



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 152 No. 032
Thursday, October 2, 2025

Speaker: The Honourable Francis Scarpaleggia



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, October 2, 2025

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayer

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

● (1000)

[English]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Hon. Maninder Sidhu (Minister of International 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 “Decision No 1/2024 of the Joint Committee on Mutual Recognition of Professional Qualifications of 10 October 2024 setting out an agreement on the mutual recognition of professional qualifications for architects”, adopted at Brussels on October 10, 2024.

* * *

[Translation]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Annie Koutrakis (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Jobs and Families, 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 on Social Security between Canada and the Republic of Ecuador”, done at Quito on June 24, 2024.

* * *

[English]

PETITIONS

FUR FARMING

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise today to present e-petition 6589. This petition was initiated by Lesley Fox from Port Alberni, British Columbia, and was signed by 10,800 Canadians who are deeply concerned about the risks and harms of fur farming.

The petitioners note that fur-farmed animals can carry high-risk zoonotic diseases, including coronaviruses and influenza. Intense breeding in captivity increases the risk of transmission between humans and animals. The petition highlights that British Columbia

has already banned mink farming due to public health risk. Infectious disease specialists in Canada have called on the federal government to end fur farming altogether.

The petitioners further raise concerns about the inhumane confinement and suffering of animals such as minks, foxes, chinchillas, lynx, bobcats and wolves, and they point out that over 20 countries have already banned fur farming. Public opinion in Canada overwhelmingly supports a nationwide prohibition.

The petitioners call upon the Government of Canada to finally prohibit the practice of fur farming for all species of animals.

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE IN DYING

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to present two petitions on behalf of my constituents.

The first petition is in regard to MAID. My constituents are concerned that advanced requests could lead to coercion or undue pressure, especially among older adults or those with disabilities, to request MAID to avoid burdening families or the health care system. There are ethical concerns among some health care professionals that carrying out MAID based on an old request without current confirmation could be seen as involuntary. There is a risk that death could be seen as a benefit contrary to what a patient might have desired.

CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the second petition I will present today calls upon the Government of Canada to reject recommendation 430 of the FINA pre-budget report, reaffirm Canada's commitment to an open culture and support each person's freedom to promote common good through the advancement of religion without punitive financial measures.

ANIMAL WELFARE

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise today to present a petition that relates to a private member's bill that I was honoured to sponsor through this place, which has received royal assent. Bill S-203 bans the keeping of whales, dolphins and cetaceans of all kinds in captivity.

Routine Proceedings

I know I should not update a petition that is being presented, but we know the Minister of Fisheries has done the right thing. The petitioners asked for the Minister of Fisheries to deny any export permits, which would have put the belugas and dolphins of Marineland at risk by exporting them to the People's Republic of China.

The petitioners call on the Government of Canada, working with the Province of Ontario, to find ways to improve the welfare of these mammals, which must not be kept in captivity but must not be exported to places of greater cruelty.

• (1005)

MALNUTRITION

Hon. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions to present today.

The first petition is with respect to malnutrition. The petitioners bring to the attention of the government the malnutrition that exists among many Canadians. In particular, they are calling on the government to convene a pan-Canadian malnutrition summit to expand Canada's healthy eating strategy and to mandate the collection and reporting of malnutrition metrics by Canadian institutes.

NATIONAL UNITY

Hon. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition draws the attention of the government to the rhetorical talk and discussion we hear from the United States with respect to Canada becoming the 51st state. The petitioners are calling upon members of Parliament of all parties to immediately forswear and discourage any and all further divisive partisanship and come together collegially to prioritize the national interest in the conduct of the nation's business and external relations.

CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS

Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition calling on the government to not cause Christian churches to lose their charitable status. The petitioners call upon the Government of Canada to reject recommendation 430 of the FINA pre-budget report, reaffirm Canada's commitment to an open culture and support each citizen's freedom to promote the common good through the advancement of religion without punitive financial measures. Christian churches should not lose their charitable status under the government.

Andrew Lawton (Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is my great privilege to present to the House a petition from concerned Canadians who are alarmed by the finance committee's pre-budget submission and recommendation that the government revoke charitable status from houses of worship and organizations that have a pro-life position.

The petitioners are very alarmed by this encroachment on Canadians' religious freedoms and freedom of conscience. Religious institutions offer a range of philanthropic initiatives, and faith itself is invaluable to Canadians. The petitioners want religious freedoms to be protected and for the government to keep its hands off the charitable status of faith-based organizations.

Eric Melillo (Kenora—Kiiwetinoong, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to present a petition in which the undersigned point out that religious charities in Canada provide vital services to society, including food banks, care for seniors, newcomer support,

youth programs and mental health support, all rooted in their faith traditions.

Freedom of religion and freedom of belief are fundamental rights in Canada that are protected by the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Excluding faith-based charities from the charitable sector based on religious beliefs undermines the diversity that is foundational to Canadian society.

The petitioners are calling on the Government of Canada 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.

I am thankful for the opportunity to share this petition this morning.

John Brassard (Barrie South—Innisfil, CPC): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I also have a petition, certified and signed by 30 people, regarding recommendation 430 of the House of Commons finance committee's pre-budget report, which proposes removing the advancement of religion as a recognized charitable purpose under the Income Tax Act. Recommendation 429 proposes to revoke the charitable status of various organizations.

Religious charities in Canada provide vital services to society, including food banks, care for seniors, newcomer support, youth programs and mental health outreach. These communities indeed promote hope, belonging, social cohesion and compassion.

The undersigned citizens and residents of Canada call upon the Government of Canada 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 work flows from sincerely held beliefs and whose contributions serve the common good of Canada.

• (1010)

Colin Reynolds (Elmwood—Transcona, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition, pursuant to Standing Order 36. In this petition, the undersigned citizens and residents of Canada call upon the Government of Canada to reject recommendation 430 of the finance committee's pre-budget report, reaffirm Canada's commitment to an open culture and support citizens' freedom to promote the common good through the advancement of religion without punitive measures.

The petitioners feel that recommendation 430 is working against religious freedoms. These charitable organizations have a large impact on the community, with many community outreach programs, and they are against this recommendation.

TAXATION

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I table a petition today calling upon parliamentarians to do what they can to ensure that disposable income increases for Canadian. In particular, the petitioners are suggesting there is a need for a tax break for Canada's middle class, and they are looking for ways we can support Canada's middle class.

It is a pleasure for me to table this petition today.

CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS

David McKenzie (Calgary Signal Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise in the House today, pursuant to Standing Order 36, to present this petition to the House. It says that the undersigned citizens and residents of Canada call upon the Government of Canada to reject recommendation 430 of the FINA pre-budget report, reaffirm Canada's commitment to an open culture and support each citizen's freedom to promote the common good through the advancement of religion without punitive financial measures.

The revocation of charitable status from religious institutions is a threat to an open society and to the right of all Canadians to pursue whatever religious path they wish. The petitioners call upon the government to act accordingly.

Steven Bonk (Souris—Moose Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure today to stand here to present a petition, pursuant to Standing Order 36, regarding limiting the rights of religious organizations and revoking their charitable status. Religious organizations in Canada and in my constituency do so much good work through either volunteering or helping those in need. It is very important that these organizations are allowed to maintain their charitable status.

The undersigned citizens and residents of Canada call upon the Government of Canada to reject recommendation 430 of the FINA pre-budget report, reaffirm Canada's commitment to an open culture and support each citizen's freedom to promote the common good through the advancement of religion without punitive financial measures.

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE IN DYING

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the first of several petitions that I would like to present to the House highlights the ongoing tragedy of the government's failed euthanasia policy.

The petitioners in this petition note in particular the pernicious effects of the government's approach to Canadians living with disabilities. These Conservative petitioners and all major disability advocacy organizations in the country have expressed opposition to the government's presenting euthanasia as a response to disability.

The petitioners say that offering medical assistance in dying as a "solution" for a disability or chronic illness reduces incentives to improve treatment and care for people with those conditions and that allowing medical assistance in dying for those with disabilities or chronic illnesses who are not dying devalues their life. The petitioners want to see the government change the existing regime to protect all Canadians whose natural death is not reasonably foreseeable. They want to see this happen by prohibiting medical assis-

Business of Supply

tance in dying for those whose prognosis for natural death is more than six months.

• (1015)

FREEDOM OF POLITICAL EXPRESSION

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, next I would like to present a petition that references Bill C-257, which was a bill in the previous Parliament, put forward by me, that would have added political belief and activity as prohibited grounds of discrimination in the Canada Human Rights Act. Petitioners are asking the House to support the bill, or presumably a similar bill in the current Parliament.

Petitioners note that Canadians can and do face political discrimination on the basis of their political beliefs and that it is in the best interests of Canadian democracy to protect public debate and to protect an environment in which people can exchange about different ideas and do so without fear of discrimination.

Petitioners therefore want the House to support the bill and defend the rights of Canadians to peacefully express their political opinions.

FALUN GONG

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am presenting a petition about a very serious issue: the persecution of Falun Gong practitioners. Petitioners would like to see an end to that persecution, the protection of Falun Gong practitioners and an end to these human rights abuses.

* * *

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.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—PASSAGE OF BILL C-242

Arpan Khanna (Oxford, CPC) moved:

That, given that,

(a) violent crime is up 55% under the Liberal government and repeat offenders continue to be released because of Liberal catch and release laws; and

(b) the Liberal government promised to pass criminal justice reform six months ago but has failed to do so;

Business of Supply

in order to keep repeat offenders in jail and keep Canadians safe, the House is of the opinion that Bill C-242, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and the Department of Justice Act, also known as the Jail Not Bail Act, must pass and is committed to sitting extended hours, holding an expeditious committee study and undertaking such other procedural measures as may be necessary to pass it at the earliest opportunity.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the hon. member for Brantford—Brant South—Six Nations.

It is always an honour to rise in the chamber to fight for law-abiding Canadians.

The results are in on the Liberals' bail reform experiment, and they failed. They failed our victims. Their policies have failed survivors and their families. They have failed Canadians

If we look at the news headlines that Canadians are waking up to every single day, we see that they are tragic; they are heartbreaking. Extortions are running wild in our community. In Surrey, B.C.; in Peel; and in Calgary, business owners are scared. They are not even picking up calls from unknown phone numbers. We hear stories of broad-daylight shootings, of murders, including of a 70-year-old grandmother who went out to buy groceries and was randomly stabbed and killed on the street. There are violent carjackings. There are home invasions. Home is the place where we are supposed to be the safest; it is supposed to be our castle where we can be in peace to raise our family and live life. Now those areas are being targeted by repeat violent offenders.

Crime is up thanks to the Liberals' failed policies. Thanks to bills like Bill C-75 and Bill C-5, they have allowed repeat violent offenders to terrorize our communities over and over again. It is thanks to their decisions and their policies.

The Liberals love to deny and to deflect, and to distract Canadians from their failed record, but they are responsible. In 2019 when they brought in Bill C-75, they codified the principle of restraint, which clearly says that judges, justices of the peace and police officers will release on the least restrictive conditions and at the earliest opportunity. That is a decision they made; they took that action and they presented it to Parliament. Conservatives voted against it then, and we are against the principle today.

Every single day that goes by, 1,600 violent crimes happen in our country. If we do the math, that is almost one Canadian per minute who falls victim to violent crime in Canada because of the Liberals' failure to act, and Canadians are scared; they are terrified. They are afraid to go on an evening walk in their neighbourhood. There are seniors in Oxford County who cannot even go to the bank without seeing security and without being nervous. That is not the Canada my parents came to. That is not the Canadian dream newcomers or folks who have been living here for generations love.

It is the Liberals' policies that have let Canadians down, and the ironic part is that they said, and the Prime Minister said in his campaign, that they were going to take decisive action and that they were going to be making changes to the Criminal Code right away. However, it has been six months, and we have not seen any legislation come forward.

The Liberals keep talking about some magical bill for bail reform. "It's coming", they say. Well, they did bail reform, and they

failed, so we do not need any more Liberal bail policies. We need to scrap Liberal bail. We need to invest in making sure our frontline officers have the tools they need. We need to make sure the Criminal Code is reflective of today's realities, which is why last week I tabled the proposed jail not bail act.

● (1020)

I did the homework for the Liberals about the jail not bail legislation. I know they are struggling to put something together. The bill came together from consultation and support from right across our country, from Whitehorse, Yukon, all the way to the east coast. I, along with my colleague, the member for Brantford—Brant South—Six Nations, and others from my Conservative team, have met with law enforcement and dozens of police unions. We have met with victim advocacy groups. I have met with the families of victims. I have sat at their tables and had conversations. They have cried because the situation is preventable. We did not have to be here today.

Our bill has feedback from Crown prosecutors and from defence lawyers, from the legal community. More importantly, thousands of Canadians are signing our petition demanding that the government finally wake up, end the madness and restore safe streets in our country again.

Our opposition day motion is important so we can pass Bill C-242, the jail not bail act, as soon as possible. We want the Liberals to get out of the way, stop blocking safe communities, stop delaying, stop denying, stop chasing photo ops and media headlines, and instead focus on fighting crime for Canadians. We have seen this not just in the big cities; crime is now coming to rural Canada. Businesses are being affected. There is an economic cost. Emotional, social and security costs are being added on.

No one has seen this level of crime before. That is why my jail not bail act would repeal the principle of restraint that the Liberals brought in. We would introduce a principle of public safety as the primary consideration for bail decisions. Let us put the rights of law-abiding Canadians first, not the criminals like the Liberals have been doing for the last number of years.

My bill would introduce a new major offences category that would include violent crimes like arson, extortion, home invasions, carjackings and assaults on peace officers and that would become grounds for a reverse onus on the criminals to get bail. We would bring in legislation to add clarity to the Criminal Code to give judges the clarity they need by making it mandatory for judges to look at the criminal history of an accused person, for all offences.

We would change and tighten risk assessment when it comes to granting bail on secondary grounds. We would add new measures as tertiary grounds. If someone who has a long rap sheet or has been charged with and convicted of an indictable offence over the last 10 years is released on bail and caught again, there should be no bail. We would tighten the conditions for bail.

Right now in Canada, a criminal who has been indicted for a major offence can be a surety, can vouch for other criminals. We have seen that. Please tell me about that. There are criminals vouching for other criminals. How does that make any sense? A surety is supposed to be somebody who could support another person to make sure they stay out of trouble, but when there are criminals vouching for criminals, that is a problem.

Our bill is not about being partisan. We are asking for members' support and for them to put their partisanship aside and think about Canadians. The bill is a common-sense piece of legislation. It would protect Canadians. It would ensure that repeat violent offenders stay behind bars, where they belong, and it would restore safe streets in our communities once again.

• (1025)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, just under six months ago, Canada elected a new Prime Minister, who put together a number of agenda items that came out of the election. One of the commitments that the Prime Minister made was to bring forward bail reform legislation that will be coming out this fall. I find it somewhat unfortunate that now the Conservatives, in a pre-emptive strike, have decided to come out to say they are tough and to blame the Prime Minister for not doing enough. It is the responsibility of the Prime Minister to do the proper consultation and to work with the cabinet and the many different stakeholders in order to present bail reform legislation.

Does the member not recognize that there is that need, and can he not be patient and wait for—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): The hon. member for Oxford has the floor.

Arpan Khanna: Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely ridiculous. The supposed new, shiny Prime Minister promised to get changes done right away. In his own words, he said he would be decisive. With every single day that goes by, 1,600 people are victims of crime.

The member talks about being patient. He wants us to be patient when people are dying in this country. I say shame on the Liberals. People are dying. Bailey McCourt's family has called us in tears because their daughter would be alive if my bill had passed. This is something the Liberals need to wake up and look at, because Canadians are dying and it is their inaction. They are all about photo ops and headlines. Why are they delaying action? Their policies are

Business of Supply

causing problems. Their bail reform ideas from 2019 have destroyed our country.

Enough is enough. Let us bring back safe streets.

• (1030)

[Translation]

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the list of serious offences related to today's motion includes aggravated sexual assault. I would like my colleague to explain what aggravated sexual assault means to him because that is something that the Standing Committee on the Status of Women is looking at right now.

I moved a motion in committee on gender-based crimes, crimes committed against women. I also moved a motion to enable the committee to study the criminalization of coercive control. In the near future, the committee will be conducting a study on the justice system and its responses to victims, particularly with regard to section 810 of the Criminal Code.

I would like my colleague to tell us whether he has any interest in the report that we will be publishing and the recommendations it will contain.

[English]

Arpan Khanna: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my hon. colleague for all the work she is doing on advocating for women and against intimate partner violence.

We have seen a massive rise, because of the government's policies, of women being abused and killed. I have talked about this in the past. Cait Alexander, who runs the charity End Violence Everywhere, was also a victim of abuse by her ex-partner. She was left to die, and her ex-partner got bail for only \$500. She was so scared that she left the country and is now living in the States.

The problem is very real. Making it part of a major offence category would put a reverse onus on those who commit those crimes so that they would have to prove they should be released, not the other way around. On this side of the House, we will stand with women and make sure there are safe streets in our country.

Andrew Lawton (Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to my colleague from Oxford for his work on this. When he was talking about the Bailey McCourt case, there was some groaning from the Liberal side of the aisle, which is very offensive to us, as it is to all victims of crime and their families, especially when we know that tangible changes in law could improve the situation and legitimately save lives.

My colleague's riding of Oxford is right next to mine, and there are a lot of rural communities in it, as there are in mine. We have seen, in these rural communities, a decline in feelings of safety and security. Could the member speak to that, what that means and what the bill would do for them?

Business of Supply

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): The hon. member for Oxford has 30 seconds to respond.

Arpan Khanna: Mr. Speaker, I have been meeting with Woodstock Police Service and the Crowns, along with the OPP.

I want to thank the member for the great work he has been doing in advocating for those in rural communities across Canada.

The member is right that Canadians in rural communities do not feel safe. Once-safe communities and neighbourhoods are now being targeted by repeat violent offenders. In Plattsville, 20 minutes from me, a repeat violent offender committed a break and enter into a home, bashed a car and took it. This is now becoming the norm, whether it is in rural communities like Oxford or big cities like—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Resuming debate, the hon. member for Brantford—Brant South—Six Nations.

Larry Brock (Brantford—Brant South—Six Nations, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to rise on behalf of the great citizens of Brantford—Brant South—Six Nations. It is particularly poignant for me given today's topic and given my prior history in the criminal justice system. I dare say that one of the driving forces for me to leave behind, at that point, almost 28 years in criminal justice to become a legislator was that I saw first-hand, daily, the tragic consequences of the failed, soft-on-crime agenda of the Liberal government.

It started in 2015; changes were then made in 2019 with Bill C-75 and Bill C-83 and later, in 2023, with Bill C-5. The cumulative effect is that Canadians are now living in a state of fear. Canadians are waking up every single day to read, see and hear about one heartbreaking story after another, usually about someone who has been killed, wounded, maimed or injured; someone who has had their car stolen or their home invaded; or someone who has been subject to sexual assault. Lo and surprise, individuals committing these offences are on numerous releases and are classified by police services as being well known to them, because they are repeat violent offenders.

That is the reality Canada is facing. This was not the reality prior to 2019. In 2019, there was a balance in our criminal justice system, in which the constitutional rights of the accused, such as the right to be presumed innocent and the right to reasonable bail, were balanced evenly with community safety and the safety of victims. We saw more releases and more detention orders, and people had a level of confidence that things were working as they were supposed to.

In 2019, the government decided to lie to Canadians. Justin Trudeau and his former ministers deliberately lied to Canadians by saying—

• (1035)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Order, please.

There are certain words we consider unparliamentary, so I encourage the member to leave out those words and carry on with his comments.

Larry Brock: Mr. Speaker, the government misled Canadians into believing that it was simply codifying language from the Supreme Court of Canada. The decision the Liberals were referring

to was Antic, which basically reiterated the principles under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms that apply to people who are factually innocent, although charged with a serious crime. Justin Trudeau and his ministers said they were taking the language from Antic and applying it to the Criminal Code, but the decision from Antic never directed the federal government to do anything. It was a reminder about the balance that needed to take place every single day in every single courthouse in this country.

Justin Trudeau and his then justice minister, David Lametti, decided to make it one step easier for criminals. They introduced the “Principle of restraint” under section 493.1 of the Criminal Code, which said that regardless of the grounds for detention in the Criminal Code, the primary ground for release was whether the person was going to show up for court. The secondary ground was whether there was a protection issue for the public and a presumption that this person was going to incur further charges if released. The tertiary ground was to maintain the confidence of the public, depending on the severity of the charge.

Those three grounds worked, but Justin Trudeau and David Lametti decided to introduce the principle of restraint. That telegraphed to every judge and justice of the peace hearing bail applications to this day that they “shall”, which is mandatory language, “release...the accused at the earliest...opportunity and on the least [restrictive] conditions”. This was regardless of what the charge was or the carnage the charge had caused to the community or to the victim. It was regardless of the offender's criminal record, which may have shown a pattern of breaching court orders or committing that same offence again. It was also, get this, regardless of the number of outstanding releases that person might be on. This person, according to the Liberal government, was worthy of release. That is the origin of catch-and-release. That is the reason we have the problems that exist today.

I know the member for Winnipeg North likes to turn everything into a partisan issue. To my colleague from Woodstock, I say that this particular bill and our arguments are not partisan, because community safety is not a partisan issue. Every member in the House represents constituents, and those constituents want to wake up in homes that are still safe, with windows that are still intact, doors that have not been broken in and vehicles that are still in the driveway, where their kids can play safely in the backyard and play street hockey on the streets and not be hit by stray bullets or invaded at night, as we are constantly seeing, day after day. That is what Canadians want, and that is why this is not a partisan issue.

The number one responsibility of the Liberal government is to keep Canadians safe. The member for Winnipeg North says that the Prime Minister has a robust agenda he has promised Canadians, but this is a classic bait and switch. We heard these promises during the election; we heard the promises in the throne speech, and we have heard numerous members on that side of the House make promises that this is coming. However, here we are, seven months removed since the Prime Minister became the new prime minister of this country, and we are still waiting. In that time frame, people have died, people are fearful and people are being sexually assaulted or extorted at an alarming rate.

● (1040)

Let us look at the statistics. Because of Liberal bail laws, violent crime is up 55% since 2015. Firearms crime is up 130% because of Liberal bail laws. Because of Liberal bail laws, extortion has skyrocketed 330%. Because of Liberal bail laws, sex assault is up 76%. Because of Liberal bail laws, homicide is up 29%. This is why, if the Liberals do not want to exercise their number one responsibility, they should get out of the way and let us bring forth common-sense solutions to protect Canadians.

I brought a petition, which I was hoping was going to go viral across the country, this past July, calling for the immediate repeal of the principle of restraint, restoring safe streets and applying the principle of community safety, just like the member for Oxford has done in our jail not bail act. Since the middle of July, 60,000 proud Canadians, Canadians those members in the government represent, have signed my petition. For the last four years, the government has heard from premiers, mayors, presidents of police associations, police chiefs, victim advocacy groups, to do one thing: change your approach to bail, keep Canadians safe.

Here is the Liberal government's opportunity. If you want to clearly distinguish yourself, and remove yourself from the Trudeau legacy, here is your opportunity. Stand in support of the jail not bail act, or abstain from the vote, but please telegraph to your constituents, who I am sure are going to be watching our speeches today, and if they are not, I will certainly share it among all my followers across this country, that you will do your job. Stand up for Canada, stand up for safety, stand up for victims and put violent criminals where they belong, back in jail.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Before we move to questions and comments, just a reminder that we address comments through the Chair and not directly to members on either side.

Questions and comments, the hon. Secretary of State for Combatting Crime.

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not disagree with a lot of what the member says, minus a lot of exaggeration and some oversimplification at times. We are bringing forward legislation that is going to reform the bail process. We have also brought forward other, smaller bills, wherein a lot of the work was already complete. Our strong borders act, Bill C-2, was the second piece of legislation we brought into the House, and Bill C-9, hate crime, is what we have before us. In a few weeks, we will have the bail reform as well. We are hard at work on this.

I would like to know, from the member, whether he is going to support Bill C-2, because what I have heard from a lot of the Conservatives is that they are in opposition to what law enforcement has asked for.

Larry Brock: Mr. Speaker, perhaps my friend did not hear me as clearly as I wanted her to hear me. Law enforcement has been pleading with the government for the last four years. They have had regular meetings here in Ottawa and in many parts of this country. They came here to Ottawa for a one-day summit, a one-day summit producing Bill C-48, which added reverse onus provisions to a number of firearm offences, which did not move the needle one iota on community safety. They are asking her to do her job.

Business of Supply

We cannot wait. The justice minister has been promising reform for the last six months. Get on board with the jail not bail act and protect Canadians.

● (1045)

[Translation]

Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in his work *Zadig; or, The Book of Fate*, Voltaire said, "It is better to risk saving a guilty person than to condemn an innocent one." This is a principle that exists in all democracies, in all developed societies around the world.

Keeping an accused person in jail rather than making efforts to release them under the presumption of innocence goes against all the basic rights that we stand for in democratic societies. Some countries, however, would disagree. North Korea, China and Iran do this, among others, but here in Canada, it is not part of our values.

Does my colleague still believe in a democratic system and in our core values that we follow and respect here in Quebec and Canada?

[English]

Larry Brock: Mr. Speaker, I absolutely believe in democracy. I absolutely believe in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. In the charter, we have two fundamental rights that apply to bail matters: the right to be presumed innocent until proven otherwise, and the right to reasonable bail. This is bail, not sentencing. Reasonable bail does not mean absolute bail, and that is the consequence, literally, of Bill C-75. The purpose behind a bail hearing is not to determine guilt or innocence; it is an assessment of risk. When we are dealing with violent repeat offenders, the easy solution is that community outweighs the freedom of the accused—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Questions and comments, the hon. member for Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies.

Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I quote the Vancouver Sun, from February 25, 2025: "Just weeks after former Abbotsford gangster Jarrod Bacon was arrested in a shooting in [Fort Nelson,] B.C., the charge against him has been dropped."

Witnesses against him simply do not feel safe.

Business of Supply

Ben Wall, from Fort Nelson, had nine pieces of equipment destroyed. His shop was burned to the ground. Organized crime has set up shop in Fort Nelson, and people in Fort Nelson do not feel safe.

The member made a great speech.

Would the bill make people feel safe in Fort Nelson once again?

Larry Brock: Mr. Speaker, absolutely, the bill would see immediate changes to the safety quotient across the country. There would be a rebalancing of our criminal justice system, where the rights of the accused are balanced with community safety and victim safety. Those repeat violent offenders would find it exceedingly difficult, although not impossible, to obtain bail.

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we all want to end the cycle of crime. I will give an example to my colleague. In my riding, there was an application for a rapid housing initiative. The initiative was going to create housing for the most vulnerable and for people who were released.

This application has a sworn letter from the Nanaimo parole office, from Correctional Service Canada, highlighting that they did not have any beds for clients they were releasing who had been serving two years plus a day. This application was denied by the Liberals. There was not a single bed—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): The hon. member for Brantford—Brant South—Six Nations.

Larry Brock: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what the question was.

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combating Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as Secretary of State for Combating Crime, I appreciate the opportunity to debate this motion. Public safety and our bail and sentencing laws play a critical role in the criminal justice system. These are some of the most important laws that are supposed to ensure not only that justice is served but also that Canadians are safe in their communities.

Over the past years, Canadians have raised legitimate concerns about violent crime and repeat offending. These concerns are real, and our government is working hard with law enforcement, Crown attorneys and other levels of government across this country to act on them. It is encouraging to see alignment between the Conservative opposition and the newly elected Liberal government when it comes to improving public safety, including through the adoption of stronger laws to build safer communities.

I have good news for my colleagues. The Minister of Justice will be introducing legislation during this parliamentary session to comprehensively change parts of the Criminal Code and other aspects of the criminal justice system. These comprehensive changes would strengthen bail reform in this country, to have harsher, longer sanctions for violent offenders and to make sure we have the support to help keep communities safe with direct investments in law enforcement.

As set out in our 2025 electoral platform, our government is committed to strengthening the Criminal Code bail provisions to make it onerous to obtain bail for those charged with violent or organized crime related to auto theft, home invasion, trafficking in persons, human smuggling and drug trafficking. Our government is

also committed to adding a requirement for courts to impose a firearms or weapons prohibition when granting bail to anyone charged with an organized crime-related offence.

Our government has committed to reforming Canada's sentencing regime to better address repeat and violent offending. More specifically, the 2025 electoral platform includes commitments to change the law to direct courts to give primary consideration to the principles of denunciation and deterrence when determining a sentence for anyone who has numerous convictions. That means courts would have to primarily consider a sentence that would deter repeat offenders. It includes commitments to broaden sentencing tools by allowing consecutive sentences for violent or organized crime-related auto theft.

The Prime Minister followed up on these electoral commitments when he agreed to strengthen the Criminal Code bail and sentencing laws during the June 2 first ministers meeting. Later that month, the Minister of Justice also announced publicly that bail and sentencing reforms will be forthcoming this fall to address growing concerns of repeat and violent offending at all stages of the criminal justice process. Over the summer, the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Public Safety and I undertook significant engagement with the provinces and territories, law enforcement and legal stakeholders alike to inform and develop these reforms.

Now, although looking to future solutions is important, it is equally important to look to the past and to properly understand our criminal justice system and the current state of the law. For example, despite a persistent narrative that former Bill C-75 was soft on crime, I want to highlight that it explicitly strengthened the Criminal Code bail provisions as they relate to intimate partner violence. Former Bill C-75 made it more onerous for individuals previously convicted of intimate partner violence to obtain bail. This change was based on research suggesting that victims of intimate partner violence face a higher risk of violence from their intimate partners after charges are laid. This was a critical step in recognizing the unique risks posed by repeat offenders in intimate partner violence cases and in ensuring that survivors are protected.

● (1050)

More recently, in 2023, Parliament unanimously enacted former Bill C-48 in response to a new and pressing challenge: growing concerns about repeat violent offending involving firearms and other weapons at the bail stage. The former Bill C-48 amendments were not developed in isolation. They too were the result of extensive collaboration with the provinces and territories. They also responded directly to calls for reform from premiers across the country.

Among other changes, former Bill C-75 created a reverse onus at bail to better address the heightened public safety risks posed by those accused of repeat violent offending with firearms and other weapons. That meant that violent offenders with firearms now had to prove they deserve bail, as opposed to the previous process through which the Crown was having to prove why someone should not receive bail.

This presented a significant change that reflected the seriousness of this type of offending and the need to ensure that the courts would turn their minds to the unique public safety risks that those charged with this type of offending might present. Former Bill C-48 also strengthened the intimate partner violence reverse onus. The bill expanded the reverse onus to also apply to anyone who had been previously discharged, and not just those convicted, of an offence involving intimate partner violence.

Before moving on to what the government has committed to doing, I want to address another area of criminal law that generates significant commentary: conditional sentence orders, or CSOs. A CSO is a sentence that allows an offender to serve a term of imprisonment in the community under certain conditions. They are only available when the sentence is less than two years and when the court determines that it does not pose a risk to public safety or conflict with sentencing principles. CSOs cannot be imposed for offences that involve mandatory minimums, terrorism, criminal organization offences with indictable minimums of 10 years or more, advocating genocide, torture or attempted murder.

The current CSO rules stem from former Bill C-5, which was presented in 2022. This bill strictly made mention that courts may only impose CSOs when consistent with community safety and sentencing principles. CSOs must remain proportionate to the gravity of the offence and the offender's responsibility, and provide adequate denunciation and deterrent. The government has heard concerns that CSOs have been increasingly used for sexual offences in some lower courts. Even though appellate courts hold that they rarely represent proportionate sentences, our government continues to monitor the impacts of former Bill C-5 and will consider further refinements to ensure community safety and public confidence.

As crime evolves, so must our laws. This is why the Minister of Justice will be advancing additional bail and sentencing reforms this fall.

I would now like to turn to an aspect of our bail system that often gets overlooked, and that is the matter of shared responsibility between federal and provincial and territorial governments. While federal legislation sets the laws governing bail, the effectiveness of our bail system depends largely on how it is administered. Provinces are responsible for appointing provincial judges and

Business of Supply

judges who conduct most bail hearings, who are in some provinces are called justices of the peace; overseeing the operation of police services, which are responsible for supervising individuals who are released on bail; and enforcing any conditions of release.

Provincial investments in community-based supports and supervision programs to reduce the risk of reoffending at the bail stage are also critical to ensuring that our bail system works as intended. Provinces and territories also hold the key to improving our understanding of bail outcomes. Right now, the provinces do not keep the bail data needed to ascertain whether our bail system is failing. Provincial leadership in improving data collection, and reporting is necessary to ensure effective evidence-based law reform at the federal level. It is an issue that I have brought up with every provincial representative I have met. Bail data will be crucial in understanding the fight against the cracks in our bail system.

● (1055)

In my speech so far, I have addressed several areas where reverse onuses have been imposed, such as cases involving firearm-related offences. We have yet to know whether that has had a positive impact or not. I fear, as we continue to make other reforms, that perhaps we may not understand fully whether they are having the impact Parliament intends.

Further to that, the provinces administer the bail courts. Earlier this year, Brampton mayor Patrick Brown, on behalf of Ontario's Big City Mayors, wrote a letter to the Province of Ontario sounding the alarm on cases being withdrawn, discharged or dismissed. It was almost over 50% of cases. This is shocking.

Highlighting the need for more Crown attorneys to try these cases more quickly, more judges to hear them and more spaces in jails to put criminals away is crucial. Comprehensive criminal justice reform must include all levels of government coming to the table and doing their part. We are ready to do our part and to work with the provinces and territories that are ready to do theirs.

Business of Supply

The changes I mentioned will help with our immediate issues, but if we are serious about reducing crime and seeing improvements of public safety, we must look beyond our criminal law system as well. Public safety begins with prevention. It requires supporting our youth, investing in communities and addressing the social conditions, including poverty, addiction, mental health and housing. Bail reform is but one piece of the complex puzzle. Lasting change requires a broader commitment to equity, opportunity and support.

All orders of government must work together to build an effective justice system that distinguishes between those who pose a genuine risk and those who can be safely managed in the community. People in Canada deserve a justice system that protects them all. They deserve laws that are clear, consistent and effective. They also deserve a justice system that works and that is firm but fair. They also deserve a government that listens, responds and acts, and we will do exactly that.

I also want to make mention of the opposition finally showing a shred of common sense, though it is long overdue. In Bill C-242, which is mentioned in today's motion, the Conservatives quietly removed the reckless American-style, far right, three-strike scheme they ran on in the last election. Empty slogans based on sporting rules will not foster a robust criminal system and keep Canadians safe. Canadians deserve real solutions that are guided by working collaboratively with law enforcement, attorneys and other levels of government. That is exactly what our comprehensive bill would do.

I pause here to comment on the way this motion is drafted. It claims that the Liberal government promised to pass criminal justice reform six months ago but has failed to do so. That is strange. Just last week, we introduced Bill C-9, the combatting hate act, which includes targeted Criminal Code provisions to address hate crimes, which are on the rise. The bill passed second reading yesterday evening on a deferred division and is now heading to committee for further study.

Over the summer, the Minister of Justice has been hard at work studying ways to improve our laws by consulting closely with his provincial counterparts, law enforcement, police chiefs and police associations. Meanwhile, the Conservative leader was busy fighting for his own job and then parachuted into Alberta, after being catastrophically rejected by Canadians across the country and in his own former riding of Carleton. However, it seems he has not learned any lessons from that rejection. He continues to act recklessly, prioritizing political posturing over meaningful, evidence-based criminal justice reform.

Let us reject slogans and oversimplifications. Slogans such as “jail not bail” may sound tough, but they do not get us any closer to solving the problem. Real solutions require real work. They involve strengthening laws, improving enforcement, investing in data, devoting resources to addressing the root cause of crime and ultimately building a justice system that works for everyone.

• (1100)

Let us embrace real solutions that are evidence-based, collaborative and grounded in the values of fairness and accountability. That is the path forward. That is the commitment of the government. That is what Canadians deserve and expect.

Doug Shipley (Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member opposite for her words this morning. I would like some clarification.

Last year in Barrie, a police officer was stabbed while on duty. The person who stabbed him had been arrested and released over 17 times in the two years prior to that altercation.

I wonder if the member opposite could speak to this motion and if she will support it. Then I could go back to this officer and tell him that we in the House of Commons are actually doing something to try and help him and his team and support the residents of Barrie.

• (1105)

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, even today the tertiary principles, which were mentioned by a colleague on the Conservative side as well, apply when providing bail. Judges and justices of the peace should be considering public safety first and foremost. They should also be considering whether somebody is a flight risk and the confidence the public has in the judicial system. Those are very important basic foundational principles for deriving a decision on bail. Of course, there are other considerations they take into account, but public safety is the first and ought to be foremost.

Although I cannot really comment on what happened in that case exactly, and I do not know why the judge would make such a decision, I think it is import to recognize that these decisions are made at the provincial courthouses.

[Translation]

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is twofold.

First, my colleague raised the issue of sexual crimes. We are currently studying a report on gender-based crimes in the Standing Committee on the Status of Women. The report discusses the fact that women are victims of violence, but also addresses the fact that they are victimized again by these time limits that are so unreasonable that their attackers can get off scot-free because of the Jordan decision. Witnesses have brought this up. The Bloc Québécois tabled a bill on this issue to ensure that someone accused of a sexual offence or an offence against women cannot get away with it by invoking the Jordan decision.

My colleague then spoke about court delays. She mentioned Crown attorneys, but the federal government is in no position to lecture anyone; it has been dragging its feet on the appointment of judges. The criteria are even rather questionable at times. For example, a judge who is an anti-secularism activist was appointed to the Quebec Superior Court even though he did not have the required 10 years of experience. This goes against the Canadian Judges Act, which requires much more than that.

I would like my colleague to tell us more about those two points.

[English]

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, first, the judges that are presiding over the type of criminal cases we are talking about today are provincially appointed judges.

Second, I would like to say that the issue of complexity and the length of trials when it comes to the cases the member referred to are things that have to be taken into consideration. I will not be able to talk about what the upcoming bill will have, but I know that is a concern that is shared on this side of the House. The Liberals think it is very important for us to make sure that none of those types of cases are being dismissed or withdrawn, so there should be upcoming provisions to address that issue.

Hon. Stephanie McLean (Secretary of State (Seniors), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a background in law, and I started my career doing criminal defence work. I also had the good fortune of spending a summer in the Crown prosecutor's office as a law student. During that time, I had the opportunity to volunteer with a great organization called the Elizabeth Fry Society, an organization that helps women who are at risk of becoming criminalized. Through that experience, but particularly my time with the Elizabeth Fry Society, I learned a lot about those who are at risk of criminalization. I learned that the indigenous population is at a higher risk of criminalization.

My question for the hon. secretary is this: What can be done and what are we doing to ensure that folks are not at risk of criminalization and not subject—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): The hon. Secretary of State for Combatting Crime.

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, the member raises a good question. I talked about the root causes of crime, and I consider that to be extremely important. Of course, interactions with law enforcement, systemic discrimination and what brings somebody to become criminalized are all very important factors.

This government has invested heavily in housing and mental health with respect to the transfers to the provinces. Once again, this is a shared area of responsibility. The provinces deliver these supports to Canadians, and I think it is very important.

Our gangs and guns funding was also key in providing a lot of organizations supports for young people who are at risk of offending. That, I think, is another important—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Questions and comments, the hon. member for Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola.

Business of Supply

• (1110)

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 one of our staff members, Stephanie Rennick, and wish her a happy birthday. She did not tell us, but it was revealed nevertheless.

I listened with great attention to my colleague's speech. I have never heard so many Liberal talking points that, with all due respect, say absolutely nothing. To say we are aligned with the Liberal government on justice could not be further from the truth. Former ministers of justice Arif Virani and David Lametti told us that we, as Conservatives, are out to lunch. They said, "You don't get bail. The system is working." That is what they told us, so it is wrong to say that we are aligned. We wanted to act years ago, but they stood on faith and stood on their heels.

I have a bill on intimate partner violence, Bill C-225, which would recognize it and save lives.

Are the Liberals prepared to support it, yes or no?

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, I believe we are aligned on many issues, and that is upsetting the member quite a bit, it seems. We are bringing forward tough laws, and Bill C-2 is a prime example. There would be a lot of tools for law enforcement to crack down on fentanyl and organized crime.

I would hope that the Conservatives support Bill C-2. It has been recommended by police agencies across this country, and I feel that it would be detrimental if we do not give them the tools to lay charges.

[Translation]

Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, people often say that the Conservatives put forward simplistic solutions to highly complex problems, but their proposal today makes some sense. It is true that we have a duty to protect our communities and it is also true that a growing number of repeat offenders are being released into the community awaiting trial, including people charged with violent crimes against women. Maybe we should try to find a better balance in all this, while still upholding the presumption of innocence so cherished by our system and among our values.

I would like to hear my colleague's thoughts on that. How do we strike the right balance between respect for basic rights on the one hand and public safety on the other, especially in the case of criminals who are violent toward women?

[English]

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, I was talking about conditional sentence orders. There are certain conditions that could be put in place when there is interest to public safety. However, we found, as I mentioned, that in many intimate partner violence cases, the offender recommits the offence.

Business of Supply

It is important to have data and statistics, which is why I would like more statistics from the provincial level. For example, we have put reverse onus in place for firearm offences, but we still do not know whether that reverse onus is having an impact on having less bail in those circumstances. Collecting more data on crime statistics and on how the courts are dealing with the Criminal Code would provide us with comprehensive material so we are able to act on and implement proper, comprehensive reforms. Working together is very important.

Hon. Mona Fortier (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to dig in a little more on prevention.

My colleague mentioned how important prevention is, and how it has to be part of this bill and other bills the government brings forth. I have been meeting with many national organizations representing women in different spaces, and they are also advocating not only for prevention but also support.

I would like to hear my hon. colleague on those two points.

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, it is incredibly important. I agree with my colleague that every effort should be made, whether it is to help victims of violence or those who are vulnerable because of their upbringing and living conditions, and who could be susceptible to getting into a life of crime. We should try to prevent these types of circumstances from happening and learn from the past; otherwise, we will be digging ourselves out of a very deep hole.

[Translation]

Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lis-tuguj, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with my colleague from Rivière-du-Nord.

Today we have before us a Conservative motion asking us to proceed with an expeditious study of a bill that attacks the most fundamental rights of our fellow citizens.

Who in the House protects every person's right to liberty? Who in the House protects every person's right to be presumed innocent until proven guilty under the law in a fair and public trial by an independent and impartial court? Who in the House protects every person's right not to be denied reasonable bail without just cause? We will do that. The Bloc Québécois will oppose this Conservative motion.

We have several reasons for doing so. Firstly, expediting the study of a bill that threatens our fundamental freedoms would represent a departure from democracy and a dereliction by the legislature of its duties, which we will fight against. Secondly, the Conservative bill also proposes some superficial amendments to the Criminal Code that would change nothing. Thirdly, the Conservative bill is inconsistent with sections of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and as such it raises constitutional questions that call at the very least for serious study.

Before detailing our reasons, I would like to say a few words about the sense of insecurity that some of our fellow Quebecers may be feeling and that the Conservative Party is trying to exploit. Of course, every time a crime makes the headlines, we are all shocked and outraged. When the news broke yesterday of the mur-

der of a gangster who was gunned down in broad daylight in a Laval coffee shop, that was exactly our reaction.

It should be pointed out that when they are arrested, the suspects will not be released. The Criminal Code already stipulates that anyone charged with murder must remain in custody while awaiting trial. Still, the feelings of insecurity among some of our fellow citizens is understandable. We in the Bloc Québécois are proposing a number of measures to tackle criminal organizations, such as establishing an organized crime registry, similar to the terrorist entities list. This would make it easier to prove cases where a crime is committed for the benefit of a criminal organization. We also propose facilitating the seizure of assets by means of a reverse onus, to prevent the depletion of assets when an individual belonging to an organized crime group is arrested. In addition, we propose prohibiting criminal organizations from wearing their emblems or symbols. Right now, criminal organizations parade around with total impunity and actively promote their organizations.

We are calling for the creation of a specific offence to criminalize the recruitment of young people into crime. As we saw recently in Quebec, this has become the new *modus operandi* for organized crime. This is ruining lives and destroying families and we must get tougher with those who are exploiting our youth.

In response to legitimate security concerns, the Conservatives are calling for a jail not bail act. Some people might find this reassuring. However, imagine if a police officer arrests someone and accuses them of committing a crime. Even if this person says they did not commit the crime, they will be put into prison where they will spend many months in remand pending trial before they can prove their innocence. Does this still feel reassuring?

● (1115)

If the government puts more people in jail before they are found guilty, do people still feel more secure, or does that rather open the door to a new form of insecurity and the risk that one could end up in jail on trumped-up charges for a crime they did not commit? That is what the Conservative bill is all about. It is an attack on the right to liberty and the right to the presumption of innocence.

I would like to come back to my reasons. First, we are being asked to fast-track this bill. The motion actually calls for an "expeditious...study". Obviously, we do not agree with that. We will not pass a bill that attacks our fundamental freedoms under closure. They will plead urgency, but if we fast-track a bill that will result in greater injustice rather than greater justice, can we really say we served the common good?

Second, certain aspects of the Conservative bill are nothing more than cosmetic changes. I will not get into the specifics. Nevertheless, I would like to point out that the bill seeks to amend subsection 515(10), which provides guidance for judges when determining whether or not to release an accused person. We are being told that public protection must be one of the criteria, but it already is. As I learned during my legal studies, normally, “Parliament does not speak in vain”.

For the record, but also to enlighten the House, subsection 515(10) of the Criminal Code already sets out the circumstances in which an accused may be detained. An accused is a person who has not yet been convicted. Anyone can see why it is important to have those criteria in place: charges may prove to be false. Sometimes the police receive complaints that turn out to be unfounded. It always comes back to the presumption of innocence. The basic premise of our criminal justice system is that the state must avoid perpetrating an injustice, even if that means some cases are not brought to justice. That is how our justice system works. It would rather prevent injustice than act too hastily.

The Criminal Code already stipulates that accused persons are typically released unless they are accused of serious crimes, in which case they can be detained. That is possible under the current system. We have to fight this idea that our system is a revolving door: arrest people, give them a slap on the wrist, let them go so they can commit more crimes and then see them again two days later. That is not how it works.

Subsection 515(10) states:

the detention of an accused in custody is justified only on one or more of the following grounds:

(a) where the detention is necessary to ensure his or her attendance in court

If the person is considered likely to flee from justice, they can be detained. That is already provided for in the Criminal Code.

(b) where the detention is necessary for the protection or safety of the public

It is already there. We are being asked to add something that is already there.

(c) if the detention is necessary to maintain confidence in the administration of justice, having regard to all the circumstances, including

(i) the apparent strength of the prosecution's case,

(ii) the gravity of the offence,

The Conservatives' bill also refers to this issue. They would like detention to become automatic for certain serious crimes. However, judges and Crown prosecutors already have all the necessary tools at their disposal under the Criminal Code to recommend detention for an accused, even if they have not yet been found guilty, when the charges are very serious. This is already possible when certain circumstances are met, such as the use of a firearm. These elements can be cited under the current system.

Paragraph 515(10)(c) also states:

(iv) the fact that the accused is liable, on conviction, for a potentially lengthy term of imprisonment.

The Conservatives' bill may be intended to reassure the public, but it has the potential to create injustice. In addition, it seeks to add elements that already exist in the Criminal Code.

Business of Supply

In closing, it is important to note that the Conservatives' bill clearly contradicts some sections of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Section 7 states:

Everyone has the right to life, liberty

Section 11 states:

Any person charged with an offence has the right:

...

(d) to be presumed innocent until proven guilty...

(e) not to be denied reasonable bail without just cause;

This bill raises a number of significant constitutional issues. Evidently, we will not be expediting it.

● (1120)

● (1125)

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my colleague could talk more about the fact that the Conservatives want to pass this bill quickly, under a gag order, without giving it reasonable and normal consideration, as we usually do. What implications might such an approach have?

Alexis Deschênes: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his very relevant question, because there is indeed a risk.

If this bill passes and I am still a criminal defence lawyer, I will certainly challenge its constitutionality from day one. It will be challenged on the grounds that it contradicts the fundamental freedoms enshrined in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

If this bill is rushed through, we will not have the opportunity to discuss it. Changes can certainly be made, but if we rush things, we run the risk of winding up with less robust legislation that will be ripped apart by the first judge to take a closer look at this situation.

Patricia Lattanzio (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, does my colleague believe that bail reform legislation is needed?

Alexis Deschênes: Mr. Speaker, what the Bloc Québécois believes is that we need to crack down on criminal organizations. That is the priority. We need to find ways to make their lives more difficult because these people destroy lives and make people feel unsafe. How can we do that? The proposals we have put forward will help to accomplish that.

As for the rest, we went over subsection 515(10) of the Criminal Code. Having argued this in court, I can say that judges already have quite a few legislative tools that they can use to make informed decisions and to weigh the various interests at stake, including the protection of the public, the risk of reoffending, and the right to liberty and to be presumed innocent.

*Business of Supply**[English]*

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, would the member from the Bloc Québécois agree that there is a direct correlation between the changes the Liberals made to bail provisions in the bail and sentencing reforms and an increase in crime in Canada?

The reason the Conservative Party is putting forward motions, as we have been since the return of the House, is to address these very real concerns for small businesses and victims of crime. Women, especially, have seen an increase in the amount of sexual assault and intimate partner violence, which have been caused directly by the changes in the laws put forward by the Liberal government.

[Translation]

Alexis Deschênes: Mr. Speaker, the underlying causes of crime are very complex. Would legislative changes impact certain individual cases? We cannot rule that out. However, the clients I represented, who were accused, never took the time to read the Criminal Code before committing a crime. Essentially, they were people who were suffering from addictions.

We know that there are environmental factors that also need to be addressed. I am talking about the housing crisis, overcrowding, addictions and mental health issues. I think that, when it comes right down to it, the best way to fight crime is to have a state with a social fabric like Quebec's, which could perhaps be further improved.

Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleague to talk to us about the fact that the Conservatives are moving a motion on a bill that has yet to be assessed by the law clerks or even found in order.

The Conservatives are trying to use this motion to muzzle the House of Commons. That approach seems rather unusual to me, and I would like my colleague to talk to us about it.

Alexis Deschênes: Mr. Speaker, criminal law is always a fascinating topic of study, because two principles are pitted against one another: the imperative need for society to prevent crime versus the imperative need to avoid devolving into a police state where individual freedoms become meaningless.

It is vital that we proceed with caution. The law clerks will probably ask the Conservatives whether they want to invoke the notwithstanding clause for this bill. That kind of discussion could take place in committees.

● (1130)

Rhéal Éloi Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the question raised by our Conservative colleagues' motion is of particular concern to me today.

The body of a young woman, Gabie Renaud, was discovered in my riding this week. I offer my deepest condolences to her family. I must say, I am shocked and dismayed by this incident. Her partner, the man who allegedly killed her, was on his 16th parole violation. I do not get it. I think we need to change the way things are done. This is unacceptable to me.

This is not the only case. Earlier today, I read that another woman in Saint-Charles-sur-Richelieu was murdered yesterday. It is

endless. We cannot just sit back and do nothing in the face of incidents like this. We have to get to work and find solutions. I am in.

What are the solutions? Our colleague from the Conservative Party is proposing one solution. I thank my colleague from Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Listuguj for his intervention, which was just before mine. He said it very well. The bill has not yet been introduced. We cannot say at this point that we are in favour of a bill that we have not read, since it has not been introduced, but that should be introduced eventually and should close certain loopholes. It does not work like that. We must do things in the right order if we want to be effective. The Bloc Québécois cannot support the Conservative motion today. That being said, again, there is great concern, and it affects us all. We are deeply troubled by situations like this.

Now, I am not ready to give up on the principle of the presumption of innocence. I believe that it is essential in a free and democratic society. I would not want to live in a society where a person is presumed guilty until proven innocent. That happens in other parts of the world, but I do not want that here. The presumption of innocence may cause turmoil and suffering, but it is my humble opinion that we would have even more turmoil and suffering if the presumption of innocence did not exist. We should not get rid of it. As the saying goes, let us not throw out the baby with the bathwater. The bathwater does need to be changed, though.

My colleague from Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Listuguj also spoke about criminal organizations. I have been in this House for 10 years, and I am about to table my third bill aimed at combatting criminal organizations by creating a registry of criminal organizations with associated consequences, such as a reverse onus for the seizure of property and a ban on support and displays of support for such organizations. It would be similar to the list of terrorist organizations, which is working well. We should copy that idea and use it to fight organized crime effectively.

It is true that femicides like the ones I was talking about are not related to organized crime, but this registry would be one way to fight crime.

With regard to religious exemptions, we saw such an incident again last year when a preacher was shouting something like, "Allah, kill all the Jews and don't spare a single one". That kind of thing has absolutely no place in a society like ours. How can anyone look at that situation and decide that nothing can be done? Come on. That is our job. We need to address this.

We agree with the Jordan decision and the principle of trial within a reasonable time. I agree with that. It does not make sense for someone to wait 10 years to be found guilty or innocent of the crime they were charged with. There are strict time limits. The Supreme Court examined all that and introduced time limits in the Jordan decision. Yes, they must be complied with.

Unfortunately, the provinces do not have the money to comply. They do not have enough courtrooms, judges and personnel to hold trials within the time limits. More money must be invested in the justice system. I often say that too. Justice is the backbone of a society. If people are denied justice through the courts, they will take matters into their own hands. That will lead to anarchy. We do not want that either.

It is important to respect the Jordan time limits, but to do that, the federal government will have to appoint judges and fill vacancies within a reasonable time. That is something else we are going to tackle.

• (1135)

Money also has to be transferred to the provinces so that they can administer justice more fairly and be more efficient when it comes to laying charges and proceeding to trial. The federal government also has a part to play in that. The health transfers to the provinces are unsatisfactory, and the same goes for the transfers for education and justice. When is this going to be fixed? When are changes going to be made in the way money is spent here to ensure that it goes where it is most needed, namely to the management of provincial institutions like the health system, the education system and the justice system? All of that is important.

Concerning bail, a solution has to be found, as I was saying. I do not know the exact figures, but at least 90% of femicides are committed by men. That is shocking, shameful, disturbing, troubling, and any number of other qualifiers one may care to add. However, my colleague was right to say earlier that of all the clients he represented as a defence lawyer, not one of them had read the Criminal Code before committing a crime. I do not imagine anyone is surprised by that. It should be obvious.

Yes, we can add provisions to the Criminal Code, but above all, we must act. We must act by being more vigilant. Why are repeat offenders being released when the Criminal Code already states that public safety has to be taken into consideration in bail decisions? I have not read any of these cases in particular, but I am sure the judges are not stupid. If they decided to release these individuals, they must have had good reasons. I would be interested in finding out what they are, but there must have been reasons.

In that case, what can we do? We can, of course, tighten the criteria for release, but the question would be how to do that. The Conservatives want to invert the principle and switch from the presumption of innocence to the presumption of guilt. There has to be some space between the two. Reason should be able to navigate between these two principles. I encourage everyone to give this matter more thought.

There is also the issue of minimum sentences. Our Conservative colleagues keep coming back to this issue. As the Supreme Court has found, adding minimum sentences to just about everything in the Criminal Code is unconstitutional. The government had to backtrack on this matter. The previous government had to reverse what the government before it had done. I hope we will not be playing this game forever, constantly going back and forth depending on which party is in power. We need to find a reasonable path forward.

Business of Supply

I have tried to make suggestions in the past. For instance, I proposed that when a minimum sentence is established for a certain crime in order to send a clear message to the public, courts should still have the option to choose a different sentence in exceptional circumstances. If, for any reason, a judge hears evidence during a trial and determines that a minimum sentence is not the most appropriate penalty, he or she could depart from that provision of the law. The judge could therefore waive the minimum sentence. That is one possible compromise, but not the only one.

I came up with a compromise, and I am not the only one with ideas. I am sure we can come up with others. We need creative solutions to move forward, instead of constantly going back and forth, which gets us nowhere and undermines public trust. It is certainly not the best way to convince criminals to stop committing crimes.

I have just said a lot in a short time. As I said, it troubles me and makes me uncomfortable when I see crimes like the ones that have happened this week. I am thinking, for one, of the unfortunate crime against Gabie Renaud in Saint-Jérôme, in my riding of Rivière-du-Nord. It is so difficult. I feel completely useless. I cannot understand why we have not been able to make progress sooner and prevent situations like this. I hope we can work on it, but unfortunately, our Liberal colleagues will have to agree to revisit the principles they have established, and our Conservative colleagues will have to agree to revisit theirs. We must stop shifting from the presumption of innocence to the presumption of guilt. Justice and common sense must find a balance between the two.

Linda Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the speech by my colleague from Rivière-du-Nord, and I want to offer my sincere condolences to the family of Gabie Renaud and all the people of Saint-Jérôme. Things like this should never happen.

I am the chair of the Liberal women's caucus, the largest women's caucus ever. Violence against women and femicide are unacceptable and are a cause of great concern for us.

What improvements does my colleague think need to be made to ensure that these crimes never happen again in Canada?

• (1140)

Rhéal Éloi Fortin: Mr. Speaker, yes, of course, we can work on the Criminal Code. However, a large part of the issue falls within the jurisdiction of the provinces. In Quebec, we need to invest in prevention efforts, but we have no money.

We run deficits year after year. Where does the money go? I am not the minister of finance or even the finance critic, but we need to revisit how we do things. The federal government must take responsibility. It cannot just take the money and run when it is hardly even involved in managing things that affect people's everyday lives. What people in Quebec and across Canada care about in their daily lives is health, education, roads and justice. Money needs to be invested in those things.

Business of Supply

Sooner or later, the federal government will have to sit down with the Government of Quebec and the governments of the other provinces to find ways to provide funding for efforts to fight the heinous crimes being carried out in our communities.

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleague from Rivière-du-Nord in expressing condolences to the family of Gabie Renaud. My colleague also mentioned other cases that prove the number of femicides is growing.

The Standing Committee on the Status of Women agreed to study a report from the last Parliament on gender-based crimes, particularly crimes against women. What we heard from victims and survivors is that eliminating the time limits is more important to them than minimum sentences. This is of utmost importance in cases involving sexual assault and violent crimes against women. The Jordan decision should not apply. Witnesses talked to us about this, and we will talk about it again in the report.

Not only does the Bloc Québécois agree that the Jordan decision should not apply, but we actually introduced a bill, Bill C-392, to ensure that prosecution of these crimes is not subject to such time limits and that victims can be heard. I would like my colleague to comment on how important the Jordan decision issue is and on reintroducing this bill.

Rhéal Éloi Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for the good question she asked. That is a concern. She was right to mention it. As I said earlier, I believe in the principles set out by the Supreme Court in the Jordan decision. They are essential and they must be preserved. However, until we can try people within the time limits set out in the Jordan decision, we have to ensure that the justice system is allowed to deviate from these time limits in special situations, including cases involving femicides like the ones I mentioned.

We cannot let people walk free without first standing trial. This would bring the administration of justice into disrepute. People would lose all trust in our justice system, and that may be the worst danger of all. We are going to come back with a bill similar to the one we introduced before.

Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, sadly, the news is flooded with truly disturbing cases of women being attacked, of femicides. I said it in the House: Women are not safe. We live in a constant state of hypervigilance. We know this, and it is becoming increasingly well documented. The Quebec government is even calling for this.

Does my colleague agree with me on the problems caused by Bills C-5 and C-75, which were introduced and passed by this Liberal government?

Rhéal Éloi Fortin: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I do not agree with my colleague. I do not believe that Bills C-5 and C-75 are responsible for femicides, homicides or all the crimes committed in Canada. I believe there are a number of things we need to work on and focus on. Prevention measures must be taken and the presumption of innocence must be upheld, but we must also make the judicial process more accountable and ensure that individuals who commit crimes or who are likely to commit crimes are more closely monitored.

Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Cloverdale—Langley City.

I have to ask myself what we are even doing here, talking, talking, talking, when the measures that need to be taken are quite clear. Unfortunately, because of the dithering and the government that has been in power for the past 10 years, we now have laws that make our communities a lot less safe. Just ask the family of Gabie Renaud, who was brutally murdered in Saint-Jérôme a few weeks ago and whose body was just found. Just ask the family of Marylène Levesque, who was murdered in Quebec City five years ago by Eustachio Gallese while he was on unsupervised release. We are talking about numerous situations that could have been avoided, numerous deaths that could have been avoided.

The harsh reality is that right now, in Canada, streets that were once peaceful and quiet have become danger zones for too many families. Violent crime is up 55% under this Liberal government, and that figure is not a statistical abstraction, it is the horrendous reality of forgotten victims and broken communities. Homicides have increased by 29%, gun-related crime has more than doubled in many areas, and extortion is up 357%. We need only look at what is happening at restaurants in Montreal and Laval. They are being set on fire, and gangs are going in and extorting the owners, forcing them to pay protection money, known as *pizzo*. Nothing is being done to help these restaurant owners get out of this situation.

What is happening at the moment is no accident. It is the direct result of the laws put in place by the Liberal government. We have spoken at great length about Bill C-5, which allows dangerous criminals to serve their prison sentence at home, and Bill C-75, the bill that brings us here again today and that makes it far too easy to get bail. It is spelled out in the law. Judges do not even have a choice. Dangerous criminals are automatically released.

I am not even talking about what has been done in terms of managing parole. Members may recall that after the murder of Marylène Levesque in Quebec City, I got a motion passed asking the Standing Committee on Public Safety to investigate what happened at the Parole Board. The board had undergone a complete purge, particularly the members from Quebec, who were a bit too conservative for the government. They were replaced by new members who had very little experience, if any, and who were primarily chosen for their very left-leaning, very woke ideology. As a result, decisions were made, in particular the decision to release Eustachio Gallese on parole, as is the case currently with Jonathan Blanchet, the man who killed Gabie Renaud. This guy was arrested 30 times and released 16 times under certain conditions. However, he violated those conditions, yet there were no consequences. How can a person violate the conditions of his release 16 times and still be free? It makes no sense.

Once again, we are seeing an increase in crime. In Montreal, for example, assaults and domestic violence are on the rise. Across Quebec, sex crimes have increased by 20% in just two years. Child pornography cases have doubled. Organized crime is even spreading to the regions, recruiting young people into a brutal cycle that no one in this Liberal government seems interested in ending.

Today, we are debating a motion calling for Bill C-242, the jail not bail act, introduced by my colleague from Oxford, to be fast-tracked. We are asking that the bill be passed immediately and sent to committee in order to speed up the necessary legislative changes.

We should keep in mind that the new Prime Minister has been in office for six months. During the election campaign, before he came to power, the Prime Minister said that his government would bring in changes quickly to get crime in Canada back under control.

• (1145)

What has happened over the last six months when it comes to crime and crime bills? Nothing, zip, nada.

I am sharing my time with my colleague, the member for Cloverdale—Langley City, and I hope she will elaborate on that. We have some astonishing examples of problematic Liberal measures and promises made by a supposedly new government that was going to make a difference, but that is currently doing absolutely nothing.

We are not asking it to promise us the moon. We just want the government to stop. There are enough bills. We want the government to let us pass them quickly to bring about change. Bill C-242 can be dealt with if the House accepts it today. We can get that done and move forward.

The government is not doing anything even though we are ready to move more quickly to prevent more deaths. Right now, criminals on bail or parole are laughing their heads off and doing as they please. Who pays the price? It is victims of domestic violence, women who are scared to leave their homes. Even if they stay at home, criminals have no qualms about coming back to assault them or worse, kill them. That is not acceptable in 2025 in a country like Canada.

We went through problems a few years ago because of Bill C-5, which introduced house arrest. The bill was intended to empty the prisons, and it was introduced by David Lametti, a former minister of justice who is going to become an ambassador, though I do not know to what country. Bill C-5 was brought forward on the grounds that there were too many Black, racialized and indigenous people in prison. The intent was to narrow the scope of the Criminal Code so that fewer of these people would go to jail.

The first person to take advantage of Bill C-5 after it came into force was a white man from Montreal who had committed aggravated sexual assault against his ex. Instead of going to prison, he got to sit at home watching Netflix. That is how things started, and the number of similar cases only grew. With Bill C-5, Montreal's street gangs could rest easy. They knew that they would not go to prison if they were arrested but would instead get to stay at home doing whatever they wanted. We spoke out against this from the very beginning. We voted against the bill even before it was passed,

Business of Supply

and we said that it was not going to work. A few years have passed, and sure enough, we are now seeing the result.

Two and a half years ago, I tabled Bill C-325, which aimed to reverse Bill C-5. There were also provisions in Bill C-325 requiring that criminal charges be brought against a person who fails to comply with their release conditions. Unfortunately, this was defeated by our Liberal colleagues, with support from the NDP.

I must compliment the Bloc Québécois, which initially supported Bill C-5 but then realized its mistake. The Bloc Québécois voted with me in support of Bill C-325. Ultimately, Bill C-325 was defeated by the Liberals and the NDP. As a result, Bill C-5 is still in effect.

There was Bill C-5 and Bill C-75. Today we are talking about the content of Bill C-75. We are talking about the bill brought forward by my colleague from Oxford, Bill C-242. It can be confusing when all these numbers are flying around, but what members need to understand is this. No one can understand how a person can be arrested and then be released three hours later to start committing crimes again. No one can understand why that law was enacted. That is the reason for Bill C-242. We want to undo all of that and restore a justice system that is acceptable to and accepted by the population, who is asking for no more than that.

When we see women like Gabie Renaud murdered by a man who was charged 30 times and who violated his release conditions 16 times, it is impossible to understand how he was able to go and kill Gabie. It is unacceptable.

We are basically lending a helping hand to this government, which does not seem to have the time to change course quickly. In six months, nothing has happened. We are putting bills forward. My colleague from Oxford has tabled a bill. Today's motion asks that we expedite the process and send this to committee in order to protect Canadians.

• (1150)

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I think that everyone here is saddened by what happened again this week, namely, the murder of Gabie Renaud. My colleague from Rivière-du-Nord spoke about it. It happened in his riding. Everyone is saddened by that.

It is because everyone is saddened that only one question comes to mind regarding today's Conservative motion. When dealing with issues of such magnitude, why is it absolutely necessary to quickly bring in a measure without studying it in depth? After all, this affects fundamental rights, such as the right to freedom and the presumption of innocence. Obviously, we want to work toward the same goal and we do not want things like this to keep happening. That is unacceptable in a society like ours.

Why can we not take the time to do the job right once and for all? That is all we are asking.

Business of Supply

• (1155)

Pierre Paul-Hus: Mr. Speaker, we must indeed do things right. That is important. The problem is that we have a government that has been causing problems for 10 years. Since the election of the new Prime Minister, who promised to get things done quickly, nothing has happened, so that is why we think this is urgent.

For several years now, we have been seeing an increase in crime, including crimes like the murder of Gabie Renaud and that of Marylène Levesque a few years ago. Unfortunately, there is far too much crime and murder in Canada. Swift action must be taken, which is why we want to expedite the process. Even if the bill is fast-tracked, it will still be examined in committee.

Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I have told the House many times, we women are often hypervigilant when out in public, unfortunately. I would also like to remind the House that the Conservative Party has been very consistent. We have always sided with victims.

This tragic event, Quebec's 14th alleged femicide, has captured our attention. No one on the Conservative side wants to put an innocent person in prison or see an outrageous sentence handed down for a youthful mistake. That is not what we are talking about, and I would like my colleague to make that clear so as to reassure our Bloc Québécois colleagues.

Pierre Paul-Hus: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her excellent question and her work on the Standing Committee on the Status of Women. Women do indeed bear the brunt of the crimes we are seeing these days: murder, intimate partner violence, serious violent offences. That is why we need to fix the situation as quickly as possible. Everyone expects to live their life in safety. That is what we want; that is what we are asking for. Previously, the other three parties, the Liberal Party, the NDP and the Bloc Québécois, joined forces to pass Bill C-5 and Bill C-75.

The Bloc Québécois realized that Bill C-5 was not working. I thank its members for that, and I hope they will continue to help us work on behalf of women. Yes, we need to be careful about how we do this, but above all, we have to think about the victims and future victims we must protect.

[English]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in my years as a parliamentarian, what I have witnessed is that the Conservatives tend to use the issue of crime and safety more as a fundraising tool or bumper-sticker issue to try to create fear in the minds of Canadians. We are genuinely concerned about the issue, but what has surprised me about this particular motion and Bill C-242 is that there is no reference to their American-style three strikes law. I am wondering why that is. Have they abandoned that particular policy?

We just debated a motion on that brought forward by the Conservatives. It was defeated by a majority of the members of the House. Have they abandoned that particular policy?

[Translation]

Pierre Paul-Hus: Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government is criticizing us

for wanting to make our streets safer and for wanting to protect the lives of women and also of men, who can obviously be victims too.

How can anyone fault us for wanting a safer society? There is no slogan here, just facts. Women are being killed. This is not a theoretical debate. This is one of life's harsh realities. There is one place where we can make a difference, and that is right here in Parliament, with the help of a government that should be making a difference but is currently doing nothing. That is all we are asking for.

[English]

Tamara Jansen (Cloverdale—Langley City, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the number one responsibility of government is to keep its citizens safe: safe in their homes, safe in their businesses and safe in their communities. It is not partisan and not optional; it is fundamental, but right now that promise has been broken.

Under the Liberals' Bill C-75, our bail system was rewritten. Judges were ordered to apply a so-called principle of restraint. That means repeat violent offenders, people who are known to police and who have a record of crime after crime, are put right back on our streets. It has left my community of Cloverdale—Langley City living in fear. Today, I want to share three stories, not from some faraway place and not from a textbook or report. These are stories from my own backyard of businesses, families and seniors who have paid the price for Ottawa's dangerous experiment with catch-and-release justice.

First, picture a wedding banquet. Families are gathered. Music is playing. Parents are dancing with their children. That is what a banquet hall is supposed to be: a place of joy and community. However, in Surrey, at the Reflections Banquet Hall, that joy was shattered. Instead of wedding bells, there were gunshots. Instead of safety, there was fear. The hall became a target of an extortion network that has been terrorizing South Asian businesses across the Fraser Valley.

In early June, the owner, Satish Kumar, received a voice mail demanding \$2 million and threatening his family. Within days, shots were fired at three businesses connected to him. This is what organized extortion looks like: anonymous calls, threats against children or warning shots at the door if they do not pay. It is not just one victim. It chills a whole corridor of small businesses. Weddings get cancelled, bookings dry up and an entire community starts looking over its shoulder.

Here is the core failure: a legal environment that emboldens criminals. When the consequence for violent intimidation is a quick release, the message that sends is to keep going. Liberal Bill C-75's principle of restraint and Bill C-5's repeal of mandatory jail time for serious gun crimes, including extortion with a firearm, have combined to lower the cost of terror for gangs and raised the cost of living for everybody else. The banquet hall was not just a building; it was supposed to be a safe place for families while the law did not protect it.

Then there is the tragic story of Tori Dunn. Tori is not just a name in the newspaper. She is a daughter, a friend. She is one of us, and she was attacked brutally by a man who never should have been free, a man with a record, a man known to police, a man who, under any system that valued the safety of women and the safety of families, would have been behind bars, but because of Liberal Bill C-75, he was not. He was out on bail, and Tori paid the price.

When I talk to people in my riding about Tori's story, they do not just shake their heads; they clench their fists and ask how this could happen and how our justice system could look at his record and set him free. She was 30, an entrepreneur, a daughter and a friend, and she was brutally killed in her own home in Port Kells in 2024. Her murderer, Adam Mann, was already facing eight other charges, including aggravated assault, from just a week earlier.

We do not need a law degree to see the pattern. The Liberals told the courts to restrain themselves, the courts complied, a dangerous man was back in the community, a young woman is dead and her family is left asking how a system could see the risk and choose release.

• (1200)

This is not complicated. When Parliament says to err on the side of release, people like Tori carry the risk. This is not just about Tori, though. It is about every woman who wonders if she is safe walking home at night. It is about every parent who wonders if their daughter will make it home. It is about whether the justice system values the safety of our families or the comfort of repeat offenders.

Let me tell members about something else that happened just down the road from my place in the heart of Langley. It was early morning, June 1, on the Fraser Highway. The sun had barely risen. A woman was standing by the curb, when out of nowhere she was shoved into the street. She fell really hard, and before she could even get her bearings, she was kicked and punched again and again. All of it was captured on video. This was not a scuffle. This was not a misunderstanding. It was a brutal, unprovoked attack. The man responsible, Hugh Mason, is no stranger to police. He is already known for violence and already known for breaching the law, yet he was there on our streets free to lash out at an innocent woman.

Here is what makes this hit home even worse for me. This was not just any street corner. This was steps away from the seniors home built by my own church community, the home where my grandparents lived. It is filled with seniors who worked a lifetime, who built this country and who should be able to walk outside without fear.

Business of Supply

Imagine the conversations after that crime, with seniors asking their grandchildren to walk them to the pharmacy because they do not feel safe alone. That is not the Canada they helped build. That is not the promise they earned, yet here we are because a bail system tilted in favour of the offender gave another chance to a man who had already burned through all his chances, and because Bill C-75, by the Liberals, told judges to restrain themselves, even when restraint meant danger for everybody else.

This is what catch-and-release looks like in real life. It is not just a line in a bill, but fear in the eyes of our grandmothers and grandfathers, our opas and omas. That fear, my friends, is something we have the power and the responsibility to end.

At the end of the day, this is not about politics. It is not about left and right. It is about whether a mom can walk her child to school without fear, whether a small business owner can open his doors without an extortionist calling at midnight and whether a senior, like our omas and opas, can sit on a porch without looking over their shoulder.

The Conservatives have put forward the jail not bail act, not because it sounds good on paper but because it puts people first. It says that public safety is the priority. It says that if a person commits a major crime, like pulling a gun, breaking into a home or assaulting their neighbour, they do not just stroll back onto the streets the next day. This bill would tip the scales back to where they belong. It restores balance. It protects victims. It puts common sense back at the heart of justice.

I say to the Prime Minister that if he is serious about restoring peace to our communities, he will back the bill. He will correct his justice minister, and he will reverse his party's failed bail laws, because Canadians deserve better than ideology. They deserve safety.

Let us do the right thing. Let us stand together. Let us pass the jail not bail act, and let us give our communities back their peace.

• (1205)

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, many things the member referenced are going to be in the comprehensive bail reform legislation the government will be putting out. It will be much more comprehensive and in depth than the private member's bill the motion mentions today.

Business of Supply

Beyond that, in order for someone to reach a bail hearing or sentencing hearing, they have to be caught and charged. Bill C-2 has provisions that would allow police to apprehend and charge extortionists by allowing police to receive subscriber information such as telephone numbers and IP addresses. This is essential to protecting our children from cybercrime and threats, and protecting our seniors, who are facing this issue, from extortionists.

I hope the member will support that bill. Will she or will she not?

• (1210)

Tamara Jansen: Mr. Speaker, the real issue here is the catch-and-release law the Liberals put in place that keeps putting dangerous people back on the street. The tragedy of our current system is that it only takes one case to devastate a family or a community. When extortionists target businesses or when someone like Adam Mann, already facing multiple charges, is still free to kill a young woman like Tori Dunn, no empty thoughts and prayers will bring comfort.

We need to scrap the Liberal bail. This is a direct result of the Liberals' catch-and-release approach. Bill C-75 instructed judges to prioritize restraint, which has meant giving repeat violent offenders more chances than the victims ever receive. The jail not bail act would correct that.

[Translation]

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, crime is a complex issue. It is also a matter of intervention. We need to look at this from a perspective that is as broad as possible.

That is what the Bloc Québécois is trying to do by making various suggestions, such as cracking down on criminal organizations. That is important. We are also proposing to create a registry of criminal organizations, to facilitate the seizure of assets and to prohibit criminal organizations from displaying their insignia. We also want to create a specific offence for the criminalization and recruitment of young people who commit offences. We want to limit the use of the Jordan decision, and we also want to abolish the religious exemption for hate speech. How is it that Canada's Criminal Code allows hate speech if it is uttered in the name of religion?

I would like to hear my colleague's thoughts on the various proposals the Bloc Québécois has made.

[English]

Tamara Jansen: Mr. Speaker, honestly, I want to come back to the real issue, and that is the Liberal catch-and-release system. That is the problem. Right now, judges are told to start from the principle of restraint, which tilts the balance away from public safety. That is not the fault of the judiciary. It is the framework the House handed it with Bill C-75.

We need to scrap the Liberal bail. The jail not bail act would not undermine judges. It would empower them to protect the public. It would direct them to weigh community safety first. It would ensure that they see the full record of the accused. It would give them tools to deny bail when serious risk is reasonably foreseeable. Judges need a law that lets them keep dangerous people behind bars, which is what our bill would deliver. It is a framework built on common sense, not catch and release.

Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the whole premise of this does not relate to other bills that may come forward. It is the need to scrap this bail non-reform bill. It is not just us speaking about this. The premiers and attorneys general for Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and the member's province of B.C. have called for the removal of this particular bill. It is from across the country.

What does the member think about that perspective in light of the support to scrap Bill C-75?

Tamara Jansen: Mr. Speaker, most important right now is understanding that, across Canada, when extortionists target banquet halls, when young women like Tori Dunn are murdered by someone already facing multiple charges and when seniors in Langley are afraid to walk outside after a brutal attack, those are all costs. They show up in policing, in health care, in lost economic activity and in the trauma families carry.

We need to scrap the Liberal bail.

Patricia Lattanzio (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Trois-Rivières.

[Translation]

I am pleased to speak today on issues that continue to impact the safety of our communities and the fairness of our criminal justice system, namely the operation and reform of Canada's bail system.

[English]

In recent months, communities across the country have voiced deep concerns about the ability of the criminal justice system to respond effectively to repeat and violent offenders. Let me be clear: These concerns are valid and they demand a serious, coordinated response.

That is why I welcome the opportunity to speak today not only about the federal government's past and ongoing efforts to strengthen bail laws but also about the collaborative work under way with provinces and territories, and the government's intention to table new legislation this fall.

• (1215)

[Translation]

I will begin by speaking about Bill C-242, the jail not bail act, which was introduced by the member for Oxford. Bill C-242 includes provisions to expand the reverse onus provisions for serious offences.

I am pleased to see that there is common ground between the Conservative opposition and our new Liberal government, which was elected on a promise to crack down on repeat and violent offenders. Our election promise responds to a concern shared by many Canadians that individuals who pose a serious risk to public safety should not be released without rigorous judicial oversight. It also reflects the desire to ensure that the bail system takes into account concerns about reoffending and violent offences that communities across the country have raised.

However, while Bill C-242 aims to overcome fears that individuals who pose a risk to public safety will be released without judicial oversight, the way it is drafted raises serious concerns about whether these measures could actually be effective and whether they comply with the fundamental principles of justice and proportionality.

[English]

There seems to be one crucial element that is clearly missing from this bill. Frankly, I am, at the very least, relieved. It seems the Conservatives have finally opened their eyes because they have flip-flopped on the controversial “three strikes” proposal. This kind of rhetoric may score political points, but, in reality, it solves absolutely nothing. Everywhere it has been applied, particularly in the United States, it has failed and has been ineffective at protecting citizens or reducing crime. It seems the Conservatives have finally realized this, as they chose not to include it in their own bill, Bill C-242.

However, this flip-flop raises fundamental questions. The Conservatives owe Canadians an explanation. They need to tell Canadians why they have changed their minds and publicly acknowledge that this proposal was not only misguided but also dangerous. Canadians deserve a clear answer. They deserve to know why an idea inspired by the far right in the United States, entirely incompatible with Canadian realities and our justice system, was ever even considered acceptable by the same people who claim to prioritize public safety and the public interest.

Therefore, I hope, following my remarks, a member of the opposition will rise and offer an explanation and perhaps even an apology to Canadians. Yes, they could offer an apology for even considering such legislation inspired by foreign, far right, extreme models rather than laws designed for Canada and made in Canada, laws that reflect our communities, our values and our justice system.

Let us now take a sombre look at the Conservative record when it comes to criminal justice.

In 2008, the Harper government passed the Tackling Violent Crime Act, imposing a mandatory minimum sentence for firearm offences. The Supreme Court struck this down in *R v. Nur*, calling it “cruel and unusual”.

Business of Supply

In 2012, they doubled down with the Safe Streets and Communities Act, extending mandatory minimums for drug offences. In *R v. Lloyd*, again, the Supreme Court struck this down.

In 2009, they pushed through the so-called Truth in Sentencing Act, limiting judicial discretion on credit for pre-trial custody. In *R v. Safarzadeh-Markhali*, it was struck down again for being overbroad.

In 2011, they introduced the Protecting Canadians by Ending Sentence Discounts for Multiple Murders Act. The Supreme Court invalidated it in *R v. Bissonnette*, ruling that stacked parole ineligibility violated human dignity.

In 2013, they passed legislation making the victim surcharge mandatory and non-waivable. In *R v. Boudreault*, the court ruled it “unconstitutional” and “cruel and unusual” for the poorest and most marginalized offenders.

Most recently, the mandatory minimum for reckless discharge of a firearm, another Harper-era invention, was struck down in *R v. Hills* in 2023.

The list goes on, but allow me to focus on the real action that the new Liberal government is taking. Most recently, Canadians sent the federal government a clear message. They are concerned about repeat and violent offenders and want to see urgent action. This is why the new Liberal government is firmly committed to introducing a bill this fall that will build on previous legislative reforms to strengthen Canada's bail and sentencing laws.

This forthcoming legislation will once again be shaped by strong intergovernmental co-operation. This renewed collaboration among the federal, provincial and territorial governments reflects a shared commitment to public safety and a recognition that meaningful change depends on coordinated action across jurisdictions. By working together, our governments can ensure that our bail laws are not only stronger on paper but effective in practice.

• (1220)

[Translation]

The provinces and territories also play a vital role in collecting and sharing bail data. Leadership in these areas is essential to improving the system as a whole. Bail data collection does not occur at the national level. This responsibility falls to provincial and territorial governments. Without consistent and comprehensive data from all jurisdictions, it is difficult to assess how bail laws are working, what gaps exist, and what changes are needed.

*Business of Supply**[English]*

Canadians deserve a bail system that protects communities while respecting rights. They deserve a sentencing regime that holds offenders accountable while promoting rehabilitation. They deserve to see all orders of government working together not just to pass laws but to implement them in ways that make a real difference in the lives of all Canadians. The government intends to do just that.

[Translation]

Caroline Desrochers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think it is clear that Canadians deserve to feel safe in their communities. That is why we are introducing a bill that will make bail and sentencing rules stricter and make the courts more efficient.

I would like my colleague to speak to the importance of dialogue and of consulting with those who are on the front lines of implementing the laws we vote on here in the House.

Patricia Lattanzio: Mr. Speaker, I will simply say to my colleague that, over the summer, the minister and I toured the province of Quebec. The minister also went to other provinces. We held consultations with partners, law enforcement, Crown prosecutors and victims to learn more about the challenges that the new bill will need to bring forward and address, so that Canadians feel safe after this new bill is passed.

[English]

Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I heard the member claim that the government is committed to strict measures against violent offenders, yet it continues to fuel violent crime in Canada by forcing judges to release offenders at the earliest possible opportunity and under the least onerous conditions.

Canadians are owed an apology from the government for its failure to keep them safe by releasing repeat violent offenders.

Patricia Lattanzio: Mr. Speaker, in response to my colleague's question, I would invite her to read Bill C-75 at length. She would realize that the reality is this: Because of Canada's response by defining "intimate partner violence" in the Criminal Code and creating a reverse onus for repeat intimate partner violence offenders, judges must now consider prior intimate partner convictions. Penalties are higher for repeat offenders.

Canadians deserve a debate on the facts. If the Conservatives want to repeal a bill that makes it harder for intimate partner violence offenders to get bail, they should do so directly and then face the backlash from Canadians.

[Translation]

Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives are not entirely wrong. There are several reasons why we really do need to focus on the justice system, look after it and reform it.

One of the problems that was identified a long time ago has to do with the appointment of judges. The government is behind on that. However, Quebec has long been asking to have its say on the judges Ottawa appoints to sit on higher courts, such as the Quebec Superior Court and the Quebec Court of Appeal.

As members know, the Liberals recently appointed lawyer and Liberal supporter Robert Leckey as a judge, even though he is against secularism and had not even been a member of the Barreau du Québec for the 10 years required before being appointed.

When will the Liberals finally realize that the situation could be improved by perhaps allowing Quebec to participate in the judicial appointment process, or at least in the recommendation process?

● (1225)

Patricia Lattanzio: Mr. Speaker, the appointment of superior court judges is the government's responsibility, and Quebec is already involved in the process. We are holding discussions in good faith, but we are not obligated to reach an agreement. Minister Fraser is in contact with his Quebec counterpart—

The Deputy Speaker: I must interrupt the parliamentary secretary to remind her that members cannot use a minister's first or last name in the House.

The parliamentary secretary.

Patricia Lattanzio: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice is in contact with his Quebec counterpart. Judicial independence remains a cornerstone of our democracy. We cannot comment on the case of Justice Leckey.

[English]

Steven Bonk (Souris—Moose Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite referenced that the Liberals want to protect the rights of criminals and that they want to protect the rights of citizens, but the result from their Bill C-75 is that crime is out of control and repeat offenders are on the streets in minutes.

How can the member defend the policy, when it is completely hypocritical?

Patricia Lattanzio: Mr. Speaker, as mentioned earlier, Canadians deserve a debate on the facts. If the Conservatives want to repeal a bill that made it harder for IPV offenders to get bail, then they should do so directly and face the backlash from Canadians with regard to that issue.

Caroline Desrochers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are worried about crime in their communities, and let me be clear at the outset: The concerns are valid. When Canadians see stories of violent incidents in their neighbourhoods and when they hear about repeat offenders cycling in and out of the system, it shakes their confidence. It makes families wonder whether their kids are safe walking home from school, whether seniors are safe going to the grocery store and whether their communities are as secure as they once were.

[Translation]

We must never brush these concerns aside or suggest to Canadians that it is all in their heads or that they should not be concerned. The truth is that violent crime is a problem. Recidivism is a problem. Canadians expect us, as legislators, to seriously and urgently respond to this problem with solutions, not slogans.

[English]

The motion before us today tries to frame the issue in very simple terms. It says crime is up 55%, repeat offenders are on the streets and the solution is to pass one bill, Bill C-242, the so-called jail not bail act. While it may be politically convenient for the Conservatives to package such a complex issue into a single slogan, Canadians know that public safety is much more complicated than that.

[Translation]

I would like to remind the House of what has already been accomplished. In 2023, under a Liberal government, Parliament passed significant bail reforms. These reforms specifically targeted violent repeat offenders, including those charged with serious offences involving firearms. We heard the concerns of provincial and territorial premiers and police associations, and we took action.

These reforms tightened the rules to make it more difficult for individuals charged with serious violent crimes to get bail. This was not just a slogan; it was action.

[English]

I am standing here to suggest that the work is not finished; it is far from it. In fact during the most recent election, Canadians gave the new Liberal government a fresh mandate to go further. Our platform was clear. We committed to strengthening bail again where it is failing, we committed to ensuring that prosecutors and judges have the resources they need, and we committed to making new investments in victim services and community safety programs. That is the plan Canadians voted for. That is the plan we are implementing in the current session of Parliament.

The Conservatives would like Canadians to believe that bail is the entire story, but public safety is not just about what happens at a bail hearing. Public safety is about prevention, prosecution and protection, and our government is acting on all these fronts.

Let me take a moment to talk about prosecution. One of the real challenges we face is that Crown prosecutors in courts are overburdened. Cases take too long, and dangerous offenders sometimes slip through the cracks, not because of soft laws but because of an under-resourced system. That is why our platform committed to in-

Business of Supply

creasing resources for Crown attorneys so they can prepare cases more effectively, so they can oppose bail where necessary and so they can ensure that trials move forward without unnecessary delay.

That is also why we are expanding resources for judges. Judges need the ability to impose strict release conditions when they believe someone poses a risk to public safety. They need the time and the capacity to make those decisions thoughtfully, and we are giving them those tools.

● (1230)

[Translation]

Let us now turn to prevention. If we want to permanently reduce crime, we cannot focus solely on punishment; we also have to focus on prevention. Our platform was clear on this. We are committed to expanding programs to help youth build better lives and steer them away from gangs and crime.

We are committed to strengthening mental health and addiction services because we know that untreated mental health and untreated addictions cause many people to reoffend. We are committed to the building safer communities fund and to indigenous justice initiatives because we know that reconciliation and equity promote safety.

[English]

The motion before us ignores prevention completely. It ignores prosecution completely. It says the solution is one bill and longer sitting hours, but Canadians know that one bill would not make their neighbourhoods safer overnight. They know it takes a comprehensive plan, one that is done hand in hand with the people at the front line of implementing the laws we vote on in here.

Conservatives call it “catch and release”. We call it listening to Canadians and delivering real solutions, not slogans. Let me be clear: The government agrees that repeat violent offenders must be dealt with firmly. We agree that Canadians deserve to feel safe in their communities, and we are acting on that commitment. In fact, legislation to strengthen bail further will be coming forward in the current session. We have been very clear that this is the responsible path forward, and we have committed to protecting Canadians.

Business of Supply

However, we will not reduce the issue to a bumper sticker. We will not pretend that public safety can be restored by slogans, because Canadians have heard slogans before, and they voted to not be governed by slogans. They heard them during the decade the Conservatives were in power. The Conservatives had 10 years to act. They had 10 years in which they could have strengthened bail, resourced prosecutors and invested in prevention. They did not; they failed. Now suddenly, Conservatives have discovered slogans about jail, not bail, but Canadians are not looking for slogans. They are looking for solutions.

Let me remind the House what those solutions look like under a Liberal government. They look like targeted bail reform, which was passed in 2023, with more reforms coming in the current session. They look like investment in prosecutors and judges so the justice system works the way it should. They look like prevention programs for youth, addiction treatment programs and mental health supports that reduce crime before it happens. They look like stronger victim services, because safety also means standing with the people who have already been harmed. That is the Liberal plan. It is what we campaigned on, it is what Canadians voted and it is what we are delivering.

[Translation]

The motion before us today is not a genuine plan for public safety; it is a political tactic, a mere slogan. It is an attempt to persuade Canadians that all of the problems would be solved, if only this bill were to pass.

Canadians know better than that. They know that public safety is a complex issue that requires a comprehensive approach. They know that only the Liberal government will implement a comprehensive approach like this.

We must recognize the Canadians' concerns and accept the reality that crime is a problem. However, we must not give in to the politics of fear or political slogans. We have to do the heavy lifting involved in building a fair, firm and effective justice system, something that our government is committed to achieving. We intend to act on that commitment in the current session, which is why I cannot support this motion.

• (1235)

[English]

Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I listened to the member's speech, and I think she has selective amnesia, because she said that it was easier to get bail in 2014 than in 2025. The Liberals brought in bail reform, so I think it is time to scrap the Liberal bail reform and make it so that we put prisoners in jail, not let them out on bail.

Does the member know whether it was harder for criminals to get out on bail in 2024 or in 2014?

[Translation]

Caroline Desrochers: Mr. Speaker, what I will say is that we committed to that in 2023 and we have already imposed stricter bail conditions.

Right now, we are engaged in exhaustive consultations. My colleagues are welcome to share their points of view and present their

opinions to us. We are conducting exhaustive consultations with the people on the front lines who implement the laws that we pass. These are not slogans; they are concrete actions.

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my colleague says she is open to suggestions relating to crime.

I would like to know whether she supports the Bloc Québécois's suggestion to create a list of criminal organizations and to make it a crime to wear or display the colours of those organizations. I am thinking about the Hells Angels in particular.

Caroline Desrochers: Mr. Speaker, those are discussions that we are prepared to have in the context of Bill C-2.

Today we are talking about the motion to adopt Bill C-242, which was introduced by our opposition colleagues. Crime is a problem. We know that and we acknowledge it. We want to get to work and that is why we are holding consultations with police forces, municipalities and provincial and territorial premiers. We want to ensure that we present a comprehensive plan.

[English]

Braedon Clark (Sackville—Bedford—Preston, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleague mentioned prevention in her speech. Deterrence and punishment are obviously parts of the criminal justice system, but prevention is really important. That word does not appear in the motion at all, not once.

I wonder if my colleague could touch a bit on the importance of prevention as part of the criminal justice system as well.

[Translation]

Caroline Desrochers: Mr. Speaker, prevention is a very important aspect in the fight against crime. We know that high crime rates and recidivism are linked to other problems.

We know that crime is not just a matter of being released and being given bail, and that is why we are proposing a comprehensive plan. We really need to address all the factors that contribute to a person's situation and the reasons why they commit serious offences.

[English]

Blake Richards (Airdrie—Cochrane, CPC): Mr. Speaker, at the outset of her speech, the member mentioned that she felt the pain of those who are victimized by crime, but she failed to address that with the vast majority of victims of crime, the crime is caused by those who are out on bail. These are repeat offenders who continue to offend over and over again. At the end of her speech, she talked about how crime must be dealt with firmly. If she really believes that, she will support us in scrapping Liberal bail.

Will the member support our efforts to scrap Liberal bail so that we can actually get tough on crime in this country?

● (1240)

[Translation]

Caroline Desrochers: Mr. Speaker, I will again tell my colleague that the opposition MP's motion is too narrow. It completely ignores the fact that this issue requires a much broader approach.

We know that prevention is paramount, and that is why we are putting forward a plan that addresses prevention. It is important, and that is why our plan is more comprehensive.

[English]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, 1,600 is the number of crimes that happen in this country every single day. That is almost one crime per minute.

These are not statistics. They are innocent people being hit over the head with baseball bats. They are jewellery stores being smashed in and opened up by an incoming automobile, which is then used to steal the proceeds families have spent their entire lives earning. They are the people who wake up in the middle of the night to the sound of stomping feet on their living room floor as home invaders break in to steal, rob, pillage and much worse.

They are the Farooqi family, whose courageous father came running out to protect his defenceless children against home invaders and was shot in the throat. It is a three-year-old girl who was mercilessly raped by a chronic repeat offender, a scumbag who had already been convicted of raping a 12-year-old boy yet, under Liberal laws, was out on the street.

[Translation]

That was the case for a woman killed in Saint-Jérôme by her former partner, a man who had already been arrested 30 times and released 16 times before killing his partner.

[English]

It is the case of a beautiful young mother, Bailey McCourt, murdered by her ex, who was out on bail and had been released only three hours earlier. He was only four kilometres away from the courthouse that granted him that Liberal bail.

These are not just sensationalist stories, as Liberals like to dismiss them; these are facts. While the justice minister condescendingly dismissed these crimes, saying we are not in the Wild West, the facts would beg to differ.

Under the Liberal government, since it has taken office, violent crime is up 55%, extortion is up 330%, homicides are up 29% and

Business of Supply

sexual assaults are up 76%. There is a cause and there is an effect. We know the source of this crime. It is Liberal bail, as passed into law by Liberal Bill C-75. It requires judges to release the accused at the "earliest reasonable opportunity" on the "least onerous" restrictions. Those are the words embedded in the law. As a result, the same offenders can commit literally hundreds of offences and be released, often within hours of their latest arrest.

Police say they have often not even finished the paperwork in the arrest and the offender is back out on the street. I have had police officers tell me they have arrested the same offender three times in the same day. One police officer in the Toronto area told me that in most arrests, the criminals happily confess to the crime in the back seat of the car because they do not care about being convicted anymore. They know that Liberal laws will turn them loose, regardless of the outcome of the trial.

Liberals pulled a bait and switch in order to get elected. In the last election, they knew Canadians were fed up with Liberal bail, so they said, "Give us a fourth chance and we will reverse course." What happened? It has now been six months since the Prime Minister was elected on the promise that he would reverse Liberal bail. Where are we? There has not been a single Liberal bill to reverse the bail system they set up. We are six months in.

We all know what needs to happen. The police have basically written the legislative repeal that is necessary for us to fix the Liberal mess, yet there is no bill. There is nothing. There is zero, zip, zilch.

Maybe it is because the Prime Minister took the unprecedentedly reckless act of appointing Justin Trudeau's most incompetent minister to the job. The justice minister was the immigration minister who literally destroyed the best system in the world, increasing the numbers by 300% over the previous norm, allowing criminals to come into our country unvetted and swamping our housing, jobs and health care with too many people too fast. He then went on to the housing portfolio, where he created the worst housing crisis in the OECD, and now he is in charge of the Criminal Code.

● (1245)

Compound that problem with the Minister of Public Safety, who should resign for having gone ahead with a plan to confiscate property from law-abiding firearms owners. It was a plan that he was caught on tape saying would not work. This is who we have as the keystone cops in charge of reversing the Liberal crime wave of the last decade.

Business of Supply

Some people say we need bail reform. We have bail reform. It is called Bill C-75. What we need is to undo Liberal bail reform; hence today, we are calling for the government to scrap Liberal bail and replace it with jail, not bail. Today, we put forward a motion that would allow Parliament to adopt Bill C-242, the jail not bail act. It was put forward by the brilliant member of Parliament for Oxford, Ontario. This proposal is backed by police, crime victims and everybody who wants to stop crime.

The House will hear more from the member for Niagara South, with whom I am splitting my time on this matter.

I will note that members of the government do not need to do a thing. They just need to get out of the way. They have already broken the bail system. They brought in the chaos we are now experiencing. We are not asking them to put on a cape and come to the rescue. We are asking them to simply get out of the way. If they do one thing, it should be to sit on their hands and let the House of Commons pass this motion to quickly push through the jail not bail act. We can lock up the criminals who have been terrorizing our streets. That is all we need them to do.

In fact, some people say they are doing nothing. It would be great if they did nothing, because nothing would be a massive improvement over what they have been doing, which is doing violence to our Criminal Code. Our Criminal Code has allowed criminals to do violence to our people.

The answer is actually very simple. Pseudo-intellectuals in Liberal circles love to say the problem is much more complicated. It is not a complicated problem. The statistics tell us the extent of it. We have a very small number of criminals doing a phenomenal amount of crime. The same 40 offenders in Vancouver got arrested 6,000 times. That is 150 arrests per offender per year, and those were just the occasions they were caught. Almost all of the crime is done by a tiny group of rampant reoffenders. If we keep them in jail, they cannot reoffend. It is very simple.

We did this under the previous Conservative government. One thing happened that was unsurprising and one that was maybe counterintuitive. The first thing, unsurprisingly, is that crime went down by 25%. It plummeted. It was the biggest drop in crime in modern Canadian history. It worked.

The second part was a bit counterintuitive. What else went down? It was incarcerations. After Liberals warned that we would have to build new jails to accommodate all of the prisoners, fewer people, in fact, ended up in jail. Why? It is because the same offenders who were coming in and going out just stayed behind bars. We had already reserved them a room. It was like the Hotel California, where they checked out but never really left. We kept them in the cell and never let them out. We locked them up and threw away the key.

Something else happened. The small-time offenders or those looking to get involved in a life of crime said, "Hell, no. The penalty is too serious. I'm going to get a job and follow the law." Deterrence works.

The facts are in. Liberal bail has brought hell to our streets. The only one keeping that hell in place is the Prime Minister. He and his government need to get out of the way so Conservatives can scrap

Liberal bail, lock up the criminals and throw away the key. Let us do this not out of vengeance or spite, but out of love for law-abiding people so that our children can once again play safely in our streets, so that people can go to bed at night in peace and tranquillity, so that when they wake up in the morning, their car is still there, and so that we have a safe country where law-abiding people can live good, secure, happy, worry-free lives. That is what we are working for. Will the government get out of the way and let us get it done?

• (1250)

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it sounds like the Leader of the Opposition is against a comprehensive plan coming forward.

It takes time to put a plan together, and we have done exactly that in the new reform legislation, which would deal with not only bail but also sentencing.

The Leader of the Opposition likes to mock and call people incompetent when they do not exactly agree with him, but does he agree that we need comprehensive reform, that we should also be dealing with sentencing, that we should also be working with provinces to make sure their courts are implementing bail appropriately and their judges are trained? Would he not admit that comprehensive reform is what we really need?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, the Liberals brought in comprehensive reform over the last 10 years. Let us talk about their reforms.

Their reforms require judges to release offenders at the earliest opportunity under the least onerous conditions. That was the reform, and that is why we have chaos in our streets. They brought in another reform: house arrest for sex offenders, extortionists, gun criminals and other serious offenders. That is why so many recent convicts are able to reoffend with ease. They brought in another reform, which is to waste billions of dollars chasing down law-abiding people while turning gun criminals and gangsters out on our streets for free.

We know what the Liberal reform is. It is to unleash crime and chaos in our communities. We need to reverse the Liberal criminal justice reforms, scrap Liberal bail, lock up the criminals, throw away the key and restore safety for Canadians.

Business of Supply

Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in January 2023, working as a police officer, I attended the funeral of Constable Greg Pierzchala of the OPP, who was killed by someone who had already been denied bail but was released anyway. The OPP commissioner at the time said this death would not have happened if the suspect had been kept in custody.

To the Leader of the Opposition, what is the price that Canadians are paying at this point for these failed Liberal policies?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for Windsor West not only for his service here in the House but for his courageous service as a police officer, protecting Windsorites and all Canadians. He put his life on the line every single day, like so many police officers who leave in the morning and kiss their kids goodbye, knowing it might be the last time they see them. For Greg Pierzchala, it was the last time he saw his family, as he was gunned down by someone the Liberals had released on bail. Liberal bail took his life.

What is the price that people are paying? They are paying with their blood and with their lives. Every day another tragedy unfolds on our streets. Every day, after all these years, the Liberals have known their laws are causing this chaos. Not only were they warned beforehand by police, but they have seen it through the bloodshed on our streets.

How many more people will have to die before the government will get out of the way, scrap Liberal bail and protect our people?

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there were no extreme words coming from the leader of the official opposition there.

Let us look at what he is actually saying, and we wonder why he has fallen so far to the right.

Interestingly enough, in the legislation the Conservatives are proposing, they have abandoned the policy of the American-style “three strikes and you’re out”. I wonder why. Can the leader of the Conservative Party indicate to his caucus colleagues, to Canadians, and make a policy statement? Has he abandoned “three strikes and you’re out”? If not, why did he not include it in the legislation he is proposing?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: No, Mr. Speaker, we support “three strikes and you’re out”. Criminals who commit three violent offences should go to jail. We should lock them up and throw away the key.

The member for Winnipeg North just revealed how radical and extreme he and his party have become. Here he says it is extreme to lock up criminals who have committed seven or eight offences. I will tell members what is extreme. It is when someone gets released for the 16th time, after 30 arrests, and then goes and kills his ex-spouse. These are the stories that are happening on our streets every single day. The extreme bloodshed and violence that Liberals have unleashed is what is radical. That is what we need to put an end to.

Will they get out of the way so we can scrap Liberal bail?

• (1255)

Fred Davies (Niagara South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am proud to contribute to this debate and follow my leader, who has never wavered on the need for reform of the Criminal Code.

As a new MP, I am proud to stand here after several troubling weeks in my riding of Niagara South. I am proud to bring the voices of so many angry and frustrated people who have gathered to protest the vicious assault of a three-year-old toddler known to all of us now as little E.

There might be a few of us here who grew up in the 1960s. When I was much younger, I remember Canada as a much different place. Our community was more respectful. We had few, if any, issues with feeling safe on our streets, and certainly we felt safe in our homes. We had rules and we followed them. Some here remember being able to roam our neighbourhoods with our friends, knowing that when the streetlights came on, we headed home, and we all made it home safely. Before cellphones, social media and algorithms, we rode our Mustang bikes with monkey handlebars and banana seats. In my community, we had a holdover from the Second World War. We called it the nine o'clock whistle. It was a curfew whistle that we heard around town, and that was our signal to go home.

I grew up in a family of law enforcement. My grandfather was chief of police in my small town of Port Colborne. My father was in the RCMP before joining the navy in World War II and later had a long career as a lawyer, Crown attorney and police commissioner. We respected our police, our teachers, our principals, our neighbours and our shopkeepers, and we always respected our elders. I know it sounds somewhat idyllic and even a bit like an episode of *Leave It to Beaver*, but this was the childhood I knew and remember with fond nostalgia. Yes, I watched *Leave It to Beaver* in black and white.

Sadly, my nostalgic sentimentality for a safe community has evolved into fear and trepidation in navigating our streets. What went wrong? Before I look at this, I would like to update the House on the case that has captivated, mobilized and crystallized opinion about crime in my community, the case of that three-year-old little girl who was brutally and in the most reprehensible way sexually assaulted in her own home in the city of Welland. She was attacked by a convicted and recently released registered sex offender. For me and so many in my community, this can only be described as unbelievable.

This took place in a neighbourhood in which I grew up. My grandparents owned a home on this street in Welland. As a child, I never felt unsafe in this neighbourhood. I would walk with my grandfather on Sunday mornings to pick up bread down the street at Barca's Bakery, and I would often be dispatched to pick it up myself. Again, I never felt unsafe, but little E, the sweet little three-year-old, will likely never feel safe again. After more than three weeks in the hospital recovering from this unspeakable assault, little E is now back home with her family.

Business of Supply

The House knows the story of Daniel Senecal. He was released early after being convicted of sexually assaulting a young boy. He is on the sex offender registry. He was released into my community early on parole, and within a few short weeks he reoffended, breaking into the home of this little girl. Little E did not deserve this. No little girl, no little boy, no human being should be subjected to this kind of vile act of sexual assault. This particular little girl did not deserve to spend three weeks in the hospital. Most critically, Daniel Senecal should have been in prison, not in the room of a three-year-old toddler.

Daniel Senecal has a bail hearing on October 15. Yes, this repeat convicted offender and vile excuse for a human being has a bail hearing on October 15. Now, clearly, this is his charter right and right of due process. That is not in dispute. The problem is that he is appearing for bail in the first place when he should have been in jail serving his original sentence. If that were the case, little E would have been just another happy little girl growing up without fear of being attacked by a convicted sex offender within the confines of her own home.

I started a petition in my riding, hoping to bring the voice of my community to this chamber. Little did I know how far and wide the response would be. I will present the petition after the Easter break so the government hears the voices of tens of thousands of people in Niagara.

• (1300)

During the recent election campaign, people told me their stories and their fears about rising crime rates, violent crimes and the feeling that their community is no longer safe. They spoke to me about the absurd catch-and-release policy of the current Liberal government. Violent crime is up 55%. Crime across the board, from extortion to car theft and home invasions, is way up. The stats are clear, but the fear is palpable and real. The current Liberal approach of forcing judges to release offenders at the earliest possible opportunity, under the least onerous conditions, is an abomination. The phrase “catch-and-release”, for me, is a fishing term but is oddly reflective of the main problem in the Criminal Code.

Police have told me horror stories about the utterly useless policy of catch-and-release. One officer recently told me he had arrested the same individual 30 times over a period of several months in Niagara. In some situations, the same individual was released on the same day on a simple promise to appear. This is the new expedited process, a promise to appear. An arrest can be made with the perpetrator sitting in the back seat of a cruiser and let go on a promise to appear. This is both laughable and sad, but it happens every single day. I have heard that in some cases, police simply drive by rather than waste time on useless paperwork. They know that the process is fatally flawed and that people are never going to do time for their crimes.

When I asked the Minister of Justice about the case of little E, he told me that legislation is on the way. That is not good enough. It is not good enough for little E, and it certainly does not deal with the issue of early release for abhorrent predators who are sent back into our communities and neighbourhoods to offend over and over again.

Here we are. We have a promise of bail reform but no action. I fully expect the minister will make good on his promise to introduce legislation, but will he actually change and reverse a decade of Liberal soft-on-crime catch-and-release and fundamentally reform our bail system? That remains to be seen.

To me, people like Daniel Senecal should never see the light of day again. This is not “three strikes and you’re out”. Sexually assaulting a toddler should carry a sentence commensurate with the crime, which, in my opinion, means life. When someone steals the innocence of a toddler, they forfeit their right to ever walk the streets of any neighbourhood again, let alone to ever have contact with children.

The last time I spoke about this in the House, I had been visited by many survivors of sexual assault, often perpetrated by repeat offenders. They live in fear every single day. The list of people being released only to be convicted again is staggering. Several women sat in my office in Welland and tearfully told me their stories and about the scars they have and the fears they have, living every single day looking over their shoulder.

Many know their perpetrators are somewhere out there, and they are afraid. They hide. They do not engage in events where their faces can be seen. However, a few had garnered the courage to speak out this time, knowing they were making themselves visible and vulnerable. Many continue to move from place to place out of sheer fear. They pleaded with me to bring their stories to the floor of the House of Commons, and I am so proud to do that today.

Let me conclude by taking a moment to talk to my community about the fear and frustration that has gripped all of us in my beautiful Niagara region. This is not a partisan issue. We cannot ignore that the Liberal government created this soft-on-crime catch-and-release, mandatory parole, applying an easy path for criminal activity.

Conservatives are committed to strengthening the Criminal Code and ensuring that people like Daniel Senecal would never have another chance to offend. We are here to make sure repeat offenders actually receive a sentence equal to their crime. Frankly, if it were up to me, he would rot in jail for the rest of his life.

I want to thank the people of Niagara South who signed the petition that I will present to the House shortly. To the survivors, I thank them for their courage to talk to me about the pain, the fear and the difficult path of recovery. They give me strength here, and I am grateful for their counsel and help in bringing this message forward.

I implore the government to introduce legislation. There is no time to waste. It must bring in legislation now, not sometime in the fall but right now, so dangerous criminals like Daniel Senecal never hurt children again.

• (1305)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us be real here. In the last federal election campaign, the Prime Minister made it very clear that he is concerned about what is happening with crime and safety in our communities.

He made a solemn commitment to bring forward significant bail reform. The Conservatives know that. Here, they say to not politicize it. When the government, and this particular Prime Minister, brings forward that legislation, we hope the Conservatives will recognize it for what it is and, as opposed to trying to debate it endlessly, allow legislation dealing with crime and safety to get to committee stage.

Will the member commit to doing so?

Fred Davies: Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary secretary to the government House leader turns himself into an apoplectic pretzel from time to time, trying to validate the delay by saying it is on its way. He references the promised Liberal campaign, saying that it is on its way and that they are going to do it, but when will they do it? He should give us a date. What does “the fall” mean? Does that mean next week? We are in the fall now.

We need the legislation now so people like little E are safe again in their homes. The Liberals need to change it and bring in the legislation. They have a lot of opportunity to do this. They should do it now. We do not need self-righteous caveats in the House in this language. There is no excuse for delay.

[Translation]

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my colleague gave a very impassioned speech. It is clear that the current situation inspires strong emotions in him, as it does for all of us. I thought that he gave a very good speech and I appreciated it.

In terms of the motion, I think that Parliament is important. I think that parliamentarians have a job to do in the House. When it comes to such a sensitive, significant and fundamental matter, should we not avoid moving too fast? Should we not study the details of the motion in depth?

In particular, should we not come up with something that makes sense and that will satisfy everyone for a change, rather than rush ahead with something that will be overturned later?

[English]

Fred Davies: Mr. Speaker, rushing into legislation is obviously never a good thing, but the epidemic of violent crime against people is not new. We have known this for many years. The government has had ample opportunity over the last five months to introduce legislation. My colleagues on this side of the House have been talking about it daily.

Conservatives are not rushing into this. We know what the problem is and how to fix it. We need perpetrators such as Daniel Senecal to stay in jail, not get out early. We need him to serve his sentence, serve a longer sentence and never again have the opportunity to assault a little girl as he did in my community.

Business of Supply

Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, first of all, my heart goes out to little E and her family and friends.

I hope people are watching today, because they will see the difference between Liberals and Conservatives. A parliamentary secretary got up today and said Liberals will do anything to defend the Liberal Party of Canada; Conservatives will do anything to defend the rights of victims of crime in Canada. That is the difference between us and the Liberals.

There is an example from my small town in which a child pornographer was let out on bail the same day, and he lives two blocks from our school. Would this piece of legislation ensure that criminals and animals such as that stay behind bars where they belong?

Fred Davies: Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, we believe that the time is right for our bill, Bill C-242, to be passed in the House of Commons. We are doing this because the Liberals have had ample opportunity to put legislation forward, and they have failed to do it. I do not know what they are waiting for. Do more people need to be brutally beaten and raped by repeat offenders? At what point do we say enough is enough?

The opportunity is now. Let us not wait any longer. I implore the government to bring the legislation forward now. It is already written. I do not know what the government is waiting for, but I know that children like little E need to have hope in the government. I ask it to please bring legislation forward or pass the Conservatives' bill.

• (1310)

Charles Sousa (Mississauga—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am a proud representative of Mississauga—Lakeshore, and I will be sharing my time with the member for Calgary Signal Hill.

As I rise to debate the opposition motion before us, I want to talk particularly about its narrative and the appropriate steps moving forward. My community, like many communities, is concerned. We have a number of town halls. We have talk groups. We have ongoing discussions with Peel police. We understand the dilemmas that are before us, and we recognize the concerns our neighbours face. They are concerned about guns, home invasions and auto thefts. These things have become an issue of concern across the country. However, there is also a blame game that seems to be going on. Oftentimes, it deflects responsibility. We are all responsible for ensuring that our communities are safe, at the federal level, at the provincial level and at the municipal level, and even with some of the organizations and associations that are engaged. It is appropriate for us to have this ongoing debate and discussion. I welcome the fact that it is a non-partisan issue.

Business of Supply

There is organized crime. We have been in meetings with the RCMP, border security, international agencies and the police to ensure that organized crime is addressed. Organized criminals are perpetrating some of these criminal acts; they are engaging with our young people, who are victimized themselves by being sourced in order to do these criminal acts. This is why, just last month, we introduced Bill C-9, the combatting hate act, to address hate-motivated offences. This legislation successfully passed second reading yesterday, and it is now moving to committee for detailed study and consideration.

Over the summer, the Minister of Justice engaged in consultations with provincial and territorial counterparts, law enforcement agencies, police chiefs and associations to ensure that any reforms are practical, evidence-based and responsive to the needs of Canadians. This is how responsible reform happens, through careful study, collaboration and expert guidance.

Meanwhile, the Conservative leader, who was preoccupied with keeping his job, has torqued the rhetoric, which is very partisan in its nature. While seeking his parachute return to the House after being resoundingly rejected by his constituents, he has now been more concerned for himself than for the public safety measures we are talking about. Instead of focusing on measures that truly improve public safety, he continues to advance reckless, politically motivated proposals, prioritizing appearances over solutions that actually protect Canadians.

Canadians deserve more than slogans and political theatre. They deserve government that listens, engages with experts and acts decisively to make communities safer. That is exactly what this government is doing, through legislation that addresses urgent issues while respecting the principles of justice and fairness. This is why the federal government has taken important steps to reform the bail system in recent years. In 2023, former Bill C-48 made meaningful changes to strengthen the bail system in response to concerns about efficiency and repeat offences.

For example, Bill C-48 created a reverse onus to target serious repeat offending involving weapons, and it expanded the list of firearms that trigger a reverse onus at bail. It also broadened the reverse onus targeting repeat offenders in cases of intimate partner violence. These changes made it more difficult for accused persons to obtain bail when they are charged with serious repeat offences.

All of us want to keep criminals in jail. All of us—

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

Charles Sousa: Absolutely, I do. Mr. Speaker, I take offence to the very nature of that notion. The fact that individuals are suggesting any member of this Parliament would prefer not to put a criminal in jail is offensive in its own right. There are laws that are in place. There are laws that have been in place all along. We have to enforce the law. These changes were not the result of partisan initiatives. They were reflected by broad collaboration with provinces, territories, law enforcement and legal experts. Every step was guided by data, by evidence, by consultation with those working on the front lines of criminal justice.

Despite these reforms, we understand that Canadians remain concerned about repeat offences and violent offences. This is why

the government will introduce legislation this fall to further strengthen bail and sentencing provisions in the Criminal Code.

● (1315)

The federal government has committed to establishing reverse onuses for a range of serious crimes, including violent and organized crime-related auto theft, home invasions, human trafficking and human smuggling, to make bail more onerous to obtain in these circumstances. There is also a commitment to amending the Criminal Code to direct courts to give primary considerations to the principles of denunciation and deterrence when determining a fit sentence for anyone who has numerous convictions for auto thefts or home invasions. Further commitments include expanding the possibility of consecutive sentences in violent or organized crime-related auto theft cases.

These are concrete measures aimed at addressing repeat and violent offending throughout the criminal justice process. They represent an approach that is strategic, evidence-based and evidence driven, and focused on protecting public safety without sacrificing the rights and fairness that are the foundational aspects of our judicial system.

We also know that reform cannot happen in isolation. The operation of the bail system is a shared responsibility between the federal and provincial and territorial governments, as I have already stated. While the federal government sets the legal framework, the provinces and territories manage the day-to-day operations, including court and jail administration. Strengthening the law at the federal level must therefore be complemented by effective enforcement resources and oversight at the provincial level, and without this coordination, even the best legislation would not achieve meaningful change.

Data and evidence also play a crucial role. Provinces and territories collect the data necessary to evaluate how bail laws are functioning, identify gaps and implement improvements. Better data always allows government to track outcomes, assess risks and ensure that measures designed to protect public safety are actually working. That is why our government continues to work closely with partners across the country to improve data collection, transparency and reporting in the criminal justice system.

Public safety is built through careful policy, strong partnerships and sustained action. It is not achieved through slogans and partisan posturing. It is built when governments work together to address the root causes of crime, including poverty, trauma, mental health issues and housing insecurity, as well as individuals not being given the support they need to rebuild their lives. Canadians deserve a bail system that protects communities while respecting rights, as well as sentencing systems that hold offenders accountable while promoting rehabilitation.

This government is delivering on that promise. We are not acting in haste or based on politics; we are consulting with experts, collaborating with provincial counterparts and building laws that work in practice. We are introducing legislation to ensure that repeat offenders face appropriate consequences, that courts have the tools to protect public safety and that the justice system functions efficiently and fairly for all Canadians.

In conclusion, Canadians expect a government that acts responsibly, listens to experts and delivers results. That is what we are doing with our justice reform agenda. We have introduced Bill C-9 to fight hate crime; we strengthened the bail system through Bill C-48, and we are preparing additional measures this fall to further address repeat and violent offences. That is not about political games or empty slogans; it is about real action, public safety and justice, and that is exactly the approach Canadians elected this government to take.

Laws exist, and we need to enforce them.

Rhonda Kirkland (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Conservatives on this side will not be taking lessons from this failed Ontario Liberal finance minister. It seems to me that he is suggesting criminals' rights should continue to be greater than victims' rights and that repeat violent offenders have the right to be back on our streets, terrorizing Canadians.

Is that right?

Charles Sousa: Mr. Speaker, it is interesting. The Charter of Rights protects the very individual asking that question. The judicial system is there to protect individuals. If someone is a criminal, and they have committed a violent crime, they have to face the consequences by law, but the right is there to protect the victims too. We will always fight to have a fair judicial system and to ensure that criminals go to jail and stay in jail.

• (1320)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want my colleague to expand on an issue. During the last federal election, our Prime Minister understood what Canadians were saying at the doors; Liberal candidates throughout the country raised concerns and issues related to the need for bail reform. Now we have a Prime Minister who has made a commitment to bring forward that bail reform, and this is something that will be reflective of what Canadians were asking for in the form of an election platform.

Can the member provide his thoughts on that issue?

Charles Sousa: Mr. Speaker, it was important that the leader of the Liberal Party, as all of us did during the election, recognized

Business of Supply

some of the concerns that our constituents have with crime, but make no mistake that they had concerns with crime for many years prior, even during the time the Conservatives were in power. Our leader took the time and had the consideration to listen, make commitments and put forward in our platform what we should do going forward. This is unlike opposition members, who are only using slogans and fearmongering when there is an opportunity to work collaboratively with all levels of government and authorities to ensure real safety for our public.

[Translation]

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I want to pick up on the question that was just asked.

The Liberals have been talking a lot about this bail reform promised by the Minister of Justice. I have colleagues on the Standing Committee on the Status of Women who have spoken to me about it. We were told that it would happen this fall and that the Standing Committee on the Status of Women should not take on too much because we should wait for this reform.

How does all this fit in with what we in the Bloc Québécois believe, namely that initiatives must be consistent to strengthen the mechanisms aimed at coordinating the justice system with public safety? I am thinking of repeat offenders or people who commit serious firearm offences, sexual assault or crimes against women.

How will all of that be coordinated?

[English]

Charles Sousa: Mr. Speaker, that is another great question. We need a coordinated effort. We need to ensure that the federal government and provincial jurisdictions, which act on the law and are supposed to enforce laws, deal with matters like court delays, the collection of bail data, the funding and resources necessary, and even the justice platform by the BQ.

We will continue to work in collaboration with the provincial level of judicial authority to ensure we enable those courts to act and put criminals in jail.

Kelly DeRidder (Kitchener Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member is a failed Ontario Liberal finance minister. He failed so miserably that his own PM will not even put him in cabinet. He failed Ontario financially, and now he wants to keep criminals on the streets.

Will he support the jail not bail act and not fail on this?

Charles Sousa: Mr. Speaker, there we go. The member opposite is making a personal attack over the fact that I balanced the books in Ontario, which did not happen under the Conservatives in the last go-around.

Business of Supply

We will continue to fight for Canadians. We will continue to fight for public safety. I will not be addressing rhetoric like that. It only causes concern and enables the heightening of people's hate, which is what the very law we are trying to put forward is for.

David McKenzie (Calgary Signal Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise, as it always is, in this House to speak on behalf of the citizens of Calgary Signal Hill. Striking a balance between competing interests is the work of this House of Commons. It is a job that is frequently challenging, but it is the responsibility that we have undertaken and it is what we owe Canadians.

Today, in our criminal justice system, the consideration of the protection of the public has taken a back seat to the interests of offenders. We are talking about striking a balance in our justice system, and right now, the scales of justice are out of balance and must be corrected.

The reason the Conservative Party has brought forward Bill C-242 is to help government members. Clearly, they are busy thinking about things, but they are not doing things, and Canadians require action. At this point in time, crime statistics are up throughout our country, from province to province, and we have to do something.

In August, just two months ago, I attended a meeting in Calgary with senior members of the Calgary Police Service. At that time, a superintendent described a circumstance that had occurred in Calgary in July that illustrates well the problem we have and the problem we must fix. The superintendent described a crime wave that took place in Calgary through the month of July that was identified by the police service. They responded, they put a task force together and they commenced making arrests.

A group of youths and young adults were committing home break-ins. However, very frighteningly to the police, who traditionally see criminals break into homes for the purpose of theft and focusing on times when homes are not occupied, this brazen group had been breaking into homes at night, with no consideration for whether the homes were occupied. Indeed, they seemed to prefer to break into homes that were occupied.

An individual was caught red-handed, as the expression goes, in a home at night with the residents of the home there. He was arrested, taken before a justice of the peace and released. This might not be much of a surprise or shock; the individual's criminal history and record may have been considered at that time. However, the same individual was arrested by the Calgary Police Service within a matter of days of his first arrest and released. Again, he was in a home unlawfully at night, with the residents of that home present. For a second time, this individual was taken before a justice of the peace and released. That might begin to shock the senses, but the fact is that this same individual was arrested for a third time within one week, again at night in a residence with the residents of that home present. He was taken before a justice of the peace for a third time and, yes, released a third time.

This is a system that is broken. We must make changes, and there is no point in waiting. The work has been done. The Conservative Party has done that work in co-operation with the House, and the members opposite should take note.

I wish to note the comments of some individuals with respect to incidences like the one I described, as related to me by the Calgary Police Service.

This is from Scott Weller, a home invasion victim:

As someone who knows firsthand the trauma of a violent home invasion, I believe strongly in the need for Jail not Bail. My family was attacked in what should have been the safety of our own home. The idea that violent offenders could be released back onto our streets is terrifying—not just for us, but for every Canadian family. That night changed how we live and forced us to secure our home in ways I never imagined necessary. This will have a lasting impact on our family and our sense of safety. This legislation recognizes that public safety must come first. It sends a clear message that violent crime has real consequences, and that the rights of victims and families come before the rights of criminals.

• (1325)

Here is a second comment on Conservative Bill C-242: “The Jail Not Bail Act is therefore more than legislation—it is an essential corrective—a lifeline capable of disrupting the revolving door of abuse and saving innocent lives.” That is from Cait Alexander of End Violence Everywhere.

Lastly, this is from Michelle Mollineaux, board member of Mend Canada, an indigenous-led organization in our country: “This is the kind of common-sense legislation Canadians have been demanding: a framework that rebalances our bail system to prioritize public safety while still upholding the Charter right to bail.”

These quotations highlight exactly the circumstances on our streets, exactly what this problem is and exactly what the Conservative common-sense legislation would do to sort this matter out.

In my own city of Calgary, over the last 10 years, we have seen a 66% increase in violent crime. We have seen a 33% increase in sexual assaults, a 326% increase in firearms crime and a 342% increase in extortion. With crime rates up and criminals being arrested but released, we have a problem in our justice system. There is a hole here that must be fixed, and Conservative Bill C-242 would plug that hole.

Our constituents expect us to act responsibly. Waiting around until the Liberal Party addresses this issue and brings legislation before the House is not responsible. I will say again to my friends opposite that the work has been done. They can take the rest of the day off. We are set to go.

• (1330)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member could provide his thoughts on the other jurisdictional responsibilities the provinces, territories and even municipalities have with regard to the need for bail reform. It is a shared responsibility, and I am interested to know if he feels that there is any obligation on other levels of government to take action, given that the current Prime Minister has made a commitment to bring forward bail reform legislation.

Business of Supply

David McKenzie: Mr. Speaker, we are talking about the Canadian Criminal Code. It is federal legislation. It is the responsibility of the House to fix the problems that have existed since Liberal bail reform caused these problems.

It is time to scrap Liberal bail and bring in a responsible balancing of the rights of society. The protection of our communities needs to be given greater consideration by our courts.

[Translation]

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, today, we are talking about an important and serious subject that warrants important and serious debate. Right now, the opposition motion that the Conservative Party is proposing is more of a gag order on a bill that affects people's rights. That is what my question for my colleague is about.

The Conservatives' bill should be debated and studied in committee with the seriousness it deserves. Should we not do that instead of trying to impose a gag order and fast-track a bill on such an important issue?

[English]

David McKenzie: Mr. Speaker, we know what the statistics are, we know what the problem is and we know what the solution is. The Conservative Party has proposed it. I would note that our bill has been endorsed by the Canadian Police Association and the countless victims advocacy groups, mayors and police departments that have been on the front lines of the battle against violent crime.

I made reference to attending a meeting with senior officers from the Calgary Police Service. It is disheartening to see the look in their eyes when they are defeated in the performance of their job to protect the public by weak legislation that makes their efforts irrelevant.

Connie Cody (Cambridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, just recently, a 22-year-old and a 16-year-old in Cambridge violently attacked police and security officers, punching them, kicking them and pushing them to the ground. One was later caught possessing crack cocaine. The offenders are already back on the streets, released on bail. Crime is on the rise because there are no longer consequences to bad acts.

My colleague is an accomplished lawyer who has been practising for a long time. He remembers what it was like under Stephen Harper. Can he elaborate on what it means for criminals to face real consequences?

• (1335)

David McKenzie: Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly, the prior regime in place before the Liberals broke Canada's bail system was one in which the rights of the public were considered in assessing the suitability for release of someone charged with a criminal offence. Of course we are talking about a very particular stage in our criminal justice process, a point in time when a person is charged but has not been tried and has not been found guilty.

However, when we consider past criminal behaviour as an aspect of the probability of reoffending, that consideration and the protection of the public must be part of the overall consideration our courts give to the option of bail or any other form of release. Under

the Harper government, we had the balance better struck. Those are the days we need to return to.

Amarjeet Gill (Brampton West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today I rise in the chamber to support Conservative Bill C-242, the jail not bail act.

I will be sharing my time with my colleague, the member for Richmond Hill South.

Canadians are tired of waking up to headlines that read like crime thrillers except that they are real and are happening in our neighbourhoods. In Brampton, families do not feel safe anymore. Crime is no longer the exception but is becoming the norm. Residents and communities are being impacted every day, with violent home invasions, daylight shootings, carjackings, sexual assaults and repeat offenders walking free. This is the result of Liberal catch-and-release justice and a broken bail system that puts criminals ahead of victims and communities. It is why I rise today in support of Bill C-242, the jail not bail act, a Conservative solution to restore law and order and to protect innocent Canadians.

Let me share the statistics under the Liberal catch-and-release system. Homicides are up 29%, violent crime is up by 55%, sexual assaults have increased by 76%, extortion has surged by 330%, auto thefts are up by 25%, hate crimes are up by 258% and firearms crimes are up by 130%. These are not just numbers; these are real people, victims whose lives have been shattered by repeat violent offenders who should never have been released.

In Markham, a 54-year-old man was left seriously injured in a violent home invasion. One of the suspects was already out on bail despite facing charges for robbery with a firearm and attempted murder. In Toronto, a woman was stabbed in broad daylight by a man who had been released on bail just days earlier. In Vancouver, organized crime rings are recruiting youth to commit car thefts and armed robberies, knowing they will be released within hours. In my community of Brampton, a home invasion resulted in the death of a young Canadian. In one of the most heartbreaking cases, Bailey McCourt was murdered by her ex-husband just hours after he was released on bail following an assault conviction.

Business of Supply

We are witnessing an exponential rise in crime across the country, but nowhere is it more evident than in my hometown of Brampton. In the Peel region, police recently made the largest drug bust in its history. Shockingly, six of the nine accused were already out on bail. In another major operation, targeting an extortion ring, half of the people arrested were also on judicial release. Just weeks ago in Brampton, a violent home invasion ended with a father's being shot for doing nothing more than defending his home and family. This is the result of the Liberals' Bill C-5 and Bill C-75, which introduced the so-called principle of restraint, a policy that prioritizes release even when the accused has a violent history or is likely to reoffend.

Police officers, victims and legal experts have all said the same thing: The bail system is broken, and now is the time to fix it. The solution is jail, not bail, restoring safety and trust back on our streets, in our homes and in our lives. Bill C-242, the jail not bail act, is a common-sense Conservative solution that would put public safety first and restore trust in our justice system. Judges and police would have to prioritize protecting the public, not just the rights of the accused, when deciding on bail.

• (1340)

The bill would take away automatic bail for violent offenders. If someone is charged with a major violent offence, like attempted murder, sexual assault, kidnapping or armed robbery, they would not be released automatically. If they have already been convicted of a major offence in the last 10 years and are charged again while out on bail, the bill proposes that they must be detained.

The bill would allow only judges to decide bail for repeat offenders. Police officers can now release someone charged with a major offence. Only a superior court judge would be able to make that decision. It would also remove criminals as sureties. People convicted of a serious crime in the last 10 years would not be able to act as a surety; there would be no more criminals vouching for criminals.

The bill proposes stronger rules for non-citizens. Non-citizens and non-permanent residents would hand over their passport before being released, reducing flight risk.

The bill would offer better risk assessment. The law would change the standard from "substantial likelihood" to "reasonably foreseeable", making it easier to detain someone who poses a threat. Judges would also consider the accused's criminal history, including past failures to comply with bail. It would ask for an annual transparency report. The minister of justice would have to publish a yearly report on bail reforms, bail outcomes, repetition and disparities so Canadians would know what is working and what is not.

Conservatives are taking the lead. While the Liberals stall and spin, Conservatives are acting. We are calling on the House to immediately pass Bill C-242. We are ready to support extended sittings to get this done because Canadians deserve safe streets, a justice system they can depend on to protect them, and no more headlines about violent criminals walking free.

Before I end, I have a message for Brampton residents, which is that they should stay strong. We all know that injustice has risen in our community for far too long; that is why, as their member of Parliament, I, alongside the Conservative Party, will work tirelessly

to make our streets safer. I will stop at nothing to ensure that the residents of Brampton will once again feel safe and protected in the community and in their own home.

The choice is clear. Canadians are tired of excuses. We can continue down the Liberal path of hug-a-thug justice, where innocent, law-abiding Canadians live in fear, or we can stand up for the victims, restore law and order and put violent criminals where they belong: behind bars. Let us pass the jail not bail act. Let us protect Canadians. Let us bring safety back to our streets.

• (1345)

Wade Chang (Burnaby Central, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I understand that it is the Criminal Code that we are talking about today, but can the member opposite elaborate on whether or not the Province of Ontario has enough resources to manage increased detention or stricter bail conditions?

Amarjeet Gill: Mr. Speaker, I keep saying that we have to provide safety and should not be using excuses, whether it is the federal, provincial or municipal government. We need to work toward safety and to protect Canadians from violent criminals, who are creating problems in Canadians' lives every single day. These are the excuses that the Liberal government is making: that the Ontario government or any other provincial government is not able to sustain the criminals. However, we have to make sure that victims come first, and then criminals.

Connie Cody (Cambridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, given the scale and severity of the criminal activity covered under Project Road King, which spanned organized auto theft, international drug trafficking and firearms, could the member explain why 27 of the 30 individuals charged were released rather than held in custody?

What does this say about our current approach to incarceration for serious and organized crime? Are there gaps in our system that need to be addressed to ensure public safety is our priority?

Amarjeet Gill: Mr. Speaker, we have to prioritize safety. We know violent offenders keep repeating crimes in our communities, societies and neighbourhoods. We have to ensure, every step of the way, that each Canadian has the right to live without fear and without having to face any sort of criminal situation.

Auto thefts are increasing, violent crime is up, and house invasions are up. We have to protect Canadians. The jail not bail act would protect Canadians from these crimes every day.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-2 is legislation that we have had before us for quite a while. In fact, we have had over 18 hours of debate on it.

We have a Prime Minister who has made a commitment to substantial bail reform. That bail reform is going to be coming soon to the House of Commons. Can we anticipate that the Conservatives will do what they are doing on Bill C-2 by having a filibuster as opposed to allowing it to go to a standing committee where Canadians can have more input?

My specific question to the member is this: Does he support quick passage of legislation dealing with bail reform this fall?

Amarjeet Gill: Mr. Speaker, we all know that the government has not given us any concrete evidence or produced any bill that would help to protect Canadians from crime.

The Liberals keep asking for my support. They need to know that first they have to present something to us which we can analyze. We know that we want to protect Canadians. We want to help them in their everyday lives, but members opposite keep asking questions. Having a “do nothing” approach is not going to go anywhere. We have to work hard to provide safety whenever we have a bill in front of us.

We are presenting Bill C-242. It is the best jail not bail act. I ask members to please accept it so that we can move forward and provide safety for Canadians.

• (1350)

Larry Brock (Brantford—Brant South—Six Nations, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my friend as he is one of the few Conservative MPs in the Brampton area. The majority of those ridings are dominated by Liberal MPs.

My question to the member is simple: What is the community of Brampton saying about the weak, soft-on-crime agenda of the Liberal government?

Amarjeet Gill: Mr. Speaker, Brampton residents are completely fearful. They are living their lives in fear, thinking there is no hope for them. Being their member of Parliament, I keep telling them that I will leave no stone unturned to bring safety to their communities. I am tirelessly working toward bringing in safety for Brampton residents.

Vincent Ho (Richmond Hill South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians feel betrayed, stabbed in the back, both literally and metaphorically. Every day, the people of Richmond Hill South and families across Canada watch as violent offenders are being arrested in the morning and then let back out on our streets before nightfall, due to a decade of Liberal soft-on-crime laws. Seniors are afraid to walk to the grocery store. Parents are terrified to let their kids take the bus after dark. Who do we have to thank? The pro-crime Liberals, who have intentionally put the rights of repeat violent offenders ahead of the rights of law-abiding Canadians.

Business of Supply

The Conservative jail not bail act is about one thing: standing with Canadians, not felons; standing with victims, not criminals; and standing with Canadians, not the pro-crime Liberals and their revolving door of a justice system that created the crime crisis. That is why Canadians from all walks of life agree that it is time to scrap Liberal bail.

Richmond Hill is under siege. Just weeks ago, gunfire ripped through a quiet Richmond Hill neighbourhood. A man was killed by an illegal gun, execution style, in the middle of a street in broad daylight. Parents dragged their children inside. Families huddled in fear. This is the question that echoed: Why is this happening in our once safe neighbourhood? Gangs are shooting up peaceful neighbourhoods and robbing homes, and this is often done by repeat offenders who are recommitting after being released, because of lax Liberal bail.

At Highway 7 and Leslie, someone was carjacked at gunpoint, Grand Theft Auto style. People were robbed in broad daylight at Major Mackenzie and Bayview. Places of worship were attacked by acts of hate on 16th Avenue and Bathurst. In the Hillcrest mall, robberies by repeat offenders, which have caused lockdowns, have seniors and shoppers scared to go out anymore. People are losing family members because of intentional acts of arson by criminals who are lighting up innocent people in their own homes at night, right in Richmond Hill. These are not just statistics. This is real people, real fear and real victims. Every single one of these tragedies was enabled by the pro-crime Liberal laws that keep criminals on the streets instead of behind bars. That is why it is high time to scrap Liberal bail.

The numbers do not lie and the human stories are heartbreaking, but the numbers confirm it. After 10 years of Liberal pro-crime laws, violent crime is up 55%, gun crime has more than doubled, extortion is up 330%, homicides are up 29%, sexual assaults are up 76%, and auto theft in the GTA is at levels never seen before. This did not happen by accident, but by design, because the pro-crime Liberals passed Bill C-5 and Bill C-75.

Business of Supply

Mandatory prison time was abolished for dozens of charges, and house arrest became the new norm. The Liberal catch-and-release came into effect, and the Liberal pro-crime revolving door in the justice system was set into motion. The Liberals handcuffed the police and set the criminals free. The result is that the people of Richmond Hill South, and Canadians across the country, live in fear while the Prime Minister shrugs and the minister of injustice makes jokes about the Wild West. That is not leadership; that is negligence. It is disgraceful. The only way to put an end to this and bring home safe streets again is by scrapping Liberal bail.

Let us talk about the real cost of this Liberal failure. The cost is paid by Canadians, by blood, trauma and the loss of loved ones. In Richmond Hill, seniors tell me they will not walk through the mall or go to the park anymore. It is no longer safe. Parents living near Yonge Street say that their children cannot take public transit after dark. Teens cannot ride their bikes anymore because criminals are preying on their bikes and their lives. Shopkeepers on Highway 7 do not even bother reporting theft because the same thief is back the next day thanks to the pro-crime Liberals and their lax bail laws.

What about the police officers who risk their lives arresting violent offenders only to see them walk free before their shift is even over. It has gotten so bad that the York Regional Police chief is asking victims of crime to simply comply with the demands of criminals who the Liberal injustice system has let out. That is not justice; it is betrayal. They have been straight-up stabbed in the back. That is the legacy of 10 years of the pro-crime Liberals. The only way to bring justice to the victims and families is by scrapping Liberal bail.

• (1355)

The Conservative jail not bail act would bring back sanity, common sense and peace of mind. It would lock up repeat violent offenders and slam the door on gang members. It would ensure that gun criminals, who are often using illegally obtained guns, stay behind bars where they belong. It would also force judges to finally put public safety first, not Liberal ideology.

First, this legislation would repeal the Liberal principle of restraint and put public protection first instead of the criminal. This would ensure that communities are not left at the mercy of the pro-crime Liberals after all they have endured with a decade of the Liberals' soft-on-crime approach.

Second, it would introduce a new major offences category, which would reverse the onus on bail conditions for crimes involving firearms, sexual assault, kidnapping, human trafficking, home invasion, robbery, extortion, arson and assault. It would require the accused to prove why they should be let out on bail. This would stop career criminals unleashed by the Liberal crime wave from taking advantage of this broken Liberal injustice system.

Next, it would mandate judges to consider the full criminal history of the accused and prevent anyone convicted of a major offence while on bail in the last 10 years from receiving bail, thus ending the Liberals' revolving door injustice system.

Lastly, this legislation would prohibit anyone with an indictable conviction from acting as a guarantor and would require non-residents to surrender their passports upon request.

Conservatives stand with victims, families and Canadians. That is the choice before the House. Will parliamentarians from all parties, and Liberals alike, come together and vote to scrap Liberal bail?

Let us call this what it is: a pro-crime Liberal record. Liberal pro-crime Bill C-5 scrapped jail time for violent crimes involving weapons and allowed for house arrest instead of mandatory prison time for serious offences and a dozen other charges. Liberal pro-crime Bill C-75 lowered the bar so that repeat offenders could walk free and tied the hands of provincial governments, judges and police.

What did Canadians and the people of Richmond Hill get in return? They received more Liberal-sponsored gang shootings, more Liberal-sponsored carjackings, more Liberal-sponsored home invasions and more victims.

The pro-crime Liberals talk about restorative justice. Tell that to the shopkeeper robbed for the third time because of lax Liberal bail laws. Tell that to the seniors imprisoned in their homes in fear of the crime wave unleashed by the Liberal government. Tell that to the mother who buried her son after a Liberal-sponsored gang shooting. Is the Liberal government going to restore her son's life? There is nothing restorative about that, only Liberal failure and injustice. To bring justice to victims and Canadians across this country, we must scrap Liberal bail.

Premiers, provincial attorneys general and police chiefs across the country, including from the York Regional Police in Richmond Hill, have begged Parliament to fix the Liberals' soft-on-crime bail before more blood is spilled by the Liberal-sponsored crime wave, but the pro-crime Liberals refused. They ignored the warnings and calls to action from victims, police and communities alike. They left officers demoralized and communities exposed to the crime wave the Liberals unleashed. It went so far that the Liberal minister of justice mocked victims by referring to this Liberal-sponsored crime wave as not being the Wild West. It is Canada, but it sure feels like it.

Conservatives will stand with the police, who risk their lives—

Statements by Members

The Speaker: I am sorry for interrupting the member. He will have about a minute and a half left after question period.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

• (1400)

[English]

GOVERNMENT PRIORITIES

Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, economic anxiety is rising across the country and Canadians are deeply concerned. Unemployment is at the highest level in a decade. This summer alone, 100,000 workers lost their jobs, with thousands more announced this week. Folks across our country are facing excessive costs for groceries, housing and utilities, and Trump's trade war threatens more damage. We must meet this moment with vision and resolve.

Yesterday, I met with the Prime Minister and made it clear that now is not the time for an austerity budget. Instead, Canada needs investment, not cuts. That means building infrastructure to strengthen communities, such as affordable non-market homes, clean energy and a strong public health care system. These are the kinds of nation-building projects New Democrats support, initiatives that create good, family-sustaining jobs and improve lives.

Now is our opportunity to deliver real results and lay the foundation for a prosperous and independent Canada for generations to come.

* * *

FIFA WORLD CUP

Chi Nguyen (Spadina—Harbourfront, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in June 2026, the FIFA World Cup is coming to Canada. All six Ontario matches will be hosted on the vibrant waterfront in my riding of Spadina—Harbourfront. Toronto has a proud record of hosting international sporting events, from the 2007 FIFA U-20 World Cup to the 2015 Pan Am Games. Time and again, we have delivered unforgettable moments on and off the field. Toronto's waterfront contributes over \$13 billion annually to Canada's economy, and this next chapter will be unprecedented.

Co-hosting the World Cup will support and create up to 24,000 jobs, welcome over 500,000 tourists and generate over \$2 billion in investment. It will also leave a lasting legacy of stronger public spaces, cultural programming and improved connections along our waterfront. Major games demand major collaboration across sectors and all three levels of government. We have a world-class waterfront, a thriving arts and culture scene and a proven record of hosting global events, and FIFA 2026 is our moment to shine.

Toronto is ready to welcome the world to our city.

[Translation]

TWO WORLD-CHAMPION FEMALE QUEBEC ATHLETES

Eric Lefebvre (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, September 27 will go down in the history of sport in Quebec and Canada.

First, Kim Clavel made history when she became Quebec's first female boxer to capture an IBF belt in two weight classes in her career. A few days ago, she won the IBF strawweight title. She demonstrated the strength, determination and resilience that have made her a world champion.

That same day, thousands of kilometres away, another Quebecker thrilled Canada's sporting community. At just 24 years old, Magdeleine Vallières-Mill achieved the impossible in Rwanda. She was the first Canadian woman in 127 years to win the UCI Road World Championship.

Two women, two historic achievements, one message for our young people: perseverance, passion and hard work open doors. Young people must believe in their dreams.

I congratulate them both.

* * *

[English]

CANADIAN YOUTH CHESS CHAMPION

Dominique O'Rourke (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this summer I had the pleasure of meeting Guelph's own Navika Renganathan at the Royal City Masters chess tournament held at the University of Guelph. Navika has already accomplished what many dream of. She is the reigning Canadian youth chess champion and is already representing Canada on the international stage.

Here is the remarkable part: Navika is eight years old. Her achievements bring joy to her parents, Renganathan and Nivetha, and to her entire family, who have watched with pride as she pursues her passion. It is this same pride that flows through our community of Guelph and indeed all of Canada, especially among her classmates at Sacred Heart Catholic School. We are all standing behind her this week as she competes at the International Chess Federation's World Cadet Championship in Kazakhstan.

The Parliament of Canada is cheering for Navika as she makes her next move.

* * *

FAITH

Philip Lawrence (Northumberland—Clarke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, faith is a word that has meant so much to so many, yet in today's world, often those who have faith are mocked as being naive or even ignorant. The truth is that faith is the very foundation of our civilization, bracing humanity against the unrelenting storms of life by providing us hope of something greater and better than ourselves. It acts as a north star leading us home and empowers great men, such as Lord Wilberforce in his unrelenting fight against slavery, to call out injustice and speak truth in a dark and divided world.

Statements by Members

Canada is facing challenging times. Many struggle just to get through the day, but all is not lost. We press on to build a better nation and a better future. As we move forward to build better days and have a better future, may we all take faith, have faith and keep the faith.

* * *

● (1405)

AWARD-WINNING SHORT FILM

Juanita Nathan (Pickering—Brooklin, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an extraordinary achievement from my riding of Pickering—Brooklin.

Joel Toscano from the community of Whitevale and his team have won the 2025 TIFF 48-hour film challenge, a prestigious national competition where filmmakers are given only two days to write, film and edit a short film. Out of many talented participants across the country, Joel's creativity and skills stood out, earning him this remarkable honour. His success is a testament not only to his dedication to the arts but also to the vibrant creative spirit that thrives in our community. We are so proud of Joel and his team and look forward to seeing where this talent takes him next.

I invite all members of the House to join me in congratulating Joel Toscano and his team on this outstanding accomplishment.

* * *

OPIOIDS

Michael Kram (Regina—Wascana, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is my deep honour today to welcome the Balfour family to Ottawa. James, Heather and Taylor are visiting us today all the way from Regina, Saskatchewan.

Today is the birthday of their late daughter Rachel, who was killed when she was poisoned by fentanyl in 2019. Every year, the Balfour family tries to do something meaningful to remember and honour Rachel on her birthday. This year, they have chosen to share their story with us here in our nation's capital. Tragically, the Balfours are not alone in their loss. Last year, approximately 20 Canadian families per day lost a loved one to an opioid overdose.

For Rachel Balfour, her family and the thousands of Canadian families just like them, it is time to get fentanyl off our streets so that no family has to mourn another senseless loss to the scourge of fentanyl.

* * *

FALL FAIRS

Tim Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Kitchener—Conestoga recently celebrated the Wellesley and New Hamburg fall fairs, two events that showcase the best of rural life and bring neighbours together. These fairs connect us to our agricultural roots and highlight the values of hard work, community and tradition. They also help bridge urban and rural communities, raising awareness about agriculture and inspiring future farmers. I am thankful to the volunteers, organizers, sponsors and agricultural societies whose dedication keeps these traditions alive.

This past weekend, I flipped pancakes at the 50th Wellesley Apple Butter and Cheese Festival and was also honoured to mentor young performers at the Wellesley idol competition. This milestone 50th anniversary is a testament to the enduring spirit of community and volunteerism that has made the festival a beloved celebration for generations.

I congratulate everyone involved in the Wellesley Apple Butter and Cheese Festival.

* * *

ALFIE MACLEOD

Chris d'Entremont (Acadie—Annapolis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to pay tribute to my dear friend, a proud Cape Bretoner and a true servant of the people, Alfie MacLeod.

Alfie was more than a colleague in public life. He was a man of deep conviction, boundless compassion and unmistakable wit. A long-serving MLA and Speaker of the Nova Scotia House of Assembly, Alfie dedicated his life to the people of Cape Breton, always putting community first. He was first elected in 1995, returned in 2006 and served until 2019. As Speaker from 2007 to 2009, Alfie brought fairness, humour and dignity to the role, but it was outside the chamber, at fire halls, church basements and charity auctions, where Alfie's love for his community truly shone.

Alfie faced his battle with cancer the same way he lived his life: with courage, resilience and a twinkle in his eye. He was a family man, a friend to many and a fierce advocate for Cape Breton. My wife Anne and I offer our deepest condolences to his wife Shirley, their children Daniel, Jessica and Sandra, and his grandchildren. Alfie's legacy will live on in the lives he touched and the community he so dearly loved.

I bid rest well to my friend. He deserves it.

* * *

[Translation]

MAGDELEINE VALLIÈRES-MILL

Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, for the first time in history, a Quebec woman is a world champion in cycling. Magdeleine Vallières-Mill, a young woman from Sherbrooke with roots in the Gaspé region, has achieved something remarkable. She just won the rainbow jersey at the world road bike championships in Kigali, Rwanda, becoming only the third non-European cyclist to win this prize. She amazed the crowd with her race strategy. While part of small group that broke away, decisive moves and a final sprint left all her competitors behind.

All of Quebec is proud of Magdeleine. Her victory will no doubt inspire many young women, especially those participating in this year's new women's Tour de l'Abitibi. I am already looking forward to next year, especially when Magdeleine Vallières-Mill will defend her rainbow jersey at home in 2026 on the roads of greater Montreal and the famous Camillien-Houde hill, which will host the next UCI Road World Championship.

Congratulations, Magdeleine.

* * *

● (1410)
[English]

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Hon. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this week in London we announced a \$3.5-million investment through FedDev Ontario delivered to TechAlliance to fuel local innovation and create opportunities across southern Ontario.

This funding will support innovators like Deep Breathe in developing health solutions, Vessl Prosthetics in transforming prosthetics with cutting-edge design, PolyAnalytik in advancing materials science, and many more companies. These companies prove that London has the talent, the creativity and the drive to lead. For our government, this is about more than just dollars. It is about delivery. We are backing people who take risks, solve problems and create real results for families.

From London to every corner of our region, this investment ensures that the next breakthroughs will not just be imagined here. They will be built here, create jobs here and strengthen Canada's economy. I am proud to serve in a government that is building a strong Canada through the strength of its people.

* * *

CHRISTIANS IN NIGERIA

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the tragedy Christians in Nigeria are experiencing.

The deadly terrorist organization Boko Haram is trying to eliminate the Christian faith in Nigeria. This is the same terrorist group that kidnapped dozens of young schoolgirls and burned innocent civilians alive in cages. According to reports, over 3.5 million people have been forced to flee their homes. Three churches are destroyed every single day. Seven thousand Christians were massacred this year alone and the faithful must now meet in secret or in burned-out sanctuaries.

Sadly, the world is turning a blind eye to the plight of Christians in Nigeria. There are no embedded journalists covering the violence. There are no daily updates. Politicians around the world are not asked questions about how they will respond. We cannot ignore this violence and tragic loss of life. We must speak out and shine a light on what is happening so that people can donate to relief efforts and provide support to those displaced by the violence.

To my brothers and sisters in Christ, we know they know the power of prayer. We will not forget them. Stay strong and keep the faith.

Statements by Members

JANE GOODALL

Hon. Terry Duguid (Winnipeg South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the late Dr. Jane Goodall.

Dr. Goodall was a world-renowned primatologist, conservationist and United Nations messenger of peace. She founded the Jane Goodall Institute, which continues her global mission to protect wildlife and inspire hope. Her groundbreaking discoveries about chimpanzees transformed humanity's understanding of our closest relatives and reminded us of a truth long held by indigenous peoples: that we are not separate from nature but deeply connected to it.

Her life's work sparked a revolution of empathy for animals, for the environment and for each other. In this time of climate crisis and biodiversity loss, her message has never been more urgent. Dr. Goodall gave hope to generations, especially young people, who carry forward a vision of a planet where all creatures are treated with compassion.

May her legacy continue to guide us and may we honour her memory through action to protect the natural world we all share.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Dane Lloyd (Parkland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Edmonton police have sadly announced that 14-year-old Samuel Bird from Paul First Nation is now presumed dead months after he was declared missing. This child was murdered and police believe his killers have hidden his remains west of Edmonton. My thoughts and prayers are with his family at this time.

Samuel's case is not an isolated one. In 2010, Lyle and Marie McCann were also murdered. Their killer has been brought to justice but has refused to reveal the location of his victims' remains.

I introduced Bill C-236 in honour of Lyle and Marie. It would empower judges and parole boards to hold killers and their accomplices to account when they are known to have withheld information on the location of their victims' remains. Families have a right to give their loved ones a proper funeral, and those who would deny them this fundamental right must be held to account.

We owe it to Lyle, Marie, Samuel and their families to pass Bill C-236.

Oral Questions

● (1415)

[Translation]

URBAINCULTEURS

Steeve Lavoie (Beauport—Limoilou, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, food self-sufficiency is becoming an important solution for our families and communities.

That is exactly what Urbainculteurs, a Quebec City organization, is doing: changing the way we think about urban agriculture. From rooftop gardens to the greening of schools and neighbourhoods, Urbainculteurs's innovative projects are giving people back the power to grow some of their own food while beautifying our communities. Its mission is clear and inspiring: to democratize agriculture, encourage food self-sufficiency and bring people together. This organization is not just cultivating vegetables, it is cultivating solidarity, resilience and hope for a greener and more inclusive city.

I want to sincerely thank the entire Urbainculteurs team for their tremendous commitment. They are showing us that, together, it is possible to build a future where access to healthy food is possible everywhere and for all generations.

* * *

[English]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we know that Liberal bail has unleashed crime and chaos on our streets. Violent crime is up 55% since the Liberals took office, gun crime has soared 130%, homicides are up 30%, sexual assaults are up 76%, hate crimes are up 258% and more Canadians have now died of overdoses than died in the Second World War. The Prime Minister promised criminal justice reform, but half a year later, that promise remains broken.

Liberals are obstructing our jail not bail bill, keeping in place their soft-on-crime, catch-and-release laws. In 2022, Constable Greg Pierzchala was killed by a suspect who had already been denied bail but was released anyway. His death was preventable.

Today, Conservatives are proposing a fast resolution to pass our jail not bail bill immediately to keep Canadians safe.

Will the Liberal government scrap the bail laws or get out of the way so that Conservatives can—

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

* * *

LATIN AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

Julie Dzerowicz (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, *olé, olé, olé*.

October is Latin American Heritage Month, and it is so exciting to know that we have a whole month to celebrate the amazing music, literature, food, art and language of 21 diverse and beautiful Latin American and Hispanic nations represented in Canada. This is one of Canada's fastest-growing communities: young, entrepreneurial and innovative.

From medicine to business and from arts to politics, their leaders are shaping our nation's future. They are also vital bridge-builders.

This community strengthens our diplomatic and business ties with the Americas, opening doors to new partnerships and opportunities. Its members help Canada succeed in a region that is increasingly important to our prosperity. I say *gracias* to the leaders of the Latin American and Hispanic Canadian community. They are an inspiration not only within their community but for all Canadians.

This month, let us celebrate together, and let us recognize that Latin American and Hispanic Canadians are not just a part of our present but are building our future.

Viva los latinos y los hispanos en Canada.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[Translation]

JUSTICE

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the body of a woman who was killed by her partner has been found in Saint-Jérôme. This woman was killed by a man who had been arrested 30 times before and released under Liberal laws. That is not all. A six-year-old child was found with a crack pipe in his mouth near Maison Benoît Labre, one of the federal government's so-called safe consumption sites.

Does the Prime Minister acknowledge that Liberal laws are threatening our children, our women and our citizens?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to offer my deepest sympathies to the families, friends and community members involved in the cases that the member just mentioned.

We acknowledge that bail laws need to be strengthened. A comprehensive bill will be tabled in the coming weeks.

● (1420)

[English]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, crime victims do not want the Prime Minister's sympathy. They want to know why he has broken his promise. They want to know why Liberal bail remains in place, allowing for the same repeat offenders to offend again and again.

The body of a woman was found in the last few days in Saint-Jérôme, Quebec. She was killed by her partner, who had been arrested 30 times before but released on Liberal bail.

Will the Prime Minister finally scrap Liberal bail or, better yet, get out of the way so we can do the job ourselves?

Oral Questions

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government is bringing forward comprehensive bail reform. This comprehensive bail reform is based on extensive consultations with the provinces and territories. It is based on extensive discussions with law enforcement. It is based on evidence. It is not based on cut-and-paste American bail laws. It is a bail law that will work.

We are tough on crime and firm on the rights of Canadians.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we see the Prime Minister rant and rave and point his finger at police, after they have been crying out for the government to scrap Liberal bail for years.

We have Constable Greg Pierzchala, who was killed by a man released, yet again, on bail. We have a woman killed by her husband after he was arrested and released 30 times because of Liberal laws. We have 1,600 crimes every single day in this country because of the Liberal laws.

Will the Prime Minister stop screaming, hollering and jabbing his finger, and scrap Liberal bail?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government, which has been in place for six months and has undertaken comprehensive consultations with law enforcement and with the provinces, based on evidence, is bringing forth the toughest bail and sentencing legislation that will work, not legislation imported from the United States.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, if the government wants any proof that it has been in place for 10 years, the justice minister whom the Prime Minister named is the guy who ruined our immigration system, and then he went on to ruin our housing system.

Now, six months after the Prime Minister looked Canadians in the eye and promised to scrap Liberal bail, that bail is still in place, and every day, violent repeat offenders are released on our streets, massacring our people.

Will the Prime Minister stop making excuses? The Liberals have had 10 years; he has had six months. Canadians cannot afford to wait anymore. When will he scrap Liberal bail?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am heartened by the knowledge that the members opposite will be supporting comprehensive bail reform when it is brought forward before the House in a few weeks. It will be bail reform that works, is tough on crime and is consistent with the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government's bail laws violate the charter rights of 1,600 people every single day. Their names are "victims". They are the people who get hit over the head with a baseball bat, get robbed or have their children violated in what should be the safety of their own house. A three-year-old was raped by a repeat offender out on Liberal release, a constable was shot to death by someone out on Liberal release, and now a woman has been murdered by her own partner who was out on Liberal release.

How many have to die before the Prime Minister gets rid of Liberal bail?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government is taking measures against crime. We are tightening our borders. We are reinforcing the number of RCMP officers. We are introducing in the next few weeks the most comprehensive bail reforms and toughening of sentencing laws: bail reform that will work, not bail reform that is copied from our neighbour to the south.

● (1425)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Liberals already brought in bail reform. That is the bail reform that allows the same offenders to be released 150 times a year. The justice minister voted to allow repeat offenders, violent sex offenders, to do their sentences in their living rooms. That is their policy.

We have a bill before the House today that we could pass at all stages right now if the Prime Minister did not care about who got the credit.

Will the Prime Minister put aside partisanship and grandstanding and join with us to scrap Liberal bail and save the lives of Canadians, or will he just get out of the way?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Charter of Rights and Freedoms will not just get out of the way as the member opposite wishes.

What this country needs, what victims deserve and what all Canadians deserve is bail reform and sentencing laws that work. That is what the government is bringing forward.

We share the same objectives. We invite the members opposite to join us in swift passage of the government's bail reform when it is before the House.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADA POST CORPORATION

Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, a week ago, the Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement announced the end of postal services as we know them, including the end of home delivery and the closure of post offices. Not surprisingly, postal workers declared a general strike. The minister's announcement literally signals the end of their industry. Now, passports are being held at post offices, cheques are not being delivered and elections are being postponed or may not happen at all.

What did the Prime Minister think would happen?

Oral Questions

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, here is the situation. Canada Post is no longer viable. The Crown corporation is losing \$10 million a day. The reforms in the Kaplan report must be implemented. The Crown corporation and the unions must reach an agreement.

Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are so out of touch and so irresponsible that they did not even anticipate the crisis they themselves created. For 10 years, they did nothing to modernize Canada Post: no real consultation and no real public debate on the future of this essential service, just silence and inaction. Ten years later, the Liberals wake up, set fire to the place, paralyze the postal service and deprive the public of an essential service.

How are they going to fix this mess?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Kaplan has held several consultations with workers, stakeholders, the Crown corporation and all Canadians, including Quebecers, in order to identify and provide details on much-needed reforms for Canada Post. The union and the Crown corporation must come to an agreement, and reforms need to be implemented for all Canadians.

Marie-Hélène Gaudreau (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ): Mr. Speaker, thousands of postal workers are wondering if their job is disappearing. They were not consulted. Thousands of men and women who are waiting for a cheque, a passport or another important document are wondering how they will get it back. They were not consulted. Thousands of businesses, SMEs especially, are wondering how their products will be distributed. They were not consulted either.

Does the Prime Minister realize what a mess he has made?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada Post provides an essential service to Canadians and Quebecers, but it needs to be a viable business. It is not acceptable to have a corporation that loses \$10 million a day from the pockets of Canadian and Quebec taxpayers. It is unacceptable. We need to find a real long-term solution.

* * *

● (1430)
[English]

JUSTICE

Arpan Khanna (Oxford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Liberal bail laws have unleashed crime and chaos on our streets. The Liberals' law, Bill C-75, releases repeat violent offenders at the earliest opportunity, with the least restrictive conditions. The Prime Minister promised to repeal these dangerous Liberal bail laws. Six months in, it is the same bait and switch, and the laws remain in place. Now more than half of Canadians do not feel safe in their own homes.

The question is simple: Will the Prime Minister scrap Liberal bail or get out of the way so Conservatives can?

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while the Conservatives shout empty slogans, we have done comprehensive consultations all summer so that we could get it right. The bail legislation that is going to be presented

shortly in this House would bring bail reform and harsher sentences, and it would address victims of intimate partner violence. The legislation that we are bringing forward is a complete, comprehensive package, and I hope the Conservatives will be able to support it.

Arpan Khanna (Oxford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are telling Canadians to be patient, because some day they might act. They should tell that to the families of Bailey McCourt and countless others who have lost their loved ones. Under the Liberals' watch, violent crime is up, extortion is up, homicides are up and sexual assaults are up. With every single day that goes by with the Liberals delaying, 1,600 more violent crimes happen in our streets. That is one per minute. Lives are being lost. Families are being destroyed.

Again, the question is simple: Will the Liberals scrap Liberal bail and support the jail not bail act or get out of the way so that Conservatives can clean up their mess?

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, community safety has been our top priority. That is why our first pieces of legislation have all addressed this area.

One of the rising types of crime in our country is cyber-attacks against our children. Sextortion is rising in this country more than almost anything else. Bill C-2 would address that issue. It would give tools to the police to be able to catch these child predators who are roaming free in our country. I hope the Conservatives will support Bill C-2.

Larry Brock (Brantford—Brant South—Six Nations, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Liberal laws have unleashed crime and chaos on our streets, and it is no wonder: Bill C-75 requires courts to release repeat violent offenders at the earliest opportunity with the least restrictive conditions. The results are devastating. In Markham alone, a criminal out on bail for attempted murder shot a man in a home invasion.

The Liberals promise bail reform, but it is just another bait and switch. If he is serious, will the Prime Minister scrap Liberal bail or get out of the way and let Conservatives finally do it?

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since taking office on April 28, this new government has been working on bail reform. We have been consulting with law enforcement agencies across the country. We have been speaking to mayors. We have been speaking to provincial leaders. We will continue to consult, and we will continue to bring forward the most comprehensive bail reform this country has ever seen.

Oral Questions

Larry Brock (Brantford—Brant South—Six Nations, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it has been a long six months since the Prime Minister promised bail reform, and nothing has happened. Instead, the Liberals are obstructing the Conservative jail not bail act from passing, keeping soft-on-crime catch-and-release laws on the books.

Since the Liberals took office, violent crime is up 55%, sex assaults are up 76% and gun crime has soared by a staggering 130%. Enough is enough. When will the Liberals finally protect Canadians, stop Liberal bail and back the Conservative jail not bail act?

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we will be bringing forward bail reform in very short order.

Let me take this opportunity to talk about other legislation that is in the House that the party opposite could pass today. That is Bill C-2, which would give law enforcement officers additional tools to do their job more effectively in order to make sure that guns do not come through our border. That is the type of commitment that we have on this side of the House, and we invite the party opposite to support us.

Dane Lloyd (Parkland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals unleashed crime and chaos on our streets. Under Bill C-75, courts are compelled to release criminals early and under the least restrictive conditions.

A woman on house arrest for breaking into a home with a weapon went to our local beach, kidnapped a five-year-old girl and was found in a canoe holding the girl under the water. She has been charged with manslaughter. This dangerous person should never have been allowed to walk freely on our streets.

The Prime Minister promised action, and for six months he has failed. When will the Liberals scrap their criminal experiment or let the Conservatives fix it for them?

• (1435)

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if we wish to discuss criminal experiments, let us talk about the 10-year, tattered legacy of the Harper government that saw every single piece of its criminal and justice—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: I have already turned up the volume on the speakers here, and I have one notch to go.

The hon. government House leader, from the top, please.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, if they want to talk about criminal experiments, let us talk about the 10-year, tattered legacy of the Harper government, which finished every single time at the Supreme Court of Canada having bills struck down. That is not helping victims.

In this session of Parliament, we are going to see the true agenda of the Conservative Party. The Conservatives can vote for Bill C-2; they can vote for bail reform, and they can vote to restrict intimate partner violence. We will see where the Conservatives stand on criminal justice in this session of Parliament.

[Translation]

Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that crime has increased by 55% over the past 10 years that this government has been in power, whereas it decreased by 25% during the 10 years of Conservative rule. That is the reality.

Unfortunately, what we are seeing today with the Liberal criminal justice system is that a woman was murdered by her former partner, who had been released on parole 16 times and never complied with the conditions of his release.

Why was this man able to go see his girlfriend and kill her? What do the Liberals have to say about that?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, obviously, there have been tragedies in Quebec and elsewhere in the country, and we must take action to respond to them. The Conservatives had 10 years to do just that. Things always ended up falling to pieces before the Supreme Court of Canada. The court struck down the Conservatives' legislation because it went against the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

The Conservatives will have the opportunity to take action during this parliamentary session. We will see whether they want action or whether they just want to pretend that they have all the answers here in the House, when we know that they want to destroy the charter.

Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would invite my colleague to go visit the family of the victim that was just murdered in Saint-Jérôme. Does this family think that the Liberals' laws have helped in any way? No.

The truth is that the Conservatives put in place a justice system that reduced crime by 25%. What we need are laws that are fair but tough on criminals. Criminals belong in prisons, not in homes.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, obviously, criminals belong in prison and we need to have a justice system that works, that has democratic principles and that respects everyone's rights, including the victims'.

During this parliamentary session, the Conservatives will have the chance to vote for victims' rights. They will have the chance to vote for common-sense crime laws. Will they do that?

*Oral Questions***FORESTRY INDUSTRY**

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton, BQ): Mr. Speaker, once again, there are new tariffs affecting our forestry industry. Washington announced an additional 10% tariff on our softwood lumber, which was already subject to tariffs of 35%. This is not all. Donald Trump also announced tariffs of 25% on our wood products, like cabinets. Meanwhile, the assistance announced by Ottawa in August is still not available. It is one defeat after another for the Prime Minister, our self-proclaimed saviour.

Could the saviour start by saving our lumber industry?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, of course we are taking note of the new tariffs imposed by the U.S. administration. At the same time, we completely disagree with these tariffs. This is why we are here to help the furniture industry. We are also here to help the softwood lumber industry.

Today, we launched a program to support our SMEs through Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, or CED. I hope that I can count on my colleague's support to help businesses in his riding and across Quebec.

• (1440)

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Trump keeps handing the Prime Minister one defeat after another.

Today, there are new tariffs on lumber. Yesterday, we learned that a new deal could allow more American milk to cross the border. Last summer, the Prime Minister decided to sacrifice the digital services tax that web giants were supposed to pay. It is one defeat after another, and Quebec's forests, milk and culture are taking the brunt of the damage.

Could the Prime Minister finally stand up for Quebec's economy?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government stands up for Quebec's economy every day. In fact, there was some good news in Saint-Bruno-de-Montarville, because 150 new jobs were announced at Alstom. That is just one example.

I hope my colleague will be here tomorrow, as there will be good news from Boeing and CAE: more jobs in the aerospace sector.

That said, the tariffs are unjustified. We are here for the industry. I hope I can work with my colleague to help the sector in his constituency. Furthermore, supply management is not on the table, and Quebec culture will never be on the table.

* * *

[English]

JUSTICE

Michael Guglielmin (Vaughan—Woodbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Liberal bail has unleashed crime and chaos in our streets. Their weak law, Bill C-75, requires courts to release repeat violent

offenders at the earliest opportunity. Recently, three suspects were arrested for a series of home invasions in Vaughan. Guess what. Surprise, surprise, two of them were out on bail.

The Prime Minister promised Liberals would flip-flop on bail, but six months after he came to power, weak Liberal laws are still on the books.

Will he do the right thing and scrap Liberal bail or get out of the way and let us do it?

Patricia Lattanzio (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, before the hon. member poses a question about repealing Bill C-75, I would suggest it would be a good idea for him to read it in its entirety. He does not seem to understand that the bill actually makes it harder for people who are charged with intimate partner violence to receive bail.

Now, we are willing to work in good faith with members of any party to strengthen the bail system, have harsher penalties for serious crimes and, most importantly, keep Canadians safe. The only question I have is whether the Conservatives will support the bill.

Michael Guglielmin (Vaughan—Woodbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the only thing the Liberals seem to do with any speed around here is to manufacture excuses for their inaction. Meanwhile, in the last eight weeks, York Region has seen 914 assaults, 296 vehicle thefts and 174 break and enters.

We know what to do. Mayors, police chiefs and Canadians all across this country have been calling on the Liberal government to scrap its failed bail laws, Bill C-5 and Bill C-75.

Canadians are watching. Will the Prime Minister do the right thing and scrap Liberal bail laws or get out of the way so Conservatives can do it for them?

Patricia Lattanzio (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives stand here and lecture us about criminal justice, but Canadians remember their record. Time and time again, they imposed unconstitutional mandatory minimums, piled on cruel punishments and tied the hands of judges, only to have the Supreme Court strike down each decision. Now they claim that we are not acting on bail reform. It is a bit rich.

The truth is, since we made our commitment, the minister has been working with provinces and territories and consulting with police chiefs, police associations and frontline stakeholders to get this right. We want to—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Niagara South.

Fred Davies (Niagara South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Daniel Senecal brutally sexually assaulted, choked and nearly killed a three-year-old little girl in Niagara. This crime has mobilized my community and galvanized an effort to have the Criminal Code changed so monsters like this never see the light of day again.

The Conservative jail not bail act will restore safe streets and keep vile perpetrators like Daniel Senecal in jail. The government can act right now by supporting our legislation.

Will the Prime Minister scrap Liberal bail or get out of the way and let Conservatives do it?

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combating Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, cases like this one are exactly the reason we are taking the action that we are. With Bill C-9, we made murder-motivated hate crimes a constructive first-degree offence. I want to thank the Conservatives for allowing that bill to go to committee. Bill C-9 would create more hate-related crime offences in the Criminal Code, with tougher penalties.

Bill C-2 brings tough-on-crime legislation as well. I am afraid that the Conservatives think it is too tough and have not been—

• (1445)

The Speaker: The hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona.

Colin Reynolds (Elmwood—Transcona, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals' bail has unleashed crime and chaos on our streets. One recent example was a home invasion where the perpetrator was out on bail. Their law, Bill C-75, requires courts to release violent career criminals at the earliest opportunity and under the least onerous conditions.

The Prime Minister promised the Liberals would flip-flop on bail, but it was a bait and switch, with the bail law still in place six months after he took power. Will the Prime Minister scrap Liberal bail or get out of the way and let Conservatives do it?

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have committed to bringing forward comprehensive bail reform legislation, which we will do over the next several weeks.

I want to be clear that this issue around bail is not just the responsibility of the federal government. It also involves the provinces. It is up to the provinces to fund their courts adequately. It is up to them to ensure their justices of the peace and judges are trained. It is also important that they have facilities.

It is a comprehensive approach where the federal government is ready to do its part. We invite the provinces to do the same.

Sukhman Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Liberal bail policies have unleashed crime and chaos on our streets. Swift 1200 AM radio in Surrey was struck by gunfire on Monday night. Thankfully, no one was inside at the time, but our communities live in constant fear that next time they will not be so lucky.

No one should have to fear for their safety while simply doing their job, but after 10 years of Liberal soft-on-crime policies, this

has become far too common. It is enough empty promises. The Liberals have failed to act.

Will the Prime Minister get serious on extortion and adopt our Conservative bill, or will he get out of the way and let the Conservatives do it?

Patricia Lattanzio (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians deserve to feel safe in their communities. Our government is cracking down on repeat violent offenders, with new legislation that will be forthcoming to strengthen bail, sentencing and court deficiencies. We are working closely with provinces and territories to reform bail and sentencing and address delays, giving police and prosecutors stronger tools to keep violent offenders off our streets. This is what Canadians want. This is what they elected us to do, and that is exactly what we will do.

* * *

[Translation]

DENTAL CARE

Tatiana Auguste (Terrebonne, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian dental care plan is a great success. This morning, the Minister of Health announced that more than five million Canadians are now benefiting from coverage under the program. In my riding, people have told me that this program has allowed them to see a dentist for the first time in decades, which has saved them from having to go to the emergency room for dental problems.

Could the minister tell us more about how important this program is for Canadians?

Hon. Marjorie Michel (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for the question.

The Canadian dental care plan is one of the most important social programs in the history of our country. I would like to remind the House that the Conservatives and the Bloc voted against it. Every day, more Canadians have access to the affordable dental care they need. This program helps them to save up to \$800 a year.

I would like to close by thanking all of the dentists, denturists, hygienists and specialists who are participating in our program.

*Oral Questions***JUSTICE**

Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister promised to reform his deeply flawed criminal justice system, but six months later, nothing has been done. He continues to release dangerous repeat offenders. I would remind members that, over the past 10 years, sexual assaults have increased by 76% under the Liberals' watch.

The Conservatives are proposing legislation that we can pass very quickly to protect Canadians: the jail not bail act.

Will the Liberals abandon their bail system? If not, they should get out of the way. We will take care of it.

Patricia Lattanzio (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the reality is that, in former Bill C-75, we strengthened Canada's response to intimate partner violence by defining the term “intimate partner” in the Criminal Code and creating a reverse onus for repeat offenders of intimate partner violence.

Canadians deserve a debate based on facts. If the Conservatives want to repeal a bill that makes it harder for perpetrators of intimate partner violence to get bail, they should be clear about that with Canadians.

• (1450)

Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is not the reality. Quebec has already had 14 suspected femicides so far this year. Recently, one of the victims was allegedly murdered by her partner, who has a long criminal record for domestic violence and who violated his conditions 16 times. Despite that, he was out of custody.

Since the Liberals came to power, violent crime has increased by 55%. Homicides are up 30% and sexual assaults are up 76%. How many women need to be raped and murdered, and how many young people need to be abused before the Liberals get the picture and change the law?

Patricia Lattanzio (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, before the hon. member asks about repealing Bill C-75, I strongly suggest that she take the time to read the whole thing first.

She does not seem to understand that this bill actually makes it harder for people charged with intimate partner violence to get bail. We are prepared to work in good faith with members of all parties to strengthen the bail system.

Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would encourage her to read Patrick Lagacé's column in this morning's *La Presse*.

He speaks out against a justice system that protects dangerous repeat offenders with lengthy criminal records who are released back into society. Who is looking after the victims? Nobody is doing that in this government. The Liberals promised to act and to take down their ridiculous laws and yet nothing is being done.

Will they do something and pass our legislation that supports victims? If not, they should get out of the way so we can do it.

Patricia Lattanzio (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we travelled around this summer meeting with Crown prosecutors and police associations to discuss the right way to implement bail reform. We do not wish to pass any old law and have it be challenged before the Supreme Court and possibly struck down.

On this side of the House, we take the time we need to do things right.

* * *

[English]

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in 2017, Gullfam Hussain, a Pakistani national, was convicted in the United Kingdom for “Adult sexual activity with a female child family member 13 to 17—offender over 18—penetration”. Said differently, Hussain had incestuous sex with his underage niece and was placed on the U.K.'s sex offender registry. However, in 2023, the Liberals granted Hussain a visa to enter Canada.

Can the Liberals explain why they allowed a publicly listed incestuous child sex abuser into Canada?

Hon. Lena Metlege Diab (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians' trust in their immigration system is paramount. That is why we are constantly working to improve immigration security screening processes, particularly in response to new challenges and pressures.

We have the border bill, Bill C-2. I invite my colleagues to help us pass that bill, which will further strengthen our immigration system.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it seems the Liberals could not do a simple Google search on an incestuous child sex abuser. Nonetheless, the person who let this person into Canada is now, thanks to the Prime Minister, our justice minister. Instead of deporting Hussain, right now the Liberals are letting him gum up Canada's court system.

This is truly disgusting and is antithetical to what it means to be Canadian. The person who allowed this incestuous child sex abuser into Canada should be fired.

Why did the Prime Minister promote the then immigration minister, who allowed an incestuous child sex abuser into Canada, to the Minister of Justice?

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada has a robust system of determining who is admissible and who is not admissible to Canada. I would like to confirm that the Canada Border Services Agency is working to remove the largest number of people in Canadian history. Over 20,000 people are targeted to be removed and are inadmissible to Canada. We are doing it as we speak.

We will continue to work with law enforcement and the CBSA to ensure our borders are safe and that those who are undesirable in Canada will not be permitted to come here.

* * *

● (1455)

EMPLOYMENT

Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister promised Canadians he could handle Donald Trump. He promised he would quickly negotiate a win. For Canadian workers, it has been nothing but losses. We have the second-highest unemployment rate in the G7. Invista is closing its plant in Maitland and moving to Texas. That is 100 jobs gone. Kap Paper in Kapuskasing is shutting down. That is 350 jobs gone. In Oshawa, GM is shifting truck production south.

Hundreds of jobs are gone already and thousands more are at risk. When will the Prime Minister finally keep his promises, stop losing jobs and start standing up for Canadian workers?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, just a few weeks ago, I stood with the building trades unions and the Prime Minister as we announced the first five projects that will be managed by the Major Projects Office coalition. This is good news for Canadians, because we are laser-focused on creating jobs and supporting the training that Canadians need to seize those opportunities. What do Canadians get from Conservatives? They get fearmongering, they get hate and they get Conservatives voting against their own interests over and over. We on this side will take care of Canadians' interests.

Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister promised he would have a deal with Trump by July 21. It is October, he has no deal and Canada is bleeding jobs. Imperial Oil is shutting down in Calgary. That is 900 jobs gone. Thousands of forestry jobs in B.C. are at risk because he has not gotten a softwood lumber deal done. He promised he would create middle-class jobs, but instead he has lost 86,000 jobs since he became Prime Minister.

When will the Prime Minister abandon his job-killing policies here at home, finally keep his promise to get a deal and save Canadian jobs?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, one thing we agree on with members of the opposition is that it is time for all hands on deck. That is what this Prime Minister has been saying ever since the election and before. This is a time for Canadians to pull together. In fact, the provinces and territories recognize that. They are investing in Canadian workers, they are investing in training and they

are investing in major projects. Who is standing against Canadians? It is only one group, and that is the Conservative Party of Canada.

Rhonda Kirkland (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is saying a lot of things, but there is no action. He promised he would negotiate a win with the U.S. by July 21. It is now October, and Canada has the second-highest unemployment and the fastest-shrinking economy in the G7. This week in Oshawa, auto workers were told more jobs are moving to the United States.

It is clear the biggest threat to Canadian jobs is the Prime Minister's broken promises and failure to get a deal. Are Canadians losing their jobs because of his failed diplomacy abroad, his job-killing policies at home or both?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this government never talks down our workers, never talks down our economy and never talks down our industries. We are there to create jobs while we are protecting a lot of jobs.

Of course, I hear everything that is happening in the auto sector. That is why we have been there for Honda, for Toyota, for Stellantis, for Ford and for GM. We have put a remission system in place to make sure that they protect jobs. Meanwhile, Canada will be the second-best country in the G20 for doing business, according to The Economic Intelligence Unit, and among the G7, Canada is ranked third with respect to ease of starting a business.

David McKenzie (Calgary Signal Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister promised Canadians that he would negotiate a win with Donald Trump by July 21. That was months ago, and Canadians are worse off than we were before. We have the fastest-shrinking economy and the second-highest unemployment rate in the G7. All the while, the Prime Minister has jetted around the globe. In Calgary, Imperial Oil is cutting 900 jobs. This is a direct result of 10 years of Liberal anti-energy law and policy.

Canadians are losing jobs. Is it because of the Prime Minister's failed jet-set diplomacy, or his job—

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Industry.

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this government has a true plan to build one Canadian economy, and when it comes to building one economy, we have made sure that we will have important major national projects. We have announced them in the energy sector, including in LNG. Of course, the member should ask the Premier of Alberta what she thinks about that.

Oral Questions

The other thing I would like to say is that GDP is actually growing; look at the last numbers in July. When we look at what is happening in the country, wages are increasing. Indeed, when we saw wages grow by 3.3% across the country—

• (1500)

The Speaker: The hon. member for Oakville West has the floor.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Sima Acan (Oakville West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when I talk to my community in Oakville West, I hear a great deal of concern for the world around us.

For the last 80 years, the United Nations General Assembly has brought leaders from all backgrounds into one room to bridge political, social and economic divides. Our Minister of Foreign Affairs was there this past week and reaffirmed Canada's commitment to a more peaceful and prosperous world.

Can the minister share with the House how Canada is confronting the challenges our world is facing?

Hon. Anita Anand (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week at the United Nations, I reiterated Canada's commitment to multilateralism. At a time when countries are retreating towards protectionism, Canada will not retreat. We will continue to be a leader on the world stage, we will strengthen our defence and security, we will strengthen our economic resilience and we will enhance our commitment to core values.

With these three pillars of foreign policy, we will build Canada strong.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, every dollar the Prime Minister spends comes out of the pockets of Canadians. Liberal inflationary spending, the carbon tax, fuel standards and the plastics ban are all hidden taxes driving up the cost of groceries. Moms and dads are struggling to feed their kids, and food banks are seeing record usage. Still, the Liberals voted against our motion to axe all taxes on food. Nutritious food should not be a luxury.

When will the Liberals finally stop taxing food?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite maybe has not done her own grocery shopping for a while, because there is no GST tax on food. I will say this—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: I know members want question period to finish as close to three o'clock as possible, but if we keep having interruptions, that will not be possible.

The hon. Minister of Jobs and Families, from the top, please.

Hon. Patty Hajdu: Mr. Speaker, I will rephrase it in a way that does not insult the member, since she feels so insulted.

People who are grocery shoppers know that there is not GST on food in this country, so it is misleading for the member opposite to pose a question like that in a way that could confuse Canadians.

What I can say is that we have cut taxes for 22 million Canadians. I know that the bill is seeking the approval of the House, and I hope the Conservatives are not going to vote against the support that Canadians need at this time.

Kelly DeRidder (Kitchener Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, just yesterday, the Liberals voted against our motion to lower hidden food taxes for Canadians. They voted to keep taxing food with their industrial carbon tax on fertilizer and farm equipment, and with inflation tax from increasing spending. These Liberal policies mean families are paying more at the grocery store. Pork was up 37.2% in March alone.

When will the Liberal government finally stop its hidden grocery taxes and provide real relief to Canadians?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us just debate on facts. This is what the House of Commons is about.

Indeed, there is no GST on food at the grocery store. That being said, we also cut taxes for the middle class for 22 million people across the country. We also cut taxes for first-time homebuyers across the country, and we cut the carbon tax.

We know that things are sometimes difficult across the country. We will be there for people. That is why we have a strong social safety net, have done a lot when it comes to dental care and pharmaceutical care and will continue to enhance that social safety net.

• (1505)

Tamara Kronis (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, CPC): Mr. Speaker, every dollar the Liberal government wastes means higher taxes hidden in Canadian grocery bills.

The Prime Minister has not even spared our morning coffee. Since he took office, the price of coffee is up 23%, and sugar is up 20%. Liberals refuse to scrap the industrial carbon tax, the packaging tax and the fuel standard tax. The sweet things in life should not come at a bitter price.

When will the Liberals finally axe their hidden taxes on food?

Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance and National Revenue and to the Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, all the experts will tell us that the answer to food insecurity is income security. First and foremost, what does that mean? It means good jobs for Canadians, but it also means a stronger social safety net to help support people in their times of need.

Both of them require a strong economy in Canada. That is why our government is focused on making generational investments in housing, defence and infrastructure so we can build the strongest economy in the G7. That is how we will ensure that families can feed themselves for generations to come.

* * *

SMALL BUSINESS

Giovanna Mingarelli (Prescott—Russell—Cumberland, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, small businesses in my riding of Prescott—Russell—Cumberland are the heart and soul of my community and the key to building the strongest economy in the G7, but with the current trade situation with the United States, small businesses are facing unique challenges.

Can the Minister of Women and Gender Equality and Secretary of State for Small Business share what our government is doing to support small businesses?

Hon. Rechie Valdez (Minister of Women and Gender Equality and Secretary of State (Small Business and Tourism), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government understands that small businesses are the backbone of the Canadian economy, and that is why we launched the buy Canadian policy that will strengthen supply chains and create more opportunities for small businesses. We made it easier for them to access BDC loans so they can compete, grow and reach new markets. We are also stepping up to support small businesses, especially those hit by the U.S. tariffs, through the \$5-billion strategic response fund.

These measures will protect and strengthen Canadian businesses as we build the strongest economy in the G7.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Richard Bragdon (Tobique—Mactaquac, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has said Canadians should judge him by grocery prices. Across Canada, rural families are feeling the pain at the checkout, including in New Brunswick, where groceries are up 23%, far outpacing inflation, yet yesterday the Liberals voted against the Conservative motion to make food more affordable. Instead, they doubled down on their hidden taxes, like the industrial carbon tax, their fuel standards and their packaging tax, policies that hit rural Canadians hard.

When will the Liberals finally stop their hidden tax on food and give Canadians a break at the grocery store?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Tobique—Mactaquac is home to McCain Foods, one of the great Canadian food companies. Whether people are from Johnville, Bristol, Hartland or Woodstock, they have a lot of sense and they

know this: There is no tax on food at the grocery store. The member knows it, and Conservatives know it.

People have big common sense in the Saint John River Valley. We will keep talking to them and doing stuff for them.

* * *

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for Combating Crime posted on X, “On behalf of the Government of Canada I am announcing that on the advice of our officials, we have deemed the group Kneecap ineligible to enter our country.”

Can the minister advise whether the parliamentary secretary was authorized to make this announcement? If yes, who authorized it? Was it the minister, department officials or the Prime Minister's Office? If no one authorized it, can the minister advise what follow-up action will be taken to address this serious misrepresentation of authority? Canadians deserve to know.

Hon. Lena Metlege Diab (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, persons seeking to come to Canada must meet eligibility and admissibility requirements of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act. Each case is assessed individually. Entry into Canada may be refused for a number of reasons. An individual whose electronic travel application has been declined can reapply by doing an eTA and addressing the reasons it has been refused.

IRCC cannot comment on individual cases.

● (1510)

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I am following up with the hon. minister. The story has made a lot of waves in media. It does not seem at all clear that there is evidence that the band Kneecap was deemed ineligible by the department.

Since the minister cannot discuss any individual case, can she please confirm whether any authorized entity within the Canadian government refused entry to the Irish band Kneecap or whether it was just one rogue MP?

[Translation]

Hon. Lena Metlege Diab (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said, each case is assessed individually. Anyone wishing to enter Canada must meet the requirements of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act. A person whose application for an electronic travel authorization has been refused may reapply after explaining the reasons. We cannot comment on individual cases.

*Business of Supply**[English]***BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

Chris Warkentin (Grande Prairie, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Thursday question, when we ask for the government's agenda for the upcoming week.

During the election, the Prime Minister made a lot of promises. He said that he was going to fix Liberal bail. Specifically, he was going to fix the mess that Justin Trudeau, as well as the vast majority of the Liberals, created by passing Bill C-5 and Bill C-75.

Would the House leader inform the House if the Liberals will finally bring in legislation, in the upcoming week, to fix the disaster they have created in the bail system in this country?

During the election, the Prime Minister promised that, by July 21 of this year, months ago, he would have a deal with Trump regarding our trade deal with the United States. Over the last number of weeks, we have reports that we have the fastest-shrinking economy in the G7. We have the second-highest unemployment rate in the G7. The jobs crisis is worsening in this country. We have seen the announcements from Imperial Oil of 900 job losses in Calgary. We have had the Kap Paper announcement here in Ontario, as well as GM's announcement that it is going to discontinue production of some of its models in Canada and move those jobs to the United States.

Will the House leader finally update the House as to whether the Prime Minister will fulfill his commitment to get a deal with the United States in the coming week?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is funny that those questions did not make the top 40 of the ones they wanted to ask today. Of course, the Prime Minister and ministers are in regular contact with our friends and neighbours in the United States. We will be advocating for Canadian workers and Canadian jobs.

In terms of criminal justice legislation, the member well knows that, right now, he could stand up and ask for unanimous consent on a very tough border bill that would help the government get tough on crime. This week, we had the chance to vote on Bill C-9 and move it through the legislative process.

The member need not fret. Legislation is going to be coming fast and furious, and the Conservatives will have a decision to make whether they want to support constitutional bail reform concocted with provinces and territories, victims associations and all manner of other stakeholders, or will they keep grandstanding in the way that they do? In the meantime, we have a very interesting week coming up.

• (1515)

[Translation]

Today, we are concluding debate on the Conservative Party's opposition day motion. Tomorrow, we will resume second reading debate of Bill C-8, An Act respecting cyber security, amending the Telecommunications Act and making consequential amendments to other Acts.

[English]

Next Monday, we will consider second reading of Bill C-11, the military justice system modernization act. We will continue with this debate on Wednesday. On Tuesday, we will commence second reading debate of Bill C-10, the commissioner for modern treaty implementation act. Thursday, October 9, shall be an allotted day.

Chris Warkentin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The hon. member called on me to stand in the House and call for unanimous consent to pass all stages of a bill that would fix the bail system in this country, the Liberal bail system that has been broken by the caucus across the way.

I ask for unanimous consent to pass, at all stages, Bill—

The Speaker: That is not a point of order, that is a question for question period.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS*[English]***BUSINESS OF SUPPLY****OPPOSITION MOTION—PASSAGE OF BILL C-242**

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Vincent Ho (Richmond Hill South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the people of Richmond Hill South, and Canadians across the country, are demanding safe streets. They want criminals behind bars, not behind the wheel of a stolen car. They want kids playing safely in parks, not dodging gunfire from illegally smuggled guns, which the Liberals let across the border at record levels. They want seniors to be free to walk their neighbourhoods, not locked indoors by fear of a crime wave unleashed by the Liberals.

The Conservative's jail not bail act delivers what the pro-crime Liberals never will: justice for victims, protection for families and safety for communities. The Liberals gave us crime and chaos. Conservatives will bring home safe streets and secure borders. I, along with the rest of my Conservative colleagues, will be voting to scrap Liberal bail.

Business of Supply

Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have committed to strict measures against violent offenders, yet they continue to fuel violent crime by refusing to repeal Bill C-75. The bill is forcing judges to release offenders at the earliest possible opportunity and under the least onerous conditions. Violent criminals have been emboldened and are taking advantage of their new freedom to terrorize Canadians because of it.

If the Liberal government were to support our motion, the jail not bail act, today, would Richmond Hill once again be a far safer place to live and raise families?

Vincent Ho: Mr. Speaker, yes, Richmond Hill would be one of the safest communities across the country to live, raise a family, play and work. The Liberals can just admit that they have failed over the last 10 years with their Liberal soft-on-crime policies and their weak bail policies, and join us in supporting the Conservatives' jail not bail act to, finally, scrap Liberal bail.

• (1520)

[Translation]

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my colleague's speech comes at a time when we are preparing to study a report on crimes against women. These crimes obviously leave their mark. When victims came to testify before the Standing Committee on the Status of Women, they said that regulating the use of the Jordan decision could make a real difference.

The Bloc Québécois previously introduced Bill C-392 to regulate the use of the Jordan decision. Of course, it is always preferable for a trial to be held as quickly as possible. However, we want to ensure that the Jordan decision cannot be invoked for certain crimes, such as sexual offences, murders, kidnappings, firearms offences and terrorism. Survivors and victims are asking us to do this.

What does my colleague think?

[English]

Vincent Ho: Mr. Speaker, it is simple. After 10 years of Liberal pro-crime laws, violent crime is up 55%, gun crime has more than doubled, extortion is up 330%, homicides are up 29% and sexual assaults are up 76%. Auto thefts are at levels never seen before. There is one simple solution, which is to scrap Liberal bail.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is always a concern when Conservatives stand up to intentionally, or maybe, sometimes, unintentionally, mislead.

For example—

Frank Caputo: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the member full well knows that he cannot accuse another member, or a party, for that matter, of intentionally misleading the House. He knows that he cannot do that. He should withdraw that statement.

The Deputy Speaker: I did not hear the member say “the House”.

I will let the member continue and finish his question.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the member could reflect on the automobile theft in the area of York.

From what I understand, the percentages are actually down, yet the member has indicated that auto theft is up.

Would the hon. member be able to provide some clarification on that issue?

Vincent Ho: Mr. Speaker, the Liberals like to import U.S.-style politics. They have a history of that, but now they are importing U.S.-style crime. Property crime rates and violent crime rates are now higher in Canada than they are in the United States. That is because of 10 years of weak Liberal bail laws.

If the Liberals could just admit that they failed, after 10 years of their soft-on-crime approach, they could support the Conservative jail not bail act and scrap Liberal bail.

Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the hon. member on his speech and say to him that I was just wondering if he could perhaps enlighten us a little more on why bail reform is needed in the country. The Liberals keep telling us that they are bringing in bail reform, but they do not tell us why it is needed.

I was wondering if the hon. member could tell us why bail reform is needed.

Vincent Ho: Mr. Speaker, the answer is in the question. It is because the Liberals broke our justice system with Bill C-5 and Bill C-75, making house arrest the new norm and bringing in the revolving door justice system that we have now. They broke our justice system. Their bail reform is what caused this catch-and-release system, which has allowed crime to ravage our communities.

We are asking why the Liberals will not scrap Liberal bail.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will not provide any further comment on the member's lack of a response to my question, but I think it is a legitimate issue when we take a look at the stats the Conservatives continue to provide the House. I would suggest to anyone who is listening to do a bit of a follow-through on the stats.

Business of Supply

I will start off by reflecting on the last federal election. Every member of the House, I am sure, is aware of what was taking place on the streets, homes and communities we all represent. I can say with absolute confidence, as I have said earlier today, and even last week when the Conservatives brought in another motion dealing with the issue of crime, that it is an issue the government is acting on. The Conservative opposition knows that. Canadians know that, because we made a commitment in the election platform to have significant bail reform for this fall. The Prime Minister has made and reinforced that commitment, and we will see bail reform coming to the floor of the House of Commons. Why? It is because it is not only a reflection of what Canadians were talking about in the last election but also a commitment that every Liberal member of Parliament made to their constituents. We are going to see bail reform legislation. That is the motivation.

I say to my Conservative friends across the way that, not only were we given a solid mandate in the last election to bring forward our platform, but also the opposition was given a message. We all have a responsibility to our constituents to advance legislation and ideas for the betterment of our communities. That is why, earlier today, I had the opportunity to ask a number of questions. One of those questions was dealing with Bill C-2.

Bill C-2 is one of the measures to secure and make Canadians safer by doing more at our borders. We have now had over 18 hours of debate on that legislation. There is no indication whatsoever from the Conservatives as to when they are going to allow that bill to pass the House of Commons, let alone get it out of second reading so that it can go to committee, where Canadians and stakeholders will have the opportunity to provide direct input. We even had a minister indicate that he is open to ideas and suggestions that might give additional strength to the legislation. I say all of that because I want the people who are following the debate on the issue of crime and safety in our neighbourhoods to understand what is motivating this, whether it is the Prime Minister, the cabinet or the entire Liberal caucus.

I will contrast that to what I have witnessed from the Conservative Party. What is motivating the Conservative Party as Conservatives continue to ratchet up hard feelings and division? I believe that it is very real and very tangible. I have some quotes that I would like to share. There are three in particular. Here is something that the member for Cariboo—Prince George said in September, “in my riding, 98% of the crime is created by five or six prolific offenders. When they are in jail, the crime rate goes down.” I would question the numbers, but I question the numbers on a lot of things with the Conservatives.

However, here is something that I find truly amazing.

• (1525)

This is what a Conservative member said on the floor of the House. The MP for Oxford said, “We are now living in a war zone in Canada.” He was referencing the issue of crime and safety. How ridiculous a statement that is. We can think about that, having a member of Parliament standing up and saying we are in a war zone. I think the member needs to get a better understanding of what a war zone actually is. However, I cannot blame him because it comes right from the leadership.

Leadership within the Conservative party has gone so far to the right. Members can listen to the things he says, the extreme comments we get from the leader of the Conservative Party. Today, when I was asking him a question, in part this is what his response was: “The extreme bloodshed and violence that Liberals have unleashed is what is radical.” I expect the member might want to clip that and put it out on his social media because it truly reflects the type of leadership we are seeing from the Conservative Party. Nothing has changed with the leader.

I remember a quote that I said last year, that the leader of the Conservative Party said to his caucus. The entire Conservative caucus got together, and what did the leader of the Conservative Party have to say? The headline was “...‘nuclear winter,’ [leader of the Conservative Party] tells his MPs”. I quote from the article:

“There would be mass hunger and malnutrition with a tax this high...our seniors would have to turn the heat down to 14 or 13 C just to make it through the winter,” [the leader] said.

“Inflation would run rampant and people would not be able to leave their homes or drive anywhere.”

This is the type of leadership we see coming out of the Conservative leadership office: extreme positions. Then we wonder why we get members making the statement that we are in a war zone when it comes to crime. It is ridiculous.

What motivates the Conservatives on crime? I will contrast what motivates the government, which is, as I pointed out, an electoral mandate and listening to our constituents. The legislation that is ultimately brought forward on bail reform will be a true reflection of their expectations and needs and what Canadians want to see. It is something that is being well taken care of.

The Conservatives say he has been Prime Minister for five months and ask where the legislation is. If we are going to have significant bail reform legislation, there is a responsibility to do some consultation. There is a responsibility as a government, and as a minister, to work with the many different stakeholders, whether the police, non-profits, territories or provincial governments, and the list goes on. It is not something where they lock themselves in a room and then come up with a substantial piece of legislation and put it on the table of the House of Commons. There is actually a lot of work involved in bringing forward the type of bail reform we are going to be seeing this fall. That gives us a sense of what motivates the Liberal caucus.

I have argued and I have seen over the years that the Conservatives love to talk tough about crime. They really do. It is as if there were no horrific crimes when Harper was the Prime Minister of Canada. That is sarcasm. There were a lot of horrific crimes. I can assure members there were. At the end of the day, whether home invasions, murders or whatever type of crime, I can assure members that it took place even under Stephen Harper, even when their leader sat around the cabinet table.

Business of Supply

• (1530)

The motivation for the Conservative Party is not Canadians. It is not that Conservatives want reform because of Canadians. They utilize the issue of crime and safety, I would suggest, to generate funds, money, and ultimately, to promote hate. That is what I believe. They may not like it, but let me give tangible examples of that. For some reason, I actually receive emails, and let me quote, these are email—

The Deputy Speaker: I have a point of order from the member for Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola.

Frank Caputo: Mr. Speaker, the member just accused the Conservative Party of promoting hate. That is reprehensible. We should be able to debate in here. We should be able to debate the issues, even if we disagree, without resorting to that. He should withdraw that and apologize.

• (1535)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the word “hate”.

The Deputy Speaker: I thank the hon. parliamentary secretary for withdrawing that word, and I will allow him to continue.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the word “hate”, but let us realize that fundraising plays a critical role in why the Conservative Party takes the position it takes. It is all about raising money. Let me give a good example.

Here are four emails. These are all emails that the Conservative Party has sent out to literally thousands and thousands of people. Every one of these emails actually has a link to donate to the Conservative Party. One says, “More criminals loose on the streets to terrorize our people.” Another one says, “Criminals are WREAKING HAVOC across our country.” The third one says, “The cause of this VIOLENT uptick in crime? The Liberals' radical catch-and-release policies.” The fourth email says, “Crime is out of control — and it's only going to get worse”.

These Conservative fundraising emails are circulating for one purpose, to raise money. Is it any wonder I make the statement that the Conservative Party uses the issue of crime and safety as a mechanism to fill its political coffers? That is the reality.

At the end of the day, if we want to look at how to serve Canadians on the crime file, it is first and foremost to reflect, as we have as a new government, as the Prime Minister has in the commitment to bail reform, on what it is Canadians are telling us. We are prepared to accept judgment when the time is right, when we have the bail reform legislation before us.

However, let me warn my Conservative friends across the way that there is other legislation before the House that would make our communities safer, that would provide more support for our law enforcement officers and our border control officers. The Conservatives have yet to pass that legislation. I am referring to Bill C-2. Bill C-2 is substantial legislation. With the very limited amount of time that the House has for debate, the Conservatives continue to talk that legislation out. Bill C-2 would make a difference. It would make our communities safer. If the Conservatives really and truly are genuine in wanting to make our streets safer, why are they holding up the bill at second reading?

In fact, the motion we are talking about today is about how we could speed up a private member's bill. It is not the first time. The member who stood up on the point of order spoke about his private member's bill, Bill C-225, an act to amend the Criminal Code. He said, “This bill is a monumental change.” He continued, “I ask that the House streamline the passing of this bill as quickly as possible.” That is a programmed bill. It gets two hours of debate at second reading. Bill C-2 has already had 18 hours of debate. After two hours, his bill gets to go to committee, yet he is asking us to speed it up even more, just as we saw here today on another private member's bill.

The work involved in getting legislation before the House needs to be respected. Oh, how the Conservatives cry if the government applies a bit of pressure or attempts to shame them into doing the right thing, to be there for Canadians by passing legislation. When it comes to their legislation, democracy goes out the door. That is what I witness. If members challenge what I am saying, I invite them to have me go to a public meeting at a university.

• (1540)

Let us see if we can bring in some independent individuals who would take a look at the arguments the Conservatives have. I would take no issue at all. Ideally it would be in Winnipeg North, but I can be flexible; it could be in Ottawa. Including with the member opposite, I would welcome the opportunity to have a good, healthy debate in Ottawa, although we cannot be sitting in session, in terms of the hours. Outside of the hours, I am sure we can arrange something. The bottom line is that the Conservatives apply a double standard.

Here is the reason I raise this: We know that Canadians are genuinely concerned about crime and safety in their communities. We know that for a fact. We understand that there needs to be bail reform. There needs to be tougher penalties for repeat violent offenders. Canadians elected the Prime Minister and the Liberal government on a platform of reforming the bail system. We are, in fact, committed to working together to ensure that we can make stronger laws and have safer communities.

In these five to six months, we have put into place legislative measures and budgetary measures from a commitment to increase RCMP officers by hundreds and do the same thing in terms of border control. There has been extensive consultation, and I think there is a responsibility for all members of Parliament, no matter what side of the House they are on, to recognize the agenda before us and to come down and talk about how we can achieve what all of us say we want to see: safer communities and individuals who are committing these crimes, especially repeat offenders, being held to account.

Business of Supply

These are all important things, but it is also important for us to recognize that the federal government plays a significant role that we are living up to. When I think of our judicial system, it is not just Ottawa. There are provincial governments and, arguably, municipal governments that also have a significant role to play. We know that. The last time I was speaking on a very similar issue, I referred to the need for more Crown prosecutors. I cited a story in the Winnipeg Free Press from September 9, an editorial. It amplified and tried to say that the province was at fault because of the issue of Crown attorneys.

Members can go ahead and look up the story to read it for themselves. I will read one line from it. The bottom line is this:

The cost of inaction is far greater than the cost of investment. Failing to fund the Crown's office means risking collapsed trials, emboldened criminals and disillusioned victims. It means communities losing confidence in the courts' ability to protect them.

This is something that reflects on provincial governments. Municipal governments provide law enforcement officers. To not recognize that law enforcement officers play a role or that provinces play a role is irresponsible. At the end of the day, it is a shared responsibility. Ottawa needs to do its job, and the Prime Minister and the new government that were elected just last April are doing the job that Canadians want us to do on this critically important issue. That is why we see bills like Bill C-2 for our borders, Bill C-9 for hate or the bail reform legislation, which is going to be coming down very shortly.

Kelly DeRidder (Kitchener Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I just listened for 20 minutes to the member across creating a bunch of slander against the Conservative Party and a wonderful smoke-screen. The Liberals are not taking any accountability for what their bills have done with repeat offenders in our communities. I ask the member how he is going to respond to the family in my community whose six-year-old child was assaulted. The accused was released, out on conditions, living in the same community as the child who was assaulted.

What does the member say to them about how the Liberals are going to fix what they have created with their bill, Bill C-75?

• (1545)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I would say to them the same thing I said to any victims during the Harper era. Victims of crime need to be listened to, and where we can support them, we need to support them.

To try to give a false impression that terrible crimes are occurring only during a Liberal administration is misleading at best. I would suggest that it is a lot worse, in terms of what the Conservatives are doing. The member accused me of using slander. I supported everything I said with information that I am prepared to share. If she wants to come sit with me, I would be happy to share it with her.

[Translation]

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois has several proposals for cracking down on criminal organizations.

I would like my hon. colleague to talk about the idea of prohibiting criminal organizations from openly displaying their emblems or patches. We are currently seeing criminal organizations wearing them with impunity and promoting their criminal activities completely legally. To us, that is a problem. It emboldens this type of organization.

I would like my colleague's thoughts on that.

[English]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, during the nineties and still now, to some degree, the whole issue of gangs and their patches was a hot topic in the province of Manitoba, my home province. I would be very careful in what we say a person can and cannot actually put on a jacket. I hope the member will have the opportunity to raise the issue at the standing committee. One has to be very careful with that, because what might be perceived as a gang patch in the eyes of some might not necessarily be that in the eyes of others. A gang can easily adopt a patch that is universally utilized. It is a note of caution, but I encourage the member to raise the issue at committee.

John-Paul Danko (Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the member's highlighting the Conservatives' hyperbole in the House. As someone who comes from the private sector and as a former municipal councillor, I would say that the statements made here when protected by parliamentary privilege are absolutely astounding.

The member is absolutely right that this serious issue of crime and safety is being utilized to mobilize the Conservative Party's radical base and divide Canadians, which is exactly why the party lost a 20-point lead going into the last election.

How is our government's approach different?

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, my preference is to amplify something, because of the Conservative member's question, and answer this member's question indirectly. I cited emails that were actually sent out by the Conservative Party and that emphasized the issue of crime. The party ratchets up the issue in order to generate money to fill its coffers. Otherwise, we can look at some of the statements that have been made. The most outrageous one I heard was from the member of Parliament for Oxford, who said, "We are now living in a war zone in Canada." That says a lot in itself.

Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to rise on behalf of the people of Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola. Just yesterday, I had a phone call from a constituent who talked about crime. This is somebody I have known for a long time. He said that after a worker was assaulted, he literally cannot find workers.

The member talks about speaking to students about my bill, which he referenced, on intimate partner violence and says that it should be passed quickly. I agree that it should be passed quickly.

I want a yes or no answer to this. I will pay for the member to come to my riding. We will go to a law school and discuss it; we will walk in the streets of Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola to look at crime, and he can tell us whether it is out of control. It is my time, my dime: Will he take me up on it, yes or no?

• (1550)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, time is the greatest resource one has, and I want to be very careful in how I spend my time. I would welcome the opportunity to have a debate with the member opposite. Having said that, I would suggest that maybe we could meet at the University of Winnipeg or the University of Manitoba, which has a law department. I am more than happy to assist the member in setting something up. I welcome that debate, and I hope he actually follows through and connects with me. I look forward to seeing him at the University of Manitoba or the University of Winnipeg.

[Translation]

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, one thing that has not been discussed much in today's debate is the fiscal imbalance. My colleagues may be wondering what the fiscal imbalance has to do with today's debate and whether I am out to lunch. Let me explain.

What we are debating today is a federal matter, but let us not forget that every decision made here regarding the Criminal Code inevitably has repercussions on the finances of Quebec and the provinces, since the administration of justice is largely their responsibility. Let us not forget that the fiscal imbalance persists, whether in terms of health transfers or in the area of justice. We can make decisions here, but then the burden falls on Quebec and the provinces.

Does the federal government recognize that, at some point, it will have to admit that the decisions made here regarding the Criminal Code and justice have repercussions on Quebec's finances?

[English]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, the member highlights the fact that our judicial system requires multiple levels of government to be involved in one way or another. Ultimately, even if a province makes a decision, it has an impact in terms of federal responsibilities and vice versa. We need to see more coordination.

I think most Canadians would be very surprised to hear that we do not even have the bail data to make the types of decisions that would be good to see. Provinces need to accumulate more data on the issue of bail and who is getting released. That would be very beneficial.

More coordination is something we are interested in. This is why the minister and parliamentary secretary are meeting with all the different stakeholders, in particular, our provinces and territories.

[Translation]

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our new Liberal government was elected on a promise to reform the bail system. We have ambitious measures to protect public safety. On this side of the House, we understand that if we propose a measure, we need to ensure that it is constitutional.

Could my colleague explain why, when we propose amendments to the Criminal Code, it is important to ensure that they comply with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms?

Business of Supply

[English]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, the thing that comes to mind with that particular question is this: If we take a look at Bill C-242, the bill being proposed in this motion, I suspect that no legal opinion would give any sense of comfort that it is compliant with our Constitution or the Charter of Rights. In fact, I would argue that it would not be found compliant if allowed to proceed.

It also raises a question. We can remember the Conservative policy of “three strikes and you're out,” the American-style policy we debated a little over a week ago. Why did they not include that policy in Bill C-242? Have they changed their attitudes toward it? Do they see it as another form of legislation they can generate more funds on?

Who knows? We will continue to remain focused on my colleague's constituents and Canadians as a whole to ensure we get the bail reform that Canadians want and deserve.

Chak Au (Richmond Centre—Marpole, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Vaughan—Woodbridge.

I rise today not to debate ideology but to defend a principle that every Canadian holds dear: the right to feel safe in their own community.

From Richmond to Vancouver and from Kelowna to Surrey, Canadians are witnessing a justice system that no longer protects them. Violent offenders are arrested, brought before a judge and, despite long criminal histories and active bail conditions, are released again, sometimes within hours and sometimes with fatal consequences.

Let me tell members about Tori Dunn, a 30-year-old woman from Surrey who was murdered in her own home by a man who had been released on bail despite facing robbery charges and having a long history of violence. Her death was not inevitable; it was preventable. There is also Jordan Paul Campbell Mutual, who had 10 outstanding warrants while out on bail. He set two police officers on fire during an arrest attempt. Mohammed Majidpour, who had over 24 prior convictions, assaulted a woman with a metal pole and committed arson on the same day. He had been released on bail multiple times. These are not isolated incidents; they are the result of a justice system that prioritizes procedure over protection and leaves communities to bear the consequences.

The numbers do not lie. Between November 2022 and December 2023, British Columbia held nearly 4,800 bail hearings. In them, crime prosecutors sought detention in only 23% of cases, and judges granted detention just 41% of the time. In violent crime cases, judges ordered detention in only 43% of them, even when the accused was already out on bail for yet another violent offence. In Kelowna, 15 repeat offenders were responsible for over 1,300 police files in one single year. That is one police interaction every four days per person.

This is not a justice system that protects the public; it is one that enables repeat offenders.

Business of Supply

At the heart of the crisis is Bill C-75. Passed in 2019, it introduced the principle of restraint, requiring judges to release accused offenders at the earliest opportunity and under the least restrictive conditions. While intended to ensure fairness, it has had the opposite effect on public safety. Judges now feel bound to release individuals who pose a clear risk. Repeat violent offenders exploit the system. Crown prosecutors, constrained by federal policy, seek detention in fewer than one in four cases. Even when they do, judges often decline. This disconnect between the Crown and the judiciary is not just procedural but dangerous. It creates a system where public safety is treated as secondary, and where legal technicalities override lived realities.

Meanwhile, our peace officers are sounding alarms, and it is time to listen. Police officers are arresting the same individuals repeatedly, only to see them walk free. They face burnout, frustration and rising violence. In Vancouver alone last year there were 6,200 violent crimes, including nearly 5,000 assaults. Assaults on public officers rose by 20% in a single year. Vancouver police chief, Adam Palmer, has called for urgent bail reform. Deputy Chief Howard Chow said that reverse-onus bail provisions would, in his words, “dramatically improve” public safety. Even Vancouver mayor, Ken Sim, speaking bluntly, said, “Excuse my language, but that’s [BS]”, when he was talking about a man with 60 police interactions who was released yet again, only to commit another violent attack.

● (1555)

This is not just a policing issue; it is also a public safety crisis. While the system fails to contain repeat offenders, victims are being retraumatized. Imagine surviving a violent crime, reporting it and then seeing one’s attacker walking free, days after, back in one’s neighbourhood, back into one’s life.

There is no justice in retraumatization. Victims often face sleepless nights, anxiety and fear, not just from the crime itself but also from the knowledge that the system may not protect them. Families like that of Tori Dunn feel betrayed. Survivors of assault and harassment are forced to relive their trauma every time they see their attacker walk free. This is not just emotional; it is systemic.

When victims see attackers released without consequence, it sends a dangerous message that their pain is secondary, that their safety is negotiable and that justice for them is optional. Across Canada, people are asking why violent offenders are walking free. Why are police arresting the same person over and over again? Why does the system seem more concerned with the rights of repeat offenders than with the safety of law-abiding citizens? The answers are buried in legislation that prioritizes leniency over logic and in a judicial culture that has lost sight of its duty to protect.

A recent survey shows that 68% of Canadians now believe that the bail system is too lenient, a dramatic increase from just 41% three years ago. This is not just a perception problem; it is a reflection of lived experience.

I know what the Liberals and their NDP allies will say. They will argue that tougher bail is too harsh. They will say that criminals deserve a second chance, but how many second chances should a repeat violent offender get before an innocent person loses their life? How many times should a small business owner be robbed before we admit that the system is failing?

The truth is that our opponents are more concerned with ideology than with safety. They lecture Canadians about root causes, while ignoring the root fact, which is that when a violent offender is behind bars, they cannot harm innocent people. That is why we are supporting the jail not bail motion. It is not radical; it is reasonable. It would not target first-time offenders. It would not strip anyone of their rights. It does say that if someone has been convicted of three or more serious offences, they should not be eligible for bail, probation or parole.

It says that if someone is charged with a major offence, like sexual assault, home invasion or a firearms offence, they should face reverse-onus bail. Judges must consider someone’s full criminal history, not just the current charge. If someone has recently been convicted of a major offence, they should not be released again while facing new charges.

It is not about punishment; it is about prevention, about protection and about restoring trust.

Let us stand with victims, restore safe streets and act now, because justice delayed is danger delivered, and Canadians cannot wait for more.

● (1600)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when we think of Bill C-75, something that the Conservatives have brought up a lot today, we should think in terms of what it actually did. It abolished peremptory challenges to the jurors and modified the process of challenging a juror for cause, introducing judicial standby. It enhanced measures to better respond to intimate partner violence, provided additional measures to reduce criminal justice system delays and to make the criminal law and the criminal justice system clearer and more efficient, facilitated human trafficking prosecutions and allowed for the possibility of property forfeiture.

I am wonder if the member could indicate whether or not the Conservative Party would actually repeal Bill C-75.

Chak Au: Mr. Speaker, I am new to the House, but I have one observation so far. When my learned colleagues on the other side of the chamber make a statement about their achievements, it could mean a very small step, but they left out 99 steps that they have not addressed. By saying that Bill C-75 made some progress, the member has left out many of the loopholes, many of the gaps and many of the challenges that our ordinary citizens are facing and suffering from.

• (1605)

[Translation]

Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lis-tuguj, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my colleague spoke about certain events that took place in his region. I want to talk to him about a decision handed down yesterday in my region, at the New Carlisle courthouse in the Gaspé.

A man with no prior criminal offences was charged with sexual assault with a weapon, forcible confinement, assault and criminal harassment against three alleged victims over an extended period of time. After he was charged, he was taken into custody. He has remained in custody since last April. Yesterday, he tried to get bail. His request was turned down and he is still in prison.

Why is that? It is because a number of tools already provided in the Criminal Code make it possible to keep inmates who pose a danger to public safety in custody, even if they have not yet been found guilty.

My question for my colleague is this: What is missing from the Criminal Code that prevents us from ensuring that dangerous individuals remain in prison?

[English]

Chak Au: Mr. Speaker, I find that information very inspiring and interesting. We are talking about repeat violent offenders who have committed crimes on many occasions and are just allowed to walk free on the streets. As I mentioned in my speech, only about one-fourth of those offenders are detained, so the others are walking our streets, threatening the safety of the general public. We are not talking about one individual case but about a phenomenon that has been happening time and again in our communities.

Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what the member on the other side of the floor observed was very astute, which is that the Liberals come up with bills that always have something of value in them, but there are always poison pills that make it impossible to support them. That was the case for the Conservatives with Bill C-75. Over and over, today in the House, the Liberals said they are committed to strict measures against violent offenders. That means that every example given on this side of the floor of the horrific things that have been done by individuals who have been out on bail are not violent offences to the Liberals, and that is very disturbing.

I would like to know from the member whether, if the Liberal government supported our motion for jail not bail, his communities would once again be far safer places to live and to raise a family.

Business of Supply

Chak Au: Mr. Speaker, Canadians have spoken. Sixty-eight per cent of Canadians said that our current bail system is too lenient. We can talk to law enforcement officers, mayors and councillors all over the country, and they are going through the same thing. There is a crisis in their communities, and they need reform in the bail system.

Michael Guglielmin (Vaughan—Woodbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, imagine for a moment a father sleeping peacefully at home with his wife and kids, when violent thugs kick in their door and break into their home. He does what any husband would do: He tries to protect his family. Then he is fatally shot and murdered. This is not a scene from a Hollywood production; this was the reality for Aleem Farooqi and his family in Vaughan when Aleem was gunned down defending his family, a true hero.

Imagine someone waking up in the morning in their home to find out that their car in the driveway, right below where their children sleep, was almost stolen the night before. That is what happened to me back in August of this year, and I am not special. This has happened to numerous people in Vaughan—Woodbridge and thousands of Canadians all across this country. In my community, everybody knows someone who has had a car stolen. In fact, in the last eight weeks, York Region has seen 296 vehicle thefts. How about gun violence? In the last eight weeks, we have had 10 shootings and a bank robbery.

Last month, I attended a press conference in Vaughan—Woodbridge, joined by the Leader of the Opposition, fellow Conservative members of Parliament and victims of crime, and we attempted to address this very issue. The message was clear. Something needs to be done. Something needs to change in this country.

For far too long now, I have heard horror stories in my community of citizens being terrorized, their homes being broken into, their cars getting broken into and their loved ones being fatally shot. People are genuinely afraid. They are afraid in their own homes and afraid in their own communities.

I was born and raised in Vaughan—Woodbridge, a place that has always been to me the perfect place to raise a family. In my youth and early adult life, it was a community where I felt safe, where people would walk around at night without fear. They would not worry if they had forgotten to lock their doors, and they would go to bed knowing they were safe in their own beds. However, over the last decade, that sense of security has been shattered.

Business of Supply

My friends in my community no longer feel safe walking at night. When our youth go to school, they face threats of gun violence, stabbings and assaults. Our seniors are anxious, wondering if their cars will be on the driveway when they wake up in the morning. Just last Wednesday, two homes fell prey to shootings. The shootings happened only minutes apart, and both of these homes had been shot earlier the same month. That means the residents have now lived twice through violent attacks. Recently in Vaughan, three suspects were arrested for committing a series of home invasions, and two of these suspects were already out on bail.

What happened? The Liberals introduced bail reform with Bill C-5 and Bill C-75, and these Liberal bail laws have completely broken our bail system.

What needs to change? Today, this is exactly what we are here to address. This is far from a partisan issue. Premiers, mayors, police associations, attorneys general and Canadians have been asking for the federal government to end catch-and-release bail laws like Bill C-75, a law that forces judges to apply the principle of restraint, which puts repeat violent offenders back on the streets, and Bill C-5, which repealed mandatory jail time for serious gun crimes, including extortion with a firearm.

We all know the consequences. Since these laws were introduced, all across Canada, violent crime is up by 55%, firearm crime is up by 130%, extortion has skyrocketed by 330%, sexual assaults are up by 76% and homicides are up by 29%. In 2019, David Lametti, now the Prime Minister's right-hand man, passed Bill C-75, forcing judges to release offenders at the earliest opportunity under the least onerous conditions.

Today, the Conservatives have introduced a motion in the House of Commons. For people tuning in from my community, the motion reads as follows:

That, given that,

- (a) violent crime is up 55% under the Liberal government and repeat offenders continue to be released because of Liberal catch and release laws; and
 - (b) the Liberal government promised to pass criminal justice reform six months ago but has failed to do so;
- in order to keep repeat offenders in jail and keep Canadians safe, the House is of the opinion that Bill C-242, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and the Department of Justice Act, also known as the Jail Not Bail Act, must pass and is committed to sitting extended hours, holding an expeditious committee study and undertaking such other procedural measures as may be necessary to pass it at the earliest opportunity.

● (1610)

The Conservatives are here to say that in order to stop this chaos on our streets, keep repeat violent offenders in jail and keep Canadians safe, we must pass my hon. colleague from Oxford's bill, the jail not bail act, Bill C-242.

What would the jail not bail act do? First, it would repeal the Liberal principle of restraint and replace it with a directive that the primary consideration is the protection and safety of the public. Second, it would introduce a new major offence category with reverse onus bail conditions for firearm, sexual assault, kidnapping, human trafficking, home invasion, robbery, extortion, arson and assault charges. Third, it would strengthen bail laws by mandating judges to consider an accused's full criminal history and would prevent anyone from getting bail who was convicted of a major of-

fence in the last 10 years and is charged with a major offence while out on bail. Fourth, it would prohibit anybody with an indictable conviction from acting as a guarantor, would require judges to enforce bail conditions on guarantors and would require non-residents to surrender their passport upon request.

Do not take our word for it. Take it from Cait Alexander, a survivor of domestic violence who runs the organization End Violence Everywhere: "The Jail Not Bail Act is therefore more than legislation—it is an essential corrective—a lifeline capable of disrupting the revolving door of abuse and saving innocent lives."

How about the Toronto Police Association? It stated:

The proposed ideas will put victims and communities first, restoring the balance that is desperately needed at a time when youth violence and gun crimes are out of control and innocent victims are paying the ultimate price. We would encourage all levels of government to set aside their political differences and do what's right.

After the horrific murder of Aleem Farooqi in my community of Vaughan, Vaughan's mayor, Steven Del Duca, called on the federal government for urgent bail system reform, stating, "I am calling on the Prime Minister to show leadership and to urgently overhaul the system".

I will repeat that this is not a partisan issue. People's lives are at risk every single day the government delays. The Prime Minister and Minister of Justice have spent the last six months spiralling, dithering and failing to act. In that time, violent crime has surged and innocent Canadians have paid the ultimate price.

I have heard Liberal members say they are going to introduce stronger bail laws, except they have not, even though we know what is needed because we have heard it from every single corner of this country. What we do not need is more Liberal reforms. We need to scrap Liberal bail and restore safety on our streets.

If the Prime Minister and Liberal members of the House are serious about restoring peace to our communities, they will back this bill, reverse their disastrous bail laws and tip the scales of justice back in favour of innocent Canadians. If they do not want to support the bill for political purposes, they can abstain and let it pass so people in this country can have a sense of security again.

Business of Supply

Every day, Canadians wake up and see another headline about a violent shooting. Tomorrow, many Canadians will wake up and their car will be stolen from their driveway. We have a job to do on behalf of the people who sent us here.

The government's primary responsibility is to keep Canadians safe. It is time to put victims ahead of criminals and violent criminals behind bars, where they belong. That is why I encourage every member of this House to support my colleague's bill, Bill C-242, the jail not bail act. It is very important that we stand up for our communities and the people of this country and put repeat violent offenders behind bars.

• (1615)

[Translation]

Madeleine Chenette (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages and to the Secretary of State (Sport), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to tell my constituents in Thérèse-De Blainville and the people in communities across our country that the life of each and every citizen is important and must be protected. With that in mind, it goes without saying that we are all working to enact legislation that will keep them safe. The government is working on it.

I would like to know what consultations the Conservatives carried out to ensure that Bill C-242 will not negatively impact the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. How can they ensure that it will not be challenged again, causing further delays? What analysis have the Conservatives done with respect to the consultations they conducted?

[English]

Michael Guglielmin: Mr. Speaker, for years now, police associations, mayors and individuals across this country have been demanding bail reform. Violent crime is surging. Over and over again we see the same story: Repeat violent offenders are out on bail committing crimes and terrorizing our citizens.

If the Liberals wanted to act and had a sense of urgency, they would have introduced bail reform at the beginning of the session of Parliament, but clearly they continue to delay. If they want to do what is right, they can step aside and allow us to introduce legislation and fix the problem for them.

[Translation]

Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois has also suggested ways to crack down on organized crime. Using an opposition day to focus on a private member's bill is fair game.

As I understand it, Bill C-242 is 10th on the list of private members' bills coming up for debate in the House. Why fast-track it today when we do not even know the bill's status? Is it going to be ruled in order or not on the basis of constitutionality?

I have the same question as my colleague from Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Listuguj. What is lacking in subsection 515(10) of the Criminal Code that would prompt us to fast-track Bill C-242?

• (1620)

[English]

Michael Guglielmin: Mr. Speaker, maybe I was not clear in my remarks during my speech. People in this country are legitimately afraid. They are losing trust in the very notion of justice in this country. They have faced repeated hurdles and delays from the government. For the last six years, it has failed to act to address the very serious concerns of citizens, police associations, police departments and mayors all across this country.

The reason the Conservatives are acting with urgency is that this is an urgent problem and someone needs to stand up for the rights of the people of this country.

Tamara Kronis (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would ask my hon. colleague to elaborate a bit on the ways in which a Conservative government would address the issue.

Michael Guglielmin: Mr. Speaker, our party, as we put forward in our jail not bail act, would like to remove the principle of restraint being introduced for repeat violent offenders. We would like to keep repeat violent offenders in prison. We would like to have mandatory minimums on serious offences like human trafficking, sexual violence and extortion. We believe that violent criminals need to be kept in prison, not given the principle of restraint.

We do not need a revolving door in our justice system. We need to keep these people off the streets so our citizens, communities, friends and neighbours can feel safe in their country again.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the member could provide his thoughts on Bill C-48, bail reform legislation that was passed. It was supported in virtually every corner of Canada. The only ones who dragged their feet on it were the Conservatives.

I would ask the member to provide his thoughts on that bail reform legislation.

Michael Guglielmin: Mr. Speaker, bail reform is upon us right now. We introduced the jail not bail act. We have brought an opposition day motion forward to ask the House to expedite this bill so it can be studied at committee.

As I said before, this should be a non-partisan issue. We hear over and over again that everyone is in favour of bail reform. Will the Liberals get out of the way and pass our bill so we can keep communities safe?

[Translation]

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Québec Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me start by saying that I will be sharing my speaking time with my distinguished colleague from Bourassa.

Business of Supply

I am very pleased to have this opportunity to explain what the government is currently doing to build safe communities and to prevent crime, as well as our plans for the future.

Canadians expect the government to be smart about fighting crime. I want to thank and commend the many mayors, provincial partners, and provincial and municipal police forces for their ongoing collaborative efforts to reduce gun and gang crime.

We are all responsible for making things better, and we all want to make things better. That is why, in recent years, the Canadian government has made significant improvements to Canada's firearms laws. New firearms licensing requirements have come into force, maximum penalties for firearms trafficking and smuggling have been increased, and many new harm reduction tools have been put in place. We will keep working to ensure that Canada's firearms regime is responsible and effective, supports the safe use of firearms by law-abiding owners and protects our Canadian communities from the devastating effects of gun violence.

Effective enforcement and operational co-operation are also essential in the fight against gun violence. Investments have also been made to improve law enforcement and border security services. This includes funding for the RCMP to increase its capacity to trace crime guns and enhance anti-smuggling activities, as well as funding to the CBSA to strengthen border controls in order to prevent the smuggling of firearms into the country. We will also continue to strengthen co-operation with key U.S. partners, including through the cross-border firearms task force.

We know that gun violence is a tragic reality across the country and that it is often linked to street gangs. For too long, the roots of this violence have been neglected. The Canadian government has made considerable efforts to change this situation, because everyone deserves to feel safe in their communities, and that sense of safety is shattered every time a violent crime occurs. Our efforts must start there, in the community. Grassroots efforts, meaning community-led initiatives, can help address the social conditions that lead to criminal behaviour.

Getting tough on crime is not enough; we also have to be smart and strategic about our approach. We need to get to the root cause of the problem. In the community, this is done by addressing the social determinants of crime. These are conditions that may lead individuals to engage in violent and criminal behaviour. Our government must firmly believe that any solution to gun and gang violence must combine prevention and intervention efforts.

In 2022, for example, the Department of Public Safety launched the building safer communities fund, which provided \$250 million directly to municipalities and indigenous communities to strengthen gang prevention programs and address the social conditions that give rise to crime. This money supports initiatives that tackle the root causes of gun crime by supporting community-led projects that address violence among youth involved in or at risk of joining gangs. The fund uses data, including demographic data and crime statistics, to direct investments where they will have the greatest impact. This targeted approach ensures that the most at-risk communities receive timely support that they can invest in protecting the safety of their residents.

• (1625)

To support communities, \$391 million will go directly to the provinces and territories as part of the gun and gang violence action fund, and \$10 million will be allocated to the youth gang prevention fund.

That is in addition to more than \$40 million per year for the national crime prevention strategy, which supports community efforts to prevent youth involvement in crime and tackle known risk factors.

In June 2022, the Government of Canada also tabled the federal framework to reduce recidivism, which aims to break the cycle of reoffending, support rehabilitation and make our communities safer for everyone.

Over the past few years, the Government of Canada has also introduced reforms to simplify unnecessarily complex or redundant bail rules that caused unfortunate and detrimental delays in the criminal justice system without necessarily improving public safety. Canadian bail laws are very clear. A person must be detained while awaiting trial if their release would pose a public safety risk or undermine confidence in the administration of justice.

That said, we are determined to continue working with the provinces and territories to make responsible and effective changes to the bail system, where warranted. Similarly, our partners know as well as we do that when it comes to preventing and combatting gun and gang violence, there is still much work to be done together. We are hopeful that both sides of the House can work together.

• (1630)

Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the speech by my colleague from Quebec Centre. He invoked the principle that “an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure” by reminding us of everything that needs to be implemented before crimes are committed. We agree on that point.

Would my colleague agree with the Bloc Québécois that something needs to be done about the amount of time before an accused person is brought to trial? Would he be in favour of making sure the Jordan decision does not apply to certain serious cases, such as sexual offences, murder, kidnapping, offences involving firearms or acts of terrorism?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for his pertinent and thoughtful comments.

The key word here is “thoughtful”. The measures we put in place must be thoughtful measures. Sadly, some of the measures implemented by the Harper government were poorly thought out. They led to court challenges, sometimes reaching the Supreme Court. These measures were struck down, which had a huge impact on delays.

My colleague is correct in pointing out that there may be other ways to reduce delays. When we reduce delays we also reduce costs, backlogs and injustices that directly affect victims.

[English]

David Bexte (Bow River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my hon. colleague's speech to the House, but I cannot help but be frustrated, and my constituents are frustrated, by the release of criminals back into society. He stated that people who are arrested must be detained if there is a risk of reoffending, yet we see evidence time and time again that they are let go. I visited detachments and police in my riding. They are afraid, and they fear for their own safety when repeatedly arresting the same criminals again and again.

I wonder if the member could square that circle and resolve that discrepancy.

[Translation]

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Mr. Speaker, we all agree that we want to reform the bail system. That is why, as the Prime Minister said again today, we will very shortly be bringing the House a proposal to reform the bail system that will achieve three known objectives.

The first objective is to combat gun violence and organized crime to make it harder for violent repeat offenders to get bail. The second objective is to increase the penalties for violent repeat offenders, particularly those involved in organized crime, break-ins, auto theft and human trafficking. The third objective is to reduce court delays, as our colleague from Montcalm was saying. Reducing these delays warrants careful consideration of this bail reform proposal.

[English]

Sima Acan (Oakville West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, during the last election, I visited door to door and spoke to lots of constituents in my riding of Oakville West. The major issue that came up on the doorsteps was crime.

We are all aware that crime has decreased right now, but to me and my constituents even one is too many. We are working on bail reform. We have spent months on bail reform to make sure we have a very well-studied reform.

Could my colleague please tell us why it is important for the Prime Minister to bring in tougher bail reform?

• (1635)

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Mr. Speaker, in fact this calls for the support of all members of Parliament on both sides of the House. When it comes, it will come quickly. We need to arrive at a consen-

Business of Supply

sus. I think we all share the same objective, a consensus based on reason, efficiency and clear guidance on the part of experts.

I am confident. I look forward to broad bipartisan support for the bail reform bill, which is going to come soon.

[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 Saanich—Gulf Islands, Persons with Disabilities; the hon. member for Regina—Lewvan, Natural Resources; the hon. member for Courtenay—Alberni, Emergency Preparedness.

Abdelhaq Sari (Bourassa, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am deeply honoured to rise today and speak on such an important topic that affects Canadians, their peace of mind and their safety.

My speech will address the issue from a number of angles. Specifically, I would like to discuss the need to work in a much more systematic way with multiple stakeholders. I would also like to talk about the need to address the issue in a much more thoughtful way, as my colleague so aptly said, and from a legal perspective that takes our Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms into account.

Canadians expect to live in safe, peaceful communities. They want a government that is tough on crime but capable of making smart choices. That is exactly the path we are on. I want to start by thanking our partners, who are very important stakeholders in this decision. They include the mayors, provinces, police departments and community organizations doing critical work on the ground. Thanks to them, our fight against guns and gangs is making headway. They deserve recognition in the House and elsewhere for their daily commitment.

Unfortunately, gun violence remains a tragic reality in too many neighbourhoods. Every shooting and every life lost is a stark reminder that we must continue to work tirelessly. That is exactly what we are doing with stronger laws and strict enforcement. In recent years, we have modernized our laws to strengthen gun control. We have established stricter licensing rules, introduced tougher penalties for gun trafficking and smuggling, and put in place new tools to help law enforcement trace crime guns.

Business of Supply

We have also invested in the RCMP and the CBSA to enhance their ability to intercept illegal weapons. We are working hand in hand with our American partners, because cross-border smuggling requires a coordinated response. Protecting Canadians requires strong laws as well as effective police co-operation.

I would like to focus on a word that carries a lot of weight, one that is extremely important, but that I do not often hear from the other side of the House. That word is prevention. Prevention means addressing the root cause. However, in order to address the root cause, we must first understand the social determinants that lead a person to commit a criminal act or a violent act that could be criminal.

However, we also know that just filling up prisons will not solve these problems. To build truly safe communities, we need to work on prevention. That is why we launched the building safer communities fund to provide \$250 million directly to municipalities and indigenous communities. This funding supports grassroots prevention programs to provide tangible alternatives for at-risk youth so they do not end up in a life of crime.

This is in addition to \$400 million for the gun and gang violence action fund, as well as ongoing investments through the national crime prevention strategy. These measures support on-the-ground initiatives, such as mentoring, sports, training and academic support. Every dollar invested in prevention is a dollar invested in the safety and future of our young people.

We also need to talk about how we have to break the cycle of recidivism. We may agree on that goal, but we disagree with how the members opposite want to go about achieving it. Public safety is not just about preventing people from embarking on a life of crime; it is also about preventing recidivism.

● (1640)

In 2022, we adopted a federal framework to reduce recidivism, a first in Canada. This framework identifies risk factors, supports rehabilitation and promotes the safe reintegration of offenders into society. Ultimately, breaking the cycle of recidivism also means breaking the cycle of violence.

Now let us talk about bail. Our government wants to reform the bail system to make it clearer and more effective. The rule is simple: When someone poses a threat to public safety, they must remain behind bars. When release is justified, it must be supervised so as to never compromise public confidence in the justice system. It is in this spirit that we are working closely with the provinces and territories to improve the system, always with the aim of striking a balance between public safety and respect for the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

In conclusion, there is no quick fix. Instead, we are implementing smart ideas to put an end to gun violence and street gangs. One thing is clear: By combining strong laws with better equipped police services and significant investments in prevention and rehabilitation, we can save lives and give Canadians back the basic right to feel safe in their communities. This is our government's commitment and the vision we are standing up for: a Canada that is safer, fairer and more united.

Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lis-tuguj, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government is promising legislation to reform the parole system and the bail system in particular. The notwithstanding clause would allow the government to exempt this law from being attacked on the basis of fundamental freedoms. Section 11 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms guarantees the presumption of innocence as well as the right not to be denied bail.

Would my colleague be willing to immediately dismiss the notion that the Liberal government might use the notwithstanding clause in the event that its bill is at risk of being challenged?

Abdelhaq Sari: Mr. Speaker, what is important to say about this bill, and I will say it again, is that it will be a smart, thoughtful bill that respects the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

What I can say for certain is that it will not be an American-style bill, like the one proposed by the Conservatives. I can assure my colleague that there will be no American-style bill.

[English]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member for Bourassa has been a very strong advocate for his constituents. Looking at the need for bail reform, members such as him, alongside the Prime Minister, have done a great deal of work from within trying to reflect the interests of their constituents. I am wondering if he could provide his thoughts, from his constituents' perspective, as to why it is important that members co-operate in getting this legislation passed.

● (1645)

[Translation]

Abdelhaq Sari: Mr. Speaker, since the member referred to my constituents in his question, I would obviously like to talk about prevention.

What my constituents need most is prevention aimed at young people. They need programs that can prevent them from falling into a life of crime, programs that can help them stay in school, and they need a sports centre where young people can gather so they can become the champions, the lawyers and the members of Parliament of tomorrow.

That is what my constituents in Bourassa really want. They do not want to fill our prisons. That is not what they want. That is not what the law is all about. What people actually tell me every day is that they want the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms to be respected. That is very important.

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Québec Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what my colleague thinks of our Conservative friends' decision to remove what is known as the "three strikes and you're out" provision from their new bill, which was directly inspired by certain American practices. What does he think?

Business of Supply

Abdelhaq Sari: Mr. Speaker, I believe we can work with our neighbours to the south to secure our border. We really need to co-ordinate our security efforts. However, importing and copying American laws — I do not know if I can say this, but it is not a smart move.

We want to work in a smart way with all stakeholders while respecting the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. We are in Canada. We are not south of the border, in the United States. We are not here to fill our prisons. On the contrary, we are here to respect the charter and we have no need to import carbon copies of American laws.

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, is my hon. colleague's government in favour of creating a specific offence to make it a crime to recruit young people to commit offences, as organized crime currently does?

Abdelhaq Sari: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, I missed part of the question. Could the member repeat it?

[English]

The Deputy Speaker: We have to resume debate.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In no way would I want to mislead the House in any fashion. I did not imply that we pass the motion. I was referring to potential bail reform legislation that would be brought in by the government.

The Deputy Speaker: I thank the parliamentary secretary for clarifying. It is so noted.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Kitchener Centre.

Kelly DeRidder (Kitchener Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is always an honour to rise on behalf of my riding of Kitchener Centre. I rise not just as a member of Parliament today but as a representative of a community. My community, Kitchener, is hurting. It is hurting from rising crime, broken trust and a justice system that no longer puts public safety first.

After a summer of violent crime and eroded trust in our public safety, Canadians are demanding swift action and they have every right to do so. Across this country, violent crime is up 55%. Firearms offences from non-law-abiding citizens have surged by 130%, and extortion has skyrocketed by 330%. These are not just statistics. They represent shattered lives, grieving families and communities living in fear.

This crisis did not happen by accident. In 2019, the Liberal government passed Bill C-75, which forced judges to release offenders at the earliest possible opportunity under the least restrictive conditions. As a result, there is a revolving door by which repeat violent offenders end up back on our streets. I want to be clear: This is a crisis of the Liberals' own making, and Canadians are left to live with the devastating consequences.

I will be splitting my time today.

We have all heard the heartbreaking stories. One that stays with me is that of Daniel Senecal. He was convicted of sexual assault, released under weakened bail laws and then accused of sexually assaulting a three-year-old child, whom we have come to know as little E. This three-year-old child has had to spend three weeks in the hospital recovering from this unimaginable, irrevocable act, and she

will be scarred for life. She is a child. That is the cost of this system, which prioritizes offenders over victims.

There is also Scott Weller, a victim of a violent home invasion. Scott said, "As someone who knows firsthand the trauma of a violent home invasion, I believe strongly in the need for Jail not Bail. My family was attacked in what should have been the safety of our own home. The idea that violent offenders could be released back onto our streets is terrifying—not just for us, but for every Canadian family." Scott's words are powerful. They remind us that public safety must come first, that the rights of victims and families must come before the rights of violent offenders.

The Toronto Police Association put it plainly: "The proposed ideas will put victims and communities first, restoring the balance that is desperately needed at a time when youth violence and gun crimes are out of control and innocent victims are paying the ultimate price." This is why Conservatives are introducing Bill C-242, the jail not bail act. The bill would restore accountability, protect communities and put victims first.

I will bring this closer to my riding in Kitchener. In the region of Waterloo, in 2024 alone, there were 3,896 undertakings and 2,334 releases. That is a 61% release rate. This means that the majority of the accused individuals were sent back into our neighbourhoods. What is even more troubling is that approximately 50% of the charges brought forward by the Waterloo Regional Police are not being pursued by Crown prosecution. That is half of these cases gone. They are not prosecuted; they are gone.

Of those released on an undertaking or release order in 2023 and 2024, 20% were found to be in disregard of the terms of their release. What is worse is that more than half of those offenders were caught multiple times. These are the repeat offenders we need off our streets.

I received an email today from Anke, a 76-year-old woman in my community. She told me that she is nervous to walk around her community in broad daylight. She wants us to restore Canada to what it was, making it safe for her children and grandchildren.

Families are not the only ones suffering. Businesses in the downtown core of Kitchener Centre are struggling. They are being broken into. Their customers are afraid to come downtown. The rise in crime is hurting our business community of hard-working entrepreneurs, who are trying to keep their doors open and staff safe.

Business of Supply

• (1650)

Public safety is economic safety, and right now both are at risk, but perhaps the most disturbing example is what happened recently in my own community: the sexual assault and attempted kidnapping of a six-year-old child. The accused was released on conditions and is still residing in the same community where that child lives. This is not okay. Our children's safety is at risk. No parent should have to live with the fear that a violent offender is living down the street. No child should be put in harm's way because our justice system has failed to act.

Bill C-242, the jail not bail act, would, first, repeal the Liberal principle of restraint and replace it with a directive that public protection and safety be the primary consideration. Second, it would create a new major offences category with reverse-onus bail conditions for charges like firearm offences, sexual assault, kidnapping, human trafficking, home invasion, robbery, extortion, arson and assault.

Third, it would strengthen bail laws by requiring judges to consider an accused's full criminal history and by preventing bail for anyone convicted of a major offence in the last 10 years who is now charged again. Fourth, it would toughen the risk assessment standard from "substantial likelihood" to "reasonably foreseeable". Fifth, it would prohibit anyone with an indictable conviction from acting as a guarantor. We would enforce bail conditions on guarantors and require non-residents to surrender their passport upon request.

This is not about being punitive; it is about being responsible. It is about restoring order to our streets, trust in our justice system and confidence in our communities. Conservatives are calling on all political parties to set aside political differences and to do what is right. Canadians deserve a justice system that protects them and enables them, not repeat offenders.

To every victim, every family, every child, every business owner and every community that has lived through the trauma of violence, I say that Conservatives hear them. We stand with them. We are taking action. They deserve to learn, live and work in safe streets, to go to bed without worry, to know their children can play safely in their yard and their park, and to live in the Canada we lived in before the Liberals' Bill C-75, the "get out of jail free card" act.

Let us restore justice. Let us restore confidence in public safety. Let us pass Bill C-242, the jail not bail act.

• (1655)

Sima Acan (Oakville West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I did quick research on the crime rate for the member's region, and I see that since 2023, the rates have been coming down, but I want to emphasize that I strongly believe in tougher bail reform. That is why I always say that even one is too many.

Therefore I want to ask the member this: If she truly believes in the motion's stated urgency, why would the Conservatives introduce a bill that undercuts their leader's main crime platform, demonstrating a clear lack of policy consensus in their own party?

Kelly DeRidder: Mr. Speaker, a quick Google search might have indicated some crime, potentially, coming down, but the statistics are coming straight from the Waterloo Regional Police

Service, and we are talking about repeat violent offenders here. Therefore I am going to ask this question: Will the member across the aisle support Bill C-242, the jail not bail act?

[Translation]

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Standing Committee on the Status of Women, of which I am a vice-chair, is finalizing our report on coercive control, gender-based violence and femicide. These studies started during the last Parliament and we are picking up where we left off.

Our next study will focus on a motion that was tabled in collaboration with the Conservative members of the committee. The study will seek to determine how section 810 of the Criminal Code could be improved to ensure the safety of women and girls. Conservative MPs have added a review of bail and sentencing regimes.

Does my colleague not believe that this type of debate should transcend partisanship? Should we not study the issue seriously in the House and in committee, rather than adopting such a bill under closure?

[English]

Kelly DeRidder: Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives have put forward a bill on intimate partner violence that I am hoping all parties also support.

Today, we are debating Bill C-242. I ask the member if she will support our Conservative bill, Bill C-242, the jail not bail act.

Doug Shipley (Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I listened intently to the words of my colleague.

In Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte, we have a terrible crime issue. The mayor has actually ordered a state of emergency to be put in place to help deal with some of the lawlessness going on.

I was surprised to hear from the Liberal member opposite that the crime rates are going down. I have in my hand numbers from Stats Canada, saying that total violent crime is up 49.84%, homicides are up 27.75%, sexual assaults are up 74%, total firearms offences are up 116%, extortion is up 357% and auto theft is up 45%. I could keep going, but they are all up. The residents in my riding are definitely concerned that they are going up.

Business of Supply

Maybe the member on this side could make clear what is going on in Canada and why it is important today to try to pass the bill to put people in jail and stop bail.

Kelly DeRidder: Mr. Speaker, Bill C-242, the jail not bail act, would stop repeat offenders. I cannot say that enough. A majority of the offences happening in Canada right now are from repeat violent offenders. The bill would help reduce crime by keeping them in jail and not letting them free on the least restrictive conditions. That is what the bill would do to help Canadian families.

• (1700)

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Québec Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, all experts agree that bail reform needs to be thoughtful and intelligent. Just a few months ago, the Conservative leader ran on a “three strikes and you’re out” policy, which I think many people said was unreasonable. Why was it dropped from Bill C-242?

Kelly DeRidder: Mr. Speaker, I am going to make this answer very quick.

It has not been dropped. We still support “three strikes and you’re out.” The bill that we are debating today is about real bail reform: Bill C-242, the jail not bail act. Will the member opposite support it?

Tim Watchorn (Les Pays-d'en-Haut, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to rise on behalf of the citizens of Les Pays-d'en-Haut. It is a pleasure to rise to debate the opposition motion before us, and I will talk particularly about the narrative it tries to present.

The motion suggests that the Liberal government proposed criminal justice reform in the last six months and has failed to act. However, the reality tells a very different story. Just last month, we introduced Bill C-9, the combatting hate act, which includes targeted amendments to the Criminal Code to address hate-motivated offences. The legislation successfully passed second reading yesterday and is now moving to committee for detailed study and consideration.

[Translation]

The Minister of Justice worked tirelessly over the summer to find ways to strengthen and modernize our criminal justice system. He held consultations with his provincial and territorial counterparts as well as police forces, chiefs of police and their associations to ensure that any reform introduced is practical, evidence-based and truly tailored to the needs of Canadians. That is how responsible reform happens: through meticulous study, collaboration and expert advice.

Meanwhile, the Conservative leader was far more preoccupied with his political future than any real public policy work. He spent his summer chasing after a second chance as a candidate parachuted into an Alberta by-election following his resounding defeat at the polls by voters from across the country in the last election, including voters from his former riding of Carleton. Still, he shows no signs of having learned from that experience. Instead of focusing on measures capable of truly improving public safety, he keeps proposing reckless initiatives based on political calculation, putting optics before real solutions to protect Canadians.

[English]

Canadians deserve more than slogans and political theatre. They deserve a government that listens, engages experts and acts decisively to make communities safer. That is exactly what the government is doing through legislation that addresses urgent issues while respecting the principles of justice and fairness. That is why the federal government has taken important steps to reform the bail system in recent years.

In 2023, former Bill C-48 made meaningful changes to strengthen the bail system in response to concerns about efficiency and repeat offending. For example, it created a reverse onus to target serious repeat violent offences involving weapons. It expanded the list of firearms that trigger a reverse onus at bail. It also broadened the reverse onus, targeting repeat offenders in cases of intimate partner violence.

These changes made it more difficult for accused persons to obtain bail when they are charged with serious repeat violent offending. These changes were not the result of partisan initiatives. They reflected a broad collaboration with provinces, territories, law enforcement and legal experts. Every step was guided by data, evidence and consultation with those working on the front lines of criminal justice.

Despite these reforms, we understand that Canadians remain concerned about repeat and violent offending. That is why, as set out in the government's 2025 electoral platform and reaffirmed at the first ministers' meeting in June, the government will introduce legislation this fall to further strengthen both bail and sentencing provisions in the Criminal Code.

• (1705)

[Translation]

Our federal government committed to establishing a reverse onus for a range of serious crimes, in particular violent car theft, car theft for a criminal organization, home invasion, and human trafficking and smuggling, in order to make it much harder to get bail in these circumstances.

Our government also committed to amending the Criminal Code to direct courts to primarily consider denunciation and deterrence when sentencing repeat car thieves or home invasion offenders. Other commitments included broadening the possibility of consecutive sentencing for car theft with violence or car theft involving a criminal organization.

*Business of Supply**[English]*

These are concrete measures aimed at addressing repeat and violent offending throughout the criminal justice process. They represent an approach that is strategic, evidence-driven and focused on protecting public safety without sacrificing the rights and fairness that are foundational to the justice system.

We also know that reform cannot happen in isolation. The operation of the bail system is a shared responsibility between federal and provincial and territorial governments. While the federal government sets the legal framework, the provinces and territories manage day-to-day operations, including court and jail administration. Strengthening the law at the federal level must therefore be complemented by effective enforcement, resources and oversight at the provincial level. Without this coordination, even the best legislation would not achieve meaningful change.

Data and evidence also play a crucial role. Provinces and territories collect the data necessary to evaluate how bail laws are functioning, identify gaps and implement improvements. Better data allows government to track outcomes, assess risks and ensure that measures designed to protect public safety are actually working. This is why our government continues to work closely with partners across the nation to improve data collection, transparency and reporting in the criminal justice system.

[Translation]

Public safety is built through thoughtful policy, strong partnerships and sustained action. It is not achieved with slogans and partisanship. It is built when governments work together to address the root causes of crime, including poverty, trauma, mental health issues and housing insecurity, and when individuals get the support they need to rebuild their lives.

Canadians deserve a bail system that protects communities while respecting the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, as well as a sentencing regime that holds offenders accountable while promoting reintegration.

Our government is delivering on that promise. We are not acting hastily or out of political expediency. We are consulting experts, collaborating with our provincial counterparts and developing laws that work in practice. We are introducing legislation to ensure that violent repeat offenders face appropriate consequences, that the courts have the tools they need to protect public safety and that the justice system works effectively and fairly for all Canadians.

[English]

In conclusion, Canadians expect a government that acts responsibly, listens to experts and delivers results. That is what we are doing with our criminal justice reform agenda. We have introduced Bill C-9 to fight hate crime. We strengthened the bail system through former Bill C-48, and we are now preparing additional measures this fall to further address repeat and violent offending.

This is not about political games or empty slogans. It is about real action, public safety and justice. That is exactly the approach Canadians elected this government to take.

Tako Van Popta (Langley Township—Fraser Heights, CPC): Mr. Speaker, over the summer months, I had the opportunity to visit

the downtown Vancouver core and some businesses there and organizations that support businesses. We heard about the explosive growth of crime on the streets: shoplifting, smashed windows, open drug use. Merchants do not even bother calling the cops anymore because the police say that with the Liberal bail laws of release at the earliest opportunity and with the least restrictive conditions, the criminals are out on the street again before the sun sets that evening, wreaking havoc on the streets.

Will the member agree with me that this is untenable and that something needs to be done for our downtown cores? I am sure it is in his riding as well.

● (1710)

Tim Watchorn: Mr. Speaker, we all agree that criminality is on the rise and needs to be addressed. We all agree that bail reform is a necessary process that has to be done properly. It has to respect the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and it has to be done so that once the legislation is passed it is not overturned by the Supreme Court. That is what our government will do with the legislation that will be presented in the fall.

[Translation]

Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, does my colleague from Les Pays-d'en-Haut agree with the Bloc Québécois that we need to crack down on criminal organizations, including by creating an organized crime registry similar to the registry of terrorist organizations? This would make it easier to prove that a crime has been committed for the benefit of a criminal organization.

Does he agree that we should facilitate asset seizure by reversing the onus to avoid the dissipation of assets when an organized crime figure is arrested? Does he agree that we should create an explicit offence to criminalize the recruitment of young people to commit crimes?

Tim Watchorn: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from the east for his question. He is my riding neighbour.

I find these proposals rather interesting. However, I think they should be debated in committee. I suggest that my colleague across the way bring up these ideas in committee. They will be given serious consideration.

Business of Supply

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Québec Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my colleague and thank him for his wisdom in pointing out that, when bills and laws passed by this government are overturned and struck down by the Supreme Court, it has truly harmful consequences for the justice system and for victims.

Could my colleague elaborate on the harmful consequences that poorly drafted laws and bills can have on victims?

Tim Watchorn: Mr. Speaker, when laws are poorly drafted, delays in the justice system increase considerably, and victims are forced to relive the crime over and over again, often in court, and that is unacceptable.

It is essential that every bill be drafted in such a way that it will be accepted by the Supreme Court. That way, victims will be better served in the future.

[English]

Tamara Kronis (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member defended the Liberal record on bail reform, yet he acknowledges that serious violent crime is on the rise. We have certainly heard member after member tell tragic stories of situations that occurred in our ridings with people out on bail. The Conservative bill we are debating today talks about protection of the public. I am wondering how the hon. member believes that could be unconstitutional.

Tim Watchorn: Mr. Speaker, I am not saying it is unconstitutional. I am saying that any law brought forth has to be 100% non-challengeable at the Supreme Court level so as to not waste the time of the courts and make victims more vulnerable.

John-Paul Danko (Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Madawaska—Restigouche.

Every Canadian deserves to be safe in their community and in their own neighbourhood. Whether it is walking home from work at night, taking their children to school, playing at the park or simply opening the doors of a small business, people should not have to worry about violence or repeat offenders undermining their security and safety. The truth is that Canadians are worried. Violent crime is a real issue. Repeat violent offenders are a serious problem. Our government acknowledges this, and we are taking action to address it.

However, the motion before us today suggests that the Conservative proposal is some sort of magical solution to these issues, a single piece of legislation the Conservatives have branded the jail not bail act, another three-word clickbait slogan. They claim that passing this one bill will make Canadians safe. I have heard today and in the past a really unfortunate trend of Conservatives repeatedly politicizing awful, violent crimes to promote their political agenda and raise money. It is disgraceful. Canadians know better and Canadians deserve better. They deserve safety, and that requires more than just slogans. They know it requires real reform.

Let me remind the House of what has already been done. In 2023, our government passed bail reforms that made it harder for violent repeat offenders to be released. These reforms were targeted toward individuals charged with serious violent crimes and firearm

crimes. They were supported by premiers. They were supported by police, and they are already in force across Canada today.

We also know this work is not finished. This is why, during the most recent election, our new Liberal government campaigned on and received a strong mandate for further reforms. In our platform, we committed to strengthening bail further. We committed to ensuring that prosecutors have the resources they need to oppose bail where appropriate, and we committed to ensuring that judges have the tools they need to keep Canadians safe while respecting fundamental charter rights. We are delivering on those promises. In this very session, in a few weeks, new measures will be brought forward to strengthen bail laws and tighten federal sentencing guidelines.

Let us look at the broader picture. The Conservatives claim that bail reform alone will solve violent crime, but the reality is that keeping Canadians safe requires work on three fronts: prevention, prosecution and protection. Our government has been clear that on prosecution, we are investing in federal Crown attorneys. Too often, federal Crowns are overloaded, their cases are delayed and dangerous offenders can slip through the cracks. Our government is committed to new funding for federal Crowns so they can prepare stronger cases, challenge inappropriate bail applications and move trials forward without unnecessary delays.

On protection, we are expanding victim services, because Canadians who are harmed by violent crimes need support. Our government is increasing funding so that victims can access counselling, legal assistance and safety planning. This is part of our commitment to a justice system that protects people and also brings criminals to justice.

On prevention, our government has made historic commitments. We are expanding youth programs so that young people have positive opportunities and do not end up in the justice system in the first place. We are investing in mental health and addictions treatment, because untreated illness and addiction are drivers of repeat offences. We are also supporting indigenous justice initiatives, because reconciliation and fairness are also part of public safety.

Business of Supply

None one of these measures are mentioned in the Conservative motion. None of these measures fit neatly into a silly three-word bumper sticker, but Canadians know they are essential to safe communities. The Conservatives like to talk about the need for urgency. They say, “Pass this bill today and rush it through.” Let us be clear: Urgency is not the same as effectiveness. Canadians do not want legislation that is rushed, half-considered and ultimately ineffective. They want reforms that work, that last and that withstand the scrutiny of courts and the test of time.

• (1715)

That is what our government is delivering. Our approach is comprehensive. We are reforming bail laws further this session, we are funding federal Crowns and judges to ensure that cases move more effectively, we are investing in victim services and community safety programs, and we are addressing the root causes of crime through youth initiatives, addiction treatment and mental health supports. That is the difference between this government and the opposition. It wants a headline and to divide Canadians for clicks, but we are delivering a real plan. The opposition wants to pretend that there is a silver bullet, but we know that Canadians deserve more than silly three-word slogans.

I want to pause and remind our colleagues of the history. For 10 years, even under a Stephen Harper majority, the Conservatives had the chance to fix this. For 10 years, they could have strengthened bail. For 10 years, they could have funded prosecutors. For 10 years, they could have invested in prevention. They did not. Canadians remember the failures of the Harper years. Now they show up with silly slogans hoping people forget their record. Canadians deserve better than that.

Our new Liberal government was elected with a clear platform, a platform that promised to strengthen bail, support victims, resource prosecutors and invest in prevention. Canadians chose that platform and gave us the mandate to deliver, and that is exactly what we are doing in this session.

Let us acknowledge that crime is a serious problem. Let us commit to keeping repeat violent offenders off the streets. Let us strengthen sentencing for violent crimes and drugs. However, let us also recognize that one bill is not the answer. A safer Canada requires a safer justice system at every level. It requires prevention, prosecution and protection, and that is exactly what our government is delivering.

Our forthcoming legislation on strengthening bail reform and sentencing is part of a broader suite of public safety measures. Bill C-2, the strong borders act, would add 1,000 border security agents and 1,000 new federal RCMP officers. It has additional measures that would give police the tools they need to bring international criminals to justice. It would strengthen our borders to keep U.S. firearms off the streets of our cities.

Bill C-9, the combatting hate act, would add new provisions to protect vulnerable communities from targeted hate at places of worship and community centres. It would also classify as a hate crime the use of terrorist symbols such as those of Hamas and Hezbollah, which are sometimes used to promote hate.

I want to take a moment to reflect on my record as a municipal councillor for the City of Hamilton, Canada's eighth-largest city, where I worked closely with law enforcement partners at the Hamilton Police Service. I want to thank the chief of police and the senior leadership team in Hamilton for their invaluable insight and leadership. I have been through the defund the police nonsense, I have been through the activist efforts to decriminalize drugs like fentanyl, cocaine and methamphetamines, and I have been through the activist efforts to allow homeless tent encampments in city parks, and it is clear that public opinion has shifted on those failed ideas.

In Hamilton right now, gun crime, youth and gang violence, property crime associated with tent encampments, and public drug use are all top of mind for residents in my riding. These are all issues that require solutions beyond the federal level. Of course, federal legislation is required that sets responsible federal law on bail and sentencing, and we need to ensure that police have the tools necessary to bring criminals to justice, but that also requires the provinces to do their part. The provinces are responsible for provincial superior courts, for appointing and training justices of the peace and for funding and regulating municipalities. Municipalities have a duty to ensure that police have the tools and resources they need to uphold public safety, and even local school boards have a responsibility to make sure they work collaboratively with police to ensure that youth have an opportunity for positive interactions with police as part of the public education system.

In closing, it is clear that there is work to be done on bail reform and sentencing at the federal level. Our government is committed to making those changes, along with wider initiatives, in order to improve public safety across Canada.

• (1720)

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, can the member acknowledge that when the Liberals changed Bill C-5 and Bill C-75, there was an increase in crime across our country? Will the member acknowledge that the action taken by the government, specifically in my province of British Columbia, to decriminalize hard drugs was one of the worst policy failures in the history of Canada?

• (1725)

John-Paul Danko: Mr. Speaker, after reflecting on the British Columbia example of decriminalizing illegal drugs, I completely agree that it was a terrible policy decision. We have seen the fallout in municipalities across Canada, including in Hamilton.

Bill C-5 is obviously problematic. Some of the sentencing restrictions on police when they are policing illegal drugs are problematic. Our government is committed to fixing what needs to be fixed.

Sima Acan (Oakville West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since our government has already committed to introducing comprehensive and targeted bail reform, does my colleague agree that it would make more sense for us to work together on that legislation instead of passing a rushed private member's motion, which is a copy of a failed, costly and American-style policy?

John-Paul Danko: Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to rise on issues that I think we largely agree on. Across the aisle, we agree that bail reform is an issue and that repeat offenders are an issue. After talking to Hamilton police, I know that part of the problem is youth repeat offenders.

I hope that when the governing party brings legislation forward, members opposite will support it. It is an opportunity, truly, to work collaboratively.

[Translation]

Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lis-tuguj, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleague to comment on the Bloc Québécois's proposals. We believe the government should take aim at criminal organizations and give police forces the tools they need to do more damage to criminal organizations and do it faster.

Those tools include creating an organized crime registry, prohibiting criminal organizations from parading around with their recognizable logos, facilitating the seizure of assets and creating a specific offence in the Criminal Code that makes it a crime to recruit young people to commit offences.

[English]

John-Paul Danko: Mr. Speaker, reflecting on some conversations with Hamilton police, I agree with the member opposite that we need to take a stronger stance on organized crime, especially gangs and organizers who use and recruit youth to carry out crimes on their behalf.

We are strengthening the provisions in the legislation to give police the electronic tools they need to address those crimes, but I would say the recruitment and utilization of youth is a significant issue that needs to be addressed.

Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member said that the government is committed to strict measures against violent offenders, yet it continues to fuel violent crime by refusing to repeal Bill C-75.

The Liberals complain about Pierre Elliott Trudeau and the Conservatives bringing in minimum sentences that they claim hampered judges' independence, but they were proven to reduce the number of incarcerations. By comparison, their bail reform law,

Business of Supply

Bill C-75, forces judges to release offenders at the earliest possible opportunity under the least onerous conditions. It has emboldened violent criminals to offend again and again.

Does the member not see an increase in violent crime today as a result of the impact of these repeat offenders taking advantage of their new freedom to terrorize Canadians?

John-Paul Danko: Mr. Speaker, I have acknowledged that repeat offenders are a problem across Canada, in part because of some of the provisions in previous legislation on having the least onerous measures. However, I would say that the provinces, which train and regulate justices of the peace, also have a big part to play in this, because it is often the justices of the peace who are setting bail conditions and releasing repeat offenders.

[Translation]

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, during the last election campaign, Canadians across the country asked us to take concrete measures to build a safer Canada. They elected a new Liberal government, and they had a clear and legitimate expectation: reform our bail system, improve public safety and ensure that our communities are safe.

Today, I am speaking to my House of Commons colleagues, but I am also speaking to Canadians, especially those in my riding of Madawaska—Restigouche, and I want to make one thing clear: Our government intends to deliver on this promise. We are determined to take serious, rigorous, responsible action to ensure that every citizen enjoys the safety they deserve.

These commitments are deeply rooted in our thoughtful, balanced and evidence-based public safety platform. Our Liberal platform states that we intend to: fight gun violence and organized crime by cracking down on smuggling at the border and by equipping police with modern investigative tools; strengthen the bail system to keep repeat violent offenders off the streets, while respecting the charter; support victims of crime by improving services and ensuring that the justice system hears their voices; invest in prevention and community safety, including mental health care, addictions treatment and youth programs that address the underlying causes of crime; and protect Canadians from emerging threats, like human trafficking, cybercrime and increasingly sophisticated organized crime networks.

Business of Supply

These are not just promises, however. Concrete actions are already under way. Bill C-2, the strong borders act, was introduced in the House in June. It will enable us to advance our new government's priorities: ensuring that Canadians are safe, strengthening our borders, combatting transnational organized crime and protecting the integrity of our immigration system. This bill builds on Canada's border plan, which has \$1.3 billion in funding. This is the largest investment in border security in the history of this country. I invite my colleagues in the official opposition to work with us to ensure that this bill moves forward to committee stage. A party that claims to care about public safety should certainly want to strengthen security at our borders.

We also introduced Bill C-9, which will help us fight hate crimes. This bill introduces a series of targeted reforms to the Criminal Code aimed at ensuring safe access to community spaces, denouncing hate crimes, clarifying the legal meaning of the term "hate" and criminalizing the wilful incitement of hatred against an identifiable group by displaying certain symbols of terrorism or hatred in public. This bill is designed to protect the safety and dignity of Canadians, while preserving space for lawful protest and charter-protected freedom of expression.

Our government will also soon introduce ambitious and responsible legislation that will aim to strengthen Canada's bail system to make it harder for repeat violent offenders to get bail, increase penalties for the most serious repeat violent crimes, particularly those related to organized crime, break and enters, auto theft and human trafficking, and address court delays so that serious cases are dealt with quickly and victims are not retraumatized by court backlogs.

I would also like to highlight the collaborative approach that is key to our government's work. Over the summer, the Minister of Justice and his parliamentary secretary held a series of consultations across the country. They met with provincial and territorial partners, police chiefs, peace officer associations, defence lawyers and Crown prosecutors to hear their concerns, ideas and experiences on the ground. This collaborative approach reflects a core Liberal value.

We understand that the only way to strengthen the justice system is by working hand in hand with those on the front lines. These conversations will continue at the upcoming federal-provincial-territorial meeting of ministers of justice and public safety in October, where bail reform and community safety will be on the agenda.

We must all recognize that public safety is not just about repressive measures; it is also about prevention and support initiatives that address the root causes of crime.

• (1730)

That is why our government is investing in community programs, mental health services and addiction prevention. These efforts complement our legislative measures and strengthen the resilience of our communities. What is more, by collaborating closely with the provinces, territories and local stakeholders, we are ensuring that our measures are tailored to the specific realities of different parts of the country.

I would also like to note that, despite our willingness to take action, we must ensure that the proposed measures fully respect the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The motion put forward today by our colleagues in the official opposition does not appear to have benefited from this in-depth reflection. The approach set out in Bill C-242, introduced by the Conservative Party, raises serious constitutional concerns. It would be irresponsible to rush ahead with changes to the Criminal Code without properly reviewing them. I wonder if the bill, which is sponsored by the leader of the official opposition, actually underwent a rigorous legal analysis. Did my opposition colleagues truly take the time to verify whether this bill complies with the requirements of the charter? These are important questions.

Effective public safety requires more than just slogans. If this bill were to be struck down by the courts, it would only increase public frustration, waste time and resources, and, above all, disappoint Canadians.

The Harper government's track record reminds us that an ill-conceived reform can backfire on its own objectives. A number of Criminal Code amendments introduced by the former Conservative government were found to be unconstitutional. As a result, they did not improve public safety. On the contrary, they caused longer court delays and spread doubt and frustration in a certain segment of the public.

We will not make the same mistakes. We need to stay focused on evidence-based reforms and sustained investments in policing and prevention. The Liberal approach centres on a targeted, responsible approach to reform, consistent with the charter, that runs no risk of being immediately struck down by the courts, as seems possible for Conservative opposition's Bill C-242. We have a responsibility to build a robust, balanced and sustainable legislative framework that complies with our Constitution in every way. That is how we intend to keep Canadians safe, not only in the short term but also, and I want to emphasize this, in the long term.

Under our Liberal approach, community safety will also top our list of priorities without sacrificing fairness, basic rights or the effective administration of justice. We believe that we can and must do both: protect the public while respecting our constitutional obligations.

That is why Canadians elected us. They elected us to improve public safety, maintain confidence in the justice system and ensure that violent offenders face real, proportionate and fair consequences.

Today, I invite all parties to set partisan differences aside and work together to build a robust, compassionate and efficient justice system based on evidence and co-operation, not fear and confrontation. Canadians are watching us. They expect results, and they deserve a government that lives up to those expectations.

• (1735)

[English]

Clifford Small (Central Newfoundland, CPC): Madam Speaker, after 10 years of the Liberal government, crime and chaos are exploding in rural Newfoundland. Not long ago, a couple of highway gas stations and convenience stores located about 30 kilometres apart, in Stoneville and in Birchy Bay, were hit with a pickup truck as the repeat offenders sought to take out the ATMs there. No charges were laid. The police have their hands tied by the Liberal bail-not-jail justice system.

On behalf of Ruth Burns and Tina Hodder, will the member opposite commit right now to voting against criminals, against the Liberal crime wave, and not only support our Conservative motion to bring jail, not bail, to criminals but also support his people in Madawaska—Restigouche who are tortured by the crime rate in his own riding?

[Translation]

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault: Mr. Speaker, we were clear during the campaign. We are going to take public safety seriously. Our actions speak for themselves. As soon as Parliament came back this fall, we introduced Bill C-2, the strong borders act. We also introduced Bill C-9 to combat hate crimes.

We will soon be introducing an ambitious bill to reform bail in Canada. We are reviewing this bill seriously and thoroughly to ensure that it complies with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Implementing hasty measures to amend the Criminal Code is not acting in the interest of public safety; it is merely a short-term publicity stunt. We are seeking to improve public safety in the long term. We owe it to Canadians to take this seriously.

I hope that my colleagues in the opposition will work with us when this bill is introduced and that we will work together to get it passed.

• (1740)

Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Madam Speaker, currently, subsection 515(10) of the Criminal Code sets out the bail conditions that a judge may impose.

My colleague announced a bail reform bill. Is the government suggesting that judges are not doing their job properly?

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault: Madam Speaker, I want to clarify that I did not announce the content of any future bills. Rather, I said that a bill consistent with our election commitments would be introduced this fall. One of those commitments was bail reform.

Canadians have told us that there is room for improvement in our justice system. Our decision to improve Canada's bail system does not mean that we think judges are not doing their job properly, quite the contrary. That is not at all what we have been hearing.

Here is what we are going to do. We are going to make it harder for violent repeat offenders to be released on bail. We are also going to increase the penalties for the most serious violent crimes committed by repeat offenders, including organized crime, home invasion, auto theft and human trafficking.

Business of Supply

The public expects us to take action on these issues. Canadians want action. They have asked us to make changes to our legal system so that we can tackle these crimes and create safer communities.

Our Liberal government has listened to the people. We want to deliver on what has been asked of us.

[English]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I truly appreciate the approach of my colleague and friend in dealing with the legislation in general and his position on the motion.

The question I have for the member is in relation to the issue of crime and safety in our communities. If we want a good example of the Conservatives' behaviour on this issue, all we need to do is take a look at Bill C-2, which would provide a stronger sense of security and tangible actions for Canadians to be safer in their homes. On that legislation, the Conservatives have now debated 18 plus hours, and they are not allowing it to go to committee. On the other hand, they say that crime and safety is important. I wonder if the member could provide his thoughts on that contradiction.

[Translation]

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault: Madam Speaker, I firmly believe that words need to be backed up by actions. If members are serious about public safety, why block a bill designed to strengthen our border security? If it truly believes in public safety, I hope that the Conservative opposition will work with us and allow us to move Bill C-2 on to the committee stage.

[English]

Steven Bonk (Souris—Moose Mountain, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am very much looking forward to the next speech, which will be offered by my friend from Cariboo—Prince George, who I will be splitting my time with. I know he will have insights, which are always unique, and I am very much looking forward to it.

Across the country, Canadians are experiencing something they never thought possible in Canada: a loss of trust in their own safety. For decades, one of the things that set Canada apart was the fact that families could feel safe and secure in their own homes. Business owners could work late without fear, and children could walk to school without a second thought. This sense of security is now being replaced by fear.

Business of Supply

Just yesterday, I spoke with a small business owner in my riding of Souris—Moose Mountain. She told me that, for the very first time in her life, she is afraid to go out at night. She described knowing of one individual in her community who had been arrested more than 180 times. That person had 180 arrests, and every time that person was back on the streets almost immediately. She said to me, “Our streets are not safe anymore.”

That sentence should stop us in our tracks, because when Canadians begin to feel unsafe in their own communities, when fear starts to dictate the way we live our daily lives, then government has failed at one of its most fundamental duties, which is to protect its citizens. That failure is a direct result of Liberal bail policies. This is why we must scrap Liberal bail.

We need to be honest about how we made it here. The erosion of public safety is not a coincidence. It is the result of deliberate choices made by the Liberal government. When Liberals passed Bill C-75, they weakened bail conditions and lowered thresholds for release. They did this in the name of so-called fairness, but in reality what they created was a revolving door of justice.

Across the country, we see the same scenario playing out over and over again. A repeat violent offender is arrested, police officers do their jobs, charges are laid and then, sometimes within hours, the same offender is back on the streets free to reoffend. It is hard to describe the frustration police officers feel when they risk their lives to apprehend violent criminals only to see them walk free before the ink is even dry on the paper. That is the reality of Liberal bail. It is broken and dangerous, and it must end. It is time to scrap Liberal bail.

Yesterday I spoke with Estevan's chief of police, Jamie Blunden. Chief Blunden is not only responsible for law enforcement in the city, but he also sits on the national police service of Canada and the national advisory committee, where he works directly with police leaders from across the country.

Chief Blunden told me something very important. He said that police chiefs from coast to coast to coast are united in supporting this bill. They know better than anyone what it looks like on the ground when repeat offenders are automatically released. They see the victims. They see the businesses broken into time and time again. They see the toll it takes on officers who arrest the same individuals over and over, with no real consequence.

When the people we trust to keep us safe are speaking with one voice, we must listen. Police chiefs are saying loud and clear to scrap Liberal bail and restore public safety.

We can talk about statistics. Violent crime up 39% since the Liberals took office. Gang-related homicides have doubled, and car thefts are at record highs. Behind every number is a victim. This is not compassion. This is not fairness. This is failure. It is the failure of Liberal bail. If we are to restore safety and dignity to victims, then we must scrap Liberal bail once and for all.

Conservatives believe in a simple principle: If someone repeatedly breaks the law and endangers the public, they should not be granted the privilege of bail. Public safety must come first.

Bill C-242, the jail not bail act, is rooted in that principle. This legislation would ensure that repeat offenders are kept behind bars until trial, end the automatic release of criminals who have proven time and time again that they have no respect for the law, and put the rights of victims and communities ahead of the rights of repeat offenders. This bill is not about vengeance. It is about safety, deterrence and restoring faith in our justice system. It is about replacing a failed policy with a common-sense one. It is about making a clear choice to scrap Liberal bail and replace it with Conservative common sense.

● (1745)

Sometimes people think that crime is a big-city problem, something happening only in Toronto, Vancouver or Montreal, but that is not true anymore. It is also in communities like Estevan, Weyburn and Moosomin. Residents are telling me the same thing: Crime is growing, repeat offenders are emboldened and people feel unsafe in their own neighbourhood. When rural Canadians who have taken pride in their safety in their close-knit towns start telling their MPs they are afraid to leave their own house after dark, that should be a warning sign for the rest of the country. This is not just about big cities; it is about every community, every neighbourhood and every Canadian.

That is why it is time to scrap Liberal bail. Victims' rights must come first. It is worth reminding ourselves that our justice system is not meant to protect only the rights of the accused; it must also protect the rights of victims. Victims deserve to feel that justice is being done. Communities deserve to feel that the system is working to keep them safe.

Right now, under the Liberal catch-and-release system, victims are left feeling abandoned, and communities are left feeling vulnerable. Conservatives believe that this is the time to put the rights of victims and the safety of communities back at the centre of our justice system. To do that, we need to end the failed experiment of catch-and-release. We need to scrap Liberal bail.

Public safety is the first duty of government. The very first duty of any government is to keep its citizens safe. Everything else, our prosperity, our freedoms and our sense of community, depends on that foundation. The Liberals have neglected that duty. They have chosen ideology over common sense. They have chosen to prioritize repeat offenders over the safety of ordinary Canadians, and Canadians are paying the price.

However, Conservatives are offering a different path: a path where dangerous repeat offenders are held accountable; a path where police officers are supported, not undermined; and a path where business owners, parents and seniors can feel safe again in their communities. That path starts when we scrap Liberal bail.

It is important to remember that bail was never meant to be automatic. The original intent of bail was to balance two things: the presumption of innocence and the protection of society. When someone posed a clear risk to the community, bail was never supposed to be granted.

What the Liberals have done is strip away that balance. They have tilted the system so heavily in favour of offenders that the protection of society has been forgotten. That is why Canadians are seeing violent repeat offenders back on the street time and time again. That is why victims are losing faith. That is why police are calling for change. To restore the balance, we must return to common sense, and that means it is time to scrap Liberal bail.

I return to the words of my constituent, the small business owner who told me she is afraid to walk outside at night. That fear should never be normal in Canada. I also return to the words of Chief Jamie Blunden, who told me that police chiefs across the country support the bill. When citizens and law enforcement are both calling for the same thing, the House has a duty to act.

The Liberals have chosen leniency and ideology, and this has left Canadians vulnerable. Conservatives choose accountability, common sense and public safety. The choice before us is clear: protect Canadians or protect criminals. Conservatives are choosing Canadians. Conservatives are choosing public safety. Conservatives are choosing to scrap Liberal bail.

I urge all members of the House to support Bill C-242, the jail not bail act. Canadians deserve to feel safe again in their home, their street and their community.

● (1750)

Doug Eyolfson (Winnipeg West, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would be the first to agree that many of the examples are of very horrendous things.

I practise medicine, and one of the things we have learned in medicine, but this goes for all fields, is that when we describe individual occurrences and anecdotes, we know that the plural of “anecdote” does not equal data. According to Statistics Canada, the crime rate, the crime severity index, the police-reported crime per 100,000, the youth crime rate and the homicide rate in Canada are all decreasing.

How is our system not working, when indicators across Canada are showing things are improving?

Steven Bonk: Madam Speaker, for example, I can relate the story I told in my speech, where one person was arrested 180 times in one community yet was continually released on bail. That means that we have a very small number of criminals in Canada, but they are very productive.

If someone repeats serious crimes over and over again, they should not be allowed out on bail.

Business of Supply

[Translation]

Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Speaker, as I was saying earlier, the Conservatives are entitled to focus attention on Bill C-242, which will likely be studied soon enough since it sits 10th in line in the draw for private members' bills.

Ever since the debate started, members have been urged to set partisan politics aside. At the same time, the Conservatives moved a motion that we will inevitably have to vote against because it is asking us to fast-track a bill that requires debate. The problem is, fast-tracking is designed to limit debate.

In my opinion, bills can be better improved when we follow the usual process. This bill is not 267th in line. It is 10th in line. Today, the Conservatives are putting Bill C-242 in the spotlight. If we study it in due course, we will probably be able to work together across party lines.

● (1755)

[English]

Steven Bonk: Madam Speaker, I am really surprised that keeping Canadians safe, keeping repeat offenders away from our communities so that people can feel safe in their own homes and businesses can feel safe operating without the fear of criminal activity, is such a partisan issue in the House. I thought everyone here would want to try to help Canadians. I really do not understand why it is such an issue for everyone else to support the bill.

[Translation]

Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrahk, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague on his speech, but also on his election. I also want to take this opportunity to commend his predecessor, Dr. Robert Kitchen.

[English]

My question to my colleague is very simple but very accurate, when we see what is going on in the country.

How would the member explain to the people why, during the Harper years, criminality was down, but after 10 years of Liberal government and administration, we have seen a rise in each and every department of criminality in the country?

Steven Bonk: Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for his kind words.

It was interesting. There was a bit of a paradox. Under the Harper government, crime went down by 25%. Everyone thought that we would have to build more jails to house all of the criminals, yet the amount of criminality went down. There is something to be said for deterrence and stronger measures. We have to make sure that we have the victims at the centre of our justice system, not the criminals.

Business of Supply

Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague from Souris—Moose Mountain for his kind words. I immediately felt the weight of the world on my shoulders when he said that he was looking forward to my speech.

I am going to be very plain and blunt for a change—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): I must interrupt. The hon. member's phone is too close to the mic.

The hon. member for Cariboo—Prince George.

Todd Doherty: Madam Speaker, I guess I ruined my own video. We will just edit that out.

We are here today to talk about something that is near and dear to my heart in our communities. The hon. member for Winnipeg North mentioned me in his speech a little earlier. He said could not believe the member for Cariboo—Prince George used these words and exaggerated the state of what is going on with the crime rate in my riding of Cariboo—Prince George. As a matter of fact, we have had a community declare a state of emergency because of five or six prolific offenders who commit over 90% of the crime. I did say that. I also said that our communities are like war zones because of the Liberals' failed drug policies.

I ask the 12 people who are watching this debate online or through CPAC today, do our communities look the same as they did 10 years ago? They do not. We can walk just 500 yards from this building, and there are people passed out or sleeping on the streets; we do not know whether they are alive. We have become completely desensitized to the fact that we have an opioid crisis and have had tens of thousands of Canadians lose their lives since 2016. It is because of the Liberals' failed policies. It is unbelievable.

We have the Liberals from urban centres who stand up and say that Canadians have never had it so good. We have the member for Winnipeg North asking how I dare use these statistics from my community.

As a matter of fact, we had another fire in Prince George just on the weekend. I received a text message from a constituent saying that they are fed up and that if politicians are not going to do something, it is time for citizens to take the matter into their own hands.

Premiers, mayors, attorneys general and police associations from across our country are calling for bail reform, yet the Liberals on the other side stand up and say that it is just the Conservatives wanting to fundraise off this. When my colleagues stand and cite horrific events that took place because of the Liberals' failed crime policies, in which violent offenders were released only to reoffend, likely on the very same day, the Liberals say we are sensationalizing it. It is unbelievable; it really is.

I like to bring everything back to home, so I am going to talk about my riding of Cariboo—Prince George a little more. I am going to bring Mr. Hubbard's name into the House once again. Bob Hubbard, a senior in my riding, returned home last fall only to find his house being ransacked and robbed. Mr. Hubbard tried to stop the perpetrators of this crime, but they stole his car and ran him over. They dragged him down the driveway and left him for dead.

Those criminals were picked up within hours, and they were released within hours. They left a man for dead, and they were released within hours.

● (1800)

We have had a number of fires in our town of Prince George, all done by criminals. A headline reads, “‘Under siege’: Owners of Prince George brewery lost to arson urge [government] to act on street disorder”. The perpetrator of this fire, I happen to know. I grew up with him. He is a repeat offender with a long rap sheet: 19 court appearances since 2021, and 27 criminal charges since 2006, including assaults, death threats, breach of probation and even a sexual assault. He is committing these heinous crimes in our community. He destroyed a long-standing brewery in our community, and the owners, Daryl Leiski and Cindy Zurowski, had this to say:

That one act destroyed our business, displaced 50 employees, and disrupted the lives of hundreds more – families, partners, community members, and neighbours.... We are under siege....

We built it downtown because we believed in this city....

And it was lost in a reckless, deliberate act of arson.

They continued:

Give us back our streets. Give us back our sense of safety. Without it, businesses like ours cannot survive, let alone rebuild.

The member for Winnipeg North is likely going to stand up and again, in his loud voice, complain about me reading these events into the record. He is going to say that I am sensationalizing.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: You are.

Todd Doherty: Madam Speaker, he is heckling me right now, and he is laughing. He is laughing at the suffering of those in my riding. It is gross, yet he continues to do this time and time again. I can just say, shame on him.

Madam Speaker, 53,000 Canadians have lost their lives in the overdose crisis since 2016. I will mention Brianna MacDonald, a 13-year-old who, last year, lost her life in a homeless encampment. She turned 13 on July 15, my son's birthday, and she was found deceased on my daughter's birthday, August 23. I will also mention Tyler Dunlap, 17 years of age. He was in the hospital the night before, getting his stomach pumped from an overdose. His parents, like Brianna's, pleaded with the doctors and the system to get their child help, to keep him in the hospital.

I am not sensationalizing this. These are real families who have lost loved ones because of the Liberals' failed drug policies. That is shameful. It is maddening.

What about the first responders? Every day, they have to respond to another overdose and bring somebody back from death only to have that person back on the street and overdosing later the same day.

What about my brother? He has been on the street gripped in addiction forever, a criminal, an addict. He is not a toss-away, nor are any of the Canadians who are living on the streets and who are just trying to exist, trying to get their next fix.

The reality is that Bill C-75 codified the principles of release to the point where there were three grounds to deny bail. Primary grounds are ensuring that the accused appears in court. The reality is that people with extensive previous counts of failing to appear are not being detained. There are good points in Bill C-75, but time and time again we are seeing that the most violent offenders are released, only to reoffend, cause death, assault.

No one stands for the victims. The criminals have more rights than the victims. Where are the voices for the victims? That is what our Conservative team is doing today, standing up for the rights of the victims of crimes, and we will continue to do that.

• (1805)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, first of all, no one laughs at or mocks, in any way, inside this chamber, individual victims or the individuals the member mentioned.

However, I do call into question statements that this particular member has made. For example, when he says our communities are like war zones, I believe most Canadians would disagree. That is extreme. When we have the MP for Oxford saying, “We are now living in a war zone in Canada”, I disagree. The member himself said a community had “a state of emergency [declared] because of five or six prolific offenders”. I would challenge the member on that particular issue.

I believe the Conservatives ratchet up this issue to justify a motivation that puts their party ahead of Canadians. When are they going to start putting Canadians and Canadian interests ahead of their own political interests?

Todd Doherty: Madam Speaker, as a matter of fact, when the town of Williams Lake, the mayor and council, wanted to declare a state of emergency it was actually over one prolific offender. When four to five or five to six prolific offenders are in jail, the crime rate goes down. When they are out of jail, the crime rate goes up. That is the reality.

The member does not want to believe it. He does not want to agree to it. That is his job, to be a good soldier, a lap dog, to just stand there and say all the talking points of the government. I say shame on him. He has made a good career of it, but shame on him. I quoted the owners of CrossRoads Brewing, who said they were under siege. Those were not my words but those of my constituents. If he does not believe it, he can be woefully blind and go merrily along his way, but it is just wrong. That is ignorance.

• (1810)

[Translation]

Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lis-tuguj, BQ): Madam Speaker, the issues raised by my colleague and the proposal his party is putting forward today touch on fundamental rights enshrined in the charter: the right to be presumed innocent until proven guilty by an impartial court, and the right to liberty. In this context, since we are dealing with fundamental guarantees that define our rule of law, it is important to remember that, even if we seek to crack down on crime, we do not want to become a police state where people are imprisoned without sufficient evidence.

Business of Supply

Why is my colleague so eager to fast-track this bill?

[English]

Todd Doherty: Madam Speaker, total violent crime in our country is up 54% to 55%. Homicides are up 30%. Sexual assaults are up 75% to 76%. Total firearms crime is up 130%. Extortion overall for our country is up 330%. In my home province of British Columbia, it is up 481%. Overdose in my province is the leading cause of death for youth and young adults aged 10 to 18. That is under the Liberal government. That is its record. That is its legacy. It is disgusting.

Ellis Ross (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, CPC): Madam Speaker, I have been listening to this debate for the last few days now. I hear the other side of the House talk about this when Conservatives talk about the rapes of children and toddlers, the murders and assaults, and women not wanting to walk the streets at night, including members of the Liberal government. The response is always the same. They say we are always sensationalizing or dramatizing the incidents. I guarantee members that if the parents of that toddler came in right now, they would not think of it as sensationalism; they are left with trauma.

When did all of this start? I was an MLA for seven years and we were complaining about it back in the B.C. legislature.

Todd Doherty: Madam Speaker, I have a tremendous amount of respect for my hon. colleague.

I will finish the way I started, with a simple question: Do our communities and our country look the same as it did in 2015 when the government took power? The answer is no.

Blake Richards (Airdrie—Cochrane, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is an honour to wrap up the debate today, and I think what I would like to do with the little time I have is point out that there have been a number of examples given today of victims of crime in this country, and to say that I really hope that members of the Liberal government were listening to all those examples, because the lives of the people in them, whether they were people who were murdered, children who were sexually assaulted or people whose homes had been invaded, will be changed forever. In some cases, people have lost family members. That has all happened because of the bail policy of the Liberal government.

What we are talking about is scrapping the Liberal bail policy and putting in place jail not bail, for people who commit crimes over and over again in our communities, make our communities unsafe for people and create more victims. The reality is that, at the end of the day, what we are talking about is keeping people safe from crime and making sure that there are no more victims. I cannot imagine how anyone could possibly have sat here today, listened to the debate and heard all the examples that were given of people who have lost their life, of children who have been sexually assaulted, and of home invasions.

Adjournment Proceedings

All these things happened because of the Liberals' policy of allowing bail for serious criminals over and over again. The crime stats have been cited many times today. When we look behind those stats, it is people who have been victimized, and they have been victimized by the same offenders who continue to reoffend over and over again, only because of the policies of the government that allow them back out on the street with what is called a revolving door justice system.

There is not even much justice in the system at all, and that is shameful. It is something the government could do something about today. It could support us on this particular piece of legislation that we are talking about, but—

• (1815)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): It being 6:15, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the business of supply.

[*Translation*]

The question is on the motion.

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

[*English*]

Rachael Thomas: Madam Speaker, we seek a recorded division for the motion.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): Pursuant to Standing Order 45, the division stands deferred until Monday, October 6, at the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions.

* * *

[*Translation*]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed the following bill, to which the concurrence of the House is desired: Bill S-228, an act to amend the Criminal Code (sterilization procedures).

[*English*]

I also have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing the House that the Senate has passed the following bill to which the concurrence of the House is desired: Bill S-1001, an act to authorize Gore Mutual Insurance Company to apply to be continued as a body corporate under the laws of the Province of Quebec.

The bill is deemed to have been read the first time and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I suspect if you were to canvass the House you would find unanimous consent to call it 6:30 p.m. so we could get on to the late show.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

[*English*]

PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, welcome to Adjournment Proceedings, where I will be taking up a question I asked on June 4 of this year. As members will recall, Parliament had only recently resumed. I had intended to ask a different question, but someone had called my office and caught my wonderful chief of staff on the phone. As the caller was explaining that she was living with disabilities and could not figure out how she was going to feed her children, she started to cry on the phone.

When the minister responded to me, she made the assumption that this was a constituent of mine, but I do not know where Tina lives. She called our office and changed my question that day because I just had to know.

We had been working so hard in this place and in the previous Parliament. My friend, the former member for Kitchener Centre, Mike Morrice, had worked incredibly hard with other advocates for people with disabilities from all sides of the House. We worked to try to get a commitment and the legislation through to ensure that we would have a Canada disability benefit. We knew that it was about to start being mailed out at that point, in July.

There was sadness at the tragedy of it all because we had been promised by ministers in the previous government that when we got the bill through it would lift Canadians with disabilities up out of poverty. However, hearing Tina, living with disabilities, crying on the phone because she could not figure out how to feed her children, I knew that the cheques that were going to start going out in the month of July would max out at \$200 a month. That was not going to lift people up out of poverty.

Therefore, my question that day was this: Now that the Prime Minister was raising the urgency of having nation-building projects, could the government, please, not make lifting all Canadians with disabilities out of poverty a nation-building project?

The answer I received was not from a minister responsible for disabilities, and the minister who responded, actually the Minister of Jobs, misnamed the program that I was talking about. It is the Canada disability benefit, not credit. However, the response was not adequate. That is why we sometimes send in slips and say we would like to discuss this in the Adjournment Proceedings. Yes, as the minister said, it is important to work with provinces and territories to ensure that money will not be clawed back, but there needs to be much more done by the federal government.

For example, we need to increase the benefit amount. That is pretty basic. We need to broaden eligibility so people can automatically get their Canada disability benefit if they are already receiving other disability-related benefits. It should be individual income, not household income, that determines when the Canada disability benefit is sent. It is not the income of the people they live with; it is for them. We need to raise the income threshold and the working income exemption. We need to do these things to ensure that the Canada disability benefit lifts people with disabilities out of poverty. We should make sure there are no clawbacks and no reductions.

I am still proud of the work that we did, and I want to again mention Mike Morrice. More than half of the amendments accepted to the bill were his amendments, including the one to ensure that this benefit be indexed to inflation. However, if they index \$200 to inflation, they are not going very far.

I will wrap up here and hope for a better answer tonight and a real sign of commitment.

● (1820)

Wade Grant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I thank my friend opposite for her advocacy for Canadians with disabilities. I am sure we all share her concern. Every barrier, be it physical or attitudinal, is a barrier to the well-being of persons with disabilities, especially to their mental and financial well-being. Allow me to bring colleagues up to date.

The application portal for the Canada disability benefit opened on June 20, and payments were distributed in July. Low-income persons who were eligible for the disability tax credit, between the ages of 18 and 64, could apply either online, by phone or in person at a Service Canada office.

This new monthly benefit provides a maximum of \$2,400 in financial support per year, per person, and is expected to improve the financial security of more than 450,000 working-age Canadians with disabilities in 2025-26. To date, over 186,000 people are already receiving the benefit.

People who have filed their 2024 tax return and who are potentially eligible for the benefit received an official letter from the Government of Canada inviting them to apply. The government has also funded community-based navigator services across the country to help individuals who need assistance applying for the Canada disability benefit, the DTC and other provincial and territorial benefits.

The federal government has engaged extensively with provinces and territories, and called on them to exempt CDB payments from counting as income in relation to their income support programs. It continues to engage with provinces and territories with a view to maximizing the benefits of the CDB to eligible persons with disabilities.

Budget 2024 committed \$6.1 billion over six years and \$1.4 billion ongoing for the Canada disability benefit. I should remind the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands that, in the spirit of “nothing without us”, the Government of Canada developed the benefit in consultation with more than 8,000 Canadians, including persons

Adjournment Proceedings

with disabilities, disability stakeholders, indigenous governments and organizations, and provincial and territorial governments.

This benefit will make a difference because we know that persons with disabilities are more likely to live in poverty than their working-age peers without disabilities. This is due to economical and social exclusion, barriers to employment and other factors. Disability is expensive. People who live with a disability or support someone who has a disability know this all too well. Disability should not equal poverty, and that is why we have created the Canada disability benefit.

● (1825)

Elizabeth May: Madam Speaker, I am desperately trying to find out what happened to the position of minister for disabilities. It was Carla Qualtrough, who no longer serves in this place. She was, herself, a woman with disabilities and quite inspiring. It was then Kamal Khara, who did not win her seat in Brampton.

Can the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment explain how he is here tonight to defend the government's position on people with disabilities?

We know, those of us who served in the last Parliament, how we worked together to get the Canada disability benefit legislation passed. We know the cheques started going out in July. My point is those cheques are utterly inadequate to meet the needs of Canadians with disabilities.

Wade Grant: Madam Speaker, I want to start by commending the member opposite for the compassion she has for all constituents. I have seen it first-hand, being across the Salish Sea from her for many years, and I thank her for the question.

Persons with disabilities have the right to be fully included in their communities. They have the same right as all Canadians, the right to live a decent life. It is why we spent more than three years, with the help of the disability community, bringing the Canada disability benefit to fruition.

We are also working with provinces and territories to make sure that money Canadians receive from the Canada disability benefit will not be clawed back through other benefits they receive. Our goal is that people's financial security improves because of this benefit.

Financial support is being delivered to working-age, low-income persons with disabilities, and by investing in persons with disabilities, the government is working to make Canada a financially strong, inclusive and viable country.

Adjournment Proceedings

NATURAL RESOURCES

Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to take up the question I had during question period a little while ago. It was about the hard-working men and women at Evraz steel, the steel plant in Regina, Saskatchewan, and the fact that they have continually had to lay off more and more workers because there is just not as much work as there used to be back in the good old days, one might say. We have had years of policies put forward by the Liberal government, such as Bill C-48, the shipping ban; Bill C-69, the “no more pipelines” law; and the emissions cap, which has been shown to really affect the resource industry in our country. My colleague for Calgary Midnapore said it very well: We have seen a thousand people getting laid off in Calgary recently. We have seen mills being closed in B.C. because of the tariffs on softwood lumber.

I know there are five projects from the Major Projects Office that have been announced. The question I focused on was this: If these get built, first and foremost, they should be built with Canadian steel, Canadian product and Canadian labour. This is one of the questions I would like to follow up on.

The other one is this: Five projects were announced, but there are still 38 major projects at the impact assessment phase. Over the last few years, according to my numbers, 86,000 jobs and \$54 billion have fled the country in investment in our energy sector. TransCanada, for example, is building pipelines, just not in Canada; they are in the United States.

I would like a couple of answers to the questions I laid out. They are fair, and they are non-partisan. I think there is something we need to work on to grow our energy and our resource industry as a major economic driver. Along with that would be our agriculture industry as well. We have seen fertilizer reduction targets. We have seen industrial carbon tax. We have seen carbon tax 2.0 being added to farming. This has increased farmers' cost of doing business, and we have then seen the price of food go up also.

I would love an answer from my colleague from across the way, and I will follow up in a minute.

• (1830)

Corey Hogan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Madam Speaker, yes, we will be looking to use more Canadian steel and more Canadian materials in general as the Minister of Industry has said. Yes, the government will support pipelines that are in the national interest and meet environmental and social standards, as well as those that meet the bedrock requirement for meaningful indigenous engagement. In fact, Ksi Lisims LNG, recently approved, will see Canadian natural gas produced and liquefied at the highest environmental standards, and this will travel by pipeline to access new markets.

I want to take this opportunity to talk about business more broadly, and the One Canadian Economy Act. I think it is pertinent to the overall thrust of the query. With the support of members opposite, our government has created a clear pathway for projects of national interest. Practical changes mean approvals are faster and simpler, and proponents are provided more certainty while standards are upheld. The member opposite may not know this, but I have done work for many energy companies and worked on many major

pipeline projects in my career, such as northern gateway, energy east and TMX, to name the most notable. If we are moving oil and gas, pipelines are the safest, most economical and most environmentally friendly way to do so, and they require a lot of steel.

The energy industry will be healthy if we continue to develop our resources to high environmental and social standards, as our trading partners increasingly demand and as Canadians expect. Courts have also demanded, and rightly so, that we meet our moral and treaty obligations to first nations, and the Prime Minister has been clear that this will be an expectation for all major projects. I want to caution, though, that a blanket “yes all pipelines, all the time, without a thought to the specifics” approach is not what Canadians call for or what the courts will allow, and that would not serve Canada's energy sector or Canadian workers, whether in steel or in other sectors. Projects must be reviewed on their merits: economic, social, environmental and legal. A balanced Canadian approach is called for, such as the one laid out in our new One Canadian Economy Act.

Results are already showing; this is the positive. Investment and investor interest are being drawn to Canada. Projects are being advanced all the time. These projects mean jobs. I already mentioned Ksi Lisims LNG, but we also have LNG Canada phase 2 and Cedar LNG as concrete examples. Pathways plus, a strategy with the Major Projects Office, would increase global competitiveness for the oil and gas industry and support market diversification by positioning Canadian energy as the cleanest barrel of oil on the world market.

Talking of ripping up environmental assessments is a move that would only drive investment away and increase risk for Canadian workers. It is not accurate to say that no pipelines were built by the last Liberal government, as was in the original query. The most economically consequential pipeline in decades, TMX, was built, but it is true that pipeline projects have faced challenges. An honest assessment will include that the Harper government fought too much with provinces and courts. They put too little attention into the duty to consult, treating it superficially, as well as too little care into the environment and due process. As a result, not one pipeline to tidewater was built in that time.

Let us calibrate on a balanced Canadian approach. We must respect provinces and indigenous rights holders. We must have clear timelines and certainty, and we must go faster. We must do the things that are now possible under Bill C-5 and the new Liberal government. Our new approach means workers in Regina producing the steel, indigenous communities partnering as owners and Canadian innovators providing to the world the innovations we will compete and win on. I think that is something we can all support.

Warren Steinley: Madam Speaker, there is a lot to unpack there.

First of all, the Harper government built four pipelines. The only difference was that it used private money. The Liberals used \$38 billion of taxpayers' money. Second, the member said that their one economy is already showing results, but 1,000 people were laid off in Calgary. That is probably not the result he wants. I would say the results have definitely been found lacking.

Seeing as he brought up the economy, there is a question I often want answered. The Prime Minister promised that by July 1, he would knock down interprovincial trade barriers to make trade easier within Canada. Can the member give me a couple examples of interprovincial trade barriers that have been knocked down by the government?

Corey Hogan: Madam Speaker, I will have to leave to my colleagues in industry and internal trade the specifics of the hon. member's question, but I note that my comments were about getting pipelines to tidewater and pipelines to new markets. Certainly, there were no pipelines of that nature made during that time.

There are many examples, though, of how innovation and investment are coming back to Canada as a result. Just this morning, at the natural resources committee, we heard from witnesses who talked about global capital being very enthusiastic about Bill C-5, major projects and the ability to pull things back.

I want to wrap up by saying that this helps secure our economic sovereignty and helps build the future right here at home, as the Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions and the Minister of Industry have said. To that end, when the time comes to consider major new projects, whether pipelines, housing or infrastructure, our government will champion Canadian workers, Canadian innovation and the responsible use of—

• (1835)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Courtenay—Alberni.

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am here tonight to urge the federal government to make the establishment of a sovereign aerial firefighting capacity fleet a core nation-building investment in the upcoming federal budget.

Wildfires across Canada are increasing in both intensity and cost, demanding bold and timely action. We saw fires rage across Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland this last summer. This past fire season may not have been a record season for British Columbia, but it was certainly a record in terms of the extraordinary amount of equipment loaned from British Columbia to other provinces to help them.

Adjournment Proceedings

I want to congratulate and thank the Province of British Columbia and Minister Ravi Parmar, the Minister of Forests, for prioritizing homes and people's lives in other provinces to ensure that their lives were protected and for ensuring that B.C. loaned the equipment in a timely way. That reality underlines the urgency.

Without a national air tanker fleet, provinces are left to shoulder the cost of aviation resources, with no guarantee that they will be available when and where they are needed most. Combatting wildfires in the climate crisis era requires a wartime level of effort. Other nations have demonstrated that repurposing retired military aircraft into civilian firefighting roles provides exactly the kind of rapid-response capability and national resilience that Canada currently lacks.

Canada has a rare opportunity to follow this proven model. By converting our retired CC-130H Hercules fleet into modern air tankers, we can protect communities, safeguard critical infrastructure and reduce the catastrophic carbon emissions released during mega fires. This approach would also ensure that retired military assets continue to serve Canadians in peacetime through life-saving civilian use.

Partnering with the private sector and first nations to retrofit a portion of the retired CC-130H Hercules fleet would create a permanent national capacity to fight wildfires. A Port Alberni-based company in my riding, Coulson Aviation, has already demonstrated global expertise in converting CC-130 aircraft and operating them as large air tankers, successfully partnering with governments in Australia, the United States and beyond.

I am therefore calling on the federal government to partner with the private sector, in collaboration with first nations partners, to retrofit a portion of Canada's retired CC-130H Hercules aircraft into large air tankers for wildfire suppression; to deploy these aircraft as part of a strengthened national wildfire response capacity, shared with provinces and territories, using them, where appropriate, for international humanitarian and emergency missions; and to prioritize this made-in-Canada solution that leverages Canadian aviation expertise, protects lives and communities and safeguards the environment. In addition to strengthening our wildfire response, these investments would create high-skilled jobs in Canada's aviation sector, support innovation in emergency response technology and enhance Canada's ability to contribute to our NATO commitments and provide mutual aid abroad in times of crisis.

Adjournment Proceedings

I am strongly encouraging the minister and the government to ensure that funding for sovereign aerial firefighting capacity is included in the next federal budget. We cannot wait. Such an investment would save lives, strengthen our communities and build long-term resilience for Canada in the face of the climate crisis.

Wade Grant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my hon. colleague for the opportunity to discuss our government's response to wildfires across the country. We know that natural disasters are increasing in frequency and severity, and all levels of government must work together to protect Canadians and our communities.

The 2025 wildfire season has been the second-most severe on record in our country, surpassed only by the unprecedented 2023 season. Our thoughts are with those who have been affected by the fires. I also want to express my deep appreciation and gratitude to the first responders, who work tirelessly to keep Canadians safe.

Throughout the summer, our government met with first responders, local officials, indigenous communities and the Canadian Armed Forces to hear directly about their first-hand experiences in combatting wildfires. Everyone involved in wildfire response demonstrates exceptional dedication to their critical work. As a government, we are committed to making sure that communities, provinces and territories have the people, resources and tools they need to prevent, mitigate, prepare for, respond to and recover from wildfires.

We take the concerns raised about Canada's wildfire fighting capabilities very seriously. This is a matter of the utmost importance to the minister and the government. We are committed to exploring all options for keeping Canadians safe from the increasing threat of wildfires, and we are taking a whole-of-government approach to determine how best to bolster Canada's wildfire response capabilities.

It is imperative that we have the tools we need to defend our communities from future wildfire seasons. Canadians and their communities deserve to be protected from these emergencies, and we understand the importance of being a good partner on the international stage and meeting our NATO commitments. We are exploring links between these two priorities.

Regarding aerial firefighting capabilities, I am proud to be able to say that Canada is a leader in the aerospace industry, with end-to-end capabilities, being one of the few countries that can design, manufacture and maintain an aircraft from nose to tail. I would also remind the House that as a result of Canada's world-class aerospace industry, the De Havilland water bombers are in high demand, and delivery may be a few years away.

We need to be mindful that long-term resilience goes hand in hand with short-term readiness. However, Canadian industry also has strong abilities in retrofitting existing aircraft to serve firefighting purposes, and they continue to be valuable tools to fight wildfires across this country.

Our government contributes to the Canadian Interagency Forest Fire Centre, whose valuable work ensures that firefighting resources from the federal government, provinces and territories, and

international partners are where they need to be, when they need to be there, to protect communities.

Throughout the wildfire season, the minister keeps in close contact with her provincial and territorial counterparts. The open lines of communication are critical, as wildfire situations can evolve quickly. We collaborate with local officials, provinces and territories, indigenous communities, non-governmental organizations and international partners to mobilize resources, fight fires, evacuate communities and rebuild after the fact.

• (1840)

Gord Johns: Madam Speaker, investing in the aerial firefighting fleet far outweighs the cost to do that, and what we are facing now, which is a massive loss in biodiversity and cost to infrastructure and private property, driving up our home and business insurance. There is the impact on the forest sector and industry, as well as the release of emissions. Canada is the worst in the world right now in release of emissions due to wildfires. The impact on people's lives, homes and human health is unprecedented. Of course, there is also the impact on indigenous peoples. This is an act of reconciliation.

When it comes to nation building, we are calling on the government to treat the issue with the wartime effort that is required. I hope we will see that in the upcoming federal budget.

Wade Grant: Madam Speaker, I am well aware of the threat that continued wildfires pose to communities right across this country; they threaten infrastructure, health, the economy and the environment all across this country.

Keeping Canadians safe is of the utmost importance to our government. We are carefully considering all options as we re-evaluate how the federal government can best support emergency situations.

The 2025 wildfire season may be winding down, but our government understands the importance of being prepared for the wildfires that future seasons will bring. We will continue to work across the government and with our provincial, territorial and indigenous partners; non-governmental organizations; first responders; industry; and other stakeholders to deliver real, effective solutions to the ongoing problems caused by wildfires.

We will always be ready to respond to climate emergencies, while meeting our international commitments. This of course includes the renewed NATO defence investment pledge. We are building a Canada that is strong, resilient and equipped to face all natural disasters.

Adjournment Proceedings

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): 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 6:44 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Thursday, October 2, 2025

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS		Larouche	2263
International Trade		Lawton	2263
Sidhu (Brampton East)	2259	Brock	2264
Foreign Affairs		Sahota	2265
Koutrakis	2259	Champoux	2265
Petitions		Zimmer	2265
Fur Farming		Johns	2266
Johns	2259	Sahota	2266
Medical Assistance in Dying		Shipley	2268
Vis	2259	Larouche	2268
Charitable Organizations		McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)	2269
Vis	2259	Caputo	2269
Animal Welfare		Champoux	2269
May	2259	Fortier	2270
Malnutrition		Deschênes	2270
Gerretsen	2260	Brunelle-Duceppe	2271
National Unity		Lattanzio	2271
Gerretsen	2260	Vis	2272
Charitable Organizations		Champoux	2272
Zimmer	2260	Fortin	2272
Lawton	2260	Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)	2273
Melillo	2260	Larouche	2274
Brassard	2260	Vien	2274
Reynolds	2260	Paul-Hus	2274
Taxation		Brunelle-Duceppe	2275
Lamoureux	2261	Vien	2276
Charitable Organizations		Lamoureux	2276
McKenzie	2261	Jansen	2276
Bonk	2261	Sahota	2277
Medical Assistance in Dying		Larouche	2278
Genuis	2261	Wagantall	2278
Freedom of Political Expression		Lattanzio	2278
Genuis	2261	Desrochers	2280
Falun Gong		Wagantall	2280
Genuis	2261	Champoux	2280
Questions on the Order Paper		Bonk	2280
Lamoureux	2261	Desrochers	2281
GOVERNMENT ORDERS		Steinley	2282
Business of Supply		Brunelle-Duceppe	2282
Opposition Motion—Passage of Bill C-242		Clark	2282
Khanna	2261	Richards	2283
Motion	2261	Poilievre	2283
Lamoureux	2263	Sahota	2284
		Gill (Windsor West)	2285
		Lamoureux	2285
		Davies (Niagara South)	2285
		Lamoureux	2287
		Brunelle-Duceppe	2287
		Steinley	2287
		Sousa	2287
		Kirkland	2289
		Lamoureux	2289
		Larouche	2289

DeRidder	2289
McKenzie	2290
Lamoureux	2290
Larouche	2291
Cody	2291
Gill (Brampton West)	2291
Chang	2292
Cody	2292
Lamoureux	2293
Brock	2293
Ho	2293

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Government Priorities	
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	2295
FIFA World Cup	
Nguyen	2295
Two World-Champion Female Quebec Athletes	
Lefebvre	2295
Canadian Youth Chess Champion	
O'Rourke	2295
Faith	
Lawrence	2295
Award-Winning Short Film	
Nathan	2296
Opioids	
Kram	2296
Fall Fairs	
Louis	2296
Alfie MacLeod	
d'Entremont	2296
Magdeleine Vallières-Mill	
Lemire	2296
Science and Technology	
Kayabaga	2297
Christians in Nigeria	
Scheer	2297
Jane Goodall	
Duguid	2297
Public Safety	
Lloyd	2297
Urbainculteurs	
Lavoie	2298
Public Safety	
Gill (Windsor West)	2298
Latin American Heritage Month	
Dzerowicz	2298

ORAL QUESTIONS

Justice	
Poilievre	2298
Carney	2298
Poilievre	2298
Carney	2299
Poilievre	2299
Carney	2299
Poilievre	2299
Carney	2299
Poilievre	2299
Carney	2299
Poilievre	2299
Carney	2299
Canada Post Corporation	
Normandin	2299
Carney	2300
Normandin	2300
Carney	2300
Gaudreau	2300
Carney	2300
Justice	
Khanna	2300
Sahota	2300
Khanna	2300
Sahota	2300
Brock	2300
Anandasangaree	2300
Brock	2301
Anandasangaree	2301
Lloyd	2301
MacKinnon	2301
Paul-Hus	2301
MacKinnon	2301
Paul-Hus	2301
MacKinnon	2301
Forestry Industry	
Savard-Tremblay	2302
Joly	2302
Savard-Tremblay	2302
Joly	2302
Justice	
Guglielmin	2302
Lattanzio	2302
Guglielmin	2302
Lattanzio	2302
Davies (Niagara South)	2303
Sahota	2303
Reynolds	2303
Anandasangaree	2303
Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)	2303
Lattanzio	2303
Dental Care	
Auguste	2303

Michel	2303	Ho	2308
Justice		Wagantall	2309
Vien	2304	Larouche	2309
Lattanzio	2304	Lamoureux	2309
Vien	2304	Viersen	2309
Lattanzio	2304	Lamoureux	2309
Vien	2304	DeRidder	2312
Lattanzio	2304	Bonin	2312
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship		Danko	2312
Rempel Garner	2304	Caputo	2312
Diab	2304	Larouche	2313
Rempel Garner	2304	Deschênes-Thériault	2313
Anandasangaree	2305	Au	2313
Employment		Lamoureux	2314
Strahl	2305	Deschênes	2315
Hajdu	2305	Wagantall	2315
Strahl	2305	Guglielmin	2315
Hajdu	2305	Chenette	2317
Kirkland	2305	Thériault	2317
Joly	2305	Kronis	2317
McKenzie	2305	Lamoureux	2317
Joly	2305	Duclos	2317
Foreign Affairs		Thériault	2318
Acan	2306	Bexte	2319
Anand	2306	Acan	2319
The Economy		Sari	2319
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)	2306	Deschênes	2320
Hajdu	2306	Lamoureux	2320
DeRidder	2306	Duclos	2320
Joly	2306	Bonin	2321
Kronis	2306	DeRidder	2321
Turnbull	2307	Acan	2322
Small Business		Larouche	2322
Mingarelli	2307	Shipley	2322
Valdez	2307	Duclos	2323
The Economy		Watchorn	2323
Bragdon	2307	Van Popta	2324
MacKinnon	2307	Thériault	2324
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship		Duclos	2325
Kwan	2307	Kronis	2325
Diab	2307	Danko	2325
May	2307	Vis	2326
Diab	2307	Acan	2327
Business of the House		Deschênes	2327
Warkentin	2308	Wagantall	2327
MacKinnon	2308	Deschênes-Thériault	2327
		Small	2329
		Thériault	2329
		Lamoureux	2329
		Bonk	2329
		Eyolfson	2331
		Thériault	2331
		Deltell	2331
		Doherty	2332
Business of Supply		Lamoureux	2333
Opposition Motion—Passage of Bill C-242		Deschênes	2333
Motion	2308	Ross	2333

Richards	2333	Grant.....	2335
Division on motion deferred.....	2334	Natural Resources	
Message from the Senate		Steinley	2336
The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès).....	2334	Hogan.....	2336
ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS		Emergency Preparedness	
Persons with Disabilities		Johns.....	2337
May.....	2334	Grant.....	2338

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>