



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 148 • NUMBER 412 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, May 8, 2019

—

Speaker: The Honourable Geoff Regan

CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, May 8, 2019

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayer

• (1405)

[English]

The Speaker: We will now have the singing of *O Canada*, led by the hon. member for Edmonton Centre.

[Members sang the national anthem]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[Translation]

ARVIDA

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Quebec has a hard time preserving its heritage. For years now, the City of Saguenay and Quebec City have been asking Ottawa to put Arvida on the list of proposed UNESCO world heritage sites.

Arvida's first 270 houses were built in just 135 days. It is a unique and very well-preserved world-famous model of urban design. It played a key role in the development of the Saguenay region, which, because of aluminum, has been integral to Canada-U.S. industrial relations for over a century. UNESCO asked countries to do more to showcase their industrial heritage and 20th-century architecture. Arvida checks both boxes. Enough dithering already.

When will the government put Arvida on UNESCO's world heritage list?

* * *

[English]

278 CORMORANT SQUADRON

Mr. Sukh Dhaliwal (Surrey—Newton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize the outstanding young men and women of the 278 Cormorant air cadets squadron. Led by commanding officer Captain Jagdeep Masoun and chairperson Rupinderjit Thind, the program aims to help young people become good citizens as well as develop an interest in the various activities of the Canadian Forces.

These young Canadians are learning valuable life skills such as leadership and teamwork. They are giving back to the community, which makes Surrey-Newton and all of Canada a better place.

I would like members to join me in thanking the B.C. Provincial Committee of the Air Cadet League of Canada and the 278 Cormorant air cadets, their parents, and volunteers for their dedicated commitment, service and hard work in helping others.

* * *

SPECIAL OLYMPICS WORLD SUMMER GAMES

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise to mark the achievement of a great young Calgarian, Amber Harriman, from my riding of Calgary Shepard, who returned in March from Abu Dhabi, where she competed in the 2019 Special Olympics World Summer Games as part of Team Canada. Out of the 12 medals brought home by Calgarians, Amber earned seven gold medals in gymnastics. I would say that she did very, very well.

Did I mention that these were her first world games? She did it with her trademark hard work, a typical can-do Alberta attitude and an extraordinary love of the sport. She describes gymnastics as challenging but beautiful and graceful all at the same time. Athletes like Amber represent Alberta and their hometowns with pride, and they show off our talented sports enthusiasts.

I invite all members today to join me in congratulating Amber on this impressive achievement and for being an inspiration to other aspiring athletes in Alberta and across Canada.

* * *

CHAIR OF THE CONFERENCE FOR ADVANCED LIFE UNDERWRITING

Mr. Andy Fillmore (Halifax, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Roger Sinclair, from my beautiful riding of Halifax, on his appointment as chair of the Conference for Advanced Life Underwriting, also known as CALU.

Roger is a founder and partner at SBW Wealth Management & Employee Benefits and has spent 37 years providing practical financial advice to clients throughout Atlantic Canada. He is recognized as a national industry leader. Mr. Sinclair is the first Nova Scotian to chair CALU.

Over 480 CALU members from across Canada are in Ottawa this week for CALU's annual general meeting, where Mr. Sinclair was confirmed as the new chair just this morning.

Statements by Members

I congratulate Roger on this great achievement. I look forward to working with him in Halifax to help Nova Scotians and all Canadians navigate advanced planning issues to benefit their futures.

* * *

SUICIDE PREVENTION

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, tonight Parliament will vote on Motion No. 174 to establish a national suicide prevention action plan. Canada is the only G7 country without a plan, yet suicide cuts across all political, cultural and economic spectrums. We lose 4,000 people every year to suicide, and each one of those deaths hits communities and families like a shock wave of grief. Quebec established a plan and dropped youth suicide rates by 50%. It is time the Parliament of Canada stepped up.

I began this journey in the dark night of the northern suicide crisis, but I was inspired by the determination of youth leaders like Randall Crowe, of Treaty 9, who keep kicking at the darkness until it bleeds daylight. Since then I have met so many amazing activists, like Jack Hicks, Courtney Taylor and Lynne Sutcliffe, who are making hope a reality on the ground. It is time Parliament joined with them.

I am asking my colleagues to stand together tonight and vote for Motion No. 174 to establish a national suicide prevention action plan.

* * *

[Translation]

JEAN VANIER

Mrs. Mona Fortier (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, we lost an inspiring philanthropist who championed the rights of persons with disabilities. Jean Vanier worked tirelessly to help the most vulnerable Canadians have an equal chance of reaching their full potential.

[English]

After visiting a psychiatric hospital, Jean Vanier made it his mission to foster communities where those with developmental disabilities could participate fully, free of any barriers.

Since founding L'Arche in 1964, the charity has established communities that house thousands of people with and without disabilities in more than 35 countries.

[Translation]

Mr. Vanier also contributed to society in many other ways, always striving to make our world fairer and more inclusive for all. His legacy should inspire all Canadians to work to build a fairer, friendlier world. The world has certainly lost an extraordinary leader.

* * *

[English]

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the bad policy of the Liberal leader to go into massive debt on so-called social infrastructure, the controversial giveaways, such as the hundreds of millions of dollars given to the China-

controlled Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank, and the money given to Hillary's Clinton's foundation are all hitting home in Canada with the Prime Minister's lack of climate change preparedness that the carbon tax is supposed to fund. It is all talk and no action.

What taxpayers want is for a responsible government to be investing in physical infrastructure, such as the main bridge into Garrison Petawawa, Canada's largest army base. That bridge was in danger of being swept away in the flood and had to be closed last week. The new Conservative government of Doug Ford has signed off on the Petawawa bridge, when the old, tired Liberal Party of Ontario would not.

The biggest scandal of the last three and a half years has been the total neglect of Canada's physical infrastructure. Only by electing a responsible Conservative government that respects private property will homeowners see meaningful investment to protect roads and bridges.

* * *

● (1410)

[Translation]

HÉLÈNE SENTENNE FOUNDATION

Mr. Jean-Claude Poissant (La Prairie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Fondation Hélène-Sentenne will be celebrating its 30th anniversary on May 16. This arts and culture organization was named after the Town of Candiac's first secretary, who served for 30 years before retiring.

The foundation operates out of the Maison Hélène-Sentenne, formerly known as Maison Melançon. Over the years, this building has become an arts hub for Candiac and the surrounding community, hosting no less than 20 national festivals, 28 juried art shows, 20 solo exhibitions, six art symposiums, over 40 classical music concerts, and 30 Son et brioches concerts, not to mention countless Christmas and Valentine's Day concerts.

Today, I join all the people of Candiac in thanking and congratulating the foundation's president, Ghislaine Nivose, and her entire team for all their hard work in promoting arts and culture in the riding of La Prairie.

Long live the Fondation Hélène-Sentenne.

* * *

[English]

BRAMPTON CRICKET LEAGUE

Ms. Sonia Sidhu (Brampton South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to recognize the work of a wonderful organization in Brampton, the Brampton Cricket League. The league promotes the game of cricket at the grassroots level. Last month it celebrated its 10th anniversary.

Statements by Members

I am proud of the work of its president, Faraz Saleem, vice-president, Mukesh Rawat, and the entire team. Sports teach us discipline, grace and dignity. That is why I will always remain committed to supporting organizations like the Brampton Cricket League, as they work tirelessly to spread sports in our community and engage youth.

Today the reason I am wearing BCL's jersey is to promote cricket and BCL's work. As it is about to start its 2019 summer games season this weekend, I send my best wishes to the players, volunteers, supporters and the organization. I congratulate the Brampton Cricket League.

* * *

GOVERNMENT PRIORITIES

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the big promises and sunny ways promised to Canadians in 2015 have led to four years of cloudy skies and broken promises by the Liberal government.

The Prime Minister claimed that he would strengthen the middle class, improve Canada's presence on the world stage and run an open, transparent and ethical government. He has failed on each and every count. He has failed on pipelines, on taxes, on immigration, certainly on ethics and transparency and also on trade.

Canadians are not buying what the Prime Minister is selling, and neither are our trusted trading partners around the world. Unfortunately, they are also not buying our peas, lentils, wheat, pork or canola.

The Prime Minister promised that he would have the backs of our farmers, and he has not. Our farmers have asked for a WTO challenge of China. He will not do this. The Prime Minister promised he would fight for jobs in our energy sector. He has not. Clearly, the Prime Minister is not as advertised.

Canadians have had enough, and in October, they will change the channel.

* * *

ASTROPHYSICS

Mr. Raj Saini (Kitchener Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, space: the final frontier. Thanks in part to Canada's own Captain Kirk, Professor Avery Broderick, a theoretical astrophysicist from the University of Waterloo, we are one step closer to where no one has gone before.

Using the event horizon telescope, a team of over 200 scientists were finally able to photograph a black hole. Black holes are so dense and have such strong gravity that anything that crosses their threshold is sucked in, never to return. The discovery allows us to test long-held theories about black holes and their effects on surrounding space.

Professor Broderick declares that we truly are standing at the threshold of a new era of astrophysics.

May the team behind this discovery live long and prosper.

● (1415)

INDIGENOUS NURSES DAY

Mr. Dan Vandal (Saint Boniface—Saint Vital, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on this National Nursing Week, I rise today to pay special tribute to the exceptional work of the indigenous nurses who provide care to all Canadians from coast to coast to coast and to celebrate Indigenous Nurses Day.

The over 9,700 strong and skilled indigenous nurses are invaluable in the promotion, development and practice of indigenous health and nursing. Due to their unique perspective and understanding of the specific needs of indigenous communities, they are able to combine traditional indigenous practices with western medical practices. These nurses know all too well the barriers that indigenous people face when accessing health care and are perfectly placed to help tear these barriers down.

Please help me in welcoming the Canadian Indigenous Nursing Association to Parliament Hill and in congratulating it on the celebration of its 45th year.

Bravo.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUEBEC INTERESTS

Mr. Bernard Généreux (Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after four deficit budgets and no plan to put an end to this reckless debt load, the Liberals continue to demonstrate that they are incapable of governing.

Yesterday the Auditor General called out the government for its inability to manage the migrant crisis at our borders. He also noted that the RCMP is lacking the resources it needs to keep us safe.

Call centres are swamped, and the government is incapable of responding adequately to the millions of Canadians who just want information on how to pay their taxes or get the old age benefits to which they are entitled.

Quebeckers asked for a single tax return to make life easier for them, but the Liberals said no.

Trade disputes have been blocking trade with the U.S. and China for months now, and the government keeps sending letters instead of taking action.

However, when it comes to political interference, in not just one but two legal matters involving their buddies, they are quick to do whatever it takes to find a solution.

Quebeckers deserve a lot better—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Vimy.

*Oral Questions***WORLD OVARIAN CANCER DAY**

Mrs. Eva Nassif (Vimy, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today is World Ovarian Cancer Day, a sad day for anyone who has lost a mother, daughter or loved one to this silent, little-known disease that is often only discovered in its advanced stages.

Research on ovarian cancer is essential and has been overlooked, but our government is taking action. Budget 2019 allocates \$10 million for ovarian cancer research.

Last Sunday, I participated in the shaved head challenge organized by Leucan in my riding. I would like to thank the participants and donors for their remarkable work. I would also like to thank all those who support cancer research in some way. Thank you for being such a bright light.

* * *

*[English]***WAVING GRANNY**

Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, a woman from my riding has made the national news for her dedication to the young people in the community. They call her the “Waving Granny”.

Tinney Davidson has been spreading joy in the town of Comox. Every morning, Tinney is at the window, waving to all Highland Secondary School students who walk by. She became such a part of the students' lives that they would worry when they did not see her when she was away on vacation.

After 11 years of sharing smiles and making people happy, she sadly will be moving away.

Her impact was so positive that to honour her, 400 students from the school showed up on her lawn recently to give her handmade hearts, blow her a kiss and wave a final goodbye.

Tinney is a female leader in the community who followed her calling to spread joy and happiness among students in the Comox Valley. Women like Tinney deserve to be recognized for their loving hearts and ability to share the most important commodity we have, kindness.

My riding is a better place because of Tinney and I want to thank her and honour her here today.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

Ms. Leona Alleslev (Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this week the Macdonald-Laurier Institute issued a scathing assessment of the Liberal government's record, stating that the prime minister “holds the security of Canadian citizens and the country's sovereignty in near total disregard.” This is the most severe of criticisms, for there is no greater responsibility of a prime minister than to protect its citizens and uphold the sovereignty of the nation.

The Liberals tell us that Canada is back, but a disastrous trip to India, an escalating diplomatic and trade crisis with China, a worse deal on NAFTA, compounded by punishing national security tariffs

show that the Prime Minister has devastated our reputation on the world stage.

Canada has never been more alone, and the Prime Minister is not as advertised.

Canada needs a strong prime minister who understands the complexity of these turbulent times, is honest about the threats we face and will vigorously defend the sovereignty of our nation, and that would be the current leader of the opposition, a Conservative prime minister in 2019.

* * *

● (1420)

NATIONAL NURSING WEEK

Ms. Kamal Khara (Brampton West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as a registered nurse, it is an honour to recognize the leadership role nurses play in our society during National Nursing Week.

The theme for this year is “Nurses: A Voice to Lead – Health for All.” According to the International Council of Nurses, this theme reflects that every nurse has a story and every story has the potential to improve the lives of individuals and communities. I could not agree more. I have seen this first-hand during my experiences as a nurse and during visits to Brampton Civic Hospital in our community.

At a time when our health care is under attack through the cuts imposed by Doug Ford and the Conservatives, our government will continue to stand together with nurses and health care providers to ensure healthy communities for all Canadians.

I encourage everyone to join me in thanking the nurses in our communities for their tireless service, advocacy and leadership.

ORAL QUESTIONS*[English]***JUSTICE**

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister tried to interfere in a shipbuilding contract and when he was caught, he tried to destroy the reputation and career of the person who stood up to him. We have seen this before and it is a dangerous pattern with the government.

Why is it that anyone who says “no” to the Prime Minister ends up with a target on his or her back?

Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the prosecution in question was handled by the Public Prosecution Service of Canada, which operates independently from the Department of Justice and independently from my office. My office had no role whatsoever in the decision to seek a stay of proceedings. The decision belongs to the director of public prosecutions alone.

The director of public prosecutions stated in February and repeated today that there was no contact or influence from outside the PPSC on either the initial decision to prosecute or the decision to stay the charge.

Oral Questions

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, however, the lawyer for Mark Norman was quite clear that the government did impede this investigation by withholding important documents and facts.

When it looked like the truth was going to try to come out in the SNC-Lavalin corruption scandal, the Prime Minister shut down the investigations. When it looked like the truth in this scandal was going to come out, the Prime Minister tried to prevent a fair trial by withholding evidence and using delay tactics.

What is in those documents that the Prime Minister is so afraid of?

Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have stated a number of times in the House, the government has met all of its obligations with respect to third party records applications during the course of the trial. All documents and priority individuals identified by the defence in February had already been provided to the court.

As I have said, it is the Public Prosecution Service of Canada that has undertaken the evaluation of the evidence of this case and the prosecution of this trial. It is its decision and its decision alone to stay the proceedings.

[Translation]

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Privy Council Office's investigation into the matter led nowhere, but the Prime Minister needed a scapegoat so he set his sights on a respected vice-admiral from the Canadian Armed Forces.

Why did the Prime Minister say that this matter would end up in court even before the RCMP laid any charges?

Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I already told the House, the government followed all the rules in this case. The prosecution was handled by the Public Prosecution Service of Canada. The PPSC is the one that decided to launch this investigation and to prosecute, and it was the PPSC's decision to stay the proceedings.

• (1425)

[English]

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is shameful that the Prime Minister does not have the fortitude to answer these questions himself. Long before any charges were laid against Vice-Admiral Norman, the Prime Minister told the media that it would inevitably wind up before the courts. Today, Vice-Admiral Norman's lawyer described those comments as “an extraordinary event”.

How did the Prime Minister know that this would end up in court before any charges were made, and why will he not stand and answer these questions for himself?

[Translation]

Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in February the Public Prosecution Service of Canada said that there was no influence in this case and it reiterated that today. By claiming the opposite, the opposition is raising doubts about our justice system and our legal institutions.

We are very proud that the system worked as it should.

[English]

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Vice-Admiral Mark Norman had the honour and integrity to face allegations against him, himself. The Prime Minister does not have the same fortitude or backbone.

Let us look at what Mark Norman's lawyer did say. She said, “There are times when you agree with what happens in a court” and at times “you don't and that's fine, but what you don't do is you don't put your finger and try to weigh in on the scales of justice. That is not what should be happening.”

That is exactly what the government did in trying to block and obstruct evidence coming before that court. What is in those documents that the Prime Minister is so afraid of?

[Translation]

Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have said many times, my office had no say in the decision to stay the charges. This decision was made by the Public Prosecution Service of Canada.

I did not give any instructions or directives, and neither I nor my office had any contact whatsoever with anyone regarding the decision to pursue or stay the charges. The director of public prosecutions said so in February and she repeated it today.

* * *

[English]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canadians wake up daily to alarming news about mass extinctions and catastrophic climate change, and yet Liberals are planning to steamroll ahead with the Trans Mountain pipeline, despite the NEB not fully considering the impacts to climate, despite toxic tanker traffic and threats to the coastline and despite indigenous concerns.

Better choices will lead to better results. Will the Prime Minister stop spending billions on pipelines, and instead invest in the clean energy economy of the future?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was at the G7 meeting in France, where we talked about how we need to take more action on climate, how we need to take action on nature and how we need to do it in an affordable way while creating good jobs. That is exactly what we are doing.

Oral Questions

We are putting a price on pollution, giving the money back, such that a family of four in Ontario receives \$307. We are tackling our biodiversity challenge and protecting nature by doubling the amount of nature that we protect in Canada. We know that we need to tackle climate change. We need to protect more nature. We need to do it in a way that creates good jobs and grows our economy.

[Translation]

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, even though it poses a danger to our coast, to marine life and to ecosystems; even though indigenous communities said in consultations that it should not move ahead; and even though the court of appeal found that the Liberals had not done their homework, the Liberal government is going to move forward with the Trans Mountain expansion anyway. Indigenous and coastal communities have clearly stated that they do not want this pipeline.

Why do the Liberals refuse to listen?

[English]

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are following the guidance of the Federal Court of Appeal to move this process forward in the right way, through meaningful consultations, and we are making progress every day.

The NEB's report, completed on time, marked an important milestone in this process. On indigenous consultations, our teams are on the ground and they are engaged in a meaningful two-way dialogue. On this side of the House, we are working each day to get this right.

* * *

[Translation]

JUSTICE

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Vice-Admiral Norman's trial has been a debacle from the start. People deserve to know the truth about allegations that the Prime Minister's Office interfered in the judicial process yet again. As we saw in the SNC-Lavalin case, the Liberals have no respect for the independence of the system.

Will the Liberals launch an independent investigation into credible allegations of interference by the Prime Minister's Office in Vice-Admiral Norman's case?

• (1430)

Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government did not play any role in the prosecution of Vice-Admiral Norman. My office did not play a role and neither did the PMO.

This decision falls to the director of public prosecutions alone. Today, she said, as she indicated in February, that there was no outside influence in the proceedings.

[English]

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, that runs contrary to what we have heard from Mark Norman's defence team. They have raised serious concerns about Scott Brison, about the Liberals' cozy relationship with the Irving companies and about political interference directly from the Prime Minister's office.

Sunshine is the best disinfectant. Canadians deserve the truth. Why is the Prime Minister refusing to hold an independent investigation into the Liberals' troubling handling of this case?

Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the director of public prosecutions stated today, as she stated in February, that there was no contact or influence, including political influence, from outside the PPSC, either at the step of the initial decision to prosecute or the decision to stay the charge.

On this side of the House, we believe in our judicial institutions and we believe in our prosecutorial institutions, unlike the previous government, which had a record of interfering with the courts.

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this was said today in the press: "I have an important story to tell that Canadians will want and need to hear."

We have had documents withheld, we have had witnesses silenced and we have seen a personal attack on the reputation of a revered public servant. I am not talking about SNC-Lavalin. What I am talking about is the trial of Vice-Admiral Mark Norman.

Will the Prime Minister do the right thing and apologize?

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the Public Prosecution Service of Canada confirmed today, every decision was made completely independently. Let me quote from that statement:

No other factors were considered in this decision, nor was there any contact or influence from outside the PPSC, including political influence in either the initial decision to prosecute Mr. Norman or in the decision to stay the charge today.

Any accusations otherwise are absurd.

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what is absurd is the fact that these cabinet ministers are being sent out with such flimsy lines and actually do not address the matter. The matter, simply put, is that Vice-Admiral Mark Norman had to spend the last two and a half years scraping and fighting and defending himself while the government sat back and let it happen. It did not produce the documents it was supposed to. In fact, the Prime Minister, on two occasions, said that this matter would end up in court even before the RCMP laid the charge.

What is the government afraid of?

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, based on the decision today, the charge against Vice-Admiral Norman has been stayed. Based on today's decision, my deputy ministers have reviewed the policy in place regarding Vice-Admiral Norman's request to have his legal fees paid for as it relates to this case. I agree with this advice and I have authorized it.

[Translation]

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, now, that is quite the coincidence. After we learned that the former parliamentary secretary to the minister of foreign affairs was going to testify against his own Liberal government in the Vice-Admiral Norman case, the charges were dropped.

Once again, this Liberal government attempted to interfere politically, as it did in the SNC-Lavalin case. What was the strategy of the Prime Minister's entourage? It was to tarnish the reputation of Vice-Admiral Norman.

What is the Prime Minister hiding from Canadians?

Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the director of the Public Prosecution Service of Canada did say today, as she did in February, that there was no outside interference in either the initial decision to prosecute Vice-Admiral Norman, or during the trial, or in the decision to stay the charge today.

It is therefore clear that there was no interference and that the system worked as it should.

• (1435)

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, even before the RCMP filed charges, the Prime Minister said that this would probably end up in court.

After trying to destroy the reputation of the former attorney general in the SNC-Lavalin case, this government tried to completely tarnish the reputation of vice-admiral Norman, a man of integrity who stood up to this Liberal government's interference in our justice system. The vice-admiral even paid his own legal fees, which amount to \$500,000.

When will the government and the Prime Minister—

The Speaker: Order. The hon. Minister of National Defence.

[English]

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first I want to encourage the member to actually read the statement from the Public Prosecution Service of Canada, which I will quote again:

No other factors were considered in this decision, nor was there any contact or influence from outside the PPSC, including political influence in either the initial decision to prosecute Mr. Norman or in the decision to stay the charge today.

When it comes to the legal fees, I have authorized for this payment to occur.

Ms. Leona Alleslev (Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, service to country is an honourable profession and to be willing to give one's life in the defence of the nation should be revered, but what this government has done to Vice-Admiral Mark Norman undermines the values of our nation that every person who serves in uniform is willing to fight to defend. The use of code words and the withholding of documents to tip the scales of justice is clear political interference.

Why does this Prime Minister think that it is acceptable to behave in this manner?

Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have stated a number of times

Oral Questions

over the course of the last couple of weeks, this government, and my department in particular, fulfilled all of their obligations with respect to documents requested in the proceedings. All the priority documents identified in the month of February had been given over at the point of trial.

This prosecution was directed by the Public Prosecution Service of Canada. It is independent of the government and of my department. It proved today that the system works.

Ms. Leona Alleslev (Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is unwilling to admit that politically interfering against a man whose only desire was to serve Canada honourably was wrong. There are many members on the other side, including in cabinet, who served this country in uniform. We swore an oath to serve and defend this nation and the values for which it stands.

Putting service ahead of self takes courage. When will they find the courage to stand for what is right and honour their oath to serve this country ahead of the leader of the Liberal Party?

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am thankful for all the members who serve our Canadian Armed Forces and our veterans as well, including all members in this House. We should not compare one service over another, regardless of party affiliation, and we honour that.

Our defence policy makes sure that it is fully funded and we are going to be focusing on looking after our people. We have increased our defence spending by 70% and we are putting a premium on looking after them and their families.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the government's witch hunt against Vice-Admiral Norman has collapsed, but it has exposed the ruthlessness of a Prime Minister who was willing to destroy the career of a naval officer who served this nation with distinction. Why? It was because the vice-admiral raised questions about a lucrative pork-barrel deal on an important naval deal.

What we have seen are the shocking lengths to which this Prime Minister will go to interfere in the legal system to help cronies in the Liberal Party, but to attempt to destroy an admiral's career is way over the line. I am asking the Prime Minister to stand in this House today to apologize to Vice-Admiral Norman and his family.

Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member well knows, the RCMP, which did the initial investigation, operates independently of government. The Public Prosecution Service, which looks at the evidence gathered by the RCMP and decides whether to lay charges, which proceeds with the prosecution if it decides to lay charges and then, in this case, decides to stay the proceedings, also operates independently of government, independently of my office and independently of the Prime Minister's office.

The director of public prosecutions stated today, as she stated in February, that there was no outside—

• (1440)

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

Oral Questions

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the minister left out one important point: It was a star Liberal MP, a former decorated general, who stepped forward and was willing to testify against this Prime Minister and his own government over this harassment of Admiral Norman, so this is much bigger than defending the cronyism of the Liberal Party of Canada, which the Attorney General of Canada has been defending as of late. This is about the rule of law in Canada.

Why is the Prime Minister refusing to stand up to apologize to Canadians, to explain himself and to launch an independent investigation into the behaviour of his government?

Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the only thing I agree with in the hon. member's statement is that this is about the rule of law in Canada, and indeed the rule of law in Canada functioned very well, from the RCMP in beginning its investigation through to the Public Prosecution Service acting independently and making decisions based on the evidence as it came through.

This Public Prosecution Service operates independently of government. It operated independently of government. It made appropriate decisions. It proves that the rule of law is alive and well in Canada and that the system works well.

Mr. Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Vice-Admiral Mark Norman served our country with honour and distinction, but the Prime Minister and the Liberals tried to destroy him. They attacked him personally and professionally, and they even tried to bankrupt him and his family. Now the Prime Minister needs to start to make amends, and that starts by issuing an apology.

Will the Prime Minister finally apologize for all that he has done to Vice-Admiral Mark Norman?

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I encourage the member to actually read the statement of the Public Prosecution Service of Canada, which confirmed today that every decision made was completely independent. I will have to quote again: "No other factors were considered in this decision... including political influence". Any accusations otherwise are absurd.

Mr. Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is unbelievable that the Prime Minister cannot bring himself to apologize for what he has done to Vice-Admiral Norman, a man who has served our country with honour for decades. The Prime Minister seems to have no problem apologizing for the actions of others, but when it comes to his own bad conduct, "sorry" seems to be the hardest word.

Why did the Prime Minister have no problem apologizing to a convicted terrorist, Omar Khadr, but cannot bring himself to apologize to Vice-Admiral Norman for the damage he has done to his career, his family and his reputation?

Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I obviously reject the premise of the hon. member's question.

This country is all about the rule of law. This country is about great institutions, like the RCMP, like the Public Prosecution Service, which was a good thing started by the previous Conservative government in order to give independence to the

prosecutorial decisions and the governance of prosecution proceedings in Canada.

That system worked well today. Members do not have to just believe me. They can believe the lawyer for Vice-Admiral Norman, who said the rule of law worked.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, a few days after the hon. member for Orléans announced that he was preparing to testify against his own government, the Prime Minister dropped the charges against the vice-admiral.

If the Liberals had provided the documents requested by Vice-Admiral Norman's defence team, this whole matter would have been settled in no time. For more than a year, the Liberals allowed Vice-Admiral Norman's reputation to get tarnished and his career destroyed.

Will the Prime Minister at least apologize?

• (1445)

Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said in French and English, the government fulfilled all of its obligations with respect to documents requested in the proceedings.

The Public Prosecution Service of Canada operates independently from the Government of Canada, my office and the Department of Justice. This proves that the rule of law system works very well in Canada.

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the Attorney General that, upon leaving the courthouse this morning, Vice-Admiral Norman's lawyer said there had been political interference because the government did not provide the document requested. This story is not over.

Will the Prime Minister apologize to Admiral Norman?

Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I reject the premise of the question.

We fulfilled all our obligations. We co-operated with the court for the production of documents.

The director of the Public Prosecution Service of Canada makes decisions independently of government. As she said in February and again today, there was no political interference.

* * *

[*English*]

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is creating two classes of refugees in Bill C-97 to pander to the right. Facing backlash, the government emailed Liberal MPs saying that no asylum seekers would be at risk. The Canadian Association of Refugee Lawyers and Amnesty International were clear: That is not true.

Oral Questions

The Liberals are desperate for a fix, but experts were explicit: There is no fix. Any people pretending the Liberal proposal is the same as the independent work of the IRB are fooling themselves.

Will the Prime Minister do what thousands of Canadians are demanding and withdraw these dangerous provisions?

Hon. Bill Blair (Minister of Border Security and Organized Crime Reduction, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be very clear that our government remains committed to a fair and compassionate refugee system.

As the UNHCR has stated, we are upholding our international and domestic legal obligations, as all claimants still have access to a robust oral hearing, subject to appeal, and will receive Canada's protection if they are found to be at risk. The UNHCR went on to attest that the PRRA, which we are providing, provides the same objectives as the IRB's process and confirms the same degree of refugee protection.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General issued a scathing criticism of the Liberal government yesterday morning on the issue of web giants. The government keeps saying that it is waiting for the international community to join forces to come up with a solution to address the growth of the digital economy. These are just more excuses, and the problem has yet to be solved.

What is interesting is that of the 60 countries polled by the OECD, Canada is one of just two countries that have yet to do anything. Worst of all, it has no intention of doing anything.

What excuse will the Prime Minister use next to justify his failure to act?

[English]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the various remedies available to all western governments are under active consideration now through the forums provided by the Five Eyes alliance and by the G7 security ministers. Various potential approaches have been advanced by a number of those countries. There will be international discussions following later this spring.

It is obviously clear that those who purvey dangerous material on the Internet need to assume responsibility for their behaviour.

* * *

RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Churence Rogers (Bonavista—Burin—Trinity, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, rural communities across Canada play an important role in our national economy and are a special part of the Canadian identity and vibrancy. As the MP for Bonavista—Burin—Trinity, a large rural riding, I see first-hand the unique sorts of issues faced by rural communities and the need for a coordinated, specific plan to address them.

Can the Minister of Rural Economic Development please give this House an update on the work being undertaken to develop a national rural economic development strategy?

• (1450)

Hon. Bernadette Jordan (Minister of Rural Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government understands that rural communities face unique challenges, requiring unique solutions.

Since my appointment as minister of rural economic development, I have visited rural communities across the country to hear directly from Canadians, including in my hon. colleague's riding. We have heard from stakeholder groups, local governments and small business owners. The feedback we have been receiving has been immensely helpful in getting the message out, which we will make sure will help form our national economic development strategy.

I look forward to continuing the work to develop this strategy, bringing it back to the House soon and sharing these opportunities with all Canadians.

* * *

[Translation]

JUSTICE

Mr. Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in February 2018, the Prime Minister announced that the Norman case would go to court even before the RCMP laid charges. On the eve of the election, the charges were withdrawn after the Liberal member for Orléans confirmed that he would testify on behalf of Vice-Admiral Norman. We were told these are coincidences.

The government never wanted to hand over the necessary documents to Vice-Admiral Norman's defence team. What is it hiding?

Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will repeat that the decision to stay charges was made by the director of the Public Prosecution Service of Canada alone. As I have repeated many times, we co-operated with the court to produce the documents required for the trial. The director herself said this morning, as she did in February, that there was no political influence in this case.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICES AND PROCUREMENT

Mr. Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Vice-Admiral Norman has always put the national interest first. The *Asterix* was a tremendous success for military procurement. It was delivered by Davie on time and on budget.

However, the Liberal government is hurting Quebec by putting its political and partisan interests ahead of the national interest, which is to provide our armed forces with suitable equipment in a timely manner.

Why did the government want to take the contract away from Davie?

*Oral Questions**[English]*

Hon. Carla Qualtrough (Minister of Public Services and Procurement and Accessibility, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can assure members that we are laser-focused on delivering for our men and women in the military and in the Coast Guard.

We have delivered a fully costed defence policy and a defence investment plan that is going to allow research and development into the future. We have launched the future fighter jet procurement for the replacement of 88 fighter jets. We have delivery of our first interim jet. We have the first large vessels in the water built under the national shipbuilding strategy, including the first offshore fishery and science vessel and the first Arctic offshore patrol ship. We are building two more. We cut steel on the fourth last week. We purchased fixed-wing search and rescue aircraft. We have awarded—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman.

* * *

JUSTICE

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it was the political interference by the Liberal government that was the catalyst for the Vice-Admiral Norman show trial. The Liberal government obstructed the legal process and sat on the evidence that Vice-Admiral Norman needed to defend his case. It dragged his good name through the mud, drove him into near bankruptcy and refused to turn over evidence to the courts. It is no surprise that the case against Vice-Admiral Norman has been dropped.

Canadians want to know, what is the Prime Minister so desperate to hide?

Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I disagree with every single premise in that question. A great institution, the RCMP, led the investigation and produced evidence, which it gave over to the prosecution service. The prosecution service, which operates independently from government, evaluated that evidence and decided to move ahead with laying charges in this case, and then went through the proceedings.

During the proceedings, the Department of Justice co-operated with the court for the production of third party document requests. That is—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman.

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the minister should actually listen to the press release by Marie Henein today in Vice-Admiral Norman's defence. She actually said that they waited for six months after they made the request for documents that still have not shown up.

Now the Prime Minister callously stomped all over the admiral, who served this country with distinction. The Prime Minister maliciously accused Mark Norman of a crime he never committed, then blocked him from getting any legal assistance. The Prime Minister dragged his feet disclosing evidence for the case and sent completely blacked-out documents.

What is in those documents? What is the Prime Minister covering up?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman should know that all of the procedures here, conducted by the office of the public prosecutor and by the RCMP, are totally independent of the Government of Canada. The whole structure is designed to keep it independent so that the decisions that are made are made on the basis of proper legal considerations, and all of those considerations are weighed carefully in court before a judge.

The matter was entirely without political influence, and that is what the prosecutor said today.

* * *

● (1455)

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Ms. Cheryl Hardcastle (Windsor—Tecumseh, NDP): Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to congratulate Unifor and GM Canada for finding a solution to save hundreds of jobs in Oshawa.

While this is a good start, I am concerned with another auto announcement. In my riding, Ford Canada will eliminate the third shift of the Essex Engine plant, come October 1. Workers are bearing the brunt of Liberal inaction. For years, the NDP has been calling for a national auto strategy. How many job losses will it take before the Liberals start a working group and get us a national auto strategy?

Hon. Navdeep Bains (Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are very encouraged to see the positive news in Oshawa, with regard to the GM workers. More importantly, the member opposite raised the question of jobs. Since we formed government in 2015, 11,500 new jobs have been created in the automotive sector. In comparison, in the Conservatives' first two years, 20,000 jobs were lost, before we even hit the recession. That is because we have been able to attract six billion dollars' worth of investments in the automotive sector.

That is our track record, and we look forward to campaigning on that.

* * *

*[Translation]***INTERNATIONAL TRADE**

Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau (Berthier—Maskinongé, NDP): Mr. Speaker, chicken farmers are here in Ottawa.

I met with them yesterday, and I can say that they are very worried. The lack of import controls, one of the key pillars of supply management, is compromising the entire system.

The Liberals sacrificed our farmers in the recent free trade negotiations. An NDP government would never have allowed these breaches in our supply management system.

Will the Liberal government promise to control our imports, support the survival of our family farms and protect our supply management system?

Hon. Marie-Claude Bibeau (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I actually met with the chicken farmers' association at midday today. I got to have a great discussion with this group, one of many, to give them some assurances.

Our government made a commitment to all industries regarding supply management. We made a firm commitment in budget 2019, and I am working very hard so I can fulfill those commitments over the coming months.

These associations can count on our government.

* * *

[English]

JUSTICE

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have seen the Prime Minister fight veterans in court before. He says that they are asking for more than he can give, but when it comes to fighting people who are standing up against him, then money is no object.

How many taxpayers' dollars has the Prime Minister wasted trying to destroy Vice-Admiral Mark Norman?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Veterans Affairs and Associate Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is kind of rich to have our hon. colleague mention veterans affairs after what her Conservative government did to veterans affairs. It cut 1,000 jobs, cutting agents who work on pension benefits.

We, as a government, allocated \$10 billion of new money and allocated a pension for life. We have taken care of veterans in this country and will continue to do so.

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Royal Canadian Navy is our senior service, and today its most senior officer, Mark Norman, was completely vindicated.

The Crown said there was no reasonable prospect of conviction. There was never a reasonable prospect of convicting Mark Norman. He never should have been removed from command. He never should have faced a criminal charge. He never should have been the fall guy for Liberal corruption.

Can the government start making it right? Can the defence minister commit today to reinstating Mark Norman as the vice-chief of the defence staff?

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: I encourage members to be judicious with their language.

• (1500)

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we stated before, no other factors were considered in this decision, including no political influence.

As mentioned today to the media, General Vance, Vice-Admiral Norman's immediate superior, will be having discussions. Once

those discussions have been had, I will have the appropriate military advice to make appropriate decisions.

* * *

ETHICS

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today the Liberals are talking about independence. Let us review.

Scott Brison independently manipulated a \$700-million contract. The Prime Minister's office independently hired James Cudmore, who revealed the leak. The Prime Minister independently—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order, order. The hon. member for Durham has the floor. Order.

Hon. Erin O'Toole: Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are a little touchy today.

Scott Brison independently tried to stop a naval contract. The reporter who revealed that, James Cudmore, was independently hired by the PMO. The PMO independently had Michael Wernick look into the leaks and found that 73 people knew. The Prime Minister independently said Mark Norman would be charged.

Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have stated a number of times in this House today, there are a number of outstanding institutions that did their jobs properly to protect the rule of law in Canada.

The RCMP conducted an investigation, which produced evidence. The prosecution service took that evidence, assessed it, decided to lay charges, decided to proceed with the prosecution and then decided to stay it, all within its independent powers as our prosecution service.

Our government co-operated in producing thousands of documents under third party record application—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Kitchener South—Hespeler.

* * *

TOURISM

Mr. Marwan Tabbara (Kitchener South—Hespeler, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, tourism is a key economic driver in Waterloo Region.

For 10 years, the Conservatives failed to understand that Harper made cuts to Destination Canada's budget, and now Doug Ford is cutting the province's tourism budget. It is very clear that the tourism sector is not a priority for these Conservatives.

Can the Minister of Tourism, Official Languages and La Francophonie reassure the hard-working people of the tourism sector what our government is doing to support them better?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Tourism, Official Languages and La Francophonie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Kitchener South—Hespeler for his important question and hard work.

Oral Questions

Last year, Ontario welcomed almost 10 million international visitors, contributing \$7 billion to the economy. The Conservatives made it clear that 700,000 hard-working Ontarians in the tourism sector are not a priority for them.

Our Liberal government understands the growth in the sector, and that is why we invested \$60 million in our budget. How can the Conservatives say, on the one hand, that Ontario is open for business, and meanwhile they are cutting—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: I am hearing unparliamentary language from the hon. member for Battle River—Crowfoot. He should know that this is not permitted in the House. I invite him now to apologize for his remark.

Hon. Kevin Sorenson: Mr. Speaker, I apologize.

The Speaker: I thank the hon. member.

The hon. member for Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes.

* * *

ETHICS

Mr. Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government seems concerned and confused about its jurisdiction, but the Prime Minister's actions in the Vice-Admiral Norman trial are the exact same as those in the SNC-Lavalin scandal. The Prime Minister tried to interfere in an ongoing criminal trial. The fact that he was unsuccessful twice does not change the fact that he tried to put his fingers on the scales of justice. Thankfully, our independent justice system resisted his attempt to politically interfere with it.

This is corrupt, this is shameful and it has no place in our democracy. When will the Prime Minister apologize for his continual attempts to pervert the course of justice?

Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the rule of law in Canada and the course of justice are doing quite well today.

The prosecution service of Canada, acting independently of government, as the director said, and acting independently of influence, including political influence of any kind, made a decision to stay a proceeding after having led a process and after having started that process based on evidence given by another great institution, the RCMP.

The rule of law is functioning as it should in Canada. Justice has been served. I am quite proud of our system.

* * *

• (1505)

[*Translation*]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Leader of the Conservative Party announced that he would move the Canadian embassy from Tel-Aviv to Jerusalem if he became Prime Minister. Not only would this policy be irresponsible, but it would also violate international

law and United Nations Security Council resolutions. Most especially, it would make no sense for anyone who wants peace in the region. The Conservatives seem to have a simple plan to copy Donald Trump's foreign policy, which is particularly troubling for stability in the Middle East.

Will the Liberals commit to condemning this plan, knowing that East Jerusalem is internationally recognized as occupied Palestinian territory?

[*English*]

Mr. Robert Oliphant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada is a steadfast friend of Israel and a friend to the Palestinian people. Canada's long-standing position is that the status of Jerusalem can be resolved only as part of a general settlement of the Palestinian-Israeli dispute.

That has been a long-standing policy of consecutive governments, and we remain strongly committed to the goal of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East, including the creation of a Palestinian state living side by side in peace and security with Israel, which we celebrate today on its day of independence.

* * *

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Mr. Francesco Sorbara (Vaughan—Woodbridge, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government is committed to supporting the Canadian agri-food processing industry. Under the Canadian agricultural partnership program, I joined the Minister of Agriculture last week in announcing an \$8.5-million investment in Vaughan-based and family-owned organic food processor Riverside Natural Foods.

[*Translation*]

Can the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food tell us how these investments will increase trade, support agricultural innovation and create good jobs for the middle class?

Hon. Marie-Claude Bibeau (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Vaughan—Woodbridge for accompanying me to Riverside Natural Foods.

[*English*]

This is an expanding family business whose healthy snacks are enjoyed in more than 30 countries. It is a business that has provided markets for Canadian agriculture products.

Our investment under the agriInnovate program will help Riverside install its new, first-in-Canada robotic equipment, customize and automate production, and develop many new healthy snack foods.

Through budget 2019, we are investing \$100 million to drive innovation in the food processing industry.

JUSTICE

Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there are still so many unanswered questions with respect to the Vice-Admiral Mark Norman case. What was the level of political interference by Liberal MPs, the cabinet and the Prime Minister to try to change the supply ship contract? What was the Prime Minister hiding when we fought in court to deny the defence access to key documents?

The Prime Minister said on two occasions that the Vice-Admiral Norman case would end up in court before charges were laid. How did he know that?

The Prime Minister can start by answering this question. What was he trying to hide and whom was he protecting?

Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have said a number of times today, the Department of Justice co-operated with the court and fulfilled its obligations for the production of third party documents. There were thousands of documents. Yes, it took time, but we fulfilled our obligation to the court.

The system of justice in Canada is working. The Public Prosecution Service made an independent decision to stay proceedings based on the evidence it had in front of it. It took the initial decision to proceed with the case based on evidence raised by another institution—

[*Translation*]

The Speaker: The hon. member for Joliette.

* * *

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the government announced \$3.9 billion in compensation for supply-managed farmers in the budget. However, there is no mention of that money in the budget's financial tables, schedules or votes. There is no line item for the compensation and no program for that purpose. None of the departmental budgets make any mention of this compensation.

If there is money to compensate our farmers, can the Minister of Finance tell us exactly where to find it, how much there is and, most importantly, how we can approve that amount in the House before the election?

Hon. Marie-Claude Bibeau (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to reassure my colleague and supply-managed farmers.

Our government made them a commitment. The budget clearly states that \$3.9 billion will be allocated, \$2.4 billion of which will go to farmers. We are also strongly committed to helping processors.

I would ask the member to wait a few weeks for more information on this matter.

• (1510)

Mr. Pierre Nantel: Mr. Speaker, if you seek it, I think you will find the unanimous consent of the House for the following motion: that the House of Commons (a) acknowledge the concerns of the Government of Quebec about the budget situation at Telefilm

Business of Supply

Canada; (b) recognize, as La Presse noted yesterday, that without Telefilm and its operating budget, Quebec cinema and artists such as Xavier Dolan would not have had as much international success; (c) note the outrage of the film industry over the dismissal of some of the leadership at Telefilm; (d) call on the government to resolve the crisis, act swiftly to secure funding for francophone cinema for 2019-20, and ensure that films in production in the coming months are not jeopardized.

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

Some hon. members: No.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—NATURAL RESOURCES

The Speaker: It being 3:10 p.m., pursuant to order made on Tuesday, May 7 the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion relating to the Business of Supply.

Call in the members.

• (1515)

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

(*Division No. 1308*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultair
Albrecht
Allison
Arnold
Barrett
Bernier
Bezan
Brassard
Chong
Cooper
Deltell
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Généreux
Godin
Harder
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Liepert
Lobb
MacKenzie
Martel
McColeman
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Nater
Nuttall
O'Toole
Poilievre
Reid
Richards
Scheer
Shields
Sopuck

Albas
Allelev
Anderson
Barlow
Benzen
Berthold
Block
Calkins
Clarke
Davidson
Diotte
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Gallant
Gladu
Gourde
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Lloyd
Lukiwski
Maguire
McCaulley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Motz
Nicholson
Obhrai
Paul-Hus
Rayes
Rempel
Saroya
Schmale
Shipley
Sorenson

Routine Proceedings

Stanton
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Yurdiga

Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Vecchio
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Zimmer — 86

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Amos
Angus
Arya
Ayoub
Bagnell
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bendayan
Benson
Bittle
Blair
Boissonnault
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Cannings
Carr
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cormier
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhillon
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Duvall
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Fergus
Finnigan
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fry
Garrison
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hajdu
Hardie
Hehr
Holland
Hughes
Iacono
Joly
Jordan
Julian
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Lighthound
Long
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Mathysen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)
Monsef
Morrissey
Nantel
Nault
O'Connell
Oliver

Alghabra
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Aubin
Badawey
Bains
Baylis
Beech
Bennett
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boulerice
Bratina
Brosseau
Caron
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Choquette
Cullen
Dabrusin
Dhaliwal
Donnelly
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dusseault
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hardcastle
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Hussen
Jolibois
Jones
Jowhari
Khalid
Kwan
Lametti
Lapointe
Laverdière
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacGregor
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mihychuk
Murray
Nassif
Ng
Oiphant
O'Regan

Ouellette
Pauzé
Peterson
Picard
Poissant
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Rusnak
Saini
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Simms
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Tabbara
Tassi
Tootoo
Vandal
Vaughan
Weir
Wilson-Raybould
Yip
Zahid — 199

Paradis
Peschisolido
Philpott
Plamondon
Quach
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Ruimy
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Singh
Spengemann
Stetski
Tan
Thériault
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Virani
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Young

PAIRED

Members

Gill

LeBlanc — 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

I wish to inform the House that because of the deferred record division, Government Orders will be extended by seven minutes.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

● (1520)

[*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 two petitions.

* * *

[*Translation*]**COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE**

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Hon. Larry Bagnell (Yukon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 92nd report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

The committee advises that pursuant to Standing Order 91.1(2), the subcommittee on private members' business met to consider the order for the second reading of a private member's bill originating in the Senate, and the items added to the order of precedence on Thursday, April 11, 2019, and recommended that the items listed herein, which it has determined should not be designated non-votable, be considered by the House.

Routine Proceedings

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 91.1(2), the report is deemed adopted.

* * *

[English]

INSTRUCTION TO THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP) moved:

That it be an instruction to the Standing Committee on Finance that, during its consideration of Bill C-97, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 19, 2019 and other measures, the Committee be granted the power to divide the Bill into two pieces of legislation: (a) one containing all the provisions related to immigration and refugees; and (b) one containing all remaining provisions of the Bill.

The Speaker: Debate, the hon. government House leader.

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, I move:

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

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There was very clearly a call for the question on the motion that was presented by the member for Vancouver East, so we should proceed to a vote on that basis.

The Speaker: I certainly did not call for the question. I asked for debate. We do not really have a procedure whereby we call for the question in that sense, but at any rate I did not hear it. The point is that I am told the motion is in order. We are now on the motion.

Mr. Mark Strahl: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, when you called for motions, there was a motion on instructions to the committee to travel. What happened to that motion that was on the floor? There was no call for, "Is the House ready for the question?" There was no debate. There was nothing. There was simply a point of order and a subsequent motion. I would assume that we would have to dispense with the motion before the House before a subsequent motion could be put. Perhaps you could clarify whether that is the question.

• (1525)

The Speaker: The hon. members will know that I called for debate. The hon. government House leader rose after I called for debate. She could have waited until the end of a 20-minute speech and made a motion. Instead, she made a motion right away. That is in fact in order. Therefore, we are on that motion now.

This is a non-debatable question. It supersedes the previous motion, and clearly it seeks to know the will of the House. If it is the will of the House to go to orders of the day rather than go back to the previous motion, that is what we will do.

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.

• (1600)

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

(Division No. 1309)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Amos	Anandasangaree
Arseneault	Arya
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Bains
Baylis	Beech
Bendayan	Bennett
Bibeau	Bitte
Blair	Boissonnault
Bossio	Bratina
Breton	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Champagne	Chen
Cormier	Cuzner
Dabrusin	Damoff
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz
Easter	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Ellis
Erskine-Smith	Eyolfson
Fergus	Fillmore
Finnigan	Fisher
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fry	Fuhr
Gerretsen	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Graham	Hajdu
Hardie	Harvey
Hébert	Hehr
Hogg	Holland
Housefather	Hussen
Iacono	Joly
Jones	Jordan
Jowhari	Khalid
Khera	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier	Levitt
Lightbound	Lockhart
Long	Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
May (Cambridge)	
McCrimmon	McDonald
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendicino
Mihychuk	Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)
Monsef	Morrissey
Murray	Nassif
Nault	Ng
O'Connell	Oliphant
Oliver	Ouellette
Paradis	Peschisolido
Peterson	Picard
Poissant	Qualtrough
Ratansi	Rioux
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Rota	Rudd
Ruimy	Rusnak

Government Orders

Sahota	Saini
Sajjan	Samson
Sangha	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms	Sorbara
Spengemann	Tabbara
Tan	Tassi
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Virani
Whalen	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young
Zahid— 153	

PAIRED

Members

Gill LeBlanc— 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

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 Saskatoon West, Transportation; the hon. member for Drummond, The Environment.

NAYS

Members

Aboultatif	Albas
Albrecht	Alleslev
Allison	Anderson
Angus	Arnold
Aubin	Barlow
Barrett	Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu	Benson
Benzen	Berthold
Bezan	Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Block
Boudrias	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Brassard
Brousseau	Calkins
Cannings	Caron
Chong	Choquette
Christopherson	Cooper
Cullen	Davidson
Deltell	Diotte
Donnelly	Dreeshen
Dubé	Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dusseauil	Duvall
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Fortin	Gallant
Garrison	Généreux
Gladu	Godin
Gourde	Harcastle
Harder	Hughes
Jolibois	Julian
Kelly	Kent
Kitchen	Kmieć
Kusie	Kwan
Lake	Laverdière
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	Lukiwski
MacGregor	MacKenzie
Maguire	Martel
Mathysen	May (Saanic—Gulf Islands)
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McColeman
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Motz	Nantel
Nater	Nicholson
Nuttall	Obhrai
O'Toole	Paul-Hus
Pauzé	Plamondon
Poilievre	Quach
Rayes	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Sansoucy	Schmale
Shields	Shipley
Sopuck	Sorenson
Stanton	Ste-Marie
Stetski	Strahl
Stubbs	Sweet
Thériault	Tilson
Trost	Trudel
Van Kesteren	Viersen
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Weir
Yurdiga	Zimmer— 120

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

● (1605)

[English]

CRIMINAL CODE

BILL C-84—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.) moved:

That, in relation to Bill C-84, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (bestiality and animal fighting), not more than one further sitting day shall be allotted to the consideration at third 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 third 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.

[Translation]

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 Calgary Nose Hill.

[English]

Hon. Michelle Rempel (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, frankly, this is a bill that the government should have dealt with on the front end of this Parliament. There has been a lot of bipartisan support for this bill. I am just really disappointed that the government had to invoke time allocation, when I think there has been discussion among all parties with a view to having this bill pass expeditiously.

The government is going to allow a speaker, and other opposition parties were not going to have a speaker, and I do not understand why we are doing this. The government could have just put no speakers up. This is one of those situations where I know we have stakeholders in Ottawa who are watching this.

The government could have just managed this situation so much better. If one is going to build trust in this place, putting forward time allocation for something like this just seems a little heavy-handed and ridiculous. Why did the government have to quash bipartisan support for a bill that was probably just going to go on a voice vote anyway today?

Government Orders

Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for her engagement on this issue in her private member's bill, Bill C-388, which took up one of the central issues of this bill.

It is unfortunate that we are going to time allocation. I cannot speak to the negotiations that went on, but I can say that we would like to see this bill through. As the hon. member has pointed out, there is a great deal of support on all sides of the House for this bill. The work that was done in committee was exemplary in terms of bringing forward amendments that were accepted, and we feel this bill needs to move forward, so we are using time allocation because we have to.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the justice minister just stated something that is factually not true. This is the 70th time in this Parliament that the Liberals have used time allocation and closure, and he is saying that they are using it because they need to. The point is that they absolutely did not need to use the sledgehammer.

The government seems completely unwilling to work with opposition parties on anything, even on a bill that has a fairly broad level of consensus. I agree with the member for Calgary Nose Hill that it probably would have passed on a voice vote. Instead of bringing it to the House and working it through, it imposed closure for the 70th time.

This is in complete disregard for all the commitments I remember from back in 2015 when the Prime Minister said things would be different. He said this government would approach Parliament in a co-operative way and make sure parliamentarians can work together. Instead, we have had closure or time allocation 70 times. It is completely unacceptable and completely unnecessary.

Why is the government imposing closure on this Parliament for the 70th time?

• (1610)

Hon. David Lametti: Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak to negotiations that went on with this bill or any other bill. That is not one of my functions in this House. What I can say is that there is a wide degree of support for it, not just in this House but also across Canada. We have managed to unify the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, the Canadian Federation of Humane Societies, the Canadian Cattlemen's Association, the Canadian Veterinary Medical Association, the Chicken Farmers of Canada, the Canadian Pork Council, the Egg Farmers of Canada, the Canadian Hatching Egg Producers, the Turkey Farmers of Canada, the Canadian Bison Association, the Canada Mink Breeders Association and the Canadian Sheep Federation.

My name gets tagged on a lot of social media, with people asking where this bill is, why it is not happening and why the opposition is stalling. I have to respond to that in some personal way. We are moving forward with this bill because it is something that has a great deal of support, and we intend to get it through.

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate that the Minister of Justice has not been the Minister of Justice throughout this Parliament, so he is taking on some legislation he had no role in crafting. However, he is the representative of the government today, and he needs to stand

and answer and be accountable to the people and their representatives.

Why such a different approach? On this piece of legislation, we have a stand-alone piece of legislation that has gone through committee process and whatnot, and through debate, yet shamefully, in Bill C-74, an omnibus piece of legislation, the Liberals pushed through a provision for deferred prosecution agreements. They did not have a single witness from the academic community or bar association come for a thorough discussion about that particular regime, which is unlike any that has been used in the Criminal Code before. Why did they do that while giving a stand-alone bill to this, when they could easily have taken that DPA section from division 20 of Bill C-74 and put it in Bill C-75, another piece of omnibus legislation? Why is there such a mismatch in how they present to this place and with where their priorities are?

Hon. David Lametti: Mr. Speaker, we felt these two issues were fairly well agreed upon on all sides of this House, therefore we could get it through. We also felt that the committee work that would be done on this, specifically in front of the justice committee, would build a better bill. That is precisely what happened. The three recommendations made by the justice committee helped a great deal to improve the bill.

With respect to this particular bill, which is what we are talking about today, we felt this was the best way to move forward.

Mr. Randall Garrison (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I find it passing strange to hear what is coming from the Minister of Justice today.

I am one of those people who have wanted to speak to this bill. I have some things to say about its limitations and its failure in terms of being a missed opportunity to do a more comprehensive reform.

That said, I have been waiting to speak for a month. I have been waiting for the government to bring this bill forward. We have a limited number of people who want to speak. We are prepared to move forward with it. We have always been prepared to move forward.

He is the Minister of Justice. It is your bill now, and your answers do not make a lot of sense to me. Why are you even wasting this half-hour and the time it takes to vote? We probably could have finished dealing with this bill in this time.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I just want to remind the hon. members to speak through the Speaker, not to the Speaker.

Government Orders

Hon. David Lametti: Mr. Speaker, I will respond to part of the question. Certainly my commitment as Minister of Justice, moving forward, is to undertake a more comprehensive review of the question of animal rights more generally. I have done that publicly now on a number of occasions, both in front of the committee and in front of a round table hosted by my colleague, the member for Parkdale—High Park, with a number of leading animal rights advocates in Toronto.

I understand the importance, and I recognize, as the member has intimated, that this is a rather narrow bill. It is very narrow in scope. We need to do a lot more.

Mr. Michael Cooper (St. Albert—Edmonton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice is quite right that there is widespread consensus, and he is also right that a lot of good work was done at committee.

However, I have to say I was a little surprised by his assertion that there are stakeholders out there who are alleging that it is the opposition that is holding up or stalling the bill. Nothing could be further from the truth.

It is the government that has been holding up this bill. It is why the D.L.W. decision was issued in June 2016. It is now May 2019, and the government has still not responded. It is why the member for Calgary Nose Hill felt the need to introduce a private member's bill more than a year ago, a private member's bill that the government essentially copied and pasted into this legislation.

What was the minister talking about?

• (1615)

Hon. David Lametti: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his work on the committee. It brought valuable improvements to the bill, and I certainly enjoy my interactions with the hon. member, both in the House and at committee.

It is true that we incorporated a private member's bill from the member for Calgary Nose Hill. I thanked her for that contribution previously in answer to her question. However, we added another important element to the bill, which was animal fighting. That was also something we felt we could target quite clearly, and for which there was a great deal of support. It would also help us indirectly combat organized crime, which is often part of the animal fighting context.

I would say to the hon. member that we are doing our best to get this through the House as best we can, given the negotiations that happened. As I have just said, I am not privy to those negotiations. We feel this is the best way to move forward to get this done.

Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I find it absolutely bizarre that we have this motion before us today.

We have heard from all sides of this House that there is support for this bill, yet instead of allowing some time for people to express their opinions on it, the government has taken a sledgehammer to it. Certainly the previous government used time allocation on occasion, but it was when there was no consensus.

Again, I would like the minister to tell us why Liberals feel they need to use a sledgehammer, when the parties just wanted an

opportunity to put up a speaker and were willing to let this bill move forward.

Hon. David Lametti: Mr. Speaker, we would like to get this bill through this Parliament because a number of Canadians are waiting for it. I agree with the hon. member for St. Albert—Edmonton that this is a long-overdue response to the D.L.W. decision of the Supreme Court of Canada. I share that sentiment completely. Therefore, we are moving to get the debate done. We know that there is a high degree of support.

MPs have had a great deal of time in first reading, second reading and committee work to have an impact on this bill. They have had a positive impact on this bill. It is time to move on.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Robert Aubin (Trois-Rivières, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I will comment not on the substance of the bill but on the sense of urgency. As members know, a time allocation motion is supposed to be an exceptional and justifiable measure, but I am having a hard time seeing how it is justified now.

Why is there time allocation for this?

Considering the government's meagre legislative agenda, is the goal to adjourn the House on June 1?

Hon. David Lametti: Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his question.

I do not know the answer to his question. As I said, I am not privy to party leaders' negotiations about time allocation and procedures.

Adopting this bill is one of our government's priorities. It is important to people across Canada. Animals will be better off because of this bill.

This is a very specific bill, and we have reached consensus on both those aspects. The nearly unanimous support of the House indicates that we will be able to go ahead with this.

[*English*]

Mr. Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes, CPC): Mr. Speaker, actions speak louder than words, and 511 days ago, the hon. member for Calgary Nose Hill introduced her private member's bill, Bill C-388. It addressed what should have been the subject to be discussed before this House today. The government says that this is a priority for it and, while there is a Supreme Court decision that is awaiting its answer, it has dragged its feet on what has been the product of hard work and consensus by all parties at committee.

It is very disappointing to stakeholders and very disappointing for members, intervenors and witnesses that time allocation has been moved on this issue that is very important. The government has had ample opportunity to advance it. Why now is it slamming the door on open debate in this place?

Government Orders

•(1620)

Hon. David Lametti: Mr. Speaker, as I have stated, I think there is a high degree of consensus on all sides of the House for this bill. I disagree with the hon. member's interpretation of events over the last two years, roughly, with regard to the way in which this bill proceeded. I do agree on the contribution made by the member for Calgary Nose Hill with a private member's bill that covers one of the two subject matters addressed in this bill. However, I think Canadians across Canada are waiting for this bill to get through.

Again, sharing the sentiment that there is much more work to be done, we feel it is time to get this bill through the House of Commons, the Senate and on to royal assent, such that we can move on to a larger look at the question of animal rights in this country.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, the more I hear the justice minister, the more perplexed I am about the government.

For weeks and weeks, it did not bring this forward on the Order Paper. The bill was languishing because of government inaction. Then the government brought it forward, but brought it forward with the sledgehammer of closure to shut down debate, even though all members have indicated interest. A couple of members wanted to speak, but all members wanted to get on with this. Discussions can take place, and from there we can have a voice vote or a rapid vote. However, if there has been any delay, it has been on the government side.

To counteract this, an hour has been used up, which could have been used for discussion from the members who wanted to make their views known on the record. Then we would have proceeded to a vote. Instead, we have a very ham-fisted, sledgehammer imposition by the Liberal government that delays any discussion debate for an hour. This is after the government made the bill languish on the side rather than bringing it forward for debate in the House of Commons.

I am so perplexed by the strategy of the government. It seems desperate and incompetent at the same time. Why is the government imposing a sledgehammer rather than just allowing the members speak who want to put their views on the record, followed by the vote that all members want? Why use the sledgehammer when it was so unnecessary?

Hon. David Lametti: Mr. Speaker, the bill was introduced on October 18, 2018, with second reading debate on October 29, 2018. The justice committee studied it and concurred in a report stage and third reading debate that began on March 18, 2019.

I put it to the hon. member that there has been ample opportunity for members to speak to the bill and have an impact on it. There were three hours of debate at the second reading stage, there was no report stage debate, and there was an hour of debate at third reading.

Members in the House who have wanted to speak on the bill and make their views known have had ample opportunity to do so.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I have to say for the hon. Minister of Justice that not all members in this place have had ample opportunity. Some of us have had no opportunity.

I would also like to say that, while the Green Party is in strong agreement with the bill, there is a difficulty with repeatedly using

time allocation. This debate is about the question of time allocation. The overall message, which is most unfortunate, appears to be that allowing full debate on legislation, whether it is on an omnibus budget bill or a small bill that is relatively widely supported, such as Bill C-84, is basically a waste of time. The message is that it is up to the government to pass the bills, and when the opposition debates, it is basically a waste of time and gets in the government's way.

I do not think that is what the government wants to communicate to Canadians, but the number of times time allocation has been used in this place is not only deeply shocking to me, but it is horrific. It means that what Stephen Harper did in this place is now normalized by the very members who used to decry it.

•(1625)

Hon. David Lametti: Mr. Speaker, I share the substantive concern that the hon. leader of the Green Party is raising. I can speak to the bills that I am, as minister, shepherding through the House. Certainly, on Bill C-84, the process has worked in the sense that a number of very good amendments were made at committee stage and there was robust debate.

Both Bill C-75 and Bill C-78 have had a number of interesting discussions in the House. They have gone to the other place. We are thinking about amendments on them based on our work in this House and on what the Senate is doing.

The process is working. I think we are approaching it in good faith. The fact of the matter is that sometimes we run out of time, and we feel we have done that in this particular case.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):

Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to be on both opposition and government benches. I have recognized on both sides that at times there is a need to use time allocation, because it is a tool that is there to ensure that priority bills can be passed. In fact, we have seen the New Democratic Party members here identify government bills they believe are a priority, and they supported time allocation.

It is interesting to listen to the questions that have been posed to the minister. When was that interest expressed to have an hour debate and then allow it to pass? The expression of interest to do so only came after time allocation was put into place.

For the minister, in recognizing the importance of Bill C-84, I suspect that if we did not bring in time allocation, there would be a very good chance we might not be passing the bill today, because we have seen oppositions in the past talk out a bill that everyone supports, ultimately forcing government to bring in time allocation.

Hon. David Lametti: Mr. Speaker, I recognize the hon. member's wisdom in all matters procedural in this place.

I am in an awkward position to answer that question in the sense that I was not privy to the conversations and negotiations that were had in order to advance the agenda of this place as things move forward.

Government Orders

Although this is a small bill in terms of length, it is an important bill focusing on two kinds of activity, which we as Canadian society feel are reprehensible. Therefore we are taking strong measures against each of them in each case. Both were deemed important enough to be included in the bill. Both were deemed important enough to create a new government bill, and so we are moving forward with it because Canadian society wants us to.

Mr. Michael Cooper: Mr. Speaker, during the justice committee's study of Bill C-84, we heard evidence about a strong correlation between individuals who commit acts of bestiality and individuals who abuse women and children.

It was on that basis that I put forward an amendment at committee to amend section 160 to require that all individuals who commit acts of bestiality and are convicted under section 160 be required to register with the National Sex Offender Registry. I am very pleased all members of committee supported that amendment.

I was wondering if the minister could speak to that issue.

Hon. David Lametti: It would be a pleasure to speak to that issue, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the hon. member for his work with that amendment. He rightly identified a gap in the previous legislation in which, although some events associated with bestiality could be caught under other sexual offences, bestiality simpliciter would not be caught. He rightly identified that and moved that forward in committee, and I thank him for that. It is a better bill because of that.

He is absolutely right that studies are now increasingly linking bestiality with other forms of sexual abuse, particularly with children, so it is important to move forward in a coherent and unified fashion.

Once again, I thank the member for his work on the bill. I thank him in particular for this particular amendment.

• (1630)

Mr. Dan Albas: Mr. Speaker, part of the minister's argument today has been that we need to get this legislation to the Senate to speed things up. I can understand that. We only have so much time.

That being said, by the same token, Bill C-75 has gone to the other place and it is a much larger bill. Would the member not agree that this particular bill, Bill C-84, should have been wrapped up in Bill C-75, gone to the justice committee and had full exposure to all of the different parts in that omnibus piece of legislation, so it could have maybe left a stand-alone bill for us to have a full discussion on the deferred prosecution agreements, an issue which was in Bill C-74, division 20?

That piece of legislation did not get a full hearing at finance committee. Only one witness from the justice department came to speak to it. I still get calls on a regular basis from people in both the academic and the legal communities who feel that the Liberal government's approach to that piece of omnibus legislation maligned Parliament and denied the proper hearing of major changes to the Criminal Code.

Would the member not agree that this place must be respected? Would he agree that that kind of sleight of hand by the government needs to change?

Hon. David Lametti: Mr. Speaker, I am glad the hon. member has brought up Bill C-75. We feel it is an outstanding piece of legislation that goes a long way toward improving the efficiency, fairness and speed, frankly, of our criminal justice system.

The unifying theme of Bill C-75 is, in fact, to make the criminal justice system more fair, more efficient and better working, particularly in light of rulings by the Supreme Court of Canada, such as Jordan, which force us to take those matters seriously.

The elements brought up in Bill C-84 do not have that same goal in mind, if I may, and therefore it is appropriate that Bill C-84 be part of a separate piece of legislation. It just did not fit in Bill C-75.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully, and the justice minister said that without time allocation at second reading this bill passed after three hours of debate. Then he said that for third reading there has been an hour of debate, but Liberals want to impose closure, that is shut down Parliament. Based on what he just said, has it not occurred to him that if members of Parliament from all parties are willing to move on after three hours of debate at second reading, it would be roughly similar at third reading? By his activity today in shutting down Parliament, by moving this sledgehammer, all he has done is complicate passage of the bill when there were perhaps only two hours of debate still to come.

Any reasonable Canadian would say three hours of debate on a important bill like this before the House of Commons is not excessive in any way. It is not opposition parties trying to delay. It is not opposition members of Parliament saying they are not going to pass the bill. Any reasonable Canadian would assume that the three hours of scrutiny are just part of moving things through.

However, we saw that the government, by the justice minister's own admission, sat on the bill for well over a month, almost a month and a half. The problem is the government. The problem is the incompetence of the government in trying to move motions and bills through the House of Commons. The problem is not opposition members of Parliament, who simply want a couple of hours of debate in order to finalize before we have the vote.

Why did the justice minister close down debate when, by his own admission, we were only talking about a couple of hours and some members of Parliament who wanted to express their views on this subject?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Before the hon. minister answers that question, I want to point out that sometimes we put our earpieces down. When we put them down, we should try not to put them next to the microphone. It is just to save the ears of the translators or the interpreters, because I know they put a lot of effort into it and we do not want to make their job harder than it is.

The hon. minister.

• (1635)

Hon. David Lametti: Mr. Speaker, I wondered what that whistling was in my ear. When took my earpiece out, I realized it was the hon. member.

I think Canadians expect us as a government to move forward with balanced debate, with respect for democracy, but also with the ability and the desire to get pieces of legislation through Parliament in order that they be enacted in law. Reflecting on that balance, the government feels it is time to move forward with the bill.

Again, I repeat. Because of the degree of agreement that exists in the House, because of the time taken, and because of the narrow scope of the bill, it is time to move forward. There has been ample opportunity to discuss the bill, debate the bill and amend the bill. I just cited a member opposite for his yeoman's work on the bill, and Canadians deserve to have the bill enacted because of the vices that it corrects.

[*Translation*]

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

[*English*]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

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.

• (1715)

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

(*Division No. 1310*)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Amos	Anandasangaree
Arseneault	Arya
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Bains
Baylis	Beech
Bendayan	Bennett
Bibeau	Bittle
Blair	Boissonnault
Bossio	Bratina
Breton	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Champagne	Chen
Cormier	Cuzner
Dabrusin	Damoff

Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz
Easter	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Ellis
Erskine-Smith	Eyolfson
Fergus	Fillmore
Finnigan	Fisher
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fry
Fuhr	Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones	Gould
Graham	Hajdu
Hardie	Harvey
Hébert	Hehr
Hogg	Holland
Housefather	Hussen
Iacono	Joly
Jones	Jordan
Jowhari	Khalid
Khera	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier	Levitt
Lightbound	Lockhart
Long	Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
May (Cambridge)	
McCrimmon	McDonald
McGuinity	McKay
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendicino
Mihychuk	Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Soeurs)	
Morrissey	Murray
Nassif	Nault
Ng	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
Ouellette	Paradis
Peschisolido	Peterson
Picard	Poissant
Qualtrough	Ratansi
Rioux	Robillard
Rogers	Romanado
Rudd	Ruimy
Rusnak	Sahota
Saini	Sajjan
Samson	Sangha
Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms	Sorbara
Spengemann	Tabbara
Tan	Tassi
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Virani
Whalen	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young
Zahid — 149	

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Albas
Alleslev
Anderson
Arnold
Barlow
Barsalou-Duval
Benson
Berthold
Blaikie
Block
Boulerice
Brassard
Calkins
Caron
Choquette
Clarke
Cullen

Government Orders

Davidson	Deltell
Diotte	Donnelly
Dreeshen	Dubé
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	Dusseault
Duvall	Eglinski
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Fast	Fortin
Gallant	Garrison
Généreux	Gladu
Godin	Gourde
Hardcastle	Harder
Hughes	Jolibois
Julian	Kelly
Kent	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kusie
Kwan	Laverdière
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	Lukiwski
MacGregor	MacKenzie
Maguire	Martel
Mathysen	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McColeman
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Motz	Nantel
Nater	Nicholson
Nuttall	O'Toole
Paul-Hus	Pauzé
Plamondon	Poillievre
Rayes	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Sansoucy	Saroya
Scheer	Schmale
Shields	Shipley
Sopuck	Sorenson
Stanton	Ste-Marie
Stetski	Strahl
Stubbs	Sweet
Thériault	Tilson
Trost	Van Kesteren
Vecchio	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Weir	Yurdiga

Zimmer — 119

PAIRED

Members

Gill

LeBlanc — 2

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I declare the motion carried.

THIRD READING

The House resumed from March 18 consideration of the motion that Bill C-84, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (bestiality and animal fighting), be read the third time and passed.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I wish to inform the House that because of proceedings on the time allocation motion, Government Orders will be extended by another 30 minutes, for a total of 37 minutes.

Mr. Randall Garrison (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke, NDP): Mr. Speaker, given the debate we just had on time allocation, I want to assure the House that I am very pleased to get up today to speak to Bill C-84. However, I am disappointed not to be speaking to a broader bill that could have simply been called “an act to amend the Criminal Code, animal cruelty”, because what we really needed was a broad review of the animal cruelty legislation and not a bill just narrowly focused on bestiality and animal fighting. Instead of that broader review, the government introduced a narrow and weak bill, which, fortunately, the justice committee strengthened with amendments. I will return to those in a moment.

Even though the Liberal government has missed the larger opportunity to modify animal cruelty provisions in the Criminal Code as a whole, some legislation on animal cruelty is long overdue. By my count, since 1999, there have been 14 failed attempts to amend Canada's animal cruelty laws. Some would argue that we have seen no significant changes in animal cruelty laws since the 1950s. I have to say that I am not sure that we would have seen the government introduce any legislation on animal cruelty at all if it had not been for the Supreme Court decision in *R. v. D.L.W.*, in 2016, which pointed out the problems with the narrow definition of bestiality in the existing Criminal Code provisions.

My skepticism of the will of the Liberals to act was fuelled when the Liberals used their majority to defeat their own backbencher's private member's bill, Bill C-246, from the member for Beaches—East York,, entitled the modernizing animal protections act. That was the kind of broad look at the changes we needed and that this government bill should have brought forward. Bill C-246 would have provided for much more comprehensive reform than we have in the bill before us today, and New Democrats supported that bill when it came before the House, in contrast to the Liberals.

Bill C-246 would have increased sentences for repeat animal abusers, including creating the ability to have a lifetime ban, after a second conviction, on any ownership of animals. However, that is not in the bill we are dealing with today, and I am disappointed that it is not there.

As well, Bill C-246 proposed to deal with a wide range of acts beyond the Criminal Code that actually deal with the way we treat animals, including the Fisheries Act, the Textile Labelling Act, the Wild Animal and Plant Protection and Regulation of International and Interprovincial Trade Act—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I just want to interrupt the hon. member for a moment.

The hon. member for Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke has a speech that I am trying to hear but cannot because of the grumbling or the mumbling. It is not loud, and I am sure that members do not even realize that their talk is drowning him out. However, I want to remind hon. members that someone is giving a speech, and we should all listen and hear what he has to say.

The hon. member for Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke.

Mr. Randall Garrison: Mr. Speaker, let me just pick up again on Bill C-246, the Liberal backbench bill that the government defeated. It would have also dealt with the things that are in this government bill. We could have done what is in this bill before us, and more, by passing that private member's bill.

Government Orders

Perhaps most importantly, Bill C-246 would have moved offences against animals out of the property section of the Criminal Code and into a new section dedicated to offences against animals. This would not only have been an important legal reform; I think it would also be a very important symbol of our need as humans to rethink our place in the natural universe and to see ourselves as part of the web of nature on which we depend for our very survival, rather than seeing the Earth and all of its beings as simply property for us to use and discard when we are done.

I have spent a lot of time on this private member's bill because it puts the much narrower government bill in front of us into a proper context. The fact that the government used its majority to defeat a more comprehensive reform of animal cruelty legislation tempers the credit the government should get for bringing forward this bill today.

At this point, I also want to give credit to the Conservative member for Calgary Nose Hill, who pushed the government to act on the very narrow definition that the Supreme Court found by introducing her own private member's bill, Bill C-388, in order to make sure that the government was forced to bring forward its own bill instead of having to deal with hers.

The member for Calgary Nose Hill did acknowledge some concerns in her caucus that attempting to modernize and strengthen animal cruelty provisions might affect farmers and hunters. I also want to acknowledge concerns in indigenous communities that reforms of animal cruelty legislation should not infringe on aboriginal rights and traditional hunting practices.

However, like the member for Calgary Nose Hill, I believe we can update animal cruelty legislation and at the same time avoid unintended impacts on farmers and hunters and unintended consequences with regard to aboriginal rights.

Perhaps I should mention that I am not a hunter, nor have I eaten meat for more than 35 years. I am a proud dog owner, although I resisted the temptation today to wear a t-shirt with a picture of my poodle on it under my jacket. I should also say that my support for this bill will keep peace at home, as my partner is a very passionate advocate for animal rights.

In fact, New Democrats in this House have consistently advocated reform of animal cruelty laws. The member for Port Moody—Coquitlam has proposed his private member's bill, Bill C-380, which would have banned the importation of shark fins. He has been working very hard on the Senate bill, Bill S-238, which is a parallel bill, to make sure that we pass that bill before the House rises to help end the cruel practice of shark finning.

Both the member for Vancouver East and the member for New Westminster—Burnaby have introduced motions to ban the import of products containing dog and cat fur. Former Toronto NDP MP Peggy Nash had a private member's bill, Bill C-232, to strengthen animal cruelty laws, as did former NDP Quebec MP Isabelle Morin, so this is not a new cause for us to take up. This is something we have been fighting for for many years in this House.

At the justice committee, the member for Beaches—East York moved an amendment to Bill C-84, which was adopted unanimously and which broadened the government's too-narrow bill, and three very important provisions were added to the bill in committee.

The first of those allows a prohibition order on animal ownership for a certain period, as determined by a judge. The second makes it an offence to violate an order prohibiting animal ownership, meaning that someone could actually be prosecuted for violating that order of prohibition. The third allows restitution orders to compel those convicted to pay for the care of animals injured. Those were quite important aspects from his own private member's bill on which the member got consensus to bring into the bill before us today.

A separate amendment was also adopted to add bestiality to the list of offences covered in the Sex Offender Information Registration Act. As the member for St. Albert—Edmonton very clearly pointed out, the reason for doing this is that abuse of animals is often an indicator of other forms of abuse, in particular of child abuse. This becomes information that is very useful to the police. I thank him for bringing forward that amendment to this bill.

● (1720)

Those two amendments, one with three provisions and one with one provision, added important aspects to Bill C-84, even though it remains, as I said before, less than the comprehensive reform of animal cruelty legislation that I would like to see before the House.

Still, Bill C-84 does redefine bestiality more broadly than the court decision and it does prohibit a broader range of activities associated with animal fighting, so I and my fellow New Democrats are supporting this bill.

I would have to say personally that even if it contained only the provisions banning activities associated with animal fighting, I would support this bill. It is important to ban promoting, arranging and profiting from animal fighting. It is important to ban breeding, training or transporting animals to fight and it is important to ban keeping any arena for the purpose of animal fighting. I think these are very important steps.

I am not going to go on for a long time, despite the accusations of the government that the reason that we wanted to speak was to delay the bill. I am not even going to use all my time today. I want to conclude by saying that the reason I wanted to speak is to bring our attention to the fact that there is still a lot of work to do on animal cruelty after we pass Bill C-84.

Government Orders

We are missing the opportunity for that comprehensive reform that I have been talking about. In particular, I believe this bill should have included basic standards of care and housing for animals. It could also have included restrictions on tethering animals, in particular dogs, a practice that, since it is unregulated, can be a severe threat to the health and safety of dogs. Of course, tethered dogs are much more likely to bite, and specifically to bite children. In fact, according to the Montreal SPCA, tethered dogs are three times more likely to bite and five times more likely to bite children.

Again, after Bill C-84 passes, there is much more work to do beyond fixing the additional provisions of the Criminal Code that I mentioned earlier. Most important, of course, is the work that needs to be done on protecting endangered species and the habitat that they depend on. This past week, we saw the release of an alarming report from the United Nations intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity. This report documents the unprecedented and accelerating rates of species' extinction at rates never before seen in human history. The report warns that more than one million animal and plant species are facing extinction within the next few decades as a result of human activity.

What we do need now, and I mean right now, are bold measures to protect and preserve the ecosystems that the endangered plants and animals depend on. Since I arrived in this House eight years ago, I have been an advocate for emergency action to protect the southern resident killer whales, as we are at the brink of losing a species, each of whose name is individually known. Instead of a bold and urgent recovery plan for the orcas that would mobilize large-scale habitat restoration where appropriate and put millions of hatchery chinook in the water, this work is being left to volunteers, and they have undertaken this work without any government support. Instead of support, we have a timid recovery plan that tries to manage declining stocks of chinook by relying on fishing restrictions when everybody knows that what we actually need—not just the whales, but all of us—is more fish in the water.

In conclusion, while passing Bill C-84 is an important step forward in animal protection, it is only a first step in a process that will require us to re-examine our place in the natural world.

* * *

• (1725)

INDIGENOUS LANGUAGES ACT**BILL C-91—NOTICE OF TIME ALLOCATION MOTION**

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I hope that this will not need to be utilized.

In case an agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Order 78(1) or 78(2) with respect to the third reading stage of Bill C-91, An Act respecting Indigenous languages, under the provisions of Standing Order 78(3), I give notice that a minister of the Crown will propose at the next sitting a motion to allot a specific number of days or hours for the consideration and disposal of proceedings at that stage.

Once again, I hope this will not need to be used.

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-84, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (bestiality and animal fighting), be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member across the way for his passion on this topic.

I have recently been in touch with the Guelph Humane Society, which is really concerned about delays in this legislation coming forth. One point they made was that 87% of cases involving bestiality also involve child pornography, sexual interference with a child and online luring of children in terms of sexual assault, so this bill actually protects children as well as animals.

Could the member maybe expand on that and comment on how humane societies play an important role in this legislation as well?

Mr. Randall Garrison (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke, NDP): Mr. Speaker, since the member made reference to delay, something I tried to stay away from in my speech, I will go ahead now and say that the government only in its fourth year got to this legislation. Every time we talk about delay, the implication is that somehow the opposition side has been delaying things. It is the government that has been delaying. It is the government that has been negligent in getting the bill before us. All the while, it has been pushing on what we would call an open door. We have been willing to co-operate. There is always a time for speakers. There is always a certain amount of time we should give to that debate. Nobody has been holding up this bill.

• (1730)

Hon. Michelle Rempel (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, first, I want to give credit to the many advocacy groups that have paved the way for this bill, such as Animal Justice and the Canadian Federation of Humane Societies. Also, I want to give a shout-out to my legislative manager, Bari Miller, who is a militant vegan who always pushes animal rights on me. I give credit to her where credit is due.

My colleague opposite talked about some of the concerns raised in debate. Since I hope this bill will be going to the other place quickly, could he speak to some of the stuff that came up in debate specifically around this not affecting any sort of artificial insemination process used in animal husbandry and the fact that this bill would not preclude things like the Calgary Stampede from continuing?

Mr. Randall Garrison: Mr. Speaker, I want to again thank the member for Calgary Nose Hill for her advocacy on this issue. What I said in my speech I really think is a credit to her. She has been the leader in pointing out in this House that there is no necessary connection between improving animal protection and the way we treat animals and some of the fears that have been stirred up by the other side that this would somehow affect aboriginal rights or the rights of farmers to farm or that it would do away with the Calgary Stampede. None of those would be the case. None of those would ever have to be the case.

Government Orders

What the bill is aimed at are particularly egregious abuses of animals in our society. For me, the worst is animal fighting. We do not have good statistics on animal fighting, but we all know that it goes on. We do not have the proper tools to attack those abusive practices. This is not aimed at farmers. It is not aimed at exhibitions. It is not aimed at aboriginal people.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):

Mr. Speaker, in their questioning, the NDP and the Conservatives talked a lot about the time crunch. It is important to recognize that the government, like Canadians and like members opposite, supports the legislation. It seems that everyone supports the legislation. However, just because everyone supports it does not necessarily mean that there is not mischievous behaviour. For example, today the NDP tried to prevent the bill from being debated by moving a motion. Had that motion been debated, we would not be dealing with Bill C-84 today.

It is a bit disingenuous to say that it is the government that is trying to hold back the legislation. I believe that there is fairly solid support both inside the House and outside the House, and I too would like to applaud all those advocates over the years who have brought us to this point.

Mr. Randall Garrison: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to thank the member for that question, because when it comes to disingenuous, he is the poster boy for disingenuous. If we looked in a dictionary, we would find his picture under the word “disingenuous”. Nobody did anything today, or any other day, on the opposition side to delay this bill. The only thing I agree with in his question is the credit he gave, which I neglected to give adequately, to the animal rights activists who also pushed the government to move the bill forward.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Mr. Speaker, what the member for Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke said is very important to remember. When the member for Vancouver East stood to move that motion, we put no speakers up. We were interested in going straight to a vote. I just want to put the facts straight before the House.

In my riding of Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, we had a dreadful case of animal cruelty last year. I acknowledge that changing the law, by itself, would not solve animal cruelty. It would be one important tool, but we need a variety of measures.

Shortly after the government defeated its own Liberal member's bill, Bill C-246, the then justice minister made a promise before the media that her government would be looking at the whole range of tools in the tool kit to see if it could revisit this issue. It dragged on through 2016, 2017 and 2018, and here we are finally in 2019.

Can my colleague add some comments on how the government has moved at such a glacial pace on such low-hanging fruit as Bill C-84?

• (1735)

Mr. Randall Garrison: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Cowichan—Malahat—Langford for his work on this issue. I also thank him for his work on reconciliation in his community over some things that happened around animal cruelty issues.

When we talk about a glacial pace, let me just say this. We voted on the private member's bill put forward by the member for Beaches—East York on October 5, 2016. Therefore, if somebody is worried about how fast or how slow we have gone, we could have finished with this issue in a much better bill than the one before us today had the government not killed its own backbench private member's bill.

It is not a question of somebody delaying this legislation except for government members.

Mr. Anthony Housefather (Mount Royal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the number of times everyone in this place agrees on something constantly amazes me. Everyone in this place agrees this bill is important to move forward to the Senate as quickly as possible, yet we still manage to find ways to partisan the argument with one another for no apparent reason—

An hon. member: Why are you standing up? You're doing it right now, delaying it.

Mr. Anthony Housefather: No, I am not. I want to make that clear. I am casting blame in every direction.

An hon. member: Jaw-dropping.

Mr. Anthony Housefather: It is jaw-dropping.

Let us come back to the bill, Mr. Speaker. We have a bill right now with which everyone agrees. We have—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I would suggest that the hon. member perhaps direct his speech in the direction of the Chair.

Mr. Anthony Housefather: Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to direct my speech toward you.

The Deputy Speaker: That would be great. It sometimes happens when a speech gets directed across the aisle. It is one of the reasons that convention seems to work in avoiding some of this extra noise and some of the commentary that ensues from this kind of approach.

Mr. Anthony Housefather: Mr. Speaker, right now, this is something on which we can all agree. Animal cruelty laws in Canada need to be vastly improved. We have laws that were adopted in the 1890s, slightly amended in the 1950s and they have unfortunately not been radically revamped in the world we live in today where most of us recognize that animals should not be treated as pure property. Animals are sentient beings. Animals can suffer. Most animals have the ability to know whether they are feeling pain. Today, our animal cruelty laws are, unfortunately, many years behind the times.

I want to salute the many groups that advocate for animal welfare, which helped in moving this legislation forward. I also want to congratulate those many other groups that work with animals, ranging from agriculture to people who deal with animals in other ways, including fishers and anglers. They have worked to ensure we have legislation that is satisfactory to virtually everyone. That is possible to do, with further animal cruelty legislation.

Government Orders

It is not true to believe that we can never find more compelling reasons to improve animal welfare because nobody will agree. People can agree, if we all come together. I strongly back the request of my colleague from Beaches—East York at our committee to look for an all-party parliamentary committee, probably not in this mandate but in a future mandate, to ensure we can all work with the many interest groups out there to advance animal cruelty legislation in Canada.

This is a specific bill that deals with several small issues. We made changes at the justice committee to broaden the scope of the bill slightly. As initially drafted, Bill C-84 defined bestiality. It is probably something that most of us never thought we would be talking about in this place, but I will do that.

A Supreme Court judgment in *R. v. D.L.W.* required legislative action. In *R. v. D.L.W.*, the Supreme Court ruled that penetration was a necessary part of the definition of bestiality in the Criminal Code. It does not mean that there were not other offences in the Criminal Code that could deal with elements of bestiality short of penetration. However, the Court placed the onus on us in the House of Commons and on the people in the other place to revise the definition of bestiality in the Criminal Code, and we are proceeding to do that.

A number of people have said that the Supreme Court erred in its judgment. I do not agree that the Supreme Court erred. We disagree with the conclusions of the Supreme Court judgment, but that does not mean it erred in law. We take our law from the British system and in the British system and throughout the Commonwealth, there have been numerous cases where there were rulings that penetration was a necessary element of bestiality. That does not mean that now that the Court has clarified this, we in Parliament cannot change the definition to clarify that bestiality does not require penetration. We are doing that in Bill C-84. When the bill came before the committee, not only did each and every member of the committee agree with the proposed definition in the bill, but so did every group that came before the committee.

We also have expanded the scope of the offence of encouraging, aiding or assisting at the fighting or baiting of animals so that the offence:

- (i) includes promoting, arranging, receiving money for or taking part in the fighting or baiting of animals or birds, and
- (ii) also applies with respect to the training, transporting or breeding of animals or birds for fighting or baiting..

We are all aware that causing animals to fight for our own pleasure as human beings, the ability to push animals to hurt one another so some people can sit there and laugh or bet, is entirely cruel, inhumane and should not only be abandoned, but people who violate that type of a provision should be punished, and punished severely. Therefore, I am pleased we are expanding the scope of that offence.

● (1740)

The bill would also expand the scope of the offence of “building, making, maintaining or keeping a cockpit so that the offence applies with respect to any arena for animal fighting.” We should be extending this not only to people who cause cocks to fight. Anyone who causes any type of animal to fight in an arena should be subject to the penalties of the Criminal Code. I am pleased that the bill would expand those provisions.

[*Translation*]

The Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights also decided that certain provisions of the act should be amended.

[*English*]

With respect to section 160 of the Criminal Code, which prevents people from possessing or residing with an animal for a period of time, up to a lifetime ban, we wanted to ensure that people convicted under these new sections could be prohibited from owning an animal for up to the rest of their lifetime. Those who have been cruel to an animal once, particularly if they have been cruel in a very flagrant way or cruel a repeated number of times, should not be allowed to own animals.

The committee assigned in the bill the same prohibition and punishment of not being able to own an animal that the existing provisions on animal cruelty in the Criminal Code did. We also added a new subsection, which notes that people who have been convicted under these sections can also be required to pay the person or organization that has to take care of an animal to rehabilitate it. This would pay for the care and damage that they caused.

We also amended subsection 490.011(1) of the code, which defines the designated offences for which a convicted individual would be required to register in the sex offender registry, so that people who commit the offence of bestiality simpliciter will be required to register as a sex offender.

There was a significant amount of debate regarding this issue. Previously, individuals had commented that there was not enough proof linking the offence of bestiality simpliciter to other sex offences. However, our committee decided, based on the scientific evidence we had seen, there was sufficient evidence to require a person to register as a sex offender if he or she committed bestiality simpliciter and was convicted. I am very pleased my colleague's amendment on that score was accepted.

Finally, we repealed subsection 447(3) of the Criminal Code, which provided that “A peace officer who finds cocks in a cockpit or on premises where a cockpit is located shall seize them and take them before a justice who shall order them to be destroyed.” This required each and every cock that was seized to be destroyed no matter its health.

We determined that there was no reason to believe that each and every cock that was found in a fighting area necessarily needed to be destroyed. We were also convinced that provincial legislation on this matter was sufficient enough to deal with any orders that had to be made regarding the destruction of an animal that was so debilitated by fighting and needed to be destroyed.

Government Orders

To come back to my first point, the bill was indeed an example of our being able to find support from all sides. That should be congratulated. It means members were able to rise above partisanship to decide this was good for Canada, good for the animals in Canada, good for the children in Canada and good for all of us. At committee, we were able to work together with respect to unanimously approving amendments.

I am hoping that based on this agreement, we will be able to put partisanship aside and ensure the bill is adopted as swiftly as possible so it can move to the other place and become Canadian law prior to the next election.

A number of people in the House have advanced the cause of promoting the welfare of animals and they all deserve to be applauded, no matter from which side of the House they come. They are doing something truly noble in trying to help protect the very vulnerable animals, which really deserve much more protection than our criminal law and other laws afford them today.

• (1745)

Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for his work at committee on the bill and for the legal aspect that he brings to the discussion.

He mentioned the effect of this issue on children. The Guelph Humane Society has been working with women in crisis in Guelph. Women in abusive relationships who also have pets need a place to protect their pets while they are taken out of threatening situations. The pets themselves are often abused as well.

Could the member please make the connection between the pets, the children and vulnerable women and how important it is that we move the legislation through the House without any more parliamentary interference?

Mr. Anthony Housefather: Mr. Speaker, the bill assures us that while there may be other offences in the Criminal Code that people who commit acts of bestiality that do not involve penetration by children, in front of children, around children or involving children could be punished with, now they would indeed be able to also be charged under the bestiality provisions, and that is a step forward. No child should ever be forced to engage in the acts that we have heard about at committee. No child should ever be a viewer of those acts. The bill that we put forward allows us to make sure that they can be charged under the bestiality provisions of the Criminal Code.

Mr. Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it was a pleasure to work with the member on the justice committee. I have a question about one aspect of the bill, which talks about baiting. On a point of clarification, would baiting be just in regard to the act of fighting? I know, for example, that when hunters are conducting a bear hunt, baiting is a common practice. Is that something that the bill would prevent, or is it something that is in the bill just in the aspect of actual fighting animals?

• (1750)

Mr. Anthony Housefather: Mr. Speaker, it was a great pleasure to serve with the hon. member for Provencher on the justice committee, and he has been sadly missed ever since he moved to another committee.

The definition of baiting was discussed at committee on a number of occasions to make sure that it would not involve, for example, the baiting of fish or anything that would potentially infringe on the rights of people today who use bait to catch a fish.

What we understood, and what was clarified by the justice department, was that baiting is in the context of bear-baiting. That is why we used the word “baiting”. It is from the Middle Ages, from bear-baiting. It would not infringe on practices used in Canada today. The justice officials clarified that.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it would be appropriate to acknowledge not only those inside the chamber, but the many advocacy groups out there. I have received emails from people who want to make sure that I vote for this legislation. It has brought a lot of Canadians together for a wonderful cause. I applaud their efforts in terms of taking some of the credit for what we are debating today and ultimately will be passing.

Mr. Anthony Housefather: Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge the words of my colleague from Winnipeg North. I agree completely. Canadians across the country came together to push Parliament to improve our laws on animal cruelty. Those Canadians, like other Canadians who are passionate about other issues, deserve to be congratulated, and we need to work with them to further advance laws to protect animals. I am hopeful we will do so in the next Parliament.

The Deputy Speaker: It being 5:52 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 third reading stage of the bill now before the House.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

• (1830)

[*Translation*]

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

*Government Orders**(Division No. 1311)*

YEAS

Members

Abouttaif
 Albrecht
 Alghabra
 Allison
 Anandasangaree
 Angus
 Arseneault
 Ashton
 Ayoub
 Bagnell
 Barlow
 Barsalou-Duval
 Beaulieu
 Bendayan
 Benson
 Berthold
 Bibeau
 Blaikie
 Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
 Boissonnault
 Boucher
 Boulерice
 Brassard
 Breton
 Calkins
 Caron
 Chagger
 Chen
 Choquette
 Clarke
 Cullen
 Dabrusin
 Davidson
 Deltell
 Dhillon
 Donnelly
 Drouin
 Dubourg
 Duguid
 Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
 Duvall
 Easter
 Ehsassi
 Ellis
 Eyolfson
 Falk (Provencher)
 Fergus
 Finnigan
 Fortier
 Fragiskatos
 Fry
 Gallant
 Généreux
 Gladu
 Goodale
 Gourde
 Hajdu
 Harder
 Harvey
 Hehr
 Holland
 Hughes
 Iacono
 Jolibois
 Jones
 Jowhari
 Kelly
 Khalid
 Kitchen
 Kusie
 Lake
 Lametti
 Lapointe
 Laverdière
 Levitt
 Lightbound
 Lobb
 Long

Albas
 Aldag
 Alleslev
 Amos
 Anderson
 Arnold
 Arya
 Aubin
 Badawey
 Bains
 Barrett
 Baylis
 Beech
 Bennett
 Benzen
 Bezan
 Bittle
 Blair
 Block
 Bossio
 Boudrias
 Boutin-Sweet
 Bratina
 Brosseau
 Cannings
 Casey (Charlottetown)
 Champagne
 Chong
 Christopherson
 Cooper
 Cuzner
 Damoff
 Davies
 Dhaliwal
 Diotte
 Dreeshen
 Dubé
 Duclos
 Duncan (Etobicoke North)
 Dusseault
 Dzerowicz
 Eglinski
 El-Khoury
 Erskine-Smith
 Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
 Fast
 Fillmore
 Fisher
 Fortin
 Fraser (West Nova)
 Fuhr
 Garrison
 Gerretsen
 Goldsmith-Jones
 Gould
 Graham
 Hardcastle
 Hardie
 Hébert
 Hogg
 Housefather
 Hussen
 Jeneroux
 Joly
 Jordan
 Julian
 Kent
 Khera
 Kmiec
 Kwan
 Lambropoulos
 Lamoureux
 Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
 Leboutillier
 Liepert
 Lloyd
 Lockhart
 Longfield

Lukiwski
 MacGregor
 MacKinnon (Gatineau)
 Martel
 Mathysen
 McCauley (Edmonton West)
 McCrimmon
 McGuinty
 McKenna
 McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
 Mendicino
 Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
 Soeurs)
 Morrissey
 Murray
 Nassif
 Nault
 Nicholson
 O'Connell
 O'Regan
 Ouellette
 Paul-Hus
 Peschisolido
 Philpott
 Plamondon
 Poissant
 Qualtrough
 Rayes
 Rempel
 Rioux
 Rogers
 Rota
 Ruimy
 Sahota
 Sajjan
 Sangha
 Sarai
 Scarpaleggja
 Schmale
 Serré
 Shanahan
 Shipley
 Sidhu (Brampton South)
 Singh
 Sorbara
 Spengemann
 Stetski
 Stubbs
 Tabbara
 Tassi
 Tilson
 Trost
 Van Kesteren
 Vandenbeld
 Vecchio
 Warkentin
 Webber
 Whalen
 Wrzesnewskyj
 Young
 Zahid

MacAulay (Cardigan)
 MacKenzie
 Maguire
 Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
 May (Cambridge)
 McColeman
 McDonald
 McKay
 McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
 McLeod (Northwest Territories)
 Mihychuk
 Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-
 Motz
 Nantel
 Nater
 Ng
 Nuttall
 Oliver
 O'Toole
 Paradis
 Pauzé
 Peterson
 Picard
 Poilievre
 Quach
 Ratansi
 Reid
 Richards
 Robillard
 Romanado
 Rudd
 Rusnak
 Saini
 Samson
 Sansoucy
 Saroya
 Schiefke
 Schulte
 Sgro
 Shields
 Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
 Simms
 Sopuck
 Sorenson
 Stanton
 Strahl
 Sweet
 Tan
 Thériault
 Tootoo
 Trudel
 Vandal
 Vaughan
 Virani
 Waugh
 Weir
 Wilson-Raybould
 Yip
 Yurdiga
 Zimmer— 276

NAYS

PAIRED

Members

Gill LeBlanc— 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

• (1835)

[English]

NATIONAL SUICIDE PREVENTION ACTION PLAN

The House resumed from May 2 consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on Motion No. 174 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]

• (1845)

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

(Division No. 1312)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Aldag
Alghabra	Alleslev
Allison	Amos
Anandasangaree	Anderson
Angus	Arnold
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Aubin
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Bains
Barlow	Barrett
Barsalou-Duval	Baylis
Beaulieu	Beech
Bendayan	Bennett
Benson	Benzen
Berthold	Bezan
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Block
Boissonnault	Bossio
Boucher	Boudrias
Boulerice	Boutin-Sweet
Brassard	Bratina
Breton	Brosseau
Calkins	Cannings
Caron	Casey (Charlottetown)
Chagger	Champagne
Chen	Chong
Choquette	Christopherson
Clarke	Cooper
Cullen	Cuzner
Dabrusin	Damoff
Davidson	Davies
Deltell	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diotte
Donnelly	Dreeshen
Drouin	Dubé
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	Dusseault
Duvall	Dzerowicz
Easter	Eglinski
Ehsassi	El-Khoury

Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Fergus	Fillmore
Finnigan	Fisher
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fry	Fuhr
Gallant	Garrison
Généreux	Gerretsen
Glada	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Gourde	Graham
Hajdu	Harceastle
Harder	Hardie
Harvey	Hébert
Hehr	Hogg
Holland	Housefather
Hughes	Hussen
Iacono	Jeneroux
Jolibois	Joly
Jones	Jordan
Jowhari	Julian
Kelly	Kent
Khalid	Khera
Kitchen	Kmiec
Kusie	Kwan
Lake	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Laverdière	Lebouthillier
Levitt	Liepert
Lightbound	Lloyd
Lobb	Lockhart
Long	Longfield
Lukiwski	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor	MacKenzie
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maguire
Martel	Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
May (Saamich—Gulf Islands)	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McColeman	McCrimmon
McDonald	McGuinty
McKay	McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendicino
Mihychuk	Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	Miller
Morrissey	Murray
Motz	Nassif
Nantel	Nault
Nater	Nicholson
Ng	O'Connell
Nuttall	O'Regan
Oliver	Ouellette
O'Toole	Paul-Hus
Paradis	Peschisolido
Pauzé	Philpott
Peterson	Plamondon
Picard	Poissant
Poilievre	Qualtrough
Quach	Rayes
Ratansi	Rempel
Reid	Rioux
Richards	Rogers
Robillard	Rota
Romanado	Ruimy
Rudd	Sahota
Rusnak	Sajjan
Saini	Sangha
Samson	Sarai
Sansoucy	Scarpaleggia
Saroya	Schmale
Schieffe	Séré
Schulte	Shanahan
Sgro	Shiple
Shields	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Singh
Simms	Sorbara
Sopuck	Spengemann
Sorenson	Ste-Marie
Stanton	Strahl
Stetski	Sweet
Stubbs	

Private Members' Business

Private Members' Business

Tabbara
Tassi
Tilson
Trost
Van Kesteren
Vandenbeld
Vecchio
Warkentin
Webber
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Young
Zahid

Tan
Thériault
Tootoo
Trudel
Vandal
Vaughan
Virani
Waugh
Weir
Wilson-Raybould
Yip
Yurdiga
Zimmer — 278

Deltell
Dhillon
Donnelly
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Duvall
Easter
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyolfson
Falk (Provencher)
Fergus
Finnigan
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fry
Gallant
Généreux
Gladu
Goodale
Gourde
Hajdu
Harder
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hughes
Iacono
Jolibois
Jones
Jowhari
Kelly
Khalid
Kitchen
Kusie
Lake
Lametti
Lapointe
Laverdière
Levitt
Lightbound
Lobb
Long
Lukiwski
MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martel
Mathysen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McColeman
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Morrissey
Motz
Nantel
Nater
Ng
O'Connell
O'Regan
Ouellette
Paul-Hus
Pescholido
Philpott
Plamondon
Poissant
Qualtrough
Rayes
Rempel
Rioux
Rogers
Rota
Ruimy
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Schmale

Dhaliwal
Diotte
Dreeshen
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dusseault
Dzerowicz
Eglinski
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Graham
Harcastle
Hardie
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Hussen
Jeneroux
Joly
Jordan
Julian
Kent
Khera
Kmiec
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Liepert
Lloyd
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKenzie
Maguire
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCaughey (Edmonton West)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Mendicino
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Murray
Nassif
Nault
Nicholson
Oliver
O'Toole
Paradis
Pauzé
Peterson
Picard
Poilievre
Quach
Ratansi
Reid
Richards
Robillard
Romanado
Rudd
Rusnak
Saini
Samson
Sansoucy
Saroya
Schiefke
Schulte

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Members

Gill

LeBlanc — 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

[*Translation*]

RURAL DIGITAL INFRASTRUCTURE

The House resumed from May 3 consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on Motion No. 208, under private members' business, in the name of the member for Pontiac.

• (1855)

[*English*]

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

(Division No. 1313)

YEAS

Members

Abouttaif
Albrecht
Alghabra
Allison
Anandasangaree
Angus
Arseneault
Ashton
Ayoub
Bagnell
Barlow
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bendayan
Benson
Berthold
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boissonnault
Boucher
Boulerice
Brassard
Breton
Calkins
Caron
Chagger
Chen
Choquette
Clarke
Cullen
Dabrusin
Davidson

Albas
Aldag
Alleslev
Amos
Anderson
Arnold
Arya
Aubin
Badawey
Bains
Barrett
Baylis
Beech
Bennett
Benzen
Bezan
Bittle
Blair
Block
Bossio
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Bratina
Brosseau
Cannings
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Chong
Christopherson
Cooper
Cuzner
Damoff
Davies

Private Members' Business

Serré
Shanahan
Shipley
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Singh
Sorbara
Spengemann
Ste-Marie
Strahl
Sweet
Tan
Thériault
Trost
Van Kesteren
Vandenbeld
Vecchio
Virani
Waugh
Weir
Wrzesnewskyj
Young
Zahid

Sgro
Shields
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Simms
Sopuck
Sorenson
Stanton
Stetski
Stubbs
Tabbara
Tassi
Tilson
Trudel
Vandal
Vaughan
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Whalen
Yip
Yurdiga
Zimmer— 276

Lukiwski
Maguire
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Nater
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Plamondon
Rayes
Rempel
Saroya
Shields
Sopuck
Stanton
Strahl
Sweet
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Viersen
Waugh
Weir
Zimmer— 89

MacKenzie
Martel
McColeman
Motz
Nicholson
O'Toole
Pauzé
Poilievre
Reid
Richards
Schmale
Shipley
Sorenson
Ste-Marie
Stubbs
Thériault
Trost
Vecchio
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Members

Gill

LeBlanc— 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

The House resumed from May 6 consideration of the motion that Bill C-406, An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act (foreign contributions), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-406 under Private Members' Business.

● (1905)

[*Translation*]

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

(*Division No. 1314*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Allison
Arnold
Barrett
Beaulieu
Berthold
Block
Boudrias
Calkins
Clarke
Davidson
Diotte
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Fortin
Généreux
Gourde
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Lloyd

Albas
Alleslev
Anderson
Barlow
Barsalou-Duval
Benzen
Bezan
Boucher
Brassard
Chong
Cooper
Deltell
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Gallant
Gladu
Harder
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Liepert
Lobb

Aldag
Amos
Angus
Arya
Aubin
Badawey
Bains
Beech
Bennett
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Cannings
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Choquette
Cullen
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhillon
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Duvall
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Fergus
Finnigan
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hardcastle
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hughes
Iacono
Joly
Jordan
Julian
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Long
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)

NAYS

Members

Alghabra
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Bendayan
Benson
Bittle
Blair
Boissonnault
Boulerice
Bratina
Brosseau
Caron
Chagger
Chen
Christopherson
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Donnelly
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dusseau
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fisher
Fragiskatos
Fry
Garrison
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hajdu
Hardie
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Hussen
Jolibois
Jones
Jowhari
Khalid
Kwan
Lametti
Lapointe
Laverdière
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacGregor
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)

Adjournment Proceedings

Mathyszen	May (Cambridge)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	McCrimmon
McDonald	McGuinty
McKay	McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Morrissey	
Murray	Nantel
Nassif	Nault
Ng	O'Connell
Oliver	O'Regan
Ouellette	Paradis
Peschisolido	Peterson
Philpott	Picard
Poissant	Quach
Qualtrough	Ratansi
Rioux	Robillard
Rogers	Romanado
Rota	Rudd
Ruimy	Rusnak
Sahota	Saini
Sajjan	Samson
Sangha	Sansoucy
Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Schulte
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simms
Singh	Sorbara
Spengemann	Stetski
Tabbara	Tan
Tassi	Trudel
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Virani
Whalen	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young
Zahid— 187	

PAIRED

Members

Gill

LeBlanc— 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

I wish to inform the House that, because it is getting late, the period provided for private members' business is cancelled. The order is therefore deferred to a future sitting.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

[*English*]

TRANSPORTATION

Ms. Sheri Benson (Saskatoon West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it was a week ago that I asked, for the sixth time, how the Liberal government planned to ensure safe and equitable access to transportation for people in Saskatchewan who had been affected by the end of STC and the pull out of the Greyhound service in the province. I have asked six questions and still no answers. I certainly hope I will get some answers tonight for the people of Saskatchewan.

Many people, particularly in rural, remote and indigenous communities are unable to travel to see family, get to work, do business in nearby communities, go to school or even access medical care due the end of STC and the Greyhound service in the province.

Many indigenous women are unable to travel safely between communities.

I know the Prime Minister has not forgotten about the Highway of Tears and I know the Prime Minister does not think that indigenous women and girls should be walking on highways, hitchhiking or finding rides online from strangers instead of taking safe, reliable and affordable public transportation. Therefore, I am confused as to why the Prime Minister and his government are doing nothing to prevent this in my province.

In his response to my latest question, the Prime Minister acknowledged the gaps in coverage that private transportation companies had left. He said, "We would encourage the member opposite to encourage the Saskatchewan government to partner with us." I found that a bit of an odd response.

The Prime Minister seems to think that a partnership consists of simply splitting the cost. If there is no agreement on the cost, then there can be no agreement and therefore no partnership.

My response to that is that a partnership already exists. Both the federal and provincial governments are responsible for the safety and well-being of all Canadians, even ones who live in Saskatchewan. This partnership is permanent and cannot be dissolved because one of the partners is failing to live up to its own responsibility. However, the government does not seem to agree.

Instead of living up to its own responsibility to the people Saskatchewan, the federal Liberal government is content to do nothing and wait for leadership from its Conservative provincial counterparts before acting.

I have no confidence whatsoever that this leadership is going to come from the Saskatchewan Party in my province. Premier Moe and his Conservative government saw fit to actually get rid of a valuable Crown asset and leave people literally stranded in indigenous communities and rural communities.

However, this does not mean the Prime Minister of Canada has to do the same. Many people had hope that the Prime Minister and his Liberal government would rise above their Conservative counterparts and protect indigenous women and girls and seniors and those without the ability to travel independently.

The provincial government must answer for its bad decisions and it will, but why is the federal Liberal government abdicating its responsibility to the people of Saskatchewan? Why is the government failing to ensure that safe and affordable public transportation is available to the people of Saskatchewan as it has for Canadians living in other provinces?

● (1910)

Mr. Terry Beech (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member, my friend, and I hope her ear is feeling better after her incident.

Last year, Greyhound announced it would be discontinuing services in western Canada and northern Ontario on October 31, 2018. The federal government recognizes the effects these service reductions would have on communities, especially rural, remote and indigenous communities.

Adjournment Proceedings

For decades, since the 1950s in fact, provinces have had a lead role in governing intercity bus services. As such, the provinces also have a lead role in determining solutions to Greyhound's withdrawal. However, given the scale, impacts and interprovincial nature of these reductions, the federal government decided to work collaboratively with the provinces and territories through a federal, provincial and territorial working group to determine the best path forward.

The deliberations from this working group were built into the federal government's plan, which was announced to the public on October 31, 2018. As part of this plan, the federal government announced that it would be willing to cost-share with the affected provinces in filling the service gaps left behind by Greyhound on a temporary and transitional basis. The federal government remains willing to cost-share with the affected provinces, including Saskatchewan, to restore these services. Federal money is on the table, and the member opposite's provincial Conservative government is refusing to use it to help the people of Saskatchewan.

Although the funding announced on October 31 was mostly related to addressing the short-term service needs following Greyhound's withdrawal, the federal government also recognizes that intercity bus reductions have been occurring for decades. That is why the federal government will also continue working with provinces and territories to develop longer-term and more innovative solutions to address the surface mobility needs of Canadians. In the meantime, the federal government is encouraged by the number of private sector operators coming in to fill these gaps. We will continue to encourage their entry and to facilitate more coverage for Canadians.

Ms. Sheri Benson: Mr. Speaker, I must acknowledge that the government has indeed offered something to address this crisis, but the fact that it is short-term and of minimal dollars concerns me. I think the federal government knows that the provincial government in Saskatchewan sees no value in accessible and affordable public transit, nor in protecting the vulnerable in our society. Therefore, I do not see how the federal government thought its temporary, half-hearted cost-sharing proposal would solve this crisis, or it would understand that when it was offered it was simply rejected.

I want the government to offer a real and lasting solution. I think it has a responsibility and a leadership opportunity here to help the people of Saskatchewan. Therefore, I want to see the federal government step up on the transportation crisis facing my constituents and all the people in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Terry Beech: Mr. Speaker, there is federal money on the table to help address the gap left by Greyhound service cuts in western Canada. However, given the lead role of provinces in governing the industry, any funding offered to the provinces would have to be cost-shared. Some provinces are interested in cost-sharing and others are not. The Conservative Saskatchewan government cut STC routes, and it is not coming to the table on Greyhound service gaps.

The federal Liberal government is doing everything it can to help Canadians maintain access to intercity transportation options, including the long-term options that I mentioned in my previous speech.

● (1915)

[*Translation*]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. François Choquette (Drummond, NDP): Mr. Speaker, once again, I have the honour to rise in the House to talk about an extremely important issue: the fight against climate change and climate disruption.

On December 12, world leaders met in Poland for the 24th conference of the parties on climate change. Back then, I asked the Prime Minister a question about the leadership the government needs to show on climate change.

We see more and more young people protesting around the world, even here at home in Quebec and Ottawa. Last week, I was with young people who were protesting on Friday, demanding that the government do more to fight dangerous climate change.

According to a climate change performance report released at COP24, Canada ranks 54th out of 60. It does not get much lower than that. That is unbelievable. It is really appalling, and it shows that we are performing very poorly. Our record is nothing short of disastrous.

In 2015, the Prime Minister said that Canada was back. He was very proud of that. However, he kept the same weak targets as Stephen Harper's Conservatives. It was the same weak reduction target of 30% by 2030. That is not enough. Scientists are saying that we need a reduction target of at least 45% by 2030 to limit the global temperature increase to no more than 1.5°C to 2°C.

Still, lots of good things happened while the Liberal government was busy buying billions of dollars worth of pipelines with taxpayers' money. For example, the young people of Drummond are becoming increasingly vocal about the environment. We must listen to them. Students at Collège Saint-Bernard in Drummondville organized activities for students at their secondary school to raise awareness about how important water is for us. Water is a limited natural resource that we cannot take for granted. I would like to congratulate Eloyse Marcotte, Laurence Bélanger, Danika Ouelette, Ambre Bérenger, Élianne Simard and Marie-Soleil Desrosiers for their fine project. I congratulate them for their civic engagement on the environment. The environment is increasingly top of mind for our youth, and we must listen to them. I congratulate these young people for this great project. These are the types of initiatives we must carry out.

As I was saying, on Monday, a report from a group of UN biodiversity experts was published. This report highlighted once again the decline of our biodiversity. One of the five drivers of the massive decline in biodiversity and species on this planet is climate change. This is yet another example of why we must take much more action on climate change. The government must show some leadership and take all the necessary measures.

This is why we are asking whether the government will finally adopt our plan to bring back the ecoENERGY retrofit homes program and renovate homes across Canada.

Adjournment Proceedings

[English]

Mr. Terry Beech (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians see the impacts of climate change in our country: floods, droughts and forest fires. We understand the need to take action to ensure a sustainable planet for future generations. In fact, it is one of the core reasons I ran for office in the first place.

With regard to the rankings stated in the member's speech, he knows that those rankings were in place before a number of initiatives were implemented, including carbon pricing nationally. We have definitely gone up, but we have a lot more work to do. That is why Canada is committed to being a global leader in addressing climate change.

We joined other countries in developing the Paris Agreement. Canada was also one of the first countries to sign and ratify the agreement.

For the past two years, we have been working with our provincial and territorial partners to implement actions under the pan-Canadian framework on clean growth and climate change, which is Canada's plan to meet our Paris Agreement greenhouse gas emissions reduction target of 30% below 2005 levels by 2030.

A key pillar of the framework is putting a price on carbon pollution. When carbon pollution is not free, people and businesses are motivated to pollute less. Our analysis found that pricing carbon pollution in Canada will reduce Canada's greenhouse gas emissions by 50 million to 60 million tonnes by 2022. That is equivalent to closing more than 30 coal-fired electricity plants.

In the provinces of Ontario, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and New Brunswick, the federal backstop carbon pricing system will be in place to protect the environment and spur innovation. Any direct proceeds collected will go directly back to the people in these provinces. Households will receive a climate action incentive, which will give most families more than they pay under the new system. Funds will also be given to the provinces' schools, hospitals, businesses and indigenous communities to, for example, help them become more energy efficient and reduce emissions, helping Canadians save even more money and improve our local economies.

The framework also contains important additional actions to reduce emissions across all sectors of the economy, including phasing out coal-fired power plants, developing new building codes and regulating methane emissions. We are also protecting and enhancing carbon sequestration in our forest and agricultural sectors and are supporting clean technology and innovation.

A great deal of effort continues to be devoted to implementing this plan, and the plan is working. As reported in Canada's 2018 greenhouse gas emissions projections, Canada's GHG emissions in 2030 are expected to be 223 million tonnes lower than projected prior to the adoption and implementation of Canada's climate plan.

While this improvement reflects the breadth and depth of our plan, we expect additional reductions from actions such as our investments in public transit, clean tech and innovation, carbon stored in forests, soils and wetlands and measures taken by provinces and territories.

We are committed to being transparent with Canadians on our climate action. Canada submits annual reports to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change on its greenhouse gas emissions levels. It also publishes annual greenhouse gas emissions projections toward 2030.

We have also established robust reporting and oversight mechanisms to track and drive the implementation of the pan-Canadian framework, including annual reports to first ministers and Canadians. The "Second Annual Synthesis Report on the Status of Implementation" was published in December 2018.

Our government is committed to transparency for Canadians as we continue to take steps toward meeting our Paris Agreement targets and protecting this planet for our children and future generations.

• (1920)

[Translation]

Mr. François Choquette: Mr. Speaker, the members opposite are deliberately turning a blind eye, unfortunately.

The Liberals say they are going to put a price on carbon, but they forget to say that they exempted Canada's major greenhouse gas emitters from their carbon tax plan. This cannot work. Furthermore, the Liberal government continues to give the fossil fuel industry some \$3 billion a year in subsidies. It also spent \$4.5 billion to buy a pipeline and another \$10 billion or so to expand it.

The Liberals then throw hundreds of millions of dollars here and there to combat climate change and they think they are doing a lot. They are not putting their energy into the right places. It is shameful. They are sticking their heads in the sand, unfortunately. They need to do something.

When will they stop sticking their heads in the sand and demand that the major greenhouse gas emitters also pay the carbon tax?

[English]

Mr. Terry Beech: Mr. Speaker, while other countries are starting to talk about a green new deal, Canada is already working hard to implement one. We are putting a national price on pollution, we are banning the use of coal power and we are moving to have 90% of our electricity come from non-emitting sources. We are making historic investments in transit and green infrastructure, as well as in electric charging stations and zero-emissions vehicles.

We are also investing in the green jobs of the future, especially in my riding of Burnaby North—Seymour. Since I have been a member of Parliament, we have announced more than 3,000 well-paying, green new jobs.

Adjournment Proceedings

We know we have to act quickly. The IPCC gives us only 11 more years to take drastic action for the sake of future generations.

Canadians can be proud of the work our government is doing, but I know we have much more work to do. To get the whole story, I would encourage members of the House and the member opposite to read my report, entitled “Our Government’s Work on Climate Change and the Environment”. A copy is available on my website, at terrybeechmp.ca/policy.

● (1925)

[*Translation*]

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

(The House adjourned at 7:25 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Wednesday, May 8, 2019

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Arvida

Ms. Pauzé 27511

278 Cormorant Squadron

Mr. Dhaliwal 27511

Special Olympics World Summer Games

Mr. Kmiec 27511

Chair of the Conference for Advanced Life Underwriting

Mr. Fillmore 27511

Suicide Prevention

Mr. Angus 27512

Jean Vanier

Mrs. Fortier 27512

Infrastructure

Mrs. Gallant 27512

Hélène Sentenne Foundation

Mr. Poissant 27512

Brampton Cricket League

Ms. Sidhu (Brampton South) 27512

Government Priorities

Mr. Barlow 27513

Astrophysics

Mr. Saini 27513

Indigenous Nurses Day

Mr. Vandal 27513

Quebec Interests

Mr. Généreux 27513

World Ovarian Cancer Day

Mrs. Nassif 27514

Waving Granny

Ms. Blaney (North Island—Powell River) 27514

National Security

Ms. Alleslev 27514

National Nursing Week

Ms. Khera 27514

ORAL QUESTIONS

Justice

Mr. Scheer 27514

Mr. Lametti 27514

Mr. Scheer 27515

Mr. Lametti 27515

Mr. Scheer 27515

Mr. Lametti 27515

Mr. Scheer 27515

Mr. Lametti 27515

Mr. Scheer 27515

Mr. Lametti 27515

The Environment

Mr. Singh 27515

Ms. McKenna 27515

Mr. Singh 27516

Ms. Hajdu 27516

Justice

Mr. Singh 27516

Mr. Lametti 27516

Mr. Singh 27516

Mr. Lametti 27516

Ms. Raitt 27516

Mr. Sajjan 27516

Ms. Raitt 27516

Mr. Sajjan 27516

Mr. Rayes 27517

Mr. Lametti 27517

Mr. Rayes 27517

Mr. Sajjan 27517

Ms. Alleslev 27517

Mr. Lametti 27517

Ms. Alleslev 27517

Mr. Sajjan 27517

Mr. Angus 27517

Mr. Lametti 27517

Mr. Angus 27518

Mr. Lametti 27518

Mr. Strahl 27518

Mr. Sajjan 27518

Mr. Strahl 27518

Mr. Lametti 27518

Mr. Paul-Hus 27518

Mr. Lametti 27518

Mr. Paul-Hus 27518

Mr. Lametti 27518

Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship

Ms. Kwan 27518

Mr. Blair 27519

Canadian Heritage

Mr. Dusseault 27519

Mr. Goodale 27519

Rural Economic Development

Mr. Rogers 27519

Mrs. Jordan 27519

Justice

Mr. Martel 27519

Mr. Lametti 27519

Public Services and Procurement

Mr. Martel 27519

Ms. Qualtrough	27520
Justice	
Mr. Bezan	27520
Mr. Lametti	27520
Mr. Bezan	27520
Mr. Goodale	27520
Automotive Industry	
Ms. Hardcastle	27520
Mr. Bains	27520
International Trade	
Ms. Brosseau	27520
Ms. Bibeau	27521
Justice	
Mrs. Gallant	27521
Mr. MacAulay	27521
Mr. O'Toole	27521
Mr. Sajjan	27521
Ethics	
Mr. O'Toole	27521
Mr. Lametti	27521
Tourism	
Mr. Tabbara	27521
Ms. Joly	27521
Ethics	
Mr. Barrett	27522
Mr. Lametti	27522
Foreign Affairs	
Mr. Caron	27522
Mr. Oliphant	27522
Agriculture and Agri-food	
Mr. Sorbara	27522
Ms. Bibeau	27522
Justice	
Mr. Brassard	27523
Mr. Lametti	27523
Agriculture and Agri-food	
Mr. Ste-Marie	27523
Ms. Bibeau	27523

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Business of Supply	
Opposition Motion—Natural Resources	
Motion negatived	27524

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Lamoureux	27524
Committees of the House	
Procedure and House Affairs	
Mr. Bagnell	27524
Instruction to the Standing Committee on Finance	
Ms. Kwan	27525

Motion	27525
Ms. Chagger	27525
Motion	27525
Motion agreed to	27526

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Criminal Code	
Bill C-84—Time Allocation Motion	
Ms. Chagger	27526
Ms. Rempel	27526
Mr. Lametti	27527
Mr. Julian	27527
Mr. Albas	27527
Mr. Garrison	27527
Mr. Cooper	27528
Mrs. McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	27528
Mr. Aubin	27528
Mr. Barrett	27528
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	27529
Mr. Lamoureux	27529
Motion agreed to	27532
Third Reading	
Bill C-84. Third reading	27532
Mr. Garrison	27532
Indigenous Languages Act	
Bill C-91—Notice of time allocation motion	
Ms. Chagger	27534
Criminal Code	
Bill C-84. Third reading	27534
Mr. Longfield	27534
Mr. Garrison	27534
Ms. Rempel	27534
Mr. Lamoureux	27535
Mr. MacGregor	27535
Mr. Housefather	27535
Mr. Longfield	27537
Mr. Falk (Provencher)	27537
Mr. Lamoureux	27537
Motion agreed to	27538
(Bill read the third time and passed)	27539

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

National Suicide Prevention Action Plan	
Motion	27539
Motion agreed to	27540
Rural Digital Infrastructure	
Motion	27540
Motion agreed to	27541
Canada Elections Act	
Bill C-406. Second reading	27541
Motion negatived	27542

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Transportation	
Ms. Benson	27542

Mr. Beech 27542
The Environment
Mr. Choquette 27543

Mr. Beech 27544

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>