If there was any trust left after any of these single incidents, it has only been further shattered after each and every one. It also makes us question whether there have been other violations that just have not come to light as of yet.

Privilege

The Speaker has now repeatedly failed to uphold the neutrality and impartiality that is required of the office he holds. After so many incidents, it cannot be argued in a believable way that it was simply an oversight. The Speaker has intent. He has shown to Canadians and to members of the House his intent to use his office to further his partisan interests. In fact, this pattern of behaviour actually creates more doubt and more questions about how the Speaker wields his power and authority in this chamber.

• (1955)

The Speaker's decision to oust the opposition leader from the chamber for the use of the word "wacko" is quite fresh in everyone's mind. That was a notable ruling from the Chair that stands out even more given the free pass that is regularly given to the Prime Minister for the use of similar language. Given the pattern of behaviour that has been established, are Canadians and we as members of Parliament expected to believe that a decision of that nature was not motivated by partisanship?

The Liberal government seems quite comfortable with the Speaker's behaviour. While his partisan endeavours suit the Liberal government's interests, I think Canadians would have hoped they too understand that a hyperpartisan Speaker undermines the integrity of our democratic institution, an institution that we all have a shared duty to uphold.

Perhaps what is most concerning is the position that the Liberals' NDP partners have taken. The NDP seem to be very forgiving of the Speaker's repeated actions, despite assertions previously made by the member for New Westminster—Burnaby. It was not that long ago that after the Speaker delivered his remarks at a Liberal Party of Ontario event, which, as members will recall, was done in his official robes from the Speaker's office using his title of Speaker, the member for New Westminster—Burnaby went on public record putting a line in the sand for the NDP. He told Canadians that the NDP would call for the Speaker to step down if such an incident were to happen again. Well, it has happened again, and the Deputy Speaker's ruling confirms this.

The Speaker has acted in a clearly partisan manner, but that line in the sand from the NDP has now suddenly disappeared and is nowhere to be seen. That empty threat from the NDP was also accompanied by excuses that the Speaker was improperly briefed in his role. In fact, the member went so far as to suggest that this was a shortcoming of our institution itself. That excuse from the NDP somehow suggests that the Speaker could not be expected to know that participating in hyperpartisan activities would be inappropriate, and that in doing so, he would be undermining the institution.

I would expect that any individual who holds the office of Speaker possesses sound judgment. That is a minimal trait that should be expected of the Speaker, who presides and makes rulings in this House. Regardless, the excuse of not knowing cannot be used over and over again. The Speaker must take responsibility for his actions.

Privilege

While it is not shocking that the NDP is yet again eager to protect its Liberal masters, it is nonetheless shameful. It is absolutely imperative that the Speaker of the House, regardless of their party affiliation, carry out their role in a manner that is impartial and neutral. That neutrality ensures that the Speaker can maintain the trust of all members in the House. It is what fosters good order in this place, and it gives credibility to and confidence in the rulings that are made by the Chair.

That trust has been lost, and the Speaker's continued defiance of the neutrality required of him has shattered any hope of it being repaired. The Liberal government and its NDP coalition partners have a responsibility to protect our democratic institution. They cannot continue to defend the unacceptable partisan conduct of the Speaker. Only with a new, non-partisan Speaker can we restore the trust that has been broken and get on with the important business of the House.

● (2000)

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): It being 8:02 p.m., pursuant to order made earlier today, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the privilege motion now before the House.

[*English*]

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. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded vote.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Call in the members.

● (2045)

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

(*Division No. 786*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Bergeron	Berthold
Bérubé	Bezan
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins
Carrie	Chabot
Chambers	Champoux
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	DeBellefeuille
Deltell	Desbiens
Desilets	Doherty
Dreeshen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)

Ellis	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Fast	Ferreri
Findlay	Garon
Gaudreau	Généreux
Genuis	Gill
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Hoback	Jeneroux
Jivani	Kelly
Khanna	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lehoux	Lemire
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Maguire	Majumdar
Martel	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Melillo	Michaud
Moore	Morantz
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Pauzé	Perkins
Perron	Plamondon
Poilievre	Rayes
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Roberts	Rood
Ruff	Savard-Tremblay
Scheer	Schmale
Seeback	Shields
Shiple	Simard
Sinclair-Desgagné	Small
Soroka	Steinley
Ste-Marie	Stewart
Strahl	Stubbs
Therrien	Thomas
Tochor	Tolmie
Trudel	Uppal
Van Popta	Vecchio
Vidal	Vien
Vignola	Villemure
Vis	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Williams
Williamson	Zimmer — 142

NAYS

Members

Alghabra
Anand
Angus
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Battiste
Bibeau
Blair
Blois
Boulerice
Brière
Carr
Chagger
Champagne
Chen

Chiang
Collins (Victoria)
Coteau
Damoff
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duguid
El-Khoury
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Garrison
Gould
Guilbeault
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Miao
Morrice
Murray
Ng
O'Connell
O'Regan
Powlowski
Robillard
Rogers
Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Schiefke
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sousa
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Trudeau
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vandenbeld
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhaliwal
Diab
Duclos
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser
Fry
Gainey
Gerretsen
Green
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Julian
Kelloway
Khara
Kusmierczyk
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)
Maloney
Masse
May (Cambridge)
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod
Mendicino
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
Oliphant
Petitpas Taylor
Qualtrough
Rodriguez
Romanado
Sajjan
Samson
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sorbara
St-Onge
Tassi
Thompson
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandal
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi — 168

PAIRED

Members
Caputo
Drouin

Bendayan
Dowdall

Government Orders

Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz
Fortin	Gallant
Joly	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Normandin	Thériault — 12

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CANADA-NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR ATLANTIC ACCORD IMPLEMENTATION ACT

The House resumed from May 27 consideration of the motion that Bill C-49, An Act to amend the Canada—Newfoundland and Labrador Atlantic Accord Implementation Act and the Canada-Nova Scotia Offshore Petroleum Resources Accord Implementation Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, be read the third time and passed, and of the amendment.

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak to Bill C-49. As I have mentioned in the House, I have had the pleasure of living across the country, from one side to the other, from Victoria to northern Alberta and even in Newfoundland for a while. Therefore, Bill C-49 hits a bit close for me, so I am very pleased to speak to it.

To sum up Newfoundland, I will tell members of an experience I had. One day in Edmonton, I was door knocking for the first campaign in 2015. A lot of Newfoundlanders live in my riding of Edmonton West, or as I call it, “Edmonton West Edmonton Mall”. A couple was in the garage. It was a hot day and the garage door was open. They were sitting having a beer inside their garage, and we started chatting. They said they were from Newfoundland, and I said I used to live in St. John's, so we started chatting. They invited me to have a beer, so I sat down with them. We had a nice beer together.

A couple of years later, during the horrible forest fires in Fort McMurray, where, of course, a lot of people from Newfoundland were living, the residents had to evacuate. This couple had taken in a couple from Fort McMurray, who also were Newfoundlanders. I was at an event one night at the Good Shepherd Church. It was a fundraising event. I ran into this couple, and they introduced me to this other couple who they were housing. They were complete strangers, but because they were Newfoundlanders, they were happy to take in this couple. We started chatting and they said they were from St. John's. I said that I used to live there and they asked where. I said I used to live on Bindon Place.

Government Orders

It turned out that they were my former neighbours. This couple lived in the lot right behind our house. Back then, if anyone has ever lived in St. John's, they would know it has very lovely winters with lots of snow. The first year I lived there, we had 22 feet of snow, a record amount of snow. It was not until June that I found out we actually had an eight-foot fence in our backyard. This couple was laughing about living behind us. I had to laugh because, at the time, we had this beautiful dog named Doonesbury. He was the world's greatest dog. He would wander on these huge snowbanks, from yard to yard because, of course, the snow was way above the fence. It turned out that he had often visited their yard to do his business, so it was years later that I had the opportunity to apologize for my dog.

There are a few things I would note about people from Newfoundland. They really never leave the rock. I worked in Fort McMurray for a while, and we had the largest club at the time, the Newfoundland club. When we would meet in Fort McMurray, they all had the same wish; they wanted to be able to go back home to work and to get good jobs, which of course were not available. That is why they were in Fort McMurray. When I lived in Newfoundland, every time I travelled to the mainland or away, usually to Nova Scotia where our regional office was, and then flew back to St. John's, I would land at about midnight at the airport, and there were always about 50 to 70 people, families holding up signs and welcoming back their family members, who were mostly coming from Alberta because of work. Since taking over this job nine years ago, I have probably returned to the Edmonton airport 300 to 400 times, and not once has anyone been waiting there for me with a sign. With Newfoundlanders, it was always like that. It was quite amazing.

It is a beautiful city. I enjoyed my time living there, although I cannot say the same about the weather with the massive amounts of snow. I remember that on the May long weekend, I was flying to Nova Scotia; I think it was May 21. The day before, in Halifax, there was a record high of 36°C. I was waiting in St. John's for my wife to come home with the car and drive me to the airport. We had a snowstorm, and she got the car stuck in the driveway in a snowbank. She walked in with our two kids, who were about one and two years old at the time. With tears streaming, she said that she was leaving me and was moving back to Victoria. That almost sums up the weather. However, I noticed a month later, in late June, that we were shovelling the snow in the driveway, and in the back of the house where there was sun, we were mowing the backyard. That is the weather in Newfoundland.

Everywhere I have lived, I have run into people from Newfoundland who want to get back to the rock, but they want good jobs. Bill C-49 I do not see delivering that. There are quite a few flaws in the bill. I want to go over some of them.

Clause 19 of Bill C-49 would open the door to more red tape and likely to delays. We have heard repeatedly about a lack of investment and productivity in this country. It takes 15 to 20 years to get a mine approval and years to get a housing approval. In Alberta, we see people not wanting to invest in the country because they know the red tape and the approval process make it so slow. Clause 19 is going to add to that and going to discourage investment. It would shift decision-making power and licence approvals to the federal

and provincial ministers, while tripling the amount of time the decision can take.

The government often talks about how we need experts to make the decisions, yet this bill will take power away from experts and regulators and put it into the hands of the very partisan and biased natural resources minister. Can members imagine anyone who is involved in resource investment in this country looking at our current environment minister or natural resources minister and saying that Canada looks like a great place to invest in because they can trust their opinions? Of course not.

Clause 28 would give the federal minister, with the approval of the provincial minister, the power to outright ban drilling in certain areas and to even halt projects that are already approved and in progress. That sounds a bit like Kinder Morgan and Trans Mountain. That was approved, and it was going to spend billions of dollars just to find out that the government can retroactively change the rules. Who wants to invest in this environment? Who wants to create good jobs in this kind of an environment? If the bill were to pass with clause 28 as written, it would put an end to offshore petroleum drilling in Atlantic Canada, killing good-paying jobs for workers and further strengthening eastern Canada's dependence on foreign oil imports from dictatorships like Qatar and Saudi Arabia.

● (2050)

We have seen how the government treats resource projects in this country. Section 61 and 62 would invariably be abused by the government, and they would attach so many strings that approval for projects would become unfeasible. Does anyone remember energy east? We have TransCanada ready to spend billions of dollars so we can bring Alberta oil and Saskatchewan oil out east to get the eastern provinces off of U.S. oil and off of dictator oil. Instead, the government threw up so many roadblocks and changed the goalposts so many times, it ended up cancelling the project.

Section 61 and 62 would bring the unconstitutional Bill C-69 into the review process, allowing the minister to attach any conditions they see fit to an approval. Sections from the Impact Assessment Act, previously Bill C-69, also known as the no-new-pipeline bill, have been put into Bill C-49. On October 13, 2023, the Supreme Court ruled Bill C-69 largely unconstitutional. The federal government has not fixed those sections to date. If Bill C-49 is passed, as written, it would include 32 references to sections of Bill C-69 that the Supreme Court identified as unconstitutional.

Government Orders

Bill C-49 also includes the discretionary decision-making power of the minister and the entirety of the designated project scheme, both of which are unconstitutional, so components of Bill C-49 may also be unconstitutional. Section 64 of Bill C-69 was deemed unconstitutional, and is referenced throughout Bill C-49, which allows the minister to interfere in a project they think is in the public interest and create any conditions they deem necessary to which the project proponent must comply.

We, in Alberta, know full well what the government does to resource projects. We know full well how it works against resource projects. Of course, we had Bill C-50, the so-called just transition bill, which we called the unjust transition bill. It would be absolutely devastating to Alberta.

I want to give members some numbers the conference board put together. Bill C-50 would destroy 91,000 jobs in Alberta. That is a 58% increase in Alberta's jobless rate. There would be a decline in our GDP of almost 4%, and a 50% bigger hit than the 2008 financial crisis. Alberta revenue would be chopped up to \$127 billion over 10 years. That is almost a 20% drop per year.

We see very clearly the Liberal government's intention toward our natural resources. It is kill the resources at all costs, send Canadians into poverty, hurt Alberta, hurt Newfoundland, and hurt resource-producing provinces, which is why we will not vote for Bill C-49.

• (2055)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is disappointing that the Conservatives would not recognize the opportunities that they are denying Atlantic Canada. We know that we are talking about the generation of potentially billions of dollars of future investment. We have Conservatives, in particular Conservative members of Parliament from Atlantic Canada, denying that we have premiers in Atlantic Canada, a Progressive Conservative premier and a Liberal premier, who are waiting for this legislation to pass, and then they pass mirroring legislation.

Why is the Conservative Party of Canada today denying Atlantic Canada the opportunities that this legislation would provide?

Mr. Kelly McCauley: Madam Speaker, that is an amusing question from the member for Winnipeg North. If we could hook up a windmill in front of him, his speaking time, I am sure, could power most of what the Liberals are proposing.

No one believes the Liberals have any intention of helping resource-developing provinces. Whether it is Bill C-50, which is going to have the emission cap and punish Newfoundland as well, Bill C-69, the no-new-pipeline bill, or banning ships off the B.C. coast, the Liberals have zero believability when they say they are there for resource-producing provinces. It is no different in this bill.

Mr. Rick Perkins (South Shore—St. Margarets, CPC): Madam Speaker, the interesting thing about the proposed bill and the member's speech is that, in addition to the four elements of the IAA being incorporated into it, it was introduced in June of last year, and within four weeks, the Newfoundland government was issuing tenders for exploration licences. They do that every summer, and every summer they get responses. Last year, after the bill was

introduced, the "no-capital bill", as I call it, there were zero applications in Newfoundland, and those applications went to the Gulf of Mexico.

I know the member has a lot of experience with what the IAA can do to destroy energy projects out west. Does he think it is going to continue that trend that we saw last summer?

Mr. Kelly McCauley: Madam Speaker, my hon. friend is right. Investors are looking at Bill C-49 and they are looking at Bill C-69. They see provisions in the bill before us that would give the very anti-resource Minister of Environment and the anti-resource Minister of Natural Resources power to arbitrarily kill projects, even after investors have invested billions. Who would invest billions into the country on any project knowing that at any time the same government that says it wants to phase out oil and gas can step in and kill a project on a whim for political gain?

This issue is no different, and we will continue to see a lack of investment in Canada while we have the current government in power.

• (2100)

Mr. Sean Casey (Charlottetown, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to hear from the member about the long-standing tradition of the Conservative Party of Canada standing against renewable energy in the Atlantic provinces. I represent Prince Edward Island. When I first ran in 2011, Stephen Harper was the prime minister. He repeatedly and steadfastly refused to invest in a third cable that would have allowed power to come from Point Lepreau in New Brunswick over to Prince Edward Island, a place that did not have its own resources except for wind. As soon as we came into power, we fixed that. Here we are, 14 years later, and the Conservative Party is upholding its tradition of opposition for renewable energy in Prince Edward Island.

Could the member elaborate a bit on that rich tradition of the Conservative Party of Canada?

Mr. Kelly McCauley: Madam Speaker, I think we just have to look to the people of P.E.I. and ask whom they chose for their government. They threw out the provincial Liberal government and put in a Conservative government. We can look at Newfoundland. A Liberal riding last night held a by-election, and they went to the people and asked whom they trust on jobs. The Liberal vote dropped 50%. The Conservative vote went up to a point that Kim Jong-Un in North Korea would be envious of. The people decided, and they are deciding for the Conservatives.

*Government Orders**[Translation]*

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): It being 9:02 p.m., pursuant to order made on Wednesday, May 27, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the third reading stage of the bill now before the House.

[English]

The question is on the amendment.

[Translation]

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

[English]

The hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, we request a recorded vote, please.

[Translation]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Pursuant to Standing Order 45, the recorded division stands deferred until

Wednesday, May 29, at the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions.

- (2105)

[English]

Hon. Anita Anand (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I move:

That this House do now adjourn.

[Translation]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Pursuant to order made on Wednesday, February 28, the motion is deemed adopted.

(Motion agreed to)

[English]

Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until Wednesday, May 29, at 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1). I hope everybody has a great evening.

(The House adjourned at 9:05 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 28, 2024

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Public Sector Integrity Commissioner

The Speaker 23901

Government Response to Petitions

Mr. Lamoureux 23901

Committees of the House

Fisheries and Oceans

Mr. McDonald 23901

Health

Mr. Casey 23901

Safe Hospitals Act

Ms. Findlay 23901

Bill C-391. Introduction and first reading 23901

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) 23902

Petitions

Gaza

Mr. Johns 23902

Questions on the Order Paper

Mr. Lamoureux 23902

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Privilege

Request for Office of Speaker to be Vacated—Motion That Debate Be Not Further Adjourned

Mr. MacKinnon 23902

Motion 23902

Mr. Tochor 23902

Mr. Therrien 23902

Mr. Julian 23903

Mr. Gerretsen 23903

Mr. Bezan 23903

Mrs. DeBellefeuille 23904

Mr. Nater 23904

Mr. Julian 23904

Mr. Perkins 23905

Mrs. Gill 23906

Motion agreed to 23908

Resuming debate on the privilege motion

Motion 23908

Mrs. Thomas 23908

Mr. Lamoureux 23909

Mr. Trudel 23909

Mr. Johns 23910

Mr. Perkins 23910

Mr. Steinley 23910

Mr. Gerretsen 23911

Mr. Trudel 23912

Mr. Julian 23912

Mr. Bezan 23912

Mr. Lamoureux 23914

Mr. Masse 23914

Mr. Patzer 23914

Mr. Cooper 23914

Mr. Gerretsen 23916

Ms. Chabot 23917

Mr. Masse 23917

Mr. Steinley 23917

Mr. Lamoureux 23917

Mr. Ste-Marie 23918

Mr. Lamoureux 23919

Mr. Johns 23919

Mr. Perkins 23920

Mrs. Vignola 23920

Mr. Scarpaleggia 23921

Mr. Patzer 23921

Mr. Julian 23922

Mr. Julian 23922

Mr. Lamoureux 23925

Ms. Rempel Garner 23925

Ms. Michaud 23925

Mr. Johns 23926

Mr. Perkins 23926

Mr. Gourde 23926

Mr. Lamoureux 23927

Mr. Perkins 23928

Mr. Lamoureux 23928

Mr. Patzer 23928

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

National AccessAbility Week

Ms. Hepfner 23929

Claudette Hethrington

Mr. Godin 23929

Pacific Economic Development

Mr. Weiler 23929

Alexandre McKenzie

Mrs. Gill 23930

The Economy

Mr. Chahal 23930

Automated External Defibrillators

Mr. Reid 23930

Northern Ontario Economic Development

Mr. Serré 23930

Technology and Innovation in Southern Ontario	
Mr. May (Cambridge)	23930
Opioids	
Mr. Doherty	23931
Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec	
Mrs. Shanahan	23931
Leader of the New Democratic Party	
Mr. Brock	23931
Housing Construction	
Mr. Martel	23931
Northern Economy	
Ms. Jones	23932
Disability Rights Champions	
Ms. Collins (Victoria)	23932
Vanessa Lepage-Joanisse	
Ms. Gaudreau	23932
Housing	
Ms. Ferreri	23932
Kosovo	
Ms. Vandenbeld	23933

ORAL QUESTIONS

Housing	
Mr. Poilievre	23933
Mr. Trudeau	23933
Mr. Poilievre	23933
Mr. Trudeau	23933
Mr. Poilievre	23933
Mr. Trudeau	23933
Mr. Poilievre	23933
Mr. Trudeau	23934
Mr. Poilievre	23934
Mr. Trudeau	23934
Democratic Institutions	
Mr. Blanchet	23934
Mr. Trudeau	23934
Mr. Blanchet	23934
Mr. Trudeau	23934
Indigenous Affairs	
Mr. Singh	23934
Mr. Trudeau	23935
Infrastructure	
Mr. Singh	23935
Mr. Trudeau	23935
Housing	
Mrs. Gray	23935
Mr. Fraser	23935
Mrs. Gray	23935
Mr. Fraser	23935

Mr. Bragdon	23935
Ms. Freeland	23936
Mr. Bragdon	23936
Ms. Freeland	23936
Mr. Berthold	23936
Mr. Fraser	23936
Mr. Berthold	23936
Mr. Duclos	23936
Official Languages	
Mr. Beaulieu	23936
Ms. Anand	23936
Mr. Beaulieu	23937
Ms. Anand	23937
Mr. Villemure	23937
Ms. Anand	23937
Taxation	
Mr. Barlow	23937
Ms. Sudds	23937
Mr. Barlow	23937
Ms. Freeland	23937
Ms. Rood	23937
Mr. Wilkinson	23938
Ms. Rood	23938
Ms. Freeland	23938
Labour	
Ms. Zarrillo	23938
Mr. O'Regan	23938
Persons with Disabilities	
Mr. Bachrach	23938
Mr. Zuberi	23938
Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency	
Ms. Diab	23938
Ms. Hutchings	23938
Taxation	
Mr. Ellis	23939
Ms. Sudds	23939
Mr. Ellis	23939
Ms. Freeland	23939
Mr. Epp	23939
Mr. Holland	23939
Mr. Tolmie	23939
Ms. Freeland	23939
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship	
Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe	23940
Mr. Miller	23940
Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe	23940
Mr. Miller	23940
Mental Health and Addictions	
Mrs. Goodridge	23940
Ms. Saks	23940
Mrs. Goodridge	23940
Ms. Saks	23940
Mr. Paul-Hus	23941
Ms. Saks	23941

Regional Economic Development	
Mrs. Chatel	23941
Ms. Martinez Ferrada	23941
Justice	
Ms. Lantsman	23941
Mr. Virani	23941
Ms. Lantsman	23941
Mr. Virani	23941
Mr. Khanna	23942
Mr. Virani	23942
Regional Economic Development	
Mr. Carr	23942
Mr. Vandal	23942
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship	
Ms. Kwan	23942
Mr. Miller	23942
The Environment	
Mr. Angus	23942
Mr. Guilbeault	23943
Presence in Gallery	
The Speaker	23943

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Fall Economic Statement Implementation Act, 2023	
Bill C-59. Third reading	23943
Amendment negated	23944
Clauses 1 to 136, 138 to 143, 168 to 196, 209 to 216, and 278 to 317 agreed to	23946
Clauses 137, 144 and 231 to 272 agreed to	23947
Clauses 197 to 208 and 342 to 365 agreed to	23948
Clauses 145 to 167, 217 and 218 agreed to	23950
Clauses 219 to 230 agreed to	23951
Clauses 273 to 277 agreed to	23952
Clauses 318 and 319 agreed to	23954
Clauses 320 to 322 agreed to	23955
Clauses 323 to 341 agreed to	23956
(Bill read the third time and passed)	23956

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Privilege	
Request for Office of Speaker to be Vacated	
Motion	23957
Mr. Patzer	23957
Mr. Lamoureux	23957
Mr. Lemire	23957
Mr. Julian	23958

Mrs. Gill	23958
Mr. Lamoureux	23959
Mr. Boulerice	23959
Mr. Julian	23960
Ms. Lantsman	23960
Mr. Lamoureux	23961
Mr. Beaulieu	23961
Mr. Julian	23962
Mr. Brassard	23962
Mr. Lamoureux	23963
Ms. Larouche	23963
Mr. Boulerice	23964
Ms. Rempel Garner	23964
Mr. Lamoureux	23965
Ms. Larouche	23965
Ms. Mathysen	23966
Mr. Perkins	23966
Ms. Sahota	23967
Mr. Lemire	23968
Mrs. Roberts	23968
Mr. Kelly	23968
Mr. Lamoureux	23969
Mr. Julian	23969
Mr. Waugh	23970
Mr. Kmiec	23970
Mr. Lamoureux	23971
Mr. Trudel	23972
Mr. Julian	23972
Mr. Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	23972
Mr. Lamoureux	23974
Mr. Julian	23974
Mr. Tochor	23975
Mr. Lamoureux	23976
Mr. Julian	23976
Mrs. Roberts	23976
Mrs. Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	23977
Motion negated	23979

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Canada-Newfoundland and Labrador Atlantic Accord Implementation Act	
Bill C-49. Third reading	23979
Mr. McCauley	23979
Mr. Lamoureux	23981
Mr. Perkins	23981
Mr. Casey	23981
Division on amendment deferred	23982
Ms. Anand	23982
Motion	23982
(Motion agreed to)	23982

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>