



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 148 • NUMBER 299 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, May 23, 2018

—

Speaker: The Honourable Geoff Regan

CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, May 23, 2018

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayer

• (1405)

[*English*]

The Speaker: It being Wednesday, we will now have the singing of O Canada, led by the hon. member for Red Deer—Lacombe.

[*Members sang the national anthem*]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*Translation*]

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, GPQ): Mr. Speaker, certain parties have taken a sudden interest in defending Quebec's interests lately, but when it is time to actually do something in Parliament, they are nowhere to be found.

Quebec has the strictest environmental laws. That is why we insist that our laws take precedence when Ottawa decides to get involved in our affairs. That is exactly what I proposed in committee yesterday, but all the parties voted against my proposal because, whenever the three federalist parties have to choose between Quebec's interests and Canada's, they always choose Canada and hang Quebec out to dry.

All of the parties voted against measures that would protect Quebec if ever energy east were to resurface. They also voted against measures that would protect British Columbia from being forced to accept Trans Mountain. There is going to be a demonstration in Montreal on Sunday. I invite everyone to join me in sending a message to our elected representatives that it is up to Quebec and the provinces to decide what happens within their borders.

* * *

KURLING FOR KIDS

Mr. Michel Picard (Montarville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, kids are the future.

Kurling for Kids was founded in 1999, through the generosity of Robert Sears, who wanted to give back to the hospital that had saved his daughter's life.

Since then, a number of curling clubs across Quebec have been holding events to raise money to support children's hospitals.

I am very proud to rise in the House today to announce that Curling Mont-Bruno raised \$20,000 at a Kurling for Kids event on April 7.

More than \$400,000 has been raised across Quebec in 2018 and donated to the CHU Sainte-Justine Foundation and the Montreal Children's Hospital Foundation.

I want to take a moment to thank partners across Quebec, including Curling Mont-Bruno, for their dedication to and love for our children.

* * *

[*English*]

YORKTON FILM FESTIVAL

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is my honour to rise in the House today to praise and bring attention in this place to the upcoming Yorkton Film Festival. The Yorkton Film Festival is the longest-running film festival in North America. It was established in 1947. This will be its 71st year of celebrating short films. In 1956, it instituted the Golden Sheaf Awards. Filmmakers originating from the Netherlands, India, Sweden, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, Norway, France, and the United States have all competed for our Canadian prize.

It surprises many that Yorkton, a small city of 16,000-plus people in the heart of Saskatchewan, has managed to continually pull off one of the most prominent film festivals in the world with class and perfection, but it is not a surprise to me. I am honoured to be presenting the Golden Sheaf Telefilm award at the Yorkton Film Festival red carpet dinner this coming Saturday evening.

* * *

STREETSVILLE LIONS CLUB

Mr. Gagan Sikand (Mississauga—Streetsville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give special recognition to an incredible community organization. The Streetsville Lions Club is a community-based group of volunteers chartered by Lions Clubs International. Founded in 1952, the Lions meet the needs of local communities and the world every day, because they share a core belief: to serve their communities.

Statements by Members

The club organizes and assists with implementing a number of events in the Streetsville community. On May 10, the club sponsored a dinner event to show its appreciation for its volunteers. I was disappointed that I could not share in the celebrations. Therefore, please allow me to use my time here in the House to express my gratitude and support for the Streetsville Lions Club and to congratulate and thank the wonderful people who volunteer to make our community better every single day.

* * *

ARMENIA

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 30th anniversary of the Karabakh movement, a monumental event for the global Armenian community. In 1991, the people of Artsakh declared independence from the Soviet Union and their aspiration for a Nagorno-Karabakh republic. The region's residents, primarily ethnically Armenian, then held a referendum in which 82% of all voters participated, and 99% voted for independence. Unfortunately, war then broke out between Azerbaijan and Armenia. Despite a 1994 ceasefire, long-term peace and a durable political solution have been absent. Since 2016, innocent lives have been lost on an almost daily basis.

This House must affirm our commitment to the protection and human rights of civilians and call on all parties to strictly adhere to the terms of the ceasefire. More fundamentally, we call on the Canadian government to work for a just solution to this conflict, one that conforms with international law and is built on the inalienable right of the people of Nagorno-Karabakh to self-determination.

* * *

● (1410)

*[Translation]***ARMENIA**

Ms. Jean Yip (Scarborough—Agincourt, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the first Republic of Armenia was established 100 years ago.

[English]

Its emergence on May 28, 1918, provided hope to thousands of refugees and a home to the Armenian people in the wake of the Armenian genocide. For the first time since 1375, the Armenian people could lay claim to a country of their own.

Only two years after its founding in 1918, Armenia was invaded by the Soviet Union, leaving its people, who had so recently achieved their freedom, once again without their own nation. With the collapse of the Soviet Union in September 1991, Armenia regained its independence and remains free to this day.

This year, during the month of May, Canadians of Armenian background and communities around the world will celebrate this milestone and remember the sacrifices made by the Armenian people.

* * *

CRIMEAN TATARS

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this week I had the honour of speaking at an event hosted with the Munk School of Global Affairs, in Toronto,

highlighting the desperate plight of Crimean Tatars in Russian-occupied Ukraine. This event featured a presentation by Crimean Tatar leader Mr. Mustafa Dzhemilev as well as a number of academics. I would like to salute the courageous advocacy of the Crimean Tatar community, as well as the Ukrainian community and the Ukrainian government, which have stood with it. The Embassy of Ukraine in Canada co-hosted this event.

Ukraine provides a home to people from a range of different cultural backgrounds. The Kremlin, by contrast, imposes its brutal will on all those within its empire.

The ongoing abuse of Crimean Tatars is one of many under-discussed human rights issues highlighting the brokenness of our international system. Powerful autocrats like Putin undertake human rights abuses themselves and defend abuses by smaller client states. There is no effective enforcement of international human rights. If anything, capacity for enforcement is declining.

For the sake of Crimean Tatars, other Ukrainians in occupied areas, and all other victims around the world, we must face up to the brokenness of our international system and do more to fix it.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE CONGRATULATIONS

Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Cape Breton—Canso, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as parliamentarians, we are unanimous in recognizing and respecting the hard work of our committed staff members, regardless of party affiliation. Long hours, tough files, complex issues being dealt with in an intense and public forum is a typical day at the office for a Hill staffer.

I rise today to recognize a friend and colleague, who first arrived on Parliament Hill twenty years ago today. Bright-eyed and bushy-headed, Jamie Innes came from his native New Brunswick, heeding the call to public service. From the government side to the opposition side and back to the government side, Jamie has worked for MPs and been a trusted adviser to various ministers, and he played a critical role in the House leader's office back in the opposition days. His hard work, patience, and integrity have earned him the friendship and respect of his peers, and his sharp political instincts have yielded great equity in his advice.

Twenty years later, his hair is a little thinner, his skin is a bit thicker, but he still has that passion for public service, and that remains constant. For two decades of service to this place, join me in congratulating our friend, Jamie Innes.

Statements by Members

[Translation]

POLITICAL SCIENCE STUDENTS

Ms. Anju Dhillon (Dorval—Lachine—LaSalle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend a warm welcome to 25 students from the University of Michigan who will be spending the next month on the Hill. As part of their political science summer course, these students will have the opportunity to learn and experience how our Parliament operates by working in our offices on the Hill, meeting dignitaries, and exploring life and culture in Canada. It is an honour and a pleasure to see so many talented young people with an interest in politics.

[English]

Beyond providing the opportunity to learn more about Canadian politics and parliamentary affairs, the program also promotes a positive exchange between Canada and the United States. I know that this chamber will show these students that politics can indeed be a positive thing.

I wholeheartedly wish them all the best in their endeavours here in Ottawa and beyond.

* * *

● (1415)

JUSTICE SYSTEM

Mr. Kevin Waugh (Saskatoon—Grasswood, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as we approach the 13th annual Victims and Survivors of Crime Week, which gets under way this Sunday, we must acknowledge the struggles of families that are still waiting to get justice as a result of unacceptable delays in our judicial system.

Dwayne Demkiw, of Alberta, was murdered in May 2015. However, his family, which lives in Saskatoon, is being forced to wait until 2019 for his accused murderer to stand trial.

As of May 4, there are still many judicial vacancies on Alberta's Court of Queen's Bench alone, and there are well over 50 judicial vacancies across this country. These vacancies do nothing but cause further hurt for victims of crime, such as the Demkiw family.

There is no excuse for this government to allow these vacancies to be left unfilled, and there is no excuse for victims of crime being denied justice.

* * *

CLIMATE CHANGE CHAMPION

Mr. Fayçal El-Khoury (Laval—Les Îles, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Michael Haddad is a Lebanon UNDP climate change champion.

[Translation]

Today he is with us, as he has travelled to Canada to walk 100 kilometres to the North Pole. Completely paralysed from the chest down since the age of six, Michael is going to take up this challenge for humanity in order to raise awareness about climate change around the world. Why the North Pole? We are all aware that this region is changing as a result of the accelerated melting of ice.

[English]

Moreover, prime scientific institutions are coordinating to introduce to the world this scientific challenge, endorsed by the United Nations, as making Michael walk to the North Pole is exactly like putting a person to walk on the moon.

[Translation]

Thank you to Michael, who is the epitome of courage.

* * *

YOUTH ADDICTIONS AND MENTAL HEALTH

Mr. Robert Oliphant (Don Valley West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week, I had the honour of holding a consultation on youth, addictions, and mental health at the Bellwood Health Services rehab centre in Don Valley West.

There were 25 stakeholders at this town hall including young people with addictions, professionals, as well as community associations. Most adults with mental health problems say that the first symptoms arose during adolescence. However, only one in four youth gets the care they need. The stigma around mental health and addictions continues to be a serious problem, which is why we have to talk about it.

I want to thank everyone who took part in this town hall. Together, we will continue to find innovative solutions to help our young people.

* * *

[English]

NATURAL GAS-GENERATED ELECTRICITY

Mr. Glen Motz (Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the City of Medicine Hat is able to provide affordable, stable natural gas-generated electricity to residents and industry.

In the past several months, the city has announced new investments worth hundreds of millions of dollars by companies coming to our city, in part because of the availability of reliable electricity. These two companies combined will have a daily electrical demand of up to 80 megawatts, provide nearly 500 permanent jobs to our community, and help us grow and diversify our economy.

Natural gas-generated electricity is a viable and clean source of energy. Natural gas will be there when the sun does not shine and the wind does not blow. The City of Medicine Hat has recognized the need to provide a favourable investment climate that will ensure continued growth in natural gas-fired electricity. Lower energy costs have resulted in Medicine Hat growing its economy and creating jobs while reducing emissions, all without a new tax.

I invite the Minister of Environment to visit my city and see how we can move economy and environment forward without a carbon tax.

*Oral Questions***MENTAL HEALTH**

Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is every Canadian's responsibility to promote mental wellness in our communities.

[*Translation*]

I am proud to inform the House that I recently held a town hall on mental health here in Ottawa, and another in my riding of Guelph.

[*English*]

These two events provided me with a unique opportunity to consult with mental health experts, service providers, and, most importantly, my constituents.

Canadians deeply care for each other's mental health, and together we can develop innovative and collaborative community-based programs to help those who are suffering.

I am confident that there is a role for members in the House to make a positive difference for Canadians, leveraging the unprecedented investment funds available to build healthy, compassionate, and resilient communities.

* * *

• (1420)

NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, May 24 is International Women's Day for Peace and Disarmament, a day when women legislators jointly express their deep concern about the existential threats to humanity and the environment from climate change, nuclear weapons, and unresolved international conflicts, in particular those between nuclear-reliant nations.

Tomorrow, UN Secretary-General António Guterres will call on governments, parliaments, and civil society to take action to end the threat of nuclear war.

I have joined other women parliamentarians in expressing support for the UN General Assembly's decision for a high-level conference on disarmament to advance effective measures to build a framework for a nuclear weapon-free world. As women representatives, we are proud of our home countries and our national identities, but we also recognize a common humanity. We recognize the need to collaborate in building a peaceful, secure, sustainable, and just world.

I invite my fellow Canadian women legislators to join me in supporting this initiative for peace.

* * *

JUSTICE

Mr. Michael Cooper (St. Albert—Edmonton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, time and again, the government has turned its back on victims, from opposing mandatory sentences to failing to appoint a victims ombudsman after six months. Now the government is watering down sentences with Bill C-75. Bill C-75 makes serious indictable offences prosecutable by way of summary conviction. As a result, serious offences, including participating in a terrorist organization, kidnapping a minor, and impaired driving causing bodily harm, can be punishable with a mere fine.

There can be no justice for victims when terrorists, kidnappers, and impaired drivers are able to walk away scot-free. Bill C-75 is an absolute travesty. Victims of crime deserve better than the Liberal government.

* * *

FOOD BANKS

Mrs. Deborah Schulte (King—Vaughan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today marks the launch of representatives against hunger, a Food Banks Canada initiative in which elected representatives are asked to raise awareness about hunger in their communities.

Every day, food banks across the country work hard to raise the food and funds necessary to assist over 860,000 people. There are three exceptional food banks in King Township and Vaughan, which provide crucial, compassionate service and bring our neighbourhoods together to help fight local hunger. They are the King Township Food Bank, run by Carol Ann Trabert; the Humanity First Food Bank in Concord, run by Dr. Aslam Daud; and the Vaughan Food Bank, run by Peter Wixson. Behind these individuals are teams of dedicated volunteers and donors, working tirelessly to support the less fortunate in our communities.

I encourage my colleagues to develop strong relationships with their local food banks, even fast for a day to experience what it is like not to have enough to eat. I want my colleagues to take this important conversation online using the hashtag #RepsAgainstHunger.

My hope, and the hope of Food Banks Canada, is that hunger in this country will be eliminated and one day we will no—

The Speaker: Oral questions.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[*Translation*]

DEMOCRATIC REFORM

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister said yesterday that he was willing to work with the opposition parties and consider their amendments to his electoral reform bill. Not only does this bill let the Liberal government campaign use taxpayer money outside an election period, but it also continues to allow American interference in our elections.

If he really wants to improve this bill, will he tell Elections Canada to immediately halt the implementation of this legislation until it is passed?

Oral Questions

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first of all, we are very proud to say that many of the elements of the bill we tabled regarding Elections Canada actually stem from recommendations that Elections Canada made on how to improve our electoral system. The previous Conservative government mucked up our voting system by making it harder for Canadians to vote and making it easier to use more money to convince Canadians to vote for them. Fortunately, their tactics failed, and now we are working to overhaul and improve our system.

* * *

● (1425)

[English]

GOVERNMENT APPOINTMENTS

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in April, the Prime Minister informed the opposition parties of his intention to appoint Saskatchewan's Michael Boda as Canada's new Chief Electoral Officer, but just recently, the Prime Minister changed his mind, with absolutely no explanation.

Can the Prime Minister please explain exactly why he rescinded Michael Boda's appointment?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, after a rigorous, open, merit-based process, we are happy to have chosen Stéphane Perrault as the most qualified candidate for the position of Chief Electoral Officer. With over 20 years serving in government, he has extensive knowledge and understanding of the Canada Elections Act and the Canadian parliamentary system. We have every confidence that under his continued leadership, Elections Canada will be more than ready for the 2019 federal election. We have submitted an excellent candidate to this House and hope that all members confirm his appointment.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister refused to answer this question yesterday, so I will try again today.

One fact in the recent violent confrontations along the Israel-Gaza border is undeniable: the riots that led to those tragic deaths were deliberately orchestrated by the terrorist group Hamas. Unfortunately, the Prime Minister's statement last week ignored Hamas's involvement and instead blamed Israel, the most democratic, pluralistic nation in the region.

Will the Prime Minister apologize for his poorly worded statement and finally join me in condemning Hamas for the role it played and explain his silence yesterday?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week I spoke directly with Prime Minister Netanyahu and explained to him that regardless of which country was involved, any time a foreign military sniper shoots a Canadian citizen, a Canadian civilian, we will have questions about that. We will stand up and express how concerned we are and ask to know exactly what happened. A Canadian doctor was shot by an Israeli sniper. This is something that we have to actually push back on and ask how that happened.

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, how about pushing back on the fact that this entire incident was orchestrated by a terrorist group, Hamas? This is shameful. Here we are, a week later, after the world has seen Hamas putting innocent civilians in harm's way just to achieve this very type of tragic incident, and the Prime Minister continues to place the blame unilaterally on Israel, a country that goes out of its way to minimize civilian casualties.

Will the Prime Minister finally do what the entire international community has already done: condemn Hamas and recognize its role in this tragic event?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, we have repeatedly condemned the violence, including the incitement to violence by Hamas, but I will express once again that I am proud that Canada is one of those countries in which support for Israel and friendship with Israel go beyond partisan lines. Our government has continued to be a friend to Israel.

There is, in fact, only one issue on which we deeply disagree with the Conservatives with regard to Israel. It is that we do not think it should be a partisan domestic issue.

The Speaker: Order. Yesterday I asked the hon. member for St. Albert—Edmonton not to be yelling when someone else has the floor. I ask him again not to do that.

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canada used to have one voice when it spoke to the issue in the region, until this Prime Minister changed the government's position when it comes to Israel.

The Prime Minister has politicized this issue by failing to condemn Hamas until a week later, by placing the blame unilaterally on Israel, and by ignoring the fact that Hamas put those innocent civilians in harm's way deliberately.

Why did the Prime Minister take so long to acknowledge the role that a terrorist organization had in this? Why is he politicizing our relationship with Israel?

● (1430)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, how quickly they forget. In the 2015 election campaign, protestors were outside the home of a Jewish leader in Toronto because he had dared to support the Liberal Party in our election and leaders within the Jewish community had actually stepped forward and supported a different party than theirs.

The politicization of the Israel question has been done by them. It is shameful and unhelpful to the kind of pluralistic democracy we are. We will always be a friend to Israel on this side of the House.

* * *

[Translation]

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP): Mr. Speaker, page 40 of the Liberals' 2015 election platform reads, and I quote:

We will fulfill our G20 commitment and phase out subsidies for the fossil fuel industry over the medium-term.

Oral Questions

Not only does the government not have a plan to eliminate those subsidies, but now it also wants to give Kinder Morgan a blank cheque.

Does the government intend to keep its promise and eliminate subsidies for the oil and gas industry?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, together with our G20 partners, we have committed to phase out inefficient fossil fuel subsidies by the year 2025, and we are on track to meet that target.

Canada is able to develop its resources while protecting the environment. That is why we are committed to the Trans Mountain expansion project, which will create thousands of good jobs.

We have also made significant investments in our world-class oceans protection plan totalling \$1.5 billion.

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP): Words, Mr. Speaker, just words.

The truth is that the Liberals have no intention of cutting off oil and gas subsidies and no plan to do so. The truth is that they now want to subsidize Kinder Morgan. How much will that cost? The government says it cannot answer that question because it does not negotiate in public.

News flash: when they announce that they are going to subsidize a company like Kinder Morgan or some other company that wants to take over the project, that is negotiating in public.

What is it going to be? \$500 million? \$1 billion? \$5 billion? Does the government have a cap in mind for the Kinder Morgan subsidy?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government respects the fact that it must create economic growth while protecting the environment. That is why the Trans Mountain project had to satisfy additional assessment criteria before we approved it.

It is important for people to know that, once approval has been granted, the government will keep its promises. That is why we are working with the company and with our partners across the country to ensure this project gets built because it is in the national interest.

[English]

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canada's efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions are in shambles.

The government committed to abolish fossil fuel subsidies by 2025, but the Auditor General concluded that the government had no intention to do so. The betrayal does not end there. What is worse is the Liberals now want to bail out a Texas-based oil company.

Canadians do not want to give a handout to a big U.S. oil company. Why are the Liberals giving a blank cheque to Kinder Morgan?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, together with our G20 partners, we have committed to phase out inefficient fossil fuel subsidies by the year 2025. We are on track to meet this target. Unfortunately, the NDP continues to say we have not done anything, but in budget 2016 we announced the expiration of the tax writeoffs on capital investments in LNG facilities and in budget 2017 we announced the elimination of certain

tax credits for exploration expenses in the oil and gas sector in certain cases.

We are committed to growing the economy and protecting the environment at the same time. The NDP and Conservatives still think there is a choice to be made. We know they go together.

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, that is not according to the Auditor General. The Prime Minister promised to abolish fossil fuel subsidies, and that promise was made with other G7 countries. He made this commitment over and over again. As we approach the next G7 summit, the world will be watching, and the lack of Canadian leadership will be glaring. Rather than paying off a Texas-based oil company and its fat-cat shareholders, will the government end fossil fuel subsidies and invest in a transition for energy workers toward a future in sustainable energy?

• (1435)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the lack of concern by the NDP for the hard-working Albertans in our oil and gas sector is disheartening. As I said to them when I was out there, we recognize that the Trans Mountain expansion is in the national interest. Ensuring we continue to get good prices for our resources while we move forward toward a low-carbon economy is exactly what all Canadians expect.

We are pleased to have found that project in the national interest. We will get that project built, despite the naysaying by the NDP.

* * *

CARBON PRICING

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the finance department has calculated the cost of the federally imposed carbon tax on the average Canadian family. I obtained the documents; it is just that all the numbers are blacked out. Now, many are calling it a cover-up, a carbon tax cover-up. The Prime Minister is here today. He could uncensor those documents, end this carbon tax cover-up, and tell Canadians what this tax will cost them.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, over the past couple of years we have done two things that are completely foreign to the Conservative Party. One of them is to take real action on reducing our carbon emissions. The second is to work collaboratively with the provinces instead of setting them up as enemies.

Oral Questions

What we are doing is working with the provinces so they can establish their plans to reduce their carbon emissions, including putting a price on carbon pollution. They will determine how they will be returning the money collected from that price on pollution to their citizens. Speculation about—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Carleton.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, well, we would not have to speculate if the Prime Minister would just uncensor the documents that would tell us. He says not to worry: he is going to raise taxes on working-class consumers, but he will give the money back to provincial politicians to spend. This is his version of trickle-down economics. He takes money from the people who earn it, gives it to politicians, and expects us to believe that a few drops will trickle down to the people who earned it in the first place.

Why does he not uncover the cost, tell the truth, and indicate how much this tax will cost the average family?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what the Conservatives simply do not understand is that growing the economy for the future requires us to also be protecting future generations. That means being smart about reducing the amount of carbon emissions, reducing the pollution we are putting out. By putting a price on pollution, by encouraging better choices by industry and citizens, we know that we are creating a sustainable future for everyone. That is why for 10 years they made no choices, showed no leadership on the environment, and could not build a strong economy.

* * *

TAXATION

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, he has used his “better choices” line again. Nothing could better indicate how much he is out of touch. This millionaire Prime Minister told British Columbians, who are paying \$1.60 a litre for gas, that they just need to make better choices if they want to stop overpaying to get from A to B. Furthermore, the Prime Minister wants to charge the GST on top of the carbon tax. He will raise a quarter of a billion dollars in B.C. and Alberta alone.

How much money will his government take from taxpayers in this tax on the tax?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite likes to talk about taxes, but you notice he does not explain why he voted against raising taxes on the wealthiest one per cent and lowering them on the middle class. That is the first thing we did.

Then he wanted to continue to send child benefit cheques to millionaire families instead of giving more money to the families who need it. Our Canada child benefit gives more money to nine out of 10 Canadian families and is lifting hundreds of thousands of kids across this country out of poverty. Those are the choices that we have made, and we are going to continue to make them despite—

• (1440)

The Speaker: The hon. member for Carleton.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister promised before the last election that he, because he is a millionaire, would stop taking child care benefits. Now he is taking

taxpayer-funded nanny services for his kids while making everybody else pay for their child care out of their own pockets.

On the issue of taxes, the Fraser Institute has calculated that 80% of middle-class taxpayers are paying more since the Prime Minister took office, \$800 more. How much will those same families have to pay in higher carbon taxes?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in French we say, “*chassez le naturel, il revient au galop*”. As soon as the Conservatives get in a place they do not like, they start attacking personally. They start slamming someone and throwing mud.

The fact is that we lowered taxes for the middle class and raised them on the wealthiest one per cent. The study they are talking about actually did not even count the Canada child benefit.

What I think Canadians would want to hear is whether they will then change back the Canada child benefit to benefit millionaires and take money out of the pockets of the poorest in Canada, because that is what they want.

* * *

[Translation]

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher (Beauport—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île d'Orléans—Charlevoix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the G7 summit will be held in La Malbaie, in my riding, in June. It is quickly approaching and people have many questions and want answers, especially about the significant costs associated with this event.

For several weeks now, major transformations have overshadowed the natural beauty of the region and inevitably resulted in significant expenses.

With the G7 only three weeks away, is the Prime Minister able to inform us of the cost of the G7 summit?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first, I am very proud to invite the world leaders to our magnificent region of Charlevoix. I know that the residents of Charlevoix are proud to welcome people from all over the world and to show them how beautiful their region is.

I will be headed to the beautiful region of Charlevoix this afternoon to meet with community leaders, the mayor, and residents to answer their questions, as we have been doing for the past few months, and to talk about how this event will be a great success for them, their country, and the world.

Oral Questions

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, everyone wants the G7 in Charlevoix to succeed. However, some 100 kilometres away in Quebec City, there is talk of demonstrations and we know that tends to spell trouble at G7 summits. That is why there is legitimate concern among Quebec City store owners, who fear that these demonstrations will turn sour.

Last week, on FM93, the Minister of Families was rather vague when the mayor of Quebec City was very clear, and I quote, “I understand the store owners' concern and I want them to rest assured and feel safe.... If there are any damages, I want them to be compensated.”

Will the Prime Minister give a clear response? If, by some misfortune, there is trouble, will Quebec City store owners be compensated?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, obviously we are working with the mayor of Quebec City and the authorities to ensure that everything goes smoothly.

We acknowledge that it is important for citizens to be able to express themselves, whether they agree or disagree with the events, but we must ensure that this is done in accordance with the law and in an orderly fashion. That is why we are working with the local police, with the Sûreté du Québec, and with the RCMP to ensure that the public, the store owners, and everyone else are safe during this magnificent G7 meeting being held in Charlevoix and during other events being held in Quebec City.

* * *

MARIJUANA

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government deliberately chose to tax medical marijuana in its Bill C-74.

Canadians who have a prescription to purchase medical cannabis are already required to spend hundreds or even thousands of dollars a month to buy enough for their own needs. The Liberals had a chance to address that yesterday in committee, but they outright rejected the NDP's amendments.

How does the Prime Minister explain to the 270,000 patients in Canada who use medical cannabis that his bill will make their cannabis even more expensive?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are legalizing cannabis to better protect young people and our communities from the effects of cannabis and the black market. Right now, the medical-marijuana system actually purveys a lot of recreational cannabis to users. We know that this will all change once we have a regulated system in place, and we will work with stakeholders in the medical industry to ensure that medical marijuana is still—

• (1445)

The Speaker: The hon. member for Vancouver Kingsway.

[*English*]

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, many Canadians rely on medical cannabis as a key part of their health care treatment. However, unlike prescription drugs, patients have to pay sales tax on medical cannabis and it is not eligible for

reimbursement under most health insurance plans. Now, the Liberals are imposing an additional excise tax that will further impair access to the medicine people need. This is unfair to patients and it is damaging to public health. Will the Liberals do the right thing and withdraw this ill-advised tax on medicine?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are legalizing and regulating cannabis sales because we know that we need to better protect our kids and protect our communities from the impact of organized crime. That is why we are doing this. We recognize that under the current prohibition the medical-marijuana system actually purveys an awful lot of recreational cannabis to users. This situation will shift significantly once we have a legalized regime in place, and we are going to be working with the medical marijuana community to ensure that those who use marijuana as medications do not suffer undue extra penalties. That is something we have committed to doing. We are going to work responsibly toward that.

* * *

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Matt Jeneroux (Edmonton Riverbend, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in eight days Kinder Morgan will be making a decision on the Trans Mountain expansion project. So far, this Prime Minister's only solution is to make taxpayers pay for the project that was privately funded. For two and a half years, the Prime Minister has completely failed to defend Canadian resources. Will he finally show some leadership and tell Canadians what his plan is for the next eight days?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our plan is to get that pipeline built because it is in the national interest, because it is part of both growing the economy and protecting the environment together. As the members know, we are working right now in financial discussions with the proponent. We are ensuring that we will be able to move forward in a responsible way. That is exactly what we are going to do. We are going to do what is in the national interest. The national interest is to build that pipeline so we can get our resources responsibly and sustainably to new markets across the Pacific.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's botched handling of the Trans Mountain project has landed us in a constitutional crisis. Who is going to pay for this? It is Canadian families, natural resource workers, and our economy across Canada, which is having a rough time thanks to his decisions. The Prime Minister's inability to handle this situation has left the provinces gearing up for a constitutional battle in the courts. The Prime Minister has failed utterly.

When is he going to show some leadership on this file and get our natural resources sector working again?

Oral Questions

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I find it funny that Stephen Harper's Conservatives are still talking about leadership on natural resources. For 10 years, they talked up Alberta's oil economy every chance they got, but they never got anything done. They were not able to get a single kilometre of pipeline toward new markets built. They could not make it happen because they did not know, did not understand, and still refuse to understand that growing the economy goes hand in hand with protecting the environment. Because they were unable to protect the environment, they could not grow the economy the way it needed to be done. We are going to do things differently.

[*English*]

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the problem is that nobody believes this Prime Minister's empty words, and there are only eight days left until the deadline for the Trans Mountain expansion. The Prime Minister caused this crisis. He is damaging confidence in Canada. The president of ATCO said, "The delay of those projects is almost as good as a cancellation". The Prime Minister has already killed four major energy projects in Canada worth \$84 billion, and investment is leaving Canada at historic rates. What is the Prime Minister actually doing to stop energy investment from leaving Canada, along with the hundreds of thousands of jobs that go with it?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, after 10 years of failure by Stephen Harper to get even one kilometre of new pipeline built to new markets, we are getting it done. We have approved the Kinder Morgan TMX pipeline expansion under a strengthened process that brings in indigenous communities, that respects science, that gets the social licence that so completely evaded the previous government because Canadians did not trust them. Canadians did not believe they had the best interests of Canada and Canadians at heart.

What that means is that we are growing the economy and protecting the environment as well.

• (1450)

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last month, the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance, and the Minister of Natural Resources all promised a law to provide certainty for Trans Mountain, but there is still no law and still no plan. The Prime Minister's failure harms Canada's reputation in the world and risks future energy development. The CEO of Goodreid Investment Counsel says, "This is going to make other companies, other projects, all pause and say, 'what if?'".

We need strong political leadership here, and I do not think we are getting it. Where is the legislation the Prime Minister promised Canadians?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if one actually listens to the Conservative members, one realizes they are actually hinging an awful lot of their political survival on our not getting the pipeline built. We are going to get that pipeline built, and I look forward to seeing what the Conservatives have to say once construction season starts, once shovels are in the ground, and once we deliver on this pipeline to new markets, which they were unable to do. Would they be happy then, or would they be miserable that it was our government that got it done—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: I would ask the hon. member for Chilliwack—Hope and others to come to order and not to speak or call out when someone else has the floor, as much as I like the voice of the hon. member for Chilliwack—Hope.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Berthier—Maskinongé.

* * *

DEMOCRATIC REFORM

Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau (Berthier—Maskinongé, NDP): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Liberals said that they were open to working with the opposition parties. Today, they are threatening to curtail debate on the election bill. They are doing exactly the same thing as Stephen Harper did in 2014. Is this real change? I do not think so.

If the Liberals really want to pass this bill before the summer recess, there are other alternatives.

Will the Prime Minister and the Liberal Party commit to working with us to find a solution and agree not to limit debate on the election bill?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we look forward to debating this bill in committee. We know that there are many witnesses and members who want to make suggestions regarding this bill in committee. That is an important step in the process.

We look forward to sending this bill to committee so that the NDP, the Conservative Party, and others can share their opinions on this important bill. That is why we are very happy to soon send it to committee so that we can all do the work together.

[*English*]

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): No, Mr. Speaker, that is not true. The Prime Minister had a deadline to fix the damage done by the previous Conservative government to our election laws, and for 18 months they did nothing. Now they are panicking and actually threatening to shut down debate in Parliament just hours after it started. New Democrats have made a proposal to properly study the bill, get out on the road to talk to Canadians, and still allow the passage of the bill to get Elections Canada doing its job for us.

Let us find out which path the Prime Minister is going to choose. Is he willing to work with us, or is he going to follow the dangerous one set by Stephen Harper?

Oral Questions

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is in fact the fourth day of debate on the elections bill, and we are looking forward to sending it to committee so that the member opposite and all members will be able to weigh in and make their concrete recommendations to improve this piece of legislation. Yes, we know that Elections Canada rules need to be improved after the Conservatives broke them. That is why we look forward to having robust discussions at committee, so the work can actually get done and delivered in time for Canadians in the next election.

* * *

[Translation]

RAIL TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Angelo Iacono (Alfred-Pellan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, no community should ever have to experience what Lac-Mégantic went through on July 6, 2013. All Canadians remember the 47 people who died, and we stand with all those whose lives were irreparably changed.

On May 11, the Right Honourable Prime Minister was in Lac-Mégantic to make an important announcement. Would he share that announcement with us?

• (1455)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Alfred-Pellan for his question.

It is one that has been on the minds of all Quebeckers and all Canadians. For nearly five years now, the people of Lac-Mégantic have worked very hard to recover, rebuild their town, and create a better future for their community.

On May 11, the Minister of Finance and I announced that we have signed an agreement in principle with the Government of Quebec to jointly fund the rail bypass project.

We know that some wounds will never heal, but we sincerely hope this bypass will mark a new beginning for the people of Lac-Mégantic.

* * *

ETHICS

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the current investigation of the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard indicates that there were blatant ethical breaches, and there is more to come.

A company that did not meet the bid criteria was awarded a lucrative quota by this minister. The contract was awarded to a corporation owned by the brother of a Liberal MP. A former Liberal MP also stands to profit, not to mention the minister's own family.

When did the Prime Minister learn that all the Liberal supporters and family of the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard would profit from this lucrative contract?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our decision to introduce indigenous participation is consistent with our desire to establish a renewed relationship with

indigenous peoples. Expanding access to the Arctic surf clam fishery is a major step towards reconciliation.

When the Conservatives launched a similar process, they chose to exclude indigenous peoples. The minister will continue to work with the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner and to follow his advice.

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the investigation into the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard is part of the time-honoured Liberal ways where the more things change, the more they stay the same. There is favouritism for everyone, from the Liberal extended family to the Liberal uncle, the Liberal cousin, and the Liberal cronies. Nothing is off limits for that crowd. It is scandalous.

When did the Prime Minister find out that every Liberal partisan and the minister's family would benefit from this lucrative contract?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what Canadians understand is that despite the mudslinging and the baseless allegations hurled by the Conservatives in the House of Commons from time to time, we have a Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner in charge of ensuring that there is no conflict of interest or ethical breach.

We on this side of the House have confidence in the commissioner and we are working with him. We know that this is important work that must be respected, despite the petty politics we often get from the Conservatives.

[English]

Hon. Peter Kent (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as the Ethics Commissioner gets into his formal investigation of the fisheries minister, he is going to find very clear evidence, in the minister's own handwriting, of his interference in the bidding process for a very lucrative clam harvesting licence. This is a confected company with close Liberal Party and family connections that did not meet the bid criteria, that did not even own a boat, and was awarded a very valuable quota by the minister. Will the Prime Minister remove the minister from this tainted file and restart the bid process?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our decision to introduce indigenous participation is consistent with our commitment to developing a renewed relationship between Canada and indigenous peoples. Enhancing access to the Arctic surf clam fishery broadens the distribution of benefits from this public resource, and is a powerful step toward reconciliation. When the Conservatives went through a very similar process to increase access to this fishery, they chose to exclude indigenous peoples.

As to the matter raised by the member, our member will continue to work with the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner and follow his advice—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Thornhill.

Hon. Peter Kent (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the question now is when was the Prime Minister made aware that Liberal partisans and the minister's family would benefit from this lucrative rigged contract?

Oral Questions

• (1500)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again we have a situation in which the Conservatives are slinging mud and throwing groundless accusations across the floor of the House of Commons as if they were true.

What is reassuring to members of this House and indeed to all Canadians watching is that we have a Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner whose job is to get to the facts of the matter, not the partisan spin and the angry attacks. We trust the Ethics Commissioner, work with the Ethics Commissioner, and support him in the important job he does.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Vancouver just banned plastic straws and lids. Montreal has banned plastic bags. Tofino, Edmonton, and Saskatoon are close behind.

However, the Prime Minister thinks he can lead a discussion about ocean plastics at the G7 while doing nothing here at home. Municipalities are filling the leadership void because the Liberals' oceans protection plan still does not even mention combatting plastic pollution.

With World Oceans Day and the G7 only two weeks away, is the Prime Minister just looking for another photo op or will he actually explain his plan to protect Canada's waters from plastic pollution?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the protection of our oceans continues to be a priority for this government.

On top of the \$1.5 billion oceans protection plan, which will bring world-class protection to our coasts, we are moving forward this year with a significant amount of leadership on protecting our oceans. From a round table on plastics at the World Economic Forum in Switzerland to the leadership shown at the Commonwealth a few weeks ago to our leadership at the G7 on moving forward on plastics to our leadership and co-hosting a meeting in Nairobi, Kenya on our oceans this fall, Canada continues to lead—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Timmins—James Bay.

* * *

DEMOCRATIC REFORM

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, when I drive the 407, like other Canadians, I expect at least that my name and address will be kept private, not shared around in a bunch of dodgy Conservative nomination races. The 407 data scandal is exhibit A as to why we need to have political parties held accountable and brought under the Privacy Act.

The Prime Minister is pushing through his electoral reform bill, whose privacy protections are about as reliable as a pinky swear from a party operative. Why is he ignoring the call of the Privacy Commissioner to hold political parties accountable?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it would be easier to believe the high dudgeon from the member opposite if it were not for the fact that on this side of the House, we are moving forward with open and transparent public

financing. We have invited the media in to our financing events. The NDP and the Conservatives still refuse to open up and publicly announce their fundraising efforts.

If the member opposite is so serious about transparency and openness, perhaps he could do like we do and invite the media to his next private fundraiser.

* * *

[Translation]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, not only is the Liberal government allowing ISIS fighters to return to Canada, but it is also allowing these murderers to live free, as if nothing had happened.

Yesterday, the Minister of Public Safety said that under our government, no fighters were charged when they returned to Canada. Either the minister is misinformed or he is not brave enough to tell the truth.

Is the Prime Minister waiting for a tragedy to happen before he steps up and takes responsibility?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, the Conservatives' political approach relies on fearmongering and dividing Canadians.

Our security agencies and police forces take all potential threats seriously and have access to measures including surveillance, passport revocations, and criminal charges, when there is sufficient evidence. We know they are doing their job, and they are good at it.

It is worrisome that the Conservatives seem to want elected officials to intervene and tell police officers who to arrest and when. On this side, we will continue to trust those who—

The Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles.

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, never, under any circumstances, do we take security lightly. The Prime Minister, on the other hand, demonstrates every day that his government does not take Canadians' safety and security seriously.

First, the Prime Minister reinvents history. He accuses our government of cutting the Canada Border Services Agency's budget. We proved that this never happened. Second, he says no Islamic fighter was ever charged under our government. Again, Canadians remember our track record of fighting Islamic terrorists. We went after them with conviction and courage.

Oral Questions

Could the Prime Minister wake his minister up and get him to understand once and for all that keeping Canadians safe is his number one responsibility?

• (1505)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives cannot deny the facts. During their last majority term, they slashed \$400 million from the Canada Border Services Agency. That is the kind of budget cut that compromises our safety and security, and that is why we are making investments and showing respect for the work our police and border officers do.

We are doing whatever it takes to protect Canadians. Unfortunately for the Conservatives, engaging in the politics of fear, as they have been doing for so long, does nothing to keep us safe.

[*English*]

Hon. Michelle Rempel (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our Conservative government did introduce laws that gave law enforcement officials better tools to keep us safe from terrorists, which the Liberal government has weakened. We sent resources to help keep our allies in the combat to halt the spread of ISIS. However, in contrast with the Prime Minister, we did not pay for poetry lessons for ISIS terrorists, or remove Canada from the fight to contain ISIS, or vote against a motion to declare genocide against victims of ISIS.

Therefore, for the love of all that is holy, will the Prime Minister seek justice for the victims of Abu Huzaifa?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am going to take issue with plenty of what the member opposite said, but one specifically where we did not engage and we withdrew some of our support in the fight against ISIS in the Middle East. On the contrary, we are pleased with the extraordinary work that the men and women of the Canadian Forces did in northern Iraq in helping with the retaking of Mosul, of the significant impact on the ground that we had.

We can be proud of the work the Canadian Forces did to degrade and defeat ISIL. We were part of that, despite what the Conservatives say.

* * *

[*Translation*]

DAIRY INDUSTRY

Hon. Denis Paradis (Brome—Missisquoi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know that a strong, competitive dairy industry is essential to Canada's prosperity, creates good jobs, and makes high-quality dairy products available to Canadians. The world's best dairy producers happen to be in my riding, Brome—Missisquoi, and all across Quebec.

Can the Prime Minister tell us about our government's recent investments in Canada's dairy industry?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Brome—Missisquoi for his question.

Through the dairy farm investment program, our government has given Canadian dairy producers over \$66 million, \$26 million of which has gone to Quebec dairy producers. Through the dairy

processing investment fund, we have given dairy processors close to \$24 million, and \$10 million of that went to Quebec.

Our government will continue to invest in, protect, and stand up for dairy producers across Canada.

* * *

[*English*]

RAIL TRANSPORTATION

Mrs. Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, one year ago, OmniTRAX announced it was closing the port of Churchill, devastating the economies of communities along the rail line. Rather than considering all offers to get this railway up and running, the Prime Minister is picking winners and losers.

A potential buyer, which includes indigenous partners, has announced, "We have halted our negotiations because of interference from the federal government."

Why are the Liberals interfering and limiting the options for this line to get running again?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government recognizes the importance of the rail line to the people of Churchill and the surrounding area. Our priority remains the safety and well-being of the people impacted by the loss of rail service.

We will continue to work closely with the Town of Churchill, the Province of Manitoba, and others in support of the immediate and long-term interests of the region. No negotiations with any parties will be conducted in public.

However, if the member opposite really wants to help, she can call on her friend Merv Tweed, former Conservative MP at OmniTRAX, and tell him to make the right deal for Canadians and for Churchill.

* * *

[*Translation*]

DAIRY INDUSTRY

Ms. Karine Trudel (Jonquière, NDP): Mr. Speaker, our dairy producers are still facing uncertainty and living under tremendous stress. The price of milk is at an all-time low and farmers are struggling. The Liberal government's inaction and lack of concern are primarily to blame for this difficult situation.

Think of diafiltered milk, the undermining of supply management in CETA and the TPP, and the inadequate and mismanaged investment program. Many of these farmers have yet to see a dime.

Is the Liberal government proud of its disastrous record when it comes to our dairy producers?

• (1510)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, through our dairy farm investment program, our government has given more than \$66 million to Canada's dairy farmers, including \$26 million to dairy farmers in Quebec. Through the dairy processing investment fund, we have given nearly \$24 million to dairy processors, including \$10 million in Quebec.

Our government will continue to invest in, protect, and defend our dairy producers and supply management across Canada.

* * *

[English]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Leona Alleslev (Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government listened to Canadians and they want decisive action to protect our environment. Canadians have entrusted us with the environmental stewardship for today and tomorrow, and that stewardship must extend to how government departments operate.

The Department of National Defence manages the largest infrastructure portfolio in the federal government. As outlined in “Strong Secure Engaged”, we are committed to modern and sustainable infrastructure for our Canadian Armed Forces.

Could the Prime Minister please inform the House on how our government is ensuring the greening of Canadian defence infrastructure?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill for her service as a veteran of our armed forces.

We are taking action to combat climate change across the government. The Minister of National Defence recently took part in a building dedication ceremony for the newly constructed Royal Canadian Electrical and Mechanical Engineering School at CFB Borden. This facility was designed to meet the LEED silver certification standard, and has incorporated green building concepts to minimize its footprint. It will provide our forces with state-of-the-art facilities.

We believe in green infrastructure and clean technology, including in our new defence policy.

* * *

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals used tax dollars to pay fees for government staff to attend a conference organized by Canada 2020. Canada 2020 and the Liberal Party are so incestuous it is hard to know where one ends and the other begins.

The president and co-founder of Canada 2020, Tom Pitfield, is married to former Liberal Party president Anna Gainey. In 2016, Pitfield joined the Prime Minister on that infamous, unethical vacation to the Aga Khan's private island.

Oral Questions

Now, without blaming Stephen Harper, could the Prime Minister explain why taxpayers are paying to send government employees to a Liberal Party conference?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we know, decisions to attend conferences are made by the public service. We support its right to send people to conferences that are good for their development and professional improvement.

* * *

[Translation]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we know what happens when people seek to sign a deal at any cost. They always lose.

The Liberals agreed to market access concessions of 2% in supply-managed sectors under CETA. During the by-election in Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean, the Prime Minister swore with his hand on his heart that he would protect supply management at any cost. However, after the election, he agreed to concessions of 3.25% in supply-managed sectors under the trans-Pacific partnership. That is twice that Quebec farmers have been taken for a ride.

When it comes to NAFTA, can the Prime Minister assure us that there will be no concessions, not 3%, not 1%—

The Speaker: Order. The right hon. Prime Minister.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that the Liberal Party created our supply management system, and we will continue to defend it.

We were able to sign agreements with countries around the world while protecting a system that works very well for our farmers, our consumers, and our country. We will continue to defend that system. We know it is important for our products to have access to new markets. This is an important era of global trade for Canada. We will always protect our supply management system.

* * *

[English]

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members the presence in the gallery of the Hon. Zach Churchill, Minister of Education and Early Childhood Development, and the Hon. Derek Mombourquette, Minister of Municipal Affairs for the Province of Nova Scotia.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

* * *

• (1515)

[Translation]

SITUATION OF THE ROHINGYA PEOPLE

Ms. Hélène Laverdière (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find that there is unanimous consent for the following motion:

Routine Proceedings

That the House: (a) acknowledge that (i) over 750,000 Rohingya refugees have fled Myanmar since October 2016 to escape the Burmese military's large-scale campaign of ethnic cleansing, (ii) the atrocities committed by the Burmese military include sexual violence, mass killings and widespread arson and may well amount to crimes against humanity, (iii) Burmese authorities have been unwilling to credibly investigate these horrific crimes and bring those responsible to account; and (b) therefore call on the Government of Canada to (i) implement the recommendations in the Report of Special Envoy to Myanmar Bob Rae, (ii) support the work of the United Nations Human Rights Council and the High Commissioner for Human Rights, who has described the campaign against the Rohingya as a "textbook case of ethnic cleansing," and has said that he "has strong suspicions that acts of genocide may have taken place in Rakhine State since August," (iii) redouble efforts in accountability and evidence-gathering; (iv) publicly support a referral of the situation in Myanmar by the United Nations Security Council to the International Criminal Court, and (v) increase diplomatic efforts to call on all Member States of the United Nations, particularly members of the United Nations Security Council, to support and advocate for such a referral; (vi) impose tough new sanctions on perpetrators of gross human rights violations, including members of the Myanmar military.

The Speaker: Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the House to move the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt this motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

ROYAL ASSENT

[English]

The Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a communication has been received, as follows:

Rideau Hall
Ottawa

May 23, 2018

Mr. Speaker,

I have the honour to inform you that the Right Honourable Julie Payette, Governor General of Canada, signified royal assent by written declaration to the bills listed in the schedule to this letter on the 23rd day of May, 2018, at 14:12 p.m.

Yours sincerely,

Assunta Di Lorenzo

The bills assented to were Bill S-5, An Act to amend the Tobacco Act and the Non-smokers' Health Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts—Chapter 9, and Bill C-49, An Act to amend the Canada Transportation Act and other Acts respecting transportation and to make related and consequential amendments to other Acts—Chapter 10.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

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

While I am on my feet, I move:

That the House do now proceed to orders of the day.

● (1520)

The Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion, the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: Call in the members.

● (1555)

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

(Division No. 668)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Allestev	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baylis
Beech	Bennett
Bibeau	Bittle
Blair	Bratina
Breton	Brison
Caesar-Chavannes	Carr
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Casey (Charlottetown)
Chagger	Chen
Cormier	Cuzner
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeCoursey	Dhillon
Di Iorio	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Eyolfson
Fergus	Fillmore
Finnigan	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Freeland
Fuhr	Gameau
Gerretsen	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Graham	Grewal
Hajdu	Hardie
Harvey	Hébert
Hehr	Hogg
Holland	Housefather
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Joly
Jones	Jordan
Jowhari	Kang
Khalid	Khera
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
LeBlanc	Lefebvre

Leslie
Lockhart
Longfield
Maloney
May (Cambridge)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Soeurs)
Monsef
Murray
Ng
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Peterson
Picard
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Ruimy
Sahota
Samson
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Tabbara
Tassi
Virani
Wilkinson
Yip

Lightbound
Long
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-
Morrissey
Nassif
O'Connell
Oliver
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Philpott
Poissant
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Rusnak
Sajjan
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sohi
Spengemann
Tan
Vandal
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Young— 160

NAYS

Members

Albas
Anderson
Arnold
Barlow
Beaulieu
Bergen
Berthold
Blaikie
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boucher
Boutin-Sweet
Brosseau
Cannings
Choquette
Clement
Cullen
Deltell
Donnelly
Dubé
Dusseau
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Gallant
Généreux
Gill
Hardcastle
Hughes
Johns
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lake
Laverdière
Lloyd
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
Marcil
Mathysen
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Motz

Albrecht
Angus
Aubin
Barsalou-Duval
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Block
Boudrias
Brassard
Calkins
Caron
Clarke
Cooper
Davies
Diotte
Dreeshen
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Fortin
Garrison
Genuis
Gourde
Harder
Jeneroux
Jolibois
Kent
Kmieciak
Kwan
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Liepert
Lobb
MacGregor
Maguire
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McColeman
Moore
Mulcair

Government Orders

Nantel
O'Toole
Pauzé
Poilievre
Rankin
Reid
Richards
Saroya
Shields
Sorenson
Ste-Marie
Strahl
Sweet
Tilson
Trudel
Van Loan
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Weir
Zimmer — 123

Nicholson
Paul-Hus
Plamondon
Quach
Rayes
Rempel
Sansoucy
Scheer
Shipley
Stanton
Stetski
Stubbs
Thériault
Trost
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Wong

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

ELECTIONS MODERNIZATION ACT

BILL C-76—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister of Small Business and Tourism, Lib.) moved:

That, in relation to Bill C-76, An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act and other Acts and to make certain consequential amendments, not more than one further sitting day shall be allotted to the consideration at second reading stage of the Bill; and

That, 15 minutes before the expiry of the time provided for Government Orders on the day allotted to the consideration at second reading stage of the said Bill, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required for the purpose of this Order, and, in turn, every question necessary for the disposal of the said stage of the Bill shall be put forthwith and successively, without further debate or amendment.

• (1600)

[English]

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 67.1, there will now be a 30-minute question period. I invite hon. members who wish to ask questions to rise in their places so the Chair has some idea of the number of members who wish to participate in this question period.

The hon. member for Banff—Airdrie.

Mr. Blake Richards (Banff—Airdrie, CPC): Mr. Speaker, here we are and this is the situation. The government has brought forward changes to our electoral law, the law that governs the way the House of Commons is made up, the way that Canadians have an opportunity to have a say on who sits here and represents them here. I do not know of any legislation that could be more significant, but after one hour of debate, the government moved notice of time allocation.

Government Orders

I remember a few years ago when the Liberal member for Coast of Bays—Central—Notre Dame brought forward a motion that would amend some Standing Orders of the House of Commons. One of them was a standing order that dealt with time allocation. It was to change it so that no motion pursuant to that standing order could be moved if it dealt with the Canada Elections Act or the Parliament of Canada Act. It also went on to amend the standing order around closure as well to make sure that closure would not be used for the Canada Elections Act or the Parliament of Canada Act.

A number of members of the Liberal Party made comments then, a couple of which I will share. The member for Coast of Bays—Central—Notre Dame said:

If we are actually debating on second reading, third reading, or reports stage any changes to the Elections Act or the Parliament of Canada Act, time allocation and closure need not apply.....

He continued:

[I]f we are making changes to the way Canadians express their opinions by the fundamental right of democracy.... I hope every member of this House will agree with us that closure and, specifically, time allocation would be set aside because of something of this importance.

I also remember the member for Winnipeg North saying:

We now have the government bringing in time allocation on a bill that deals with Elections Canada.... We need to debate this legislation.

The hon. member for Malpeque said:

It has to be noted that in terms of this motion today that we are only dealing with the Canada Elections Act and the Parliament of Canada Act. What more important business could Parliament have than with those particular acts, which are the underpinnings of our democracy?

We need to ensure, at least on those particular pieces of legislation, that a slight majority government in Canada cannot impose its will in this place. It is one of the flaws in our democracy.

I wonder does the Liberal government members still believe those words they made back then.

Hon. Karina Gould (Minister of Democratic Institutions, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am glad to be working with my hon. colleague yet again. There is one point he made that I think is incredibly important. I agree that this incredibly important legislation, which is why I am pleased to be here today to work with members on both sides of the House to get the bill to committee so that the committee can do the important work that needs to be done, to ask those questions of witnesses and experts to ensure that we get this legislation right.

More than half of what is in this legislation has already been studied by the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs. It has already been agreed to by the committee. It is based on recommendations made by the former CEO of Elections Canada, which were agreed to by the procedure and House affairs committee. I have had the wonderful opportunity to work with them to bring this legislation forward so that we can do good things for democracy, good things for Canadians, and ensure that we expand the franchise to as many Canadians as we can who have the inherent right to vote.

I look forward to working with my colleague from Banff—Airdrie, who is vice-chair of that committee, and with members on both sides of the House so that we can get this done and improve elections legislation here in Canada.

● (1605)

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Madam Speaker, so that Canadians can understand what is going on here, the Liberals have proposed what they call “generational changes” to our election laws, a whole sweeping 350-page omnibus bill. In the last Parliament, Liberals moved a motion that when it comes to election bills, Parliament should never force them through with the use of time allocation as the previous government did.

Liberal members from Toronto—St. Paul's, Charlottetown, Cape Breton—Canso, Saint-Laurent, Charlotteville, Bourassa, Malpeque, Sydney—Victoria, Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Westmount, Wascana, Labrador, Winnipeg North, Beauséjour, Cardigan, Scarborough—Guildwood, Vancouver Quadra, Halifax West, Lac-Saint-Louis, Bonavista—Burin—Trinity, and the Prime Minister himself voted that Parliament should never change our election laws if the government uses the procedure of time allocation to shut down debate in Parliament.

This is exactly what the Liberals are doing now. I am confused by what the minister just said, because today we gave the Liberal government a proposal that would have avoided this. It would have allowed proper study at committee and allowed Canadians to have their say on a bill that belongs to them, not to her or her government. The Liberals did not even have the decency to respond to the proposal. We suggested the number of hours at committee, the tour that we could do across the country, the study at committee, and the passage of the bill in time for Elections Canada to do its work on behalf of all Canadians. What did the Liberals do? They said nothing and then moved time allocation, which they promised in the last campaign not to do.

If this is not hypocrisy, I do not know what is. The Liberals promised not to do this; they all campaigned on not doing this. My friend did not campaign in the last election by saying that she would do exactly what Stephen Harper did. She did not campaign by saying that when it were to their benefit, they would shut down debate in Parliament. It is not for them to decide. These laws do not belong to the Government of Canada; they belong to all Canadians.

Let Parliament do its job. Pick up our proposal, say yes, say no, say something, and let us get to work on behalf of all Canadians.

Government Orders

Hon. Karina Gould: Madam Speaker, that is exactly what I want us to do. Let us get to work on this legislation and send it to committee so we can do the work that Canadians sent us here to do. In fact, the committee has done great work already, which is evident in this legislation. I have had great working opportunities with the member's colleague from Hamilton Centre, who put a lot of work into this on behalf of the New Democratic Party on the recommendations that were put forward. More than 30 hours were spent at the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs studying more than half of what is in this legislation. Over 85% of the recommendations from the CEO of Elections Canada are contained in this legislation. This is good legislation that I look forward to debating and having questions asked about it at committee, and to being there and testifying on behalf of the government to what is good about this legislation.

Furthermore, we absolutely are here to make sure that we make changes to the previous unfair elections act so that Canadians have the right to vote. That is exactly what we are doing. I know that the members want to get this done and to work together. Therefore, let us work together to send this to committee to make sure we have witnesses, we hear the testimony needed, and that we get this done in time for the next election.

• (1610)

Mrs. Karen Vecchio (Elgin—Middlesex—London, CPC): Madam Speaker, there is a lot of dialogue currently going on here, and we have an NDP member who is very concerned. I am watching the member for Winnipeg North, and we have pages and pages of quotes of him where he is being extremely hypocritical. Let me just read this simple quote, and maybe the democratic institutions minister can explain to me how all of a sudden, when they switch from that end to over there, the government members forget everything they ever said before. This is something that was said back on June 5: “The government has invoked time allocation on this important budget bill, thereby limiting the amount of time members of Parliament will have to speak to it.”

Could my colleague explain why the Liberal majority today are using mechanisms to pass laws that not only abuse the rules but are also not in the best interest of Canadians? The minister is saying that they are going to take it from here, where there are 338 members of Parliament who get to debate legislation and be the voice of their constituents, down to a level where—being a chair—I recognize that 10 people are going to make the choices for all Canadians. Is that the right thing to do, and can she explain why this is not extremely hypocritical of the government?

Hon. Karina Gould: Madam Speaker, Canadians have seen pages and pages of why we need to change the so-called Fair Elections Act the previous government brought in. In fact, there were five sections dedicated in *The Globe and Mail* to begging the previous government not to bring forth that legislation. The former CEO of Elections Canada stated that he could not support something that disenfranchised so many Canadians. That is exactly why we need to work together to ensure that we are increasing democracy and Canadians' ability to vote, because it is their right in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. That is exactly why we are working here in the House on behalf of Canadians, to ensure that we can continue to further democracy.

Furthermore, there have been over 30 hours of debate and discussions in the procedure and House affairs committee. This is the fourth day of debate in the House. Let us get it to committee. Let us continue to work hard on this, and let us make sure we do what is right for Canadians.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Madam Speaker, have there been four days of debate? Is the minister kidding the House? I cannot believe what I just heard from the minister. Thursday, May 10 had the sitting hours of a Wednesday, and then we had a Friday May 11. Yesterday was the only full day. Today is a Wednesday, so we will be lucky if we get an hour this afternoon to debate the bill. I just cannot understand the gall of the Liberals. The Liberals before 2015 and the Liberals now are just completely different stories.

I am sick of the Liberals blaming the opposition for their delays, when they let Bill C-33 languish at first reading for 18 months. They dumped this bill in the House of Commons on April 30 and then expect us to wear the blame for their delays. Will the minister please explain to the House why she delayed this, when the Liberals control the procedure and House affairs committee and have a clear majority in the House. Here, at the 11th hour, she is dumping the blame on the opposition for her government's fault.

Hon. Karina Gould: Madam Speaker, as I have said, over 50% of the bill has already been studied and agreed to by the procedure and House affairs committee. Over 30 hours was dedicated to much of what is in the bill. Furthermore, the majority of its contents is stuff that was recommended by the previous CEO of Elections Canada, which administers elections on behalf of Canadians and ensures that we have integrity in our electoral system.

We are absolutely committed to ensuring that we have the necessary debate, but let us get this to committee so we can ask those questions there and so all members of the House can have an opportunity to pose questions to me, to the CEO of Elections Canada, to officials, experts, and witnesses to make sure that we get this right. I look forward to hearing those reasonable, interesting, and exciting amendments to see how we can do what is best for Canadians before 2019.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Thériault (Montcalm, GPQ): Madam Speaker, when this government first took office, it promised to reform the Canada Elections Act. However, what we have here are amendments that seek to modernize the act but that really only make minor changes to it.

The minister said that the bill covers 85% of the Chief Electoral Officer's recommendations, but the real problem with this bill is what is being left out.

During our debates and hearings on the so-called electoral reform that the government promised to make, a renowned and respected former chief electoral officer, Jean-Pierre Kingsley, said that, in the interest of fairness, the government should immediately reinstate the per-vote subsidy.

The government claims to want to do things differently, so why then is that not included in the minister's bill?

Government Orders

•(1615)

Hon. Karina Gould: Madam Speaker, let us see what is in the bill. We are strengthening the powers of the Chief Electoral Officer of Canada. That is very important because it allows us to safeguard the integrity of elections in Canada. There are situations that call for more powers, and that is covered by this bill.

[English]

We are returning the ability of Canadians to vouch to establish their residency and to establish their identity. This is incredibly important. We know that Statistics Canada said there were 150,000 Canadians who were unable to vote in the last election because the Conservatives took that right away from them. We are looking at expanding the franchise to voters living abroad. We are also looking at ensuring that young people are engaged early on, establishing a youth voter registry for ages 14 to 17, so that they can be on the electoral list when they turn 18 and have that right to vote.

There is so much in this legislation that is good for democracy and good for Canadians. Let us work together, let us get this to committee, let us do the proper study, and let us get this in place for 2019.

Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC): Madam Speaker, a number of times in question period our leader has stood up and asked a very specific question about some pieces of this legislation. He was never given a clear answer, so I do not think it is acceptable to say that we will go to committee and get clear answers.

It is clear that the Liberals are trying to rig this bill in their favour, and they are rushing it through and hoping Canadians do not notice. I would like the minister to stand up and tell us how they can possibly justify rigging an elections act in their favour and have ministers able to go out and do pre-writ spending instead of having the same kind of rules for the government as we do for the opposition.

Please stand up and tell us why you have not been able to give a clear answer on that issue and why you are rigging this bill to suit the Liberal Party of Canada.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I want to remind the member to address questions to the Chair and not to the individual member.

The hon. minister.

Hon. Karina Gould: Madam Speaker, I think the member is confused because she is recalling Bill C-23 from the previous government. That is what happened when the Conservatives tried to rig the election in their favour. This bill is precisely trying to fix those abhorrent changes that were put forward with regard to democracy and to specifically ensure that we re-establish its integrity.

In the previous response I mentioned returning power to the commissioner of Elections Canada to compel testimony and lay charges, precisely because there were some members on the other side of the aisle who ended up in jail for their transgressions. Therefore, we are empowering the commissioner of Elections Canada to make sure he has the tools necessary to enforce the law

and also to ensure that the law is strengthened so that we can uphold democracy here in this country.

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to commend the minister for this piece of legislation, which I think has at its heart the inclusion of all Canadians in our democratic process.

I have been listening to this debate over the last little while, and in particular yesterday, when individuals in the opposition were talking about how the voter information cards were fraught with error and how there would be fraudulent occurrences happening. Professors at Carleton University have said that there is very little evidence that there will be fraudulent or double voting. We have the Chief Electoral Officer saying that very rarely does it lead to criminal prosecution. Professors at the University of British Columbia are saying that it is blatantly manipulative to say that using those information cards will lead to increased voter fraud.

Therefore, I wonder if the minister could please speak to how this piece of legislation allows more Canadians who have often felt disenfranchised to now become included in our electoral system.

•(1620)

Hon. Karina Gould: Madam Speaker, I think it is incredibly important, when we are looking at this legislation, to look at the importance of the return of vouching and the return of the voter identification card. In fact, yesterday the acting Chief Electoral Officer, Stéphane Perrault, said at committee that one of the important things is that sometimes individuals living in households as couples do not have any identification that establishes their residency and that they can use a voter information card to establish residency along with their identification. This is particularly important, for example, for elderly women whose bills may not come in their name. It is important to ensure that they have the ability and the right to vote.

Furthermore, with regard to accessibility, for the first time we are putting forward the idea of an incentive for political parties and candidates to receive a reimbursement when it comes to providing accessible material. We heard of several issues from Elections Canada's disability committee with regard to voting and the polls. Seven of those eight recommendations are in this proposed legislation.

We look forward to hearing more about this, asking those tough questions at committee, and talking about this further.

Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau (Berthier—Maskinongé, NDP): Madam Speaker, I just want to say it is infuriating, it is disgusting, that we are debating time allocation on this bill.

I remember. I was here in 2014 when we had the debate on the unfair elections act. The Liberals were with us. We talked about how we were infuriated and appalled by the time allocation that the then-government put forward.

The member for Winnipeg North even said:

We now have the government bringing in time allocation on a bill that deals with Elections Canada. ...[W]e have the irresponsible nature of the Conservatives trying to ram it through and limit debate in second reading, which is disgraceful.

Government Orders

He said a few years ago that he thinks we should remember these things. I wonder if he feels that way again today.

The member for Malpeque said:

Mr. Speaker, invoking closure on this bill really is the height of hypocrisy.

I think we all feel that again today.

He went on:

How can the government invoke closure on a bill about democratic reform? This place is supposed to be about debate and good discussion. The minister is shutting that debate down and, I believe, putting democracy at risk.

Fast-forward to 2018, and we are living the exact same thing. How can the Liberals justify what they said in 2014 and during the election with what they are doing now? It is a disgrace.

Hon. Karina Gould: Madam Speaker, as has been repeated, and as I have said, the procedure and House affairs committee has spent over 30 hours looking at the recommendations from the CEO of Elections Canada.

This has been great conversation, great debate, and great dialogue, and it has factored into this proposed legislation. It has ideas and issues that have been factored in from all sides of this House. Over half of those recommendations have been agreed to by all parties in this House.

Let us work together. Let us keep working together. Let us do this for democracy. Let us get it to committee, where we can all ask those questions and have a robust dialogue and debate and get this done in time for the next election.

Mr. Scott Reid (Lanark—Frontenac—Kingston, CPC): Madam Speaker, the minister, quite correctly, points out that we have discussed the CEO's report and recommendations at committee.

However, let us be clear about this: this is a bill that is 300-odd pages long, and while a substantial portion of it is those recommendations, a very substantial portion is outside of those recommendations. The part, by page count, that is outside of the CEO's recommendations is far larger in scope than most bills.

This time allocation motion makes it impossible for us to discuss those aspects, those voluminous aspects, in appropriate detail. I think the minister would have to concede that.

Second, I think the minister would also have to concede that many of the CEO's recommendations were not dealt with by the committee. Indeed, we could have done so had we not had other items of government business that pushed them out of the way. The suggestion that this bill is essentially putting forward the CEO's recommendations is simply not accurate.

Finally, I would note that on a highly technical matter, as these recommendations tend to be, how they are put into effect is very important. Going through those technical recommendations is something that is legitimately the business of not only the committee but of this House.

Does the minister not agree with those assertions?

• (1625)

Hon. Karina Gould: Madam Speaker, that is why I think we need to get this bill to committee as soon as possible. It is to ensure that

those questions are asked of witnesses, that those questions are asked of myself, of officials, of Elections Canada, so that we can have the proper scrutiny, so that we can get this done, so that we can ensure that we have restored the transgressions in democracy that were put forward by the previous government in Bill C-23 and ensure that we have integrity in our system in 2019.

That is exactly what we are going to do. I look forward to continuing this conversation and continuing this debate and dialogue with colleagues in this House and at committee. Let us get it there. Let us get it done for Canadians.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, I thought I might just take a moment to express, on behalf of the many Canadians who were genuinely interested and are genuinely interested in real democratic reform in Canada, our disappointment in the government. Canadians thought they were electing a government that was genuinely interested in not only improving Canada's electoral laws, but in doing it the right way.

We have watched the government come into power. We are hearing today that Liberals want to get the legislation to committee. We had a whole special committee on electoral reform. It did great work. It actually came to a multi-party agreement, because the government did not have a majority on that committee. At the end of that whole process and after all these platitudes about how wonderful that committee was, the government threw out all that work while it was making a science of cash-for-access fundraising that heretofore had never been done in that way and to that extent.

Then the Liberals could not even bother to meet the bare minimum requirement of tabling a bill to undo the nefarious changes to the election laws carried out by the Harper government. They could not get it done on time. Now the Liberals have brought it here and are using time allocation, which was something they said they would never do.

Why do Canadians who want real electoral reform have to be so disappointed all the time?

Hon. Karina Gould: Madam Speaker, there is so much in this legislation that we are proposing that I know New Democrats and the Liberals share. We want to get this done. Therefore, let us work together. Let us not play partisan games. Let us get this to committee to make sure that we do this for Canadians. That is exactly what we should be doing here.

There is good stuff for democracy here. There is good stuff for democratic reform. Let us do this and make sure that we get it done for 2019.

Mr. Robert-Falcon Ouellette (Winnipeg Centre, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I heard the heckling when "partisan games" was mentioned. It is quite telling.

Government Orders

The unfair elections act was enacted by the Harper Conservatives back in 2014, and it was called the low point of the legislative agenda in that year. It was said to be a partisan attack on Canada's elections rules. It ignored fact and mocked expertise.

I think it is time to get Bill C-76 out of this place—as it is a highly partisan issue, as we heard from the heckling—and get it to committee. The heckling goes on, so we need to get the bill to the experts and hear from the Chief Electoral Officer about what should happen with the rule changes that we need so that we can ensure that the electoral rules actually reflect Canadian values. I think that is what is most important to ensure that we get more people out to vote and enable young people, indigenous people, and people who have disabilities to go out and exercise their democratic right in their democracy, which is here in our country of Canada.

Hon. Karina Gould: Madam Speaker, I could not agree more. We need absolutely to get this bill to committee.

It is telling that in 2014 over 400 academics signed an open letter to the previous Conservative government begging it not to move forward with the Fair Elections Act.

We need to make these changes. It is imperative for democracy that we do that. It is imperative for Canadians who have the right to vote to make sure that we move forward with these changes. Let us get this to committee, ask those questions, have that debate, and then bring the bill back to this House so that we can make those changes and do what is right for Canadians.

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Madam Speaker, there are times in the House that the hypocrisy of the Liberals is stifling. It is hard to believe.

The deputy House leader, the member for Winnipeg North, in debate about the Fair Elections Act when time allocation was called on February 6, called using time allocation an “assault on democracy”. He then suggested that the Conservatives were going to send it to hours at PROC. Does this not sound familiar? That member, the person now pushing the bill through the chamber, called bringing time allocation on elections legislation “disgraceful”. These are their words.

I feel for the minister having to stand up and justify the terrible double standard and hypocrisy of the Liberal government. I would also invite her to get to know Elections Canada reports, because the Neufeld report that formed the basis of the Fair Elections Act said that 42% of vouching incidents were false votes or irregularities—42%. In Elections Canada's own report on election participation by vulnerable groups that do not vote enough, vouching has nothing to do with it, so once again the Liberals are bringing in something that Elections Canada has said is unreliable.

In this day and age, it is reasonable to ask someone to show their identification to show that they are of voting age and that they live in the riding. Why the lack of common sense?

• (1630)

Hon. Karina Gould: Madam Speaker, leave it to the party opposite to view expanding the franchise and enabling more Canadians to vote as a bad thing.

On this side of the House, we firmly believe that a Canadian has a right to vote, has a constitutional right to vote, and we are going to do what we can to make sure that they can cast that ballot. We are not afraid of more Canadians voting.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The question is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Call in the members.

[*Translation*]

• (1710)

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

(*Division No. 669*)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baylis
Beech	Bennett
Bibeau	Bittle
Bratina	Breton
Brisson	Caesar-Chavannes
Carr	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Chen	Cormier
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	DeCoursey
Dhillon	Di Iorio
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz
Easter	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson	Fergus
Fillmore	Finnigan
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Freeland	Fry
Fuhr	Garneau
Gerretsen	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Graham	Grewal
Hajdu	Hardie
Harvey	Hébert

Government Orders

Hehr
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Jones
Jowhari
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
LeBlanc
Leslie
Long
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Monsef
Morrissey
Nassif
O’Connell
Oliver
Ouelletle
Peschisolido
Philpott
Poissant
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Rusnak
Sajjan
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sohi
Spengemann
Tan
Vandal
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Young— 159

Hogg
Housefather
Hutchings
Joly
Jordan
Kang
Khera
Lametti
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lefebvre
Lightbound
Longfield
Maloney
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Murray
Ng
Oliphant
O’Regan
Paradis
Peterson
Picard
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Ruimy
Sahota
Samson
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Tabbara
Tassi
Virani
Wilkinson
Yip

NAYS

Members

Albas
Anderson
Arnold
Barlow
Beaulieu
Bergen
Berthold
Blaikie
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boucher
Boutin-Sweet
Brosseau
Cannings
Choquette
Clement
Cullen
Deltell
Donnelly
Dubé
Dusseault
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Gallant
Généreux
Gill
Hardcastle
Hughes
Johns
Kelly
Kitchen

Albrecht
Angus
Aubin
Barsalou-Duval
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Block
Boudrias
Brassard
Calkins
Caron
Clarke
Cooper
Davies
Diotte
Dreeshen
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Egliniski
Falk (Provencher)
Fortin
Garrison
Genuis
Gourde
Harder
Jeneroux
Jolibois
Kent
Kmiec

Kusie
Lake
Liepert
Lobb
MacGregor
Maguire
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Saarnich—Gulf Islands)
McColeman
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Motz
Nicholson
Paul-Hus
Plamondon
Quach
Rayes
Rempel
Sansoucy
Scheer
Shipley
Stanton
Strahl
Sweet
Tilson
Trudel
Van Loan
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Weir
Zimmer— 121

Kwan
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lloyd
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
Marcil
Mathysen
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Moore
Nantel
O’Toole
Pauzé
Poilievre
Rankin
Reid
Richards
Saroya
Shields
Sorenson
Stetski
Stubbs
Thériault
Trost
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Wong

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[*English*]

SECOND READING

The House resumed from May 22 consideration of the motion that Bill C-76, An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act and other Acts and to make certain consequential amendments, be read the second time and referred to a committee, and of the amendment.

The Speaker: I wish to inform the House that because of proceedings on the time allocation motion, government orders will be extended by 30 minutes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Thériault (Montcalm, GPQ): Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening, in spite of the shameful time allocation motion, to speak to the elections modernization act at second reading. I think that the “elections modernization” part of the title is a bit much, since one of the main changes is to restore the voter card as a valid piece of ID. I will get back to this point.

I want to start by saying that it is shameful that the government has resorted to a gag order on this matter. In a former life, I sat in another Parliament, the Quebec National Assembly, which unfortunately uses the British system. Never would a government take advantage of its parliamentary majority to change election laws. In 1999, a change was made regarding voter ID. I want to inform my colleagues in the House that this does not enhance the integrity of the vote. The government will not make it easier to vote by simply considering the voter card as a valid form of ID. My colleagues can Google what happened in Quebec in 1998. An organized identity-fraud system was uncovered as part of the Berardinucci case. The court issued two rulings, and since then, voters in Quebec have been required to produce a piece of photo ID to vote.

Government Orders

During the last election, Quebec had no problems with voter identification. Voters in municipal, provincial, and federal elections have no problem showing ID. However, voting is a sacred act in a democracy, and we should not make it too easy. I am hearing talk about the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, but voting is not a freedom. Voting comes with a duty, the duty to prove eligibility to vote.

The minister wants us to hurry up. She says this bill will go to committee, where it will be improved. That is not at all the experience I have had with clause-by-clause studies of bills in committee after second reading. What we actually hear is, “Talk all you want, sweetheart, but when your speaking time is up, we will use our parliamentary majority to do whatever we want.” The government votes down amendments and does not improve bills.

In my opinion, on an issue as important as voting rights and election laws, this government should not procrastinate and wait until the last second to try to change a few things in hopes of not looking stupid. When they first came into office, we were facing a major reform to the Canada Elections Act. We even hoped to change the voting system. Anything was possible. What we heard from Canadians can never be taken away from us. That special committee's report went into the trash. It was called a special committee because it was open to all parliamentarians, even those who did not belong to a recognized parliamentary group in the House.

• (1715)

In the debate on changes to the Elections Act, the next logical step would have been to give independent MPs the right to speak and even to vote in that committee. Now the minister wants us to hurry up. I would encourage her colleagues to slow down instead.

People told us that they were fed up with the party line, that the party line was one of the reasons they were so cynical. Government is all about executive power. It is all about cabinet. MPs who want to be ministers are more interested in doing the executive's bidding than honouring their mandate as parliamentarians here in the House. We are legislators, not ministers. We belong to the legislative branch and we represent the people. In a Parliament like ours, legislative power is the foundation of democracy. When my colleagues on the government side exist solely to rubber-stamp whatever the Prime Minister and the ministers tell them to, they are not doing their job. That is why voters do not bother to vote.

It is utter nonsense to say that people will not vote because it is too difficult or because the identification requirement prevents them from voting. During the hearings on electoral reform we held for months, people told us what keeps them from voting. For example, they say that their riding has been red since their great-grandfather's time and that this will not change, or that the riding has been blue since their great-grandmother's time, and this will not change. They are being stripped of their power of representation, and this is why democracy is suffering.

They told us that they want their vote to count. The current government not only proved unable to keep its promise to bring in a new voting system that represents the plurality of representation and ensures that every vote counts, but also went to great lengths to prevent all votes from actually counting, as they would if voters

could finance the political parties they believe in through the votes they cast. Voters would then vote in accordance with their beliefs instead of voting strategically.

I have certainly spent a lot of time in my political life criticizing Jean Chrétien, but at least his legacy in politics and in this House was to give voters the ability to vote with conviction because he allowed their vote to finance a political party. That party might not get an MP elected, but that system gave the party the same chance right out of the gate to have its voice heard on an equal footing, in a democratic society, in the democratic debate that is an election. This also enabled the party to have the necessary funding between elections to promote its views.

To me that is democracy in a nutshell, but it is nowhere to be found in a bill that claims to limit spending. It does not even limit the government's pre-election spending. We have fixed-date elections and the government continues to make announcements, to use taxpayers' money to pay for its ads.

Under these circumstances, it is clear that we will be voting against the bill.

• (1720)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): 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, Natural Resources; the hon. member for London—Fanshawe, Canada Post; and the hon. member for Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, Agriculture and Agri-Food.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is important for us to recognize that the legislation we have before us has been quite well received across Canada. My understanding is that members in opposition, New Democrats and others, except for the Conservative Party, are looking at supporting the content of the legislation. We need to recognize that what we have in the legislation is something that would strengthen our democracy. Elections Canada has done a phenomenal job. It is recognized around the world as an incredible independent organization that does a phenomenal job in organizing and pulling off elections.

Many of the things we are passing today to go into committee come out of the Elections Canada recommendations. I wonder if my colleague across the way could provide his thoughts on how important it is that we follow and support those recommendations, which are virtually taken right from Elections Canada's book.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Thériault: Madam Speaker, as I already said, the problem with this bill is what it leaves out. It contains some interesting things, but they are cosmetic.

However, we must be consistent. If there is a fixed-date election and that leads people to spend a lot of money in the pre-election period, and we need to limit that, that is a very good thing.

Government Orders

If they claim that because there is a fixed-date election, spending during the pre-election period must be limited, why was government advertising left out? Why did they not include government ads? Why was a limit not placed on that as well?

The government recognizes that when we did not have fixed-date elections, the government in power could make whatever announcements it wanted. It was the Prime Minister who decided whether to announce an election or not. We could not assume that the government was making a lot of announcements because an election was coming. We could not assume that, but we could have our doubts.

We now have fixed-date elections and we want to limit spending in the pre-election period. There is still a lot of work to be done with respect to third parties.

I challenge the members opposite, who will be sitting on the committee, to let the bill be improved by the opposition's amendments just for the fun of it. I cannot wait to see what they will do.

• (1725)

Mr. François Choquette (Drummond, NDP): Madam Speaker, like my hon. colleague from Montcalm, I would like to say that it is shameful to see the Liberals using the same old tactics as Stephen Harper and his Conservatives by imposing gag orders and limiting the time for debate on such an important bill as this one on electoral reform.

I am not completely satisfied with what is and what is not included in this bill. As my colleague mentioned, a committee consulted people from across Canada to get recommendations, but the government dismissed them all out of hand, including the recommendation to implement a proportional voting system.

Another important thing is that, when Canadians voted in the past, their vote was worth something because the party they voted for was given \$2 so that every vote counted.

If the per-vote subsidy were reinstated, it would encourage Canadians to get out and vote for the party they really believe in.

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Speaker, that is more of a comment than a question, but I completely agree with my colleague.

The problem is that the Liberals decided to move a time allocation motion and curtail debate. What is more, in committee, the Liberals reject the opposition parties' amendments. They decide not to make any amendments and not to improve bills, and they can do that because they have a majority. That is why parliamentarians are so angry to see the Liberals, who promised to do politics differently, using the same approach that they criticized the previous government for using. It is the same old story.

It seems to me that the least the Liberals could have done was to show even the slightest willingness to undertake a reform.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour for me to rise to speak to Bill C-76.

[*English*]

I am pleased to rise in debate today, but I regret that it is in the context of time allocation already being applied to the bill. I

appreciate that the Liberal side of the House has provided time for my colleague, the hon. member for Montcalm, and for me to speak to the bill, but I regret deeply the use of time allocation. Because I was not able to get in on the debate on time allocation that occurred before the vote, let me suggest some ideas to the hon. minister, the government House leader, and others as to how we might avoid so many time allocations.

It is my belief that the ability, in votes, of all three of the larger parties, particularly the official opposition and the governing party, to put forward as many speakers as possible on any bill is a black box for our House leaders. Getting agreement is something I will leave to them. I can only assume that when we have a lot of time allocations, the coordination is not going well. I do not blame any one party more than the others. I will just say that it is not a good thing for this place when we have time allocation, particularly on a bill that is important.

I would like to suggest that the Speaker has the power, and could be encouraged by those within this place who want the place to work better, to insist on a rule that has fallen into disuse. That rule is that members cannot read speeches. If no one could read a speech, people in the back rooms could not hand a speech to someone and say, "Go give this speech. You are up next."

They would have to call enough people forward who had read the bill and understood the bill and were prepared to debate it without notes. I am not saying that there are not many of us who are prepared to do that, but the ability of a House leader, on any side, to decide to play games with this place would be significantly minimized if we went back to that rule, which already exists.

I would urge those who think it is a good idea to perhaps speak to their own House leaders. In that case, I would just have a conversation with myself, but the rest of those assembled here should talk to their whips, talk to the House leaders, and talk to the Speaker if they think it would be a good idea to say that we do not want all the members to just read. I am not saying that members do not get up and read speeches they have written themselves. I know that happens, but a lot of times, people read something they have never seen before in their lives. We can tell by the rapt attention with which they deliver something they do not actually know much about or believe in.

Here ends the rant on how to get this place to work better. If people could only get up and speak based on what they know about a bill, we would get more interesting debates and more civilized debates, and we might have an easier time getting agreement on how many speakers there would be on legislation.

It is really tragic that we are seeing time allocation as often as we are seeing it. I do not think it is healthy for democracy, and I know it is going to be an election issue, with everyone saying, "They did it more. They did it too. They are hypocrites." We should not live in glass houses if we are going to collect stones.

Government Orders

This bill is good legislation. It is very good legislation. It undoes a lot of what happened in the unfair elections act before the last election, but that does not mean that it is perfect legislation, which is why we should not be hearing from the minister that it has already been discussed at PROC. It should be discussed in this place at second reading, where all members who are engaged in the issue and know about it can participate, because not everyone is on PROC. It is a committee.

We know that Bill C-33, which was excellent legislation, languished for a year and a half. It was tabled when I was still serving on the Special Committee on Electoral Reform, which was one of the more tragic experiences of my life. We were still sitting around the table putting forward good ideas, but then saying, “Oh, the minister has new legislation that just came out that has some of our ideas in it.” That was Bill C-33. It came out in December of 2016, and everything from Bill C-33 is now rolled into Bill C-76.

For those who are not familiar with the bill, perhaps who are watching from home, let me say that Bill C-33 did a lot of very good things. I know that the Conservatives will disagree. They like Bill C-23, which they called the Fair Elections Act. What it did was make it harder for Canadians to vote. There is no doubt in my mind about that. I had people come to me who were not allowed to vote.

• (1730)

Bill C-23 was focused on the false notion that Canada suffered from voter fraud. However, it is very clear, on the evidence, that the problem in Canada is not people who try to vote more than once; it is people who vote less than once. We do not have any voter fraud that the elections commissioner has ever really been able to find is a problem. Our problem is low voter turnout.

The Conservatives were quite self-congratulatory when we went from an average national voter turnout of 60% in 2011 to a voter turnout of 68% in 2015. They said that proved that the unfair elections act did not decrease voter turnout. In fact, I think it masked what would have been a much bigger voter turnout. Young people mobilized in 2015. There were a lot of efforts to educate people about vote mobs, advanced poll voting, and getting people who did not usually vote out to vote.

I am enormously proud to represent Saanich—Gulf Islands. In 2011, when the voter turnout nationally was 60%, voter turnout in Saanich—Gulf Islands was just a titch below 75%. In 2015, when I was re-elected, voter turnout was just a bit below 80%. Now, that is nothing compared to my friend who is leader of the Green Party in Prince Edward Island, Peter Bevan-Baker. When he was elected, voter turnout in his riding was 93%.

Let us not be satisfied with 68%. We need to see 90% or 95% of Canadians voting and feeling good about the democratic experience. I think getting back the voter registration card is important. Bringing back vouching is important, and so is bringing back the powers of the Chief Electoral Officer to inform people and educate people. Warn people when voter fraud is happening.

Everything in Bill C-33 that would undo Bill C-23 is to the good and should be passed quickly. As well, I really like the idea that the Elections Canada folks would go into schools and register people who are 16 to 18 years old so that when they get the right to vote,

they know what they are doing. They know where to go. They have already registered to vote. That is all in what was former Bill C-33. It is all good stuff. I wish we had already passed it.

Now we are looking at new and additional changes. I wish we had seen more. Clearly, if we are going to protect the privacy of Canadians, it is long past time that political parties were exempted from the Privacy Act. I have never heard a single good reason why we are in a special category, political parties, and Canadians' data is safe with us. Clearly, it is not safe with us. We get hacked. We hire companies and do not have any idea that they will be doing stuff like Cambridge Analytica or some of the ones that mine data and use it for other things. We are not in a position to say that it is good enough to have a voluntary code of privacy practice for every political party that we are required by law to show Elections Canada and have posted publicly.

By the way, I do not think “trust us” works terribly well for political parties. One of the best pieces of legislation from the 41st Parliament, the Reform Act, to bring about reform in this place and reduce the power of political party leaders over their MPs, which came out under the name of the member for Wellington—Halton Hills, required a change in the Parliament of Canada Act. It was executed. Section 49 is new and requires parties, immediately after the election, to have a discussion in caucus and a vote to decide what the powers of the leader will be. For instance, will the power of the leader include throwing someone out of caucus?

I am reliably informed that even though that is the law of the day, two out of three recognized parties in this place skipped that step and did not think it was important to follow the Parliament of Canada Act, section 49. I am deeply dismayed that this took place. All MPs in this place should ask their party leadership if they did that. Did they file the letter with the Speaker? They should ask to see the letter filed with the Speaker to comply with section 49 of the Parliament of Canada Act.

On to the other things in Bill C-76. I hope the government will be open to amendments. As I said, this is good legislation. It does take on things like pre-writ spending. However, why are we allowing any pre-writ spending on televised election ads that bombard Canadians with negative messages and attack ads. It is good to regulate spending before an election. Let us just say that between election day and the next time a writ drops, no one is allowed to spend any money on political ads. There is not an election going on, so no spending. I will be bringing forward things like that as amendments.

Why are we increasing the spending ability of third parties? I would love to see us go in the direction of many countries around the world, including the U.K., which prohibit spending for electronic political ads of any kind at any time. It is very useful legislation.

Government Orders

There are many things I would like to suggest need more work in this legislation. Getting it to committee is important, but not so important that we should have time allocation in this place.

• (1735)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I really do appreciate many of the comments made by the leader of the Green Party.

She was here during the debate on Bill C-23, Harper's Fair Elections Act. We found that there were a great many individuals, academics, Elections Canada itself, and parties within the chamber, excluding the Conservatives, who really opposed the legislation. Today, we have a wide spectrum of support, not only outside this chamber but also inside it, where we have more than one party supporting the legislation.

Would my colleague and friend across the way not recognize that there are some who ultimately do not want to have the elections laws reformed? If this legislation passes, it will strengthen Canada's democracy. I agree there is always room for improvement. However, this will provide additional strength to Canada's democracy. Would the member not agree that at times we do have to look at ways to get legislation through, because there are parties that will put up whatever obstacles they can to prevent its passage?

• (1740)

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the problem that the government has in making the case for limiting debate via time allocation now is the massive amount of time that went by when Bill C-33 did not come to second reading. There was lots of time to get Bill C-33 through, no matter how many speakers one party or another were to put up.

Bill C-76, bringing in Bill C-33 and additional measures, requires more study.

I completely agree and am not going to take a single point away from the fact that most of what is in this legislation was already recommended by Elections Canada. I have not doubt that most of what is in it will improve the health of our democracy. However, it is fundamental legislation. It takes a while to get back to the Elections Act. We should have full time to debate it at second reading.

I will admit in a non-partisan way that the use of time allocation in the 41st Parliament was much more egregious, because the legislation it applied to made it harder for people to vote. However, for the Liberals to try to reverse that legislation with time allocation because they say they are not as bad as the other guys because their legislation is better does not do away with the fundamental issue of respect for Parliament, respect for this place, and allowing Parliament to have full debate at second reading, full discussion in committees, and adequate time to go through debate at clause by clause, and adequate time at report stage and third reading.

The delay on the government side in bringing the legislation forward does not make a good excuse.

Mr. Michael Cooper (St. Albert—Edmonton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member touched on third parties. During the last election, we saw large amounts of foreign money going to registered

third parties, who in turn used it or mixed it with their general funds for all manner of political activities.

One of the reasons they were able to do that was the loopholes in the Canada Elections Act. The biggest loophole is that six months and a day before the issuance of a writ, there is no regulation of foreign funding going, for example, to third parties.

This bill does not fix that loophole. It in fact just moves the date for which there is absolutely no regulation of third parties' financing closer to the election date. Could the hon. member comment on that?

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, I certainly find it offensive that any foreign money goes into any third party. Clearly, there should be no foreign money allowed for any political party.

That is one of the strengths of our democracy, I have to say, in the strong legislation brought in under the former prime minister, the Right Hon. Jean Chrétien, to get big corporate and union money out of federal politics. I think we need to watch out for any opportunity where those principles are perverted. Frankly, we should bring back the per vote support, so that voters can choose, when they vote, a small way of creating public funding for parties to reduce the pressure for fundraising, which can lead to a lot of ethical issues, as we have frequently debated in this place.

I am certainly grateful to my friend for raising it. Frankly, I would prefer that election spending be reduced to the minimum and that public service broadcasts replace paid political ads as much as possible, both to turn down the temperature and turn up the volume on information and issues, and so that people can really understand a candidate and not just a political party brand. Then, when a candidate is standing before a voter, it would be like a job interview for that person who wants to go work for that constituency.

We need to go back to times when party leaders did not tell MPs what to do, and when candidates could stand on their own merit and ask voters to please trust them with their vote.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): It being 5:45 p.m., pursuant to an order made earlier today, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the second reading stage of the bill now before the House.

• (1745)

[*English*]

The question is on the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And five or more members having risen:

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Call in the members.

• (1825)

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

(Division No. 670)

YEAS

Members

Albas	Albrecht
Anderson	Arnold
Barlow	Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu	Benzen
Bergen	Bernier
Berthold	Bezan
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Block
Boucher	Boudrias
Brassard	Calkins
Clarke	Clement
Cooper	Deltell
Diotte	Dreeshen
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Fortin	Généreux
Genuis	Gill
Gourde	Harder
Jeneroux	Kelly
Kent	Kitchen
Kusie	Lake
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Lukiwski	MacKenzie
Maguire	Marcil
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McColeman
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Motz	Nicholson
O'Toole	Pauzé
Plamondon	Poillievre
Rayes	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Saroya	Shields
Shipley	Sorenson
Stanton	Ste-Marie
Strahl	Stubbs
Sweet	Thériault
Tilson	Trost
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Vecchio	Viersen
Wagantall	Warawa
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Wong
Zimmer — 85	

NAYS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Amos
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Aubin	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baylis

Beech	Bennett
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Boutin-Sweet
Bratina	Breton
Brison	Brosseau
Caesar-Chavannes	Cannings
Caron	Carr
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Casey (Charlottetown)
Chagger	Champagne
Chen	Choquette
Cormier	Cullen
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
DeCoursey	Dhillon
Di Iorio	Donnelly
Drouin	Dubé
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	Dusseault
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Eyolfson
Fergus	Fillmore
Finnigan	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Freeland
Fry	Fuhr
Garneau	Garrison
Gerretsen	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Graham	Grewal
Hajdu	Hardcastle
Hardie	Harvey
Hébert	Hehr
Hogg	Holland
Housefather	Hughes
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Johns
Jolibois	Joly
Jones	Jordan
Jowhari	Kang
Khalid	Khera
Kwan	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Laverdière
LeBlanc	Lefebvre
Leslie	Lightbound
Long	Longfield
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Masse (Windsor West)
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Mathysen	
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McCrimmon	McDonald
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Monsef	
Moore	Morrissey
Murray	Nantel
Nassif	Ng
O'Connell	Oliphant
Oliver	O'Regan
Ouellette	Paradis
Peschisolido	Peterson
Philpott	Picard
Poissant	Quach
Qualtrough	Rankin
Ratansi	Rioux
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Rota	Ruimy
Rusnak	Saganash
Sahota	Sajan
Samson	Sangha
Sansoucy	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schieffe
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)

Government Orders

Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sohi
Spengemann
Tabbara
Tassi
Vandal
Weir
Wilkinson
Yip

Sikand
Sorbara
Stetski
Tan
Trudel
Virani
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Young— 196

Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fry
Gameau
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hajdu
Hardie
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Jolibois
Jones
Jowhari
Khalid
Kwan
Lametti
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
LeBlanc
Leslie
Long
MacGregor
Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Mathysen
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Monsef
Moore
Murray
Nassif
O'Connell
Oliver
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Philpott
Poissant
Qualtrough
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Rusnak
Sahota
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sohi
Spengemann
Tabbara
Tassi
Vandal
Weir
Wilkinson
Yip

Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Freeland
Fuhr
Garrison
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Grewal
Hardcastle
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Johns
Joly
Jordan
Kang
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Laverdière
Lefebvre
Lightbound
Longfield
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Morrissey
Nantel
Ng
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Peterson
Picard
Quach
Rankin
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Ruimy
Saganash
Sajjan
Sangha
Sarai
Schieffe
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Stetski
Tan
Trudel
Virani
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Young— 196

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the amendment defeated.

[*Translation*]

The question is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

• (1830)

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

(*Division No. 671*)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Aubin
Badawey
Bains
Beech
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bratina
Brisson
Caesar-Chavannes
Caron
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Cormier
Cuzner
Damoff
DeCoursey
Di Iorio
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fergus
Finnigan

Alghabra
Amos
Angus
Arya
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Bennett
Bittle
Blair
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Brosseau
Cannings
Carr
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Choquette
Cullen
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhillon
Donnelly
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dusseault
Easter
El-Khoury
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fisher

NAYS

Members

Albas
Anderson
Barlow
Beaulieu
Bergen
Berthold
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boucher
Brassard
Clarke
Cooper

Albrecht
Arnold
Barsalou-Duval
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Block
Boudrias
Calkins
Clement
Deltell

Private Members' Business

Diotte	Dreeshen
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Fortin	Généreux
Genus	Gill
Gourde	Harder
Jeneroux	Kelly
Kent	Kitchen
Kusie	Lake
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Lukiwski	MacKenzie
Maguire	Marcil
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McColeman
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Motz	Nicholson
O'Toole	Paupé
Plamondon	Poillievre
Rayes	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Saroya	Shields
Shipley	Sorenson
Stanton	Ste-Marie
Strahl	Stubbs
Sweet	Thériault
Tilson	Trost
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Vecchio	Viersen
Wagantall	Warawa
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Wong
Zimmer— 85	

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried. Consequently, this bill is referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

● (1835)

[English]

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND GOVERNMENT SERVICES ACT

The House resumed from May 9 consideration of the motion that Bill C-354, an act to amend the Department of Public Works and Government Services Act (use of wood), be read the third time and passed.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at third reading stage of Bill C-354 under private members' business.

● (1840)

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

(Division No. 672)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Amos
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Aubin	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell

Bains	Barsalou-Duval
Baylis	Beaulieu
Beech	Bennett
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet	Bratina
Breton	Brisson
Brosseau	Caesar-Chavannes
Cannings	Caron
Carr	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Champagne	Chen
Choquette	Cormier
Cullen	Cuzner
Dabrusin	Damoff
Davies	DeCoursey
Dhillon	Di Iorio
Donnelly	Drouin
Dubé	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dusseault	Dzerowicz
Easter	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson	Fergus
Fillmore	Finnigan
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Freeland
Fry	Fuhr
Gameau	Garrison
Gerretsen	Gill
Goldsmith-Jones	Goodale
Gould	Graham
Grewal	Hajdu
Hardcastle	Hardie
Harvey	Hébert
Hehr	Hogg
Holland	Housefather
Hughes	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Johns	Jolibois
Joly	Jones
Jordan	Jowhari
Kang	Khalid
Khera	Kwan
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Laverdière	LeBlanc
Lefebvre	Leslie
Lightbound	Long
Longfield	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Marcil	Masse (Windsor West)
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Mathysen	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
May (Cambridge)	McDonald
McCrimmon	McKay
McGuinty	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McKenna	Mendès
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mihychuk
Medicino	
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Monsef	
Moore	Morrissey
Murray	Nantel
Nassif	Ng
O'Connell	Oliphant
Oliver	O'Regan
Ouellette	Paradis
Paupé	Peschisolido
Peterson	Philpott
Picard	Plamondon
Poissant	Quach
Qualtrough	Rankin
Ratansi	Rioux
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Rota	Ruimy
Rusnak	Saganash
Sahota	Sajjan
Samson	Sangha

Private Members' Business

Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sohi
Spengemann
Stetski
Tan
Thériault
Vandal
Weir
Wilkinson
Yip
Zimmer— 207

Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Tabbara
Tassi
Trudel
Virani
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Young

● (1850)

[*English*]

During the taking of the vote:

Hon. Kevin Sorenson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There was some mix-up here, and we just want to be sure I was recorded as supporting the motion.

[*Translation*]

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

(*Division No. 673*)

NAYS

Members

Albas	Albrecht
Anderson	Barlow
Benzen	Bergen
Bernier	Berthold
Bezan	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Block	Boucher
Brassard	Calkins
Clarke	Clement
Cooper	Deltell
Diotte	Dreeshen
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Généreux	Genuis
Gourde	Harder
Jeneroux	Kelly
Kent	Kitchen
Kusie	Lake
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengary)	Lloyd
Lobb	Lukiwski
MacKenzie	Maguire
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McColeman
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Motz	Nicholson
O'Toole	Poillievre
Rayes	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Saroya	Shields
Shipley	Sorenson
Stanton	Strahl
Stubbs	Sweet
Tilson	Trost
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Vecchio	Viersen
Wagantall	Warawa
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Wong— 72

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.
(Bill read the third time and passed)

* * *

● (1845)

[*Translation*]

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH ACT

The House resumed from May 10 consideration of the motion that Bill C-326, An Act to amend the Department of Health Act (drinking water guidelines), as reported (without amendment) from the committee, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at report stage of Bill C-326 under private members' business.

YEAS

Members

Albas	Albrecht
Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Amos
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arnold	Arseneault
Arya	Aubin
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Bains
Barlow	Barsalou-Duval
Baylis	Beaulieu
Beech	Bennett
Benzen	Bergen
Bernier	Berthold
Bezan	Bibeau
Bittle	Blaikie
Blair	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Block
Boucher	Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet	Brassard
Bratina	Breton
Brison	Brosseau
Caesar-Chavannes	Calkins
Cannings	Caron
Carr	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Champagne	Chen
Choquette	Clarke
Clement	Cooper
Cormier	Cullen
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
DeCoursey	Deltell
Dhillon	Di Iorio
Diotte	Donnelly
Dreeshen	Drouin
Dubé	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dusseault	Dzerowicz
Easter	Eglinski
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Eyolfson
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Fast	Fergus
Fillmore	Finnigan
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Freeland
Fry	Fuhr
Gameau	Garrison
Généreux	Genuis
Gerretsen	Gill
Goldsmith-Jones	Goodale
Gould	Gourde
Graham	Grewal
Hajdu	Hardcastle
Harder	Hardie
Harvey	Hébert
Hehr	Hogg
Holland	Housefather

Private Members' Business

Hughes	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Jeneroux	Johns
Jolibois	Joly
Jones	Jordan
Jowhari	Kang
Kelly	Kent
Khalid	Khera
Kitchen	Kusie
Kwan	Lake
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Laverdière
LeBlanc	Lefebvre
Leslie	Lightbound
Lloyd	Lobb
Long	Longfield
Lukivski	MacGregor
MacKenzie	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maguire	Maloney
Marcil	Masse (Windsor West)
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Mathysen	
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McColeman
McCrimmon	McDonald
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendès	Mendicino
Mihychuk	Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)	
Monsef	
Moore	Morrissey
Motz	Murray
Nantel	Nassif
Ng	Nicholson
O'Connell	Oliphant
Oliver	O'Regan
O'Toole	Ouellette
Paradis	Paupé
Peschisolido	Peterson
Philpott	Picard
Plamondon	Poilievre
Poissant	Quach
Qualtrough	Rankin
Ratansi	Rayes
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Rioux
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Rota	Ruimy
Rusnak	Saganash
Sahota	Sajjan
Samson	Sangha
Sansoucy	Sarai
Saroya	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Schulte
Serré	Shanahan
Sheehan	Shields
Shipley	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Sohi	Sorbara
Sorenson	Spengemann
Stanton	Ste-Marie
Stetski	Strahl
Stubbs	Sweet
Tabbara	Tan
Tassi	Thériault
Tilson	Trost
Trudel	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Vandal
Vecchio	Viersen
Virani	Wagantall
Warawa	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Weir	Whalen
Wilkinson	Wilson-Raybould
Wong	Yip
Young	Zimmer — 278

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

● (1855)

[English]

NET NEUTRALITY

The House resumed from May 22 consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on Motion No. 168 under private members' business.

The question is as follows. Shall I dispense?

Some hon. members: Agreed.**Some hon. members:** No.

[Chair read text of motion to House]

● (1905)

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

(Division No. 674)

YEAS

Members

Albas	Albrecht
Aldag	Alhabra
Alleslev	Amos
Anandasangaree	Anderson
Angus	Arnold
Arseneault	Arya
Aubin	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Barlow
Barsalou-Duval	Baylis
Beaulieu	Beech
Bennett	Benzen
Bergen	Bernier
Berthold	Bezan
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Block	Boucher
Boudrias	Boutin-Sweet
Brassard	Bratina
Breton	Brisson
Brosseau	Caesar-Chavannes
Calkins	Cannings
Caron	Carr
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Casey (Charlottetown)
Chagger	Champagne
Chen	Choquette
Clarke	Clement
Cooper	Cormier
Cullen	Cuzner
Dabrusin	Damoff
Davies	DeCoursey
Deltell	Dhillon
Di Iorio	Diotte
Donnelly	Dreeschen
Drouin	Dubé
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	Dusseault
Dzerowicz	Easter
Egliniski	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast

Adjournment Proceedings

Fergus	Fillmore
Finnigan	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Freeland	Fry
Fuhr	Gameau
Garrison	Généreux
Genuis	Gerretsen
Gill	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Gourde	Graham
Grewal	Hajdu
Hardcastle	Harder
Hardie	Harvey
Hébert	Hehr
Hogg	Holland
Housefather	Hughes
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Jeneroux
Johns	Jolibois
Joly	Jones
Jordan	Jowhari
Kang	Kelly
Kent	Khalid
Khera	Kitchen
Kusie	Kwan
Lake	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Laverdière	LeBlanc
Lefebvre	Leslie
Lighthound	Lloyd
Lobb	Long
Longfield	Lukiwski
MacGregor	MacKenzie
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maguire
Maloney	Marcil
Masse (Windsor West)	Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	McCaughey (Edmonton West)
McColeman	McCrimmon
McDonald	McGuinty
McKay	McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)	Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Monsef	Moore
Morrissey	Motz
Murray	Nantel
Nassif	Ng
Nicholson	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
O'Regan	O'Toole
Ouellette	Paradis
Pauzé	Peschisolido
Peterson	Philpott
Picard	Plamondon
Poillievre	Poissant
Quach	Qualtrough
Rankin	Ratansi
Rayes	Rempel
Richards	Rioux
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Rota	Ruimy
Rusnak	Saganash
Sahota	Sajjan
Samson	Sangha
Sansoucy	Sarai
Saroya	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Schulte
Serré	Shanahan
Sheehan	Shields
Shipley	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Sohi	Sorbara
Sorenson	Spengemann
Stanton	Ste-Marie
Stetski	Strahl
Stubbs	Sweet
Tabbara	Tan

Tassi	Thériault
Tilson	Trudel
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Vandal	Vecchio
Viersen	Virani
Wagantall	Warawa
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Weir
Whalen	Wilkinson
Wilson-Raybould	Wong
Yip	Young
Zimmer — 277	

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

I wish to inform the House that because of the delay, there will be no private members' business today. Accordingly, the order will be rescheduled for another sitting.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

[*English*]

NATURAL RESOURCES

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise tonight in the House to return to a question I asked on February 5 of the Prime Minister.

February 5 should not seem like so long ago, but it was when conversations about Kinder Morgan were less tinged with hysteria than they are today. It is a shame that we have descended into sort of a tit-for-tat competition without regard to the facts.

I want to focus on facts. That was what I did in my question on February 5 for the Prime Minister on the use of the figure of 15,000 jobs being at stake in building Kinder Morgan, that this was an exaggeration. Even Kinder Morgan had never suggested that. Therefore, I have decided, in the four minutes allowed to me, to put forward the five top whoppers of claims about Kinder Morgan that are not factually correct, and hope I have time to add some facts about what is correct.

First, 15,000 jobs is something that is repeated often. I do not know where it came from. Kinder Morgan's submission to the National Energy Board put forward that its project would create a grand total of 2,500 jobs a year for two years. It never asserted more than that, and it asserted 90 permanent jobs. There is no multiplier factor I can find that comes to 15,000 permanent jobs. It is 2,500 jobs a year in construction for two years.

Adjournment Proceedings

Second, repeated quite often is the idea that this pipeline has been operated by Kinder Morgan since 1953, shipping dilbit with no problems. However, there are two problems with that statement. In 1953, the pipeline was run by a different company, TransCanada, and it was shipping a different product, crude, not dilbit. When Kinder Morgan took it over and bought it in the early 2000s, starting about 2004-05, very small amounts of bitumen mixed with diluent started to be shipped. This is the substance that has specific problems, and it is very different from crude.

The third point that keeps being claimed is that dilbit is just like crude and anyone can clean it up. We know that this is not true because of a spill that happened at an Enbridge pipeline at Kalamazoo, Michigan. This was the first time that even people like me who were dubious about pipelines realized that shipping diluted bitumen was an entirely different matter from shipping crude. The dilbit in the Kalamazoo River separated, the diluent floating to the surface and making the neighbourhood surrounding it sick. It was the symptoms of human illness that alerted Enbridge that it had a pipeline break, because it had systematically shut off all the alarms as they went off in the control room. Then the bitumen sank to the floor of the river.

The studies on bitumen and diluent fall into different categories. The studies done approximating ocean conditions, such as at the Bedford Institute of Oceanography in Halifax, show that in ocean water with sand, bits of seaweed, and so on, when the diluent separates, the bitumen forms oil balls around particulates and then it sinks. However, if they fill a tank full of fresh water in Alberta and add in salt and do the studies there, they are able to report that bitumen mixed with diluent will float, at least for a while, until the diluent floats away.

Fourth, the next big whopper is that there is a \$73 billion benefit to the Canadian economy over 20 years. That comes from a study by a company called Muse Stancil. Kinder Morgan submitted it in the NEB process. It was thoroughly reviewed by economists working for the City of Vancouver, who found that it was fatally flawed. This conclusion was also reached by a Minnesota public government review of a report by the same company. It found that its assumptions and data were unrealistic and unreliable.

Fifth, in my last seven seconds, is the claim that we lose \$40 million a day, which is totally false.

• (1910)

Mr. Steven MacKinnon (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to my friend from Saanich—Gulf Islands, I am going to have to do this evening, as I am filling in my for my esteemed colleague, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources.

I listened with interest to the member's remarks and her efforts in myth-busting with respect to Kinder Morgan. I do not know that she cited sources for any of this information, but what I do know is that this government has taken a very rigorous approach to its approval of pipelines. It has taken a science-based approach. We are, in fact, debating further enhancements, but this government, in a surfeit of caution, added a layer of suspenders and a belt, so to speak, to the approval of the Kinder Morgan pipeline by appointing a review

panel. That review panel, coupled with the NEB approval, led the government to approve this pipeline, and I think the rest is history.

There are certainly ferocious arguments being made on the side of environmentalists. There are certainly ferocious arguments being made, for example, by Conservatives in favour of the pipeline. We choose to take these projects on their merits, using science and evidence, and based on the knowledge that the environment and the economy are not a choice. We can have the prosperity generated by a modern natural resource industry, one that has multiple points of access to global markets and that does not leave hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars on the table, or jobs on the table, or take money out of the Canadian economy.

We choose to have that growth, all the while making sure that there are environmental safeguards that go with the construction of such projects. There is also the more general framework on climate change our government is putting forward, whereby we tax carbon pollution, taxing something we do not want and hopefully seeing a return. The proceeds of that will foster activities we do want, whether it be innovation in the green economy, whether it be income, or whether it be other sorts of things, as provincial governments and others see fit.

I think we have struck a very useful, constructive, and productive balance with respect to the Kinder Morgan pipeline. I do not know that the arguments on either side of the extremes of this argument are particularly helpful. We have a science-based, evidence-based approach that seeks to reconcile the environment and the economy, create prosperity for Canadians, create jobs in our energy sector and beyond, and make sure that Canada retains its leadership role as a participant in the war on climate change, and more generally, as a leader in the vanguard of environmental protection the world over.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, I will go to sources in the time I have remaining.

The source that there would not be 15,000 jobs but 2,500 jobs over two years comes from Volume 5 of the submission of Kinder Morgan to the National Energy Board. I also direct the parliamentary secretary to the submissions from Unifor and the Alberta Federation of Labour that Kinder Morgan threatens jobs, information the NEB refused to hear.

Second, that Kinder Morgan has been shipping only since it was created can be found on any site. To the point that the dilbit cannot be cleaned up, I refer the hon. member to the report of the Royal Society of Canada Expert Panel and the American Academy of Sciences.

Adjournment Proceedings

To the question of the exaggerated claims of financial benefit, I refer him to a report from the Minnesota Department of Commerce and the evidence from Vancouver, which can be found in an article by Andrew Nikiforuk in *The Tyee*, on April 11th, entitled “Kinder Morgan's Blackmail”. The sources are hyperlinked to that article.

Last, for the \$40 million a day, google Robyn Allan: Scotiabank report a fantasy. The member will find all the sources there.

● (1915)

Mr. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of respect for the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands. Obviously, we can disagree without being disagreeable.

I, too, have a couple of sources. The TD Bank has calculated that Canada's reliance on oil exports to the United States has cost the Canadian economy \$117 billion over the last seven years. If we apply even conservative inflation estimates and project into the future, we have forgone, and will continue to forgo, billions of dollars in tax revenues that could be used to fund an oceans protection plan. These are tax revenues that could be used to build hospitals and schools, tax revenues that could be used to help Canadians in need, and indeed, tax revenues that could be used to help with reconciliation with Canada's indigenous people.

On that, I would also point out the 43 indigenous communities that have signed millions of dollars in benefit agreements along the pipeline's route. This is an important issue.

CANADA POST

Ms. Irene Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, when I asked a question regarding harassment in the Canada Post workplace in February, the minister assured me that she was doing everything in her power to address the issue. However, when I attended the CUPW spring educational conference at the end of April, the members were quite vocal about the fact that harassment was still one of the biggest issues plaguing them in the workplace. There appears to be some light on the horizon, albeit if not late in its timing, for those already suffering the effects of bullying and harassment. The Canadian Union of Postal Workers reported on May 9 that some incremental first steps had finally been taken on the part of the minister, who assured them that there would be follow-up. I do hope that is the case.

During committee hearings on Bill C-65, a union representative described a culture of harassment that is deep-seated and systemic. New Democrats are committed to supporting workers in finding a resolution to reduce incidences of bullying and harassment in all workplaces. As the NDP critic for Canada Post, my primary concern is to address this dysfunctional culture within the corporation. We have witnessed a steady deterioration in the working conditions of postmasters and assistants, including reduction of hours, post office closures, and other issues that contribute significantly to the potential for stress and unhealthy conflict in the workplace. CPAA members report mental health issues related to this particular situation and things like absenteeism, which is second only to musculoskeletal issues. While workplace conditions are not always the cause of mental health issues, a culture of bullying and harassment certainly does nothing to alleviate workers' stress levels. It just makes sense to work to create an overall cultural change at Canada that improves

working conditions and reduces stress with meaningful and concrete solutions.

To quote the Government of Canada's Department of Employment and Social Development from November 2, 2017, on the release of the report entitled “Harassment and sexual violence in the workplace public consultations—what we heard”:

Harassment and sexual violence are unacceptable. Period. The Government of Canada made a commitment to Canadians to take action to ensure that federal workplaces, including Parliament Hill, are free from these types of behaviours....

Harassment and sexual violence in the workplace negatively impact not only the person experiencing these behaviours, but also their families, coworkers, and their employers.

The release goes on to say that the government is committed to taking meaningful action to address the full spectrum of harassment and sexual violence at work and will be announcing next steps in the near future. I am encouraged to hear that Jessica McDonald, Canada Post's new CEO, has initiated discussions with the Canadian Postmasters and Assistants Association to discuss bullying and harassment in the workplace. It appears that she is attempting to find the root of the problem, and a solution as well, and that she is open to working with the unions. This gives me cause for hope.

The time for addressing these issues is now. We cannot afford the cost of bullying and harassment in the workplace. We cannot afford it in human terms; nor can we afford it in dollars and cents, because the bottom line is that this kind of disruption of work costs us all. Therefore, I am waiting to hear from the minister.

● (1920)

Mr. Steven MacKinnon (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be here today to discuss this very important issue. I can perhaps shorten the length of the wait.

I too was happy to join the Minister of Public Services and Procurement in meeting with the national president of CUPW and several of his colleagues to discuss this very issue. They presented us with a number of specific allegations and, of course, also made a number of general observations with respect to harassment and bullying in the workplace.

This is something that we take very seriously. In announcing our new vision for Canada Post, where we kept our promises around home delivery, where we kept our promise to renew the board of Canada Post, and kept our promise to change the leadership at Canada Post, we also made sure that we put the accent on improving the labour-management climate at Canada Post. We frankly agree that a healthy workplace is the sign of a healthy corporation, and that all sides, labour, management, and others, have an obligation to work together to create a harmonious work environment, free of bullying, free of harassment, for everyone.

Adjournment Proceedings

[Translation]

Canada Post is committed to providing a safe and healthy workplace, free from harassment, conflict, and violence. We must adopt a systematic approach to addressing reported cases of harassment. Canada Post is committed to addressing these cases quickly, professionally, and discretely.

[English]

Canada Post has implemented and is actively promoting workplace policies that reinforce this commitment. Employees have been provided with access to a toll-free hotline, managed by a third party, and are encouraged to call to report any kind of workplace incident.

[Translation]

As the Prime Minister said in Winnipeg, harassment, threats, and bullying are never ok, in any workplace in this country. He takes harassment at a crown corporation, within the responsibility of the federal government, extremely seriously, as we all do. We are at a critical time in our society, during which sexual harassment is finally a top priority.

[English]

That is why our government introduced Bill C-65. This bill, which is currently being considered in the other place, will create a more robust regime that better addresses harassment and violence in all federally regulated workplaces, including, of course, Canada Post. This legislation is part of a comprehensive strategy focused on three main goals: to prevent incidents of harassment and violence from occurring; to respond effectively to these incidents when they do occur; and to support victims, survivors, and employers in the process.

We are very proud of the progress we have made at Canada Post and working with our partners in the labour unions. We want to ensure that Canada Post continues to have a bright future. That is why we have renewed the board of directors. That is why we are renewing and will continue to renew the management of Canada Post. As well, that is why we are proud to stand here to say that we are with the employees in their desire to have a harmonious and productive workplace at Canada Post and, indeed, everywhere.

Ms. Irene Mathysen: Mr. Speaker, I beg to differ. In its election promises, the government led voters to believe that it would restore lost postal services, and has done nothing of the sort.

I do know that Canada Post workers, represented by CPAA and CUPW, will be eager to hear that progress is being made on the part of the corporation and that the government is committed to addressing and preventing bullying and harassment in the workplace. It is very important because the workers, their livelihoods, and their families depend on it.

Bills are only lip service until there is determined and dedicated action. I have promised the workers at Canada Post that I will work as effectively as possible to change the reality in their workplace. Canada is a country of incredible prosperity. We can deliver the mail, we can deliver financial services, and we can do it effectively if the government will just listen.

● (1925)

Mr. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for her intervention on this issue and, indeed, on the future of Canada Post.

We too are committed to a bright future at Canada Post. We too are committed to workplaces free of harassment and bullying. We too are taking measures, including the passage of Bill C-65, hopefully very soon, and other active measures that will govern workplaces to make sure that we have a climate of respect, collaboration, and harmony in Canada Post and beyond.

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, in one of my first questions as the NDP's agriculture critic, I decided to put the government on the spot regarding the words it says in the House with regard to protecting our supply-managed sectors and trying to match those words with its actions. The premise of my question was that if the Canada-EU free trade agreement, commonly known as CETA, created a breach in our supply management sectors, the CPTPP threatened to blow it wide open.

I think that all hon. members, especially those who have agricultural sectors in their ridings, are quite aware that there are three main pillars to supply management: import control, producer pricing, and production discipline. I liken it to a three-legged stool. The stool simply will not stand up if just one of those measures is not kept in control. For example, if import controls are weakened, this will have an impact on the other two pillars.

Under the CPTPP, we know that certain percentages of market access to foreign countries have been guaranteed for our supply-managed sectors, and people in those sectors are starting to raise the alarm. It is all well and good for the Minister of Agriculture to stand in the House and claim that the Liberal Party was the one that brought in supply management and is there to defend it, but I go back to the earlier point of actions meeting words. There is a bit of concern on this side of the House, and among some of the major players, that while the Minister of Agriculture means well in his words, he may not be the one fully driving this agenda and other members of cabinet are in fact undermining his position.

If we look at some of the myths that exist out there about supply management, artificial pricing and limiting the supply are probably the two biggest myths. I acknowledge that out there in the punditry this is a bit of a political football. However, I think that the critics are a bit distant from the consumer and they lack a holistic view of farming and agriculture today. I am privileged to represent a few farmers from the supply-managed sectors in my riding. In fact, the former president of Dairy Farmers of Canada, Mr. Wally Smith, is a constituent of mine, so I know this sector very well.

Adjournment Proceedings

If we look at pricing, the big factor here is what happens in the United States. If they overproduce or underproduce a commodity such as eggs, the prices fluctuate. That is really what causes the major detractions from the Canadian price. As far as limiting supply is concerned, supply management does not limit supply. It is really all about monitoring the supply and trying to make sure that producers are matching the demand.

Members do not have to take my word for it. They just have to look at some of the statistics and what some of the major stakeholders are saying about the government. Mr. Pierre Lampron, the president of Dairy Farmers of Canada, said:

On the one hand, the Canadian government has repeatedly stated that it wants a vibrant, strong, and growing dairy sector that creates jobs and fosters investments; on the other hand, it continues to carve out pieces of our domestic dairy market, first through CETA, and now through the CPTPP.... The Government must understand that in continuing to make these concessions, they are putting the Canadian dairy sector in jeopardy.

It goes across the sectors. If we talk to Chicken Farmers of Canada, the egg producers, and so on, we would find similar quotes.

What I am looking for today is for the government, through the parliamentary secretary, to match its actions with its words. I will let the parliamentary secretary respond, and I hope to hear something good from him.

• (1930)

[Translation]

Mr. Jean-Claude Poissant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague across the way with whom I had the pleasure of travelling two weeks ago as part of a cross-Canada study on how to increase our agricultural exports to \$75 billion.

The government fully understands the importance of the agriculture and agrifood sector to our economy, our trade, and to our workers and their families. That is why promoting Canada's agricultural trade interests is a priority for our government.

On average, roughly half of our agricultural production is exported. We are the world's largest exporter of canola, flax, pulse crops, maple syrup, and wild blueberries, and the third largest exporter of wheat and pork.

Canadian agrifood exports are increasing by about 10% every year, and the goal set in budget 2017 is to expand exports to \$75 billion a year by 2025.

Negotiating and concluding free trade agreements help in achieving that goal by providing access to new markets, enhancing regulatory co-operation, and promoting better integration with our trade partners. Upholding Canada's supply management system is every bit a priority.

Supply management is the system that our producers chose for themselves, and it has been working well for over 40 years. Canada's dairy, egg, and poultry producers and processors are vital to our country's prosperity and growth and are an integral part of Canadian agriculture.

When I was young, I lived on a dairy farm, that of my ancestors. I have a very clear memory of when I was seven and eight years old.

We milked the cows and put the milk in cans. When the truck came by to buy the milk, the driver could give us the price he wanted or he could decide not to take all of the milk. It was in those years that farmers got together to ask the government of the day to implement a supply management system. I know what I am talking about. It was after that happened that Canada's dairy producers were able to prosper.

The development of markets and the protection of supply management are not mutually exclusive. Canada is developing new markets for its products throughout the world, while defending the interests of Canadian industries, including those under supply management. Over the years, Canada has successfully concluded ambitious free trade agreements with major trading partners and has sought to negotiate new agreements while maintaining the pillars of supply management.

That has been our message all along, and we will stay on that message at the negotiating table.

We will keep working to sign good deals, not just any deal. We will defend our national interests and stand up for Canadian values.

[English]

Mr. Alistair MacGregor: Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat that I do not doubt the sincerity of the minister or the parliamentary secretary in defending supply management, but I just want to see the actions of the Government of Canada matching up those words.

I do not have much time, but I want to leave the House with a great statistic from 2015. In the United States, there are 199 egg producers who represent 99% of the overall supply, versus 1,014 in Canada, who produce 100%. If we look at the size difference of our countries and the fact that Canada is able to have over 1,000 egg producers all thriving because of supply management, I should think that this speaks to the strength of the system and how we can keep the small family farm thriving.

The parliamentary secretary can be sure that I will be doing my duty as the NDP's agriculture critic in holding the government to account on its words, and I thank him for his words tonight.

• (1935)

[Translation]

Mr. Jean-Claude Poissant: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague opposite.

As I said, we are protecting supply management, and that has not prevented Canada from signing quite a few free trade deals and negotiating new ones. Supply management is integral to Canadian agriculture, and I can assure my colleagues that we will protect and defend it.

The government is also working to open new markets and promote Canadian producers' interests by negotiating new free trade agreements and modernizing existing ones because trade is crucial to keeping our agriculture and agrifood industry successful and competitive.

When negotiating trade deals, Canada has always been steadfast in promoting supply management. The government has always supported—

Adjournment Proceedings

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Order. The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted.

(The House adjourned at 7:37 p.m.)

[*English*]

Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

Mr. Trudeau	19528
Ethics	
Mr. Gourde	19528
Mr. Trudeau	19528
Mr. Gourde	19528
Mr. Trudeau	19528
Mr. Kent	19528
Mr. Trudeau	19528
Mr. Kent	19528
Mr. Trudeau	19529
The Environment	
Mr. Johns	19529
Mr. Trudeau	19529
Democratic Reform	
Mr. Angus	19529
Mr. Trudeau	19529
Public Safety	
Mr. Paul-Hus	19529
Mr. Trudeau	19529
Mr. Paul-Hus	19529
Mr. Trudeau	19530
Ms. Rempel	19530
Mr. Trudeau	19530
Dairy Industry	
Mr. Paradis	19530
Mr. Trudeau	19530
Rail Transportation	
Mrs. Block	19530
Mr. Trudeau	19530
Dairy Industry	
Ms. Trudel	19530
Mr. Trudeau	19531
The Environment	
Ms. Alleslev	19531
Mr. Trudeau	19531
Government Spending	
Mr. Brassard	19531
Mr. Trudeau	19531
International Trade	
Mr. Barsalou-Duval	19531
Mr. Trudeau	19531
Presence in Gallery	
The Speaker	19531
Situation of the Rohingya People	
Ms. Laverdière	19531
Motion	19531
(Motion agreed to)	19532
ROYAL ASSENT	
The Speaker	19532

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions

Mr. Lamoureux	19532
Motion	19532
Motion agreed to	19533

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Elections Modernization Act

Bill C-76—Time Allocation Motion

Ms. Chagger	19533
Motion	19533
Mr. Richards	19533
Ms. Gould	19534
Mr. Cullen	19534
Mrs. Vecchio	19535
Mr. MacGregor	19535
Mr. Thériault	19535
Mrs. McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	19536
Mrs. Caesar-Chavannes	19536
Ms. Brosseau	19536
Mr. Reid	19537
Mr. Blaikie	19537
Mr. Ouellette	19537
Mr. O'Toole	19538
Motion agreed to	19539

Second reading

Mr. Thériault	19539
Mr. Lamoureux	19540
Mr. Choquette	19541
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	19541
Mr. Lamoureux	19543
Mr. Cooper	19543
Amendment negatived	19545
Motion agreed to	19546
(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee) ..	19546

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Department of Public Works and Government Services Act

Bill C-354. Third reading	19546
Motion agreed to	19547
(Bill read the third time and passed)	19547

Department of Health Act

Bill C-326. Motion for concurrence	19547
Motion agreed to	19548

Net Neutrality

Motion	19548
Motion agreed to	19549

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Natural Resources

Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	19549
Mr. MacKinnon	19550

Canada Post

Ms. Mathysen	19551
Mr. MacKinnon	19551

Agriculture and Agri-Food

Mr. MacGregor..... 19552

Mr. Poissant..... 19553

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: <http://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.

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 : <http://www.noscommunes.ca>