



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 152 No. 018
Wednesday, June 18, 2025

Speaker: The Honourable Francis Scarpaleggia



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, June 18, 2025

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayer

• (1400)

[*Translation*]

The Speaker: It being Wednesday, we will now have the singing of the national anthem led by the hon. member for Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation.

[*Members sang the national anthem*]

[*English*]

VACANCY

BATTLE RIVER—CROWFOOT

The Speaker: It is my duty to inform the House that a vacancy has occurred in the representation, namely Mr. Kurek, member for the electoral district of Battle River—Crowfoot, by resignation effective June 17, 2025.

Pursuant to paragraph 25(1)(b) of the Parliament of Canada Act, I have addressed a warrant to the Chief Electoral Officer for the issue of a writ for the election of a member to fill this vacancy.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

STEPHEN CHARLESON

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honour the life of Moonaquin mit Stephen Charleson, a proud member of the Hesquiaht First Nation and the House of Kinquashtakumtlth.

Stephen was a lifelong fisher, learning traditional fishing and navigation skills from his father and brothers and living his entire life on the lands and waters around Hesquiaht Harbour, except for the painful years he spent in residential schools and the Indian boarding homes program.

He was immensely proud of the recognition by the courts of Hesquiaht fishing rights through the T'aaq-wiihak fishery. He was both a teacher and a learner, studying the Nuu-chah-nulth language in his final years. Throughout his life, he shared his teachings and touched the lives of hundreds of people from all walks of life, es-

tablishing the Hooksum Outdoor School in 2000, specializing in outdoor and environmental education.

Stephen recently passed to the other side and leaves behind his loving wife, Karen, six children, 12 grandchildren and a legacy of strength, culture and connection to home. May he rest in peace, and may we honour his memory with action and respect.

* * *

GRADUATION CONGRATULATIONS

Hon. Jenna Sudds (Kanata, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate the outstanding class of 2025 from my riding of Kanata.

To the students of AY Jackson, Earl of March, West Carleton, Holy Trinity, All Saints, Maurice-Lapointe, Bell High School and Franco-Ouest, this is a moment to be proud of. They have worked hard, shown resilience and hopefully had some fun along the way. Now they step into the world with the knowledge and the opportunity to make a real difference.

I thank the teachers and staff for their dedication. I thank their families; their support helped make this day possible. To every graduate, I say celebrate, take pride in all accomplishments, and move forward with confidence. The world is ready for them to make their mark.

Congratulations to the class of 2025.

* * *

SACRED HEART CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL

Sandra Cobena (Newmarket—Aurora, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we all remember that one teacher who made a lasting impact on us, the one who believed in us before we believed in ourselves, the one who would stay up late to push us further and who made us feel worth every minute of their time.

At Sacred Heart Catholic High School in Newmarket, I saw that spirit alive. I saw it first during the election, when teachers organized a candidates' debate so that the students could moderate the discussion and challenge ideas. They did not just teach civics; they brought it to life for their students.

I saw it again when students participated in the Newmarket Night Market, proudly showcasing their artwork, including one powerful piece celebrating strength, empowerment and the women who shape us. That painting now hangs in my office, and I would like to invite everyone to stop by to see it and enjoy a cup of tea.

Statements by Members

I thank the teachers at Sacred Heart and every educator who goes that extra mile. [Translation]

* * *

● (1405)

WORLD REFUGEE DAY

Sameer Zuberi (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this Friday is World Refugee Day. The day highlights the plight and dreams of those seeking refuge because of threats to their lives.

[Translation]

The fate of refugees concerns us all.

[English]

Two years ago, this House unanimously adopted M-62, my motion to welcome 10,000 vulnerable Uyghurs to Canada. This was a historic vote. It was a vote of parliamentary solidarity. Since then, I have been working to ensure our government honours the will of this House on that day.

Refugees, once settled in Canada, make countless economic and social contributions to our country, making Canada better off. Our government has historically been and must continue to be a leader in refugee resettlement. It is our duty toward the most vulnerable.

[Translation]

World Refugee Day is an opportunity to recognize the challenges facing refugees and to appreciate the richness that these individuals bring to Canada.

* * *

[English]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Vincent Ho (Richmond Hill South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we all remember fond childhood experiences. For me, I grew up going to Hillcrest Mall in Richmond Hill with my family. It is a place where, for over half a century, seniors gathered at the food court for coffee and families came to shop and connect. It was always a safe, welcoming space and a pillar of our community.

Just last week, another violent robbery at Hillcrest Mall shook our community. This time, jewellery store employees were pepper-sprayed and assaulted in a terrifying smash-and-grab. The mall was locked down and hundreds of shoppers, including young children, were left terrified.

A few days later, arrests were made, and what did we learn? The suspects were repeat offenders who were out on bail after committing another violent robbery. These attacks are part of a disturbing pattern across the country fuelled by 10 years of Liberal soft-on-crime policies. Communities are living in fear, and violence is becoming the new normal.

Conservatives call for ending catch-and-release, bringing back mandatory prison time and keeping our streets safe. It is time to end the revolving-door justice system and lock up the criminals for good.

NATIONAL PUBLIC SERVICE WEEK

Marie-France Lalonde (Orléans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since this is National Public Service Week, I would like to begin by thanking all public servants in Orléans and across Canada for their essential work.

The next two weeks mark the beginning of graduation season for grade 12 students. I want to congratulate the 1,514 graduates from the eight high schools in Orléans.

[English]

I congratulate the class of 2025. They did it. I look forward to seeing what they will achieve in their next chapter.

As summer arrives, I wish everyone in Orléans a wonderful summer. Let us all take time to relax, recharge and spend time with friends and family.

I also would like to invite everyone to join me at Petrie Island to celebrate Canada Day on July 1, and my annual family barbecue on August 28.

* * *

RESOURCE SECTOR WORKERS

Aaron Gunn (North Island—Powell River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today I would like to recognize the contributions of the incredible resource sector workers in my riding and, indeed, the country. They are the loggers, the miners, the farmers, the fishermen and the energy sector workers in oil and natural gas. They are the hard-working men and women of this country whose work gives us the lumber with which we build our homes and the fuel with which we heat them, the gas that moves us from A to B, and the food and fish that sustain us.

These are the workers who built this country and continue to build it every single day, yet too often their contributions are denigrated, their jobs threatened, and in some cases their livelihoods destroyed. This is despite the fact that it is their sweat and toil that serve as the foundation on which the rest of our economy and country is built.

I hope all parliamentarians from all parties will join me in recognizing these amazing Canadians and thanking them for their contributions to Canada.

• (1410)

ANTI-SCAB LEGISLATION

Hon. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on June 20, we are turning the page. The anti-scab legislation will come into force, banning replacement workers during strikes and lockouts in all federally regulated sectors. It is a long overdue step toward a fairer economy.

For far too long, the threat of replacement labour weakened bargaining and eroded trust. This law, however, will restore balance, protect the integrity of collective bargaining and leave good Canadian workers less vulnerable. We are sending a clear message that Canadian workers are not replaceable. Now more than ever, as we gear up to build a historic economy, workers will be the building block to a stronger economy and a more just and resilient Canada.

I want to thank every worker, the Canadian Labour Congress, which worked really hard to see this bill through, and especially our former colleague, former minister Seamus O'Regan.

Our Liberal government has stood up for workers and will continue to stand up for workers.

* * *

FINANCE

Jasraj Hallan (Calgary East, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister said that he was the man with a plan. A budget is a plan, and now he is shooting blanks. After being Trudeau's economic adviser for the past five years, he is worse than the old guy when it comes to accountability and transparency.

As the Liberals hide, Canadians are worried about how much more debt, inflation and taxes are going to be dumped on them, since this guy says he is going to spend even more than Justin Trudeau did.

A spring budget could tell Canadians what the plan is to lower the cost of government, which would lower the cost of living. It could show a plan to actually get homes built, not more bureaucracy.

A spring budget could show Canadians a plan to gain economic independence from the U.S. by scrapping anti-energy laws like Bill C-69, Bill C-48 and the job-killing oil and gas cap. It could have a plan in it to bring home safer streets by repealing hug-a-thug laws like Bill C-75 and Bill C-5, and finally get immigration under control.

If the Prime Minister is the guy who says he is the man with a plan, he needs to prove it and bring home a spring budget now.

* * *

[Translation]

QUEBEC'S NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in five days, Quebec will celebrate its national holiday. It will be a celebration of summer filled with song, reflecting our history and our stories.

Statements by Members

I would like to remind members that, 45 years ago, René Lévesque proposed a way to coexist with our neighbours, with our neighbour, as equals. Being united and partnering with our neighbour is a noble pursuit as long as it is freely consented to, but not when that neighbour is imposing its vision, its plan, and its interests that differ in terms of priorities and values.

In the global south, the west and no doubt the Middle East and perhaps Asia, the coming months will present challenges that will remind us, as friend, partner and ally, that we must realize our full potential, which requires the equality of our nation with all others.

Let us hope the summer will be restful despite the challenges that lie ahead of us. In that spirit, I wish all Quebeckers and everyone who loves them a wonderful, very national holiday for the land of dreams.

* * *

[English]

SANDEE BUTTERLEY

Ernie Klassen (South Surrey—White Rock, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week, I lost a friend, and my community lost one of our true leaders. Today, I would like to honour and pay respect to the memory of Sandee Butterley.

Sandee was a one-of-a-kind woman who would help out and champion every cause that would benefit our entire community. She generously donated to organizations such as the hospice society, the White Rock Pride Society, the local community Christmas dinners, Coldest Night of the Year and Uniti, generously contributing to a housing project for people with intellectual disabilities in an inclusive environment.

Sandee believed in supporting the local business community. She would frequently stop in and visit and encourage the business owners. She even had an omelette named after her at the locally owned diner that she was seen at most mornings.

Her kind and caring spirit will live on in the memory of all who met her and loved her. Rest in peace, Sandee.

*Statements by Members***THE ECONOMY**

Jeremy Patzer (Swift Current—Grasslands—Kindersley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadian oil and gas is the key to our prosperity. Ten years of Liberal anti-energy laws have kept it in the ground and stopped pipelines from getting built, including laws like Bill C-69, the “no new pipelines” act; Bill C-48, the shipping ban; the oil and gas production cap; and the industrial carbon tax. It is impossible to ignore the national consensus to get rid of these bad Liberal laws.

There was an election this spring in which the Prime Minister promised big things. Then we heard fancy speeches from him in Calgary. He also met with the premiers in Saskatoon. Parliament has already been sitting for four weeks. We just hosted the G7 meetings in Alberta with key energy allies, yet we still have not seen any announcements for new projects or proposals.

The Prime Minister needs to stop with the fancy words and act on repealing the Liberal anti-energy policies immediately. Canadians need a government that will approve energy infrastructure, sell to our allies and deliver paycheques to our people. Now that the Prime Minister's elbows are clearly down, it is time for him to stand up and get back to work.

* * *

• (1415)

**RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITIES IN OTTAWA WEST—
NEPEAN**

Anita Vandenberg (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the incredible communities of Ambleside and Northwest One in Ottawa West—Nepean. Both of these are celebrating their 50th anniversary.

These are more than just condo towers; they are what we call NORCs, naturally occurring retirement communities. Ambleside One and Two and the Northwest One towers, Poulin and Regina, are home to many long-time residents, including some who have lived there since the beginning.

These are vibrant communities where residents truly look out for each other. They host Friday night potluck meals; organize yoga, choirs and current affairs discussions; and support the surrounding communities with food drives, environmental action and more. While there are some young families, most of the residents are older adults, and their community spirit combats the social isolation of seniors, helping residents live longer, healthier and more connected lives.

Congratulations to Ambleside One and Two and to Northwest One.

* * *

HOUSING

Jacob Mantle (York—Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, over this session of Parliament, I have repeatedly asked the Liberals how they will fix the housing crisis that they themselves have created, and the response has been typical of Liberals. They say that the government will save us and that not one, not two, but three gov-

ernment housing agencies will build homes for people, and they should be thankful about it.

The next generation of homebuyers does not need the government to save them. They just want what generations before them had, which is an opportunity to work hard and own a home of their own choosing. The generational unfairness is on display in the House: questions from the next generation of homebuyers, who are shut out of the market, and half measures from the Liberal housing minister turned robber baron, who is profiting from the dysfunction he now oversees. It was that minister who said housing prices do not need to come down.

The Liberals simply do not understand the housing crisis. I wonder if that is simply because too many of them are profiting from it.

* * *

[Translation]

SENIORS' RESIDENCE IN ALFRED-PELLAN

Angelo Iacono (Alfred-Pellan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will be celebrating a milestone in Alfred-Pellan: the 30th anniversary of the Marronnier residence, a true pillar for our seniors and an exceptional place to live in the heart of our community.

Since 1994, this residence, which was founded by the Morzadec family, has been providing an exemplary living environment for over 1,700 residents. It is known for its warm and friendly atmosphere, modern facilities and dedicated staff, who put the well-being of seniors at the heart of everything they do.

The Marronnier is much more than a place to stay; it is a true community, built on respect, solidarity and joie de vivre.

I would like to recognize and congratulate the residents, staff, volunteers and managers for their daily commitment.

Happy 30th anniversary to the entire Marronnier family.

* * *

[English]

FINANCE

Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are asking Parliament to approve half a trillion dollars in spending without committee oversight, without ministers being able to answer even simple questions in the House and without a budget. The Parliamentary Budget Officer stated that the deficit could be as high as \$20 billion more than originally projected and that legislators must risk placing even more faith in the government than usual because there is no budget.

Sure, we should put more faith in a government that promises a significantly reduced consulting spending but is increasing it to \$26 billion this year for their friends, such as those at McKinsey. Sure, we should put more faith in a government that promised a 2% spending cap increase, yet is increasing it by 8%.

If the Liberals continue this way and do not present a budget until spring, it will have been at least a year since the last budget, the longest period since the sixties, outside COVID. Canada needs a budget now to control inflation, reduce deficit, stop tax hikes and reverse the lost decade of Liberal failure.

* * *

VANCOUVER GRANVILLE

Taleeb Noormohamed (Vancouver Granville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise in this House as the re-elected member of Parliament for Vancouver Granville.

I want to thank my constituents for placing their trust in me once more. Their ideas and determination inspire me every day. I want to thank the hundreds of volunteers who supported me, as well as my family, who give so much to allow me to serve.

From Kits Point to south Van, from Shaughnessy to Main Street and from South Cambie to Granville Island, I am here to make sure that our community's priorities are top of mind: affordable housing, better health care, a stronger and more innovative economy, and safer streets.

Now is the time to ensure that all Canadians' ideas and ambitions become reality. To my constituents, I say that I carry their stories with me into every conversation and every decision I make in this place. They have placed their trust in me to be their voice in Ottawa, and I do not take that responsibility lightly. I will keep working hard to make sure that they are heard and that they are well represented. This work is about them, and I am here to fight for what matters most for our community.

Let us build Canada strong together.

ORAL QUESTIONS

● (1420)

[English]

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government is doubling down on its insane ban on gas-powered vehicles. The latest Liberal overreach kicks in next year, and soon one's favourite car, truck or van will be illegal. However, this mandate is already driving up prices. The average price of a new car is \$67,000; used cars are approaching \$40,000, and the Liberal mandate will add an additional \$20,000 per vehicle.

The Liberals have already priced working Canadians out of the housing market. Why are they pricing working Canadians out of the ability to buy a vehicle as well?

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us first start with a fact, which is

Oral Questions

that there is no ban on gas-powered vehicles. More to the point, once again, we are seeing the Conservatives talking down one of our most important industries, which is employing hard-working auto workers in our country at the very moment we are facing tariff threats from the United States. I find it rich that the Conservatives are choosing to take this position instead of talking up a growing and important industry.

We stand with our auto workers.

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there absolutely is a ban. It starts to come into effect next year, and it will absolutely devastate the auto sector here in Canada.

The auto sector is already under fire from unjustified U.S. tariffs and the PM's inability to get a deal. GM and Ford are also saying that this ban will kill jobs. In fact, a new report says that this ban on gas-powered vehicles will kill 90,000 auto jobs.

Instead of sending even more jobs to the U.S., why not end the ban on gas-powered vehicles and let Canadians decide what kind of vehicle they want to buy?

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is nice to hear that the Conservatives are finally recognizing that we are talking about an industry that is facing unjustified tariffs from the United States. However, let us also talk about how our auto sector is important. We need to support it in this moment. It is creating well-paying union jobs in our country. An EV standard actually makes sure that new electric vehicles are available to Canadians. They are cheaper to operate; they are cheaper on upkeep, and Canadians want to be able to have access.

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we do not have to allow Canadians to buy one type of vehicle by banning their ability to buy the ones that they actually want.

This is raising a lot of questions. Canadians and auto workers for GM do not want the EV mandate, but the Prime Minister is intent on pushing it through. Why? Well, right before becoming Prime Minister, he was chair of Brookfield, and he advocated for a ban on gas-powered cars.

Oral Questions

Brookfield is heavily invested in the EV supply chain, yet the Prime Minister refuses to reveal his financial interests or self-admitted conflicts. Is it not true that this is not about the environment but about the bottom line for Brookfield?

Hon. Evan Solomon (Minister of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Innovation and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are in a trade war launched by the United States that is targeting our auto workers and our auto sector. Make no mistake, we will fight for every job and every worker.

We have invested in the auto sector, including in the EV sector, to build good jobs in places such as St. Thomas, where the Amino Corp. is employing people. This government will always invest in workers and make sure that the auto industry is growing, resilient and successful.

[Translation]

Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, every time this Liberal government proposes a new environmental measure, it is either a tax or an obligation.

Now the Liberals want to ban the sale of gas-powered vehicles, which will cut 90,000 jobs in Canada. They want to punish Quebecers who choose gas-powered vehicles by imposing a \$20,000 increase on vehicles that already cost an average of \$67,000.

Why does the Prime Minister want to take away Canadians' freedom to choose what vehicle they drive?

● (1425)

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us start by clarifying one thing: We are not banning gas-powered cars.

Furthermore, in Quebec, regulations are in place to ensure that Quebecers have access to the sale of electric vehicles. These rules already exist, even in my colleague's riding.

Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the Minister of Environment that people in Quebec have already started saying that forcing people to buy an EV by 2035 is a non-starter.

The problem for us is that this is a matter of freedom of choice, not a need for control. What we are seeing right now is a Liberal government that wants to control what Canadians do.

Many Canadians cannot afford to buy an EV, or they find that an EV is not suitable for their lifestyle. Take the example of someone who lives in northern Quebec and hunts, fishes and works in the bush. It is impossible for this person to do all that with an EV.

Forcing EVs on Canadians is not a solution.

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again, we are not forcing people to buy EVs, any more than we are banning internal combustion vehicles. It is also important to mention that EVs are less expensive to use and are cheaper to maintain. Canadians want access to these vehicles.

Why do the Conservatives not want Canadians to have that choice?

Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government already tried to control Canadians' lives by imposing the carbon tax. The Liberals called us every name in the book for years. What did the new Prime Minister do? He scrapped the carbon tax because he knew it was not working.

Now, we are asking the same thing: Stop forcing things on Canadians. If they want an EV, let them buy one. If they want a gas-powered car because it suits their needs, let them buy that. We are asking the Liberals not to impose rules that will drive up car prices and make people buy something they cannot afford once again. We are asking them not to create an obligation based on their ideology.

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what we are hearing right now is completely absurd and a bit ridiculous.

I will say it again: We will help people who work for automakers. If the Conservatives want to imply that the cars we manufacture in Canada are no good, that is their prerogative. The Liberal Party and I will always support our auto industry.

* * *

CANADA-U.S. RELATIONS

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the main issue during the election campaign was a serious crisis, a tariff and trade crisis. The day after the election campaign, poof, it disappeared. The Prime Minister went to Washington to meet with President Trump and came back with nothing to show for it.

That said, the Prime Minister has since made significant concessions on tariffs, borders and defence. He said that all of the tariff issues would be resolved before the G7, but he is returning empty-handed yet again.

Should workers be satisfied with a 30-day deadline?

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (President of the King's Privy Council for Canada and Minister responsible for Canada-U.S. Trade, Intergovernmental Affairs and One Canadian Economy, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister and the U.S. President had a constructive meeting in Kananaskis during the G7. They discussed a number of issues.

Obviously, the priority for us was to speak directly to the U.S. President about the issue of tariffs and, as my colleague just indicated, the impact that tariffs are having not only on Canada's economy and Canadian workers, but also on the U.S. economy. We wanted to talk about the fact that it is harmful to Americans to continue with this tariff plan.

I am confident that we have made progress, but we will not stop until this matter is resolved.

* * *

GOVERNMENT PRIORITIES

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, if the G7 is considered progress, then we are not out of the woods yet.

The government is muzzling Parliament, suspending the rule of law, and preventing elected members who are not siding with the Liberals and the Conservatives from speaking, but meanwhile nothing is happening on trade and tariffs. There is talk about oil. However, Bill C-5 has nothing to do with trade and nothing to do with tariffs in the foreseeable future.

Have the government and the Prime Minister misplaced their priorities?

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (President of the King's Privy Council for Canada and Minister responsible for Canada-U.S. Trade, Intergovernmental Affairs and One Canadian Economy, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on the contrary, the bill on one Canadian economy seeks specifically to respond to the threat of U.S. tariffs and economic instability. During the election campaign, the Prime Minister was very clear. We are going to build major projects in Canada and we are going to build them the right way by respecting the environmental standards and working in partnership with indigenous peoples, the provinces and the territories.

I know that my friend from the Bloc Québécois may not be happy about us working with the provinces and territories to do great things in Canada, but that is precisely what we are going to do.

• (1430)

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals need to stop regurgitating stock answers.

Bill C-5 will not have any impact on the Canadian economy, but it will have a huge negative impact on the public purse for many years to come. Bill C-5 will have no impact on the tariff war and no foreseeable impact on production-related trade or on the Canadian economy.

Will the Liberals stop taking people for fools and admit that Bill C-5 is the Prime Minister's business plan and that it goes against the interests of Quebec workers?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Minister of Transport and Internal Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of respect for my Bloc Québécois colleague, but I cannot agree with the notion that Bill C-5 will have no impact on the Canadian economy.

Economists who have studied the impact of free trade within Canada have found that this measure will add \$200 billion to the

Oral Questions

Canadian economy and grow the GDP by 2% to 4%. That is a significant impact.

* * *

[English]

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Brad Redekopp (Saskatoon West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in Saskatoon, winter temperatures often hit -30°C, so families need vehicles that actually work in the winter, but the Prime Minister, backed by his radical former environment minister, is doubling down on Justin Trudeau's plan to ban gas-powered cars and force Canadians to buy expensive EVs that do not stand up to the cold. His plan would hike car prices by \$20,000 and leave families stranded. It is out of touch, unaffordable and anti-choice.

Will the Prime Minister stop punishing Canadians for living in a cold country and repeal his unscientific, job-killing electric vehicle mandate now?

Hon. Evan Solomon (Minister of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Innovation and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are in a trade war that was launched by the U.S. As we know, the auto sector is already under attack.

Let us hope that my colleagues will join us by not attacking the auto sector, but by supporting jobs across the auto sector in all forms and making sure that our communities remain strong in that industry.

Brad Redekopp (Saskatoon West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what the government is doing. It is attacking the auto sector. Our supposedly "elbows up" Prime Minister promised to get tough with the U.S., but these unjustified tariffs will kill 50,000 Canadian auto sector jobs. While he is bungling the trade talks, his self-imposed ban on gas-powered cars will gut another 40,000 jobs. The combination of these two failures will be disastrous for our auto industry. That is 90,000 jobs gone, poof.

Will the Prime Minister admit that his failures are killing our auto sector and finally stand up for 90,000 Canadian jobs?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this line of questioning is somewhat absurd. Whether someone wants to get on a Ski-doo, get on an all-terrain vehicle, gas up their F-150 or have the plumber take their truck to work, that is a person's choice in this country. There is no ban on gas-powered vehicles. This is the completely conjured up, fake showmanship from the Conservatives. It is unbelievable.

There is an auto sector in Canada. We are going to stand up for the people in it. We are going to protect it and we are going to give consumers choice.

Oral Questions

Ziad Aboultaif (Edmonton Manning, CPC): Mr. Speaker, an Ipsos poll says that two-thirds of Canadians disagree with the disastrous Liberal plan for the ban of the sale of new gas-powered vehicles by 2035. The EV mandate would eliminate 38,000 jobs and cost \$138.7 billion. U.S. tariffs could mean 1,000 more jobs lost. Prices will go up by \$20,000 per vehicle. Canadian jobs will vanish.

When will the Liberals repeal their EV mandate?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am having trouble understanding the actual line of questioning from the opposition. They are trying to—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

• (1435)

The Speaker: I cannot hear, and it is important that I be able to hear the conversation.

The hon. government House leader.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I know the member of Parliament. He knows there is no ban on gas-powered vehicles. I will invite him to the riding, and we will go out on a Ski-doo ride when the winter comes.

The fact is that Canadians have choice and will continue to have choice. In the meantime, we are going to power a new industry to put Canadian auto workers, Unifor workers, unionized men and women, to work building all kinds of vehicles in this country.

Kerry Diotte (Edmonton Griesbach, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I believe it is on the website.

It is not a surprise to Albertans that Liberals think that gas and diesel are pure evil. Why else would they be sticking with Justin Trudeau's EV mandates? EV sales are sagging and auto manufacturers are dead set against these mandates. This Liberal idea is a real clunker, and it is an affront to free choice.

Will the Prime Minister reverse this reckless policy and let Canadians buy the vehicles they actually want to buy?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when I go down to the street corner gas station near my house, they have this thing called a pump. The pump offers various choices of grades of gasoline, and for the hon. member's benefit, there is a yellow one that says "diesel!". If someone happens to have a diesel engine, they stick that pump into their vehicle. People have a choice to run their diesel truck or run their diesel car. That is all good. Canadians have the choice. Let us drive on.

Matt Strauss (Kitchener South—Hespeler, CPC): Mr. Speaker, contrary to that member's remarks, on my phone right now, I am reading Canada's electric vehicle availability standard, regulated targets for zero-emission vehicles. It is on the government's website. It is regulating and mandating this, while Canadians are not choosing to buy EVs. EV sales are down 45% in our country right now, and that is okay. Living in a liberal democracy means different people make different choices for their families based on their different needs, as they see fit.

Why will the Liberals not respect the right of Canadians to choose the vehicle that serves their family best?

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Conservatives. Why, in this moment, when we are facing unjustified tariffs from the United States, are they talking down a climate-competitive industry that is right here in our country? In fact, globally, if they looked at the reports, including the International Energy Agency's reports, global rates for the purchase of EVs are going up, so this is a growing sector. I hope they will support it, because we do.

[Translation]

Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Bloc and the Liberals voted against our motion to end the ban on gas-powered vehicles. They want to impose their way of life on everyone, but they do not understand people's reality. This ban would penalize regions like mine and many others.

In Saguenay, it is cold, and public transit is less readily available than in big cities. We need our gas-powered vehicles.

Why does the Prime Minister want to dictate what kind of vehicle Canadians should buy?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I recognize my hon. colleague. He coached the Chicoutimi Saguenéens. They are not as good as the Gatineau Olympiques, but that is neither here nor there.

Maybe he breathed in too much Zamboni exhaust. In Canada, we have options. We have gas-powered Zambonis, natural gas-powered Zambonis and electric Zambonis. Canadian arenas have options, and consumers have options. Workers are going to build all three.

Everyone will get what they want.

Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the average price of a new car is already \$66,000. The Liberals want to put a tax on gas-powered cars, which will increase the price by \$20,000.

The people of Saguenay should have the freedom to choose the vehicle that meets their needs at an affordable price and not be forced to drive an electric vehicle. Many people need gas-powered pickups to go into the woods and work. People want to be sure they can get home at the end of the day.

Will the Liberals and the Bloc continue to harm our regions?

Oral Questions

• (1440)

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, not only are we not going to harm the regions, but in fact, we plan to build up the regions. We will build up regions like Bécancourt, which is now in the auto industry. We will support the electrification of transportation.

[English]

I want to also suggest to my Conservative colleagues across the way that there is a guy in Queen's Park. His name is Doug Ford, and he supports electric vehicles. He supports an automobile industry in Ontario and across Canada. I suggest that they maybe they give Doug Ford a call to see what he thinks about EVs.

* * *

*[Translation]***CARBON PRICING**

Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals and the Conservatives all voted to make Quebeckers pay \$814 million in bogus Canada carbon rebate cheques. The Parliamentary Budget Officer confirmed it, saying that the funds will obviously be drawn from the consolidated revenue fund.

Worse still, Quebeckers are going to keep paying. The Parliamentary Budget Officer also said that there was no doubt that there would be interest to pay on that amount because, in a deficit situation, every additional expenditure results in additional borrowing.

Why are the Liberals and Conservatives stealing from Quebeckers?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is quite simple.

Quebec did not participate in consumer carbon pricing. The rebate is an adjustment for communities and provinces subject to such pricing.

Quebec did not participate, so the rebate does not apply to Quebeckers.

Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, sometimes we are asked what the Bloc Québécois is good for. At the very least, it is good for having members of Parliament who do not steal \$814 million from Quebeckers to write cheques for Canadians.

Right now, there are 44 Liberal members from Quebec. All 44 of them voted to steal from Quebeckers, as did the 11 Conservatives from Quebec. They all rejected the National Assembly's unanimous motion calling on the government to pay back that money. Clearly, these members do not stand up for Quebeckers.

The real question is not what the Bloc Québécois is good for, but what these people are good for.

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is very simple. The carbon tax did not apply in Quebec, so Quebeckers did not get the rebate. It is very simple.

*[English]***HOUSING**

Shelby Kramp-Neuman (Hastings—Lennox and Addington—Tyendinaga, CPC): Mr. Speaker, CMHC released May's housing starts, and predictably for the government, the outlook is not good. In Belleville, starts are down over 50 points, and in Toronto, nearly 60%. The minister's staggering ignorance of the plight of everyday Canadians is not surprising when we remember that he is not only stuck up in his ivory tower here in Ottawa but also sitting on a massive, \$10-million, real estate portfolio.

Why is the housing minister telling young Canadians that home prices do not need to go down? Is he unable, or unwilling?

Hon. Gregor Robertson (Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, we are well aware of the challenges Canadians have with housing affordability. That is why they elected us to represent them and drive the pace of housing construction in Canada. That is what we will do. That is what we will deliver.

We have already delivered on the GST break for first-time homebuyers. We are going to take it further and faster.

Shelby Kramp-Neuman (Hastings—Lennox and Addington—Tyendinaga, CPC): Mr. Speaker, tell that to the young Canadians who cannot afford a home. For a decade, the Liberal government has continuously failed to address the housing crisis with solutions. To add insult to injury, it appointed a minister who has a significant interest in seeing housing prices soar sky-high. The housing minister is actually part of the problem.

How can Canadians actually trust a government that cannot lower housing costs, and a minister who has personal interest in keeping prices high and young Canadians in the basement?

Hon. Adam van Koeverden (Secretary of State (Sport), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians remember when Pierre Poilievre stood in front of a Canadian woman's house in Niagara Falls and called it a "shack". I remember when Pierre Poilievre stood in the House and called the co-op where I grew up "Soviet-style" housing. Now, if that were not enough, the Conservatives are stigmatizing modern, modular, affordable housing as shipping containers.

The Conservatives voted against every single measure to support lower-income families to be able to access affordable housing. It is people like me, who grew up in that type of housing, whom the Conservatives want to insult. That is pretty ironic, given that, despite not getting re-elected, Pierre Poilievre continues to live in taxpayer-funded government housing.

Oral Questions

● (1445)

Pat Kelly (Calgary Crowfoot, CPC): Mr. Speaker, under the Liberals, we have become a country with two kinds of families: those that already own real estate and those that likely never will. The media reports that the housing minister owns real estate worth millions of dollars, while he tells Canadians who cannot afford a home that prices must not fall.

Will the minister, the former mayor of one of the most unaffordable places on earth, admit that his government spent a decade driving up housing prices and apologize to Canadians for crushing their dreams of home ownership?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the minister has stood up and articulated and represents policies, which we debated in an election campaign, that will create hundreds of thousands of new homes for Canadians. In the meantime, he will of course be in compliance with the very strict ethics code and regulations that we in the House of Commons all live under. Doubting that is, frankly, unseemly on the part of the member.

Pat Kelly (Calgary Crowfoot, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after 10 years of the Liberals' driving prices up, housing supply has never been worse. According to CMHC, housing starts are down 10% in Vancouver, down 58% in Toronto, down 51% in Hamilton and down 71% in London. All these cities received funding under the Liberals' so-called housing accelerator fund, and their housing starts are falling.

Why is the minister protecting real estate investors instead of giving hope to millions of Canadians locked out of home ownership by the government?

Hon. Gregor Robertson (Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member needs to check the facts. The housing starts across Canada are up to almost 280,000 pace this year, which is almost at a record level. We have been building at a strong pace this year and last. We are seeing unprecedented levels of rental housing being constructed for the first time in decades.

The government is delivering, and we will take it further. We will double the rate.

Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the housing minister is part of the problem. He said that housing prices do not need to come down, and now we know why: He has a \$10-million real estate portfolio, including three, not one or two but three luxury properties.

Housing costs have doubled under the Liberals, putting home ownership out of reach for more and more Canadians. How can the minister sit in his Vancouver penthouse and tell young Canadians who are priced out of the market that prices do not need to come down?

Hon. Adam van Koevorden (Secretary of State (Sport), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying about people in glass houses. Well, a lot of the Conservative members also have quite a few investment properties. They rent out their units. However, for another thing, I just want to reiterate that their leader, Pierre Poilievre, did

not get re-elected, and he continues to live in taxpayer-funded government housing.

What is clear is that any time the Conservatives have an opportunity to support lower-income or vulnerable families and their access to truly affordable housing, they vote against every single measure.

* * *

SENIORS

Juanita Nathan (Pickering—Brooklin, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, I had the pleasure of attending the Seniors Month celebration in my riding of Pickering—Brooklin. This event brought together dozens of local seniors for an afternoon filled with live music, dancing, light refreshments and the presentation of the Senior of the Year award. It was a vibrant testament to the vital role that seniors play in enriching our community. Seniors are the backbone of our town, serving as volunteers, caregivers and lifelong contributors.

I would like to ask the Secretary of State for Seniors what our government is doing to ensure that seniors, especially those on a fixed income, can age with dignity and security in communities like mine and across the country.

Hon. Stephanie McLean (Secretary of State (Seniors), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for her advocacy.

Our government is committed to ensuring that seniors can age with dignity. We have introduced several initiatives that are making a real difference in the lives of seniors. We have provided an OAS increase of 10%, increased the guaranteed income supplement for low-income seniors, made dental care available to seniors aged 65 and older and invested in projects under the new horizons program.

We will continue to work with provinces, municipalities and community partners to ensure that every senior from Pickering to Vancouver Island has what they need to thrive.

* * *

● (1450)

JUSTICE

Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the equivalent of five to seven grains of salt, a 0.2 milligram dose, is how much fentanyl it takes to kill somebody, so it is no surprise that Canadians would be shocked to hear that somebody who had 24 grams of fentanyl, enough to kill thousands of people, was sentenced to house arrest. Whom do I blame? Again, it is not the judge, not the prosecutor and not the defence lawyer. I blame the Liberals for their lack of action and for passing Bill C-5.

When will the Liberals finally legislate so that people who traffic fentanyl cannot serve their sentence on the couch?

Oral Questions

Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is clear the fentanyl crisis is responsible for the taking of innocent lives in this country. It is incumbent upon all members of the House to approach this with empathy, but also with a level of seriousness to prevent fentanyl from sweeping through the nation and causing such damage.

Going forward, we are going to be implementing a series of reforms that will target violent offenders, repeat offenders and organized crime, which is responsible for the preponderance of fentanyl in this country.

I hope that we can work across the aisle on this important issue to help keep Canadians safe and protect our communities.

Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that all sounds great. Unfortunately, the minister voted for Bill C-5, which took away mandatory minimums for people serving sentences for fentanyl trafficking, for gun trafficking and for extortion with a firearm. Fentanyl is killing people: brothers, sisters, mothers and fathers.

Will the minister look into the camera and tell people whose children are victims, people who have died from fentanyl, that he will legislate to end the insanity?

Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is essential that we approach this issue with the seriousness with which it deserves, including respect for decisions that have come from courts in the country. As we move forward, we are going to work in a manner that will ensure that serious crimes will be treated seriously and that serious offenders will be punished seriously.

I hope we can avoid turning something as serious as the fentanyl crisis into a partisan issue for political gain, and instead work to advance measures in a collaborative manner to help protect Canadians, their families and communities in every region of this country.

Andrew Lawton (Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, a worker at a so-called safe injection site in Toronto helped someone literally try to get away with murder. Her sentence was a house arrest sentence with educational programming and daily trips to the gym, par for the course from the lawless Liberals, who care more about criminals than victims and who think bail should be as easy to get as free drugs.

When will the Liberals stop ignoring pleas from Canadians to fix the justice system and clean up the streets?

Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is beyond reprehensible that a member of the House would accuse another member of caring more about criminals than about Canadians. We should be able to work together to, certainly, punish wrongdoers but also to give law enforcement the tools it needs to keep their community safe.

We have been giving tools to law enforcement so that we not only punish wrongdoers after a crime has been committed but also prevent it in the first instance. I want to thank the law enforcement

officials who have been in the news recently for the various busts that they have been responsible for and for bringing people to justice.

I hope that we can work together across partisan lines to advance important reforms to the criminal justice system later this year that would help further protect our communities.

Andrew Lawton (Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, if the minister does not want to be criticized for caring more about criminals than victims, he should look at his own government's record. The Liberals adjourned the justice committee meeting yesterday after 16 minutes to start their summer vacation, without tabling or discussing a single motion or bill related to justice.

Violent crime is up 50%. Opioid overdoses are up 200%. Health officials in my riding are warning about carfentanyl on the streets of Elgin County. People are dying, and those who are responsible are walking free.

When will the Liberals table a crime bill and focus on that instead of their summer break?

Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the member's eyes betray him, but we are here and ready to work to advance reforms to protect our communities. Yesterday at the justice committee, although the accusation is that there was an attempt to get home early for summer, what actually happened was that a Conservative member was seeking to advance reforms that would have made it easier for people who have been charged with intimate partner violence to get out on bail. I think that is a bad idea, and I am willing to stay here and work to protect the victims of intimate partner violence and to advance reforms that would punish wrongdoers.

Once again, it is not about caring more about criminals than about Canadians, but it seems that the member cares more about his social media clicks than he does about advancing—

• (1455)

The Speaker: The hon. member for Markham—Unionville has the floor.

Michael Ma (Markham—Unionville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, extortion is up 357%. The Trudeau Liberals voted down a common-sense Conservative bill that would enforce a three-year mandatory minimum penalty for extortion and restore a four-year minimum penalty for extortion involving a non-restricted firearm, because it was repealed by the Liberals in Bill C-5.

Will the Prime Minister finally adopt the Conservative plan to crack down on violent extortion?

Oral Questions

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to thank the members of the Toronto Police Service, Durham police, my friend who represents York Regional Police, and the OPP, for their work to dismantle an organized crime group operating in the tow truck industry.

Project Yankee has resulted in the seizure of firearms and vehicles, the arrest of 20 individuals and more than 100 criminal charges, including multiple counts of conspiracy to commit murder. It is another day and another criminal organization dismantled by law enforcement.

Canada's new government will always be there to protect Canadians.

* * *

[Translation]

GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE

Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there have been 10 femicides in Quebec since the beginning of the year. At one point, there were five in five weeks.

Yesterday, a woman was killed in Vaudreuil-Dorion. She was in a toxic and violent relationship. Did the system let her down, as it has many other women before her?

When will the Prime Minister correct the mistakes made by his predecessor, Mr. Trudeau, which contributed to leaving these women unprotected?

[English]

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, every Canadian should feel safe in their community, especially in their home. We will automatically revoke gun licences for individuals convicted of intimate partner violence offences and those subject to protection orders. We are delivering on the recommendations made by the Mass Casualty Commission related to community safety, policing and countering gender-based violence.

The implementation of the national action plan to combat gender-based violence continues to support the work of building a Canada free of gender-based violence that supports victims, survivors and their families no matter where they live.

[Translation]

Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, facts are stubborn things. Under the Liberals, violence against women has continued to rise.

By maintaining Bill C-5 and Bill C-75, which were passed by Justin Trudeau, this government is protecting criminals rather than victims. That is a well-known fact. Meanwhile, women are living in fear. The government needs to take a good hard look in the mirror and admit that it is responsible for the problem.

When will the Prime Minister take action and change these laws to keep all women in Canada safe?

Hon. Nathalie Provost (Secretary of State (Nature), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her question. I am deeply moved to rise in the House on this issue.

I am here with the Liberal government because, up until March of this year, the Liberal government worked tirelessly to reduce the risk of gun violence in Canada by banning assault-style weapons.

We still need to make regulations. We are going to do that because we need to see this through. That is what a government that fights crime is all about.

* * *

[English]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Mr. Speaker, new reports from the Department of National Defence confirmed today that less than 50% of the equipment used by our armed forces is operational. Only 46% of our navy ships are seaworthy, and fewer than half of the land vehicles and aircraft needed by our army and air force are even serviceable.

While the Prime Minister makes grandiose claims of fixing the armed forces, the actual numbers tell a very different story. Money without results will not defend Canada's sovereignty. Why should anyone believe the Prime Minister when his own defence department contradicts his promises?

• (1500)

Hon. David McGuinty (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, here are the facts. In the last decade, we have tripled our defence spending. We are investing \$72 billion through our defence policy update, \$40 billion through NORAD modernization and \$11 billion to train our next generation of aviators. We are procuring 200 new aircraft, 12 submarines, six Arctic and offshore patrol ships, two joint support ships and so much more.

Now more than ever, it is time to support and equip our forces with what they need to meet the challenges we face.

James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Mr. Speaker, throwing money at the problem does not fix the problem. The facts show that the lost Liberal decade has reduced the capabilities needed by the armed forces to protect Canada today. Last year, the department said it would meet its targets this year, but now the Liberals have kicked the can down the road for another seven years before the operations of the armed forces will be up to standard.

Under Liberal watch, our armed forces simply do not have the tools they need to do the job to deal with today's growing threats. The Prime Minister's talk is cheap. Where is the plan?

Oral Questions

Hon. David McGuinty (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister announced \$4.5 billion yesterday for our efforts in Ukraine. We have committed to reducing overall government spending by more than \$15 billion while ensuring the services and supports that Canadians rely on are there. We have exceptional expert staff dedicated to meeting our priorities, but we also sometimes rely on outside expertise, and the member knows this, but we are committed to doing so in a transparent and fiscally responsible way. Any potential reductions in spending are being considered carefully, and minimizing the impact on military readiness is the driving force behind each decision.

* * *

DENTAL CARE

Gurbux Saini (Fleetwood—Port Kells, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, one in four Canadians avoids visiting a dentist because of cost and accessibility. Delaying preventive care can have a wide-reaching impact, including more expensive treatments, worsening health outcomes and lost productivity.

Can the Minister of Jobs and Families please update Canadians on our plan to deliver dental care to uninsured Canadians?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the last elections, Canadians chose to place their vote with a party that knows Canada is strong when we take care of each other.

As of May 29, 2025, all eligible Canadians can now apply for the Canadian dental care plan, and to date, four million Canadians have been approved for coverage and over two million have received care, including people in my community of Thunder Bay—Superior North. For more information, visit Canada.ca/dental.

* * *

MARINE TRANSPORTATION

Dan Albas (Okanagan Lake West—South Kelowna, CPC): Mr. Speaker, David Eby, the Premier of British Columbia, has doubled down and made the plan for BC Ferries to purchase four new vessels from a Chinese state-owned enterprise his own.

The Minister of Transport has said she will give BC Ferries \$36 million this year. Will the minister commit today that she will personally guarantee that not one cent of this transfer will go to the Chinese shipyard? Will she stand up against David Eby's moral failure, support Canadian jobs in steel and shipbuilding and make this transfer conditional on BC Ferries supporting jobs here in this great country?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Minister of Transport and Internal Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I share the concern and anger of other members of this House about the purchase of Chinese ferries. I have written to the Province of B.C. to make clear that the federal government's support for BC Ferries, which is explicitly for operating support, must not be used for anything other than the operation of ferries. We owe it to the people of B.C. to support the operation of their ferries. We also owe it to the people of Canada to support Canadian shipbuilding, Canadian steel and Canadian—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Okanagan Lake West—South Kelowna.

Dan Albas (Okanagan Lake West—South Kelowna, CPC): Mr. Speaker, she is just going to write a cheque to them with no conditions.

During the election, the Liberals were all elbows up and talking about team Canada in the face of unjustified American tariffs on steel and aluminum, and I thought it was bad enough that the government has been elbows down since the election on protecting Canadian jobs. Now, does the government not see that by going along to get along with David Eby, it is not on team Canada, but on team China?

● (1505)

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Minister of Transport and Internal Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my answer was very clear, as have been my previous answers on this question: Federal government support goes only to operating costs; the federal government has no authority over BC Ferries. However, I want to object, in the strongest possible terms, to the insult to a premier of a Canadian province and a suggestion that a Canadian premier would act in the interests of China and not of Canada. All of our premiers are patriots, as are all members of this House.

Tamara Kronis (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the BC Ferries deal did not sink Canadian shipbuilders; Ottawa did.

Our shipbuilding unions say Canadian companies could not bid because federal policies stack the deck against them. It is the federal government's job to set fair conditions so provinces can build at home, but all the government does is rearrange Liberal deck chairs.

What I want to know is this: Will the Liberals fix their broken policies or are we going to just keep waving goodbye to good Canadian jobs from the dock?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Minister of Transport and Internal Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some confusion among the Conservative MPs about what is provincial jurisdiction and what is federal jurisdiction. There is no such confusion on this side of the House.

Having said that, I want to inform all members of this House that I have instructed all the entities under control of Transport Canada to buy Canadian and, where that is not possible, to buy reciprocally from free trade partners that give Canada access to their government procurement. That is what we should all be doing at all levels of government.

*Routine Proceedings***PUBLIC SAFETY**

Charles Sousa (Mississauga—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, Peel police announced the outcome of project outsource, an 11-month project that has led to multiple arrests connected with extortions, shootings and fraud. This affects my community and others.

Can the Secretary of State for Combatting Crime speak to the actions the government is taking to crack down on organized crime, protect our streets and keep Canadians safe?

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, allow me to thank Chief Nishan Duraipappah, who is here in Ottawa today to collaborate with our new government on public safety. I thank the dedicated officers of Peel police, who, through project outsource, have dealt a significant blow against criminal networks responsible for intimidating and harming members of our community.

The strong borders act would give police across the country the tools needed to replicate the success of project outsource. Organized crime should be on high alert. Canada's new government will do what it takes to dismantle their networks, seize their guns—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as a retired police officer who served on the front lines for nearly three decades, I have seen first-hand the damage violent criminals can do, especially when the justice system fails to hold them accountable.

Today, extortion is up nearly 400%, and that is not a coincidence. The Liberals repealed mandatory minimums and gutted the bail reform act. They even voted down a Conservative bill to restore serious penalties for extortion involving firearms.

My former colleagues working on the front lines are begging for help. Will the Prime Minister finally listen and adopt the Conservative plan to crack down on violent crime?

Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first, let me acknowledge and thank my hon. colleague for his years of service to promote public safety in this country.

We are working alongside police forces and federations representing frontline members to understand the needs of frontline officers to ensure they have the resources to help keep communities safe. In addition, we are moving forward with a series of reforms that are going to strengthen sentencing regimes for violent repeat offenders, as well as addressing the needs of the bail system, particularly targeting home invasions, human trafficking, auto theft and other offences related to organized crime.

I am happy to work with the hon. member and benefit from his experience as we advance these important reforms.

* * *

PHARMACARE

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Nova Scotia is ready to negotiate a pharmacare deal, but it is still waiting on an invitation from Health Canada. The Prime Minister has not

committed to expanding pharmacare for all Canadians. Access to essential medications should not depend on where one lives or one's private coverage. With the job losses from Trump's trade war, the need for public medication coverage is clear.

Will the Liberal government commit to delivering universal pharmacare for all Canadians?

• (1510)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marjorie Michel (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the opposition member for his question, and I can assure him that we are working closely with the provinces and territories to provide the best health care for Canadians.

[*English*]

Hon. Andrew Scheer: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

I have in my hands a document entitled “Canada’s Electric Vehicle Availability Standard”, with a timeline where it says that the requirements increase to—

Some hon. members: No.

Dan Albas: Mr. Speaker, on another point of order, I would ask the Minister of Transport to table her letter to David Eby that she referred to in question period today, out of respect for transparency.

The Speaker: That is not a point of order.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

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, the Public Sector Integrity Commissioner report for the fiscal year ended March 31.

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

CIVIL AVIATION SAFETY

Mike Kelloway (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport and Internal Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2) and consistent with the policy on the tabling of treaties in Parliament, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the treaty entitled “Agreement between Canada and the European Union Amending Annex B of the Agreement on Civil Aviation Safety between Canada and the European Community”, done at Washington on June 12, 2024.

* * *

AIR TRANSPORT

Mike Kelloway (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport and Internal Trade, Lib.): As well, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2) and consistent with the policy on the tabling of treaties in Parliament, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the treaty entitled “Agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of the Federal Republic of Nigeria on Air Transport”, done at Ottawa on March 5 and at Abuja on May 21.

* * *

[Translation]

AN ACT RESPECTING CYBER SECURITY

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-8, An Act respecting cyber security, amending the Telecommunications Act and making consequential amendments to other Acts.

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

* * *

[English]

DEPARTMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION OMBUD ACT

Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-212, An Act to establish the Office of the Ombud for the Department of Citizenship and Immigration and to make related and consequential amendments to other Acts.

She said: Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a private member's bill to establish an independent ombud office for Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, with a mandate to examine the department's practices to ensure that they are fair, equitable, unbiased, non-racist and non-discriminatory. I thank the member for Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie for seconding the bill and for defending the values of fairness, justice and equality.

New Democrats know that immigration is an exercise in nation building, but shortcomings in addressing biases, unfairness and racism at IRCC undermine this goal. If passed, the bill would create a dedicated oversight body to ensure fairness and accountability within IRCC and an ombud office that could serve as an impartial entity to address individual complaints and concerns, which is a gap in the system that every member in this House will know about. This office would also have a mandate to review concerns about differential treatment and discriminatory practices within IR-

Routine Proceedings

CC and be empowered to look at trends and patterns to identify systemic issues.

Trust in Canada's immigration system depends upon its being just, effective and equitable for all. I hope all members of this House will agree and support the bill.

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

* * *

● (1515)

IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE PROTECTION ACT

Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-213, An Act to amend the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (cessation of refugee protection).

She said: Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a private member's bill to repeal the unjust and unfair Conservative laws targeting refugees and protected persons in Canada.

Again, I thank my NDP colleague, the member for Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, for seconding the bill.

In 2012, the Conservatives brought in Bill C-31, an unjust and punitive bill. It amended the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act by giving CBSA and the Department of Justice the power to retroactively bring cessation applications against permanent residents of Canada if refugees and protected persons have to re-avail themselves of protection after temporarily travelling back to their country of origin. That means people are unable to travel back for any reason. No matter how much time has passed, whether the conditions in their country have changed or whether they have resettled permanently in Canada, had children and established their families in the community, they cannot travel back, even to visit a dying loved one for a last time, without risking the loss of their permanent status.

These cessation provisions are wrong and unjust. I hope the members in this House will support the bill and bring forward just policies for refugees.

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

* * *

NATIONAL RENEWABLE ENERGY STRATEGY ACT

Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-214, An Act respecting the development of a national renewable energy strategy.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to rise today to introduce the national renewable energy strategy act. I thank my colleague from Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie for seconding the legislation and for all his work to protect our environment.

Routine Proceedings

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has been clear that we must cut global greenhouse gas emissions in half by 2030 and reach net zero by 2050 to avert catastrophic global climate change. The time for action is now. That means implementing solutions for clean energy and transitioning away from fossil fuels. While we do this, we must ensure that workers are not left behind.

Jobs in Canada's clean energy sector are projected to grow by nearly 50% by 2030, and the industry's GDP contribution is on track to reach \$100 billion by the end of this decade. This legislation would accelerate our transition to a clean energy future by requiring that the Minister of Natural Resources develop and implement a national strategy to ensure 100% of electricity generated in Canada comes from renewable energy sources by 2030.

I call on all parliamentarians to support this vital initiative for our country and our planet.

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

* * *

● (1520)

MARINE LIABILITY ACT

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-215, An Act to amend the Marine Liability Act (national strategy respecting pollution caused by shipping container spills).

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce a bill today that would amend the Marine Liability Act to require the development and implementation of a national strategy to address pollution caused by shipping container spills.

In 2016, when 35 shipping containers fell from the *Hanjin Seattle* into the ocean off the coast of Vancouver Island, the government did not have an emergency response plan in place or resources available to rapidly respond.

In 2021, when 109 shipping containers fell from the *ZIM Kingston* into the ocean, again off the coast of Vancouver Island, the government still did not have an emergency response plan or proper equipment to respond.

If a spill were to happen today, the government again would not be prepared to respond.

Volunteers have been cleaning debris off our shores for years, following shipping containers and finding items such as refrigerators, urinal mats, inflatable toys, lost containers with Styrofoam, plastic items and toxic chemicals that continue to pollute our marine ecosystems.

With climate change making extreme weather events more common, it is essential that Canada has a strategy in place to prevent shipping container spills and to respond rapidly and effectively when they happen. This bill seeks to begin that work before the next disaster happens.

I am thankful to my colleague, the MP for Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, for seconding the bill and for his ongoing work to build a cleaner, more sustainable future.

I hope all members will support this very important bill.

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

Gord Johns: Mr. Speaker, I am rising regarding the establishment of a national strategy on brain injuries in Bill C-206.

There have been discussions between parties, and I am hoping, if you seek it, that we find agreement to adopt the following motion by unanimous consent: That notwithstanding any Standing Order or usual practice of the House, Bill C-206, an act—

Some hon. members: No.

* * *

PETITIONS

CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS

Brad Redekopp (Saskatoon West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition today regarding recommendation 430 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Finance, which would remove the “advancement of religion” as a recognized charitable purpose under the Income Tax Act.

The petitioners recognize that religious charities in Canada provide vital services to society, including food banks, care for seniors, newcomer support, etc. Freedom of religion and belief are fundamental rights in Canada, protected by the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and singling out or excluding faith-based charities from the charitable sector based on religious belief undermines the diversity and pluralism foundation of Canadian society.

The undersigned are asking the government to reject recommendations 429 and 430 of the House of Commons finance committee's pre-budget report, refrain from including these recommendations in the federal budget or any related legislation and affirm the charitable status of faith-based organizations, whose members' work flows from sincerely held beliefs and whose contributions serve the common good of Canada.

JUSTICE

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today I rise to present a petition on behalf of my constituents, who are alarmed about the increase in repeat violent offenders being released on bail.

The petitioners have witnessed a sharp increase in car theft, gang violence and drug-related deaths. Violent crime has increased by 50%; violent gun crime has surged by 116%, and in 2022, 256 Canadians were tragically killed by people out on bail thanks to Liberal catch-and-release policies under Bill C-75. Police officers are increasingly powerless to protect the public.

The petitioners are calling on the Minister of Justice to urgently reform Canada's bail laws and restore safety on our streets.

CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS

Arpan Khanna (Oxford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is always an honour to rise on behalf of petitioners from Oxford County, who are raising concerns about the finance committee's recommendation 430, which would potentially strip charitable status from our places of worship and from religious organizations.

The petitioners are raising concerns, especially because these organizations and houses of worship do so much good work in our communities. They help with food banks. They help resettle newcomers to our country. They help those who need support the most, the most vulnerable.

The petitioners are calling on the government and all legislators to reject any attack on religious organizations and their ability to practise their faith openly and freely to support Canadians.

• (1525)

FINANCE

Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of petitions to present today.

The first petition is on behalf of petitioners who are calling for a federal budget. They say that a federal budget is a critical tool for ensuring transparency and accountability in government spending and priorities. They also state that Canadians are facing significant economic uncertainty, including inflation, housing pressures and cost of living challenges, and they deserve to see the government's financial plan to address these issues.

Petitioners also say that delaying the presentation of the budget undermines the ability of Parliament and the public to scrutinize and debate the government's fiscal policies. Therefore, they call on the government to present a budget before the House rises this spring.

CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS

Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the second petition I am presenting is from Canadians from across the country who are concerned about recommendations 429 and 430 in the finance committee's pre-budget consultation report. These recommendations call for the removal of the charitable status of religious organizations.

The petitioners warn that this could harm faith-based charities, including food banks, seniors homes, newcomer supports, mental health programs and youth programs, all of which are vital programs rooted in our community. They note that freedom of religion is protected by the charter and that targeting these organizations based on religious beliefs erodes Canada's foundations.

Routine Proceedings

The petitioners urge the government to reject these recommendations and uphold the charitable status of faith-based organizations across the country.

EMERGENCY SERVICES

Alex Ruff (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am rising today on behalf of constituents in my riding who are petitioning the government about a common-sense idea.

While the cellphone number known as *16 is used to contact the Canadian Coast Guard in the event of water-related emergencies, it is currently voluntary and only available in some regions of Canada. Therefore, the petitioners are calling upon the Government of Canada to expand the *16 number by making it accessible Canada-wide by compelling all telecommunications companies to recognize *16 as a way to contact the Canadian Coast Guard in the event of water-related emergencies.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in light of the humanitarian crisis and genocide taking place in Gaza, the petitioners are calling for the government to publicly and unequivocally reject the militarized aid model currently used in Palestine; demand the full restoration of access for UN agencies and established humanitarian NGOs, including UNRWA and the World Food Programme; insist on safe and immediate entry for Canadian health care workers and other international humanitarian personnel to Palestine; withhold Canadian funding from any entity or model that does not comply with the principles of neutrality, impartiality, independence and humanity; and, lastly, ensure that all Canadian aid to Gaza is delivered through internationally recognized humanitarian channels.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

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

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would ask that all notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

*Government Orders***GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

● (1530)

*[English]***STRONG BORDERS ACT**

The House resumed from June 5 consideration of the motion that Bill C-2, An Act respecting certain measures relating to the security of the border between Canada and the United States and respecting other related security measures, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what a pleasure it is to rise and speak again about the importance of Bill C-2. This is a continuation of sorts.

I think it is really important for us to recognize that Bill C-2 is a very important piece of legislation. We have had discussions not necessarily on Bill C-2, but on the issues. The primary purpose of Bill C-2 is to address many of the concerns that were raised in the last election.

I think it is important that we take a more holistic approach in dealing with what has been the number one issue for the Prime Minister and, in fact, the entire Liberal caucus. I have had an opportunity to expand upon that at great length in the last few days by taking a look at Bill C-2, Bill C-5 and what the Prime Minister has been doing virtually since April 28. To give that kind of perspective allows members to get a better understanding as to why this legislation is so important for all Canadians.

It is interesting. The Canadian Police Association has come on-side, indicating that it strongly supports the legislation. That says something in itself. The other thing I would emphasize and amplify at the beginning is that Liberals are very much concerned about individual rights. In fact, it was a Liberal government that brought in the Charter of Rights. The issue of privacy is something we take very seriously, but we also want to deal with the issues that Canadians asked us to deal with specifically during the last election. Bill C-2 does that.

Let us reverse this a bit. We have the Prime Minister talking about building one Canadian economy. Where that comes from is that during the election, Canadians were concerned about Donald Trump, the tariffs and trade. Members will recall that the criticism being levelled by the President of the United States toward Canada was about the issue of fentanyl, of our borders not being secure. I remember late last year talking about how Canada has a strong healthy border. At the end of the day, the Conservatives constantly criticized the border and the efforts of the government to try to explain that we had strength within our borders.

Contrast that with Pierre Poilievre when he sat in cabinet. I have made reference to this in the past. When we talk about the border, this is the first thing that comes to mind for anyone who knows any parliamentary history over the last 20 years. When he sat in cabinet, Pierre Poilievre was part of a government that cut support to Canada's border security, hundreds of millions of dollars and hundreds of personnel.

Contrast that with the previous Justin Trudeau administration, when we saw an enhancement of border control. At the end of the day, we needed to at least deal with the issues—

An hon. member: An enhancement of food bank use.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: —by ultimately, to use one of the words the member is saying, enhancing our border security to make it even stronger. That is what Bill C-2 does. It addresses an issue that was an irritant, if I can put it that way, to Donald Trump.

● (1535)

A number of measures were put into place. Under the new Prime Minister and the new administration, we have seen a tangible investment of \$1.3 billion, a commitment of 1,000 new CBSA personnel and 1,000 additional RCMP officers. This is a tangible commitment from a budgetary measure, and it will make a difference. It addresses many concerns, providing the types of supports that are necessary, the physical supports of personnel. Extend that to what we have today: substantial legislation to complement the budgetary allotment of \$1.3 billion as an investment in providing safe and secure borders.

When I say we have to take a look at it from a bigger picture, it is all part of addressing concerns that Stephen Harper failed to deal with completely when Pierre Poilievre was around the cabinet table and the Conservative caucus, and improving upon the previous administration of Justin Trudeau. What we have now before us through this legislation is yet another aspect of building a stronger and healthier country.

The Prime Minister often talks about having the strongest country economically in the G7. This is part of that. One just needs to take a look at the highly successful G7 conference we just had, which I believe the Prime Minister handled exceptionally well. At the end of the day, we were able to talk about some of the measures that we have taken to address some of the shortcomings from the past. Support for our borders is one of them, and the military investment is another one. For how many years were we being challenged to provide military support?

All of this is important because when we are sitting at the table, it is from the point of view of strength. We can say that we have beefed up our borders by investing \$1.3 billion, introduced substantial legislation and met the United Nations's 2% GDP requirement. Issues have been raised in the past that reflect what Canada has: our natural resources and commodities and the people of Canada. We are coming from a very strong background going to the table.

That is why I believe Bill C-2 is very important. It is not just about national security. It builds upon the bigger picture of having a stronger, healthier economy in general.

Government Orders

We can take a look at some of the specifics. I made reference to the fact that the National Police Association supports the legislation, and there is a very good reason it is doing that. It is because these actions demonstrate to our local, domestic and international partners that we take our borders seriously and want to start dealing in a more tangible way with things such as fentanyl, auto theft, human trafficking, irregular migration and transnational organized crime. These are very important issues.

• (1540)

We have an administration that is very focused on and putting a great deal of energy into dealing with those issues. I look forward to this legislation passing and going to committee. I know there are people who have concerns. At the end of the day, some of that concern comes from, I would suggest, misinformation from the Conservative Party.

The best example I could give of that is something that was referenced when the bill was first brought in. I was listening to comments by members of the Conservative Party, who were saying that this legislation would allow the police and letter carriers to open up people's mail, to open any letter they want to. Most Canadians would be very surprised to find out that law enforcement agencies do not have the authority to even get a warrant to open a letter in transit. For the very first time, through this legislation, a law enforcement officer, through a general warrant that has been justified, would be able to open a letter, when it is warranted. I do not see that as an invasion of privacy, because it has to go through checks and balances and a process to protect the individual's privacy, yet it would make a substantial difference.

Imagine if anyone could put fentanyl into an envelope and mail it anywhere in the country. Under the current system, the police or a law enforcement officer could do nothing about it. Once it arrives, yes, they could, but not while it is in transit between destinations. I think most Canadians would be very surprised to hear that. Contrary to the misinformation we witnessed the other day when the Conservatives were talking about the legislation, it is not a free-for-all. Letters are still going to be confidential. It would not be a violation of privacy, but we need to protect people. There are communities in Canada that are very concerned about mail going to their communities, the illegal things that are put into envelopes. It is a legitimate concern.

We hear a lot about extortion. Last Saturday evening, I was sitting in a house on Sanderson Avenue and individuals were sharing with me stories of serious extortion. That has been raised in the House. Again, this legislation would enable additional tools for law enforcement agencies to do more in combatting extortion, child abuse or child pornography. It would allow more work to be done on the money-laundering file and other types of illegal money transactions. The legislation would allow for more communications with immigration and refugees. It would enable provinces, territories and Ottawa to do more in terms of sharing information. Canada, thinking internationally, is one of the Five Eyes countries, which allows us to share more information through different agencies. I see this as a very healthy positive.

• (1545)

For the individuals who really want to see a stronger and healthier border where Canadians will be protected more and where we can protect the integrity of our immigration system even more, dealing with asylum and things of that nature, this is good legislation. I look forward to the Conservatives recognizing that and allowing the legislation to go to committee at some point.

Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to rise on behalf of the people of Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola. Before I begin, I want to give a shout-out to somebody who helped me tremendously on my re-election campaign. I am grateful for Jesus Bondo's help.

I have to say this. I said this a couple of days ago and nothing changes.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: You say that all the time, Frank.

Frank Caputo: Now the member from Winnipeg is heckling me.

Mr. Speaker, the member is here doing a 20-minute speech. For those watching at home, we often divide our time into 10-minute speeches. He is doing a 20-minute speech while Liberals are either watching him or looking down. There are other Liberals who I am sure are all very capable. I have heard some of them speak, and yet today, crickets. I almost invite them to put up their hand and say, "Yes, I would love to speak", and I would seek unanimous consent to have them speak.

Why is it that on such an important bill, the member gets up, gives the speeches and asks all the questions? What is with the Liberal Party today that only he gets to talk on behalf of it?

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I heard the member opposite heckling me for the first five to 10 minutes of my comments. I think the member, more than anyone else, does not necessarily like to hear the truth. When it comes to truth and transparency, I am always happy to talk about the many things this government has been doing. There are many members of the Liberal caucus who have stood up and added value to the discussions and the debate. For some reason, the member seems to be offended if I decide to stand up on behalf of my caucus or my constituents to share some thoughts. He has the option: He does not have to stay in the chamber if he does not want to hear what we have to say.

[*Translation*]

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I will begin by saying that I am very pleased to see you in the Speaker's chair. However, I must also say that I would have liked to see you take part in today's debate in your former role as immigration critic. I would have liked to see someone as thorough as you participate in the debate on a bill of this nature.

Government Orders

The Liberals are concerned about borders. Finally. After 10 years, they are finally realizing that the refugee system is not working. They would not have introduced such a bill otherwise. This is obviously a step in the right direction. However, it will take time. This bill is 130 pages long, amends some 15 laws and affects at least three departments. It is going to take work, and the government will not be invoking closure.

However, there are things that can be done now, at the administrative level, as requested by the union representing border service officers. We could allow officers to patrol outside border crossings, as they are requesting. Is this a solution that could be considered?

[*English*]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, within the legislation, we will see border control agents being able to go to a warehouse and have access to it so they can inspect. There are some very progressive measures within this legislation that border control officers are no doubt very pleased about.

I think it is a holistic approach to dealing with a number of very serious issues. That is the reason why I am anticipating that, at some point, it will go to committee and we will get all sorts of presentations. If history has anything to do with it, we will see a government that is very open to ideas and thoughts in terms of how the legislation might be improved.

Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-2 would give unprecedented powers, without judicial review or a warrant, to the RCMP or CSIS to access information or demand information from any service provider in the country. It does not matter if it is someone's doctor, dentist, landlord, bank or psychiatrist. It does not matter who it is. They can demand information about when someone went to see them and for how long they have seen them. This has nothing to do with border security.

How could the member possibly defend this violation of Canadians' privacy?

● (1550)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I think that within the legislation we will find that the need to share and have access to information between departments and between agencies is something that is in fact necessary. To imply that there is no sense of accountability, or that individuals' rights and privacy would be violated, is premature at best. I think the member should read the legislation more thoroughly and not necessarily buy into everything that the members of her caucus might be espousing at this point in time.

Give the legislation a chance. We look forward to the presentations that might be made.

[*Translation*]

Abdelhaq Sari (Bourassa, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech. His explanations were truly comprehensive and he presented some very interesting ideas. It is a very interesting and different angle from what can be gleaned from the cursory reading that the opposition obviously did.

I have a very clear question for my colleague. We know that there is a major fentanyl crisis going on. Public safety and any oth-

er organizations tasked with dealing with this crisis really need to target precursor chemicals, including the components of fentanyl.

Can he elaborate on this or tell us where to find this information? How can we target the precursors that can be used to make fentanyl?

[*English*]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that within the legislation, there is a serious attempt to clamp down on clandestine drug production by stopping the flow of precursor chemicals that are used to make fentanyl. That is why I try to amplify the fact that we need to take a holistic approach, and if we do that, there are all sorts of things within the legislation that are there to protect Canadians. A lot of the fentanyl is being imported into the country in different forms, and the legislation would deal with that.

Frank Caputo: Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to rise on behalf of the people from Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola. Before I begin, I want to give a shout-out to someone who helped with my campaign: Zach Brubacher. I thank him very much for everything.

The member said last time during debate, one of the many times he spoke, or perhaps it was in a heckle, I am not sure, that Canada Post could not open our mail under this legislation without a warrant, so I am going to read him the provision, and perhaps he wants to retract that. This is at page 12 of the bill, proposed subsection 41(1): “The Corporation may open any mail if it has reasonable grounds to suspect that”.

Members will note that this would not be judicially authorized; there would be no production order and there would be no warrant, so perhaps the member would like to clarify the record here, because he has been telling people that Canada Post would need a warrant. It is not even the RCMP or a peace officer. Would he like to clarify the record on this important point, please?

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, let us flash back to the day the member is referring to. We had Conservative member after Conservative member giving the false impression that mail would be easily violated by a letter carrier or someone sorting at the mail office and so forth.

It is all part of that fear factor that the Conservatives like to do. The reality is that it is not as simple as the Conservative Party tries to portray it. There are checks that are put into place to ensure that the privacy of the individual is there. The legislation would enable a law enforcement officer to get a general warrant so they can actually open a letter while it is between destinations.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: We have time for a brief question and a brief answer.

The member for Lac-Saint-Jean.

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, I will be quick.

I asked the member for Winnipeg North a question earlier. It is not that complicated. The CBSA union wants this, the officers want this and the Bloc Québécois supports this demand: the ability to patrol between border crossings. It would not require new legislation. It could be done through regulations.

My question is, why does the government not do this right now?

There is no justification for taking so much time. It could act now, immediately. Why not do this right away?

• (1555)

[*English*]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I suspect the CBSA has, if the member is correct, approached the minister, and no doubt there would be discussions in regard to that. I would not necessarily give up hope. We have a government that is very proactive at protecting the interests of Canadians and building stronger and healthier borders.

James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honour to rise in this place, thanks to the support of the great people of Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, many of whom I have been hearing from on Bill C-2.

I will be splitting my time with the member for Edmonton Griesbach.

Conservatives have always supported toughening up our borders, and making sure that we are not just securing our borders, but protecting communities and upholding the rights of Canadians. In the last election campaign, we fought very hard, laying out a message on how to make sure we secure our borders, and that would include adding more border agents. We need at least a couple of thousand more border agents to properly police the border, and not just at ports of entry, which is all Bill C-2 would do. We want to make sure that they have the power to police the entire border, whether we are looking at illegal immigration, people who are trying to run fentanyl and other illicit drugs into our country or human trafficking. We often see illegal guns coming across the border. Of course, the bill before us does not address this in its entirety, and that is why I have some concerns.

We need to make sure that our borders are secure. In the campaign, our leader, Pierre Poilievre, talked about installing greater border surveillance, including the use of drones and towers, and more high-powered scanners at land crossings and seaports to ensure that everything that is coming into this country is looked at. This way, we would know whether there is contraband being smuggled into this country, especially the ingredients to make fentanyl and other opioids, which are creating so much tragedy in our communities and on our streets. This is really a sad part that is impacting so many families. We also need to make sure that we are scanning things leaving this country as well, but nothing in the bill addresses that. The illegal export of stolen vehicles has to stop, which means containers need to be scanned, both coming in and going out, but, again, there is nothing on that in the bill.

We are concerned that Bill C-2 does not address the issue of tracking the departures of those who are in Canada and need to leave. If they fail to meet their dates, then we are going to see that

Government Orders

they are staying Canada illegally, and they need to be deported immediately.

The bill would do nothing to toughen up penalties for repeat violent offenders. We are talking about stopping human trafficking, gun smuggling and fentanyl as the main reasons to thicken up our borders and secure them. However, the Liberals continue to support soft-on-crime policies, like making sure that repeat violent offenders have access to catch-and-release bail policies. We believe in jail, not bail, and the Liberals continue to have their multiple murder discounts on sentencing.

This is a big bill, over 130 pages, and that in itself makes it an omnibus bill. We know that Liberals have been scrambling since the election to finally take some Conservative policies and put them in their own policies. We will continue to support things that make Canada safer and more secure, but we do have a lot of concerns about how the Liberals continue to have catch-and-release bills, like Bill C-75, and in the last Parliament, Bill C-5. We want to go after gun smugglers, but the Liberals still erroneously vilify law-abiding firearms owners in this country instead of going after the criminals who are smuggling guns and increasing the penalties for gun smugglers, which they actually reduced in Bill C-5. We want to make sure that we are actually addressing that issue.

Another issue with the bill that I am hearing about is the concern we just heard in the previous question, which is that Canada Post would be given the ability to open mail without the proper charter-protected rights that would happen with judicial oversight and warrants. This is clear in the bill, as we were just talking about, in section 41 on page 12, “The Corporation may open any mail if it has reasonable grounds to suspect that...”, and then it lists those reasons, which include drug smuggling. That should be done under the authority of a warrant; Canada Post cannot just start opening up mail.

Government Orders

• (1600)

I am hearing from my constituents that they are concerned about part 11, which would limit the amount of cash deposits to \$10,000. That impacts those in the agriculture community who want to use cash because they have curbside sales or farmers markets where maybe they are selling livestock or processed meats, vegetables or other types of horticultural crops out of their yards and collecting cash from that. A strawberry U-pick will collect over \$10,000 cash easily in a day. Cash is still legal tender. There are ways we can still enforce the money laundering and terrorist financing rules in this country without going after people legitimately collecting cash in their day-to-day business activities. That was about part 4 on Canada Post and part 11 on farm gate sales.

I want to spend a little bit of time on other parts of this bill. In part 14 and part 16, the bill talks about the erosion of privacy rights and civil liberties of Canadians, which I have been hearing about from my constituents. They have been emailing and messaging me on social media. We need to address that.

In my last four minutes, I want to talk about part 5. Part 5 would amend the Oceans Act to provide coast guard services. It would include activities related to security and authorize the responsible minister to collect, analyze and disclose information and intelligence. It provides the power for “The Minister, or any other member of the King’s Privy Council for Canada designated by the Governor in Council for the purposes of this section”. This is where we are hearing about the transfer of the Canadian Coast Guard from Fisheries and Oceans Canada to the administrative powers of the Minister of National Defence. That was announced by the Prime Minister and the Minister of National Defence has talked about it. We have heard from the chief of the defence staff and the vice chief of the defence staff on what that is going to look like.

We know that the Canadian Coast Guard does not have interdiction capabilities. It is not a paramilitary organization; it is a civilian organization. It does not have guns on board. The ships have no defensive purposes at all. We must remember that the Coast Guard does search and rescue. It has a lot of scientific vessels that spend time studying our oceans. That is important and has to happen. It provides transit and transportation assistance by icebreaking in places like the St. Lawrence Seaway. That is all important work that the Coast Guard does. However, it is hard to make the argument that that is in the interest of national security or national defence.

This is just another exercise by the Liberals in creative accounting to move government spending from one department into National Defence without actually increasing the capabilities of the Canadian Armed Forces. They are not talking about changing the Coast Guard fleet to have them armed up. They are not talking about having the sailors and crew of the Canadian Coast Guard actually be trained up to use sidearms.

We know right now that if the Coast Guard comes across somebody smuggling contraband, such as illegal drugs, they have to call the RCMP to come on board to then do the interdiction of those vessels. It is the same thing if the Coast Guard were to see somebody illegally fishing. They would have to call conservation officers with Fisheries and Oceans to come on board to do the interdiction.

They would also, if they come across somebody who entered our waters illegally, either because they are smuggling humans or they got lost, call Canada Border Services to come in to process those individuals and do the interdiction.

The Coast Guard has absolutely no policing powers or ability to do those interdictions on their own, and it is erroneous to think that the Coast Guard provides any type of security purposes underneath the NATO construct. I would just caution the government that if it is going to try to count all of the Coast Guard's budget under National Defence, then it has to change the organization so that it can provide those broader services that have been talked about. The bill talks about how the Coast Guard is going to “support departments, boards and agencies of the Government of Canada through the provision of ships, aircraft and other services; and” “security, including security patrols and the collection, analysis and disclosure of information or intelligence”.

The Coast Guard does not have that skill set right now. It does not have that ability. The government needs to come clean with Canadians. It needs to come clean with NATO and our allies to explain how it can take a civilian organization and decide this is something that really will improve our national security and our national defence, and will actually increase the lethality and kinetic power of the Canadian Armed Forces, which we know right now, after the last Liberal decade, have been broken by the Liberals.

• (1605)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the member's comments in regard to the military and in regard to law enforcement versus the Coast Guard. I know he was the parliamentary secretary to the Conservative minister of defence a number of years back.

Is this an issue that was ever raised within the Conservative government? If so, could he maybe share with the House whether it is the Conservative position or his own personal position in regard to what direction he would take the Coast Guard?

James Bezan: Mr. Speaker, what I am commenting on is that the government plans on moving the Coast Guard under the direction of the Minister of National Defence without actually talking about how they are going to make it a security agency, which it is not; it is a civilian organization.

This is something that needs to be clearly identified. It needs to describe how this would count towards the NATO 2%, when the Coast Guard currently has no capabilities to provide that security apparatus. If they are going to now start putting either RCMP and/or National Defence personnel on board and arm up those ships, then we are talking about something completely different and we need to understand what that is.

[*Translation*]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have a simple question for my colleague.

Government Orders

In his opinion, why did it take the government so long to even lift a finger? As my colleague from Lac-Saint-Jean said earlier, this could have been done through an order or a decision by the government, rather than through the long process of passing a bill. All it needed to do was take immediate action at the border.

Why did it take President Trump bringing out the big guns for the government to decide to do this? Why did it wait so long? People inside and outside the House were sounding the alarm.

[*English*]

James Bezan: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the member to the national defence committee with me. We are both serving as vice-chairs on the national defence committee.

I know there has been much debate about how the Liberals have failed on the border, how they ignored illegal migration, like we saw at Roxham Road and Emerson, Manitoba. They welcomed everybody with open arms rather than actually trying to fix the third party agreement. It took them seven years before they finally fixed the third party agreement with the United States so that this type of illegal migration would stop.

We are back in a similar situation. They waited until Donald Trump started yelling at Canada, especially under Justin Trudeau, to do something about the border to act. They have had a decade here, and have completely ignored it. Either they ran out of ideas or they are just completely incompetent.

Pat Kelly (Calgary Crowfoot, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for bringing to the House's attention the issue around merely transferring the ministry under which the Coast Guard operates from one department to defence without actually increasing or enhancing the defence capabilities of Canada.

Taking a civilian force that undertakes civilian activity and bringing it under the authority of the Minister of National Defence does not make it a defence organization. We know the vital importance of the Coast Guard, but in order to make it a military force that increases Canada's defence capability, it needs to change.

I would like the member to comment further on that.

James Bezan: Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Coast Guard does play an important role. If the Liberals were going to move it over to National Defence and start transitioning it to be a paramilitary organization to actually be able to do interdictions and border security, I would be very supportive of that.

However, right now, I just want to know if this is anything that means anything in National Defence, or is this just more creative accounting by the Liberals, taking expenditures out of other departments, ramming them under National Defence like they have for the last seven years, and trying to say that is how we are going to reach 2%?

This does not increase the capabilities and operational readiness of the Canadian Armed Forces in any way, shape or form. We actually need to see investment in the kinetic equipment that is so desperately needed, like new planes, tanks, LAVs and ships. The Liberals are dragging their feet every time they step up; they fail to make a difference.

• (1610)

Kerry Diotte (Edmonton Griesbach, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to give my first full speech here in this hallowed hall. It is amazing to be back. Some will likely remember that I was a Conservative member of Parliament from 2015 to 2021. With this being my first full speech since coming back, I would like to quickly thank a few people who directly helped me, especially the people of Edmonton Griesbach.

Politics truly is a team sport, and I am humbled and grateful to each and every person who helped on this amazing journey to defeat the NDP and turn Edmonton Griesbach Tory blue once again. I have always hated the colour orange, anyway. I do not think I have any of it in my wardrobe.

There were hundreds who played a part in the win. That included 1,200 people who bought Conservative Party memberships from me and my team. The nomination campaign itself took a ton of work and dedication. My team and I knocked on thousands of doors and made thousands of calls, weekdays and weekends, for a year and a half. I thank my team members for that. I am also grateful for my Conservative MP colleagues, some of whom are in this very room, who helped out on this campaign and helped us win the main campaign.

Of course, thanks goes to my wife Clare Denman, who has always worked right at my side on all campaigns. Most of all, I am grateful to all the voters of Edmonton Griesbach, who once again chose me to represent them in Ottawa. I can promise that I will always represent them to the best of my ability, regardless of who they voted for. They can reach out to me and my office anytime they need assistance. We are at their service.

There is nothing I like better than knocking on doors in politics. That gives a person the very best feedback possible about what issues are most important to people, and sometimes we get it in very colourful language. In this latest campaign, I heard loud and clear that people were eager for change. They were worried about this country. The biggest fear I heard at the doors is about the rapid rise in crime over the last Liberal decade. This crime threatens all Canadians, but let us talk about the crime facing just the city of Edmonton.

Here are a few of the headlines from a search I did on Google in just the last two months. I searched for "crime in Edmonton" and got these troubling headlines from news stories: "Killing of woman, 27, the latest in cluster of Edmonton homicide files"; "Police investigate homicide of woman fatally stabbed in central Edmonton"; "Police looking for information about shooting in southeast Edmonton"; "Two males- a 14-year-old and a 17-year-old were injured"; "Edmonton man guilty of torching homes in Alberta Avenue area; court heard fires were set at behest of notorious slain landlord".

Government Orders

I found more headlines: “Death of man found unconscious in northeast Edmonton considered homicide”; “Four men charged in connection to 2020 homicide in south Edmonton”; “Edmonton youth, 15, arrested for terrorism-related offence for alleged ties to 764 online network”. I found even more headlines: “Suspect wanted in connection to 2022 nightclub killing also charged in fatal 2020 shooting”; “Second-degree murder conviction in shooting that left victim dying outside Edmonton homeless shelter for 27 hours”; “Woman facing murder charges after two others stabbed in central Edmonton”; “Two men charged with first-degree murder after fatal Edmonton shooting”.

That is quite a lot of shocking headlines. The concern about crime is something I heard time and time again at the doors during the last election campaign. I asked folks, “Don't you think the primary responsibly of a government is to make sure its citizens are safe, that they can walk around in their communities day and night safely?” Folks heartily agreed with that, but the Liberals across the floor have done nothing to truly protect us. Their soft-on-crime, turn-the-other-cheek attitude is a hopeless failure. They continue to defend Trudeau's Bill C-5 and Bill C-75, despite the fact that those bills have unleashed a crime wave. That is evident from the headlines I just read. If people want to see the result, they just need to go to downtown Edmonton and look around, or check out the challenges we are seeing in Edmonton's Chinatown.

• (1615)

Rampant, open drug use and social disorder are literally killing mom-and-pop businesses. People can ride the city's light rail transit at night, if they dare. I was at a community event in our riding of Edmonton Griesbach just the other weekend. I asked people to raise their hand if they feel safe walking in their community alone at night and to raise their hand if they feel safe riding transit alone. In the whole audience, nobody put up their hand, that I could see, except two Edmonton city councillors and a lone NDP MLA. People deserve better. They deserve to be safe in their communities.

We Conservatives will continue to push Liberals to stop coddling criminals and to push for jail, not bail, for violent repeat offenders, as well as stand up for the rights of victims, not criminals. Despite all of this evidence of the crime wave facing Canadians, the Liberal government is still avoiding the key causes of it. The catch-and-release bail system is a big problem. Instead of addressing that, the Liberal government is going after people's civil liberties.

Bill C-2 would give the government the power to search people's mail, on a whim. This does not help catch criminals. This bill is referred to as the strong borders act, but there is poison aplenty in it. It would make a host of changes the government did not run on in the last election campaign, such as those dealing with immigration. There are so many problems that I do not even have time to address them all. The Liberals will probably respond to my speech claiming that Conservatives do not care about strong border protection because we dare to criticize their beloved bill, but it is their government that oversaw a 632% increase in U.S. Border Patrol encounters of people illegally attempting to enter the United States from Canada. This bill would not make Canadians safer. Breaching our civil liberties by searching our mail for fentanyl is not the solution. If the Liberals really wanted fentanyl off the streets, why would they not punish the criminals supplying it? If they really cared

about safety, why would then not bring in mandatory prison sentences for fentanyl traffickers?

We are once again in a crisis created by the Liberal government, which seems clueless on how to fix its own mistakes. Voters nationwide wanted change from the 10 years of Liberal failures led by Justin Trudeau. Eight million people voted for our Conservative candidates, but in the end, the Liberals won a minority government. Voters were told that this election really was not a fourth term for Justin Trudeau's Liberals, but just because they say that something is not true, does not make it so. My dad used to always warn me about people who over-promise and under-deliver. He would say, “Son, mark my words, be careful of carnies who make big promises.” He was talking about circus carnies. He always warned me not to get fooled by hucksters at carnivals.

The Liberals need to deliver on their election promises. I promise that Conservatives will keep pushing them to do so.

The Deputy Speaker: Before we go to questions and comments, just as a reminder to members, especially veteran, returning members, we cannot do indirectly what we cannot do directly, including making references to the Prime Minister's last name in a different occupation that may or may not be happening in certain environments.

The member for Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas has the floor.

• (1620)

John-Paul Danko (Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that the member from Edmonton raised the issue of his observations of crime in his community: gun crime, violent crime and numerous other troubling incidents along with public safety issues.

I was just in Edmonton about a month ago and, to be honest, it reminded me a lot of Hamilton with very similar issues. Certainly the federal government has a role to play, as do municipalities. I know the member opposite was a former municipal mayor as well. Both Alberta and Ontario are Conservative-run provinces. What role does the member see provinces having in combatting crime in partnership with the federal government and municipalities?

Government Orders

Kerry Diotte: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for that promotion. I was actually a city councillor, but I did run for mayor at one time.

We all have to play a part in it, but certainly the federal government has a great deal of power to do something about crime. One of the things that really galls a lot of people in my riding is that they see violent people being released on bail only to reoffend. That is one thing that the federal government has a direct role in doing something about, and we need it to do something about it. People are constantly telling me this.

[*Translation*]

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-2 has several parts and amends a number of laws. Among other things, it allows for the inspection of goods destined for export. This is a welcome measure, in our opinion, because we remember that it was one of the reasons for the lack of action in fighting auto theft, particularly at the port of Montreal.

However, there is not a single word about increasing the number of customs officers. The customs officers' union told us there is a shortage of 2,000 to 3,000 officers, and there is every indication the government will not be able to adequately inspect all exports in order to fight auto theft.

I would like to hear my colleague's thoughts on that.

[*English*]

Kerry Diotte: Mr. Speaker, yes, again, it is one thing to try to go after fentanyl coming in through the mail, but the real problem is that it is coming in through containers and so forth, and so are the precursor chemicals. This whole thing of finding fentanyl in the mail is a tiny fraction of what is inflicting this country. We really need to look at the container vessels and start inspecting. They just need to do a job inspecting.

Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to rise on behalf of the people from Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola. I want to give a shout-out to somebody who helped my campaign a tremendous amount, and that was Mr. Spencer Paul. I thank Spencer.

To my hon. colleague, I wonder if he would agree with my sentiment, which is that the Liberals have allowed a porous border and, at the same time, have not dealt with guns, trafficking or bail, yet none of these things are in the bill. It is like they have created a mess and put an omnibus bill here before us. Does he not see it as a bit rich that the Liberals are also not dealing with the things they have created and made a mess of?

Kerry Diotte: Mr. Speaker, I would certainly concur. When the Liberals talk about guns, it is always the law-abiding gun owner who takes the brunt of their interference. Those are not the people who are causing the crime. My colleague is quite right. We need to go after the real criminals and stop coddling them, which the Liberals seem to love to do.

The Deputy Speaker: Before we go to resuming debate, I have a reminder for members that the length of speeches will now be adjusted, pursuant to Standing Order 43 and Standing Order 74. There will be 10-minute speeches with five minutes of questions and

comments, which means members do not need to say they are sharing their time.

Resuming debate, the member for Pickering—Brooklin.

• (1625)

Juanita Nathan (Pickering—Brooklin, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House for the first time in debate. I am filled with a profound sense of gratitude and humility to represent the constituents of Pickering—Brooklin, a diverse and thriving community encompassing the entirety of the city of Pickering, as well as the northern region of Ajax and Whitby, including the vibrant community of Brooklin. I am deeply honoured by the trust the people have placed in me. This is not merely a privilege but also a solemn obligation.

I pledge to discharge my duties with integrity and diligence and to bring the voices, aspirations and concerns of my constituents to the chamber with the same commitment that guided my many years of service as a school board trustee and as a city councillor. As I take my place in the chamber, I do so with deep awareness of the challenges and the responsibilities that lie ahead, not only for me personally but for all of us entrusted with public office.

The people of Pickering—Brooklin, like so many Canadians, are proud of their communities, hopeful for their future and clear-eyed about the realities that we may confront. Among these, few issues are as urgent or as foundational to our national well-being as the safety and security of our borders and our neighbourhoods. These matters strike at the core of public trust, community confidence and national sovereignty. It is with this sense of purpose that I will address the critical importance of strengthening border security and enhancing public safety for the families and communities I am honoured to represent.

Pickering—Brooklin is a tapestry of natural beauty, growth and resilience. From the shores of Frenchman's Bay, Pickering's crown jewel, to the legacy of the Whitby sports park in Brooklin, our riding is a place where families build lives, businesses thrive and communities unite, but with growth comes responsibility. For decades I have fought at the local level to ensure that schools, neighbourhoods and services meet the needs of the people I serve. Today I bring that same tenacity to Ottawa.

Let me begin with Frenchman's Bay, a treasure that defines Pickering's identity. This is a once-a-generation opportunity, and the federal government must partner with our community to secure its future. By supporting the purchase and preservation of the bay, we can protect its ecological integrity, expand public access and ensure that it remains a sanctuary for generations to come. This is not just a local priority; it is a national imperative. Healthy waterways and rich third places are the lifeblood of our environment, our economy and our collective heritage.

Government Orders

Equally urgent is the fate of the federal lands, the Pickering airport lands. These lands must not sit idle. I will advocate fiercely for their transfer to the Rouge urban national alliance, ensuring that they become part of a protected green corridor that combats urban sprawl, mitigates climate change and guarantees sustainable growth. Let me be clear that this is not about halting progress; it is about redefining it: progress that respects our ecosystems, honours our commitment to future generations and prioritizes people over pavement.

Progress also means security. Every single day, police and border service agents across the country put their life on the line to keep us safe. Day in and day out, law enforcement identifies, mitigates and neutralizes threats to our communities. On behalf of Canadians, I would like to thank law enforcement personnel for their service and for keeping us and our country safe.

However, it is not enough to thank them for their work; we must give them the tools and resources they need to effectively do their job. Just looking at the data from Durham region alone, we see that the need for such measures is very clear. From 2021 to 2023, vehicle theft in the region increased by 100%, with over 1,500 vehicles reported stolen in 2023 alone. In response, Durham Regional Police Service launched Project Attire, a dedicated unit focusing on auto theft investigations. In its first year, the project conducted 865 investigations, laid 341 charges and recovered over 50% of stolen vehicles. Despite these efforts, the region continues to face challenges, including a 13% increase in carjacking in 2024 alone.

● (1630)

This is exactly what we are doing through the stronger borders act: The bill would keep Canadians safe by ensuring law enforcement has the right tools to keep our borders secure, combat transnational organized crime, stop the flow of illegal fentanyl and crack-down on money laundering. It would bolster our response to increasingly sophisticated criminal networks and enhance the integrity and fairness of our immigration system, all while protecting Canadian privacy and charter rights.

I strongly believe that Bill C-2 is exactly what Pickering—Brooklin needs, a step forward that reflects our values, meets the moment and secures a better future for our country.

The Canadian Police Association, the largest law enforcement advocacy organization in Canada, has expressed support for the bill. It has stated, “this proposed legislation would provide critical new tools for law enforcement, border services, and intelligence agencies to address transnational organized crime, auto theft, firearms and drug trafficking, and money laundering.” The Canadian Vehicle Manufacturers’ Association supports the strong borders act for giving CBSA and law enforcement stronger tools to fight auto theft and stop stolen vehicles from being exported.

Similarly, the Future Borders Coalition calls the bill a vital step towards modernizing border security, especially through improved data-sharing and offender travel notifications that enhance public safety. Finally, the Canadian Centre for Child Protection, a national charity dedicated to the personal safety of all children, has stated that the changes proposed in the strong borders act “would reduce barriers Canadian police face when investigating the growing number of online crimes against children”.

When developing the legislation that is now before the House, the government had three major objectives: secure the border, combat transnational organized crime and fentanyl, and disrupt illicit financing. To secure the border, we propose to amend the Customs Act to compel transporters and warehouse operators to provide access to their premises to allow for export inspection by CBSA officers, and require owners and operators of certain ports of entry and exit to provide facilities for export inspections, just as they currently do for imports.

We are proposing to amend the Oceans Act to add security-related activities, such as countering criminal activity and drug trafficking, and enable the Canadian Coast Guard to conduct security patrols and share information with security, defence and intelligence partners. We will also amend the sex offenders act regulations to enhance the ability of law enforcement agencies to share information collected under the act with domestic and international partners.

Amendments to the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act and Department of Citizenship and Immigration Act would secure and extend legislative authorities to cancel, suspend or vary immigration documents and cancel or suspend processes of new applicants en masse for reasons determined to be in the public interest. Amendments would also allow IRCC to disclose immigration information for the purpose of co-operation with federal partners and to uphold the integrity and fairness of the asylum system, including by streamlining the intake, processing and adjudication of claims.

I could go on. The proposed bill has documentation and comments about modernizing legislation and equipping law enforcement with necessary tools to combat transnational organized crime in an increasingly complex threat environment.

As all members of the chamber can see, the strong borders act is a key and comprehensive component of our new government’s plan to build a safe and more secure Canada. I am asking all parties to support this important legislation.

Helena Konanz (Similkameen—South Okanagan—West Kootenay, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my constituents are contacting me. They are extremely worried about the bill’s allowing their mail to be opened. Some of the other speakers said there are checklists to prevent that.

Government Orders

Could the member explain who is going to decide who can or cannot open my mail?

• (1635)

Juanita Nathan: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Canada Post Corporation Act, the bill would remove barriers that prevent police from searching the mail where authorized to do so. Where authorized to do so, it would be with a warrant. I would like the member to let her constituents know to rest assured that a warrant would still be needed.

[*Translation*]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the same question that I asked another member earlier.

Why did it take Donald Trump pulling out the big guns for the government to finally start doing something? People had been sounding the alarm in the House and elsewhere. Why is the government taking action now, especially when it could be done much faster than with this bill, as my colleague from Lac-Saint-Jean said earlier?

[*English*]

Juanita Nathan: Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we are doing here. Canadians sent us here to deliver meaningful legislation that protects our families, our communities and our future. In Pickering—Brooklin, residents are deeply concerned about rising crimes, car thefts and the exploitation of young children through human trafficking.

That is why the Liberals are supporting the bill, and we are hoping the opposition will support the bill as well. That is why we are here for hours debating the bill, so it can pass soon. I hope my hon. colleague will support the bill.

[*Translation*]

Bienvenu-Olivier Ntumba (Mont-Saint-Bruno—L'Acadie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague for her fine presentation in support of Bill C-2. I would like to ask my colleague the following question: How does she think that this bill will protect Canadians?

[*English*]

Juanita Nathan: Mr. Speaker, like I said, the bill is here to protect us in three different ways. It is here to secure our borders so any trafficking, car theft and border security issues can be combated; to combat transnational organized crimes and fentanyl coming in and out of the country; and to disrupt illicit financing. This is what we have heard about at the doors, and our government is acting swiftly. I am really hoping the opposition will support the bill.

Rhonda Kirkland (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the member opposite on her win in my region, the Durham region, and I echo her kudos and the good things she had to say about Durham Regional Police Service officers, who work hard in our community and always have our back.

I would say that I feel like what is missing in the bill are the items needed to have the officers' back. They have our back every day. With respect to the bail reforms and the things that are necessary that are missing from the bill, does the member have a com-

ment on those so we can make sure people are not out on bail before the police are done writing their reports?

Juanita Nathan: Mr. Speaker, bail reform is very important, and it is one of our election commitments as well. When we sit again in the fall, I would assure my colleague, they will see the bail reform come through.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Brandon—Souris, Finance; the hon. member for Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, Firearms; the hon. member for Portage—Lisgar, Public Services and Procurement.

• (1640)

[*English*]

Michael Ma (Markham—Unionville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to be here speaking on behalf of the people of Markham—Unionville.

Today, we are discussing a bill framed around creating strong borders, yet somehow, it does so much more and so much less than its stated goal. We have a 140-page border bill that somehow also pushes for warrantless access to information about Internet subscribers. If this is the case, the Liberals are pushing for an expansive definition of strong borders. However, in earlier questions about the bill, when we, the official opposition, critiqued elements that could be added to it, our efforts were denied because the Liberals cited a narrow definition of this being merely a borders bill. Which is it? A borders bill that has extensive unlawful access provisions is clearly a bill that can include more real community safety elements, so let us touch on that.

To Conservatives, strong borders mean being tough on drugs across the entire supply chain. This includes drug production, not just drug trafficking. This includes drug producers, not just drug traffickers. In short, it is not just about the substances, but about the actors who are involved.

When we are talking about actors, we need real consequences for the perpetrators of these acts of social destruction. We need mandatory minimum sentences, not bail, when the issue is about fentanyl. How can a borders bill request warrantless access to Internet subscriber information and not also have strong measures against the fentanyl problem? An expansive definition of a strong border requires a holistic tackling of the fentanyl supply chain.

Unfortunately, even if Bill C-2 passes, Canadians will still be left with the unsafe society that the Liberals legislated into being. We live in a society where fentanyl traffickers have no mandatory minimums and can receive bail and where house arrest is considered a worthy punishment for the monsters who are killing our community.

Government Orders

Conservatives will keep repeating this one simple fact until the Liberals hear us: It takes only two milligrams of fentanyl to kill a single Canadian. If members understand this simple fact, anyone trafficking over 40 milligrams of fentanyl should be considered no different than a mass murderer who guns down 20 people. However, the Liberals want these people to walk free on bail and have a comfortable time under house arrest. They will not punish people on the same level as mass murders, yet they have the audacity to want warrantless access to our Internet information in their borders bill.

Are we truly talking about a borders bill? To Conservatives, a strong border means being tough on crime in order to secure the safety of our hard-working communities. From 2015 through 2023, total violent crime was up 50%, total homicides were up 28%, gang-related homicides were up about 78% and total violent firearms offences were up about 116%, which has increased for nine consecutive years.

Just as with fentanyl traffickers, we want to see a similar approach for firearms traffickers and the gun-wielding gangsters they serve. We want mandatory minimums, we want an end to bail for these particular offences and we want an end to house arrest. However, we live in a world where the Liberals have legislated an easy time for repeat offenders while launching a crusade against legal gun owners.

● (1645)

I have established what the bill does not have but should. Let me now outline what is has but probably should not.

The strong borders bill apparently finds the need to encroach upon norms we hold dear for our civil liberties. We are deeply concerned that the bill would grant people the ability to open our mail without our consent. We are deeply concerned that the bill would compel Internet companies to hand over our private data without our consent. We are further concerned that the bill even attempts to interfere in how Canadians use cash. Do the Liberals wish for a 100% digital economy?

A world where the Liberals can encroach upon cash transactions and, further, have the ability to access our private digital information leads to a world where they will eventually have complete oversight over our transactions. Is this necessary for a strong borders bill? Does this make us true north strong and free? No, it never can. The bill would curtail the freedoms of hard-working Canadians while letting repeat criminals walk free on bail. This is madness made legal.

If Bill C-2 is going to be a narrowly defined borders bill that has no room to address our drug and gun issues, it is definitely a bill that has no room for warrantless access to our mail and Internet data while limiting our capacity to use cash. However, because it is clearly a bill with an expansive definition of what constitutes a strong border, we Conservatives have some recommendations that require inclusion.

We have four points that merit consideration. One, a strong border means toughening penalties for repeat violent offenders. Two, a strong border means ending catch-and-release bail and house arrest for fentanyl traffickers and gun gangsters. Three, a strong border

means eliminating the multiple murder discount in sentencing. Four, a strong border means tackling drug issues holistically, prioritizing treatment over drug distribution to support those battling addiction.

What we need is a strong borders bill that will take public safety seriously while also protecting Canadian freedoms. What we have instead is a bill that does not address the core problems on the drug and crime files while completely disrespecting the freedoms that Canadians hold dear. Bill C-2 is an omnibus bill that falls well short of protecting Canadians while overreaching on our civil liberties.

Doug Eyolfson (Winnipeg West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member made reference to the warrantless opening of mail. I have to ask, what part of the police obtaining warrants to open mail, the same way that now happens with services such as FedEx and Purolator, did the member not understand?

Michael Ma: Mr. Speaker, the point the member made is not in the bill. The bill would allow the Canada Post Corporation to access mail without going through a standard police warrant process, and that in itself is a problem for Canadians overall.

[*Translation*]

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I will go back to the question that I asked our hon. colleague, because I unfortunately did not get an answer.

The Customs and Immigration Union says that there is a shortage of 2,000 to 3,000 officers and that the government will clearly not be able to properly inspect all exports to combat auto theft.

I would like to know what my hon. colleague thinks.

● (1650)

[*English*]

Michael Ma: Mr. Speaker, certainly, the borders bill needs to address both the resources and the legislation.

Government Orders

As the member points out, many cases of auto theft go unnoticed. Cars get loaded on trailers and ships, and they exit the country without being noticed. A strong borders bill needs to build in factors that will enable and enhance our police capabilities and our border security to protect against theft outside of the country and protect us from the improper import of guns and drugs, especially fentanyl, into the country.

Michael Guglielmin (Vaughan—Woodbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, does my hon. colleague have any examples from his riding where constituents may have a problem with being banned from using \$10,000 in cash?

Michael Ma: Mr. Speaker, there are examples. I heard during our campaigning this year that there are concerns about transactions. The point being made is that cash is very much part of our society, and there are companies that work on the basis of not wanting to pay credit card fees and so forth. To legislate and force all transactions to go through credit cards and electronic means is just not practical for small and medium enterprises.

Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the bill is purported to be a measure to address border security, fentanyl, car theft and so on, yet the Conservatives, of course, cancelled the port police, which caused part of the problem. The Liberals have been in government for 10 years, and they have not restored the port police.

In my riding of Vancouver East, we see the drugs coming in and see the crime, which are impacting our country, so my question to the member is this: Would he support the call to bring back the port police for border security?

Michael Ma: Mr. Speaker, what we need to look at is the whole border bill, what it entails and, as I mentioned earlier, the expanded definition in the bill. Would it just address certain portions of the border or would it address more? I ask because previously I have questioned the hon. minister, and while it seems the bill is very restrictive, some of the definitions have become very expansive. That is why in my question earlier, I said the bill goes everywhere but addressing its actual needs.

Vince Gasparro (Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State (Combating Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am thankful for the opportunity to speak to Bill C-2, the strong borders act.

I want to begin by thanking our dedicated officers from the Canada Border Services Agency, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and our frontline men and women who serve within our local police forces, as well as those who serve within our national security apparatus. I thank all of them for their service and their commitment to keeping us all safe.

Our border is maintained through rigorous enforcement, advanced technology and strong domestic and international partnerships. Although there is more to be done, this new government was elected in part to take concrete action in order to keep Canadians safe. This is why the bill in front of us, the strong borders act, is so important.

The bill would ensure that law enforcement has the necessary tools to keep our borders secure, combat transnational organized crime, stop the flow of illegal fentanyl and crack down on illicit financing and money laundering more broadly. These measures would bolster our response to increasingly sophisticated criminal

networks while ensuring that we protect Canadians' privacy and charter rights.

One of the key goals of this bill is to strengthen the government's effort against illicit financing and money laundering. We know that money laundering supports and perpetuates criminal activity by allowing criminals, such as fentanyl traffickers, to profit from their illicit activities and then reinvest in their criminal enterprises.

This makes strong and effective anti-money laundering controls a critical component of keeping Canadians safe. Bill C-2 would strengthen Canada's anti-money laundering and anti-terrorist financing regime through stronger penalties for financial crimes and by addressing the most prevalent forms of money laundering.

It would enhance public-to-private information sharing and strengthen the supervision and compliance of financial institutions and other businesses and professionals with anti-money laundering obligations.

The strong borders act proposes a comprehensive set of amendments to the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act to ensure that businesses and professionals regulated by the act are effective in detecting and deterring money laundering. This means strengthening the administrative monetary penalty framework through increased civil and criminal penalties while establishing safeguards for small businesses so they are not disproportionately penalized.

The strong borders act would enhance compliance program requirements and enforcement. It also means punishing serious criminal non-compliance by increasing the limits for all criminal fines 10 times. The stronger penalties proposed for non-compliance would better align Canada with other countries, including the United States and the European Union.

The strong borders act would also introduce a new offence for the provision of false information to the Financial Transactions and Reports Analysis Centre of Canada, more commonly known as FINTRAC.

We will strengthen the anti-money laundering framework and support the fight against financial crime more broadly—

Government Orders

• (1655)

The Deputy Speaker: I have to interrupt the member. I have a point of order from the official opposition deputy whip.

Hon. Rob Moore: Mr. Speaker, my apologies for the interruption, but the hon. member has referred to a “new government”. The government has been in power for the last decade. I am wondering if he might correct that.

The Deputy Speaker: That is a matter of debate.

I will let the parliamentary secretary continue.

Vince Gasparro: Mr. Speaker, we will strengthen the anti-money laundering framework and support the fight against financial crime more broadly.

We will require reporting entities or business professionals who have obligations under the Proceeds of Crime and Terrorist Financing Act to enrol with FINTRAC if they have not already done so. Enrolment would provide FINTRAC with accurate and up-to-date information on the businesses it regulates, supporting risk management efforts and improved communication. It would also enable FINTRAC disclosures to Elections Canada to detect and deter illicit financing and foreign interference in Canadian elections.

The strong borders act addresses common and dangerous types of money laundering, including through new restrictions on large cash transactions and third party deposits where someone deposits money into an account that is not their own. We will make the rules clearer for how the public sector and private sector can share information with each other to help spot and stop money laundering.

Finally, the bill introduces amendments to the Proceeds of Crime and Terrorist Financing Act and the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions Act to foster a more integrated approach and strengthen coordination among federal financial oversight agencies, reinforcing Canada's high compliance standards. These amendments would improve inter-agency coordination and communication. Specifically, bringing FINTRAC's knowledge and expertise to assist our government's financial intelligence by sharing and receiving information. We will strengthen the oversight of our financial institutions in the fight against illicit financing and money laundering.

These measures are in addition to and in support of the government's establishment of the integrated money laundering intelligence partnership with Canada's largest banks. This partnership will enhance our capacity to use financial intelligence tools to combat fentanyl trafficking and other forms of organized crime. Frankly, it will allow us to cut off the flow of illicit financing and go after the bad guys.

With these significant anti-money laundering provisions, the government is addressing the long-standing concerns stakeholders have raised in recent years. Some of these stakeholders are loud supporters of the bill. They include the National Police Federation, which stated it was “encouraged by provisions that strengthen lawful access to digital evidence, [and] improve collaboration with FINTRAC and financial institutions”. It also said that it is clear “that public safety is a top priority for this new government.”

Even the Canadian Police Association, the voice of over 60,000 frontline officers, has said that the legislation would “strengthen the ability of police to investigate and disrupt complex criminal networks by enhancing anti-money laundering enforcement,” and that “Bill C-2 would give police services the legal tools needed to respond more effectively to evolving threats.”

Transnational organized crime groups are consistently adapting to new technology and adapting new methods of criminality, and we must ensure our law enforcement and national security agencies can adapt as well. That is why the new government is being thoughtful in its approach to legislation. For example, we are proposing closing a loophole that has allowed law enforcement to open mail from FedEx and UPS, but not from Canada Post. Currently, drug traffickers can exploit this gap by shipping fentanyl in small quantities through Canada Post, beyond the reach of interception. The proposed strong borders act would change that by authorizing Canada Post to open mail with a warrant.

Previous governments have focused on the root causes of crime, and as Liberals, it is the new government that will continue that responsibility and that work. Our government, this new government, is both tough on the underlying causes of crime and tough on crime itself. By cracking down on illicit financing and money laundering, we will be tough on crime by making it more difficult for groups to fund their criminal enterprises, including the trade in illegal fentanyl, drugs, firearms and other forms of smuggling and trafficking.

• (1700)

It is just one of the many ways that the new government is taking the fight to the bad guys to keep our communities safe. I think we can all agree that there is no more important priority for us as—

Kurt Holman: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The member opposite mentioned “the new government” again.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. This is the second member, within a 10-minute speech, who has stood up on a ridiculous point of order, disrupting a member's speech. Members do all sorts of things with their speeches. I think it is very disturbing to hear that, and it can work both ways. I would ask members to not interrupt when a member is delivering a speech.

The Deputy Speaker: I thank the parliamentary secretary for his intervention. I thank the member for London—Fanshawe. Those are all matters of debate.

I will let the parliamentary secretary to the secretary of state for combatting crime finish his speech.

Vince Gasparro: Mr. Speaker, I think we can all agree that there is no more important priority for us as lawmakers than to keep Canadian communities and everyone who lives in them as safe as possible from crime. Every Canadian deserves to live on a safe street and with a strong and secure border. That is why I call on my hon. colleagues on both sides of the House to join me in supporting the strong borders act and getting it passed as quickly as possible. I look forward to their support.

Andrew Lawton (Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the hon. parliamentary secretary made, in a throw-away comment, the claim that Canada Post's powers under the bill to open mail unilaterally would be subject to a warrant. I have studied the bill, and I even looked at it just after the member said that. The word “warrant” does not appear once in part 4 of the act, which deals with the powers of Canada Post. It says very clearly “the corporation”, referring to Canada Post. There is no reference to police, no reference to courts and no reference to warrants.

Will the member please point to precisely where a warrant would be required for this authority?

Vince Gasparro: Mr. Speaker, it is not necessarily just in that particular section. I am actually a little surprised, because the hon. member wrote a great book about a politician who got blown out in his seat, and he is quite smart. I have a lot of respect for you. I am a little surprised that you would allow and be okay with a loophole with UPS and FedEx—

• (1705)

Andrew Lawton: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am happy to chat with the member. He is speaking to me directly by using the word “you”, and in doing so, not answering the question.

The Deputy Speaker: I thank the member for that point of order. Yes, it is a reminder that members speak through the Chair to keep it neutral.

I will let the parliamentary secretary finish.

Vince Gasparro: Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of respect for the hon. member. The fact is, I know there is no world in which he would want there to be a loophole between collecting data from UPS and FedEx and collecting it from Canada Post.

[*Translation*]

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the member for Eglinton—Lawrence on his election. He seems like a serious parliamentarian who wants to work constructively. That is exactly how the Bloc Québécois operates. We work constructively on bills.

This bill is going to take time. It will require thorough and rigorous study. In the meantime, we have proposals that could help us now at the border.

There is something I want to ask. The Bloc Québécois has made a proposal that responds to the request of the union representing border services officers. Our proposal is to give officers the power to patrol outside border crossings, as the union is calling for. It could be done through regulations right away.

Would my colleague agree that the government could take immediate action by making regulations to allow this? There would be

Government Orders

no need to make new legislation. In any case, we will study the bill thoroughly. Does my colleague agree that the government could take action now through regulations giving border services officers more powers?

[*English*]

Vince Gasparro: Mr. Speaker, the member's question was very thoughtful. The fact of the matter is, we are taking action now. The piece of legislation before us has the support of all the largest law enforcement organizations in the country. When the Canadian Police Association, which is the voice of 60,000 frontline officers, and our national security agencies all commend the tools that are in the bill, we know we are on the right path. We are taking action, and I am very proud of the tools it would give our law enforcement agencies and our national security agencies to go after the bad guys.

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Waterloo, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the parliamentary secretary's impressive speech. I just want to hear his thoughts on Canada's new government and the vision that we have moving forward as I can—

Grant Jackson: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I just want to put it on the record that the member is misleading the House by saying that this is a new Liberal government, when it in fact is the same—

The Deputy Speaker: I have now heard several points of order on this matter.

These are not points of order. These are points of debate. I invite the members to participate in questions and comments. It is a great opportunity to raise the matter.

[*Translation*]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Can we stop wasting time?

The Deputy Speaker: That is not a point of order.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Waterloo.

[*English*]

Hon. Bardish Chagger: Mr. Speaker, I appreciated the member's speech and the comments in regard to Canada's new government and the vision that our new Prime Minister has. On April 28, Canadians sent us here with a strong mandate, and I hope members in this House can all work together to advance the vision of Canada's new government.

As the member of Parliament for the riding of Waterloo, I am hearing from constituents who are concerned in regard to this legislation. They are wanting to understand the process and how we can assure them that their rights and freedoms will not be infringed upon. I would love to hear the member's comments, just to provide some relief and reassurance to constituents within the riding of Waterloo and across Canada.

Government Orders

Vince Gasparro: First, Mr. Speaker, I do want to go back to a quote from the National Police Federation, which says it is clear that “public safety is a top priority for this new government.” Therefore, I want to thank the organization for its support and all the other police organizations that are supporting us.

In terms of protecting civil liberties, we are doing a lot of work in committee, and this legislation continues to uphold the utmost standards to ensure that our charter rights and Canadian charter rights are being protected.

• (1710)

Helena Konanz (Similkameen—South Okanagan—West Kootenay, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I once again rise on behalf of the good people of Similkameen—South Okanagan—West Kootenay, a riding that has six border crossings, to speak to the legislation before us, Bill C-2.

We know that the bill is much more than a border bill. My riding and province have very much been on the front lines of an addiction crisis that has persisted for far too long. In fact, drug overdose is now the leading cause of death among B.C. youth aged 10 to 18. Too many families in our communities have lost their children to drug addiction. Too many drug kingpins, who fuel this crisis, have not been put behind bars. Even before my time here in the House, my Conservative colleagues highlighted the threat to our communities that is the drug running happening across the U.S.–Canada border, which had little to no response from the government during the lost Liberal decade.

We have long called for concrete actions to strengthen our borders while the Trudeau Liberal government chose to look the other way. Since they were first elected, there has been a 632% increase in U.S. border patrol encounters with people illegally attempting to enter the United States from Canada. This directly results from the government's failure to enforce effective border security. The Liberals have allowed this crisis to fester and grow, and it is putting Canadians at risk. Many of those crossings were to traffic illegal firearms into Canada for use by criminal gangs.

Canadian security services have identified 350 organized crime rings operating within our borders. For years, the Liberals, knowing we had severe problems at our border with the United States, dragged their feet on addressing any of these issues related to illegal firearms. Instead, they started targeting law-abiding firearms owners and treated them as if they were a source of rising firearms violence that needed to be dealt with. Hunters and sport shooters, who are vital to our tourism, are now often turned around at the border. Even if they go through extensive paperwork, checking every box, they often have their property wrongfully seized, and it takes them weeks, if not months, to get it back.

Even in my riding, we have seen the Liberal government go after my local sport shooters and archers. The Penticton Shooting Sports Association, situated on federally managed land for more than 40 years, recently saw its lease cancelled by the government without explanation. That is 40 years that they have been there. This is happening despite their facilities offering vital training resources to the RCMP, border guards, cadets and the public.

The club's services include hunter education, firearms safety instruction, youth and cadet firearms training, and a family-friendly environment for competitive shooting sports. I cannot emphasize enough that this is a vital training facility and club that needs to stay open.

In the meantime, illegal firearms stream across the border, where CBSA agents, already understaffed, are stretched thin, trying to slow the flow. Gun-related crime is up 116%, with 85% of gun offences committed using illegal firearms originating from the United States.

In terms of Bill C-2, Liberal MPs have spent the last several weeks proclaiming that the new Government of Canada will set new priorities, calling it the stronger borders act. However, upon closer examination, Bill C-2 goes well beyond the issue of borders. Conservatives, in the election, were very clear that we would strengthen the border.

The Liberals have packaged a range of measures into the legislation that were not discussed, let alone mentioned anywhere in the Liberal platform. Measures irrelevant to the management of the border or the combatting of illegal drug trafficking are rife in the stronger borders act.

• (1715)

There is no question that the legislation contains some measures the members of this House would probably support. However, it is such a sweeping piece of legislation that it leaves us hard pressed as members to see what the ultimate consequences of some of these changes might be, whether the measures included will actually address the problems the Liberals seek to solve or, worse, whether these measures are in direct conflict with our civil liberties.

A clear example is that the Liberals have promised to invest more money into border investigations and scanners, after years of calls to do so from my Conservative colleagues. Official statistics show that only 1% of shipping containers are inspected when coming into our country. This represents a wide-open opportunity for criminals to push drugs and guns through the other 99%. This is nothing new. More money for container scanning is welcome, but once again, the details are completely lacking. Canadians cannot be protected by a press release.

The Liberals are offering no timeline for when the investment in upgrading and expanding our scanning tools will be made or even when these resources might reach the border. It is a broken record in Canada of Liberal funding announcements being made and then the minister sitting back and assuming that changes, even positive changes, will magically appear before us all. A decade of a Liberal government has shown an addiction to taking credit for announcing measures instead of enacting or even considering them.

Government Orders

Canadians were not impressed by the last-minute election commitment to purchase two Black Hawk helicopters to patrol the entire Canada-U.S. border. Our border with the United States is just under 8,900 kilometres. It is unlikely that two helicopters could cover it in a month, let alone doing daily monitoring operations to look for smugglers. Even for the hundreds of kilometres of border that my riding encompasses, having two helicopters cover that large distance, even if both are in operation, stretches credibility. It is a joke.

Last, I wish to touch on an issue many Canadians have raised with the legislation regarding civil liberties, specifically the section of the bill that would amend the Canada Post Corporation Act. Bill C-2 broadens the government's ability to open our mail. Canadians expect that personal, private correspondence would be beyond government intervention. The Liberals must provide a more comprehensive response as to what circumstances would justify this. As my colleague, the member for Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola asked earlier this month, is it even charter compliant?

Canadians expect Parliament to make strong laws to protect them, but they also expect that their basic liberties and privacy will be respected. Several sections of the legislation have raised concerns among privacy experts and civil liberty organizations. Their concerns must be respected. The balance of security and liberty is also at the heart of western democracy. Therefore, any government seeking to grant further powers to intervene in the everyday lives of Canadians deserves the greatest level of scrutiny. Conservatives will continue to scrutinize the legislation ahead of the next vote while continuing to argue for the proper enforcement of our border and ports, with appropriate punishments for criminals.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, here we have another Conservative member who continues to want to give misinformation.

Today, the reality is that Canada Post inspectors can actually go through any parcel over 500 grams. With anything under 500 grams, such as a simple letter, someone could put in fentanyl and mail it. There is no one opening up those letters. Under this legislation, we are enabling them, under a general warrant, to be able to open those letters.

It is a simple, straightforward process, yet Conservatives are trying to give the impression that we have people working in the post office, who are not Canada Post inspectors, going through the mail and opening up letters as they want to. That is just not the case.

This legislation gives us more opportunity to deal with fentanyl. Would the member not support that?

• (1720)

Helena Konanz: Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that the bill is being pushed through at such a rapid rate that Canadians do not trust what is happening. They do not trust the Liberals. So many times in the last 10 years, the Liberals have promised something and nothing has happened or something else has come through.

The bill has not been explained properly to the Canadian people. I am not making up that what I am hearing from my constituents, which we are all hearing from our constituents, is that they do not

trust the Liberals with the bill. They are afraid they are going to lose their civil liberties if it is passed.

[*Translation*]

Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to mention that Quebec just got some amazing news.

The three-year-old girl who has been missing for three days after being abandoned by her mother has just been found in St. Albert, Ontario. I wanted to share my happiness with everyone in the House of Commons. I want to thank the police officers and everyone else who actively helped find little Claire Bell. She is alive and doing well. Soon we will find out the whole story. Many thanks to the police and to everyone who chipped in, including the members of the public who provided tips that led to the little girl being found in St. Albert.

That said, here is my question for my colleague. To reach his objectives, the Minister of Public Safety set a target of recruiting 1,000 customs officers. Right now, Canada has the capacity to train 600 customs officers per year. Does my colleague not find it odd that, at this time, we have no idea what the minister's plan is for reaching his target of recruiting 1,000 officers?

[*English*]

Helena Konanz: Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the police on their good job.

I believe there are many problems with the bill, and one of them is that nothing is explained. The Liberals talk about hiring more border guards, but where are they going to get these people? They also talk about hiring 1,000 more RCMP members. If we talk to municipalities across the country, they are waiting for RCMP officers, but there is a lack of people applying for the job. Nobody is applying at Depot. There is a lack of RCMP officers, and they are expensive for communities. I wonder where the Liberal government plans to get 1,000 RCMP officers.

Grant Jackson (Brandon—Souris, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to put some facts on the record, contrary to the member for Winnipeg North, who talks about misinformation. The only misinformation here is from him. A government that he is pretending is different is exactly the same as it has been for the last 10 years and the last 20 years that he has been here.

He questions the credibility of a long-serving municipal official from British Columbia about what she is hearing from her constituents. I would like to give her another chance to put the facts on the record about what she is hearing from her constituents with regard to the failures of the same Liberal government on border security and public safety as a whole.

Government Orders

Helena Konanz: Mr. Speaker, it is true that I am hearing this. We are hearing across the country that people are afraid. Canadians are afraid of what might happen if we allow the government to have too much power.

Anju Dhillon (Dorval—Lachine—LaSalle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has stated that the top seven priorities for the government include “Attracting the best talent in the world to help build our economy, while returning our overall immigration rates to sustainable levels.” Bill C-2 proposes important changes to address gaps in immigration authorities, provide a more adaptive system to the rapidly changing global migration patterns and empower better decision-making and information sharing.

• (1725)

[*Translation*]

We must get these important steps right. Immigration is an essential part of Canada's past, present and future. As the Prime Minister noted, this is an essential channel for new workers.

This bill would also improve security along the Canada-U.S. border and help address current and future potential challenges for individuals crossing the border in either direction.

[*English*]

This legislation would make changes to respond to a more complex global movement of people, increasingly sophisticated fraud, the need to update information-sharing mechanisms and authority over immigration documents.

[*Translation*]

First, the bill includes certain long-awaited measures to address current and future challenges. They will resolve issues that undermined the asylum system in the past and ensure the immigration system is better prepared for the future. Streamlining processing to make it more efficient will ensure certain long-standing challenges can be overcome.

The bill proposes intelligence and information sharing and ensuring that applications are ready for processing before they are sent to the final decision-making body, the Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada.

[*English*]

The legislation would do this in part by clearing the way to create a single application system and intake for all asylum claims. This would make it easier for individuals filing a claim, with clear requirements for information and documents at the outset. However, just as important, the legislation means that departments and agencies across the federal government would work from shared information. Instead of multiple departments and agencies asking for the same information, these departments would work more co-operatively with the same shared information.

[*Translation*]

In order to create a more efficient system, the bill proposes amendments so that only applications that are ready to be heard are referred to the IRB for decision. Right now, the IRB is scheduling hearings for some cases before the departments or agencies have completed certain aspects of their review. These may include im-

portant measures that take time, such as security screening or confirming the identity of a person from an area affected by conflict. If only applications that are ready to be heard are referred to the IRB, decisions can be made without delay, which may reduce the number of cases.

[*English*]

Bill C-2 would empower the IRCC to determine if an application has been abandoned even before the application has been reviewed for decision, and to remove it from processing under certain circumstances. As simple as that sounds, applicants may not always acknowledge or advise the federal government when they are not seeking asylum anymore. For example, the board could determine that applications are abandoned when applicants are unresponsive to required documents or information. Those applications would be removed through the abandonment process, allowing officials to focus efforts on those who need protection and continue to seek asylum.

[*Translation*]

There is also an important change to the claim resolution process. People who file an application from within Canada, including those at ports of entry such as airports, must be physically present in the country for their hearing. One would generally assume that a person who fled to Canada to seek protection would remain here in order to get that protection. However, there have been cases where applicants were outside the country when a decision was being made regarding their case.

People who enter Canada irregularly, between border crossings, violate our agreement on shared border responsibilities. This regime, which was put in place in 2012, created different asylum rules for citizens from certain designated countries. Some provisions of the regime were struck down by the Federal Court of Canada. The bill would repeal the provisions relating to this regime and transfer the power to establish lists for refugee hearings to IRB to allow for more strategic case management.

• (1730)

[*English*]

To address more recent challenges and issues that might arise again in the future, we are modernizing the asylum system with important reforms to strengthen migration integrity. To protect the system against surges in claims, we are introducing new ineligibility rules for asylum. These changes confirm that asylum is not a shortcut to immigration and would reduce pressures on the system so that we are focused on those who do need protection.

[Translation]

We have also seen the tragic consequences of this, including the deaths of families in our freezing cold winters. Irregular crossings are often an act of desperation and may be facilitated by human traffickers and organized crime groups. We know that some people continue to cross the Canada-U.S. border despite our warnings and laws.

By waiting 14 days or more before making an asylum claim, they are trying to sidestep the safe third country agreement, which would require them to return to the U.S. to file their claim. This delay appears, at first glance, to be a deliberate attempt to circumvent our existing immigration laws and systems. Claims made by these individuals will not be referred to the board.

We are also making changes that make claims inadmissible if they are made more than one year after someone enters Canada, if they arrived after June 24, 2020. The vast majority of asylum claims are made within one year of arrival. A one-year limit will deter people from using the asylum system to extend their stay in Canada if other mechanisms fail.

[English]

These important reforms would better align our systems and resources to serve their purpose. They would align our efforts to those who need our protection, limit attempts by others to avoid and bypass our system, and streamline the process so that we can do more with existing resources.

The many aspects of this bill will not allow me to go into detail today, but let me touch on the impacts of a few measures.

[Translation]

These changes would streamline the work of the federal government, reduce the burden on our provincial and territorial partners, and improve communications to keep our communities safe. Sharing information with law enforcement and national security agencies can help us detect and prevent fraud.

There is concern that people are using multiple identities to access government benefits or avoid detection. With robust identity verification processes, we can ensure that all levels of government are working with accurate, consistent data.

[English]

We would also prohibit further sharing by provincial or territorial government partners to foreign entities unless there is written consent and compliance with our obligations related to mistreatment, as defined in the Avoiding Complicity in Mistreatment by Foreign Entities Act. These authorities were reviewed by the Department of Justice and reflect input from the Office of the Privacy Commissioner. They are fully compliant with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and uphold our commitment to transparency and accountability.

To conclude, Bill C-2 would streamline and improve the asylum process against issues we know about now and potential risks in the future.

Carol Anstey (Long Range Mountains, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my question relates to the elimination of large cash deposits

Government Orders

over \$10,000. I represent a riding that is very rural. There are several small business owners in rural communities who are still dealing with cash. Oftentimes, financial institutions are hundreds of kilometres away. There might be long periods of time before they can get to the bank to deposit those cash amounts, which is driving up their costs.

I am just wondering if the Liberals will consider these small, responsible rural business owners when implementing this cash transaction limit in their legislation.

• (1735)

Anju Dhillon: Mr. Speaker, our government takes very seriously and emphasizes that small businesses are the backbone of our country's economy. It is very important that we keep those businesses in mind. However, when illicit financing occurs, this limit can help crack down on money laundering and terrorist financing.

It is essential that we keep track of reporting, present stronger penalties, prohibit crimes and third party cash deposits, and add FINTRAC to financial institutions' supervisory committees.

[Translation]

Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the member knows full well that, currently, border officers have the ability and authority to inspect rail cars carrying imported goods. Bill C-2 now includes an additional power, the power to inspect rail cars carrying goods destined for export.

How will officers do that, though? Currently, even though they are empowered to inspect rail cars containing imported goods, they do it rarely, if at all, because they are short-staffed. How can they be given additional powers when they are unable to fully assume their role of examining and inspecting rail cars carrying exports and imports?

Anju Dhillon: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for mentioning that little Claire Bell was found. We are so glad. We thank the police for working tirelessly for this outcome. Fortunately, all is well.

I also thank my colleague for her question. Fighting transnational organized crime and preventing fentanyl imports are extremely important. Inspections must be done. As we mentioned, we are going to hire an additional 1,000 border officers and more RCMP officers to help address those issues.

*Government Orders**[English]*

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I know that, like me, the member is very much concerned about the issue of extortion. Within the legislation and in listening to the Secretary of State for Combatting Crime, we understand and have an appreciation that there is at least a step toward providing additional tools to allow law enforcement agencies to move more on that issue.

I just thought I would provide the member the opportunity to give her personal thoughts on the issue of extortion and just how serious it is. It is nice to see whatever measures we can get that would enable us to take further action on that issue.

Anju Dhillon: Mr. Speaker, it is always an incredible moment for me to answer my colleague's questions. He is often in the House.

To answer his question, extortion has become a plague in Canada. It is very disconcerting to see the amount of extortion that is occurring and these strong measures would help in combatting that. Right now, we see the increase of such situations and so we are going to fight against this and other transnational crime.

[Translation]

Rhéal Éloi Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for her speech. Unfortunately, I have some concerns about what she considers to be the strengths and virtues of this bill. The Bloc Québécois will vote in favour of the bill so that it can be considered in committee, but I am not sure the Bloc Québécois will support it when it comes back to the House for third reading. We will see what happens in committee, but as of right now, I have quite a few concerns about the bill.

Does keeping our streets and borders safe always mean waiving our rights and freedoms? Maybe, maybe not. Personally, I do not think so. There must be other ways to make our streets and our borders safer. Once Bill C-2 is passed, if it passes in its current form, what hopes will we have left for privacy? Our personal information could be accessed, captured or even shared with various organizations, both in Canada and abroad. Mail, something we once saw as almost sacred, was untouchable. It was a Criminal Code offence to open mail. Now the government wants to open it, inspect it and use it against us.

New powers are being granted to Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada to suspend, vary or cancel visas and documents. The conditions for doing so will be set in regulations that we know nothing about. What will these conditions be? How will this new power be defined? Will people who have applied and incurred expenses for their application be reimbursed? Will this bill jeopardize the status of people who were selected by Quebec, for example? In what circumstances can someone be told that their visa application will not be processed? In our view, these are important questions. They are matters that need to be clarified. Unfortunately, we do not have many details for the moment, aside from the fact that it will all be determined in regulations. I look forward to finding out in committee what kind of regulations we can expect.

Cash transactions over \$10,000 will now be prohibited. I must admit that it is rather rare for me to walk around with \$10,000 or \$15,000 in cash in my pocket. I do not remember ever having to pay a bill \$10,000 in cash in my life. However, the fact remains that this new ban will require the use of currently available banking tools, such as cheques, Interac cards and credit cards. All of this leads to interest charges and user fees for both the payee and the payer. How will that be done? How is that going to be structured? Are we comfortable with the idea of giving financial institutions, lending institutions an advantage? I have to wonder. It also leaves a trail. As I said, I am not in the habit of paying bills for \$10,000 in cash, but I would like to hear from experts on this. Are there situations where this could become problematic? I admit that I do not see any. I have looked, but I could not find any, but I still think that this is an issue that should be addressed before we say that we are making a law about it.

● (1740)

I found the next part a bit extreme: "use an individual's personal information without the individual's knowledge or consent". Should not the authorities at least be required to obtain a warrant before doing that? This is about fighting organized crime, border breaches and terrorism. The Bloc Québécois has made that something of a calling card. I have introduced three bills to establish a list of criminal entities and to prohibit people from wearing symbols and doing anything else to promote criminal organizations, such as wearing the "support 81" shirts that caused such an uproar at the time. I believe the Bloc Québécois has been fighting this fight since the party's inception, and we will continue to do so.

Do we really want to adopt provisions that would make us live in a society where individual freedoms would no longer be protected and none of our information would be kept confidential?

I would like to talk about another serious danger. Normally, a lawyer who is seeking a search warrant must first argue before a judge that there are reasonable grounds to believe that an offence will be committed, and they must convince the judge of that. This bill changes that. Law enforcement is saying that the evidentiary threshold is a bit hard to meet, so they are asking instead for reasonable grounds to suspect. Reasonable grounds to suspect is nonsense.

For example, if I argue before a judge that I have grounds to suspect that my colleague from Dorval—Lachine—LaSalle might think, say or do this or that, but ultimately, she does not do it, I could simply say that I had suspicions about her but that I was wrong. My suspicions did not materialize, but there are no consequences. However, if someone tells me that I need to have valid reasons to believe that something is the case, then my own belief, my own credibility is at stake. That is completely different. I am really concerned about lowering the evidentiary threshold for getting a warrant. I think it merits further discussion. I would like to hear from experts on this issue.

Government Orders

As I was saying earlier, the Bloc Québécois has become somewhat of a champion in the fight against organized crime in a number of ways. We are calling for stronger borders. Not so long ago, my colleague who was in charge of the public safety file and I were outraged that the Government of Quebec had to spend \$6 million to send boats to patrol the Quebec-U.S. border along the St. Lawrence River. We were indignant. It is not up to the Government of Quebec to pay for border protection. That is the federal government's responsibility. We demand that it uphold it. I still believe that this is a federal responsibility and something that the federal government needs to do.

Is the current form of Bill C-2 the solution for controlling our border more effectively? I am not so sure. The same goes for organized crime. We are also demanding that Quebec's requests regarding entry into our borders be respected. The number of individuals who can enter Quebec each year must be limited. Not only have we reached the acceptability thresholds for integrating these people, but we have been exceeding them for quite some time now. Even if they enter without any grounds, if they manage to hide in the woods for 14 days before approaching the authorities, we have to take them in, send them to school, provide them with health care, clothe them and find them housing, even though we are unable to do so for the current population. This raises some serious issues. We are therefore calling on the government to abide by this threshold.

Does Bill C-2 respond to this request? I am not sure. Once again, it is all well and good to cancel or suspend visas, but there must be grounds for doing so, and the mechanism and the procedure for that must be set out. However, all of this is a bit vague at the moment. We are being told that it will appear in future regulations. That does not reassure me.

This is all happening right when the government is asking us to pass Bill C-5. Now, this is something we do not see every day. Under this bill, a project will be decreed to be in the national interest if the Prime Minister decides it is. Projects can be exempt from pretty much any rule whenever he sees fit. All this is happening under a closure motion. I have always believed that mixing alcohol and drugs is dangerous. Now, this mix of Bill C-2, Bill C-5 and the closure motion has me extremely concerned.

Are we witnessing something like a shift toward authoritarianism? I do not want to be melodramatic, but I think we need to be on our guard. We need to pay attention and be cautious, because none of this is reassuring for the society we live in, a society that values its hard-won privacy protections and other protections.

I urge everyone here to be cautious. I urge us all to be champions of the kind of society our constituents want.

• (1745)

Bienvenu-Olivier Ntumba (Mont-Saint-Bruno—L'Acadie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, during the last election, Quebecers and Canadians made it clear that they expect all parties to take action against cross-border crime, fentanyl, gun smuggling and auto theft.

Can my colleague confirm that he and his caucus colleagues support those goals and will vote in favour of the bill?

• (1750)

Rhéal Éloi Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for his question, and I can confirm that to be the case.

We have said this many times, and I do not want to repeat myself, but we also want to fight organized crime, drug trafficking and fentanyl, which is a terrible scourge. What we are saying is that the government cannot do it any which way.

Just because I am against criminals does not mean I agree with going around and hanging them in the streets without due process.

[*English*]

Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise on behalf of the people from Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola. Before I begin, I want to give a shout-out to someone who helped a lot in my campaign, and that is my sister, Rosie Caputo. I am very thankful to her for all of her help.

I have worked with my colleague extensively. I have a great deal of time for him. When we talk about these things, there is this balance between law and order, we have some court decisions that need to be addressed in terms of IP addresses, and also the balancing of civil liberties.

Does the member have any ideas how we can strike that proper balance in legislation like Bill C-2?

[*Translation*]

Rhéal Éloi Fortin: Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking Rosie, because I really enjoy working with her brother, who is a serious and hard-working member of Parliament. I am pleased to recognize that today.

That being said, as I mentioned at the beginning of my speech, I think he is right to point out that we need to strike a balance between protecting our borders, protecting our streets, keeping people safe and respecting individual rights and freedoms.

My colleague is also right to say that the courts have provided us with guidelines in the past. It will be important to read them carefully. That is why I believe this bill needs to be studied in committee, so we can hear from experts and make sure that, in trying to fix one problem, we do not create an even more complex and dangerous one.

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether my colleague, who is much more legally-minded than I am, will appreciate the parallel I am about to draw. He will have to let me know. I find this bill strangely reminiscent of the use of the Emergencies Act, which we voted on here.

After letting a situation deteriorate, after doing nothing, the government is going to the other extreme. The government's reaction is disproportionate and oppressive, when it could have taken a proactive stance from the start, which would have prevented things from reaching this other extreme.

Does that parallel make sense to my colleague?

Government Orders

Rhéal Éloi Fortin: Mr. Speaker, my colleague is also a man who works hard for his riding and his constituents. I am very proud to work with him as a member of the same party.

That said, parallels can indeed be drawn between the problems we are seeing now with Bill C-2 and Bill C-5, the gag order and what is looming over our heads without us knowing it. We have been sitting for three weeks, not even four. We shall see.

There are parallels that can be drawn with all that and the proclamation of emergency measures. At the time, I was co-chair of the committee that had to examine the issue. We simply could not believe it. Nothing was done after the emergency measures were invoked that could not have been done before. We asked companies to tow trucks, which they did. The situation was resolved in less than 24 hours.

Why did the government invoke those emergency measures, extreme measures that should only be used in extreme circumstances? We wondered about that and we found it troubling.

I have similar concerns now. I am not even sure that the Supreme Court would uphold bills C-2 and C-5. It remains to be seen. Whatever we pass will be swiftly challenged. Unfortunately, we are opening ourselves up to rulings that will put us back to square one. I do not think that we can ignore the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the Canadian Constitution, infringe on everyone's powers and trample on rights and freedoms without being sanctioned by the courts at some point.

[*English*]

Chris Bittle (St. Catharines, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I would like to congratulate you on your new appointment. As someone who did his master's thesis on a very specific thing, which I believe was the Thursday question, you have a love of this place. It is good to see you in that chair.

This is an important bill. I think all of us have heard from Canadians during the election that public safety is fundamentally important to them. It is disappointing to hear from some MPs who suggest that other MPs do not care about public safety. One of our fundamental priorities is to ensure the safety and security of our constituents. We may come at it in different ways, but we all fundamentally believe that we need to stand up and protect our constituents. I hope that is the debate we are having and will continue throughout this. It is not what we hear in question period, but often-times question period is a little different from what we hear at other times in this place and at committee, where I hope this bill will go very soon.

Fundamentally, I believe this bill will keep Canadians safe by ensuring law enforcement will have the right tools to keep our borders secure, to combat transnational organized crime, stop the flow of illegal fentanyl and crack down on money laundering. It will bolster our response to increasingly sophisticated criminal networks and enhance the integrity and fairness of our immigration system, all while protecting the privacy and charter rights of Canadians.

Following the introduction of the bill, we heard from the Canadian Police Association, the largest law enforcement advocacy organization in Canada, and the national voice for over 60,000 frontline

law enforcement personnel serving across every province and territory. I would like to take a moment and read what it said.

It states:

...this proposed legislation would provide critical new tools for law enforcement, border services, and intelligence agencies to address transnational organized crime, auto theft, firearms and drug trafficking, and money laundering. It's important to emphasize that these are not abstract issues, our members see firsthand that they have real impacts in communities across the country and require a coordinated and modern legislative response.

The Bill includes important updates that would strengthen information sharing between federal and local agencies, which is essential to the success of multi-jurisdictional investigations and recognizes the reality that border security is increasingly not the sole responsibility of the RCMP. In many communities located near border crossings, local police services are called upon to play a central role in enforcing our border-related laws. Giving these agencies access to better intelligence and more timely information will significantly improve public safety outcomes.

We are also encouraged by measures that would support the work of the Canada Border Services Agency and the Canadian Coast Guard by closing long-standing gaps in inspection and enforcement capacity. These steps, combined with new authorities for front-line law enforcement across the country, would help disrupt criminal operations at key points of entry and within domestic supply and distribution chains.

The proposed steps to disrupt the importation of illegal fentanyl and precursor chemicals are also crucial. A faster scheduling process will [also] allow for a more agile response to substances that fuel the opioid crisis and continue to cause immeasurable harm in communities across...[the country].

Bill C-2 would also strengthen the ability of police to investigate and disrupt...criminal networks by enhancing anti-money laundering enforcement, expanding data-sharing with trusted domestic and international partners...[while] improving access to information across jurisdictions. New provisions allowing Canadian law enforcement to share information collected under the Sex Offender Information Registration Act would...[provide] more effective cooperation in cross-border investigations. Additionally, the proposed mechanism to access data held by service providers in other countries acknowledges the reality that modern criminal investigations rarely stop at the border. These updates would help ensure that Canadian police have the tools and intelligence they need to hold offenders accountable, regardless of where they operate.

If passed, Bill C-2 would give police services the legal tools needed to respond more effectively to evolving threats.

This is the organization advocating for 60,000 frontline police officers.

Government Orders

• (1755)

I heard during the campaign, and I hear it a lot during question period, that we need to stand up and give police officers the tools they need. At the same time, I am hearing doubts from the opposition members, who are trying to pour cold water on this. On the one hand, they say that we need to do something, but at the same time they do not want this, even though police support it and it will make communities safer. I do not really understand the rhetoric versus the action, the rhetoric during question period versus the rhetoric we are hearing now. I appreciate the concerns being raised by some members of the opposition, but again, it does not match their rhetoric to get things done in those 30-second sound bites they like during question period.

I would also like to add a quote from the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police, another great organization:

The proposed Bill demonstrates a commitment to modernizing legislation and equipping law enforcement with necessary tools to combat transnational organized crime in an increasingly complex threat environment. In particular, the Bill sets out several important law amendments which will address systemic vulnerabilities within the justice system, providing critical tools for law enforcement, border services and intelligence agencies.

Canada's legislation related to lawful access is significantly outdated and urgently needs to be revised to align with modern technology. Canada lags behind its international law enforcement partners in the ability to lawfully access electronic evidence associated to criminal activity. Transnational organised crime groups are exploiting this gap to victimize our communities across the country through serious crimes such as human, drug and firearm trafficking, auto theft, and violent profit-driven crime. The provisions contained within the Strong Borders Act are an important step in advancing Canadian law enforcement's ability to effectively combat the ever-evolving nature of transnational organized criminal groups.

The chiefs of police have spoken. Frontline officers have spoken. Where is the outcry from the Conservative Party to get this passed as quickly as possible? I hear crickets, which is disappointing.

I would like to address a point that just came up, I believe from the member for Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola, with respect to IP addresses. I appreciate the concern when we are dealing with issues like this, but I would like to quote a colleague of his, the member for Parkland, when he was asking questions of the RCMP in regard to this particular issue. He said:

Imagine a phone book that has phone numbers listed, but no names. The only names that are listed are the ISPs and the telecom companies that service those phone numbers: the Telus, the Rogers and the Bells.

Police are being told now that they can't even look in the phone book of those IP addresses. They can't even know who the service providers are unless they have a warrant. The effect of this in the past month since this decision came in, according to frontline RCMP officers who are working in the integrated child exploitation units across this country, is that telecommunications companies, in compliance with the Supreme Court of Canada's decision, are now denying this critical information that police are using to track down and prosecute child sex offenders and child predators.

The member for Parkland says we need to take action, and I agree with him, but I guess this is the member for Parkland from last Parliament. Where are the members now? Again, I hear it in question period, time after time, day after day.

Let us expedite this. Let us move this forward and get it to committee. I can appreciate that there are concerns. I have never seen a government bill in my 10 years that has made it through unamended to the end, but let us ensure that we move this legislation for-

ward so that perhaps the Conservatives' actions will match their rhetoric during question period. I hope we can achieve that.

• (1800)

Ned Kuruc (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, before I ask my question, I would like to mention the celebration of LiUNA Local 837. They are celebrating 75 years today. I would like to say congratulations to Victoria Mancinelli, Joe Mancinelli, their family patriarch Enrico Mancinelli, may he rest in peace, and all the hard-working members of that union for building much of southern Ontario.

My question for my colleague is this. People from my constituency are having a hard time understanding the restriction on cash, because we have a lot of small businesses and a very vibrant Italian community that has a lot of weddings, and couples get a lot of cash during their wedding. I would like to give them the opportunity to have some clarity on that, because people in my riding are very concerned about that, and eastern Europeans as well.

• (1805)

Chris Bittle: Mr. Speaker, I do not understand this item that is out there. I have seen it, that we cannot pay cash anymore. I cannot pay \$10,000 in cash for an item at a local business. I do not know what local businesses Conservative members are going to. These things are solved.

As a member of the Law Society of Ontario, we were told years ago to never accept that amount of cash, as we then may be complicit in something we do not want to be complicit in. We can go and get a cheque or a money order. These are easy ways around it to ensure that people are in compliance and they can still engage in gift-giving. We can still buy things.

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

Chris Bittle: Money order, as the hon. member said on the other side.

Mr. Speaker, these are things we can get. A bank draft is typically the most common. I do not know how these members pay for things at their local stores. If it is about \$10,000 in cash, that is a different world than I operate in.

Hon. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to echo what we heard on the campaign trail. Canadians want safer communities. Canadians want safer borders. Canadians also want to stop being aggressed by our south-of-the-border neighbour because of the terrors that have ravaged our communities and our workers.

Can the member expand on the mandate that he has been given to respond to all of the questions that Canadians had during the campaign on safety, on secure communities and the one Canadian economy?

Government Orders

Chris Bittle: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if I will have enough time to get to all of that, but I will sum it up.

Being a member from the Niagara region, my house is only about a 10-minute drive from the border. I think everyone in my community understands that safe borders lead to safe communities. It is fundamentally important that we take action as a government to ensure that CBSA has the tools it needs, and that the RCMP and local police have the tools that they need: the tools that they have been asking for, and the tools that frontline officers have said are in Bill C-2, and they are urging Parliament to get this passed as quickly as possible.

We heard it from our constituents. We were elected as Canada's new government and we are getting to work. This is fundamentally important. I hope to see this get passed as quickly as possible.

Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise on behalf of the people of Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola. It is nice to see one of my colleagues recognizing me the way I do. I love that.

I just want to clarify something that my colleague mentioned. I think he was talking about the Bykovets decision, a decision that said judicial oversight or a judicial authorization, a warrant production order, is required for IP addresses. I believe many people in the law enforcement community would support the provisions he was referring to. I think where we, as Conservatives, take issue is that one step further when we are talking about getting data from Meta and things like that.

Does the member see the distinction between those two things?

Chris Bittle: Mr. Speaker, I would love for the Conservatives to take that energy and apply it to all of their policies with respect to criminal justice and bring a rights-based approach first. This legislation complies with the Charter of Rights. We will continue to comply with the Charter of Rights. I hope the Conservatives engage in the future with respect to all of their policies because it has been absent from their arguments since I have been here.

Andrew Lawton (Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to be able to rise on an issue as important as a bill that deals with Canada's border. I have been among those people sounding the alarm for years about the Liberal government's inaction on the border. When there has been action, it was action that aggravated and exacerbated the problems. These are long-standing challenges caused by a Liberal government that, despite its proclamations, is not a new government but a continuation of what we had over the last 10 years.

While I am heartened by the fact that the Liberals have acknowledged there is a border crisis, I have a great many concerns with the way they have chosen to tackle that. Let me be clear: One of the biggest issues, in my media career, I would frequently criticize the government's handling of was the lax approach to border security. One notable example of this was allowing Roxham Road to balloon into a full-blown illegal immigration scheme that the government turned a blind eye to. This was something that happened for years and years, and the government would not act.

Issues pertaining to smuggling of firearms, drugs and even people have been allowed to become the crisis they are today. While I

am grateful that the Liberals have decided to come to the party late, I have to ask why it took so long. What prevented them from taking action on this?

Let me be perfectly clear that a lot of the issues we see with crime and drugs in our country, including gang violence using illegal firearms smuggled in across the border, are issues that cannot just be neatly siloed off into one particular portfolio. Conservatives have been asking the Liberals for the last couple of weeks why there is nothing in the bill that deals with sentencing for fentanyl kingpins. Why is there nothing that deals with bail issues that allow repeat offenders to continue to be out on the street after offending?

The Liberals have always come back to the same position, which is that it is just a border bill, not a crime bill, but that is a very narrow and naive way of looking at the legislation. They do not understand that these cross-border issues are integrally connected to the crime and justice issues that they are not acknowledging, that they are not acting on and that the bill has no solutions for.

On this, I will say that I am grateful the government has taken some suggestions that the Conservatives have made over the years and put them in the bill, but the problem is that it is an omnibus bill. It tries to do a great many things. Some of it is stuff that I would say the Conservatives have been leaders on. Others are things that, when I look at the legislation, I wonder where they came from or who was asking for them.

While there is a lack of addressing bail issues and a lack of addressing sentencing issues, there are things in the bill about which I cannot imagine why the Liberals thought they were relevant for a bill that, by their own admission, is supposed to be about the border. I want to focus on two of those right now because I have a long track record of advocating for civil liberties.

One of the provisions of the bill, part 4, would give Canada Post unilateral power to open not just parcels but also letters. This means that a letter one sends to anyone in the country could be intercepted, without a warrant or judicial oversight, by someone at Canada Post. Something we have heard in the course of debate this evening and this afternoon is some misinformation from the Liberal government. The Liberals say, "Oh, no, it would be subject to warrant."

Well, I have combed through the legislation, the entire bill, but also part 4 specifically, and in part 4, which deals with changes to the Canada Post Corporation Act, the word "warrant" does not appear once. In the act that this section of the bill cites, there is no discussion of warrants whatsoever.

Government Orders

Therefore we are left, as Canadians, with the questions that the Liberal government is not answering: What are the constraints on this power? What would Canada Post be entitled to do or be authorized to do, not just with goods it may seize but also with information it may seize? The bill specifically talks about intercepting letters. That does not just mean opening an envelope and looking for fentanyl; that also means opening a piece of mail and being allowed to read it. Who would have access to correspondence? What could be done with it? Would it be tracked? Would it be registered? Would it be entered into a database?

These are questions that we do not have answers for because the Liberals are denying that the text of the bill is what it is.

• (1810)

Moreover, the bill would give Canada Post immunity. It would take away any liability for anything arising from demand, seizure, detention or retention, which means Canadians would have no rights to question or challenge what Canada Post is doing with their mail. To be clear, Canada Post has not asked for this power, that I have seen. This is something the Liberal government would voluntarily hand over without any regard for the civil liberties concerns.

We can look at part 11 of the bill, which would ban cash transactions over \$10,000. It would not put in a reporting requirement. It would not restrict it. It would not add bureaucracy or red tape. It is a clear ban. I will read directly from the bill:

Every person or entity that is engaged in a business, a profession or the solicitation of charitable financial donations from the public commits an offence if the person or entity accepts a cash payment, donation or deposit of \$10,000 or more in a single transaction or in a prescribed series of related transactions that total \$10,000 or more.

After 10 years of economic mismanagement, \$10,000 is a regular haul at the grocery store. This \$10,000 may seem like an amount, as the Liberals like to say, that no one is dealing in. They say no one is going around and dealing in \$10,000 transactions unless they have something to hide. I represent a lot of rural and smaller communities in my riding, and it is not uncommon for someone to buy a used vehicle, buy a farm truck or buy a new piece of equipment for \$10,000 or \$15,000. Some may ask, as the Liberals do, why anyone would need to do that. We live in a free society where we do not need to justify our decision to engage in transactions with legal tender to the government.

I am very aware of the fact that, as I speak, the Liberal government is actively fighting in court against a Federal Court decision that found its use of the Emergencies Act illegal in 2022. This is a government that unlawfully and unconstitutionally froze people's bank accounts without due process and without oversight. That sent a chill throughout the country as people realized that the government would use its power without regard for the law. I do not accept that the government is permitted to say to just trust it with putting a further restriction in place on how Canadians transact, and this is incredibly important. The Bank of Canada, which the Prime Minister used to run, has been advocating for central bank digital currency, something that would put the government more in control of and make it more able to monitor the transactions that Canadians choose to undertake.

There are many reasons that people would use cash. In fact, in most cases that I am aware of, it has nothing to do with law breaking. It is simply because of convenience, avoiding staggering credit card fees and having the ability to transact and ensure that the local farmers' market or the person selling a vehicle in a riding, neighbourhood, whatever it is, can be free of government interference.

While I am grateful the bill would deal with some issues at the border that we have long been calling for solutions for as Conservatives, it is taking a very broad brush and, in doing so, is treating ordinary law-abiding Canadians as though they are criminals, as though they have something to hide from the government or must be doing something wrong simply because they are using cash, as anyone who identifies as old school would do. What other legal things is the government planning to regulate or restrict?

When we are looking at this bill, with how many different sections and different parts it has, we have to look at the good and we have to look at the bad. I think the government has tried to do too much in the course of this legislation. We have to look at the civil liberties concerns. Anytime they have been raised in the course of debating the bill, the Liberals have fallen back on either making a false claim, such as that a warrant is required under the Canada Post section, which it is not, or just relying on the notion that we are to trust them because there is no way the Liberal government would abuse this power. I do not trust them, and my constituents do not trust them either.

• (1815)

Hon. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask the member opposite what he thinks about the mandate that Londoners sent him here with and whether he heard what I heard at the doors. What I heard at the doors is that Londoners want safer borders. They want an economy that works for everyone. They want more jobs for our communities.

I want to welcome him to the House, first of all, and hear what he thinks about the things we were hearing in London at the doors.

Andrew Lawton: Mr. Speaker, while I am honoured to represent just shy of 20,000 Londoners, London is a part of a riding that also encompasses the County of Elgin and St. Thomas and Aylmer. The fact that the voters in my riding elected a Conservative member of Parliament is an important indication of what the constituents I represent believe.

Government Orders

They were saying they wanted the Liberals to get tough with respect to the border, but they were not. That is why the constituents were voting Conservative. They were saying they wanted a government that would get tough on crime and they were not getting that from the Liberals. I was elected because people did not want the current government to do it. Of the 26,000 doors that I knocked on, not one single person said, "I really think that government needs to crack down on people buying a truck with cash."

• (1820)

[*Translation*]

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would also like to welcome my colleague from Elgin—St. Thomas—London South to the House. I enjoyed his speech.

Can my colleague tell me how we have gotten to this point? In his opinion, why is the government introducing a bill that I would call too radical for the current situation, a bill that will amend about 15 acts and attack legislation affecting three different departments? Can he tell me what this government has done over the past 10 years to show that it takes border security and our refugee system seriously?

I would like to hear his answer.

[*English*]

Andrew Lawton: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. member's very insightful question. I cannot answer to what the government members were thinking by putting this forward, but I do know that there is a general trend that we have seen from the Liberal government, of trying to do omnibus legislation so they can advance things that are very unpopular or unconstitutional while hiding behind things that are popular and that all parties would agree with. I fear that is precisely what the Liberals are doing with this bill, by going after civil liberties while also offering things that are important that we could all agree on, such as the need to get tough on border security.

Michael Guglielmin (Vaughan—Woodbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's very factual and evidence-based speech.

We have been hearing a lot of comments with respect to how the Liberals are trying to identify as a new government when, in fact, they are the same government that they have been for the last 10 years. I was wondering if the member could share his thoughts with the House regarding how the current Liberal government is, in fact, the same government that it has been here for the last 10 years.

Andrew Lawton: Mr. Speaker, as some members of this House may know, I used to have a career in media before I joined here. A few days ago, I saw a clip from question period that was a couple of years old, but I thought it was recent because the front bench was entirely the same. I do think that for a party that insists on saying that it is a new government, there is a heck of a lot of continuity, not just in the people but also the policies, attitudes and approaches, which is why I do not trust the current government to give itself or any other agencies tremendous powers of warrantless oversight on Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Bienvenu-Olivier Ntumba (Mont-Saint-Bruno—L'Acadie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am a bit disappointed that the member would make such comments. In fact, Canadians and Quebecers voted for at least 170 new members here in the House. The Liberal Party has 70 new members. These are not just the same members, but are newly elected MPs for a new government.

I would like to hear my colleague's comments on that.

[*English*]

Andrew Lawton: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the hon. member to this chamber, but ultimately the direction that the party has taken is a continuation of Justin Trudeau. In fact, the Prime Minister's most recent résumé line item was as an adviser to Justin Trudeau. If there has been a break in the timeline, I am not exactly sure when it was.

Taleeb Noormohamed (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Innovation, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to rise today to speak in support of Bill C-2. Recognizing the amount of time that I have, I will make my comments somewhat brief.

I do want to begin by saying that, throughout the last campaign, and since 2021, I have had the privilege of meeting thousands of my constituents. Over and over, I have heard one message. They want a forward-looking and ambitious government that delivers for them. They want that government to fight organized crime. They want that government to fight auto theft, and they want that government to tackle the fentanyl crisis.

Members of Parliament on both sides of the House will have heard, I suspect, from their constituents, that Canadians want to feel safe in their homes, they want to feel safe in their communities, and they want our government to ensure that we deliver that for them. This bill would do exactly that. It would deliver on bold and concrete actions. It would tackle the complex interconnected threats that Canadians are facing today.

Whether it is fentanyl, auto theft, or money laundering, Bill C-2 seeks to deal with all of those issues. It does so by delivering on three important measures: securing our borders, dismantling transnational organized crime and cracking down on illicit financing.

Securing our borders means fixing long-standing gaps in our immigration system, modernizing how we share information, strengthening visa protections to stop fraud, and improving the asylum application process to make it more efficient and fair. These reforms would preserve the integrity of our system while ensuring that those who actually need protection continue to receive it.

We can only have a strong and resilient country if our security agencies are empowered to protect Canadians while preserving their freedoms. Thanks to this bill, once passed, the RCMP and our international partners would be able to better track and apprehend child sex offenders. That is why, if this bill is passed, the Canadian Coast Guard would have a clear mandate to counter drug smuggling and enhance maritime protection and enforcement, something that has been long needed in provinces such as mine and British Columbia.

This is an opportunity for Conservatives to put their money where their mouths are. They talk about law and order. They talk about keeping Canadians safe. This is their chance to vote with us, to ensure that this bill gets passed.

This bill also directly addresses the devastating rise in organized crime and the fentanyl crisis. We intend to empower our law enforcement agencies who are at the forefront of this fight, with the ability to seize illegal drugs, such as fentanyl and its components. We are also making it easier and faster to classify illicit substances before they take root in our communities. These changes would not only stop the flow of illicit and dangerous substances into Canada, but also make it harder for criminal networks to produce and distribute them domestically.

Now, we know that supporting and protecting Canadians requires additional support mechanisms across Canada. That is why we will keep traffickers, smugglers and violent criminals accountable for their crimes by giving the authorities the legal tools that they need to act decisively.

On the point of auto theft, we know that auto theft has decreased, thanks to the work that the new government has already taken, but we also know that Canadians want us to do more. With this bill, border officials would have the authority to intercept those shipments, recover stolen property and hold those responsible accountable. For too long, money laundering and terrorist financing have allowed organized crime to profit and expand, but this bill would put forward stronger penalties for financial crimes, restrict anonymous large-cash deposits and prohibit third-party transactions that allow bad actors to hide behind others.

Finally, Bill C-2 builds upon the single largest investment in border security in Canadian history, \$1.3 billion, and reflects a clear and targeted approach to the challenges that we are facing. It reflects our government's commitment to responsible, balanced governance to tackle everyday issues that Canadians are facing. These are not small changes.

Let me be clear. This bill is about fixing systems, closing loopholes and ensuring Canada keeps pace with a rapidly evolving global landscape of crime, exploitation of systems and digital threats. Our allies are watching and Canadians are calling on us to protect them. Canadians have told us what they need. They want us to balance freedom and security. They want a government that takes safety seriously, confronts difficult problems, and delivers results, while protecting our fundamental rights and freedoms.

I urge my colleagues in the House to join us in passing this bill, putting aside partisanship and putting the security and safety of Canadians first.

Adjournment Proceedings

• (1825)

[*Translation*]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I do not know if my colleague was here earlier when my colleague from Rivière-du-Nord made his speech.

We are glad that something is finally happening, because it has been a long time coming. It took Donald Trump bringing out the big guns to get things moving. However, we are also concerned about the presumably disproportionate and freedom-killing response contained in this bill.

I asked some of his colleagues earlier why it took so long. I did not receive a convincing answer. I would like to ask the member if he is not concerned about certain abuses of individual freedoms that exist and that could be implied in the bill. Consider the granting of the power to open mail, for example, which has generally been considered a crime.

In other words, is my colleague concerned about certain aspects of the bill? Is he open to having the bill receive greater scrutiny in committee, given that it could contain abuses?

Taleeb Noormohamed: Mr. Speaker, when I was young, I was very concerned about Bill C-51, a bill introduced by Prime Minister Harper's Conservative government.

In my opinion, Bill C-2 is not perfect. No bill introduced by any government is. That is the reality. However, we have to protect the country, we have to protect Canadians, and we have to work together to keep improving the situation, including through regulations and processes. The reality is that we have to be careful. We are taking action today to protect Canadians and protect our border.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

• (1830)

[*English*]

FINANCE

Grant Jackson (Brandon—Souris, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise once again to ask the Minister of Finance why he finds it acceptable to not table a budget before he and the Prime Minister, the so-called man with the plan, head off on summer vacation.

Adjournment Proceedings

Budgeting is not optional for families and small businesses across this great country, and it should not be optional for the federal government either. Months of uncertainty about Canada's finances will undoubtedly harm Canada's credit rating and spook investors into moving further capital out of this country. However, that should not surprise anyone, given the Prime Minister's track record of moving capital and jobs out of Canada and over to his friends on Wall Street in New York City.

The Prime Minister promised to cap spending at 2% but then immediately turned around and handed Canadians a tax bill that shattered the promise and jacked up spending 8%.

An hon. member: Point of order.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): There are no points of order in Adjournment Proceedings.

Grant Jackson: Mr. Speaker, I say good try to my friends from the Liberal Party.

The only thing Canadians can confidently expect from the Liberal government and these Liberal MPs, who just tried to silence me, is rising housing prices, now rising car prices, soaring debt, runaway overall inflation and absolutely zero economic leadership, just as we have seen for the last 10 years.

Canadians, and particularly the young Canadians I represent, are the ones who are going to be on the hook to pay for the government's reckless spending. Take the millions of dollars that were dished out to the Liberals' insiders at GC Strategies, for example. Tens of millions of dollars lined the pockets of their insider friends on the backs of young Canadian families who work hard to make an honest dollar and put healthy groceries on the table and gas in their vehicles to take their kids to hockey practice and piano lessons.

Just last week, the House voted to force the government to make sure the \$64 million paid to GC Strategies was returned within 100 days. Only time will tell if the government will follow the will of Canadians and their democratically elected representatives or if it will side with its insider friends, who are surely sitting on a beach or a fancy yacht by now waiting for those Liberal MPs to join them.

A budget is Canada's best opportunity to review the decisions the Government of Canada is making. It is not optional for families and businesses in Brandon—Souris, and it should not be optional for the Liberal Prime Minister, his Liberal Minister of Finance or those Liberal MPs.

My question is, why are the finance minister and the Prime Minister completely ignoring the will of Canadians in the House of Commons and refusing to table a complete, transparent and accountable budget before the House rises on Friday?

Tom Osborne (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the people of my riding sent me here to get a job done. They sent our government here to get a job done. Let me be crystal clear: This government has been focused on getting the job done. We have delivered a middle-class tax cut that will support 22 million Canadians.

Housing is another area where Canadians asked us to be decisive and act quickly, and this government delivered targeted, ambitious

measures to support first-time homebuyers. We are supporting purpose-built rentals, unlocking public lands and cutting red tape to get shovels in the ground faster.

When it comes to the business of Parliament, this government is showing what responsible leadership looks like. We have passed main estimates. We have passed supplementary estimates. We have funded what needed to be funded. We did it with transparency and we did it efficiently.

Now, we are moving forward with one Canadian economy, which is a transformative piece of legislation to strengthen our economic union. We are streamlining interprovincial trade so we can build a more productive, more competitive economy that works for every region of Canada.

We are breaking down barriers so we can build up the Canadian economy. In Newfoundland and Labrador, this means better access to markets, more efficient regulations and a more unified approach to energy development, infrastructure and workforce mobility. We are building one economy for all Canadians.

It is time to get to work; this is what the public wants us to do. This is what we as parliamentarians have been sent here to do. If we respect the will of Canadians, we will put petty politics aside and focus on getting things done for Canadians.

Look at what we have accomplished in a matter of just a couple of months. We are not just talking, we are acting. We are not just promising, we are delivering. I will say this with confidence and conviction: we are only just getting started.

● (1835)

Grant Jackson: Mr. Speaker, what a relief they are just getting started because the first three weeks of the government have surely been a disappointment to Canadians.

The member talks about transparency, leadership and accountability. As the parliamentary secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, why have that minister and that parliamentary secretary not introduced a budget?

All of these things would give Canadians confidence in the financial literacy of the government, would give them confidence in the transparency, the leadership and financial accountability this member talks about but has not delivered in the first weeks of the government.

Adjournment Proceedings

Why will this member, who talks laudably about all of these highfalutin goals but has delivered none of them, not stand up and force the minister to deliver a budget before the House rises for the summer to deliver for his constituents in Newfoundland and all the rest of this great country of Canadians?

Tom Osborne: Mr. Speaker, I will remind the member it is Newfoundland and Labrador.

As I said in my previous statement, we have hit the ground running and we are not wasting a single moment in delivering for Canadians. We have cut taxes for the middle class. We have launched bold measures for first-time homebuyers. We have passed main estimates. We have passed supplementary estimates.

Now, we are well on our way with the one Canadian economy act, legislation that would build a stronger, more unified economy from coast to coast to coast. Numbers speak for themselves. The Prime Minister is 65% in the polls. The only thing that has not changed in this Parliament is the petty politics of the opposition.

FIREARMS

Andrew Lawton (Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the question I asked the public safety minister in a question period recently stemmed from a rather bizarre exchange I had with him during committee of the whole, in which the minister responsible for overseeing Canada's gun laws admitted that he did not know what a firearms licence was. He admitted he did not know about the Canadian firearms safety course that all Canadian firearms owners must pass to get their firearms licence. I suspect if I had a bit more time, I might have learned that the minister did not even know what a firearm was, but unfortunately we will have to save that for the next committee of the whole.

Why this is important is that the Liberal government's firearms confiscation regime is predicated on misinformation. It is actually predicated on the idea that law-abiding firearms owners are the source of gun crime in Canada. I was not actually surprised that the minister responsible for the scheme did not know anything about guns and gun owners, because if he did know, the Liberals' plans would not exist; they would not make any sense, and they would be aware of that.

We know that the vast majority of firearms crime in Canada is the responsibility of guns that have been illegally smuggled across the Canada-U.S. border. It is guns that are very connected to organized crime and gangs. It is not Grandpa Joe's hunting rifle. It is not the firearm of a law-abiding, licensed firearms owner like I am and like many of my colleagues in the House are.

What I asked the minister in question period was whether he would commit to actually learning about his file, and, because he clearly did not know anything about it, whether he would commit to scrapping the Liberal government's firearms confiscation regime. Now, the minister has had a couple of weeks to bone up on this; maybe he has, or maybe he has not, but what I can tell members is that Canadian gun owners have been attacked by the government, which does not know that they are statistically less likely to commit a crime, and less likely to have any connection to gun violence or gun crime by virtue of having gone through the rigorous vetting, training and examination that the Canadian firearms program requires of gun owners.

The firearms that were banned by order in council five years ago, and the Liberals have added to this list continually, are firearms that were used by hunters, sport shooters and collectors, without any issue and without any connection to gun crime whatsoever.

I represent a riding that has a lot of rural communities where, unlike perhaps for the Laurentian elites across the aisle, firearms are a way of life. Firearms are a way of life for people in Aylmer, people in St. Thomas, people in Central Elgin and some Londoners as well, because they understand that firearms are a hobby and a pastime that has deep roots in Canada. Therefore, when the Liberal government passes its measures on firearms based on misinformation, it should take the opportunity to be educated and to learn. Only when the Liberal government and the minister responsible for the firearms program learn about guns will they apparently realize that its regime is based on complete and utter falsehoods.

I am here to ask once and for all whether the Minister of Public Safety will commit to scrapping the confiscation scheme that only, not majorly, not generally, but only, targets law-abiding gun owners.

● (1840)

[*Translation*]

Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. member for Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, I am pleased to be able to tell him about our government's commitments to strengthening gun control and fighting gun violence in Canada.

The safety of Canadians is one of the government's top priorities, and we are taking decisive action to prevent a rise in gun violence across the country, in all of our communities. In 2020, following the deadliest mass shooting in Canadian history, in which 22 Nova Scotians died, the government felt that the significant risk posed by certain firearms could in no way justify keeping them in Canadian communities. As a result, the government banned over 2,000 makes and models of firearms. Let us be clear, these are firearms that are not suitable for hunting or sport and that exceed safe civilian use. More firearms were banned in December 2024 and March 2025, bringing the total number of prohibited firearms to 2,500.

Adjournment Proceedings

A compensation program that focused on businesses was put in place first. As of April 30, 2025, businesses have claimed compensation for more than 12,000 prohibited firearms, and as of June 16, more than 10,600 of these firearms have been destroyed. The government will soon introduce the second phase of this program, which will fairly and equitably compensate owners in the same way as it did gunsmiths. Work to expand this program to individuals is progressing well.

However, no single program or initiative can address the issue of gun violence. In addition to the gun buyback, the government's comprehensive plan to protect Canadians from gun crime includes other significant measures such as strengthening our borders, where we are committed to adding resources to combat gun trafficking and smuggling in order to keep guns from entering Canada.

Since 2017, the government has invested more than \$1.3 billion in security initiatives, including the initiative to take action against gun and gang violence, the building safer communities fund, and investments to equip the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the Canada Border Services Agency with state-of-the-art tools such as X-ray machines to detect smuggled firearms and firearm parts.

Furthermore, in the last throne speech, the government announced the deployment of scanners, drones and helicopters to detect illegal goods, as well as additional personnel and canine teams along the border. This will greatly increase the ability of law enforcement to detect and seize firearms at the border.

Furthermore, criminal sanctions for firearms smuggling and trafficking recently increased from 10 years in prison to 14. This change should act as a more powerful deterrent and support the prosecution of offenders involved in firearms smuggling. Together, these efforts seek to prevent guns from being diverted to the black market, where they would be used to commit crimes, such as future shootings.

Through these initiatives, the government is acting responsibly. It is taking concrete action to make Canada less vulnerable to gun-related violence, all while—

• (1845)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): The hon. member for Elgin—St. Thomas—London South.

[*English*]

Andrew Lawton: Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary secretary had the audacity to mention the Portapique shooting to justify the Liberal government's attack on gun owners. The brutal murderer, in that case, used illegally acquired guns. He himself did not legally own them. It is disgraceful that the government would take advantage of those victims to score political points off the backs of law-abiding gun owners. He should be ashamed, and I hope he apologizes for that.

Will the government, since clearly the minister and the parliamentary secretary do not know anything about the gun file, abandon this half-baked confiscation scheme, which targets only law-abiding owners, not killers, not gang murderers and not those who are actually responsible for breaking the law?

[*Translation*]

Jacques Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, on the contrary, I would like to reiterate our government's commitment to public safety, including through stricter gun control.

We have banned over 2,500 assault-style firearms that were deemed inappropriate for recreational use, whether it be for hunting or sport shooting. Some 12,000 guns were bought back during the business phase of the program. Phase two, for individuals, will be announced shortly. It will ensure that responsible gun owners are properly compensated.

The government has invested \$1.3 billion in initiatives to make our communities safer. Too many lives have been lost to gun violence. We will continue to take decisive action to strengthen controls, stop guns from being smuggled across the border and impose tougher criminal sanctions for firearms trafficking. We remain committed, and we will always be there to keep Canadians safe.

[*English*]

PUBLIC SERVICES AND PROCUREMENT

Branden Leslie (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last week, I asked the minister a pretty straightforward question: Why can the Liberals not get anything built on time or on budget? It is a reasonable question that most taxpayers ask, unfortunately, on a far too regular basis. His answer at the time was nonsensical. He completely ignored the question and gave some typical government gobbledegook answer.

Today, I am going to take the opportunity to outline a few examples of the Liberals' wasteful incompetence, and I would like to start local.

The Liberal government committed funds to the Municipality of Rhineland for its Gretna Arena project, but because of delays on the side of the federal Liberal government in signing the contribution agreement and due to, generally speaking, Liberal inflationary policies, the cost of the project ballooned in a huge way. As a result, the municipality cannot afford to move forward with the project any longer. To make matters worse, the Liberal government is trying to shake down the Municipality of Rhineland for \$50,000 for part of the costs that went into this project.

Let me move to the national level. The original budget of the Trans Mountain pipeline was what we would call a measly \$7 billion. Then the Liberal government went ahead and nationalized it, and the budget ballooned to over \$34 billion, nearly five times the cost of the original estimate.

Of course, we can talk about the Liberals' frankly ridiculous and unjustified firearms confiscation scheme. Instead of going after criminals, what they are doing is planning to spend \$600 million to expropriate firearms from some of the most law-abiding Canadians in this country, I would argue.

Unfortunately, taxpayers know that I can go on and on, and we know there are many unfortunate, egregious examples, but I would like to ask some simple questions. Has anyone within the government ever lost their job? Even worse, did they receive a bonus for these abysmal failures?

Hon. Jenna Sudds (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement and to the Secretary of State (Defence Procurement), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for the question and the opportunity to rise tonight to address it.

Whether it is creating more affordable housing or boosting our defence efforts, this new government is committed to building Canada strong and delivering for Canadians. With the appointment of a new Minister of Government Transformation, we are focused on transforming the way we do business. That means improving productivity, but it also means focusing on meeting service delivery standards. That is going to require us to look at new technologies, such as artificial intelligence, and change the way we manage many of our processes.

On housing, we have a plan to deliver affordable homes by creating “build Canada homes”, a mission-driven organization that will act to accelerate the development of new affordable housing.

On defence procurement, this government created a dedicated cabinet post of Secretary of State for Defence Procurement, and we have already committed to establishing a defence procurement agency focused on reforming and speeding up our military purchases.

As for the issues surrounding GC Strategies, we share the frustrations of others in this House. That is why we have taken action. Public Services and Procurement Canada has taken several steps over the last 18 months to implement changes based on recommendations that were made in the reports to Parliament. They include improving evaluation requirements, increasing transparency from suppliers around pricing and use of subcontractors, improving contract documentation and ensuring the clarification of work requirements and activities. We also introduced an updated ineligibility and suspension policy, and set up a new office of supplier integrity and compliance, empowering the government to better respond to misconduct and wrongdoing in a way that is impartial and free of political interference.

In addition, PSPC has terminated all contracts with GC Strategies and removed it from all supply arrangements. Earlier this month, the government found that the company's actions met the

Adjournment Proceedings

threshold for ineligibility, pursuant to the government's ineligibility and suspension policy, which will now prohibit the company from participating in federal contracts.

When it comes to cases of recovering funds for work not done or overbilling, we pursue them to ensure that Canadians get their money back. That is why we have taken legal action against GC Strategies, right now.

We remain committed to ensuring the best value for Canadian taxpayers with all federal procurements and projects.

• (1850)

Branden Leslie: Mr. Speaker, just for frame of reference, the question that was read, but certainly not answered, was whether anyone ever lost their job or received a bonus despite these failures.

I am not exactly sure what I just heard, but I know it was a canned response. This is why people get so frustrated with government. The Liberals sit here and they want to look at Parliament. They want to hear what we have to say, the questions that opposition members want to ask the government, and those are the types of responses we get.

Speaking of the costly and wasteful programs that we are well aware of in the government, there is a net-zero accelerator fund under the Liberal government. It has doled out \$8 billion in subsidies to very large, multinational companies without any commitment to actually reduce emissions. We know this agenda is not actually about achieving results. The Liberals, at the end of the day, have sidelined the hard-working Canadians, and at the end of the day, is this—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Hon. Jenna Sudds: Mr. Speaker, it is our responsibility to manage public funds in a way that ensures Canadian taxpayers are getting the best possible value for their dollars. I would suggest to my colleagues opposite that it is time to stop the political games of the last Parliament, and it is time to get to work on the things that matter to Canadians and the things that we talked about throughout the campaign that got us re-elected to this place: To build the strongest economy in the G7, build our military, protect our borders and our sovereignty, and ensure that in everything that we are doing, we are building Canada strong. I encourage the opposition to join us in doing just that.

• (1855)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): The motion that the House do now adjourn is deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 6:55 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Wednesday, June 18, 2025

Vacancy

Battle River—Crowfoot

The Speaker 1287

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Stephen Charleson

Johns 1287

Graduation Congratulations

Sudds 1287

Sacred Heart Catholic High School

Cobena 1287

World Refugee Day

Zuberi 1288

Public Safety

Ho 1288

National Public Service Week

Lalonde 1288

Resource Sector Workers

Gunn 1288

Anti-Scab Legislation

Kayabaga 1289

Finance

Hallan 1289

Quebec's National Holiday

Blanchet 1289

Sandee Butterley

Klassen 1289

The Economy

Patzer 1290

Residential Communities in Ottawa West—Nepean

Vandenbeld 1290

Housing

Mantle 1290

Seniors' Residence in Alfred-Pellan

Iacono 1290

Finance

McCauley 1290

Vancouver Granville

Noormohamed 1291

ORAL QUESTIONS

Automotive Industry

Scheer 1291

Dabrusin 1291

Scheer 1291

Dabrusin 1291

Scheer 1291

Solomon 1292

Paul-Hus 1292

Dabrusin 1292

Paul-Hus 1292

Dabrusin 1292

Paul-Hus 1292

Dabrusin 1292

Canada-U.S. Relations

Blanchet 1292

LeBlanc 1292

Government Priorities

Blanchet 1293

LeBlanc 1293

Blanchet 1293

Freeland 1293

Automotive Industry

Redekopp 1293

Solomon 1293

Redekopp 1293

MacKinnon 1293

Aboultaif 1294

MacKinnon 1294

Diotte 1294

MacKinnon 1294

Strauss 1294

Dabrusin 1294

Martel 1294

MacKinnon 1294

Martel 1294

MacKinnon 1295

Carbon Pricing

Garon 1295

MacKinnon 1295

Garon 1295

Dabrusin 1295

Housing

Kramp-Neuman 1295

Robertson 1295

Kramp-Neuman 1295

van Koeverden 1295

Kelly 1296

MacKinnon 1296

Kelly 1296

Robertson	1296
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)	1296
van Koeverden	1296
Seniors	
Nathan	1296
McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)	1296
Justice	
Caputo	1296
Fraser	1297
Caputo	1297
Fraser	1297
Lawton	1297
Fraser	1297
Lawton	1297
Fraser	1297
Ma	1297
Anandasangaree	1298
Gender-Based Violence	
Vien	1298
Sahota	1298
Vien	1298
Provost	1298
National Defence	
Bezan	1298
McGuinty	1298
Bezan	1298
McGuinty	1299
Dental Care	
Saini	1299
Hajdu	1299
Marine Transportation	
Albas	1299
Freeland	1299
Albas	1299
Freeland	1299
Kronis	1299
Freeland	1299
Public Safety	
Sousa	1300
Sahota	1300
Gill (Windsor West)	1300
Fraser	1300
Pharmacare	
Johns	1300
Michel	1300

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Public Sector Integrity Commissioner	
The Speaker	1300
Civil Aviation Safety	
Kelloway	1301

Air Transport	
Kelloway	1301
An Act respecting cyber security	
Anandasangaree	1301
Bill C-8. Introduction and first reading	1301
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	1301
Department of Citizenship and Immigration Ombud Act	
Kwan	1301
Bill C-212. Introduction and first reading	1301
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	1301
Immigration and Refugee Protection Act	
Kwan	1301
Bill C-213. Introduction and first reading	1301
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	1301
National Renewable Energy Strategy Act	
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	1301
Bill C-214. Introduction and first reading	1301
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	1302
Marine Liability Act	
Johns	1302
Bill C-215. Introduction and first reading	1302
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	1302
Petitions	
Charitable Organizations	
Redekopp	1302
Justice	
Vis	1302
Charitable Organizations	
Khanna	1303
Finance	
Viersen	1303
Charitable Organizations	
Viersen	1303
Emergency Services	
Ruff	1303
Foreign Affairs	
Kwan	1303
Questions on the Order Paper	
Lamoureux	1303
Motions for Papers	
Lamoureux	1303

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Strong Borders Act	
Bill C-2. Second reading	1304

Lamoureux	1304
Caputo	1305
Brunelle-Duceppe	1305
Kwan	1306
Sari	1306
Bezan	1307
Lamoureux	1308
Savard-Tremblay	1308
Kelly	1309
Diotte	1309
Danko	1310
Bonin	1311
Caputo	1311
Nathan	1311
Konanz	1312
Savard-Tremblay	1313
Ntumba	1313
Kirkland	1313
Ma	1313
Eyolfson	1314
Bonin	1314
Guglielmin	1315
Kwan	1315
Gasparro	1315
Lawton	1317
Brunelle-Duceppe	1317
Chagger	1317
Konanz	1318
Lamoureux	1319
DeBellefeuille	1319
Jackson	1319
Dhillon	1320

Anstey	1321
DeBellefeuille	1321
Lamoureux	1322
Fortin	1322
Ntumba	1323
Caputo	1323
Savard-Tremblay	1323
Bittle	1324
Kuruc	1325
Kayabaga	1325
Caputo	1326
Lawton	1326
Kayabaga	1327
Brunelle-Duceppe	1328
Guglielmin	1328
Ntumba	1328
Noormohamed	1328
Savard-Tremblay	1329

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Finance

Jackson	1329
Osborne	1330

Firearms

Lawton	1331
Ramsay	1331

Public Services and Procurement

Leslie	1332
Sudds	1333

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>