



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 151 No. 218
Wednesday, June 21, 2023

Speaker: The Honourable Anthony Rota



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, June 21, 2023

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayer

• (1405)

[*English*]

The Speaker: It being Wednesday, we will now have the singing of the national anthem led by the hon. member for Elgin—Middlesex—London.

[*Members sang the national anthem*]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

HOCKEY ACHIEVEMENTS

Mr. Terry Sheehan (Sault Ste. Marie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is something special in the water in Sault Ste. Marie, especially when it takes the form of ice. This year's Stanley Cup final had two Saultites battling for that coveted prize. At the end, it was Michael Amadio who hoisted Lord Stanley's cup. Michael played a fabulous game and made the Soo proud.

Of course, we cannot forget the runner-up, which many pundits did not predict. The Florida Panthers, coached by Sault Ste. Marie's Paul Maurice, did a stellar job this year. I congratulate him.

We also had Jack Matier. Jack Matier played in the World Juniors and brought home the gold this year with his team. We are celebrating him in the Soo as well.

We had three stellar hockey people. We know they are stars today, and they will be stars tomorrow. I congratulate them. We have a very special hockey tradition in the Soo, and this is where hockey stars are made.

* * *

[*Translation*]

END OF THE SCHOOL YEAR

Ms. Annie Koutrakis (Vimy, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this week, young people in my riding are celebrating their last days of school before the summer break. Some will even be celebrating their high school graduation.

[*English*]

The end of students' high school studies can be an exhilarating experience, as well as a daunting one. Some may move on to post-secondary studies at CEGEP and then move on to studies at a college or university. Others may find their passion in the trades or in the workforce. Regardless, this is the start of the rest of their lives.

To all graduates across Canada, I leave them with this: They should never stop learning. Whether it is in school, at home, at work or in the community, they should never lose their willingness to learn and passion for learning. Education is the open secret to success. In its many forms, it is an essential part of our daily lives.

They should go into the world and do well, but, more importantly, they should go into the world and do good.

* * *

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL INDIGENOUS PEOPLES DAY

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, today is National Indigenous Peoples Day. On this day, we celebrate the traditions and cultural wealth of the first nations and Inuit peoples, and acknowledge the tremendous debt that we owe them.

Quebeckers acknowledge this debt. They realize that more must be done. When it comes to residential school victims, murdered and missing women and access to resources, rhetoric is not enough. What we need and what we lack is concrete action. All of us have a duty to act.

Today is a day for celebrating the beauty and diversity of indigenous cultures. It is also a day for discovering indigenous art, music and lifestyles. Let us all join in the many activities being held across Quebec. Let us reach out and get to know one another better. This is always the best road to a true reconciliation.

I wish everyone a wonderful National Indigenous Peoples Day, and send special wishes to the Huron-Wendat Nation, of which I am a proud member.

Tiawenhk.

*Statements by Members***LGBTQ COMMUNITY**

Ms. Rachel Bendayan (Outremont, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are seeing an increase in hate speech against the LGBTQ community in Canada. This is happening in a global context that has authoritarian regimes targeting LGBTQ communities with cruel and draconian laws. We are fortunate to have many organizations in Canada that are standing up to fight hate and discrimination. I would especially like to highlight the work of the Centre de solidarité lesbienne in my riding.

[English]

We proudly raise the pride flag on Parliament Hill, but around the world and even in communities here in Canada, we have seen these displays come under attack and even be cancelled. In the face of this reactionary backlash, I am more than ever looking forward to marching alongside the community in Montreal's pride parade once again to celebrate our 2SLGBTQI+ community.

[Translation]

I encourage all Montrealers to join the pride parade in full force on August 13, to take part in this solidarity march with our Liberal team and join us in expressing our commitment to love, acceptance and equality.

* * *

[English]

COMMUNITY CHURCHES

Mr. Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, every week Canadians attend worship services across this country. I had the opportunity to visit St. Joseph church in Whitecourt recently, which was hosting evacuees from across the country. Children were playing in the church hall, and parents were consuming meals that were given by the community. We thank the community for its support.

That same week, I also had the opportunity to visit the community of Grouard, where St. Bernard church, one of the oldest churches in Alberta, had burned down. Community members were gathered there and remembered the funerals, the baptisms and the weddings that had taken place in that community. This community is mourning.

Since 2021, 68 churches across this country have burned down, but we should not fear. Churches will continue to be places where people can gather, come together to worship and enjoy communion and fellowship.

* * *

NATIONAL INDIGENOUS PEOPLES DAY

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on January 4, I was honoured to participate in the first Ribbon Skirt Day on Cote First Nation. Chief George Cote, Isabella Kulak and her parents, Chris and Lana, chose to come together with students and teachers at Kamsack Comprehensive Institute and Good Spirit School Division to offer forgiveness, reconciliation and ongoing learning experiences about their way of life.

I was the only woman not wearing a ribbon skirt that day. They were beautiful and worn so proudly by all the women, daughters

and granddaughters. I did not know what was expected, and I was apprehensive about possibly doing something inappropriate by wearing one.

As we shared a meal following the ceremony and circle dance, Tribal Chief Isabel O'Soup said to me, "Hey, you need a ribbon skirt." Today, my colleague and I wear our ribbon skirts in the House of Commons as we join with first nations, Inuit and Métis across Canada in celebrating their cultures, histories and heritages on National Indigenous Peoples Day.

* * *

● (1410)

AMYOTROPHIC LATERAL SCLEROSIS

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (London North Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, approximately 3,000 Canadians live with ALS. One is a constituent, Matthew Brown, who was moved when his 13-year-old son, Colin, recently organized a walk at his school. That walk is for research funds and for equipment. Colin epitomizes youth leadership in this country. At the most trying time his family has experienced, no doubt, he is on the front lines, helping his father and helping those with ALS.

To Matthew, on another issue that is close to his heart, I was so pleased to see recently that the pan-Canadian Pharmaceutical Alliance successfully concluded negotiations for the drug ALBRI-OZA. I hope provinces and territories will now follow suit and make a positive decision, so the drug can be eligible for reimbursement under public health plans.

It is an incredible story and an incredible family. I wish them all the best at this very difficult time.

* * *

END OF THE SCHOOL YEAR

Mr. Parm Bains (Steveston—Richmond East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we near the end of our session, students across Canada are graduating and opening a new chapter in their young lives. I congratulate all Richmond students from Palmer, McNair, McRoberts, Cambie, McMath and MacNeill secondary schools. I give a special mention to my fellow Super Colts from Richmond high; the grade 7s from Kingswood, my old elementary school; and all graduating students across the city.

I had the opportunity to hear outgoing student messages at a graduation ceremony, and I was so inspired by all the motivators, dreamers, workers, critical thinkers, innovators, creators, academics, athletes, communicators, technologists, community builders, artists and future lifesavers. I say congratulations to McNair graduate Kevin Bhangoo, the recipient of the Bains Family Scholarship, which is given to a student who demonstrates community building through academics, athletics or arts; Gerardo Mejia, a Cambie secondary graduate and recipient of the 2023 Loran award for integrity, courage, compassion, determination and a high level of maturity; and finally, young Logan Choi from Mia Montessori, who visited Parliament Hill in the spring.

I am convinced by the young students in Richmond, British Columbia, that the future of Canada is in good hands.

* * *

NATIONAL INDIGENOUS PEOPLES DAY

Mr. Marc Dalton (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, *tansi*. Today is National Indigenous Peoples Day, a day to celebrate and honour the cultures and contributions of more than 1,800,000 first nations, Métis and Inuit people.

Indigenous peoples have rich and diverse traditions, music, art and a history that predates European arrival by thousands of years. The indigenous peoples of Canada were integral to the development and overall prosperity of this nation. Commerce, such as the fur trade, depended upon the collaboration of indigenous peoples. A new people, the Métis, now over 600,000 strong, was born in the west, the offspring of indigenous women and fur traders. I am proud to be one of them.

There remains pain as a result of the Indian residential schools and government policies, but there is also much hope. Ours is a growing population and a young population that wants to participate and benefit from resource development, business and tourism.

I specifically acknowledge the Katzie and Kwantlen first nations, in the area where I live in British Columbia.

Meegwetch, Huy ch q'u, all my relations.

* * *

NATIONAL INDIGENOUS PEOPLES DAY

Mr. Vance Badawey (Niagara Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in commemoration of National Indigenous Peoples Day, the summer solstice is traditionally a time when indigenous peoples celebrate their culture, achievements and heritage. Today we join them in honouring the strength and resilience of these cultures. This symbolic time of year represents optimism, light and reflection; it represents reflection on our colonial past and optimism towards rebuilding broken relationships through reconciliation and trust.

In Niagara, the Fort Erie Native Friendship Centre, along with the Niagara Regional Native Centre, will be hosting festivities and telling stories today. I encourage all people of Turtle Island to go out and participate in their local community gathering today to strengthen their community relationships and foster a brighter future, all tied together by trust and togetherness.

Happy National Indigenous Peoples Day.

* * *

● (1415)

LIBERAL PARTY OF CANADA

Mr. Chris Warkentin (Grande Prairie—Mackenzie, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after eight years of this Prime Minister, Canadians are losing hope. Millions are lining up at food banks every month. Canadians are paying thousands more for gas, groceries and home heating because of the Liberal carbon tax. Families can no longer afford their mortgages because out-of-control government borrowing has driven up interest rates. Our streets are unsafe and our once

Statements by Members

quiet rural communities are targets for violence and thefts. Canadians are dying at unprecedented numbers from government-aided overdoses, and many are losing hope of ever recovering.

The good news is that it does not have to be this way. Conservatives have a positive plan that will allow everyone, every Canadian, to get ahead. We will bring forward powerful paycheques, bring home safer streets, bring home lower prices, bring home recovery for our loved ones and bring home freedom for every Canadian. It is your home, my home, our home. Let us bring it home.

* * *

CARBON TAX

Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Mr. Speaker, food, fuel and housing are basic necessities of everyday life. Carbon tax increases are increasing inflation and raising the cost of basic necessities. After eight years, the Liberals refuse to see the light on how their inflationary carbon tax has made life unaffordable for many families while doing nothing for the environment. After eight years, Canada now ranks 58th out of 64 countries on climate performance, according to the climate change performance index.

The Liberals have a tax plan, not an environmental plan. The cost to Canadians has been enormous, yet the Liberals are not happy with just carbon tax 1, and now have carbon tax 2 coming on July 1. Happy Canada Day with a new tax from the Liberals. Carbon tax 2 will cost the average household over \$1,100 per year once fully implemented. The combined carbon taxes will cost families 61¢ on every litre of gasoline.

Conservatives will axe the carbon taxes and protect our environment through technology, not taxes, and give families hope.

* * *

[Translation]

QUEBEC'S NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Ms. Soraya Martinez Ferrada (Hochelaga, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, June 24, the ground of the riding of Hochelaga will shake under the dance steps of everyone celebrating the national holiday. Across Quebec, from Gatineau to Gaspé, we will be celebrating Quebec's National Holiday. This year, the people of Quebec are showcasing their love of dance and its place in Quebec culture.

Fans of jigs, square dancing, modern jazz and others will all be able to celebrate their zest for life together. Quebec is a strong, welcoming nation, open to diversity and proud of its heritage. Let us celebrate an inclusive Quebec where everyone is welcome.

Statements by Members

On this national holiday, I must salute a monument to our Quebec culture, the immeasurable Michel Côté. Today he is being posthumously awarded the Ordre national du Québec and will be knighted. He was one of the most important figures in our popular culture. From *Broue* to *C.R.A.Z.Y.* and *Omertà*, he inspired a whole generation of Quebecers.

Happy national holiday!

* * *

[English]

NATIONAL INDIGENOUS PEOPLES DAY

Ms. Niki Ashton (Churchill—Keewatinook Aski, NDP): Mr. Speaker, on this National Indigenous Peoples Day, we join in celebration and are reminded of the need for federal action on reconciliation.

First nations here require major federal investment in housing. In Shamattawa, Oxford House, Pukatawagan, Garden Hill and many others, families struggle in third world living conditions because of a lack of federal funding and because of ongoing federal neglect.

First nations like Tataskweyak Cree Nation desperately need a new school for their young people. It is time for the Liberal government to build the school.

First nations deserve economic justice. As the fishers of Grand Rapids lost their fish shack to a fire, many are forced to pay out of pocket to truck their catch even farther. They must be compensated. These are family- and community-sustaining jobs.

Finally, first nations and Métis youth in our north deserve investment. From recreation like soccer to after-school programming, indigenous youth are leaders today and we must support them.

On this day, let us see the Government of Canada not just celebrate but also, more importantly, act.

* * *

[Translation]

QUEBEC'S NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, Quebec will celebrate its national holiday. Quebec is a proud nation. Soon there will be nine million Quebecers, and Quebec will still be one nation. While many languages are spoken in Quebec, its common language is French. Quebec sings many songs, dances many dances, colours many canvases as a single nation with diverse backgrounds, with a rich and vibrant diversity going back tens of thousands of years, to the time when many peoples were already living on this great land that would become Quebec.

This nation hosts all kinds of debate, seeks out what is best for everyone, and manages its diversity like all democratic nations. This Saturday, however, our nation will sing with one voice, put away for now the blueprint for building a greener future, set aside uncertainties, share smiles in the sincere friendship of common convictions and in its ever-richer identity of what could well become the country for everyone.

Let us be proud, sing, dance, laugh and love each other for who we are, and for all that we are.

I hope everyone has a wonderful time on Quebec's national holiday.

* * *

● (1420)

[English]

FINANCE

Mr. Eric Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after eight years of Liberal scandals and ethics issues, there is a laundry list of wasteful spending growing by the day: \$27 million in bonuses for federal housing bureaucrats as housing costs double and the building of new homes is dropping; \$116 million in consulting fees to the Prime Minister's buddies at McKinsey; \$210 million to the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank, which we will never see again after the Liberals have admitted the bank is being controlled by Beijing; and \$54 million for the arrive scam app. How can we forget the stunning \$4.6 billion in COVID program abuse that the Liberals could not be bothered to recover?

After eight years, the wasteful spending has added to endless Liberal deficits and painful inflation, and now to skyrocketing interest and mortgage rates for Canadians who are struggling to get by.

Conservatives will bring down inflation, get spending under control and scrap the Liberal tax hikes punishing Canadians. After all, it is just common sense. Let us bring it home.

* * *

GRADUATION AND RETIREMENT CONGRATULATIONS

Mrs. Marie-France Lalonde (Orléans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this week marks the beginning of graduation for our grade 12 students. I want to take a moment to congratulate the 1,821 graduates from Orléans' 10 high schools.

[Translation]

This morning I attended the graduation ceremony at École secondaire publique Gisèle-Lalonde, where I had the privilege of presenting the Governor General's Academic Medal to Anaïs Gibbings. Congratulations to the class of 2023.

On behalf of all parliamentarians and House of Commons staff, I would also like to pay tribute today to Nora Daigle, a Parliamentary Protective Service constable who is retiring after over 20 years of service. Nora has left a lasting impression on us with her unwavering dedication, good humour and perpetual smile. As a former boxer, she embodies strength and determination, and her love of photography and fine wine adds a touch of elegance to her personality.

We wish her a long and happy retirement and extend our deepest thanks for all her work.

* * *

[English]

NATIONAL INDIGENOUS PEOPLES DAY

The Speaker: Following discussion among representatives of all parties of the House, I understand there is an agreement to observe a moment of silence to commemorate National Indigenous Peoples Day and mark the discovery of the remains of 215 children at a former residential school in Kamloops.

[A moment of silence observed]

ORAL QUESTIONS

• (1425)

[Translation]

HOUSING

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after eight years under this Prime Minister and his anti-construction inflationary policies, the cost of housing has doubled.

In fact, we learned today that, in Quebec, the average rent increased by 19% in the past year. In some areas of the province, it went up by 44%. In British Columbia, nearly 100,000 people could be out on the streets because of rent hikes.

Will the Prime Minister finally reverse his anti-construction inflationary policies that caused this housing crisis?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the leader of the official opposition were actually taking the housing crisis seriously, he would have supported our investments in that area rather than going after municipalities.

Our plan involves working with the municipalities, particularly by investing \$4 billion to speed up residential construction approvals and create 100,000 new homes, by tying infrastructure investment to housing, by helping Canadians save money to buy their first home, by providing support for low-income renters and by converting surplus federal lands to affordable housing.

We will continue to be there to help with housing.

[English]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it now takes 25 years for the average Torontonian to save up for the average down payment on a house. It used to be that one could pay off a mortgage in 25 years; now, that is what it takes just to get a down payment, after the Prime Minister's anti-construction inflationary policies have doubled the cost of housing. He has done this with deficits that drive up interest rates and drive down salaries, and by funding bureaucracies that block home construction.

Will the Prime Minister reverse the policies that caused the housing crisis, so Canadians can put a roof overhead?

Oral Questions

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have one of the strongest recoveries after the pandemic of all our peer countries, including seeing the creation of 900,000 new jobs across the country since before the pandemic.

Our investments in supporting Canadians have made a real difference and have created growth in the economy. At the same time, we have continued to step up to support families in the construction of new homes by working collaboratively with municipalities to improve densification, to accelerate zoning changes and permitting, and to work to build more housing.

As the Conservative leader chooses to pick fights with municipalities, we are going to work collaboratively to get housing—

The Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister tells Canadians they have never had it so good, but in reality, housing costs have actually doubled under his leadership. In fact, they are among the worst in the world. Vancouver is now the third most overpriced market, and Toronto is the 10th. Both are worse than New York City; London, England; and even Singapore, a tiny island. In fact, the average house cost is almost double in Canada what it is in the United States, which has 10 times the people to house on a smaller land mass.

The Prime Minister's anti-construction inflationary policies are not working. Will he reverse them so that Canadians can get a roof overhead?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we across the House floor all recognize that Canadians are struggling with the cost of housing. The Conservative solution is to cut the programs that are supporting Canadian families, cut the programs that help municipalities invest in accelerating housing, cut the programs that help Canadians save up for a first down payment, and cut the programs that are delivering housing solutions for Canadians. We recognize there is more to do, but it does not start by cutting the existing programs that are helping Canadians.

We are going to continue to work in partnership with the municipalities and help Canadians through these difficult times.

• (1430)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's \$80-billion worth of programs are not working. They have led to a doubling in the cost of an average down payment, double the necessary monthly mortgage payment, and a 120% increase in the average rent. This is way out of line with what is happening in other countries. Meanwhile, he continues to drive up interest rates on mortgages with his deficits, and to give money to local bureaucracies to block home building.

Oral Questions

Will the Prime Minister get off the backs and out of the way of Canadians so they can finally afford a home?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, not only would the Conservative leader cut programs that are helping Canadians in what is, yes, a difficult housing market, but he also is choosing to pick fights with municipalities when we should be working with them, as the Liberals are doing, to increase densification, to accelerate permitting, to change zoning, and to make sure we are tying infrastructure investments, like the transit investments we are making in record numbers, to concentrations of housing and increasing housing stock.

We know we need to continue to deliver more housing supply, and we are working with municipalities and provinces to do just—

The Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister can say all the right things, but he does not get anything done.

I will give a perfect example. I know that the Prime Minister is trying to plagiarize my message on housing, but he cannot actually deliver on it. The reality is he brought in a \$4-billion housing accelerator fund that has decelerated home building. Home building is actually down 19% versus what it was before he brought in this acceleration program.

Instead of just spending money irresponsibly, why will the Prime Minister not tie dollars to houses that are actually complete?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will certainly accept the compliment that we are saying all the right things, and I will add to it because we are doing the right things.

As we step up with the first-time homebuyers tax-free account, as we work with municipalities to deliver on accelerated housing construction, in partnership in the ways that we get things done, instead of picking fights like the Conservative leader continues to do, we will continue to deliver on helping Canadians through these difficult times.

* * *

[Translation]

SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, northern Quebec and the north shore are grappling with major forest fires. That is also true for other parts of Canada. Businesses are suffering. Although big businesses may have the financial means to get through this, many small and medium-sized businesses have been dealt a serious blow from which they might not recover.

We have proposed measures to help these businesses. I want the Prime Minister to tell us if he is prepared to sit down with us and the industry now to quickly put in place urgent programs.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our thoughts are with all those in Quebec and across Canada who have been affected by these fires. Safety is obviously our num-

ber one priority. That is why our government responded immediately to Quebec's request for help.

We will continue to work with the provinces and territories throughout this difficult period and the recovery, and we are taking steps to support workers in Quebec's forestry sector and other sectors affected by these forest fires. We have put measures in place with substantial investments in the 2023 budget.

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, since we are running out of time, I will ask the Prime Minister to be more specific.

Businesses and, obviously, many workers are faced with a short-term challenge that might force them to hide the key under the mat. They need measures, and they need them soon. To facilitate the process, we took inspiration from some of the pan-Canadian measures used for small and medium-sized businesses during the pandemic. The model and the structure already exist. We can apply it quickly because the summer is not over and the threat is very serious.

Can we work together to take immediate action?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we reacted to a pan-Canadian crisis with pan-Canadian tools. In this situation, it is businesses in certain provinces that are affected, and that is why we are working with the relevant provinces.

The Government of Quebec knows full well that Canada will be there as a partner, including with our disaster assistance programs, which it will certainly be able to use. We will be there, and we will be there to work with the Government of Quebec, which will be there to help local businesses.

* * *

[English]

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Ms. Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): *Uqaqtittiji*, this morning I was honoured to attend the raising of the survivors' flag.

I thought of Monica Ittusardjuat, Ernie Bernhardt, Marie-Lucie Uviluq, the late Marius Tungilik and especially my mom, Carmen Idlout, who survived these horrible institutions.

Survivors, without intention, pass on trauma to the next generations. The Liberal government's inaction allows intergenerational trauma to continue.

When will the government act to ensure that future generations can live with pride, dignity and respect?

● (1435)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for being there at this important celebration this morning. I was touched to see so many people there, as well.

Today, June 21, is a celebration of indigenous language and culture as, at the same time, we recognize the terrible intergenerational trauma and the impacts of residential schools.

Oral Questions

It is with mixed feelings that we continue to work together in partnership with indigenous communities across the country, whether it is on housing, whether it is on health, whether it is on resolving land claims, and continue to support indigenous leadership.

We will continue on the path of reconciliation in partnership, as we have for the past seven and a half years.

Ms. Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): *Uqaqtittiji*, all I heard is empathy. What indigenous peoples need is action. Grassy Narrows is still waiting for the government to fulfill its promise to build the mercury poisoning care home in Grassy Narrows. After decades of toxic drinking water, just like countless first nations across this country, people in Grassy Narrows are left waiting for the government to keep a promise it made years ago. Indigenous peoples have heard empty words for decades. Will the government finally deliver the treatment centre that Grassy Narrows desperately—

The Speaker: The right hon. Prime Minister.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have been working with indigenous communities right across the country on responding to their needs. The situation in Grassy Narrows has gone on for far too long. It is one that we continue to engage in, working closely with local leadership and moving forward on giving the kinds of supports necessary. We recognize the scale of the challenges across the country and we will continue to walk the road of reconciliation, in partnership, in meaningful, serious ways as we always have.

* * *

HOUSING

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister expects to be judged on his promises rather than his results.

The results are these. Eight years ago, housing was affordable, taking a modest 40% of average income to pay mortgages on an average house, which is something that is now up to 60%. The average cost of a house has nearly doubled. The cost of a mortgage payment has doubled. The cost of monthly rent has doubled. It is double trouble after eight years of this Prime Minister.

Unfortunately, the Prime Minister wants to keep doing what caused the problem in the first place. Will he instead stop funding gatekeeping that blocks construction and bring down the deficits that are driving up mortgage rates?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that the member opposite talks about what happened eight years ago because when we formed government, we realized that the previous federal government had done nothing on housing for close to 10 years. It had removed the federal government from any leadership role or partnerships around housing, which is part of why we have faced real challenges over the past decade in responding to the growth and needs of housing across this country. It is why we also put into place in 2017 a national housing strategy that has led millions of Canadians to get into new residences and refurbished homes across the country. It is why we have continued to invest and step up—

The Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's main criticism seems to be that the previous Conservative government did not hold enough meetings or spend enough money. What we actually delivered was affordable housing. The average house cost was \$450,000 at the time. The average rent back then was about 50% of what it is today.

Now, Canada has the fewest houses per capita in the G7. We have fewer houses per capita than when the Prime Minister took office eight years ago at a time when house construction actually dropped off. Therefore, will he get out of the way, let Canadians build and let them put a roof overhead?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we all remember well that the previous Conservative government did not spend enough money investing in Canadians, did not support our veterans, did not support builds and infrastructure, cut and slashed programs, cut programs for seniors and for youth and raised the retirement age to 67 so that they could balance the budget in a fictional way for an election. Canadians saw through that and had the Conservatives lose that election. We have stepped up to continue to invest in Canadians, continue to invest in housing and continue to invest in supports that have seen the economy grow. I have seen record job creation and record numbers of people—

● (1440)

The Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister says that his real criticism is that our programs were not expensive enough for the taxpayers. The fact is, it is bad enough for him to fail; it is even worse for him to fail expensively and that is what he has done. He does have an \$80-billion housing program that has left us with the fewest houses per capita in the G7, even though we have the most land to build on, which is fewer houses per capita than when he took office. We now have almost double the house price in Canada versus the U.S., where they have 10 times the people to house on a smaller land mass. Why does the Prime Minister not stop judging himself by how much he can spend instead of judging by how much he can get done?

Oral Questions

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives consistently get up and say that what we really need to grow the economy and help Canadians is cuts: cuts in the investments we are making for Canadians, cuts in the programs that are helping Canadians afford new homes and cuts in the programs that are incentivizing municipalities to increase density and accelerate house building. The reality is, that proposal of cuts and austerity is exactly why the Conservatives had such an underwhelming night on Monday night in those by-elections. Canadians know they need a government that has their backs. That is what we are doing.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, just because the Prime Minister makes housing more expensive to taxpayers does not excuse the fact that he has made it more expensive for homebuyers. I will give an example: He has tried to plagiarise my message on the need to get housing built by inventing a \$4-billion accelerator program. Since that time, housing construction has decelerated.

This year, according to the Prime Minister's own housing agency, there will be fewer houses built than last year: 19% fewer. Why will he not actually take my policy, which is to link the number of dollars cities get to the number of houses that get completed?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the \$4-billion housing accelerator fund was actually a corner piece of our last election campaign, but apparently the current leader of the official opposition was too busy sharpening his knives to pay attention to our platform in the last election. We have demonstrated a level of commitment and focus on delivering for Canadians, while he continues to propose cuts.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: The noise level is starting to go up; I understand this is like a year-end for students in a classroom, and everyone is excited, but I am going to ask everyone to just take a deep breath.

We will go to the Leader of the Opposition, and let us keep everything respectful.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

* * *

GOVERNMENT PRIORITIES

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister says there is no room for savings in his sumptuous government spending, but I found some. For example, he gave CMHC \$26 million in bonuses for making housing less affordable; he gave \$181,000 for the Governor General's travel; \$116 million to McKinsey, a company that supports him but actually helped cause the opioid crisis; \$54 million for the ArriveCAN app; and \$6,000 for one night in a hotel for the Prime Minister.

Does he not think we can pass on that spending and put the money back in Canadians' pockets?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what the Conservative leader continues to put forward is a program of cutting programs for Canadians. Whether it is billions of dollars for child care at \$10 a day right across the country that he continues to campaign against, or whether it is investments in a climate action incentive that both puts a price on pollution and puts

more money back in the pockets of eight out of 10 Canadians that he would cancel, that is money in the pockets of families in his riding that he would he cancel.

Whether it is by moving forward on things like a grocery rebate or the doubling of the GST tax credit that has helped out 11 million Canadians and will continue to support seniors and young people, we will—

The Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

* * *

HOUSING

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, here is a real plan to make housing affordable: Balance the budget to bring down inflation and interest rates on Canadians' mortgages; require that cities increase the number of permitted homes by 15% in order to get more infrastructure money and pay the money out once the houses are completed and the keys are in doors; require every federally funded transit station to have high-density housing all around it; and sell off 6,000 underutilized federal buildings to convert them into affordable housing and use the proceeds to reduce the deficit.

How is that for a plan?

• (1445)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, many of the elements in his supposed plan are things that we are already very much working on. The one place we disagree is his proposal to cut programs, to cut supports to low-income Canadians and to cut supports like the housing benefit that he not only voted against but delayed passage of in the House, when we were offering a \$500 top-up to low-income Canadians. He has consistently stood against those kinds of supports and investments in Canadians, offering instead cuts and austerity at a time when Canadians need continued support.

On fiscal responsibility, we are still at the top of the class in the G7.

* * *

[Translation]

CLIMATE CHANGE

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the environmental motion that the Bloc Québécois got the House to adopt was about the forest fires.

Oral Questions

The Prime Minister himself supported the motion, which recognizes that the federal government must do more to combat climate change. I would like to remind him how he voted before we talk about oil and gas. Right now, his government is assessing whether it will approve 16 Suncor projects to drill for oil off the coast of Newfoundland.

Does the Prime Minister agree that doing more to combat climate change also means saying no to these types of oil and gas projects?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is not like we are in the process of approving drilling in places like Anticosti Island. We are here to keep defending the fight against climate change, and we recognize that the world will still need oil and gas for a number of years.

Striking that balance has helped us reduce emissions for the first time in the Canadian government's history. We are on track to meet our Paris and Glasgow targets. We will continue to show leadership and responsibility by fostering green economic growth for—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia.

Ms. Kristina Michaud (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we moved that motion so that Parliament could rise on a note of consensus and awareness.

We need to do more to ensure that the natural disasters we are experiencing do not become the norm. To do that, though, we need to make some tough decisions. Everyone knows that the main factor speeding up climate change is fossil fuels. However, the federal government is still allowing oil companies to look for new deposits to develop. We need to reduce production, but Ottawa is still thinking about increasing it.

Can the Prime Minister at least say that new oil and gas projects in Canada are a thing of the past?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the main thing is to reduce the emissions that are causing climate change. In that respect, we have demonstrated our ability as a government to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions for which Canada is responsible, and we continue to do so.

We know very well that the world still needs energy. That is why we are investing in hydrogen, nuclear, wind, solar and other projects that will enable us to create the net-zero energy the world will need.

In the meantime, we are still working to reduce our fossil fuel emissions.

* * *

CARBON PRICING

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, instead of cutting red tape so that Quebec can generate more green hydroelectricity, the Prime Minister, with the support of the Bloc, wants to impose a second carbon tax on Quebecers, which will jack up the price of gas by 20¢ a litre. It will also make food more expensive, because farmers will have to pay more for the energy they need to produce it.

Instead of going after consumers in Quebec and across Canada, why not eliminate barriers so that Quebec can provide more green electricity?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, the leader of the Conservative Party is demonstrating that he does not understand what is happening in Quebec. First of all, there has never been a federally imposed price on pollution in Quebec, because Quebec has its own approach to fighting emissions.

Second, in budget 2023, we proposed generous tax credits to encourage green energy generation in Quebec and across the country. This is the kind of thing that will make it easier for Quebecers to have a thriving green economy in a net-zero world.

• (1450)

[English]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is not only Quebecers who will have to pay more. On July 1, the Prime Minister plans to hit Atlantic Canadians with a massive new tax hike at the pump. Happy Canada Day, everyone. The Prime Minister wants us to pay more.

Now, the Newfoundland Liberal premier has said that this will do nothing for the environment, but it will make his people go cold in the winter and hungry all year long. Why will the Prime Minister not axe the carbon tax and finally come up with a real environmental plan?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we put a price on pollution, and we are now seeing the emission reductions right across the country. Canada is reaching its targets both for 2030 and towards net zero. That is what we have done by putting a price on pollution.

However, at the same time we are putting a price on pollution right across the country, we are delivering more money back to Canadians in the jurisdictions where the federal backstop is in place. That is more money in the pockets of Atlantic Canadians starting this July as we fight climate change, which is having an impact, whether it is hurricanes or forest fires, that Atlantic Canadians hear of too strongly.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has not hit a single environmental target with his tax, and Canada ranks 58th out of 64 countries in the Climate Change Performance Index. His plan is not working; it is just costing more.

In fact, the premier of Newfoundland said that the Prime Minister's claim that we need to tax to save the environment is "completely illogical, it's a false dichotomy, it's a false dilemma, and it's as insulting to us as it is simplistic." The unanimous opinion of Atlantic premiers is that this tax will hurt their people without helping the environment. Why will the Prime Minister not axe his plan to raise gas prices by 61¢ a litre?

Oral Questions

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while energy companies are making record profits right now across the country, Canadians need support, and that is why we are delivering a climate action incentive that delivers more money every three months to Canadians than the price on pollution costs them.

Everyone, except apparently the Conservatives, understands that building in price signals on things we do not want, like pollution, is one of the most efficient ways of reducing emissions and of incentivizing behaviour. That is why our emissions are going down, and we are hitting our targets.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, he has not hit a single climate target since he brought this tax in. According to the Parliamentary Budget Officer, whom he appointed, in every province in Canada this tax will cost families more than they get back in these phony rebates. In fact, it will be over \$2,000 for the average family per year. The plan is to raise the tax to 61¢ a litre.

Canadians cannot afford to eat, heat and house themselves. Why does he not axe the tax so we can bring home lower prices?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative leader is desperate to demonstrate why not taking action and not fighting climate change is the best solution for Canadians. Canadians only have to look out the window at wildfires, atmospheric rivers and intense hurricanes such as Fiona to know that we have to continue to step up in the fight against climate change. What we have been able to do is not only return more money with a rebate, including \$1,000 a year in the riding of Carleton for the average family of four, but also move forward on drawing in investments like Volkswagen, Rio Tinto, Stellantis and others that continue to invest in growing the economy of Canada—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Winnipeg Centre.

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Ms. Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, a CBC report card on the government's progress in implementing the calls for justice from the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls gave a failing grade. Only two of the 231 calls for justice have been fully implemented to date. This is unacceptable.

The Liberals must implement all the calls for justice now and put in place a red dress alert system to keep indigenous women, girls and diverse-gendered folks safe. Why is the Prime Minister not acting with urgency in the face of an ongoing genocide?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our hearts are with survivors and families of missing and murdered indigenous women, girls and 2SLGBTQI+ people. Addressing this ongoing violence requires living up to our goals as a country and all the calls for justice. We are taking a whole-of-government approach, including \$125 million to implement the national action plan for MMIWG, the appointment of a special rep to consult on the creation of an indigenous and human rights ombudsperson, and \$4 billion to support indigenous housing needs. We are also working to implement a red dress alert.

We agree that there is always more to do, but we are taking this seriously and working in partnership with indigenous peoples right across the country.

● (1455)

Ms. Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have had enough with the platitudes. We need action now. The Prime Minister acknowledged this as an ongoing genocide. The House unanimously recognized the violence against indigenous women, girls and diverse-gendered folks as a Canada-wide emergency. It has been almost four years since the national inquiry. Only two calls to justice have been addressed.

When will the Prime Minister implement the red dress alert and the remaining calls to justice? We are a target. Our lives are on the line. Our lives matter.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I understand how much more there is to do, but to dismiss \$4 billion in housing investments for indigenous people as platitudes is not doing justice to the incredible indigenous leaders who are working across the country to deliver for their citizens, in partnership with the federal government. It dismisses the hard work indigenous leaders are doing to create more housing, more safe spaces, and more shelters, with \$100 million to create 22 new indigenous shelters and transitional homes. Those are not platitudes.

We are working seriously, and we look forward to continuing to work with all members in the House on reconciliation.

* * *

GOVERNMENT PRIORITIES

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan (Châteauguay—Lacolle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on Monday, Canadians clearly rejected the Conservative party's failed approach under their new leadership and instead opted in favour of delivering real results for Canadians today and for generations to come. Whether in Quebec, the Prairies or southwestern Ontario, we see Canadians supporting the Liberal government's approach to creating jobs and creating and ensuring a clean, growing economy of the future.

Can the Prime Minister inform constituents—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order. I am going to have to interrupt.

The hon. member for Châteauguay—Lacolle can begin from the top.

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan: Mr. Speaker, I can bring it home.

On Monday, Canadians clearly rejected the Conservative Party's failed approach under its new leadership and instead opted in favour of delivering real results for Canadians today and for generations to come. Whether in Quebec, the Prairies or southwestern Ontario, we see Canadians supporting this Liberal government's approach to creating jobs and ensuring a clean, growing economy of the future.

Can the Prime Minister inform the constituents of Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Westmount and Winnipeg South Centre of what their new Liberal members of Parliament will fight for?

[Translation]

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Châteauguay—Lacolle for her question and for her hard work. I would like to congratulate all the candidates in the recent by-elections. I look forward to welcoming Anna Gainey and Ben Carr—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order.

The right hon. Prime Minister, from the top.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Châteauguay—Lacolle for her question and for her hard work.

I would like to congratulate all the candidates in the recent by-elections. I look forward to welcoming Anna Gainey and Ben Carr to the House.

[English]

Communities in Quebec, Ontario and Manitoba had a choice between the Conservative Party's divisive rhetoric, austerity and cuts, or our plan to continue to strengthen the middle class, make life more affordable, fight climate change and so much more.

There is a lot more hard work left ahead of us, and our team will be even stronger with these two new, strong voices in Ottawa.

* * *

[Translation]

HOUSING

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last year's exorbitant increases in interest rates were incredible and unprecedented. They were caused by this government's inflationary deficit. Canadians are worried about losing their homes. According to the Bank of Canada, the average Canadian could see a 40% increase in their mortgage payments. The International Monetary Fund says that Canada is the country most at risk of experiencing a default crisis.

Will the Prime Minister finally eliminate his inflationary deficits to lower interest rates on mortgages and ensure that Canadians can keep their homes?

• (1500)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have the lowest deficit in the G7. We have the best debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7, and we still have a AAA rating from rating agencies around the world.

Oral Questions

We are taking a fiscally responsible approach to protecting our economy and creating growth. At the same time, we are investing to support low-income Canadians, to help people buy new homes, and we are also investing with municipalities to create more housing and to build more new apartments and housing units.

[English]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after eight years of the Prime Minister, it now takes well over 60% of a family's pre-tax income to make monthly payments on an average house. That is mathematically impossible, but it is possibly about to get worse.

The Prime Minister's inflationary deficits are driving up interest rates faster than at any time since any of us have been alive. This means that Canadians could face 40% increases in their monthly payments. There may be another bank rate increase this summer that could push Canadians to bankruptcy.

Before Canadians lose their homes, will he get rid of his inflationary deficits to bring down those terrible mortgage rates?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada has the lowest deficits in the G7. We have the best debt-to-GDP ratio, and the lowest one in the G7 as well. We are one of the three largest economies in the world, along with Germany and the United States, to have a AAA credit rating from the bond rating agencies.

Our fiscal plan is sustainable, even as we continue to invest to support low-income Canadians, to support municipalities in building more housing, and to move forward with a plan, while the Conservative Party, once again, continues to talk about cuts to programs, cuts to services and cuts for Canadians.

* * *

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canada has the worst household debt in the G7, by far the worst, and that debt risks blowing up when rates rise.

One of the ways the Prime Minister has been wasting money is that he gave \$210 million to the Asian infrastructure bank, which is controlled by Beijing and designed to build the infrastructure of Beijing's Communist empire throughout Asia. We warned him five years ago and now some of that bank's own executives are speaking out against it. He claims he is stalling his involvement in the bank, but the real question is this: When will we get our \$200 million back?

Oral Questions

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada has long been involved in investing in infrastructure around the world because we know that it creates growth and opportunity in the global south. It continues to contribute to fighting climate change, as people are building more resilient infrastructure and indeed energy infrastructure. We are part of multilateral development banks all around the world.

As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, we are reviewing our participation in the Asian infrastructure bank, and we will make the decision that is right for Canadians.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, he is defending the \$200 million he gave to a bank, one of whose executives said, “I didn't find a single, tangible benefit to communicate back home here to Canada of what this bank does that is consistent with our values in a way that would benefit Canadians.”

While Canadians are starving and cannot heat their homes, he is forcing them to give \$200 million to this bank controlled by Beijing to expand a Communist empire in Asia. When will Canadians get their \$200 million back from this Liberal-friendly bank?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said, we are evaluating our continued participation in this multilateral development bank controlled by Beijing. We continue to look very carefully at how we are having a positive impact around the world with investments in infrastructure and how we are delivering for Canadians in the fight against climate change, in growth around the world that benefits Canadians and in participation in supports for the global south.

* * *

[Translation]

DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS

Mr. René Villemure (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Mr. Speaker, observers of federal politics have come to the same conclusion about this session. They call it four months of time wasted by the Liberals on trying to avoid an inquiry into Chinese interference.

A waste of time is what everyone is taking away from this government's stubborn defiance of the will of the people and of the House. It is high time we moved on to the next steps. The government says it is open to ideas, and the Bloc Québécois is co-operating.

Will the Prime Minister finally announce the launch of an independent public inquiry into foreign interference?

• (1505)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the fight against foreign interference in our democratic institutions is and must remain a non-partisan issue.

The Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Infrastructure and Communities has spoken to the Leader of the Opposition about a way forward. Once we reach a consensus on a way forward, free from political overtones, we will be able to take steps together.

Ms. Marie-Hélène Gaudreau (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ): Mr. Speaker, everything is already in place so that we can move on

to other things. The Bloc Québécois is collaborating. The Prime Minister knows that he can count on the NDP to do whatever he wants. We have the public's support. The Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs is having constructive discussions with the opposition parties, which we commend. If the Prime Minister really intends to launch a public inquiry, the stars could not be better aligned to do so.

Will the Prime Minister finally announce that he is launching a public inquiry so that the work can finally be done and we can all move on to something else?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are continuing to work to counter foreign interference, mainly through the National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians, the National Security and Intelligence Review Agency and other bodies.

Yes, we want to work with the opposition parties. I thank them for their co-operation to date. However, Canadians are well aware that we need a process that will not end in partisan attacks and toxicity, as it did on the last attempt.

That is why we are coordinating with the other parties to come up with something that will work so that the issue can be taken seriously.

* * *

[English]

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister just admitted that the Asian infrastructure bank is “controlled by Beijing”. He says he is not going to get our money back. He is just going to review our participation.

While Canadians cannot afford to eat, heat or house themselves, he is forcing them to give almost a quarter-billion dollars to this Beijing-backed bank.

[Translation]

I am asking the question: Will the Prime Minister take back our \$200 million from this bank, which he admits is controlled by Beijing?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we remain committed to building infrastructure around the world, particularly in emerging southern nations.

We are there for investments, for roads, for power plants and other things across the south, and we will continue to be. Yes, we are in the process of reassessing our participation in this Asian investment bank. We will share our findings with Canadians when we complete the assessment.

Oral Questions

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on the issue of Beijing's interference in our democracy, I have already spoken to the minister to indicate the Conservative Party's support. We are ready to provide the names and mandates as soon as the Prime Minister announces a public inquiry. Tomorrow, the minister wants to have a call with members of the opposition.

Will the Prime Minister finally announce a public inquiry into Beijing's interference so that we can protect our democracy before the next election?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the opposition parties are now in a position to work together to establish a process that will work well.

Given how the opposition parties have behaved in recent months toward an esteemed former governor general, we want guarantees that everyone agrees on the framework and the individual who will conduct the work so that we do not go back to personal attacks that will undermine Canadians' trust in our institutions.

* * *

[*English*]

FINANCE

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister jetted off to New York for a weekend with celebrities, and now we know the price tag. While Canadians cannot eat, heat or house themselves, he stuck them with a \$61,000 bill just for hotels for himself and his entourage. It was one weekend and \$61,000 of fun.

Canadians cannot pay their own bills and they certainly cannot afford to pay his. Will he commit to paying for his own vacations this summer?

• (1510)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to be in New York to meet with Ursula von der Leyen and Mia Mottley to engage in important conversations about the future of our economy and the fight against climate change. These are things that matter. It was a mid-week trip, and I happen to know that former prime minister Harper was also attending meetings, at the same time we were down there, with the same organization.

These are things that matter in terms of Canada's leadership in the world. They matter in terms of outcomes for Canadians. We will continue to do the work that Canadians expect of this government to lead on the global stage.

Mr. Kody Blois: Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the Conservative Party no longer resembles that led by Joe Clark, Brian Mulroney or even Stephen Harper. The leader of the official opposition is taking the Conservatives into the ditch on the far right to outflank Max Bernier by spewing conspiracy theories about the World Economic Forum, supporting candidates who are against reproductive rights and promoting hate against LGBTQ+ communities. It is the same playbook we have seen in the United States.

Can the Prime Minister reassure my constituents, including those who identify as Progressive Conservatives, that our Liberal government is the best vehicle to drive Canada forward?

The Speaker: I wanted to double-check. That does not qualify as a question.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

* * *

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the public safety minister has presided over a 32% increase in violent crime under the government. The public safety minister misled hunters when he planned to ban their rifles. The public safety minister sat on information about the transfer of one of Canada's most notorious killers to have more freedom and comfort by getting him out of a maximum-security prison when he could have passed a law to prevent it.

Will the Prime Minister commit today to firing his incompetent public safety minister?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative leader talks about freedom, but he is all talk, no walk on freedom when he hand-picks candidates who want to take away Canada's freedoms.

Let me be very clear. In Canada, everyone has the freedom to love who they love, everyone has the freedom to choose what they do with their own bodies, with safe access to abortion, and—

The Speaker: I am sorry. It is starting to get noisy in here again. We are getting close to the end, and I am wondering whether I should start bouncing around with whatever is left.

I think everybody is excited to get out of here, and I understand that. Let us start again from the top, and I want everyone to just take a deep breath and listen to each other, listen to the questions and listen to the answers.

The right hon. Prime Minister, from the top, please.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the Conservative leader is all talk, no walk when it comes to freedom when he hand-picks candidates who want to take away Canadians' freedoms.

Let me be very clear. In Canada, everyone has the freedom to love who they love, everyone has the freedom to choose what they do with their own bodies, with safe access to abortion, and everyone has the freedom to move safely in their communities without damaging blockades.

On this side of the House and in our candidates, we will always stand up for Canadians' freedoms.

*Oral Questions***PUBLIC SAFETY**

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the only thing the Prime Minister has done is free Paul Bernardo from a maximum-security penitentiary into relative freedom in a place where he can have access to other people and where he has more comforts and can put guards in danger.

The Prime Minister interfered with Corrections Canada's decisions by introducing Bill C-83, which allowed this kind of transfer to go ahead. The Minister of Public Safety knew of the transfer, or his office knew at least, for three months while he claimed that they could not walk down the hallway and tell him.

He is incompetent. Will the Prime Minister fire him, yes or no?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know how difficult this decision is for families of the victims. We share the deep concerns that Canadians have been expressing.

The decision to transfer incarcerated persons is an independent decision made by the Correctional Service of Canada. Following outreach by the Minister of Public Safety, the commissioner ordered an additional review, which is under way and will be completed soon.

• (1515)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the minister can actually order reviews, which means he can also issue directives to ensure that all mass murderers are kept in maximum-security penitentiaries. He could also adopt our law today, which would require that every mass murderer stay in a maximum-security penitentiary. That would be an apolitical way to solve the problem, but the Liberals have not done that, even though the minister knew about this problem, or ought to have known, three months ago.

Can the Prime Minister confirm this: Will the public safety minister still have that job when we come back here in the fall?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, being there and supporting victims is always top of mind for this government.

After learning of the transfer, the minister was in touch with the commissioner, and the commissioner has ordered an additional review, which is now under way and will be completed soon.

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Mr. Patrick Weiler (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today on National Indigenous Peoples Day, we recognize and celebrate the important contributions of indigenous peoples to our country, as well as the diverse culture, language and heritage of indigenous peoples.

In my riding, I think of the work of the Lil'wat Nation to restore language to their education programs, the shishálh Nation becoming the first self-governing nation in Canada and obtaining justice for day scholars, and the transformative developments of the Squamish Nation with the Senakw housing development, done in a way that highlights their heritage.

While much work has been done on the road to reconciliation, much remains to be done together. Can the Prime Minister please update this House on the forthcoming release of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act action plan?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country for his hard work.

Today, on National Indigenous Peoples Day, we released our action plan to implement the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act, developed in partnership with first nations, Inuit and Métis. The Conservative leader voted against that bill and associated himself with those who deny the realities of residential schools.

Canada cannot go backwards. We must always choose to confront the truth and strive to right these wrongs.

* * *

HOUSING

Mr. Blake Desjarlais (Edmonton Griesbach, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in Edmonton, 58% of those currently houseless identify as indigenous. Under the Liberal government, indigenous people are now 11 times more likely to use a shelter or live in inadequate homes than non-indigenous people.

The New Democrats have been calling on the government to address the housing crisis that first nations, Inuit and Métis communities have had to deal with. When will the Liberal government finally start to invest properly in a “for indigenous, by indigenous” housing strategy so that everyone can live with safety and dignity?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question of “when” is in budget 2023. That is exactly what we did. We committed to working with indigenous peoples to co-develop an urban, rural and northern indigenous housing strategy. Budget 2023 includes an additional investment of \$4 billion in this indigenous housing strategy, on top of the \$6.7 billion since 2015.

Housing remains a top priority as part of reconciliation. We will continue to work with partners on this right.

TAXATION

Mr. Kevin Vuong (Spadina—Fort York, Ind.): Mr. Speaker, Canada Day is quickly approaching. To celebrate, the Liberal government is giving the gift to Canadians of another tax, the clean fuel regulation, but the only things being cleaned are Canadians' pocketbooks, as independent analysis has found that it actually increases net greenhouse gas emissions, this time with no rebate.

Thanks to the NDP, British Columbia already has one in place, which is costing British Columbians 17¢ per litre. Can the Prime Minister share with Canadians how much the rest of the country will have to pay for his overspending and for his latest tax grab?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians have seen across the country, whether with Hurricane Fiona on the east coast, with forest fires raging across the country with greater intensity than in previous years or with the atmospheric river that B.C. was hit with just a few years ago, that the cost of inaction on climate change would be cataclysmic.

That is why we put forward a price on pollution that is bringing down our emissions and is going to allow us to reach our targets at the same time as we put more money back into the pockets of Canadians with the climate action incentive four times a year.

We are supporting Canadians while we fight climate change.

* * *

● (1520)

RCAF HELICOPTER CRASH

The Speaker: That is all the time we have for question period today.

Following discussions among representatives of all parties in the House, I understand there is an agreement to observe a moment of silence to honour the Royal Canadian Air Force members who lost their lives near Petawawa and to honour those who were injured.

[*A moment of silence observed*]

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Mark Holland (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I move that notwithstanding any standing order, special order or usual practice of the House:

(a) on the last allotted day in the supply period ending June 23, 2023, the proceedings on the opposition day motion shall conclude no later than 10:30 p.m., the House shall then proceed to the putting of the question on the motion and then, if required, the taking of any division or divisions necessary to dispose of the motion, and the Speaker shall then put forthwith and successively, without further debate or amendment, every question necessary to dispose of the motions to concur in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2024, and to the Supplementary Estimates (A) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2024, and for the passage at all stages of any bill based on the said estimates;

(b) notices of opposed items in relation to the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2024, and to the Supplementary Estimates (A) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2024, listed on the Notice Paper be deemed withdrawn;

(c) the recorded divisions on government legislation currently deferred to the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions today be deemed further deferred to the conclusion of all proceedings in relation to the estimates tonight;

(d) the motion standing on the Order Paper in the name of the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons related to the appointment of Harriet

Oral Questions

Solloway as Public Sector Integrity Commissioner pursuant to Standing Order 111.1(2) be deemed moved, a recorded vote be deemed requested and deferred after the recorded division on the motion for third reading of Bill C-42, An Act to amend the Canada Business Corporations Act and to make consequential and related amendments to other Acts;

(e) in relation to Bill C-9, An Act to amend the Judges Act, the amendment to the motion respecting Senate amendments made to the bill be deemed withdrawn and the motion respecting Senate amendments made to the bill, standing on the Notice Paper, be deemed adopted;

(f) Bill S-8, An Act to amend the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, to make consequential amendments to other Acts and to amend the Immigration and Refugee Protection Regulations, be deemed read a third time and passed;

(g) Bill C-40, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, to make consequential amendments to other Acts and to repeal a regulation (miscarriage of justice reviews), be deemed read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights;

(h) Ways and Means Motion No. 18, notice of which was tabled on June 16, 2023, be deemed concurred in, a bill based thereon standing on the Order Paper in the name of the Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations, entitled "An Act respecting the recognition of certain Métis governments in Alberta, Ontario and Saskatchewan, to give effect to treaties with those governments and to make consequential amendments to other Acts", be deemed to have been introduced and read a first time, deemed read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Indigenous and Northern Affairs; and

(i) the written questions dated June 20, 2023, standing on the Notice Paper, be deemed to have been transferred to the Order Paper on Wednesday, June 21, 2023, for the purposes of Standing Order 39.

● (1525)

The Speaker: All those opposed to the hon. member moving the motion will please say nay.

It is agreed.

The question is on the motion. All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

JUDGES ACT

(Bill C-9. On the Order: Government Orders)

June 21, 2023—Third reading of Bill C-9, An Act to amend the Judges Act.

(Motion respecting Senate amendments agreed to)

* * *

IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE PROTECTION ACT

(Bill S-8: On the Order: Government Orders)

June 21, 2023—Third reading of Bill S-8, An Act to amend the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, to make consequential amendments to other Acts and to amend the Immigration and Refugee Protection Regulations.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

*Points of Order***MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE REVIEW COMMISSION ACT (DAVID AND JOYCE MILGAARD'S LAW)**

(Bill C-40: On the Order: Government Orders)

June 21, 2023—Second reading of Bill C-40, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, to make consequential amendments to other Acts and to repeal a regulation (miscarriage of justice reviews).

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

* * *

[Translation]

AN ACT RESPECTING THE RECOGNITION OF CERTAIN MÉTIS GOVERNMENTS IN ALBERTA, ONTARIO AND SASKATCHEWAN, TO GIVE EFFECT TO TREATIES WITH THOSE GOVERNMENTS AND TO MAKE CONSEQUENTIAL AMENDMENTS TO OTHER ACTS

(Bill C-53: On the Order: Government Orders)

June 21, 2023—Second reading of Bill C-53, An Act respecting the recognition of certain Métis governments in Alberta, Ontario and Saskatchewan, to give effect to treaties with those governments and to make consequential amendments to other Acts

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

Mr. Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, there have been consultations among the parties. I think that, if you seek it, you will find unanimous consent for the following motion: Given that (1) according to the report of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, thousands of children have been forcibly deported by Russia from Ukraine to the Russian Federation; (2) the International Criminal Court has issued arrest warrants for Vladimir Putin and Maria Lvova-Belova—

Some hon. members: Nay.

* * *

[English]

POINTS OF ORDER

ORAL QUESTIONS

Mrs. Karen Vecchio (Elgin—Middlesex—London, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I stand here in a bit of disbelief. Following some very difficult questions asked by my NDP colleague and friend from Winnipeg Centre, I watched, along with other members and colleagues, as the Prime Minister sat down and directed an F-bomb at the member for Winnipeg Centre, and a little bit more of that. Honestly, just play it back. I would ask for a formal apology and for the Prime Minister of Canada to stand and apologize to my female colleague and friend from Winnipeg Centre, especially on National Indigenous Peoples Day.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to let my answer to that question stand and say that I said absolutely nothing after finishing that answer.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!**The Speaker:** Order.

The hon. member for Kings—Hants is next.

Mr. Kody Blois (Kings—Hants, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. This afternoon I had the opportunity to ask the right hon. Prime Minister a question. I started my question with a pream-

ble and I supported it by facts, and then I asked the Prime Minister if I could hear how his government would administer differently the policies that are being articulated from the official opposition.

I know this made the House leader quite upset, but I just want to see if I can have some parameters around how best I should frame my question. If I am not able to ask it, I would be very interested in hearing the right hon. Prime Minister's response.

The Speaker: In this House, we all make mistakes. We all do things that we are not aware are against the rules. I always like to see them as a learning opportunity. This is not to explain my answers but so everyone here will know why I said it was not a valid question.

The point I was looking at is on page 509 of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, which states, “ask a question that is within the administrative responsibility of the government or of the individual Minister addressed.”

Now let me explain why.

The reason I did that is there was a long preamble that really had nothing to do with administration. I hear this from both sides, so I am not pointing fingers at one side or the other. However, sometimes these things go on forever, and then it is kind of hard to determine whether there is going to be a question tied to the criticism or preamble that goes with it. That is why I called it an illegal question.

That is the reason I said it was not a valid question. When members are putting their questions together, I ask both sides to put something together that has to do with administration and, if they can, to make my life easier, to make it clear that it has to do with administration right from the beginning.

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: That has been settled. I do not want anybody challenging the Chair. If you have any questions, I invite you to make an appointment and come to my office afterward, and I will explain what happened in here.

Now we will go to the hon. member for Cariboo—Prince George.

● (1530)

Mr. Todd Doherty: Mr. Speaker, an Ottawa police officer, Sergeant Eric Mueller, was ambushed with two of his colleagues three weeks ago. Eric Mueller lost his life. An Ottawa police officer was attacked this past weekend. A London fire chief was viciously assaulted while attending a fire emergency on the weekend. A nurse was punched and kicked this past weekend.

On the last day of this session, we need to send a message to our first responders and frontline heroes that violence against them is unacceptable.

Therefore, there have been discussions among parties, and I believe that if you seek it, you will find unanimous consent to pass the following motion.

Points of Order

I move that notwithstanding any Standing Order, special order or usual practice of this House, Bill C-321, an act to amend the Criminal Code with respect to assaults against health care professionals and first responders, be amended by replacing the term “health care professionals” with “health care workers” throughout the entirety of the bill; be amended by replacing the term “first responders” with “public safety personnel” throughout the entirety of the bill; be amended by adding after clause 269.02 on the definition of a health care worker, for the purpose of subclause (1), “health care worker includes any individual employed in a health care”—

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: The hon. member for Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Glen Motz: Mr. Speaker, I am seeking unanimous consent that the Minister of Public Safety appear before the Standing Committee of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness for two hours no later than Friday, June 23, regarding—

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: I am afraid that there is a long list of points, and in order to get through them, as soon as I hear “no” from some members, we understand that the consultation that really should be taking place beforehand maybe did not quite work out the way it should.

We will now go to the member for Oshawa.

Mr. Colin Carrie: Mr. Speaker, in the last few weeks, we have all agreed on the importance of victims' rights. Today I am asking for unanimous consent from the House to adopt the following motion: I move that, notwithstanding any Standing Order or usual practices of the House, Bill C-320, an act to amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act on disclosure of information to victims—

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: We will now go to the hon. member for Chilliwack—Hope.

Mr. Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, the last time I spoke in the House, I used language that was deemed unparliamentary. I would like to withdraw those remarks and apologize to the Speaker for the disorder that they caused.

The Speaker: I thank the hon. member for his apology. The apology comes through the Speaker to the House. I want to clarify that it is not to me but to the House.

The hon. member for Kelowna—Lake Country is rising on a point of order.

Mrs. Tracy Gray: Mr. Speaker, this is on the point of order from my colleague for Elgin—Middlesex—London.

I was also witness to the Prime Minister saying the F-word in question period today after his response to an opposition party member. This is shocking and unparliamentary language. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to ask the Prime Minister to apologize, because he—

The Speaker: We have dealt with that already.

The hon. member for Lambton—Kent—Middlesex.

• (1535)

Ms. Lianne Rood: Mr. Speaker, during question period today, the Prime Minister kept deflecting on how the second carbon tax is going to hurt our farmers and put our food security and safety at risk. I would like unanimous consent to table the Parliamentary Budget—

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: The hon. member for Edmonton Griesbach is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it, you will find unanimous consent for the following motion: That, given the rising tide of hate and violence directed toward the 2SLGBTQI—

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: Once again, we are not getting any consent. I just want to make sure people understand that when they are seeking unanimous consent, they would normally check around to make sure that they have it beforehand. It does not sound as though it worked out.

The hon. member for Calgary Nose Hill is rising on a point of order.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: Mr. Speaker, in light of your ruling made yesterday, I believe if you seek it, you will find unanimous consent for the following motion: That, the house direct the government to provide complete answers to members—

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: The hon. member for Regina—Qu'Appelle.

Hon. Andrew Scheer: Mr. Speaker, I am hoping that there will be agreement on this one, because I would like to table a quote from the speech from the Minister of Finance from the fall economic update. She said that the government should not—

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: I am afraid there is no unanimous consent. I realize that sometimes, some of the rules are used to help us gain what we want in the House and then just postpone things, but at least let the hon. member get a few words in before, so that we are sure; I am very specific on “a few”.

The hon. member for South Shore—St. Margarets.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Rick Perkins: Mr. Speaker, apparently the government members do not want me to thank you.

As the House knows, I serve as the chair of the industry committee in the House. Through that role, I have had access to the two Volkswagen contracts that have been—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order. Is the hon. member asking for unanimous consent? What is he asking for? I cannot make out what the member is saying. I will let him start over.

Private Members' Business

Mr. Rick Perkins: Mr. Speaker, I will reinform the House that I serve as the vice-chair of the industry committee; as such, in that role, I have had access to the two Volkswagen contracts. Those two contracts, as we know the Parliamentary Budget Officer has said, are already \$3 billion over budget, so—

The Speaker: I believe we are getting into debate.

We will go to the hon. member for Calgary Forest Lawn, who got up on a point of order.

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan: Mr. Speaker, I think I have intercepted what looks like the Liberals' plan to balance the budget, and I would like to table this document with the House today.

The Speaker: Are there any other points of order that we are going to go to?

The hon. member for Sturgeon River—Parkland.

Mr. Dane Lloyd: Mr. Speaker, the 10th time is the charm. I am seeking consent from the House that an order of the House to issue all memoranda, briefing notes, emails—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: There was not the consultation done beforehand, so I am going to have to shut that one down.

The hon. member for Cariboo—Prince George.

Mr. Todd Doherty: I rise on a point of order directed at you, Mr. Speaker. Uncharacteristically, you may have let your emotions get the better of you today, and you yelled something unparliamentary towards one of my colleagues across the way here. I thought maybe you would want to apologize.

The Speaker: I do not remember shouting anything that was undeserved or unparliamentary.

The hon. member for Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke.

Mr. Randall Garrison: Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask for unanimous consent to allow the member for Edmonton Griesbach to read his unanimous consent motion to the House.

Some hon. members: No.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

• (1540)

[*English*]

HEALTH OF ANIMALS ACT

The House resumed from June 15 consideration of the motion that Bill C-275, An Act to amend the Health of Animals Act (biosecurity on farms), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Speaker: It being 3:40 p.m., pursuant to order made on Thursday, June 23, 2022, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-275 under Private Members' Business.

[*Translation*]

Call in the members.

[*English*]

Before the Clerk announced the results of the vote:

• (1605)

The Speaker: The hon. member for Vancouver Centre is rising on a point of order.

Hon. Hedy Fry: Mr. Speaker, I inadvertently voted nay. I would like to vote yea on the last vote.

The Speaker: The hon. member is asking for unanimous consent to change her vote. Do we have unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

(*Division No. 393*)

YEAS

Members

Aboutaif	Aitchison
Albas	Aldag
Alghabra	Ali
Allison	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arnold	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Atwin	Bachrach
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Barron	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Bendayan
Bennett	Berthold
Bérubé	Bezan
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney	Block
Blois	Boissonnault
Boulerice	Bradford
Bragdon	Brassard
Brière	Brock
Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins
Cannings	Caputo
Carrie	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Chambers
Champoux	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Chong	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cooper	Cormier
Coteau	Dalton
Dancho	Davidson
DeBellefeuille	Deltell
d'Entremont	Desbiens
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Doherty
Dong	Dowdall
Dreeshen	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Fergus	Ferreri

Private Members' Business

Fillmore	Findlay	Sahota	Saks
Fisher	Fonseca	Samson	Sarai
Fortier	Fortin	Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia
Fragiskatos	Fraser	Scheer	Schiefke
Freeland	Fry	Schmale	Seeback
Gaheer	Gallant	Serré	Sgro
Garrison	Gaudreau	Shanahan	Sheehan
Gazan	Généreux	Shields	Shipley
Genuis	Gerretsen	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Gill	Gladu	Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
Godin	Goodridge	Singh	Small
Gould	Gourde	Sorbara	Soroka
Gray	Green	Sousa	Steinley
Guilbeault	Hajdu	Ste-Marie	Stewart
Hallan	Hanley	St-Onge	Strahl
Hardie	Hepfner	Stubbs	Sudds
Holland	Housefather	Tassi	Thériault
Hughes	Hussen	Therrien	Thomas
Hutchings	Iacono	Thompson	Tochor
Idlout	Ien	Tolmie	Trudeau
Jaczek	Jeneroux	Trudel	Turnbull
Johns	Jowhari	Uppal	Valdez
Julian	Kayabaga	Van Bynen	van Koeverden
Kelloway	Kelly	Van Popta	Vandal
Khalid	Khera	Vandenbeld	Vecchio
Kitchen	Kmiec	Vidal	Vien
Koutrakis	Kram	Viersen	Vignola
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek	Villemure	Virani
Kusie	Kusmierczyk	Vis	Vuong
Kwan	Lake	Wagantall	Warkentin
Lalonde	Lambropoulos	Waugh	Webber
Lametti	Lamoureux	Weiler	Wilkinson
Lantsman	Lapointe	Williams	Yip
Larouche	Lattanzio	Zarrillo	Zimmer
Lauzon	Lawrence	Zuberi— 313	
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier		
Lehoux	Lemire		
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)		
Liepert	Lightbound		
Lloyd	Lobb	Erskine-Smith	
Long	Longfield	Morrice— 3	
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)		
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacGregor		
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maguire		
Maloney	Martel		
Martinez Ferrada	Masse		
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)	Champagne	Garon
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McDonald (Avalon)	Hoback	July— 4
McGuinty	McKay		
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLean		
McLeod	McPherson		
Melillo	Mendès		
Mendicino	Miao		
Michaud	Miller		
Moore	Morantz		
Morrison	Morrissey		
Motz	Murray		
Muys	Naqvi		
Nater	Ng		
Noormohamed	Normandin		
O'Connell	Oliphant		
O'Regan	O'Toole		
Patzer	Paul-Hus		
Pauzé	Perkins		
Perron	Petitpas Taylor		
Plamondon	Poilievre		
Powlowski	Qualtrough		
Rayes	Redekopp		
Reid	Rempel Garner		
Richards	Roberts		
Robillard	Rodriguez		
Rogers	Romanado		
Rood	Ruff		

NAYS

Members

May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)

PAIRED

Members

Garon

July— 4

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.[*Translation*]

Accordingly, the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to a committee)

* * *

● (1610)

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed from June 16 consideration of the motion that Bill C-321, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (assaults against health care professionals and first responders), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Thursday, June 23, 2022, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-321, under Private Members' Business.

Private Members' Business

● (1620)

[English]

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

(Division No. 394)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison	Gray	Green
Albas	Aldag	Guilbeault	Hajdu
Alghabra	Ali	Hallan	Hanley
Allison	Anand	Hardie	Hepfner
Anandasangaree	Angus	Holland	Housefather
Arnold	Arseneault	Hughes	Hussen
Arya	Ashton	Hutchings	Iacono
Atwin	Bachrach	Idlout	Ien
Badawey	Bains	Jaczek	Jeneroux
Baker	Baldinelli	Johns	Jones
Barlow	Barrett	Jowhari	Julian
Barron	Barsalou-Duval	Kayabaga	Kelloway
Battiste	Beaulieu	Kelly	Khalid
Beech	Bendayan	Khera	Kitchen
Bennett	Berthold	Kmiec	Koutrakis
Bérubé	Bezan	Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Bibeau	Bittle	Kurek	Kusie
Blaikie	Blair	Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas	Lake	Lalonde
Blaney	Block	Lambropoulos	Lametti
Blois	Boissonnault	Lamoureux	Lantsman
Boulerice	Bradford	Lapointe	Larouche
Bragdon	Brassard	Lattanzio	Lauzon
Brière	Brock	Lawrence	LeBlanc
Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins	Lebouthillier	Lehoux
Cannings	Caputo	Lemire	Lewis (Essex)
Carrie	Casey	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Chabot	Chagger	Lightbound	Lloyd
Chahal	Chambers	Lobb	Long
Champoux	Chatel	Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
Chen	Chiang	MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Chong	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Cooper	Cormier	Maguire	Maloney
Coteau	Dabrusin	Martel	Martinez Ferrada
Dalton	Damoff	Masse	Mathysen
Dancho	Davidson	May (Cambridge)	May (Saanic—Gulf Islands)
DeBellefeuille	Deltell	McCauley (Edmonton West)	McDonald (Avalon)
d'Entremont	Desbiens	McGuinty	McKay
Desilets	Desjarlais	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLean
Dhaliwal	Dhillon	McLeod	McPherson
Diab	Doherty	Melillo	Mendès
Dong	Dowdall	Mencicino	Miao
Dreeshen	Drouin	Michaud	Miller
Dubourg	Duclos	Moore	Morantz
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Dzerowicz	Morrice	Morrison
Ehsassi	El-Khoury	Morrissey	Motz
Ellis	Epp	Murray	Muys
Erskine-Smith	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Naqvi	Nater
Falk (Provencher)	Fast	Ng	Noormohamed
Fergus	Ferreri	Normandin	O'Connell
Fillmore	Findlay	Oliphant	O'Regan
Fisher	Fonseca	O'Toole	Patzer
Fortier	Fortin	Paul-Hus	Pauzé
Fragiskatos	Fraser	Perkins	Perron
Freeland	Fry	Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon
Gaheer	Gallant	Poilievre	Powlowski
Garrison	Gaudreau	Qualtrough	Rayes
Gazan	Généreux	Redekopp	Reid
Genuis	Gerretsen	Rempel Garner	Richards
Gill	Gladu	Roberts	Robillard
Godin	Goodridge	Rodriguez	Rogers
Gould	Gourde	Romanado	Rood
		Ruff	Sahota
		Saks	Samson
		Sarai	Savard-Tremblay
		Scarpaleggia	Scheer
		Schiefke	Schmale
		Seeback	Serré
		Sgro	Shanahan
		Sheehan	Shields
		Shipley	Sidhu (Brampton East)
		Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
		Sinclair-Desgagné	Singh

Private Members' Business

Small
Soroka
Steinley
Stewart
Strahl
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Therrien
Thompson
Tolmie
Trudel
Uppal
Van Bynen
Van Popta
Vandenbeld
Vidal
Viersen
Villemure
Vis
Wagantall
Waugh
Weiler
Williams
Zahid
Zimmer

Sorbara
Sousa
Ste-Marie
St-Onge
Stubbs
Tassi
Thériault
Thomas
Tochor
Trudeau
Turnbull
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vandal
Vecchio
Vien
Vignola
Virani
Vuong
Warkentin
Webber
Wilkinson
Yip
Zarrillo
Zuberi — 320

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Members

Champagne
Hoback

Garon
Joly — 4

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[*Translation*]

Accordingly, the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to a committee)

* * *

[*English*]

**DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS, TRADE AND
DEVELOPMENT ACT**

The House resumed from June 19 consideration of the motion that Bill C-282, An Act to amend the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Act (supply management), be read the third time and passed.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Thursday, June 23, 2022, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at third reading stage of Bill C-282 under Private Members' Business.

● (1635)

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

(*Division No. 395*)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Ali

Alghabra
Allison

Anand
Angus
Arseneault
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Bennett
Bérubé
Bittle
Blair
Blanchette-Joncas
Block
Boissonnault
Bradford
Brassard
Brock
Cannings
Casey
Chagger
Chambers
Chatel
Chiang
Cormier
Dabrusin
Damoff
Davidson
Deltell
Desbiens
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Dong
Drouin
Duclos
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Ehsassi
Ellis
Fergus
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Garrison
Gazan
Gerretsen
Gladu
Goodridge
Gourde
Guilbeault
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Kusie
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Larouche
Lauzon
LeBlanc
Lehoux
Lewis (Essex)

Anandasangaree
Arnold
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Barrett
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bendayan
Berthold
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blanchet
Blaney
Blois
Boulerice
Bragdon
Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe
Caputo
Chabot
Chahal
Champoux
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Coteau
Dalton
Dancho
DeBellefeuille
d'Entremont
Desilets
Dhaliwal
Diab
Dowdall
Dubourg
Duguid
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Falk (Provencher)
Ferreri
Findlay
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Fry
Gallant
Gaudreau
Généreux
Gill
Godin
Gould
Green
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Jones
Julian
Kelloway
Khera
Kramp-Neuman
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lametti
Lapointe
Lattanzio
Lawrence
Lebouthillier
Lemire
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)

Speaker's Ruling

Lightbound
Lobb
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor
Maloney
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
May (Saanic—Gulf Islands)
McGuinty
McLeod
Mendès
Miao
Miller
Morrice
Murray
Naqvi
Ng
Normandin
Oliphant
Paul-Hus
Perron
Plamondon
Powlowski
Rayes
Robillard
Rogers
Sahota
Samson
Savard-Tremblay
Scheer
Schmale
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Singh
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
St-Onge
Stubbs
Tassi
Thériault
Thompson
Trudel
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vandal
Vecchio
Viersen
Villemure
Vis
Weiler
Williams
Zahid
Zimmer

Lloyd
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martel
Masse
May (Cambridge)
McDonald (Avalon)
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Mendicino
Michaud
Moore
Morrissey
Muys
Nater
Noormohamed
O'Connell
O'Regan
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Poilievre
Qualtrough
Roberts
Rodriguez
Romanado
Saks
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Schieffe
Serré
Shanahan
Shipley
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sinclair-Desgagné
Small
Sousa
Stewart
Strahl
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Therrien
Trudeau
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Van Popta
Vandenbeld
Vien
Vignola
Virani
Vuong
Wilkinson
Yip
Zarrillo
Zuberi — 262

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albas
Bezan
Carrie
Cooper
Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Gray
Jeneroux
Kitchen
Kram
Lantsman
Maguire

Aitchison
Arya
Calkins
Chong
Dreeshen
Erskine-Smith
Fast
Hallan
Kelly
Kmiec
Kurek
Liepert
McCaughey (Edmonton West)

McLean
Morantz
Mutz
Patzner
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Ruff
Shields
Steinley
Tolmie
Vidal
Warkentin
Webber — 51

Melillo
Morrison
O'Toole
Perkins
Reid
Richards
Seeback
Soroka
Tochor
Uppal
Wagantall
Waugh

PAIRED

Members

Champagne
Hoback

Garon
Joly — 4

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

The Speaker: The hon. member for Sydney—Victoria is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Jaime Battiste: Mr. Speaker, with all of the different events going on for National Indigenous Peoples Day, I was unable to change my vote on Zoom. I would like unanimous consent to change my vote on Bill C-321 to be in favour.

The Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

ORDER AND DECORUM IN THE HOUSE—SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: I am now ready to rule on the point of order raised on June 20, 2023, by the chief opposition whip concerning the enforcement of the rules of decorum.

In her intervention, the whip explained that she was rising with respect to the right of the member for Lethbridge to speak in debate on business then before the House. Earlier in the sitting, a series of exchanges led the member for Lethbridge to accuse the Minister of Canadian Heritage of lying. The member was called to order by the Assistant Deputy Speaker and Deputy Chair of Committees of the Whole. The chief opposition whip indicated that she accepted this decision. However, she felt that, given the member subsequently apologized, there was no reason to continue to bar her from participating in the proceedings. The whip finished her intervention by emphasizing the need for an “even-handed application of the rules”.

[*Translation*]

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Government House Leader countered that the Assistant Deputy Speaker acted appropriately. He pointed out that she made several attempts to bring the member for Lethbridge to order, before informing the member that she would not be recognized for the remainder of the day. The members for New Westminster—Burnaby and Elgin—Middlesex—London also made interventions.

When this point of order was first raised, I committed to review what occurred. I have now done so.

*Routine Proceedings**[English]*

The member for Lethbridge, while the Minister of Canadian Heritage was responding to her question during debate, persisted with the heckling, ultimately accusing him of lying. The Assistant Deputy Speaker, who was in the chair at the time, repeatedly asked the member to cease with the heckling. The Assistant Deputy Speaker informed the member of the consequences she would face, namely that the member would not be recognized for the remainder of the sitting. Since the heckling did not cease, the Assistant Deputy Speaker indicated that this sanction would be applied. Moreover, following a point of order from the parliamentary secretary to the government House leader, she was asked to apologize for using unparliamentary language, having accused the minister of lying.

The member did make an apology but qualified it by using a different formulation of words. The Assistant Deputy Speaker commented on the nature of the apology. She reiterated that the member would not be recognized for the rest of the day, as had been decided prior to the request for an apology for the use of unparliamentary language.

- (1640)

[Translation]

House of Commons Procedure and Practice, third edition, at page 646 states, and I quote:

Members rarely defy the Speaker's authority or risk evoking the Chair's disciplinary powers. If a Member challenges the authority of the Chair by refusing to obey the Speaker's call to order, to withdraw unparliamentary language, to cease irrelevance or repetition, or to stop interrupting a Member who is addressing the House, the Chair has recourse to a number of options. The Speaker may recognize another Member, or refuse to recognize the Member until the offending remarks are retracted and the Member apologizes. As a last resort, the Chair may "name" a Member, the most severe disciplinary power at the Speaker's disposal.

[English]

As a result, I cannot find fault with how the Assistant Deputy Speaker handled the situation. Having called the same member to order four different times in the space of about a minute, it should not come as a surprise that she chose to apply a sanction. The chief opposition whip may find the sanction excessive, but I trust each chair occupant to do what is appropriate in the circumstances. I also trust members to do their utmost to maintain order and decorum at all times, and when it has been given, to heed the direction of the Chair.

[Translation]

I note that later in the sitting yesterday, some members equated the sanction applied with censorship, which only serves to undermine the Chair's authority. If members wish to participate in debate, they need to respect the rules that we have all agreed to.

[English]

Presiding over the House can be a challenge even at the best of times. The chair occupants, to whom members have entrusted the conduct of our proceedings, depend on the co-operation of all members in maintaining order. Over the course of the past weeks, we have seen examples from both sides of the House of how various accusations quickly devolve into a difficult work environment, which borders on bullying, I might add. In each instance where the

chair occupant has been called to intervene, they have attempted to restore order and ensure our rules are respected. Once a ruling is delivered, the matter is considered closed.

I take the remark seriously of the need for the Chair to be always even-handed, as voiced by the chief opposition whip. I will take the opportunity to state firmly that I and all chair occupants strive to be fair, balanced and equitable when presiding over the business of the House. We endeavour to do this every day. We will continue to do so.

I thank the other chair occupants for their support and commitment to the House, and all members for their attention.

Mrs. Stephanie Kusie: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Unfortunately, similar to the member for Sydney—Victoria, I also voted incorrectly, or did not apply my intention to the vote correctly, for Bill C-321. I would like to ask for unanimous consent to change my vote from nay to yea.

The Speaker: Does the hon. member have unanimous consent to change her vote?

Some hon. members: Agreed

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

FEDERAL ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES COMMISSION

The Speaker: It is my duty to lay upon the table, pursuant to subsection 23(2) of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, a certified copy of the report of the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Quebec.

Pursuant to Standing Order 32(5), this report is deemed permanently referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

* * *

- (1645)

[English]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

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

*Routine Proceedings***INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS**

Hon. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1), I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the report of the Canadian Delegation to the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe's parliamentary assembly, respecting its participation at the 20th autumn meeting in Warsaw, Poland, from November 24 to 26, 2022.

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1), I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the full reports of the Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association, respecting its participation at the 67th annual session in Lisbon, Portugal, from October 8 to 11, 2021, and the Parliamentary Transatlantic Forum in Washington, D.C., United States of America, from December 5 to 7, 2022.

[Translation]

Mrs. Alexandra Mendès (Brossard—Saint-Lambert, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1), I have the honour to present a report to the House in both official languages.

[English]

It is the report of the Canadian branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, respecting its bilateral visit to the United Kingdom, London, England, and Cardiff, Wales, from January 18 to 20, 2023.

* * *

[Translation]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Hon. John McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the fifth report of the Standing Committee on National Defence, entitled “The Cyber Defence of Canada”.

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this report.

[English]

I want to commend all members who had such a co-operative and hard-working attitude toward the development of this report.

HEALTH

Mr. Sean Casey (Charlottetown, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 15th report of the Standing Committee on Health, in relation to Bill C-284, an act to establish a national strategy for eye care.

[Translation]

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

[English]

I would like to congratulate the sponsor, the hon. member for Humber River—Black Creek, for being perfectly impatient in guiding the bill to this stage, and committee members for their thoughtful and thorough consideration of the bill and amendments.

INDIGENOUS AND NORTHERN AFFAIRS

Mrs. Jenica Atwin (Fredericton, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 10th report of the Standing Committee on Indigenous and Northern Affairs, entitled “Arctic Security and Sovereignty, and the Emergency Preparedness of Indigenous Communities”.

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this report.

I would like to thank all committee members for their incredible work, our witnesses, our analysts, our clerks and our support teams. I would like to wish everyone a happy National Indigenous Peoples Day.

* * *

● (1650)

[Translation]

CONSTITUTION ACT, 1867

Mr. René Arseneault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-347, An Act to amend the Constitution Act, 1867 (oath of office).

He said: Madam Speaker, today, I am pleased to introduce, seconded by the hon. member for Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook, Bill C-347, an act to amend the Constitution Act, 1867, with regard to the oath of office. This bill amends section 128 of the Constitution Act, 1867, in order to provide that, before taking their seat, members of the Senate and the House of Commons can choose to take and subscribe the oath of allegiance or an oath of office, or both.

The fifth schedule to the Constitution Act, 1867, would be amended by adding the following after the oath of allegiance: “I A.B. do solemnly affirm that I will perform my duties in the best interest of Canada and in accordance with its Constitution”.

I want to be very clear. The purpose of the bill is not to detract from the monarchy's historic role in Canada but to provide an additional option for members and senators when they are sworn in. I therefore invite all parliamentarians to support this bill when the time comes.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I am wondering whether someone else can second the motion because the hon. member who was supposed to do so is not present in the House.

An hon. member: The hon. member for Willowdale will do it.

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

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby on a point of order.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, I listened with great interest to my colleague from Madawaska—Restigouche. As we know, members must not pass between the member speaking and the Chair. Unfortunately, the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands walked in front of the member who was speaking and obstructed the video a little because his head appeared while the hon. member for Madawaska—Restigouche was making his remarks.

Routine Proceedings

Madam Speaker, I would ask you to remind all members not to pass between the Chair and the member who has the floor.

[*English*]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, I want to apologize to you if I did indeed do that.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): An apology is accepted, and I would hope that would also serve as an example of what we will try to avoid in the future.

* * *

SOMALI HERITAGE MONTH ACT

Mr. Yvan Baker (Etobicoke Centre, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-348, an act to establish Somali heritage month.

He said: Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill, which is an act respecting Somali heritage month. If passed, the bill would declare July of every year in Canada Somali heritage month. I would like to thank the member for Etobicoke—Lakeshore for co-sponsoring this bill with me and the member for York South—Weston for his counsel. I hope that all members of the House will support the legislation.

Canada's strength is reflected in the diversity of our—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): There seem to be quite a few individuals having conversations. I would ask them to take their conversations outside so the hon. member can have the respect of the House.

The hon. member for Etobicoke Centre.

Mr. Yvan Baker: Madam Speaker, Canada's strength is reflected in the diversity of our population and of our local communities, and Canada is home to many Canadians of Somali heritage. Canadians of Somali descent have left, and continue to leave, a historic mark on Canada, with contributions that span communities across our country that are reflected in our economic, political, social and cultural life.

If passed, Somali heritage month would give us a special opportunity to recognize that Canadians of Somali descent have made, and continue to make, significant contributions to Canada. It would also give all Canadians a special opportunity to learn more about Somali Canadians' contributions to Canada, by recognizing and celebrating them.

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

* * *

• (1655)

NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR THE ERADICATION OF RABIES ACT

Mr. Brendan Hanley (Yukon, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-349, An Act to establish National Rabies Awareness Day and to provide for the development of a national strategy for combating rabies in Canada.

He said: Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise to introduce an act to establish national rabies awareness day and to develop a national strategy for combatting rabies.

Rabies is a much-feared and equally devastating disease for both animals and humans. Though frequently found in certain animal populations around Canada, rabies poses a particular risk in Canada's northern communities. Changing population patterns and the growing movement of people and animals between the north and the south, combined with influences such as climate change, means a continued and changing threat rabies poses to both northern and southern Canadian communities. In many northern communities, the risk of rabies is added to an ever-present risk posed by feral or semi-feral dog populations.

[*Translation*]

Canada's remote and rural northern regions do not have regular access to veterinary services that are taken for granted in some parts of the country. The lack of service in remote communities, coupled with the lack of a coordinated rabies prevention strategy in Canada, poses risks not only for people and pets across the country, but also to livestock. This has serious health and economic implications.

[*English*]

Seconded by my colleague, the hon. member for Thunder Bay—Rainy River, I hope this bill will support debate and action on this important public health issue.

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

* * *

COMBATTING TORTURE AND TERRORISM ACT

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-350, An Act to amend the State Immunity Act, the Criminal Code and the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act.

He said: Madam Speaker, since the House voted five years ago to list the IRGC as a terrorist entity and shut down its operations in Canada, Conservatives have been pushing the Liberal government to actually list the IRGC, but it has not acted.

It is time to bring it home and protect Iranian Canadians and all Canadians from threats and violence from this vile regime. Today, I am tabling a bill that will list the IRGC as a terrorist organization, and goes further to support victims of terrorism, torture and extrajudicial killing.

In addition to listing the IRGC as a terrorist entity, this bill would allow victims of torture and extrajudicial killing by Iran and other designated state sponsors of terror to seek damages. States' involvement in terrorism as well as torture and extrajudicial killing should not be protected from accountability for these actions by the State Immunity Act and, thus, will not be protected if my bill passes.

Routine Proceedings

I know this bill will be welcomed not only by the Iranian community, but also by many other victims of crime. It requires the government to respond within 40 days to a request from a parliamentary committee to list a new entity as a terrorist organization or to list a new state as a state sponsor of terrorism.

The Liberals have had five years. They have failed to stand with victims of crime and with the Iranian community. A Conservative government will bring it home.

I hope this bill, the combatting torture and terrorism act, will become law as soon as possible.

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

* * *

PETITIONS

MYANMAR

Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP): Madam Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of petitioners who draw the attention of this House to the illegitimate military junta in Burma that continues to indiscriminately kill, torture, rape, imprison and displace civilians, particularly through air strikes, causing an increased need for vital humanitarian assistance.

Among other things, they also note that Canada has outlined its own obligations to aid in the Myanmar crisis as reported in “Canada’s strategy to respond to the Rohingya and Myanmar crises (2021 to 2024)”, as well as our commitment under the responsibility to protect principle.

The undersigned call on the Government of Canada on a number of items, including the following: increasing humanitarian aid into Burma; calling on insurance companies to stop providing insurance coverage for deliveries of aviation fuel; imposing sanctions; and promoting ongoing dialogue among pro-democracy and diaspora groups with a view to helping the Burmese people develop an inclusive democracy with full recognition and representation of all ethnic minority communities, including the Rohingya.

• (1700)

RAIL TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Larry Brock (Brantford—Brant, CPC): Madam Speaker, people in Brantford—Brant and across the province have come together to urge the government to address the cancellation of Via Rail Train 82 and take immediate action to reinstate this vital commuter service.

Via Rail plays a crucial role in facilitating transportation for all Canadians. The cancellation of Train 82 has left hundreds of my constituents without a reliable mode of transportation to Toronto before nine in the morning. This decision has not only disrupted the daily lives of commuters who depend on this train line for work, school and appointments, but has forced individuals to face unemployment, creating additional economic hardships for many.

For those affected by this unjustified cancellation, I encourage all to join me for a rally at the Brantford train station this Saturday, June—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Members are to say what is in the petition. It is not for an hon. member to promote an event or to support the petition.

Mr. Larry Brock: Madam Speaker, I will move on with the petition.

People deserve reliable transportation, thus the petitioners call on the Government of Canada to stand up for Canadians engaged with VIA Rail’s management and reinstate Train 82.

[Translation]

MYANMAR

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille (Salaberry—Suroît, BQ): Madam Speaker, because the Burmese people have shown such great courage in the face of the violence perpetrated against them, the Bloc Québécois wants to show its support for them. They continue to hope that their country will be liberated from the military forces subjecting them to an authoritarian regime.

In the interest of protecting democracy and human rights, the Bloc Québécois joins the other opposition parties in tabling this petition.

[English]

EXPANDED POLYSTYRENE

Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am here to table a petition on behalf of many people across British Columbia who are very concerned.

The petitioners are calling upon the Government of Canada to prohibit the use of expanded polystyrene in the marine environment. Foam from marine infrastructure is increasingly a source of pollution on Canadian beaches, and we know that the marine environment can be significantly harmed with this happening. The petitioners are asking for immediate action and hope to see marine life, seafood resources and ecosystems protected.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (London North Centre, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I rise to table a petition today on behalf of constituents who are very passionate on the issues of the environment.

Among other things, the petitioners call on the government to reduce emissions by at least 60% below 2005 levels by 2030 and make significant contributions to emission reductions in countries in the global south. They also call for paying for the transition by increasing taxes on the wealthiest and corporations, and financing through a public national bank.

Those are two points among many. I thank the constituents for their advocacy.

[Translation]

RUSSIA

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L’Érable, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am honoured to present a petition signed by 27 petitioners condemning the heinous acts committed by Russia in its unprovoked war against the people of Ukraine.

The petitioners wish to draw the attention of the House to Russian forces' attacks on Ukrainian civilian targets and the recent attack on the Nova Kakhovka dam, causing a major humanitarian and environmental disaster.

The petitioners call upon the Government of Canada to immediately and publicly designate Russia as a state sponsor of terrorism.

[English]

AIR TRANSPORTATION

Ms. Bonita Zarrillo (Port Moody—Coquitlam, NDP): Madam Speaker, today I bring a petition brought forward from residents of Port Moody—Coquitlam in relation to acquiring necessary data to support changes to commercial flight paths in the Lower Mainland. Nav Canada seeks to consolidate flight paths into new paths that will pass over residential areas with increased air traffic and potential negative health impacts.

Nav Canada states that the consolidated flight paths will enhance efficiency for the airlines and their air traffic controllers. The petitioners say that people will be impacted. The petitioners state that the Nav Canada plans have not undergone independent review by a third party, which would ensure adherence to internationally recognized noise limits recommended by the Government of Canada's committee of transport.

The petitioners ask that the Minister of Transport prepare an independent environmental assessment of the noise and emission impacts of the proposed flight paths, including recommendations for minimizing such impacts prior to the proposed changes taking place. This environmental assessment should be based on the latest global research and recommendations for noise and emissions, which should be limited. This assessment should be independent of Nav Canada and made public when completed.

• (1705)

ACCESSIBLE PARKING

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have a petition to present today, which is signed by roughly 300 Canadians who are calling for a harmonized approach to free parking for the disabled community in Canada. Specifically, they ask the federal government to work with the provinces and territories to make parking free for all accessible parking pass holders nationally.

CARBON PRICING

Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am presenting a petition today on behalf of residents of Kelowna—Lake Country and surrounding area. To be brief, I will mention a couple of points in here. It refers to the fact that the first carbon tax, including sales tax, will add 41¢ to a litre of gas. The second carbon tax, including sales tax, will add 20¢ to a litre of gas. It refers to making life more expensive for Canadians and a cost of living crisis. Implementing a second carbon tax demonstrates how out of touch the Liberal Prime Minister is.

Petitioners are calling on the Government of Canada to have the House recognize the failure of carbon tax 1 and call on the government to immediately cancel carbon tax 2, the clean fuel regulation.

Routine Proceedings

ACCESS TO MIDWIVES

Ms. Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): *Uqaqtittiji*, I am so honoured to rise to present a petition signed by 758 people from Rankin Inlet and surrounding communities in my riding of Nunavut. They are petitioning to raise awareness that there needs to be support and equal access to quality health care and for it to be recognized by the Government of Canada.

Petitioners state that the midwifery and maternal child care in Rankin Inlet is unsustainable and almost absent and it is the right of all Canadians to have equal access to quality health care. Midwives, they say, play a critical role in supporting reproductive rights and health promotion for persons across their lifespan. In addition, midwives provide comprehensive care during pregnancy and delivery for low-risk pregnancies.

Without the consistent midwifery presence, many more pregnancies will be at high risk. Therefore, the petitioners call upon the Government of Canada to support consistent, equitable, sustainable and Inuit-led comprehensive midwifery services in Rankin Inlet.

MYANMAR

Mr. Sameer Zuberi (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Madam Speaker, as a member of the Liberal Party, I am presenting a petition on what is happening in Myanmar, or Burma, and to the Rohingya people. It deals with the illegitimate military junta in Burma and the indiscriminate killing, torture, rape, imprisonment, displacement of civilians and air strikes.

The petitioners are drawing the government's attention to this. The petitioners call upon the Government of Canada to increase humanitarian aid into Burma to support civil society organizations and vulnerable communities. They also call upon the Government of Canada to promote dialogue and pro-democracy groups that promote an inclusive democracy within Burma, or Myanmar, that include ethnic minorities such as Rohingya and others.

BANGLADESH

Mr. Kevin Waugh (Saskatoon—Grasswood, CPC): Madam Speaker, I rise in the House today on behalf of several constituents of mine from Saskatoon—Grasswood and surrounding area. They made a number of points and are concerned about the state of democracy right now in Bangladesh. Therefore, they call upon the House of Commons to take all possible measures to help Bangladesh restore its human rights and democracy and ensure a free, fair and credible next general election.

Routine Proceedings

• (1710)

NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Ms. Lindsay Mathysen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am honoured to rise to present e-petition 4447. This petition calls to address the threat of nuclear destruction and the fact that the doomsday clock has been set at 90 seconds to midnight. The nuclear peril to humanity necessitates the total elimination of nuclear weapons, as required by the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons. This treaty has been ratified by 68 countries and signed by 95 countries, but not yet by Canada. As well, Canada is in part accountable for creating and proliferating nuclear weapons.

These residents from across the country are asking the government to sign and commit to ratifying the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, TPNW, and to send an official delegation to observe the Second Meeting of the States Parties to the TPNW from November 27 to December 1 at the UN in New York.

BEREAVEMENT CARE

Mr. Blake Richards (Banff—Airdrie, CPC): Madam Speaker, I have three petitions to present today.

In the first, the petitioners are calling the attention of Parliament to the fact that it has been over four years since Parliament published “Supporting Families After the Loss of a Child”, yet the government has still not implemented all the recommendations. As a result, families experiencing the loss of a child continue to feel a lack of compassion and support from their government.

I rise today to stand with these petitioners, who are calling on the government to finally implement all seven recommendations in the report, as well as to implement a bereavement benefit for all parents experiencing pregnancy and infant loss.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I would remind the hon. member that he cannot say whether he is in support or not in support; saying that he is standing with the petitioners is showing support. I would just ask members not to do that and to just read what is in the petition.

FIREARMS

Mr. Blake Richards (Banff—Airdrie, CPC): Madam Speaker, my second petition is on behalf of Albertans. The petitioners call on the government to finally recognize the clear difference between vetted, registered, law-abiding owners of legal rifles and firearms and criminals who smuggle guns into Canada, sell and obtain them illegally on the black market, typically for use by street gangs to commit violent crimes.

The petitioners note that the Liberals have failed to register this distinction; otherwise, their public safety measures would include replacing bail with jail for crimes committed with illegal guns as opposed to a costly confiscation of lawful gun owners' legal personal property.

The petitioners call on Parliament to reject the Liberals' gun grab.

CARBON PRICING

Mr. Blake Richards (Banff—Airdrie, CPC): Madam Speaker, my final petition is on behalf of petitioners warning that the Liberal government's promised rebates fail to cover the cost of the carbon

tax on heating and transportation fuel. Not only that, but the average Canadian family is also out-of-pocket nearly \$850 after rebates every year.

With the government set to triple these taxes on hard-working Canadians, these petitioners alert Parliament that the tax burden is becoming unsustainable. They ask members to do right by Canadian families and join with Conservatives to axe the carbon tax.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition from several hundred Canadians, from coast to coast, calling on the Government of Canada to support Motion No. 1 for a made-in-Canada green new deal.

These petitioners raise the concerns around climate change. We have seen the forest fires that have ravaged much of this country, as well as the floods. The petitioners referenced the heat dome that killed 600 people in my region of the Lower Mainland in British Columbia. The petitioners are saying that it has never been more urgent that Canada reduce its greenhouse gas emissions and transition to a low-carbon economy.

The petitioners are also calling for reconciliation with indigenous peoples and the recognition of inherent rights, title and treaty rights, fully implementing UNDRIP. They say that must be at the heart of Canada's approach in addressing the climate emergency.

The petitioners are calling for speedy action. They say that Canada should take bold and rapid action, and that the green new deal is before the Parliament—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I want to remind members to have their phones off.

We have only 10 seconds for—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I suspect, given that it is the last day of this session, you will find unanimous consent to extend Petitions by two minutes to allow additional members to present. There has been an all-party agreement on a petition on Burma. I suspect that for two additional minutes, there would be agreement.

• (1715)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

BURMA

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join colleagues from other parties in presenting a petition regarding the horrific situation in Burma.

The petition is an effort by various Burmese communities and contains a number of asks, including strengthening sanctions, calling on insurance companies to stop providing insurance covering deliveries of aviation fuel to Burma, oil and gas sanctions, support for the opposition, engagement with the opposition groups, and support for pluralistic and inclusive democratic development, including all communities, such as Rohingya.

I am pleased to join members of all parties in this important work and to advocate for the people of Burma and for democracy there.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Michael Kram (Regina—Wascana, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to present two petitions today on behalf of the Pakistani community in Regina and southern Saskatchewan. Petitioners are concerned about the turmoil in Pakistan, given the recent arrest of former Pakistani prime minister Imran Khan.

The first petition calls on the Minister of Foreign Affairs to meet with the Pakistani high commissioner immediately and inform him that it is completely unacceptable for the military regime in Pakistan to intimidate people living in that country based on the activities of their family members living in Canada. This is following multiple reports of such incidents based on social media posts made in Canada that were critical of the Pakistani regime.

ELECTIONS IN PAKISTAN

Mr. Michael Kram (Regina—Wascana, CPC): Madam Speaker, the second petition concerns reports of politically motivated acts of violence against opposition parties in Pakistan in the lead-up to general elections in that country later this year. This petition calls on the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development to study the feasibility of imposing Magnitsky sanctions on members of the Pakistani military who are responsible for these acts.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to present these petitions today in the House of Commons.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons (Senate), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like the House to join me in thanking the incredible pages we have. This is potentially the last day of this cohort, and we will see new pages come in the fall. Through you, Madam Speaker, to all the pages who make this place work behind the scenes and here, we thank them for the incredible work they have done over the last year.

The following questions will be answered today: Nos. 1487, 1488, 1490 to 1494, 1501 to 1505, 1508, 1511 to 1515 and 1521.

[Text]

Question No. 1487—**Mr. Jeremy Patzer:**

With regard to the government's Black-tailed Prairie Dogs recovery program and to the designation of the prairie dog as an endangered species by the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada: (a) what is the population threshold that must be met for the Black-tailed Prairie Dog to no longer be considered an endangered species; (b) when listing the Black-tailed Prairie Dog as an endangered species, does the government consider (i) the large population of Black-tailed

Routine Proceedings

Prairie Dogs outside of Canada, (ii) that southern Saskatchewan is only the northern tip of a much larger and more expansive habitat which runs through the continental United States and down to Mexico; (c) if the government does not take the factors in (b) into account, why not; (d) how much funding was allocated to research and programming for the Black-tailed Prairie Dog recovery program since 2021; (e) what parameters are put in to determine the success of the recovery program; (f) what progress has been made; and (g) has the implementation of the program had any adverse effects on (i) private property in the vicinity of Grasslands National Park, (ii) other wildlife within Grasslands National Park?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to part (a), the black-tailed prairie dog, *Cynomys ludovicianus*, is listed as threatened on schedule 1 of the Species at Risk Act, as recommended by the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada. Its status is based on the threat of increased drought and sylvatic plague, which are expected to cause significant population declines if they occur frequently. Drought is expected to increase in frequency due to a changing climate. Although most of the Canadian population of the species is within Grasslands National Park, it is isolated and has no connectivity between or with other populations, all of which are in the United States. The national recovery of species at risk is determined based on whether population and distribution objectives are met as outlined in federal recovery strategies. The population and distribution objectives can be found in the Recovery Strategy and Action Plan for the Black-tailed Prairie Dog in Canada, found on the following web page: https://wildlife-species.canada.ca/species-risk-registry/virtual_sara/files/plans/Rsap-Btpd-v00-2021Aug-Eng1.pdf

The Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada status assessments are determined by using quantitative criteria that are based on International Union for Conservation of Nature Red List criteria. Reaching a particular population threshold alone will not reduce the level of risk for the black-tailed prairie dog in Canada in part because they are found in a single small area and are isolated from the nearest populations found in the United States, thus the entire Canadian population could be critically impacted by threats.

With regard to part (b), when the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada, which is an arm's length group of experts, assesses species in Canada, it examines neighbouring populations. It considers whether the other population can "rescue" the Canadian population. Rescue can only take place if individuals from the foreign population can join the Canadian one. In this case, the nearest United States black-tailed prairie dog colony was too far away to do so.

Canada applies the Species at Risk Act found at <https://laws.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/s-15.3/> with the goal of maintaining our country's biodiversity, recognizing that the rate at which wildlife disappears from our planet will only be slowed if the world's governments take responsibility for the species within their own borders.

Routine Proceedings

With regard to part (c), yes, the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada and the federal government considered these things before identifying that this species' status under schedule 1 of the Species at Risk Act should be changed from special concern to threatened.

With regard to part (d), from April 1, 2021 to March 31, 2023, approximately \$129,000 was spent.

With regard to part (e), the Recovery Strategy and Action Plan for the Black-tailed Prairie Dog in Canada, posted on the Species at Risk Public Registry, found at <https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/species-risk-public-registry.html> in 2021, identifies the population and distribution objectives that will assist in the recovery of the species, and actions that can be taken to reach these objectives. A report on the progress towards meeting these objectives is required under section 46 of the Species at Risk Act and will be posted on the Species at Risk Registry in 2026.

With regard to part (f), progress towards the recovery of black-tailed prairie dogs within Grasslands National Park, and recovery measures that were implemented from 2016 to 2021, is outlined in the Implementation Report: Multi-species Action Plan for Grasslands National Park, found at https://wildlife-species.canada.ca/species-risk-registry/virtual_sara/files/Rprdi-PnpGnp-v00-2021Dec-Eng.pdf.

With regard to part (g)(i), Parks Canada is unable to comment on any adverse effects on private property in the vicinity of Grasslands National Park, in part because we do not have any information on the distribution or numbers of prairie dogs found outside the national park boundary.

With regard to part (g)(ii), Black-tailed prairie dogs are a keystone species in the prairie ecosystem. Their benefits to the ecosystem are numerous, and include aerating the soil, providing habitat and burrows for other species such as burrowing owls, endangered, and prairie rattlesnake, special concern. Their burrows provide refuge for birds, amphibians and small mammals from predators and extreme seasonal temperatures. Sustainable black-tailed prairie dog populations are also critical, as identified within the Recovery Strategy for the Black-footed Ferret in Canada, as a species that is currently extirpated from Canada, listed as endangered in the United States and classified as endangered by the International Union for Conservation of Nature. Black-tailed prairie dogs are food for predators including coyotes, badgers, golden eagles, ferruginous hawks, and red-tailed hawks. Adverse impacts of black-tailed prairie dogs have not been extensively studied; however, the implementation of dusting colonies on a rotational basis to manage sylvatic plague can have negative impacts on local invertebrate and amphibian communities.

Question No. 1488—**Mr. Jeremy Patzer:**

With regard to the government's response to the decision by the Canadian Society of Transplantation (CST) that recommends to transplant centers and to provincial health transplant programs to deny transplants to individuals who have not received their COVID-19 vaccine: did the Minister of Health or anyone acting on behalf of the government suggest or advise this course of action to the CST or any transplant center and, if so, what are the details, including (i) who provided the suggestion or the advice, (ii) the date, (iii) the summary of suggestion or advice?

Mr. Adam van Koevorden (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and to the Minister of Sport, Lib.): Mr.

Speaker, the National Transplant Consensus Guidance on COVID-19 Vaccine was written by the Canadian Society of Transplantation's transplant infections disease group, reviewed by its ethics committee and endorsed by the board of directors. The Government of Canada was not involved in these guidelines.

The published document National Transplant Consensus Guidance on COVID-19 Vaccine lays out the reasons that patients should be vaccinated against COVID-19 prior to organ transplantation. Many transplant programs had already adopted this policy in principle. By way of the guidelines, the CST formalized the policy, while acknowledging that there may be cases where exemptions should be considered.

These guidelines do not recommend that transplant programs deny organ transplants to individuals who have not been vaccinated against COVID-19.

In Canada, health care is provincially administered, which may contribute to the degree of heterogeneity in ways the guidelines have been applied.

Question No. 1490—**Mr. Warren Steinley:**

With regard to the government's deal with Volkswagen to build a plant in St. Thomas, Ontario, and the Prime Minister's claim that "There were places in the United States that were putting up way, way more money than we put on the table": (a) which specific places was the Prime Minister aware of that made such offers; (b) through what sources did the government become aware of each of such offer; (c) how much more money did each place in (a) offer, broken down by location; (d) for each offer in (c), what non-monetary measures were included with the offer; and (e) what non-monetary measures did the government offer Volkswagen?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada has committed to facilitating the industrial transformation of the automotive sector to a net-zero future and taking the actions needed to remain competitive. The specific details sought were obtained in confidence during commercial negotiations and cannot be disclosed. The PowerCo. investment is a testament to Canada's strong value proposition, including its highly skilled workforce, clean energy, abundance of critical minerals, access to markets, and a flourishing automotive and battery sector.

Question No. 1491—**Mr. Rick Perkins:**

With regard to Fisheries and Oceans Canada's (DFO) enforcement related to elver poaching in Nova Scotia since January 1, 2023: (a) how many individuals have DFO authorities charged or taken other enforcement action against; and (b) what are the details of each incident where an enforcement action was taken, including the (i) date, (ii) description of what occurred, (iii) number of individuals having had an enforcement action taken against them, (iv) location, (v) enforcement action taken, including whether any arrests were made or charges laid, (vi) items that were seized, if applicable?

Routine Proceedings

Mr. Mike Kelloway (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, from January 1 to June 8, fishery officers in Nova Scotia have conducted patrols of known elver harvesting sites across the province that resulted in 68 arrests and the seizure of 122 fyke nets, 104 dip nets and six vehicles. During this time, the abovementioned arrests and seizures were related to fishing without an authorization from Fisheries and Oceans Canada or for fishing contrary to a fisheries management order.

As these matters are under investigation, no further details will be provided at this time.

Question No. 1492—**Mr. Mark Strahl:**

With regard to action planned by the Minister of Transport to lower airline ticket prices and fees to improve the competitiveness of prices of flights departing from Canadian airports in close proximity to the United States: what action, if any, is the minister planning to take and on what date will such action occur?

Hon. Omar Alghabra (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada recognizes that Canadians rely on air transport more than many other countries to conduct business and connect with friends and family. Air transport also provides essential goods and services to regional and remote communities. Air transport in Canada is provided in the context of the country's vastness and thinly distributed population, which make economies of scale more difficult to generate than other jurisdictions such as the United States, particularly with regard to many small, northern or otherwise remote communities.

Due to Canada's geography and the location of some of Canada's major airports, the catchment areas for the large airports sometimes overlap with those of the smaller U.S. airports located close to the border. Large Canadian airports often provide a wider range of services and attract passengers from small U.S. airports, which offer a limited range of services. Overall, some travellers may find it more convenient to cross the border to access certain services depending on the services being offered by the airlines at that airport.

Canada's air carriers and airport authorities are private-sector companies, and, as such, make their own business decisions in order to remain viable and competitive. In Canada, the frequency of flights, the services offered and the prices charged by airlines are determined based on market forces. The government does not regulate air fares, and all airlines are free to set their prices in accordance with their business plans. Other factors contributing to air ticket prices include fluctuating currency rates, fuel prices and interest rates. Federal policy encourages competition between air carriers, which is ultimately the best way to establish a fair price for a service.

Similarly, airports are economically deregulated, and major airports are operated by private, not-for-profit airport authorities that are solely responsible for the operation, management and development of their airports, and that includes setting the fees that enable them to recover their costs. Like the rest of the industry, airport fees are economically deregulated. The federal government does not set or control the fees airports charge. The same applies to Nav Canada, the private corporation that provides air navigation services in Canada. It charges airlines for its services on a per flight basis, and Nav Canada's fees are also not subject to government controls.

Nevertheless, the government has introduced and will continue to introduce legislation and regulations that promote a healthy and competitive air sector. More specifically, the Transportation Modernization Act encouraged increased competition in the Canadian market by, among other things, allowing more foreign investment in Canadian air carriers. This measure should have positive impacts on competition and, ultimately, the prices paid by Canadian travellers. In addition, there are more ultra-low-cost carriers now than before the pandemic, which will provide Canadians with more low-cost options.

The government also supported the air carriers through the COVID-19 pandemic, to ensure that services remain available to Canadians. While some large air carriers availed themselves of financial assistance under the large employer emergency financing facility, the government also provided funding to ensure continuity of essential air access to remote communities through bilateral agreements with provinces and territories under the remote air service program, which supported the provision of essential levels of air services to remote communities and complemented existing funding mechanisms for air carriers. The regional air transportation initiative was also created as part of Canada's COVID-19 economic response plan to provide support over two years to eligible regional businesses, including air carriers that directly contribute to regional air transportation, and was designed to help ensure that regional air connectivity and services, which are critical to economic growth, are maintained and that regional routes are reconnected across the country. Finally, air carriers were also able to avail themselves of programs of general application such as the Canada emergency wage subsidy.

Please be reassured that Transport Canada continues to work with a range of air industry participants, the organizations that represent them and other government departments to assess appropriate options to support Canada's air transport sector generally, thereby ensuring that Canadians have the services they need at a reasonable cost.

Question No. 1493—**Ms. Bonita Zarrillo:**

With regard to the Order Amending Schedules 2 and 3 of the Tobacco and Vaping Products Act, published in the Canada Gazette, Part I, Volume 155, Number 25: (a) has the consultation period length to receive feedback on the proposed regulations ended; (b) what is the timeline for the government to decide on final regulations for flavoured vaping products; and (c) is the government still committed to reducing youth vaping rates through a targeted ban on flavours, including mint and menthol, that appeal to youth?

Mrs. Élisabeth Brière (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Mental Health and Addictions and Associate Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the consultation period for the proposed order closed on September 2, 2021. Health Canada received over 25,000 submissions and continues to assess the input it received from Canadians.

Routine Proceedings

The Government of Canada remains committed to preventing youth vaping and has taken a number of measures to that effect. The Tobacco and Vaping Products Act, TVPA, prohibits the sale of vaping products to young persons and bans advertising that could be appealing to young persons. The TVPA also contains certain restrictions with regard to flavours to help protect young persons from enticement to use vaping products. Confectionery, dessert, cannabis, soft drink and energy drink are flavours that cannot be promoted or sold in relation to vaping products labelling, promotion or packaging.

Three sets of regulations came into effect between 2020 and 2021, the vaping product labelling and packaging regulations, the nicotine concentration in vaping products regulations and the vaping products promotion regulations. The labelling and packaging regulations require a standardized nicotine concentration statement and a health warning about the addictiveness of nicotine as well as a toxicity warning. The nicotine concentration regulations cap nicotine at 20 mg/mL of liquid. The vaping promotion regulations prohibit advertising and display of vaping products at retail locations, including online, that can be seen by youth.

Health Canada continues its efforts to improve compliance with TVPA provisions on youth access to vaping products and promotions. In fiscal year 2022-23, for example, these efforts included inspecting 1,180 vaping product retailers and seizing non-compliant products at 177 establishments; and conducting inspections of 255 online vaping product retailers and issuing 230 warning letters.

With respect to public education, Health Canada has invested more than \$14 million to date in its “consider the consequences of vaping” campaign, which seeks to inform youth and their parents about the risks and harm associated with vaping. The campaign includes traditional and online advertising, as well as interactive learning tours in schools.

Finally, a new federal excise duty on vaping products came into effect on October 1, 2022. Health Canada is committed to working closely with the Department of Finance to ensure that Canada’s product taxation policy is consistent with the government’s health objectives. The Government of Canada will monitor the impacts of the excise duty to ensure its intended benefits are being achieved.

Protecting the health and safety of youth is a top priority.

Question No. 1494—**Ms. Bonita Zarrillo:**

With regard to the Skills for Success Program launched in May 2021, broken down by funding stream: (a) what are the details of all applications that have received funding, including the (i) name of the applicant, (ii) amount received, (iii) under-represented labour group represented; (b) on what dates were applicants informed of whether they were approved for funding; and (c) what metrics does the government use to measure the literacy, numeracy, and digital skills targeted through the program?

Mr. Irek Kusmierczyk (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Disability Inclusion, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, ESDC reviewed all grants and contribution programs by conducting data searches within the common system for grants and contributions, CSGC, as well as through conducting internal consultations.

With regard to part (a), the skills for success, SFS, program launched a new model in May 2021. Following this, the department

developed an investment strategy that included five investment approaches: the expansion of some existing projects; the funding of 12 unsolicited proposals that met the objectives of the program; a solicited call for organizations that was launched in 2021; a solicited call for provinces and territories that was launched in 2021; and a call for proposals, CFP, that was launched in January and closed in March 2022. The first three of the intake approaches are complete and all projects stemming from those approaches are now advancing. Funding decisions for the final two approaches are being finalized, i.e., projects are still being assessed. Therefore, a full list of applications that have received funding with additional details cannot yet be provided.

With regard to part (b), on the CFP specifically, funding decisions are being communicated at varying times, depending on whether proposals sought to support persons with disabilities, racialized Canadians or Canadians from one or more of the other identified underserved groups. As a result, some organizations have received a funding decision under the training and tools or research and innovation streams of the CFP; however, final notifications are expected to be fully confirmed by early summer 2023.

With regard to part (c), the SFS program uses the Programme for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies survey data results to help guide policy direction for the program. This survey includes measures of literacy, numeracy and problem solving in technology-rich environments on a scale of 1 to 5.

Question No. 1501—**Ms. Lori Idlout:**

With regard to the re-negotiated terms and conditions of the Canadian North and First Air merger announced on April 21, 2023: (a) what is the current average passenger load for each route over the last six months; (b) what were the average annual fares for each route (i) at the time the merger was approved, (ii) as of May 3, 2023; and (c) how will the government protect passengers from rate increases for airfare and cargo rates?

Hon. Omar Alghabra (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to parts (a) and (b), the requested information is confidential due to its commercial nature.

With regard to part (c), as per the new agreement, Canadian North must limit average annual regional fare increases for both passenger and cargo transportation to 25% per region within a calendar year unless it can be demonstrated to the Minister of Transport that this limit would result in operational losses to the company. Further, the 10% profit cap on all scheduled passenger and cargo activities will in essence constrain the company’s ability to increase its fares and adherence to this cap will be monitored on an annual basis. These conditions will be in place for the next three years.

Routine Proceedings

Additionally, Transport Canada will be retaining an independent monitor to report directly to the Minister of Transport on a quarterly basis ensuring that the airline is meeting its obligations. Furthermore, should the airline not be meeting its obligations under the new terms and conditions and unwilling to adjust its behaviour to become compliant, there are measures under the Canada Transportation Act, which can be fines of up to \$10 million.

Question No. 1502—Ms. Lori Idlout:

With regard to the Airports Capital Assistance Program and other investments meant to improve the safety of passengers and assets of airports in the Yukon, the Northwest Territories, and Nunavut, since 2015: (a) what are the details of all projects that have received funding, broken down by fiscal year; (b) how many applications related to paving gravel runways were received for funding; and (c) of the applications in (b), which applications received funding?

Hon. Omar Alhabra (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to part (a), under the airports capital assistance program, 39 projects have received funding in Nunavut, the Northwest Territories, and Yukon since 2015. The total value of these projects was \$73.7 million. Any grants or contributions awarded are reported to Canadians through the federal proactive disclosure process, which can be accessed at the following web page: <https://open.canada.ca/proactive-disclosure>.

With regard to parts (b) and (c), no applications were received for paving gravel runways. Under the terms and conditions of the airports capital assistance program, gravel runways are eligible for funding to support the rehabilitation of gravel surfaces. However, this does not include paving gravel runways with asphalt.

Question No. 1503—Ms. Lori Idlout:

With regard to the Canadian North and First air merger approved by the Minister of Transport in June 2019: (a) did the government identify any compliance issues with the original terms and conditions of the merger; (b) what are the details or all identified compliance issues identified by the government; (c) what are the details of all meetings undertaken to discuss compliance measures, including the (i) date of the meeting, (ii) attendees, (iii) compliance measures discussed?

Hon. Omar Alhabra (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to part (a), no compliance issues were identified. However, it should be noted that Canadian North was exempt from its scheduling obligations from the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, April 2020, to the implementation of the new terms and conditions, April 2023.

With regard to part (b), there were no compliance issues identified by Transport Canada.

With regard to part (c), there were no meetings to discuss compliance measures as the airline was never in breach of its commitments.

Question No. 1504—Mr. Richard Cannings:

With regard to the commitment to lowering credit card transaction fees for small and medium-sized businesses in budget 2023: (a) on what date will the details of this commitment be released; (b) what is the total number of meetings the government has had with Visa and Mastercard related to the measures announced; and (c) does the government intend to introduce lower transaction fees for other payment options, including American Express or Interac?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in budget 2023, the government announced that it had secured agreements with Visa and Mastercard to lower credit card transaction fees for small businesses, while also protecting reward points for Canadian consumers offered by

Canada's large banks, fulfilling commitments expressed in budget 2021, budget 2022 and the 2022 fall economic statement.

The government announced further details on the agreements on May 18, including the eligibility criteria for receiving lower rates with each network.

For qualifying small businesses, Visa and Mastercard have agreed to reduce domestic consumer credit interchange fees for in-store transactions to an annual weighted average interchange rate of 0.95%; reduce domestic consumer credit interchange fees for online transactions by 10 basis points, resulting in reductions of up to 7%; and provide free access to online fraud and cybersecurity resources to help small businesses grow their online sales while preventing fraud and charge-backs.

Small businesses will qualify with each credit card network individually. Specifically, small businesses with annual Visa sales volume below \$300,000 will qualify for the lower interchange fees from Visa, and those with annual Mastercard sales volume below \$175,000 will qualify for the lower fees from Mastercard.

It is estimated that more than 90% of credit card-accepting businesses in Canada will qualify for lower rates and see their interchange fees reduced by up to 27% from the existing weighted average rate.

In working towards the agreements, the government engaged with the credit card industry and businesses through a combination of in-person and virtual meetings, calls, and other exchanges. The comprehensive engagement approach included several touchpoints with small and medium-sized business groups, credit card networks, financial institutions and their industry association, acquirers, payment processors and external reward programs.

The government expects other credit card companies, such as American Express, to take similar actions to lower fees for small businesses.

Interac is a low-cost debit network and does not facilitate credit card transactions.

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 1505—Mrs. Tracy Gray:**

With regard to the Skills for Success Program: (a) how many organizations applied to the program prior to the closing date, broken down by stream; (b) what was the total value of funding requests received, broken down by stream; (c) what is the breakdown of (a) and (b) by province or territory; (d) how many organizations have been approved for the program, broken down by organization type; (e) what was the dollar value of the funding (i) approved, (ii) transferred to the recipient, as of May 5, 2023; (f) what is the breakdown of (d) and (e) by province or territory; (g) how many approved organizations have already received funding through the program; (h) what are the details of all projects and entities funded through the program, including, for each, the (i) recipient name, (ii) location, (iii) amount of funding approved, (iv) amount of funding delivered, (v) project description, (vi) start date of the project; and (i) have any third parties outside of Employment and Social Development Canada been given any responsibilities related to the application process or administration of the program, and, if so, what are the details, including, for each, the (i) name of the entity, (ii) summary of the mandate or work assigned, (iii) amount of financial compensation provided by the government?

Mr. Irek Kusmierczyk (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Disability Inclusion, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, ESDC reviewed all grants and contributions within the skills for success program by conducting data searches within the common system for grants and contributions, CSGC, as well as conducting internal consultations.

The skills for success, SFS, program was launched in May 2021. The department developed an investment strategy that included five investment approaches: expansion of some existing projects; funding of 12 unsolicited proposals that met the objectives of the program; solicited call for organizations that was launched in 2021; solicited call for provinces and territories that was launched in 2021; and call for proposals that was launched in January 2022 and closed in March 2022.

The first three of the investment approaches are complete and all projects stemming from those approaches are now advancing. Funding decisions for the final two approaches are being finalized, i.e., projects are still being assessed. It has been assumed that the questions relate specifically to the call for proposals, therefore, a full list of applications to respond to parts (d) to (h) cannot yet be provided. Final funding decisions are expected to be confirmed by early summer 2023.

With regard to part (a), under the skills for success 2021 call for proposals, approximately 433 applications were received for stream 1, tools and training stream; and 120 applications were received for the stream 2, research and innovation stream.

With regard to part (b), under the skills for success 2021 call for proposals, approximately \$904,092,567 was requested under stream 1, tools and training stream, adult learning literacy and essential skills program, skills for success, contribution; and \$197,652,753 was requested under stream 2, research and innovation, national essential skills initiative, skills for success, employment insurance, EI, part II.

With regard to part (c), under the skills for success 2021 call for proposals, please note the following. The following funding was requested under stream 1, tools and training, adult learning literacy and essential skills program, skills for success, contribution: Alberta: \$0; Newfoundland and Labrador: \$23,360,911; Nova Scotia: \$27,431,518; Prince Edward Island: \$5,420,630; New Brunswick: \$26,362,514; Quebec: \$51,788,867; Ontario: \$432,564,687; Manitoba: \$35,862,467;

Saskatchewan: \$25,038,378; Alberta: \$137,992,934; British Columbia: \$116,716,438; Northwest Territories: \$19,776,998; Yukon Territory: \$1,566,225; and Nunavut: \$210,000.

The following funding was requested under stream 2, research and innovation, national essential skills initiative, skills for success, EI, part II: Newfoundland and Labrador: \$1,974,762; Nova Scotia: \$4,697,655; Prince Edward Island: \$755,111; New Brunswick: \$2,362,673; Quebec: \$7,562,772; Ontario: \$112,304,390; Manitoba: \$5,205,579; Saskatchewan: \$8,147,682; Alberta: \$32,978,421; British Columbia: \$18,636,406; and Northwest Territories: \$3,063,302.

With regard to part (i), no third parties, outside of ESDC, have been given any responsibilities for the skills for success program related to the application process or administration of the program.

Question No. 1508—Mrs. Rachael Thomas:

With regard to the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC): what are the details and dates of all actions taken by the CRTC related to the implementation of measures contained in Bill C-11, An Act to amend the Broadcasting Act and to make related and consequential amendments to other Acts?

Mr. Chris Bittle (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, all details and dates of all actions taken by the CRTC related to the implementation of measures contained in Bill C-11 can be found here at the following web page: Regulatory Plan to modernize Canada's broadcasting system | CRTC.

Question No. 1511—Mr. Damien C. Kurek:

With regard to government information on the impact of windmills on wildlife: (a) how many (i) birds, (ii) other animals, does the government estimate were killed in Canada from windmills in the last five years, broken down by species; and (b) what impact analysis has Environment Canada conducted on (i) wildlife habitat, (ii) migration patterns, and what were the findings?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to part (a), Environment and Climate Change Canada, ECCC, scientists have participated in a number of studies on the impacts of wind turbines on wildlife in Canada. In 2013, the journal *Avian Conservation and Ecology* published a special feature called "Quantifying Human-related Mortality of Birds in Canada". This included nine research papers evaluating the impact of various sources of mortality to birds, together with an introductory overview and a synthesis paper.

A paper in that issue by Zimmerling et al., 2013, studied the impact of wind turbines on birds. They estimated an average of 8.2 birds were killed per turbine per year after correcting for the number of carcasses that would be missed by searchers. Based on 2,955 turbines installed by the end of 2011, they estimated 23,300 birds killed per year across Canada.

Routine Proceedings

Based on data from the Canadian Wind Energy Association, CANWEA, website, by the end of 2022, the installed wind capacity in Canada had increased to about 15,000 megawatts. Assuming average wind turbines are now 2-3 megawatts, this corresponds to about 5,000-7,500 turbines. Thus, if mortality rates remain similar, the number of birds killed would now be estimated at about 62,000 per year.

This number is much lower than the number of birds estimated by Calvert et al., 2013, to be killed by other human-related sources such as 200 million birds per year by domestic and feral cats, 25 million birds per year by power transmission lines, 22 million birds per year by collisions with windows in residential houses and 14 million birds per year by collisions with vehicles.

With regard to part (a)(i), Zimmerling et al., 2013, also reported data on the species composition of birds killed at wind turbines in Canada, based on available data from carcass searches. The most frequently reported species were Horned Lark, Golden-crowned Kinglet, Red-eyed Vireo, European Starling, and Tree Swallow all of which are abundant species in Canada. There was no evidence that mortality rates for any species were high enough to cause population-level impacts.

With regard to part (a)(ii), in a separate study, Zimmerling and Francis, 2016, estimated the impact of wind turbines in Canada on bats. They estimated an average of 15.5 bats killed per turbine representing about 47,000 bats per year in 2013. If mortality rates remain similar now, that would now represent 75,000-116,000 bats per year based on an estimate of 5,000-7,500 turbines. Most of this mortality occurred for only four species: Hoary Bat, 34%, Silver-haired Bat, 25%, Eastern Red Bat, 15%, and Little Brown Myotis, 13%.

There is growing evidence that mortality rates of bats due to wind turbines may be high enough to be causing population declines. Davy et al., 2020, found evidence of declines in populations of some migratory bat species in Ontario. The Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada, COSEWIC, recently recommended that Hoary Bat, Red Bat and Silver-haired Bat should all be listed as endangered under the Species at Risk Act. The reason for designation indicated that populations were declining by more than 50% over three generations, with the major threat the high risk of mortality at wind energy facilities. Please see the following web page: <https://www.cosewic.ca/index.php/en-ca/assessment-process/detailed-version-may-2023.html>. Portions of the populations of all three species migrate from Canada to the southern United States so they would be exposed to risk of mortality at wind turbines in both countries.

With regard to part (b)(i), ECCC has only participated in limited studies on the impact of wind turbines on wildlife habitat. Zimmerling et al., 2013, estimated habitat loss from wind turbines at about 1.2 hectares per turbine. Extrapolated to the current number of turbines, this would suggest a loss of 6,000-9,000 hectares of wildlife habitat based on estimated number of turbines in 2022. However, this study did not consider habitat loss that may be associated with new roads or transmission lines for turbines installed in remote areas, and data are not currently available on those potential impacts.

With regard to part (b)(ii), ECCC has not undertaken any studies on changes to migration patterns as a result of wind turbines.

Please see the following references: Calvert, A. M., C. A. Bishop, R. D. Elliot, E. A. Krebs, T. M. Kydd, C. S. Machtans, and G. J. Robertson. 2013. A synthesis of human-related avian mortality in Canada. *Avian Conservation and Ecology* 8(2): 11.

Davy, C.M., K. Squires, and J.R. Zimmerling. 2020. Estimation of spatiotemporal trends in bat abundance from mortality data collected at wind turbines. *Conservation Biology* 35:227-238.

Zimmerling, J. R., A. C. Pomeroy, M. V. d'Entremont, and C. M. Francis. 2013. Canadian estimate of bird mortality due to collisions and direct habitat loss associated with wind turbine developments. *Avian Conservation and Ecology* 8(2): 10.

Zimmerling, J. R. & C. M. Francis. 2016. Bat mortality due to wind turbines in Canada. *Journal of Wildlife Management*, 80: 1360-1369.

Question No. 1512—**Mr. Dan Mazier:**

With regard to the response by Parks Canada to the results of water samples received on January 23, 2023, indicating the presence of environmental DNA from zebra mussels in Clear Lake at Riding Mountain National Park: (a) what external suppliers, contractors, consultants were contracted by Parks Canada in relation to the response, and what are the details of each such contract, including the (i) date, (ii) amount, (iii) vendor, (iv) goods or services provided, including the type of information or advice provided, if applicable; (b) for each consultant or advisor contracted by Parks Canada in relation to this matter, what advice, recommendations, or results did the government receive; (c) who has the government consulted with on the future use of Clear Lake since the results were received; (d) which individuals and organizations were invited to Parks Canada's aquatic invasive species information meeting, held on April 24, 2023, in the Riding Mountain National Park Visitor Centre; (e) how many consultations did Parks Canada host on the future use of Clear Lake that were open to the general public prior to May 5, 2023, including, for each meeting, (i) the date, (ii) the location (iii) how the public was notified, (iv) the date the public was notified; and (f) what are the details of all decisions made by Parks Canada on the future use of the lake since the results were received, including, for each decision, the (i) date of the decision, (ii) decision, (iii) summary of terms, (iv) date the decision was published?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to part (a), Parks Canada did not contract suppliers or consultants related to Q-1512.

With regard to part (b), Parks Canada did not contract consultants related to Q-1512.

Routine Proceedings

With regard to part (c), Under the Canada National Parks Act, the superintendent has authority over decisions related to use of Clear Lake. While a consultation process was not required, in recognition of the high public interest and potential implications to partners and stakeholders that decisions around seasonal operations at Clear Lake could have, the park undertook an engagement process with key stakeholders including: first nations partners from the Keeseekoowenin Ojibway First Nation and the Coalition of First Nations with interests in Riding Mountain National Park, including leadership and band members; the local member of Parliament; provincial members of the Legislative Assembly; reeves and council representatives from local municipal governments; other federal and provincial departments and ministries; watershed districts; local business owners and chambers of commerce; cottage and cabin owners; provincial and local tourism industry representatives; environmental non-governmental organizations; volunteer groups; boaters; anglers; paddlers; and private citizens.

With regard to part (d), individuals and organizations invited to Parks Canada's aquatic invasive species, AIS, information session on April 24, 2023 were the following: Coalition of First Nations with Interests in Riding Mountain National Park; Rural Municipality of Harrison-Park; Rural Municipality of Clanwilliam-Erickson; Clear Lake Cottage Owners Association; Clear Lake Cabin Owners Association; Clear Lake Country Destination Enrichment (Marketing) Organization; Clear Lake Marina operator; Wasagaming Chamber of Commerce; Erickson and District Chamber of Commerce; Travel Manitoba; Riding Mountain National Park Biosphere Reserve; Nature Conservancy of Canada; Friends of Riding Mountain National Park; former MP for Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa, Robert Sopuck; Sandy Lake AIS Volunteer Program; Assiniboine West Watershed District; Camp Wannacumbac; and Elkhorn Resort and Spa.

With regard to part (e), three stakeholder engagement meetings were held: February 22, 2023; March 14, 2023; and April 24, 2023, at Riding Mountain National Park Visitor Centre, Wasagaming Townsite. Organizations were asked to share with their networks. The public was able to attend. The date the public was notified depended on when the organizations shared the information.

With regard to part (f)(i), discussions on potential enhancements to the aquatic invasive species program began when the eDNA results were received in January 2023. The decision to implement the enhanced program was formalized in late April, after consultations with indigenous partners, stakeholders and the public.

With regard to part (f)(ii), implementation of enhancements to the existing aquatic invasive species monitoring program, which consisted of boat and trailer inspections and a decontamination program prior to launching in Clear Lake. Additional measures in place for 2023 will include a tag process for trailered boats to lower the risk of transporting zebra mussels from other water bodies.

With regard to part (f)(iii), implementation of an enhanced aquatic invasive species program to include a tag process for trailered boats. Program enhancements are temporary. Permanent changes to the aquatic invasive species prevention program will be subject to further engagement.

With regard to part (f)(iv), interim measures for 2023 were communicated to local MPs, MLAs and municipal leaders on May 5, with information shared widely on social media on May 5 and 6.

Question No. 1513—**Mr. Michael Kram:**

With regard to the advance purchase agreement, reached between the government and Medicago on November 13, 2020, for the vaccine approved by Health Canada on February 24, 2022: what are the government's reasons for not purchasing this vaccine?

Mr. Adam van Koeverden (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and to the Minister of Sport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on November 13, 2020, Public Services and Procurement Canada signed an advance purchase agreement, APA, with Medicago for the supply of 20 million firm doses, with options for up to an additional 56 million doses of its COVID-19 vaccine.

While Medicago's COVID-19 vaccine was approved in Canada in February 2022, due to unanticipated manufacturing issues, Medicago was not able to market any lots of its COVID19 vaccine for commercial use.

On February 2, 2023, Mitsubishi Chemical Group announced its decision to cease all Medicago operations due to lack of global demand for COVID-19 vaccines and delayed production at scale as purchasers now expect bivalent vaccines. The Government of Canada is working together with Medicago to conclude Canada's APA while protecting Canada's interests.

Question No. 1514—**Mr. Michael Kram:**

With regard to the advance purchase agreement, reached between the government and Johnson and Johnson on November 30, 2020, for the vaccine approved by Health Canada on March 5, 2021: what are the government's reasons for discontinuing the purchase of more vaccines from Johnson and Johnson after purchasing 9.98 million doses?

Mr. Adam van Koeverden (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and to the Minister of Sport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when the pandemic started, it was not known which vaccines would be successful or when they would be available. Experts therefore advised Canada to secure many different types of vaccines. To secure fast access to vaccines for everyone in the country, Canada set up advance purchase agreements, APAs, with seven manufacturers: Moderna, Novavax, Medicago, Pfizer-BioNTech, Sanofi and GlaxoSmithKline, Johnson & Johnson (Janssen), and AstraZeneca.

Routine Proceedings

To date, Canada has received over 164 million COVID-19 vaccine doses. Over 98 million doses have been administered, including 24,000 doses of Johnson & Johnson's vaccine. Most of the Johnson & Johnson doses were administered to individuals with a preference for the Johnson & Johnson vaccine and/or with a contraindication to other types of vaccine. In April 2021, the National Advisory Committee on Immunization, NACI, issued a preferential recommendation that a complete series with an mRNA COVID-19 vaccine, i.e., Pfizer-BioNTech or Moderna's COVID-19 vaccines, should be offered to individuals in the authorized age group without contraindications to the vaccine, while a viral vector COVID-19 vaccine, i.e., AstraZeneca or Johnson & Johnson's COVID-19 vaccines, may be offered to individuals in the authorized age group without contraindications to the vaccine to initiate a series when other authorized COVID-19 vaccines are contraindicated or inaccessible.

Given NACI's preferential recommendation for mRNA vaccines, the adequate supply of mRNA vaccines available in Canada, and a lack of demand from provinces and territories for viral vector vaccines, Canada has terminated its APA with Johnson & Johnson. A small reserve of frozen Johnson & Johnson vaccine continues to be held in inventory in Canada, should it be needed.

Question No. 1515—Mr. Michael Kram:

With regard to the advance purchase agreement, reached between the government and AstraZeneca on November 21, 2020, for the vaccine authorized by Health Canada on February 26, 2021: after purchasing 20 million doses, what are the government's reasons for discontinuing the purchase of more vaccines from AstraZeneca?

Mr. Adam van Koevorden (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and to the Minister of Sport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when the pandemic started, it was not known which vaccines would be successful or when they would be available. Experts therefore advised Canada to secure many different types of vaccines. To secure fast access to vaccines for everyone in the country, Canada set up advance purchase agreements, APAs, with seven manufacturers: Moderna, Novavax, Medicago, Pfizer-BioNTech, Sanofi and GlaxoSmithKline, Johnson & Johnson (Janssen), and AstraZeneca.

To date, Canada has received over 164 million COVID-19 vaccine doses. Over 98 million doses have been administered, including approximately 2.8 million doses of AstraZeneca's vaccine. Most of the AstraZeneca doses were administered early in the pandemic, when vaccine supply was limited, or to individuals with a preference for the AstraZeneca vaccine and/or with a contraindication to other types of vaccine. In April 2021, the National Advisory Committee on Immunization, NACI, issued a preferential recommendation that a complete series with an mRNA COVID-19 vaccine, i.e., Pfizer-BioNTech or Moderna's COVID-19 vaccines, should be offered to individuals in the authorized age group without contraindications to the vaccine, while a viral vector COVID-19 vaccine, i.e., AstraZeneca or Johnson & Johnson's COVID-19 vaccines, may be offered to individuals in the authorized age group without contraindications to the vaccine to initiate a series when other authorized COVID-19 vaccines are contraindicated or inaccessible.

Given NACI's preferential recommendation for mRNA vaccines, the adequate supply of mRNA vaccines available in Canada, and a

lack of demand from provinces and territories for viral vector vaccines, Canada has terminated its APA with AstraZeneca.

Question No. 1521—Ms. Lianne Rood:

With regard to the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership (CPTPP): (a) what measurable goals are projected to be obtained at the onset of this agreement; (b) what is the projected benefit from this agreement to the Canadian economy within the next five years; and (c) does the CPTPP conform with the World Trade Organization rules?

Mr. Arif Virani (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade, Export Promotion, Small Business and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the following reflects a consolidated response approved on behalf of Global Affairs Canada ministers.

With regard to part (a), the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership, CPTPP, has been in force since 2018, and has now been ratified by all original 11 signatories, with Brunei Darussalam most recently notifying on May 14, 2023. It is an ambitious and high standard agreement that strengthens the rules-based international trading system. By eliminating tariffs and creating consistent and transparent rules and procedures for doing business, the CPTPP will generate long-term GDP gains for Canada.

These benefits are already being realized by Canadian businesses. In the fifth year since entry into force, total merchandise trade between Canada and all CPTPP partners was \$123.6 billion in 2022, growing by 26.1% as compared to 2018. These results are significantly higher than the gains that were projected under the economic impact assessment, EIA, that was conducted by the Government of Canada based on the negotiated outcomes of the CPTPP, which projected Canada's exports to other CPTPP countries to increase by only 4.2%. Canada's merchandise exports to CPTPP partners reached a record high of \$37.5 billion, rising by 31.1% in 2022, as compared to 2018. Canadian merchandise imports also experienced strong growth over this period, rising 24.1% to reach \$86.1 billion in 2022. In 2022, Canada merchandise exports to Japan, a market that Canadian businesses gained preferential access to under the CPTPP, reached \$18.0 billion, rising 38.8% compared to 2018. This is significantly greater than the 8.6% increase projected under the EIA. Further, in 2022, agricultural goods led Canada's top exports to Japan at \$5.4 billion, representing an 18.8% increase over 2018. Japan is the third-largest export destination for Canadian agriculture and agri-food products after the United States and China.

Routine Proceedings

With regard to part (b), the CPTPP is expected to continue having a positive impact on the Canadian economy in the next five years and beyond, especially as it enters into force for all original signatories. With the recent conclusion of negotiations for the United Kingdom's accession to the CPTPP and six other economies having applied for accession, the CPTPP has a high growth potential. Accessions will expand the benefits of the CPTPP that could lead to new investment and export opportunities for Canada. Accessions provide an efficient path for securing preferential access to new markets or enhanced access to markets already covered by Canadian FTAs. Further, accessions will expand the single set of rules between Canada, CPTPP members and accession candidates, making trade more predictable, transparent and accessible for Canadian businesses.

With regard to part (c), the CPTPP, like all of Canada's free trade agreements, conforms with the World Trade Organization, WTO, rules. The three WTO agreements cover goods, services and intellectual property. The WTO General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, GATT, and General Agreement on Trade in Services, GATS, were established with the objectives of creating a credible and reliable system of international trade rules; ensuring fair and equitable treatment of all participants, principle of non-discrimination; stimulating economic activity through guaranteed policy bindings; and promoting trade and development through progressive liberalization by elimination of discriminatory measures and/or prohibition of new discriminatory measures. The CPTPP incorporates the requirements of GATS and GATT throughout the text of the agreement, including in article 1.1, which establishes that the CPTPP is "consistent with Article XXIV of [General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade] GATT 1994 and Article V of [General Agreement on Trade in Services] GATS."

The WTO agreement on intellectual property, Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, TRIPS, plays a critical role in facilitating trade in knowledge and creativity, in resolving trade disputes over intellectual property, and in recognizing the significant links between intellectual property and trade. The CPTPP incorporates the TRIPS agreement throughout the Intellectual Property chapter.

The CPTPP was reviewed by the WTO committee on regional trade agreements, CRTA, on June 21, 2021. The WTO CRTA considers individual regional agreements, is mandated to hold discussions on the systemic implications of the agreements for the multi-lateral trading system and undertakes to assess the compatibility of individual trade agreements with WTO provisions. WTO members submitted multiple questions to CPTPP parties regarding CPTPP provisions. No members objected to the CPTPP's compliance with the WTO rules.

* * *

[English]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons (Senate), Lib.): Madam Speaker, if a revised response to Question No. 505, originally tabled on June 13, 2022, and the government's responses to Questions Nos. 1484, 1486, 1489, 1498, 1500, 1506, 1507, 1509,

1510, 1516 to 1520 and 1522 could be made orders for return, these returns would be tabled immediately.

[Translation]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Is it the pleasure of the House that the aforementioned questions be made orders for returns and that they be tabled immediately?

An hon. member: Agreed.

[Text]

Question No. 505—**Mr. Mike Lake:**

With regard to ongoing or planned government IT projects with a budget over \$1 million: what are the details of each project, including the (i) project description and summary, (ii) total budget, (iii) estimated completion date?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1484—**Mr. John Brassard:**

With regard to the purchase of promotional products since January 1, 2021, broken down by department, agency or Crown corporation: (a) what products were purchased; (b) what quantity of each product was purchased; (c) what was the amount spent; (d) what was the price per unit; (e) if the products were purchased in relation to a specific event, what are the details of the event; (f) in what country was each product manufactured; and (g) what is the relevant file number for each purchase?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1485—**Mrs. Tracy Gray:**

With regard to government advertising expenditures with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC): (a) how much did each department, agency or other government entity spend on advertising with the CBC, in each of the last five fiscal years, including 2022-23; and (b) what is the breakdown of (a) by campaign and location, or type of advertising (CBC television, CBC Gem, CBC website, etc.)?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1486—**Mr. Blake Richards:**

With regard to land owned by the Department of National Defence or the Canadian Armed Forces which is currently not being used: what are the details of each location, including the (i) size of the land, (ii) geographic location, including the municipality or the proximity to the nearest municipality, (iii) future usage, if known?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1489—**Mr. Warren Steinley:**

With regard to repayable loans and repayable contributions over \$1,000,000 given out by the government since January 1, 2019: what are the details of all such loans and contributions, including the (i) date of the loan or the contribution, (ii) recipient's details, including the name and the location, (iii) amount provided, (iv) amount repaid to date, (v) description of the project or the purpose of the loan or the contribution, (vi) program under which the loan or the contribution was administered?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 1498—Mr. Scott Aitchison:**

With regard to buildings and office space owned or leased by the government, excluding the Department of National Defence: (a) how much office space, by square footage, is currently (i) owned, (ii) leased; (b) how much did the government pay to lease office space during the last fiscal year; (c) what are the annual operating costs to run government buildings and office space, broken down by type of cost (energy, building management, etc.); and (d) what is the breakdown of (a) by province or territory and municipality?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1500—Mr. Larry Maguire:

With regard to government information on digital assets and the Web3 sector in Canada: (a) what portion of the gross domestic product does the government estimate to be related to the Web3 sector; (b) how many jobs are tied to the Web3 sector; (c) what analysis or economic studies has the government done related to the size and scope of the Web3 sector since 2016, and what are the details, including, for each, the (i) firm who conducted the analysis, (ii) scope of the work statement of the analysis, (iii) date on which the work was completed, (iv) findings; (d) what steps is the government taking to foster the Web3 sector; (e) what is the assessed risk, to Canada's economy, of creating a negative environment for the Web3 sector where large Canadian companies move to other jurisdictions; (f) how many blockchain applications has the government procured or is in the process of procuring; and (g) what are the details of all blockchain applications in (f), including, for each, the (i) applicant, (ii) date of the procurement, (iii) summary of the statement of work, (iv) contract value; (v) assessed risk of the government creating a negative environment for the Web3 sector to the procurement contract?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1506—Mrs. Tracy Gray:

With regard to leases for office buildings and office space signed by the government: (a) how many leases for (i) entire buildings, (ii) part of a building, or office space within a building, are currently active, broken down by those within the National Capital Region (NCR) and those outside of the NCR; (b) what is the total square footage of the properties in (a); (c) what is the total annual value of the leases; (d) what is the average amount of time remaining on the leases; and (e) how many leases expire, or are up for renewal, in (i) less than two years, (ii) two to five years, (iii) more than five years, from May 4, 2023?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1507—Mr. Michael D. Chong:

With regard to the report titled "PRC Foreign Interference in Canada: a Critical National Security Threat, CSIS IA 2021-22/31", dated July 20, 2021: (a) did Global Affairs Canada receive the report, and, if so, who received it and on what date; (b) did the Privy Council Office receive the report, and, if so, who received it and on what date; and (c) did Public Safety Canada receive the report, and, if so, who received it and on what date?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1509—Mr. Doug Shipley:

With regard to government expenditures on sporting event tickets since May 1, 2019: for each expenditure, what was the (i) date, (ii) location, (iii) sport, (iv) league and teams involved, if applicable, (v) total cost, (vi) cost per ticket, (vii) number of tickets, (viii) titles of persons using the tickets, (ix) name or title of the event for which tickets were purchased by, or billed to, any department, agency, Crown corporation or other government entity?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1510—Mr. Doug Shipley:

With regard to government expenditures on gala or concert tickets, since May 1, 2019: for each expenditure, what was the (i) date, (ii) location, (iii) event title and description, (iv) total cost, (v) cost per ticket, (vi) number of tickets, (vii) titles of the people using the tickets, (viii) name or title of the event for which tickets were purchased by, or billed to, any department, agency, Crown corporation or other government entity?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1516—Mr. John Brassard:

With regard to ongoing or planned government IT projects with a budget of over \$1 million: what are the details of each project, including the (i) project description and summary, (ii) total budget, (iii) estimated completion date?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1517—Mr. Gord Johns:

With regard to contracts awarded since the 2015-16 fiscal year, broken down by fiscal year: what is the total value of contracts awarded to (i) McKinsey & Company, (ii) Deloitte, (iii) PricewaterhouseCoopers, (iv) Accenture, (v) KPMG, (vi) Ernst and Young?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1518—Mr. Gord Johns:

With regard to the electoral district of Courtenay—Alberni, since fiscal year 2018-19: what are all the federal infrastructure investments (including direct transfers to municipalities, regional district associations or First Nations, national parks, highways, etc.), broken down by fiscal year?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1519—Mr. Gord Johns:

With regard to federal investments and communities which comprise the federal electoral district of Courtenay—Alberni, between the 2005-06 and current fiscal year: (a) what are the federal investments in Innovation, Science, Economic Development, and Forestry, including direct transfers to the municipalities and First Nations, for the communities of (i) Tofino, (ii) Ucluelet, (iii) Port Alberni, (iv) Parksville, (v) Qualicum Beach, (vi) Cumberland, (vii) Courtenay, (viii) Deep Bay, (ix) Dashwood, (x) Royston, (xi) French Creek, (xii) Errington, (xiii) Coombs, (xiv) Nanoose Bay, (xv) Cherry Creek, (xvi) China Creek, (xvii) Bamfield, (xviii) Beaver Creek, (xix) Beaufort Range, (xx) Millstream, (xxi) Mt. Washington Ski Resort, broken down by (i) fiscal year, (ii) total expenditure, (iii) project; (b) what are the federal investments in Innovation, Science, Economic Development, and Forestry transferred to the regional districts of (i) Comox Valley, (ii) Nanaimo, (iii) Alberni-Clayoquot, (iv) Powell River, broken down by (i) fiscal year, (ii) total expenditure, (iii) project; (c) what are the federal investments in Innovation, Science, Economic Development, and Forestry transferred to the Island Trusts of (i) Hornby Island, (ii) Denman Island, (iii) Lasqueti Island, broken down by (i) fiscal year, (ii) total expenditure; (d) what are the federal investments in Innovation, Science, Economic Development, and Forestry transferred to (i) the Ahousaht First Nation, (ii) Hesquiaht First Nation, (iii) Huu-ay-aht First Nation, (iv) Hupacasath First Nation, (v) Tla-o-qui-aht First Nations, (vi) Toquaht First Nation, (vii) Tseshaht First Nation, (viii) Uchucklesaht First Nation, (ix) Ucluelet First Nation, (x) K'omoks First Nation, broken down by (i) fiscal year, (ii) total expenditure, (iii) projects; (e) what are the federal investment funding of the Strategic Innovation Fund, broken down by (i) fiscal year, (ii) total expenditure (iii) project; (f) what are the funding of the Government of Canada's Sectoral Initiatives Program, broken down by (i) fiscal year, (ii) total expenditure, (iii) project; and (g) what are the federal investment funding of the Forest Industry Transformation (IFIT) program, broken down by (i) fiscal year (ii) total expenditure, (iii) project?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1520—Mr. Colin Carrie:

With regard to government statistics on the causes of death in Canada: (a) what were the top 50 leading causes of death for each year and quarter since 2014, broken down by sex, age interval, geographic location of death, type of location of death (long term care home, hospital, etc.); and (b) for the statistics in (a), from 2021 onwards, what is the breakdown by COVID-19 vaccination status?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1522—Ms. Lianne Rood:

With regard to the Canadian Food Inspection Agency's Directive 2009-09: (a) which agricultural groups were consulted on making the decisions within the directive; (b) on which dates did consultations take place; (c) in what manner did consultations take place; and (d) what guidance was provided on gene-editing for resilience?

(Return tabled)

Business of Supply

[English]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, I would ask that all remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons (Senate), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I ask that all notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Translation]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. 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 Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, Democratic Institutions; the hon. member for Regina—Wascana, Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1720)

[Translation]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—BALANCED BUDGET

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC) moved:

That, given that, (i) Liberal budget 2023 adds more than \$60 billion in new spending — that is \$4,200 per family, (ii) inflation in Canada increased following the introduction of \$60 billion in new Liberal spending, (iii) following the increase in Canada's inflation, interest rates were increased to 4.75%, (iv) the IMF warns that Canada is the country most at risk of a massive mortgage default, (v) average mortgage payments are up 122% since the Liberal Prime Minister took office, (vi) Canadian households have the most debt as a share of GDP of any country in the G7, (vii) the solution is to eliminate the deficits, balance the budgets in order to bring down inflation and interest rates, the House call on the government to table a plan to return to balanced budgets.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Since today is the final allotted day for the supply period ending June 23, the House will go through the usual procedures to consider and dispose of supply bills. In view of recent practices, do hon. members agree that the bills be distributed now?

It is agreed.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the hon. member for Bay of Quinte.

We are living through the same economic and scientific experiment that politicians dust off every 30 years, as soon as the last experiment is forgotten. The experiment I mean is the one where

politicians approach the economy like this: if it moves, tax it; if it keeps moving, regulate it; and if it stops moving, subsidize it.

This is exactly this government's approach. The government has turned Canada into the second-slowest country in the world to grant building permits. Under existing regulations, it takes 25 years to approve a mining project. This country imposes more taxes on small and medium-sized enterprises, which is slowing economic productivity. Then the government turns around and tries to subsidize all these things.

Let us talk about housing, for example. Since taking office, the Prime Minister has been running a country with the fewest houses per capita in the G7, even though Canada has one of the largest land masses. This is because construction projects sometimes take 10 years to be approved. What does the Prime Minister do? He hands out subsidies and big cheques to municipal politicians, who then stand in the way of this construction. That is why Vancouver is the world's third most expensive city, and Toronto is the second most expensive. Canada has a lot of land, however. The average house cost is almost double in Canada what it is in the United States, which has 10 times the people to house on a smaller land mass.

The government blocked the construction of two pipelines but then subsidized a third. This means that it is against pipelines that are built by the private sector with private money, but it is in favour of pipelines that are subsidized by the government. As a result, \$30 billion is being spent to subsidize a pipeline in western Canada that could have cost taxpayers nothing. Meanwhile, these kinds of projects are being built for free around the world.

The Prime Minister boasts about subsidies under Canada's critical minerals strategy for materials needed for electrification. At the same time, the government is blocking the development of those same kinds of mines in northern Ontario that could produce those same products. Why is this government blocking something with one hand and subsidizing it with the other? Why not do neither and just allow investors, workers and entrepreneurs to do it on their own?

The answer is that it would take the Prime Minister out of the equation. He may seem inconsistent, but he is actually very consistent, because in all of these cases, he forces people to go through him and through the government to do anything at all. He puts himself at the centre of everything that people can do in the economy. It is Canadians, ordinary folks, the people doing the work, who should be at the centre of our country.

There are real consequences and real costs to that. Over the next 30 years, Canada is expected to have the worst economic growth in the OECD. The cost of housing has also doubled.

• (1725)

Food prices are rising at the fastest pace in 40 years. When the government prevents the market from developing naturally and organically, just so it can subsidize it, that means additional costs for ordinary Canadians who are forced to pay more.

Business of Supply

There is another way. We need to remove gatekeepers so hydro-electric dams can be built and materials can be mined for electrification. We need to produce more of our own energy here in Canada, instead of importing it from elsewhere, by cutting red tape and reducing delays. We need to encourage municipalities to cut their own red tape so that we can build affordable housing for average Canadians.

The correct approach is to give Canadians the freedom to create a better quality of life that costs less. It is just common sense. Together, let us bring common sense home to Canada. That is our goal, and that is exactly what we are going to do.

[English]

We are now living through an experiment. It is not an unprecedented experiment; it is tried about every 30 years, as soon as the last experiment is forgotten. It is the idea that if the government sees something that moves, it taxes it. "If it keeps moving, [they] regulate it. And if it stops moving, [they] subsidize it." That is, of course, a quote I took from a famous American president who took the opposite approach, but it is the approach we are living with right now.

What is the result of a government that interferes in order to block Canadians from building things for themselves and then tries to subsidize that very building after the fact? The result is that the cost of everything is rising. The cost of government is driving up the cost of living. The government has produced half a trillion dollars of new money that bids up the goods we buy and the interest we pay. Now, Canadians face the real threat of a mortgage meltdown when those rates rise further.

We see this approach, though, played out again and again. For example, the government blocked two pipelines but then subsidized a third. It is not that it is against pipelines; it is just that it is only in favour of a pipeline that can be built with 30 billion tax dollars. The government blocked mines. It blocked all the mines in northern Ontario's ring of fire, and now it wants to subsidize those very same mines.

The government taxes small businesses and then claims it is coming up with subsidies to bail out those very same small businesses for the costs the government made them pay. The government claims its carbon tax works like this. It will take the money away and give it back, and somehow it will be worth more than when it left. Of course, we now know that everyday Canadians are paying vastly more in these taxes than they get back in return.

The experiment fails. Every 30 years or so it happens, and it is allowed to happen only because enough time has passed for people to forget its logical outcome. The logical way out of it is to take exactly the opposite approach; instead of taxing and blocking our industry and then subsidizing it, we should do neither. We should have real, sensible streamlined rules that allow us to protect our environment and public safety but allow our entrepreneurs, investors and industrialists to get things done. That is what we will do when I am prime minister.

Let us set some wonderful, ambitious goals. Why do we not set a goal? Instead of being the second slowest in the OECD to grant a building permit, why can we not be the fastest place to grant a

building permit anywhere in the OECD? Why can we not approve a mine or a small, modular nuclear reactor in two or three years, rather than in 25 years? What do we learn in years 23, 24 and 25 that we could not have learned in years one, two and three of these projects?

Why do we not incentivize our municipalities to do what some are trying their very best to do? For example, the mayor of Walkerton just streamlined and sped up the approval of housing so he could have three 60-unit apartment blocks finalized in several months. The great Squamish people, right inside the city of Vancouver, do not have to follow Vancouver's bureaucratic rules, because they control their own land. They were able to speed up and approve 6,000 units of housing on 10 acres of land. That is 600 units of housing per acre. People will now have homes because the Squamish know how to do what so many local government bureaucrats do not allow, which is to approve projects and get them built.

That reminds me of the great Aubrey Moodie, who was the reeve of Nepean. Jack May went to see him on a Sunday morning before he got up to go to church, and said he wanted to build a car dealership and he had a piece of land. The next day at the local town hall, the lawyers sat down with the engineers. Within 48 hours, there was approval, and within 72 hours, there was construction. The car dealership is still standing safely there, 70 years later. That is common sense.

● (1730)

That way, we can build homes that people can afford, build businesses that pay higher paycheques, lower the tax burden on the backs of the hard-working people and let them bring home more of their paycheques. That is the purpose of the government; it is to make Canada work for the people who do the work, by bringing home lower costs, by eliminating the carbon tax and the inflationary deficits, by bringing home powerful paycheques with lower taxes that reward hard work, by removing gatekeepers to build homes, to allow first nations to develop their economies and to allow our people to develop their own industry. We need to bring in homes people can afford, by removing gatekeepers, freeing up land and speeding up permits to build and build. We need to bring home safe streets for our people, with consequences for repeat, violent offenders, not by targeting our lawful firearms owners. We need to bring home our freedom again by eliminating the censorship and centralized control the government has attempted to impose on the people.

In other words, when we say, "bring it home", it means using the House to bring the power, the control and the money back into the hands of the entrepreneur, the worker and the everyday extraordinary people who know better than anyone in this room how to chart their own course and live their own lives. It is common sense. It is the common sense of the common people, united for our common home: your home, my home, our home. Let us bring it home.

Business of Supply

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons (Senate), Lib.): Madam Speaker, at least we always know when a Conservative is wrapping up their speech. It is a good cue.

I have a question for the Leader of the Opposition. He has been very critical of the government, the government's responses to COVID and the various measures that have been put in place. However, I want to read what one of his predecessors, a previous leader of the Conservative Party of Canada, said. Brian Mulroney said that the Prime Minister and the premiers “conducted themselves as well as anybody else in the world” in dealing with COVID, something Mulroney called “the greatest challenge that any prime minister has dealt with in Canada in 156 years.” The Conservatives are laughing at Mulroney. With respect to NAFTA, Mulroney said he saw firsthand how the Prime Minister made “big decisions at crucial moments” and won “a significant victory for Canada”.

How can the current leader of the Conservative Party differ so much from the leader of his party a few decades ago?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, when we look at the record of the Prime Minister, he has doubled the cost of housing; he has doubled the cost of rent, mortgage payments and necessary down payments. He has massively increased lineups at our local food banks. There are 1.5 million people standing outside food banks every single month. They are lined up all around street corners in cities like Toronto. We now see 100,000 British Columbians who face possible homelessness because of the increases in rent that the government's inflationary policies are helping drive.

These are new problems; eight years ago, we did not have these problems. Housing was affordable. Canadians could afford to eat. There is no excuse for this failure. We have all the natural advantages. We live next to the most lucrative economy in the world. We have the most educated people in the world. We have four coasts. We can do it.

• (1735)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Kristina Michaud (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, BQ): Madam Speaker, I thank the Conservative leader for his speech and for introducing this motion. The Bloc Québécois is in favour of tabling a plan to return to a balanced budget. I think that the least a government can do is to state its intentions.

I agree that the government or the Liberal Party may be spending too much money, but above all, I think that the money is being spent unwisely. It cannot expect to magically balance the books. To do that, it will need a better way to spend and invest, and the Bloc Québécois has some suggestions to make.

For example, we want to support seniors to stop their purchasing power from eroding. We want to ensure that health transfers are in line with what the provinces are asking for. We want a real plan for social and affordable housing and an EI system that works. Does the Leader of the Opposition support these measures?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, I am glad to hear that the hon. member wants balanced budgets. I agree with that. I have put forward several ideas for saving money.

For example, \$35 billion of taxpayers' money was allocated to the infrastructure bank. However, it has not completed a single project in five years. This is an enormous waste of money. What is more, the amounts awarded to consultants keep increasing, even though we have a larger public service that can do exactly the same work. Buying back hunting rifles is another example of waste.

There is a lot of waste in this government. We will eliminate waste and balance the budget to bring down inflation and interest rates.

[*English*]

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, of course, when we talk about what affects the power of Canadians paycheques, it is not just a matter of talking about taxation, because outsized price increases by corporations also affect the power of Canadians' paycheques. We have seen record profits by grocery companies and by oil and gas companies, which are raising their prices far more than the increase in the input costs they have seen. Just today, it was reported that Canada Bread Company pleaded guilty to price fixing with Weston Foods, in a scandal that goes back to even before the pandemic. We know Canadians are very concerned about unjustified price hikes during the pandemic, which some economists have said are responsible for up to 25% of inflation.

Therefore, why does the leader of the Conservative Party never address the question of corporate greed when he talks about inflation?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, this is the paradise the NDP created. It is part of a coalition government, during which all of these economic outrages the member described have been able to flourish. There is no question that since the socialist policies of the NDP, with the government, have come into place, they have actually helped corporate profits, as they always do, contrary to the false narrative. In reality, when big government controls all the money, those with the political influence do the best, and those who pay the bills do the work.

We want to put the money back in the hands of the hard-working people who earned it, not in the hands of the corporate oligarchs or the big government.

Mr. Ryan Williams (Bay of Quinte, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is an honour and privilege to follow and share my time with the future prime minister of Canada.

When I was a little boy, my grandfather used to read—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. parliamentary secretary is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, I do not recall hearing the Leader of the Opposition indicate he was sharing his time.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): He did.

The hon. member for Bay of Quinte.

Business of Supply

Mr. Ryan Williams: Madam Speaker, it is an honour and privilege to share my time with the future prime minister of Canada.

When I was a little boy, my grandfather used to read to me a great Canadian poet, Robert Service. The poem that he would read to us was *The Cremation of Sam McGee*, which starts:

There are strange things done in the midnight sun
By the men who moil for gold;
The Arctic trails have their secret tales
That would make your blood run cold;
The Northern Lights have seen queer sights,
But the queerest they ever did see
Was that night on the marge of Lake Lebarge
I cremated Sam McGee.

The greatest line from that whole poem was, “Now a promise made is a debt unpaid”.

When we said things are broken, what is broken the most are the promises to Canadians: promises for a better life and a way to boost the ability and the affordability of the middle class and those who hope to join it, a promise for a better life in Canada with ample affordable rent and housing, a promise for a good paycheque and a promise for law and order.

When we said things were broken, these promises were broken, and what is left are broken promises, empty promises that are leaving Canadians with empty wallets and the debt that is left unpaid.

Canadians deserve better. They deserve the best, and the Liberal government has failed to deliver. It is our duty to effect change and to ensure that our hard work in this House today ushers in a better tomorrow for all.

The Liberals have stood for far too long with years of hopeful policy that has only led to empty promises and empty wallets for Canadians, especially in the middle class. With more than eight million Canadians using food banks, it is plain that more people than ever before are finding themselves out of the middle class. Rising interest rates are hammering homeowners, renters and businesses as every increase takes more out of Canadians' paycheques and wallets and gives it back to the government. As a business owner, I can say it is hard to watch.

Milton Friedman said it best back in 1992, over 30 years ago, when he said that although printing money has some immediate benefits that seem desirable in the short term, it can lead to harmful consequences in the long term, causing deficits that lead to inflation. The good effects come first, and it feels good. The bad effects only come later. There is a strong temptation to overdo it, but when governments stop printing money, it is the opposite: The bad effects come first and the good effects only come later. It is hard to reverse and it is addicting.

After promising teeny-tiny deficit spending before COVID and before the election in 2015, the government spent \$100 billion prior to COVID-19 on deficits. The government printed that money. Then, after COVID, it printed \$200 billion of non-COVID deficit inflationary spending, and then in this budget, after the finance minister promised to get his house in order, we see that the government is printing \$63 billion, saying that it is bringing it down to \$43 billion because \$2,400 of new taxes per middle-class-income family is going back to those households.

This is the invisible tax that is taking hold further. Inflation rates have driven food prices up more than 10%. This invisible tax steals from Canadian incomes and steals from Canadian wallets.

We know that the solution to inflation is to stop printing money and make more of the things that money buys. Doing this creates powerful paycheques by creating more of the stuff that we need in Canada that we are short of, and powerful paycheques mean more money in people's pockets.

The complacency of the current Liberal government has fostered an environment in which our nation's doers and dreamers are forced into a playing field that is anything but level, and it is harder than ever to create those paycheques. Companies in Canada find it increasingly difficult to operate in Canada because of increasing costs caused by inflation, higher interest rates on their loans and the complete inability to hire talent and workers whom they need to generate income for their companies.

We have red tape. We cannot get LNG out of the ground. Our leader talked about this. We need faster building permits. A mine should take two or three years, not 25.

Furthermore, we have big, bossy institutions that dominate our marketplaces with rules that protect them and not our small business owners, who find it hard to grow their businesses. Although the almost 1.2 million small and medium-sized enterprises in Canada make up 98% of all businesses in Canada and employ 10.5 million people, or 54% of the workforce, monopolies run this country.

● (1740)

In this game of Monopoly, Canadians lose. We pay \$200 every time we pass “Go”. Every time we roll the dice in the game of Monopoly, and kids hate this game, we land on Telus or Rogers or Air Canada or VIA Rail or InBev beer or RBC or Bell Canada or Mastercard, and we lose every time. No one wins.

The simplicity of bringing down prices is that it is about something very simplistic. It is about freedom, freedom of choice for consumers in a free market that is not dominated by monopolies. It is about free and honest competition, about fostering our small and medium-sized enterprises and allowing them to grow.

Business of Supply

Competition is anything but competitive in the Canadian telecommunications sector, where Canadians pay the highest cellphone rates on the planet, rates that are three times higher than they are in Australia and double those in the U.S. and Europe. Is this competition? I think not. The landscape has been gamed to favour the monopolies, leaving consumers without choice. Without competition, these telcos do not have to earn our confidence and our hard-earned dollar; they just demand it. We pay for it, as some of the highest prices in the world can be found on our bills every single month. Everyone in Canada has a cellphone.

The Liberal government campaigned on lower bills and more choices. It said they would be 25% lower. Today, those empty promises come with a significant price. The Canadian telephone monopolies have suffocated start-ups and silenced critics. If they cannot win by offering the prices that they do, they buy their competitors. They have bought more competitors to take them out of the market than anything else.

We must fight for freedom of choice for Canadians. We must create an environment that breeds competition in a fair and open market. We must fight to ensure that our hard-earned dollar is equal to the affordable and reliable service that we all deserve, because the Liberal Party's empty promises just mean empty wallets.

It is the same in all sectors, and the solution to see Canadian paycheques grow is to have Canadian businesses grow. We need more homes. We need microchips. We need food. We need farms. We need food processing. We need LNG.

It is also about keeping Canadian IP in Canada. Canadians invented peanut butter, the zipper, the Ski-Doo, the Sea-Doo, the pacemaker and the WonderBra. Where are all of these inventions in the past decade?

We dedicated billions in funding to R and D, which gets pilfered by our foes and allies. We have put millions into battery research in the east coast at Dalhousie, but who owns that battery research? It is Tesla. We put millions into the Sidewalk Labs at Google. Who owns that research? It is Google. We are still paying for research from Huawei in our Canadian colleges and universities. Who is paying for that? It is Canadian taxpayers.

Again, we have not been smart at all with where we are putting our investments. When it comes to looking after Canadians' money, it is all about one thing only: It is about investing in Canadians' futures, and we have not been doing that.

People with good intentions make promises; only people with good character keep them. There were promises made and a debt unpaid, leaving Canadians with more debt owed than any generation before them.

The moral of this story is this: Do not make promises that you do not intend to keep. Perhaps the real lesson here is that promises made are only as strong as the person who gives them. If we cannot trust what someone is saying, we need to turn to a new voice.

A Conservative government will be that voice, a voice for all Canadians in a time of need. As families struggle to make ends meet and sacrifice daily to put food on the table, the last thing they need is more empty promises.

A Conservative government will rise above the unnecessary layers of bureaucracy that have stalled out in bringing about much-needed change. Action is what we offer, and bringing home paycheques to fill emptying wallets is what Canadians deserve. It is what the future deserves, and this future government will bring it home for Canadians.

● (1745)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons (Senate), Lib.): Madam Speaker, over the last three decades, there have been 20 Conservative budgets introduced in the House. I am wondering if the member knows how many of those 20 Conservative budgets actually were balanced or ran a surplus.

I ask because when he discovers that the answer is only three, he must know that there is a reason for that.

Why is it that between Brian Mulroney and Stephen Harper, of the 20 budgets that were introduced in the House, only three ran a surplus or were balanced? Why is that?

Mr. Ryan Williams: Madam Speaker, that is three more than the Liberals have ever delivered to Canadians.

The simple fact is that whenever Conservatives get in, they tend to clean up the mess from the previous government. We saw a pattern here. We talk about it. Every 30 years, we tend to learn those lessons. We saw that pattern after the current Prime Minister's father was in government. We are certainly seeing the pattern now.

The whole premise is that as Conservatives and as Canadians, we believe that the only people we need to be listening to are Canadians, but when it comes to fixing this mess, it is going to be Canadians who also fix it, resulting in powerful paycheques, businesses that get rid of red tape and lower taxes to create new jobs for workers who want a better paycheque and who want to work in those jobs, who want to make this country a better place.

Conservatives are going to do that. We look forward to many balanced budgets in the future.

• (1750)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Desilets (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, BQ): Madam Speaker, there are often peculiar components to the Conservatives' motions. The motion itself is interesting. It reads well. The Conservatives are asking for a plan and the Bloc Québécois agrees with that.

The disappointing part is that the motion is based on premises or whereases that are slightly sensationalist and off-topic. The Conservatives know it too.

Inflation and interest rates result from international forces. We can call out this government all day long—we could help the Conservatives call it out on a lot of things—but these factors are international.

It would have been nice if the content and premises had been based on the reality of the situation.

[*English*]

Mr. Ryan Williams: Madam Speaker, there is a perfect correlation in the fact that all governments that ran greater deficits ended up with higher inflation.

Something that we do not hear bandied around any more, although we used to in the beginning, is the modern monetary theory, this whole new proposition that we can spend our way out of a pandemic, out of a major problem, and that budgets would balance themselves. There was new thinking, although money has been around for thousands of years, that we could just keep spending and there would be no consequences. Well, the consequences are here and they are very real, and Canadians see them every single day.

This motion that we have is perfect, because it talks about going back to the table to return to balanced budgets. We have identified so clearly that Canadians know—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Questions and comments, the hon. member for Timmins—James Bay.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Madam Speaker, it is always really interesting to see what kind of freedom Conservatives are willing to defend and whose freedom they will not defend.

Today the Conservatives shouted down a motion to protect kids. A nine-year-old girl was threatened and attacked for having a pixie haircut, yet they will not stand up in protection. The member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan invited an MP from Uganda here who voted for the death penalty for LGBTQ people. He voted for the death penalty to kill people for their sexual orientation.

Also, in the desperation to hold back Maxime Bernier, the member in Stornoway was sending out pamphlets attacking the rights of gay people.

I would like to ask the hon. member why the opposition continues to undermine the rights of queer people, LGBTQ people and trans people and denies them freedom and the right to live their lives in dignity.

Mr. Ryan Williams: Madam Speaker, we stand up for all of those people.

Business of Supply

I think the simple premise, though, is that this party over here is supporting a government that is failing Canadians in every single aspect of their lives right now, with the homes that they cannot afford and the rents that they cannot afford. We see it every time a single mother tries to fill up her car, pay her rent or get groceries. This party is propping up the government right now and not solving any of those problems. We are the only party in the House right now standing up for Canadians, standing up for their rights and their future, and we will continue to do so.

Mr. Terry Beech (Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Kingston and the Islands.

It is a pleasure to rise to discuss Canada's current fiscal position, our independent monetary policy, the current economic context and the 2023 budget, as well as to highlight a number of measures that are making life more affordable for Canadians while building a sustainable economy that works well for all Canadians.

This week, the International Monetary Fund reaffirmed not only that Canada enjoys the lowest deficit in the G7, but that this advantage continues for each and every year through its projected horizon. It said, "Canada is a strong fiscal performer", with an enviable job market and a strong labour participation rate, which have been bolstered by the government's investments in a Canada-wide early learning and child care system.

The IMF went on to note the resilience of Canada's financial system in the face of recent global financial challenges, pointing specifically to Canada's robust regulatory framework and contingency tools to safeguard federally regulated financial institutions, as well as insurance deposits. The IMF praised Canada's progress in strengthening our anti-money laundering and anti-terrorist financing frameworks. It also noted our government's efforts to increase housing supply and to address housing affordability challenges, including with the housing accelerator fund, which provides incentives for municipalities to bolster the housing supply even further.

At the end of March, our government released budget 2023, our made-in-Canada plan for a strong middle class, an affordable economy and a healthy future. It comes at an important moment for our economy.

Business of Supply

As we have seen, Canada's economy has made a remarkable recovery from the COVID recession. There are 890,000 more Canadians working today than when COVID first began. In the first four months of 2023 alone, the Canadian economy has added nearly a quarter of a million jobs. We have now recovered 128% of jobs lost during the first months of the pandemic, while the United States has only recovered 117%. Also, universal child care has increased the labour participation rate for Canadian women to a record high of 85.7%, showing the success of that policy, and our unemployment rate remains close to all-time historic lows.

Global inflation, while still too high, has fallen in Canada from its peak of 8.1% last June to 4.4% last month, and the Bank of Canada predicts it will be 3% by this summer and 2% by the end of 2024. Canada's inflation rate also remains below that of our economic peers. Inflation in the U.K. is almost double, at 8.7%; the OECD average is at 7.4%; the EU is at 6.1%; and the G7 is at 5.4%. We can see that at 4.4% we are way below those.

Since February, the average wage for Canadians has grown by more than 5%, meaning that paycheques are now outpacing inflation. That means more money in the pockets of Canadians after a hard day's work.

Canada had the strongest economic growth in the G7 over the course of 2022, and that is projected to continue through to 2024. Also, in April, S&P reiterated our AAA credit rating, and we have the lowest deficit-to-GDP ratio and the lowest net debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7, lower than other major AAA-rated economies, such as the Netherlands and Australia.

It is this remarkably strong economic foundation that underpinned the investments we made in our 2023 budget. Unlike the Conservatives, we believe our commitment to invest \$196 billion to improve Canada's health care system over the next 10 years is a prudent investment to make, especially in a context where we are exiting the greatest global health emergency we have faced in more than 100 years. We also think it is prudent to invest in fighting climate change and to develop the net-zero technologies that our world will demand as we continue to confront the increasing costs of previous inaction on reducing emissions.

If investments in health care and the clean economy are the first two pillars of the budget, the third is our government's focus on affordability. Let us not forget that our government reduced our debt-to-GDP ratio every single year before the pandemic. This allowed us to support Canadians and Canadian businesses through the pandemic, and it is what allows us to invest in making life more affordable for Canadians today.

While inflation is coming down, I think we can all agree that it is still too high and is making it difficult for many Canadians to make ends meet and put nutritious food on the table. That is why budget 2023 introduced a grocery benefit that will help support 11 million Canadian families, including more than 50% of seniors. It will be delivered by cheque or direct deposit on July 5, so Canadians should watch for that over the next two weeks. We also secured a deal to reduce interchange fees for credit card-accepting businesses. This will save small businesses more than \$1 billion over the next five years.

• (1755)

At the same time, we are looking to reduce additional fees and charges for Canadians. This includes fees on their cellphone bills, event and concert fees, excessive baggage fees and unjustified shipping and freight costs. We are also cracking down on predatory lending. We are reducing the criminal interest rate from 47% to 35% and imposing a cap on payday loans.

We are also supporting low-income Canadians by introducing automatic tax filing so that individuals can get access to the benefits they are entitled to. For some families, this will mean tens of thousands of dollars that they might not otherwise receive.

Students are receiving better access to student loans with increased student grants. The average student is likely to save \$3,000 as a result of our government's eliminating interest on student loans. This will help young workers and apprentices get the start they need when they are looking to first enter the workforce. I have not even mentioned dental care, which will benefit nine million Canadians, as well as our investment in creating high-paying sustainable jobs that will benefit generations to come.

These investments build on significant investments that our government has made to support Canadians since first being elected in 2015. Child care costs, for example, have been reduced by 50%, with \$10-a-day child care on track to being fully implemented by 2026. Child care on its own used to be the same amount as a mortgage payment. A family with two children is now saving over \$20,000 a year in many cases.

We have increased old age security and have worked with premiers to increase the average value of pension payments going forward. We have reduced taxes for the middle class while increasing them on the top 1%. We have also increased the amount everyone can earn before paying any federal income tax at all and have reduced taxes for small businesses not once but twice.

Of course, let us not forget the Canada child benefit. This benefit, like many of the programs I have already referred to, is indexed to inflation and supports more than 3.5 million families. This means that as the cost of living rises, so will the benefit that Canadian families receive. On its own, the Canada child benefit has helped to lift hundreds of thousands of children out of poverty, and combined, these measures have lifted more than 2.7 million Canadians out of poverty, demonstrating that Canada's first poverty reduction strategy is having a significant impact.

Business of Supply

Finally, our enhanced workers benefit is supporting 4.2 million Canadian workers with higher paycheques. We have ensured, for the first time, that our investment incentives include measures to support workers with fair wages and benefits.

All of this together is happening because we believe that confident countries like Canada do well when they invest in themselves and when we invest in our people.

These are challenging times, but Canada is in an enviable position to be able to support Canadians who need it the most in a responsible and targeted way while ensuring that global inflation continues to decline in Canada. At the same time, we are securing health care and retirement security for the next generation while creating high-paying sustainable jobs for this generation.

There is obviously more work to do, more work to do on housing, more work to do on climate change and more work to do on affordability. Canadians are up to this challenge, and we are well positioned as a country to address those things. I hope that all members of this House will work together to bring forward the best Canadian ideas from right across the country, and that we will work to implement those ideas and positive solutions through the fall and through to budget 2024.

• (1800)

[Translation]

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Madam Speaker, we are talking about taxation, the budget, the management of public funds and, most importantly, how we are going to manage the money that Canadians give us through their taxes.

Just seven months ago, the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance tabled an economic update and gave the following warning. She said that we needed to control spending and avoid deficits because deficits throw fuel on the inflationary fire. Those were the exact words used by the Minister of Finance. Now, here we are seven months later and she has completely changed her tune after getting a slap on the wrist from Liberal supporters who said that they wanted more deficits and that there was no problem.

How can the member explain the fact that, just seven months ago, the Deputy Prime Minister was saying that we should not run deficits, that we should control spending and that there was a plan to balance the budget, but now all of that has gone out the window.

[English]

Mr. Terry Beech: Madam Speaker, I really appreciate having another opportunity to address Canada's current fiscal situation.

We have the lowest deficit in the G7. We have the lowest net debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7. That is what has allowed us to focus our investments in this budget on securing health care, with \$196 billion invested over the next 10 years; investing in the future with sustainable jobs; investing in the clean economy; and of course investing in affordability.

There is global inflation, and while inflation in Canada has come down from 8.1% to 4.4% and is now likely, as forecast by the Bank of Canada, to hit 3% by the summer and 2% by next year, we need to make sure that Canadians who need our support are receiving that support. We have invested in very targeted measures to make

sure that the most vulnerable Canadians who need support the most get it through these hard times, while we position Canada as a country, as a whole, to thrive going forward.

Ms. Bonita Zarrillo (Port Moody—Coquitlam, NDP): Madam Speaker, the member and I are neighbours; we share a border. Today in our local newspaper, one of the headlines said that rents are unaffordable for 40% of Coquitlam renters. While the Conservatives continue to try to deny children dental care, the NDP is working on solutions to get people in homes and stay in homes.

One thing that is happening in B.C. is a housing acquisition fund. The B.C. government has put forward a housing acquisition fund that would allow the province to work with not-for-profits and co-op housing to maintain housing in our communities. I wonder if the member can talk about whether the federal government is going to come forward with a housing acquisition fund, as has been requested over and over again by the member for Vancouver East.

• (1805)

Mr. Terry Beech: Madam Speaker, I would like to start by thanking the member for her petition today. It is an issue that I have spent a lot of time on as well. I expect our issues are similar because we are neighbours. I also want to thank her for bringing up investments in housing.

I had an opportunity to meet with mayors and councillors from across British Columbia at the UBCM Housing Summit, where we were all working together to find solutions to make rents and housing more affordable. Part of the discussion was about reviewing what the federal government has done. We have to remember that the federal government had been essentially out of housing for almost 30 years. That was until we created the national housing strategy, an investment of over \$80 billion going to a number of different things. That particular summit gave me the opportunity to review how that money has been invested. Some 39% of it that has been invested in projects across the country and 61% is still unallocated.

The investments in British Columbia on their own in the last six years already amount to more funding than the B.C. government has suggested it will put forward over the next 10 years, and we are continuing to invest on top of that. B.C. is a good partner. B.C. municipalities are a good partner. However, we can only get affordable housing if the federal government, the provincial governments, the municipal governments and indigenous governments all work together, and that is exactly what I propose we all do.

Business of Supply

Mr. Marty Morantz (Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley, CPC): Madam Speaker, I noted that when the member was talking about the IMF, he was cherry-picking points from the IMF's report that strengthened his case. I have a chart in front of me of housing market risk indicators. It says, "Economies with high household debt and more floating-rate loans have greater exposure to higher mortgage payments, and a heightened risk of defaults." Then it lists a number of countries. Do members know which country is rated as having the highest risk of all of them? It is Canada. I wonder if the member could explain why.

Mr. Terry Beech: Madam Speaker, it is good to bring up the stress test measures that were brought up in 2018. We had historically low interest rates, and we were concerned Canadians might not be able to afford their mortgage payments if there was a sudden increase from historically low rates. We put that in place. What was the Conservatives' response? Not only did they speak against the stress test, but they actually suggested in the election that came after that we should extend amortization rates. They wanted Canadians to take on more debt and wanted to, in that action, increase housing prices at the same time.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons (Senate), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak to the opposition motion that has been put before the House.

I will start by saying that I am concerned about the rhetoric in the preamble. However, the motion and the result clause is fairly short. It talks about a balanced budget and committing to a balanced budget immediately.

I found this very interesting because I asked the member for Bay of Quinte how many times Conservatives introduced balanced budgets in the House, and I even gave him the answer. It was three times in the last 30 years that Conservatives have introduced balanced budgets in the House, under Brian Mulroney and Stephen Harper. There was a grand total of 20 budgets introduced, and three were balanced.

Do members know when they came? The first came in 2006-07. This was on the heels of Paul Martin's surplus, which was a \$13-billion surplus. Stephen Harper axed that the next year, and in 2007-08, the surplus was only \$9.6 billion. After that, he started to run deficits immediately. He blew away that surplus that Paul Martin had left for him and started running deficits immediately. Then, of course, there is the famous balancing of the budget in 2014-15, when Stephen Harper slashed veterans services and sold off GM shares at bargain prices just so that he got himself in a position on paper that he was bringing in a surplus because he felt he needed to do that to solidify his base that was demanding it.

However, rather than dwell on the fact that Conservatives have done this historically, at least in recent history, I think we have to ask ourselves something: Why do governments run deficits?

There are two reasons. A government can run a deficit, one, because it is expecting the taxpayer to pay more to make up that deficit and plans to charge or tax them more or, two, because it is investing. The whole idea behind investing is assuming that a government will get something in return for that investment. When governments are running deficits to invest in Canadians, they are

doing it with the expectation that something is going to come out on other end to grow our economy. When we grow our economy, people are better off and there is more wealth in our economy.

What about population growth? We are growing at historic rates. We are just past 40 million people in Canada. When we continue to grow in such a fashion, we need to make new investments, and we are seeing it on the other side through the growth, which is why Canada is continually rated to have one of the best credit ratings in the developed world. That is why we have such a low debt-to-GDP ratio, which is what people really need to focus on. However, I know that it is not intuitive for people to want to focus on that, especially when Canadians are managing a household budget, and they cannot look at it the same way, but the reality is that we have to look at our debt in relation to our GDP.

As our GDP continues to grow, if we are spending less than that growth, we have a net benefit at the end of the day, which is essentially what we see when we bring forward these budgets that are investing in Canadians. Quite frankly, that is something that Brian Mulroney understood. It is something that Stephen Harper understood, and it is something that former Liberals, such as Paul Martin and Jean Chrétien, understood.

They understood that, if we invest in Canadians and actually use the money to invest in Canadians when running those deficits, we will get to a place eventually where Paul Martin got to, which was a \$13-billion surplus, and a surplus the year after that as well. We will get to those places naturally. The point is that we can get to that place by investing in Canadians because we see the economic growth, see the opportunities, see people being better off and see the debt-to-GDP ratio. We see the debt specifically as it relates per capita to the lowest among the G7, as we are hearing.

• (1810)

There is one thing we should be concerned about, and I rightfully share it with so many other people. It is the debt level each household is experiencing right now in Canada, but we have to ask ourselves why. Why is that? Is there something unique about Canada and our spending habits that puts us in that position? It has a lot to do, I would suggest, with the age of our population.

In the G7, Canada has one of the youngest populations. These are people who are buying new homes and investing for the first time. These are people who do not have the retirement savings that other G7 countries have. Am I excusing anything? I am not. I am saying that we have to be mindful of this and we have to be vigilant in the approach and ensure Canadians do not put themselves into situations they do not want to be in.

Business of Supply

I stress that there is a reason for the circumstances we are in, but regardless of all of this, Canada still puts itself in a position of being among the best in the G7, as it relates to the lowest debt-to-GDP ratio and the lowest deficit-to-GDP ratio, and I think it is very important that, as we reflect on this, we consider that.

I have brought these up on a number of occasions recently, and I want to talk about them again. They are the recent comments made by former prime minister Brian Mulroney on the job this government has been doing. I mean no disrespect to any living Liberal prime ministers, but I have not even heard a former Liberal prime minister speak this highly of the current government.

Brian Mulroney said, “I have learned over the years that history is unconcerned with the trivia and the trash of rumours and gossip floating around Parliament Hill. History is only concerned with the big ticket items that have shaped the future of Canada”. The article continues, “He said [the current Prime Minister] and the premiers 'conducted themselves as well as anybody else in the world' in dealing with COVID, something Mulroney called 'the greatest challenge that any prime minister has dealt with...in 156 years.'”

We have heard Conservatives tell us many times in the past how we failed the country on NAFTA, but here is what the architect of NAFTA, the Prime Minister who was the lead at the time and negotiated the original NAFTA deal, had to say about the job this government did. The article describes, “On NAFTA, Mulroney said that he saw first-hand how the current Prime Minister made 'big decisions at crucial moments' and won 'a significant victory for Canada'. He said, 'It's due to the leadership that we saw from the government of Canada'”. That is Brian Mulroney, a former Conservative prime minister, absolutely praising the work this government did in relation to keeping our economy in a good position when we had to renegotiate NAFTA.

I remember the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle at the time standing up in question period demanding the government capitulate to Donald Trump's demands, but we did not. The government stood firm. Our finance minister negotiated this, and we got a better deal at the end of the day. Brian Mulroney will even tell us that. Also, we can look at the various other things that have occurred.

I know that my time is running to an end. I think that once again we have an opposition motion in front of us that is troubling. I am getting tired of challenging the Conservatives day in and day out, but here we are. It is the last one. Hopefully when we return in the fall, we will have motions with perhaps a little more substantive measures to them than what we are seeing now.

• (1815)

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Madam Speaker, the member was discussing the population growth to 40 million. In my riding, we have close to 60,000 people without a family doctor and a problem we have never had before, which is homelessness. I am wondering how his government can call it a success, when it is not balancing the needs of the newcomers and existing population with the inflow. It has to regulate it.

How does the government plan to do this so that, when newcomers arrive in Canada, they have what they are expecting, which is a place to live and a way to be cared for health-wise?

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, I can assure the member that homelessness did, and always has, existed in her riding. It is nothing new. Maybe she is just realizing it now, but I can assure her that homelessness in her riding is most likely something that is not unique.

What I would say is that we have an obligation to support Canadians in the best way that we can. We have seen the various different measures that have come forward, whether it is the grocery rebate, the housing top-up or child care. We have brought countless measures into this place to help Canadians.

I hope the member realizes that the Conservative motion put forward today calls on us to balance the budget, which means that a number of those measures would have to be eliminated. The Conservatives have yet to tell us which measures it would be. I certainly would like to know because I am sure that would impact those who are homeless in her community.

• (1820)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ): Madam Speaker, for a skilled worker wanting to work in Quebec, the wait time is 20 months. Whoever needs a passport might as well bring a lawn chair to the Service Canada offices because that is where they might end up taking their vacation. Whoever has a passport and by some misfortune has been shortchanged by the airline, after waiting forever at the airport because the flight was cancelled or a suitcase was lost, then it takes a year and a half to get compensation if the claim is successful. Whoever loses their job and wants to get EI benefits from the fund they contributed to for years better have a six-month emergency fund because that is how long it can take to get the first cheque. Clearly, this government is no champion when it comes to providing services to the public.

Does my colleague think that a cabinet shuffle this summer will fix all that?

[*English*]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, I have no idea what that had to do with the motion we are debating today. That sounded more like just a Bloc Québécois list of grievances that he wanted to express to the House.

We are committed to helping Canadians where they need those supports. That is why we have rolled out countless measures in the last number of months and years, and why we will continue to do that.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Madam Speaker, I have seen many extraordinary stunts in the House.

Business of Supply

Perhaps one of the most spectacular was by the member in Stornoway, who has benefited from 20 years of free dental care and now has a 19-room mansion paid for by the taxpayers, as well as chefs and groundskeepers. He came into the House and said that he was going to stand and speak until the budget was changed. Then he ran out of gas three hours later. Now, the Conservatives want us to stay into the late night, until the budget is changed, all to deny children and seniors dental care.

I want to ask my hon. colleague a question because he has been accused of rhetorical hot air at times, but I would say that maybe that was just elevated temperature and talk. Why does the member think that the member in Stornoway could not sustain himself in his attack on dental care for seniors, running out of speed after a mere three hours? What does that say about his ability to drive the Conservative agenda anywhere, except maybe into the ruts?

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, that is an excellent question.

The member for Carleton, the Leader of the Opposition, came into the House and said that he had sent out fundraising emails about how he would filibuster forever or until he got what he wanted. Then he came in here and talked for about three and a half hours. That was it.

I have seen him filibuster for closer to 20 hours, since I have been in this House. To me, it just says that the member for Carleton is really losing steam. He does not have that spunk he used to have. This is really going to translate into how he is able to sympathize—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): It is time to resume debate.

The hon. member for Joliette.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ): Madam Speaker, my colleagues are applauding me because I am announcing that I will be sharing my time with the member for La Prairie, who is also my esteemed House leader.

Populism is proposing simplistic solutions to complex problems in order to pander to the population's most basic instincts. Today's motion is a good example of that. After giving an accurate picture of inflation, household debt and the housing crisis, the Conservatives are saying that the solution is simply to eliminate deficits. I guess that housing prices will then magically drop and households will have less debt. That is populist rhetoric.

Beyond the rhetoric, the motion asks only one thing, which is that "the House call on the government to table a plan to return to balanced budgets." That is what we are voting on today, and the Bloc Québécois wholeheartedly supports that, because governing involves planning and forecasting. Bringing forward a plan to return to balanced budgets is the least that we can do. Had the motion called for approval of the rhetoric of the Conservatives or the Liberals, the Bloc Québécois would vote against it in either case.

Canada is going through a tough time right now. On the one hand, a spendthrift and unserious Prime Minister is spending lavishly on one-size-fits-all programs to promote his ideology rather than to meet immediate and real needs, including in areas that are

outside federal jurisdiction. On the other hand, the populist and somewhat mean-spirited Conservative leader is proposing nothing except to get rid of the Liberals. His sound bites serve as economic policy, and his vision of the economy and the environment is stuck in the 20th century, the century of oil.

Between the two, there is the Bloc Québécois, which proposes tangible measures. It proposes flexible and targeted programs to meet people's real needs. These are much less costly and more effective programs than the current one-size-fits-all initiatives. It proposes to bring some order to how the government operates to end waste and the chronic inability to manage properly. This is all related to my question.

The Bloc proposes to end interference by having a government that uses its flexibility to address matters within its jurisdiction rather than increasing initiatives in areas that are not its responsibility. The Bloc proposes to end support for oil companies and shift that money to programs specifically designed to transition to renewable energy rather than remaining trapped any longer in the 20th century of oil.

The Bloc proposes a federal government that stops spreading itself too thin and focuses on its fundamental responsibilities, which are the following: stopping the erosion of purchasing power, especially for seniors; providing a level of health transfers that ensures the sustainability of public services; creating a Marshall plan for the construction of social and community housing; and ensuring we have employment insurance that works.

In short, we are proposing a real plan to balance the budget, which will strengthen the core responsibilities of the government and avoid the full-scale austerity that could risk plunging the economy into a recession. A plan to return to a balanced budget is necessary, especially since the government is increasing its initiatives in areas that are not within its jurisdiction, which causes tensions, boondoggles and costly duplication of efforts.

A study by the Centre of Excellence on the Canadian Federation, a research group at the Institute for Research on Public Policy, analyzed federal spending since 2015 and came to the following devastating conclusion on June 7, saying, "the current Liberal government has used federal funds to seek provincial engagement with its own social policy priorities....the current trend is toward a more directive and less collaborative use of the spending power....Partnership seems to be conditional on a province accepting the federal government's policy vision."

A plan to re-establish balance is also a way to put an end to federal paternalism that uses its spending to impose its own political choices on Quebec.

Things have also been mismanaged. Every time Ottawa touches something, it ends up costing too much. Let us take the gun registry fiasco. They spent \$2 billion to maintain a list. At that price, Quebec could not afford to keep a registry of vehicle license plates. Managing employment insurance costs two and a half times more than managing social assistance. Ottawa's management of passport files costs four times as much as Quebec's management of drivers' licences.

That is another product of fiscal imbalance. Since Ottawa is collecting more taxes than it needs to meet its responsibilities, it does not need to be a good manager of public funds.

For the Bloc Québécois, a plan to re-establish balance means putting an end to waste. There is a way to manage the state a little more rigorously. That rigour will make it possible to avoid the austerity the Conservatives are inviting us to accept today in their speeches.

• (1825)

Historically, the biggest driver of price volatility has been oil prices. The best way to protect against this is to move to the post-oil period as soon as possible. Already, 98% of Quebec's electricity comes from renewable sources and is immune to oil prices. Oil and gas account for only 13% of home energy consumption. The rest is electricity or firewood. These are all energy sources that are not affected by oil prices.

The Quebec fleet is the most electrified in Canada. The network of charging stations in Quebec is the most developed. The price gap between electric vehicles and gas-powered vehicles is constantly shrinking. The sale of personal gas-powered vehicles will be banned in Quebec as of 2035.

We need to accelerate this shift. The best and cheapest way to do that is to redirect the money currently earmarked for modernizing the oil industry to clean energy. In the post-oil world, Quebec has everything it needs to be the most prosperous society on the planet.

Since the government has not taken any budgetary or legislative measures to address the sources of inflation, it is the Bank of Canada that has had to act with the monetary tool it has at its disposal: rising interest rates. Yet there are things the government could have done.

In order to provide relief for pensioners on a fixed income, the government should have increased old age security. The government increased OAS only for those aged 75 and up, leaving those between the ages of 65 and 74 to fend for themselves.

As we know, according to OECD estimates, the net pension replacement rate was 50.7% of pre-retirement income in Canada. In other words, the transition to retirement means a major drop in the average standard of living for Canadians and Quebecers.

The average net pension replacement rate for OECD countries was 57.6% and the EU average was 63%, so Canada has a poor record in this regard, lagging far behind Italy, India, France and Denmark. We are doing only slightly better than the U.S., where inequality is skyrocketing. We need to take action. We need to better protect the standard of living of our seniors.

To reduce pressure on the cost of housing, the government needs to increase the supply of social and community housing. The current funding will not make up for two decades of underfunding and the resulting housing shortage.

To limit price increases on consumer goods, we need to improve competition laws. Last December, the Governor of the Bank of Canada told the Standing Committee on Finance that concentration in the food distribution sector and the lack of competition had led to

Business of Supply

the prices hikes we saw, which resulted in significantly higher profits for that sector, on the backs of consumers.

The competition regime needs to be reformed, particularly to slow down the trend towards concentration and the abuse of dominance that naturally ensues.

In the face of rising household debt, we need to regulate credit card fees, which are the costliest form of debt for heavily indebted households. The government's announcement in the last budget that it trusted credit card issuers to set and maintain reasonable fees is woefully inadequate.

In the face of supply chain problems, we need to make it easier to increase local production; support investments that help boost productivity to counter the adverse effects of higher interest rates on investments in production equipment; address the labour shortage, which is getting in the way of adjusting the supply to meet demand; encourage seniors to keep working by not penalizing them with GIS clawbacks; and make it easier to use temporary foreign workers in professions where there is a labour shortage by transferring management of the program to Quebec City, which is already doing the impact assessments that the federal government is asking business owners to do.

Those are some of the measures the government could take to address both the cause and effects of inflation.

Lastly, let us not forget the importance of seriously addressing the use of tax havens by major banks, multinationals, web giants and the wealthy. It is high time that this grossly unfair loophole was closed. It is immoral and we must make it illegal.

• (1830)

[*English*]

Mr. Marty Morantz (Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley, CPC): Madam Speaker, I very much enjoy working with my colleague from the Bloc at the finance committee. I find him to be an articulate and thoughtful member of the committee.

Our motion is basically to call on the government to balance budgets. I will note that, during the 2015 campaign, the Prime Minister promised he would balance the budget by 2019. Just recently, in the fall economic statement, the government had projected a surplus in the 2027-28 year. It quickly reneged on that in this budget on March 28.

Could the member share his thoughts on how anyone can believe anything the government says when it comes to balancing budgets?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Madam Speaker, a few years ago, the pandemic happened and the economy shut down. The House was unanimous in stating that we needed to implement protective measures and safeguards. That came at the cost of significant debt. There was a consensus in the House about that.

Business of Supply

Since then, the spending has continued, however, and that is concerning. What concerns the Bloc Québécois in particular is the interference in areas under the jurisdiction of Quebec and the provinces. That really is not warranted.

I, too, want to salute my hon. colleague. It is a pleasure to work constructively with him at the finance committee.

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have a great deal of respect for my colleague.

[*English*]

We have worked together before on the finance committee, and he has been an excellent colleague.

[*Translation*]

I would like to ask him a question.

[*English*]

In terms of the balancing of the budget, does the Bloc Québécois believe in a balanced budget, and what would it do to get to that point if the Bloc members do indeed believe in balancing?

• (1835)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Madam Speaker, I thank and commend the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue. It was an immense pleasure and privilege to work with him at the Standing Committee on Finance. He is doing great work in his new job.

We do not agree with every argument presented in the motion. What we find there is disingenuous. The motion asks that “the House call on the government to table a plan to return to balanced budgets” without specifying a date.

To us, governing means being responsible and presenting projections. We support this desire for transparency.

I will offer some solutions to my colleague, since he works in the revenue department. In the fight against the use of tax havens, there is a lot of money to be recovered. That is something that would help in returning to balanced budgets.

Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech. I found it very interesting.

While Alberta's oil and gas companies were making record profits, workers were being laid off. This year alone, 14,000 workers in Alberta have been let go.

Does my colleague think that one way to balance the budget would be to stop subsidizing highly profitable companies and to introduce a windfall tax?

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for her question, which she asked in French. I congratulate her. It means a great deal to me.

The problem is being stuck in the 20th century with a 20th-century economy. The money going to prop up the oil industry should

be used for the transition. We must not let workers in Alberta down. We must support them in transitioning to the sectors of the future.

I am convinced that if all the support that is currently being provided, including a large part of the \$80 billion that has been announced, were used in a smart way to develop the economy of tomorrow with Alberta's valuable workers, we would be able to succeed with flying colours.

Mr. Alain Therrien (La Prairie, BQ): Madam Speaker, I will follow up on the fine speech by my colleague, who let the cat out of the bag: We will be voting in favour of this motion. The arguments contained in the motion, and I think that he elaborated on them, are obviously not to our liking. However, we agree with the conclusion: that “the House call on the government to table a plan to return to balanced budgets”.

When it comes to inflation and interest rates, things can get quite complicated. What better way to simplify issues than with populism and things that seem obvious to everyone, when they are actually not?

Why do we have inflation? Some will say that inflation is caused by government spending. I want to sound a note of caution, however. Inflation happens if the government spends money and if it creates deficits. Some people will therefore be tempted to say that deficits lead to inflation. That is not necessarily true. This is what is known in economics as the crowding-out effect, a term we do not often hear. It means that government deficits might not result in inflation because there is a crowding-out effect, meaning consumers save money to make up for the government deficit. The result is that there is no impact on inflation. The crowding-out effect may mean that there might be an impact on interest rates, however.

Why am I saying this? I am saying it because the thing is not so easy to understand. We could spend a long time discussing economic theories. Furthermore, some theories clash. Keynesianism is different from classical or neo-liberal economics, and so on. We have to be careful to avoid simplistic analyses or we run the risk of ignoring real solutions.

Is government spending to blame for the deficit? Is the Government of Canada responsible for global inflation? Did it ride around on a scooter, waving its arms, saying it was going to send us money and create inflation, before running away like Batman and Robin? The answer is no.

I just spelled it out in simple terms. The government is not to blame. The fault lies with the global pandemic, and with the fact that governments were forced to spend like never before in history. I never saw anything like it before. Governments were spending money hand over fist, like it was going out of style.

That is the reality. Faced with an extraordinary situation, we came up with what we believed were the best solutions at the time. That is why we have inflation. I have the figures. Inflation rose to 6.8% in 2022 and fell to 4.4% in June 2023. We can therefore agree that inflation was mainly caused by a pandemic.

Business of Supply

Why is that? It is because we have economists who are monetarists. Monetarists believe that inflation is caused by printing money and that abundance reduces value. The more money is printed, the less that money is worth. This means that the value of money is eroded by inflation. That is the view of monetarists. A lot of people agree with this.

That is why it is the Bank of Canada that finds solutions to Canada's inflation. Our colleague, the leader of the official opposition, believes that it has fangs and prowls around at night, but in reality, the Bank of Canada is one of the most renowned banks in the world. When we travel abroad, for example to universities, we only have to mention the Bank of Canada and the audience applauds for half an hour. It is unbelievable. It is so renowned that the English decided that they wanted the Governor of the Bank of Canada for themselves. It is a little like Bedard in the world of hockey. He was that sought after.

I am just talking, but if members want to read something that is well done, they should read the Bank of Canada Review. It is well done. When they finish their university degree in economics, good economists often end up at the Bank of Canada—except for me, because I escaped. I was in the washroom when the recruiters came by. Some say that they are crazy, but they really do know their stuff. It is a renowned bank.

In 1991, they said that the only way to fight inflation effectively is to tweak interest rates. Starting in 1991, the Bank of Canada was the second bank, after New Zealand, to say that it would adjust interest rates to keep inflation between 1% and 3%. That worked beautifully until the pandemic hit. It was going so well. We were a model for the world. Now, with the increases, what did they do? They were forced to raise interest rates. It is a bit complicated.

- (1840)

When a government adjusts monetary policy and plays with interest rates, it takes 18 months for it to have an impact on the economy and 24 months for it to have an impact on inflation. This requires projecting two years in advance before starting to play with things. That is the reality. It is not easy.

Having said that, we could all go for a beer and tell ourselves that there is no point in us being here because the Bank of Canada manages inflation. Wait a minute. That is not true. There are things that the government can do.

First, the government can introduce well-defined policies. If wages are very high and workers are scarce, then perhaps workers could be found if the government offered tax exemptions to older people who want to go back to work. Is that complicated? A guy with glasses and a computer can do that.

No, the government would rather use the stick. They bleed dry seniors between the ages of 65 and 75 and hope that once they are at the end of their rope, they will surely want to go to work. No, that is not how to create jobs and ensure that these people can go to work.

Let us talk about housing. There is a lack of housing. It is a matter of supply and demand. We need more supply. The government needs to invest in housing. That is the smart way to fight inflation.

As for oil, we have been ripped off by shameless increases in the price of oil. Perhaps it is because we should be doing something other than burning oil. Perhaps we should be investing in the energy transition of oil companies.

With regard to productivity, we have to increase worker productivity without making more widgets. If we make more widgets, then there are more widgets on the market and the value of widgets will drop. This is not complicated.

People are wondering where I stand because I have not talked about it yet. The last part of the motion reads, “the House call on the government to table a plan to return to balanced budgets.” I would like to emphasize two things. We need restraint, not austerity. The government must stop wasting, stop encroaching on the jurisdictions of Quebec and the provinces, stop proposing one-size-fits-all measures, and stop giving money to oil companies because doing so is wrong. It has to get smart about its spending. That does not mean embracing austerity. Most of all, it must not achieve these things on the backs of Quebec and the provinces, or else services to the public will be disrupted. Most public services are delivered by Quebec and the provinces. The government must not try to rebalance its budget by cutting back on health transfers to the provinces like Jean Chrétien and Paul Martin did in the past. That must not happen.

There is something called the fiscal imbalance, which proves beyond a reasonable doubt that the needs are in Quebec City and in the provinces, and that the money is in Ottawa. This means that, even if the government remains virtually static, it will be so drowning in money thanks to the taxes it collects and the fact that it has few areas of responsibility that 40 years from now, in addition to not having a deficit, it will no longer have any debt, and some provinces will not even be solvent. They will be forced to start from scratch under another name. I do not know if they will, but they will no longer be solvent. There is a problem somewhere.

Some think that a plan to return to a balanced budget means austerity measures. That should not be the case. There is no reason why it should be, for the reasons I outlined. This government must become responsible in how it spends money. No one can claim that it is an example. I understand that the country has weathered the COVID-19 pandemic, but after returning to normal, no one can say that it has been rigorous and intelligent in its spending choices.

I just mentioned some ways in which the government could have done better. Some people spoke earlier about how the government provides its services. Let us just say there is a lot of room for improvement. To impose a plan would make this government more serious, less frivolous and less careless.

Business of Supply

The government needs to make do with the amount of money it has available. It must be intelligent. It must not cut transfers to the provinces, because they are the ones who deliver the most important services to the public. It must be preventive with regard to inflation, which is currently eroding the purchasing power of those least well-off. As I said, this government needs to have targeted, intelligent spending to protect people in need. Doubling the GST tax credit was the right thing to do. I applaud that. However, we also need to fight inflation intelligently, not in a populist way.

• (1845)

Mr. Joël Godin (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, CPC): Madam Speaker, I really enjoyed the speech by my colleague from La Prairie. I can easily imagine that he would be a favourite teacher of his students. He is an economist and I can only agree with him. I would like him to tell us, the opposition parties, things we might not understand.

Here it is the month of June and the House is about to adjourn for the summer. We spent all spring being told that we were mistaken. I would like to hear my colleague explain to me what motivated the government's attitude when it said that its plan was working. If we look at the dashboard, Canada cuts a sad figure on the global stage. I would like my colleague to talk about that.

Mr. Alain Therrien: Madam Speaker, I commend my colleague, and I thank him for his question and his compliments, as well. We have the right to accept them. I am not criticizing. I am answering my colleague's question. I think that the hallmark of this government is that it is short-sighted. We saw it with the Chinese interference. The government is going along, but it is not always easy to get on the best path to improve the situation of the community in Quebec and Canada.

That is what we are also seeing with the policies that this government adopts. It chooses the easy way out. There is a reason for the dental care plan. Tax credits and subsidies for oil companies are easy. People want them. There is no problem. That is the old way of doing things. When I suggest ways of motivating retirees to return to the labour market, it is not a short-sighted policy. Social and affordable housing are not short-term policies. In economics, we call working on productivity a long-term policy. It takes vision.

This government often makes me think of a pirate that has a patch over both eyes, not just one.

• (1850)

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am lucky to be here this evening. Our colleague is pretty funny, but he talked about several very serious topics. He also talked about a very specific issue, housing. What is the Bloc Québécois's solution for addressing the homelessness problem? I am just curious.

[*English*]

It would be interesting to hear the perspective of my colleague on that specific issue, seeing as it is the last day of Parliament. I have never actually asked the member the question.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Therrien: Madam Speaker, I commend the work of my colleague.

People often say it is a question of supply and demand. Often, the people who talk about supply and demand do not understand the concept. I am not throwing stones at anyone, but that is what it comes down to.

What is happening now is that, with the higher salaries and the growing population, the demand for housing has increased significantly. If we allow the price of homes to go up, at some point there will not be housing for everyone because the population is growing. What is more, there are people who now have the means to go live in an apartment who may not have had the means before. We need to work on supply.

If we do not work on supply, we are doomed to have shortages because we will not have enough housing to offer to people as demand keeps growing. Demographics are important and they are not being taken into consideration right now. Let us work on supply. That is the best way to ensure that people can have housing, but also that they can afford it.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, I thank the member for La Prairie for his speech and enthusiasm. I want to ask him this. The Conservatives say that today's motion is their plan for fighting inflation. However, in the past, the Conservative leader presented a plan to fight inflation based in part on the use of cryptocurrency. I do not see any reference to cryptocurrency in this motion. I am wondering why the Conservatives removed this very important pillar from their plan. Could the member for La Prairie comment on that?

Mr. Alain Therrien: Madam Speaker, I certainly do not support cryptocurrency, which creates inflation.

I would like to highlight an important point that I did not previously mention. Introducing a plan to return to balanced budgets will have an impact on the economy and inflation by changing expectations about inflation. Inflation feeds itself. Forecasting inflation is enough to create it and to throw us in an inflationary spiral. Proposing a plan to balance the budget will lower expectations of inflation occurring. This curbs salary increases, which in turn limits inflation.

[*English*]

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am indeed pleased to rise tonight to speak to the motion that is before us and to say, on behalf of New Democrats, that we do not intend to support this motion, the reason being that New Democrats simply do not believe that one can have a credible plan to fight inflation without addressing the role that outsized price increases by corporations play in contributing to inflation. Not only is there not a plan, but there is not even a mention of the ways in which outsized price increases by corporations are hurting Canadians in the pocketbook. We have heard from economists who have said that as much as 25% of the inflation that Canadians have experienced over the last two years is attributable to those very same corporate price increases.

Business of Supply

We have seen it in the oil and gas sector, where there have been record profits and, in fact, an increase in extraction. We heard at the finance committee, not that long ago, that, in Canada, we are taking out record numbers of barrels of oil and gas every day in this country. Why is it that this can be happening alongside real economic strife in places like Alberta, where that oil and gas work is happening? It is because we have also seen a significant decrease in the level of employment, due to automation and other advances in technology within the oil fields. We are seeing a decoupling of profitability in the oil and gas sector and employment in the oil and gas sector, which is what really matters for Canadians when it comes to ensuring that the wealth generated through the extraction of our natural resources actually goes to Canadian working-class families.

While that can look good in terms of productivity numbers for the industry, depending on how it runs the numbers and depending on its purpose, whether it is reporting to shareholders or whether it is reporting to this place while seeking more subsidies, it is nevertheless the case that, even as the industry continues to extract more, Canadians are benefiting less. That is true from the workers' point of view and the industry's point of view, but it is also true from the point of view of Canadian consumers because, as those same oil and gas companies that are employing fewer people, even as they take more oil and gas out of the ground, are doing that, they are also raising prices well above the increase in the cost of their inputs. In fact, some of their input costs are going down as they employ fewer Canadians in decent, unionized positions with good-paying wages.

That explains how they can be logging record profits, and by record profits, I mean more profit in a single year than the oil and gas industry has ever seen in the history of the country. One would not know that to listen to Conservatives in this place, who say that the oil and gas industry is not doing well. It is very hard to believe that an industry is not doing well when it is producing a record amount of product and it is achieving the highest amount of profit it has ever seen in the history of the country, while charging Canadians higher prices than it ever has before. As much as we hear about the carbon tax, and there is no question that the carbon tax does increase the purchase price of oil and gas, just the simple price increases, the input cost increases that those companies have been experiencing, are more than what the carbon tax is. Do we hear a word from Conservatives about unjustified price hikes by the oil and gas companies, and what that means for Canadians and their pocketbook? No, we do not. That is why this is a party that simply does not have a credible plan to fight inflation.

I think there are two different approaches one can take to trying to fight inflation, and I think they mark a significant philosophical difference between the Conservative Party and, ultimately, I would argue, the Liberal government, as well as New Democrats. On the one hand, one can try to increase people's disposable income. We see that through proposals to eliminate the carbon tax and reduce taxes generally. What I find passing strange is that, with respect to providing income support to the poorest Canadians, we know, when they see an increase in their income, that extra money is going to go only to continuing to pay their rent in the same place where they have already been paying rent, or to buy the same groceries they had been buying before but are no longer able to. That is not inflationary money in the economy. That is not driving inflation. Sup-

porting people to be able to still put a meal on the table and pay their rent is not inflationary spending.

• (1855)

That is why I am very proud that New Democrats, two times now, have pushed the government to double the GST rebate. We know it is going to households that really need a lot of help in a really difficult time, when they are struggling to afford their rent and they are struggling to afford their food, but it will help in a way that does not cause further inflation, despite what the leader of the Conservatives says. The odd thing is that, when he advocates broad-based tax cuts, like eliminating the carbon tax, he has nothing to say about the inflationary impact of returning that money to households, not just the poorest households, which can be done through mechanisms like a higher GST rebate, but also higher-income households.

If the leader of the Conservatives wants to talk about how more money in the economy is going to lead to higher inflation, it is a strange admission. That is not even to mention that the real driver of certain kinds of inflation, when we talk about spending, or what would be if corporations actually spent it in the Canadian economy, which too often they do not, is the corporate taxes that the Conservatives and Liberals have often advocated. That is why there is actually a great meeting of the minds between Liberals and Conservatives when it comes to tax policy. It is why they have worked together, from the year 2000 to now, to lower the corporate tax rate from 28% to 15%. What does that mean? It means more spending in the economy, which, if we listen to the leader of the Conservatives, automatically means more inflation.

The Conservatives do not talk about how lowering corporate taxes can contribute to inflation. To the extent that it does not, it is because that money leaves the country and actually does not get spent. That is the point that Jim Flaherty, the former Conservative finance minister under Stephen Harper, made before he passed: they had lowered the corporate tax rate, and that was meant to increase business investment and raise productivity. However, as many Conservative members are fond of pointing out, Canada's productivity numbers are not what they should be, and it is not because corporate Canada has not had vast amounts of capital in waiting to make those business investments in order to raise productivity. It is because the companies prefer to either pay it out to their shareholders here in Canada or scuttle that money away into tax havens through agreements that successive Liberal and Conservative governments have made in order to make it easier for that profit to shift out of the country without those corporations ever paying their dues and helping to fund a number of things that are really important in helping Canadians get by in this difficult time.

Business of Supply

Broad-based tax relief is one way to say we are fighting inflation. I think some of the hazards the leader of the Conservative Party likes to point out about other things, like income support, apply equally to broad-based tax relief at a time like this. We should be conscious of that when we are evaluating proposals for tax decreases. It does not mean that New Democrats oppose all tax decreases. In fact, we were very vocal about the excise tax and our feeling that it was inappropriate for the excise tax to have an automatic escalator, first of all, and that the exceptional increase in the excise tax this year, because of inflation, was not acceptable. We worked with opposition parties to oppose that, and, ultimately, although the government did not bring it down to zero, it dramatically reduced the excise tax increase with the budget implementation act.

The other way to combat inflation, which, for my money, is more effective, is to try to control the price of things Canadians cannot do without. What do I mean by that? I mean bringing down the cost of child care, because that puts money back in Canadians' pockets. It makes it easier for Canadians who want to work in order to support their family to be able to leave the home and do that work. We all know that this disproportionately affects women who want to have a career. They can do that because they can now access child care at a price that makes it so they do not work simply to pay for child care instead of contributing to the other meaningful expenses of a household.

With respect to a pharmacare program, we need to mobilize the power of bulk purchasing across the country and bring down the price of prescription drugs considerably. There have been so many studies done on pharmacare, going back decades. All of them conclude that, by having one federal program, we could significantly reduce the amount Canadians pay for prescription drugs. There is no question about it. It is why pharmaceutical companies hate the idea. It is why they have spent so much money lobbying the government to stop it. Unfortunately, they have done that far too successfully, and it is why New Democrats are here to continue pushing and to provide the political will to drown out the lobbying efforts of the pharmaceutical industry, because we know that, through good public policy, we can reduce the amount Canadians pay for drugs. That ensures not only that they get extra income, but also that corporations cannot just take that income by raising their prices, which is what has been happening in the oil and gas industry.

- (1900)

It is what has been happening in the grocery industry. If people want proof of that, they need look no further than today's news, where Canada Bread Company has admitted to price-fixing with Weston Foods. The company paid a \$50-million fine after having pleaded guilty. What about the other companies that were involved in that, and what about Canadians who have been looking at food prices over the last two years? People know very well that many companies have been raising their prices over and above the additional cost to the companies, whether it is for oil and gas to heat their home or it is for their groceries. I think we all have a legitimate suspicion that Canadians have not been treated fairly by corporate Canada.

With respect to creating more disposable income, Conservatives love to say that if the government taxes corporations, they are just

going to pass that on to the consumer. If it cuts Canadians' taxes, corporations are just going to raise their prices. Does that mean we are stuck and that there is no hope and no way forward? No, it does not, because through good public policy we can reduce the cost of child care in a way that means people cannot just up the price, because we are regulating the fees and we are providing subsidy to make sure the organizations offering child care are not doing it at an exorbitant price. It is why New Democrats have a very clear and stated preference for non-profit delivery in child care, because we think that once we incorporate that profit motive, we are exposing Canadians to the very same greedy taking that we have seen in the oil and gas sector, in the grocery sector and elsewhere. That is the way. If we can control the cost of something that people cannot do without, that puts more money back in people's pockets in such a way that it cannot just be taken back out again.

It is why I supported the Manitoba Public Utilities Board, for instance, which has been very successful, over decades, in regulating the price of auto insurance and Manitoba Hydro. Interestingly, it is a body that the current Conservative Government of Manitoba has been trying to wreck, and to impede from doing its job of looking closely at requested price hikes by these crown corporations. It is ironic, given that one would think it would be the Conservatives most of all who would want a hawkish oversight agency to be looking at crown corporations and ensuring fair pricing. However, in fact, they are undermining the Public Utilities Board. I think it is important. We could actually use something like that nationally for the price of oil and gas, to ensure that when Canadians are going to the pumps or when they are heating their home, they can be assured that they are getting a fair shake on the price, and that the fact that it is the long weekend would not dictate whether they have a hole in their budget at the end of the month.

It is why dental support is important. With dental insurance, we can ensure that people are getting a service which they otherwise would not get at all. We know that, too often, because of people's socio-economic status, they have not been able to access dental care. For those who have been able to pay, this means they are going to be able to get more service without simply seeing corresponding hikes in prices.

New Democrats have a very settled opinion on what the way to fight inflation is: through good public policy and public investment so Canadians are working together and co-operating to provide the essentials of life and create more room for disposable income in their household budgets, instead of simply cutting taxes for everyone. Cutting taxes for everyone disproportionately benefits the most wealthy and then makes it harder to provide services for everyone, and it runs all the same risks of inflationary pressure on the economy that the leader of the Conservative Party is so concerned about when it involves public funds.

Business of Supply

Here is another way in which that matters, and another way in which there is a very close resemblance between, for instance, the housing policy of the Liberal government and the housing policy of the Conservative Party. Neither one is willing to call out the role of corporate greed in housing. The leader of the Conservatives sometimes, maybe, kind of makes a passing allusion to it but is quick to say that somehow it is the fault of government. The housing market is working exactly how it was set up to work in the mid-1990s, with the blessing of Liberals and Conservatives. They decided they wanted to make it more of a financial market. They wanted a commodity-based approach to housing. That has been working. The national housing strategy, frankly, has been largely a joke in terms of increasing supply for affordable housing, and it has done nothing to impede the kind of harmful investment behaviour we see in the market.

● (1905)

The Conservatives are not proposing to do anything about that. The idea that, by simply balancing the government's books, we are going to see a significant change in the housing market or houses becoming more affordable is a joke. That is not how this is going to go. There are very deep pockets that do not rely on anything the government does in order to be able to spend in the real estate economy, acquire houses and acquire apartment blocks.

Where is the leader of the Conservatives when we talk about the travesty of buildings like Lions Manor on Portage Avenue in Winnipeg, which used to provide affordable housing? It has just been acquired, not with government money, but by a giant corporate landlord that came in, bought the building and is evicting the tenants. One does not have a serious strategy to fix the problem of housing in Canada if one cannot criticize the corporate sector and the role that it is playing in jacking up the price of housing. It cannot be done. It is not serious.

Then we look at things that the previous Conservative government did to put money in the pockets of corporate Canada, never mind the corporate tax decreases, which were substantial. The Conservatives sold the plans for the CANDU reactor, which was world-leading technology. They love to talk about nuclear, but do members know that they sold that to SNC-Lavalin for pennies on the dollar? It was \$75 million, but it came with a bunch of tax benefits and other things. I think they sold it for a final net cost of about \$15 million. I do not know what it costs to build a CANDU reactor, but I know that it is measured in billions and not millions to get the intellectual property behind that. Before the Harper government, it actually belonged to Canadians, so that when somebody decided to build a nuclear reactor on the CANDU model anywhere in the world, Canadians could benefit. I think that is a real travesty. It is just an example of how the Conservatives are no better than the Liberals when it comes to stuffing the pockets of corporate Canada at the expense of Canadians.

I am mindful of a leader who does actually have so many policy similarities to the Liberal government. I could go on about that. I recall that, in the fall of 2021, when the leader of the Conservative Party was their finance critic, we were having a debate about the mandate of the Bank of Canada. Its mandate is to fight inflation, and it has been for a long time; it is to keep inflation at a 2% target.

We talked about what the impact of maintaining that mandate would have on Canadians if we saw higher interest rates. We said that if that was the only thing the Bank of Canada was going to do, it would jeopardize strong employment by raising interest rates to get inflation under control. It would put Canadians in jeopardy of losing their homes by raising interest rates in order to combat inflation, instead of having a more nuanced mandate, as many central banks around the world do. They keep an eye on strong employment and the effect of rising interest rates on the ability of folks to stay in their homes and to keep making payments on their mortgages.

The current leader of the Conservative Party was very clear at that time. He wanted the mandate to stay narrowly on the 2% inflation target; that was it. What did the Liberals do? They acquiesced. I was on a panel with them, shot out in the foyer, at the time. I remember, because when I said that actually the Liberals had done everything he said he wanted them to do, he mused about legal action against me for having shown the very direct link between the Liberal Party's actions and the Conservative Party's advice. I said that it would be a bad day for Canadians if we did experience inflation, because the Bank of Canada would raise interest rates and put them out of their homes.

Let us not pretend that the leader of the Conservative Party has not played a very important role in keeping the Bank of Canada on a mandate that is causing these increased interest rate hikes. It is not the only thing, but the fact that it does not have a more nuanced mandate is a product of his advice and the actions of the Liberal Party. Canadians are not benefiting from the kind of nuance that has been built into other central banks' mandates.

That is why I stand here today to say that there are more ways to fight inflation than what the Conservatives have put in here. In fact, what they have put in here goes squarely against New Democrats' approach to fighting inflation. New Democrats' approach has everything to do with putting money back in the pockets of Canadians but doing it by ensuring that all the things that they have to buy, such as child care, prescription drugs, dental care, housing, are actually brought down, instead of what we see in the motion today. That is just to cut those programs in order to balance the government's books.

● (1910)

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to listen to the member speak. I know he has a good command of these issues, and he is respected for his work on the finance committee in particular.

I do agree very strongly with his take on how to combat inflation, when he says that the approach should be to focus on those things that people cannot do without, such as dental care and child care. I am glad to see that the government, with the support of the NDP, has moved in that direction. We see the benefit to thousands of Canadians who are being supported along the way in both of those areas.

Business of Supply

I do want more clarity on something. I do not ask this in a combative way; I am simply interested in the NDP's position. The member raised the issue of corporate income tax. He seemed to suggest that the NDP position would be to raise those rates back up to close to 30%. What is the position of the NDP on that specific matter? I hear some, not many, New Democrats who have a very pro-business view; sometimes they present themselves in that way, and one would expect a championing of a lower rate of tax. However, I did not hear that from this member.

• (1915)

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, the member will not hear that, when it comes to the corporate tax rate.

We ran on increasing the corporate tax rate, not to 30% but to 19%; I think that was the latest platform commitment. We have been very clear about that. This is still well below the OECD average, so it is hardly a high-water mark when it comes to fair taxation of large corporations.

Our position is that Canada has incredible competitive advantage beyond a low tax rate. Canada does not have to scrape the bottom of the barrel on its corporate tax rate in order to attract investment. We have a lot of natural resources that cannot be found elsewhere. We have an incredible labour market with a lot of skill. We provide benefits, such as health care, that oftentimes, in other jurisdictions, employers would have to pay premiums in order to be able to provide.

Canada is an attractive place to invest, and we do not have to have a bottom-of-the-barrel corporate tax rate in order to attract investment.

Mr. Philip Lawrence (Northumberland—Peterborough South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, just to set the record straight, on average, 9% of OECD countries' revenue comes from corporate taxation. I have this from the OECD report. In Canada, it is 12%. Tax revenue that comes from corporate taxation is 30% more in Canada. Therefore, to say that we are somehow below the average in the amount of taxation we take from corporations is simply not true.

I heard the member criticizing both Liberals and Conservatives. He went on about some of the things that the Liberals are doing wrong. We agree that the Liberals have a deficit and debt that is way too high. We have interest rates and inflation. We might disagree on the cause of that, but we are seeing negative consequences. We have food bank usage doubling.

Will the member vote non-confidence in the government?

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I will not do that today, but we have been very clear that the day may come.

We heard a Liberal member talking before about inflation and the hardship that Canadians are experiencing because of that. Any time they talk about this, they start listing the things that the NDP made them do, including the GST rebate, dental care, action on child care and pharmacare. The discriminating factor is that as long as we can continue to push the Liberal government into doing things to benefit Canadians in this difficult time, things that I firmly believe they would not be doing with a majority, we will continue

to support the ongoing work of this Parliament as opposed to another one.

The day will come when this Parliament ends. What we are doing now is setting up Canadians to get some meaningful relief from inflation in a way that companies cannot simply take back without price increases. I think we are paving the way for a strong majority New Democratic government in Canada.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I joined the debate 15 or 20 minutes ago. I heard part of my colleague's speech. I would like to take him back to what we call the "fiscal imbalance" and what I could also call "federal paternalism". This refers to the fact that the federal government uses the money it has and its own spending to impose its own choices on Quebec.

What does my colleague think about federal paternalism? I imagine that he must support it.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I think that there is always a danger of seeing something like that when we work in teams. I also think that it is possible to have a genuine partnership between the provinces and the federal government.

It is a matter of how the programs are implemented and how involved the provinces are in the decisions surrounding how the program will be implemented in their jurisdictions.

When it comes to child care, for example, there is a good model. The provinces have had a lot of say in how it will be implemented in their own jurisdiction, including Quebec, which has always been a leader in child care. There are models for good collaboration. We want to look at these models to ensure that we do not become the victims of dangerous federal government paternalism.

• (1920)

[*English*]

Ms. Lindsay Mathysen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, one thing that has been brought to mind by this motion is the focus on this idea of returning to balanced budgets. In times past, during both Conservative and Liberal majority governments, they tried to make themselves look better by balancing the budget. To do this, not only did they cut services, but they also cut housing strategies and a lot of things Canadians depend upon. They also raided the employment insurance fund, which was paid for by the deferred wages of workers. What is the member's perspective on that? I would really love to hear.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Madam Speaker, yes, that is a fact, and it has been done by Liberal and Conservative governments. In fact, it was a key election commitment of the sitting Prime Minister that he would not do this anymore.

I think the running tally between Liberal and Conservative governments by 2015 of what had been raided out of the employment insurance account was about \$63 billion or so. This was money that did not belong to government but belonged to workers in order to pay wages while they are out of work. Perhaps somebody knows that number better.

What I find quite disconcerting is that the current government is at it with the same old tricks, except that this time, instead of just gratuitously grabbing that money out of the EI account, it has said that it is going to take \$25 billion of pandemic CERB debt and apply it to the EI account. Therefore, it is saying that it is not really taking money out of the account but just debiting the account.

One does not have to be a democratic socialist to be upset about this. The Canadian Federation of Independent Business thinks it is a bad idea, and it is upset about it too. Both employers and employees are rightly upset about the fact that the federal government has once again decided to go grab out of the EI piggy bank, which is not what it is. It is also why we should have legislation to protect that account, but we do not, and it is why we have been very consistent in calling on the government to—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Questions and comments, the hon. member for Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola.

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Madam Speaker, I worked with the member on the Standing Committee on Finance quite well. I would simply like to ask about his views on building more housing. He seems to be completely against real estate investment trusts or other private entities, but ultimately, if we are going to see more purpose-built rentals to give people a roof over their heads, it is going to take an incredible amount of money. Some of these larger corporations are able to do that. They are doing it in places like Westbank First Nation. Quite honestly, municipal gatekeepers are preventing private, public or not-for-profit entities from building more affordable housing—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I will give the hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona a few seconds to answer.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Madam Speaker, it is an important opportunity to correct the record. We are not against private developers creating new housing, but that is not what is going to fix the housing crisis. They have been doing that for decades, and it is not helping. We have been on a track to destruction for a long time.

What we think is a real problem is when a big corporate landlord buys a building that used to provide affordable rents, renovates the premises, kicks out all the tenants who needed those affordable rents, jacks up the rents and then invites in other people with more ability to pay. They are not creating new units. This leaves the other people destitute and without a place to live. We will not solve the housing crisis by kicking the poor out of existing affordable units and then allowing those big corporate landlords to make mad profit off new tenants. We need a different plan now.

[Translation]

Mr. Joël Godin (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, CPC): Madam Speaker, first of all, I would like to thank my colleague who spoke before me, the hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona.

Business of Supply

I do not share his political opinions and values, but I must point out the effort he made to speak French. I am very pleased to hear more French in the House of Commons. I tip my hat to him.

I will be sharing my time with my colleague from Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek.

Just over three months ago, on March 28, the Liberal government tabled an irresponsible budget that increases debt and inflation. A few weeks ago, I rose in the House to give a speech on Bill C-47, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 28, 2023. I began my speech on this bill on June 6 by criticizing the government, which, in my opinion, is choosing to throw money at everyone and waste money. It is making decisions in its own self-interest to hold on to power, using taxpayer dollars to buy a little bit of support from the NDP. The NDP will probably never have as much power in the future as it has in this Parliament—

• (1925)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member's telephone is vibrating and causing a disturbance.

The hon. member has the floor.

Mr. Joël Godin: Madam Speaker, I was saying that the current government is a minority government and that, in my opinion, the NDP will probably never again have the power it has right now in this 44th Parliament. It is rather odd and a bit disappointing to us, Canadians, who work hard to save our money and make the best use of it.

This government is reaffirming its commitment to reducing the federal debt and thinks that it will do that by wasting our money. I am asking this question again because here we are near the end of the session before the House adjourns for the summer. That is likely not news. I think that Canadians noticed that it was possibly our last day. I want to take this opportunity to wish a very good summer to the 337 other parliamentarians who worked hard for many hours. I think Canadians should know how many hours we all spend on serving them. I wish my colleagues a very good summer. I hope they take care of themselves and their family and that they come back in September in full form.

I was saying that it is unfortunate to see that nothing has changed on the Liberal side. Canadians are still stretched to the limit with inflation. They are drowning. What is really unfortunate is that it is getting worse because of this government's policy. Six months ago, the Deputy Prime Minister was saying that we should not run deficits or that we should minimize them because they would have a direct impact on inflation. That was six months ago when she tabled the November economic statement. Then she tabled the budget in March.

Business of Supply

When I look at this massive budget, unfortunately I do not see an approach or a target date for balancing the budget. That is rather unfortunate. We are caught in a downward spiral. The problem is that the cost of living is going up. Companies need more revenue. Employees need more income. The government is increasing taxes, which means that there is no way out, no escape.

The housing situation is a tragedy. I have before me an article that was updated in today's *Journal de Montréal*. In Quebec, rent prices have risen by 13.7% in just one year. I am not talking about food or heating or consumer goods. I am talking about something that every Canadian cannot do without, namely housing. Worse still, the increase in some cities is as high as 44%. That is huge.

There was another article posted online whose headline read, "I'm prepared to sleep in the living room: this mom of two teens has 10 days left to find a place to live". It is tragic. It is no joke. We need to give ourselves the means to be rigorous and to get our public finances in order. The members across the aisle are telling us that everything is fine, that the outlook is good, that they have received a good report card from the international community. Unfortunately, it all depends on how one looks at report cards. I could go on and on about housing statistics, but I will go back to my original text.

Businesses are no longer able to make good deals. Everything costs more. There is a labour shortage. We need to increase wages. At the end of the day, there is only one payer and that is the Canadian taxpayer. It is important to be able to strike the right balance. There is no sign of that from this government, however. As my economist colleague from the Bloc Québécois said, this government has no vision. It is reactive. Foreign interference is one example of the government being reactive.

• (1930)

That went on for quite a while. Because of the situation, the special rapporteur resigned. We do not know whether he resigned willingly or was forced to. We told the government that an independent public inquiry was needed. They played with words about the process, and they might wait until the last minute, when they have no other choice, before they reach that conclusion. We are wasting time. As my grandfather said, time is money.

I was talking about businesses. It is very important to give them the tools they need, which brings me to another topic, the carbon tax. The government has been in power for eight years. It brought in a first tax and took certain measures. Looking at the results after eight years, we see that there have been no reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. I am told that there was a drop at one point, but that was during the pandemic. The pandemic certainly did reduce consumption, but it reduced a lot of other things too. When we look at the projections, we can see that we are going to hit a wall.

The first carbon tax did not work. Now we will wave a magic wand. We will solve the greenhouse gas problem by introducing a second carbon tax.

If the first tax did not work, then the second likely will not either. No one needs to take a university class to understand that. Instead of taking care of the environment, this government is taking money out of taxpayers' pockets and making them even poorer. However, I

would like to remind the government that Canadians cannot take any more. They have been bled dry. They are no longer able to pay their bills.

The fact that 1.5 million Canadians have to use food banks is very serious, yet the government is saying that we do not have to worry, that everything is fine and the situation is under control.

I have some data from the OECD. We are being told that Canada is doing well when it comes to the real GDP growth projections for 2023-24 and that we are among the leaders. I do not know about that. I did a search earlier while I was waiting for my turn to speak. In terms of the real GDP growth projection for 2023-24, the average for all countries is 2.7%. The projection for Canada is 1.4%, but the government is saying that things are going well and that everything is under control. We are on the right path, the results are good and we need to trust the government.

For 2024, the real GDP growth projection for all countries is 2.9%. That is an average. The projection for Canada is not 7% or 5.1%. It is 1.4%.

On that note, I want to wish everyone a good summer. I will be pleased to answer my colleagues' questions.

Mr. Darrell Samson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs and Associate Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech. As always, his speech was energetic and to the point. I appreciate his speeches.

However, I would like to mention the one thing I find problematic. He said that we are wasting money. The difference between the Conservative Party and our party is that we are investing in Canadians. We are investing a lot of money to help them. Since 2015, we have created 1.2 million jobs. Since COVID-19, we have created 900,000 jobs. That is huge.

What did the Conservatives do? I would like to know where they are going to make cuts. Before the hon. member was elected, the Conservatives closed nine veterans offices and cut 1,000 positions at Veterans Affairs Canada. Are there any other places where the member plans to make cuts?

• (1935)

Mr. Joël Godin: Madam Speaker, I would like to begin by saluting my colleague, whom I sincerely appreciate. We have the privilege of working together on issues related to the international Francophonie. I had the opportunity to work with him on Bill C-13.

It is a good thing that he was the Liberal representative for the study on Bill C-13, because without him, we would have had even less to show for all our efforts. I would like to acknowledge him and thank him for the work that he did, although he could have done more.

Business of Supply

Now, as for the situation in 2015, all I can say to my colleague from Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook is that we had a time horizon to balance the budget. We left the books in great shape, whereas this government has run up a deficit larger than the deficits of all prime ministers combined since Trudeau senior.

Mr. Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Madam Speaker, in 2022, environmental disasters caused by climate change cost \$275 billion. The five biggest oil companies made \$220 billion in profits in 2022. Oil companies received \$20 billion in funding from the government. I rounded these figures.

As my colleague claims, we know that the government spends unwisely. Does he believe that the \$20 billion the government spent on an industry that made \$220 billion in profits that year was a bad investment? He seems to be concerned about climate change and the environment, so does he not think that this money could have been better spent on the energy transition?

Mr. Joël Godin: Madam Speaker, I would like to salute my colleague from Montcalm. That is definitely a concern for me. As the member for Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, I am concerned about two things, namely official languages and the environment.

His question contains the answer because, when it comes to the energy transition, we need to take a gradual approach and have a vision. We must not be reactionary. That is what the Liberal government is doing, by always acting at the last minute and improvising.

Yes, we must commit to the energy transition, but we need to do it intelligently. We do not need to get too drastic, we simply need to improve the situation. We need to set a target and create a plan to meet that target. The Liberal carbon tax plan fails to meet any targets. All it does is fill the government's coffers and leave Canadians poorer.

[*English*]

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Madam Speaker, I have a lot of respect for my colleague. I hope he has a great summer ahead of him.

This motion is misguided. Cutting help to people is not the solution. In fact, we have seen corporate taxes go from 28% to 15% under the Liberals and the Conservatives. What has happened? Real estate trusts, banks, and oil and gas companies are raking in record profits. We also keep seeing increases in bank fees and oil and gas prices.

When are the Conservatives actually going to have the courage to stand up against corporate welfare and make sure corporations pay their fair share so that people get the help they need?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Joël Godin: Madam Speaker, once again, I salute my colleague from Courtenay—Alberni. I hope he has a great summer too. I appreciate his kind words.

I think it is important to act like a responsible parent. When a parent has a budget to manage, they have to manage it intelligently. If we, as parents, acted like this government, we would all be bankrupt and lining up at food banks. The answer I would give my colleague is that we must do things intelligently.

• (1940)

[*English*]

Mrs. Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): Madam Speaker, I rise in this place today to speak to the opposition motion put forward by the Conservatives to address the cost of living crisis facing Canadians. This is a crisis that the government has done nothing to fix. In fact, it is the Liberals' inflationary policies that created the crisis in the first place.

What has their response been? They have continued to run high deficits, pushing inflation to 40-year record highs. The Prime Minister excused this reckless spending by claiming that interest rates were at record lows and would remain there for many years to come. Now we have record debt, record inflation, and interest rates that have continued to rise despite the Prime Minister's prediction. This is causing pain for Canadians across the country, as their household budgets are being stretched thinner and thinner under the Liberal tax-and-spend plan. While Canadians are struggling, the government continues to increase taxes, making the essentials more expensive.

The Liberals have been persistent in their misinformed statements that the carbon tax is a net positive for Canadians. The Parliamentary Budget Officer's reports on the two carbon taxes have rejected this notion. The first carbon tax the government introduced will end up costing Canadians up to 41¢ per litre of gas. The added second carbon tax will cost another 17¢ per litre. Adding GST, this comes to 61¢ per litre. This will cost Saskatchewan families an extra \$2,840 each year, but some Canadian families will pay up to \$4,000 for the combined Liberal carbon taxes in other parts of the country.

This is a slap in the face to Saskatchewanians and Canadians. The carbon taxes have only made life more expensive for Canadians and have cost them more money for no results. The carbon taxes were never an environmental plan; they were a tax plan to fuel government spending.

Even while Canadians are struggling, the government cannot show fiscal restraint. It has no respect for taxpayers, as it continues to ramp up its inflationary spending. When the Prime Minister formed government, the national debt was \$612.3 billion. By the end of this fiscal year, the federal debt is projected to reach \$1.22 trillion. This means the Prime Minister has doubled the national debt in just eight years.

Business of Supply

The national debt will break down to \$81,000 per household in Canada. Additionally, debt-servicing costs have been growing just as fast as the government's deficits. This fiscal year, it is projected that the cost to service the national debt will be \$43.9 billion. This cost is quickly approaching the amount of money given to the provinces through health transfers.

Canadians are deeply concerned about the economic policies of our country, except, it would seem, those sitting on the government benches. Most Canadians do not have a trust fund to fall back on, so they need to be careful with their money. The government needs to start demonstrating respect for hard-working Canadians by being good stewards of the public purse.

Without a plan to eliminate the deficits and balance the budget, inflation and interest rates will continue to rise and hurt Canadian families across the country even more. The Liberals have not put forward a plan to do this. Instead, they poured more gasoline on their inflationary fire by adding more than \$60 billion in new spending. That is \$4,200 per Canadian family. This spending is driving up deficits and consequently increasing inflation.

The Bank of Canada, which was widely predicted to lower interest rates, instead raised them from 4.5% to 4.75% following the tabling of the Liberals' budget. That is why the Conservatives are now calling on the government, through this opposition motion, to return to balanced budgets and give Canadians a break.

• (1945)

Now we are receiving warnings from the International Monetary Fund that Canada is the country most at risk of massive mortgage defaults. Across Canada, average mortgage payments have increased by 122% since the Prime Minister took office. Despite this warning, we see no plan from the government to get inflation under control to avoid a potential mortgage default crisis. Instead, the Liberals are burying their heads in the sand, leaving Canadians to their own devices as they spend away their future. This is not sustainable and is pushing Canadians closer to the edge.

Canadian households now have the most debt as a share of GDP of any country in the G7. This is not a record we want to hold. There is a solution. The Liberals must eliminate the deficits and balance the budget in order to bring down inflation and interest rates. I know this may not be easy for them, as they seem to know only one economic policy, which is to raise taxes and print money, but the fact is that if the Liberals were to put together a plan to return to balanced budgets and eliminate deficits, lower inflation and interest rates would follow. However, this is not something they can wait to do. We are already at a crisis point.

Just last month, the food bank in Saskatoon held a food drive, as the usage of food banks has reached a new record of 24,000 people a month. Across Canada, there are 1.5 million more people using food banks on a monthly basis, not to mention that one in five Canadians is skipping at least one meal a day because they cannot afford to eat. This is because food price inflation is also at a 40-year high. "Canada's Food Price Report 2023" has predicted that a family of four will spend up to \$1,065 more on food this year. With many Canadians struggling paycheck to paycheck, the rising cost of food is breaking their banks.

The dream of home ownership is also fading fast. When the Liberal government took power, Canadians spent 39% of their paycheques on their monthly housing payments. Now they spend 62% of their paycheques. This is reflected by the growth of average rental and mortgage costs. Mortgage payments have doubled, from \$1,400 per month to over \$3,100 a month. Rent across Canada has doubled, from \$1,172 to \$2,153 for a two-bedroom apartment, and it has more than doubled in Canada's largest cities. This is why we must get interest rates under control.

For years, the Conservatives have warned the Liberal government that its out-of-control spending has consequences and hurts Canadians across the country. However, it responded with the infamous quote from the Prime Minister that budgets will balance themselves. We are now eight years into the government's tenure and have seen the effects of the Prime Minister's so-called self-balancing budgets. It has been a disaster for Canadians.

According to an article last month from the Financial Post and the Macdonald-Laurier Institute, over 10 years, real GDP per capita growth has been at its lowest since the 1930s. The article states, "This extended period of slow growth has widened the gap between per capita growth in the United States and Canada, demonstrating that the causes of our slumping growth are domestic, not external." The Liberals can no longer blame external factors for their own failures. The economic troubles our country now finds itself in are a result of the failed economic policies of the government.

In conclusion, I think it is in the best interests of every Canadian that this House call on the government to rein in its spending. It is time for the government to show the fiscal restraint that was promised by the Minister of Finance prior to the introduction of her latest budget. Instead of cancelling Disney+, let us cancel the deficits, axe the taxes and balance the budget.

• (1950)

Mr. Adam van Koeverden (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and to the Minister of Sport, Lib.): Madam Speaker, Conservatives love to stand up in the House and claim to be the stewards of the economy and to have presided over the previous government with balanced budgets, but they only balanced the budget once and it was a fake balanced budget. It was at the expense of a lot of infrastructure in Canada.

The member opposite ran on a commitment in the last election to both price carbon and run deficits. I do notice there has been a little change of heart of late on the other side, but there is a lack of a plan. It would be great to hear directly from the member on this. Any balanced budget would require program cuts. What specific programs is she suggesting the government cut?

Business of Supply

Mrs. Kelly Block: Madam Speaker, there are a number of things that we might decide not to spend Canadian taxpayers' money on.

Let us talk about the carbon tax. We would cut the carbon tax. We would stop paying high-priced consultants. We would not allow the Prime Minister to consider exorbitant spending on vacations. We would not provide sole-source contracts to Liberal insiders that have cost Canadians millions of dollars. We might get rid of the infrastructure bank.

[Translation]

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ): Madam Speaker, I have to say that the motion paints an accurate picture of the difficulties faced by Canadians and Quebecers. However, there is a problem with the solution. For the Conservatives, the solution is to eliminate deficits. They think that when the deficits are eliminated, all the problems will be magically solved: The cost of housing will drop, and households will have less debt. We really do not agree with that.

We are going to vote in favour of the need to table a plan to return to balanced budgets. We agree with that because governing requires planning. To govern is to anticipate. Tabling a plan to return to balanced budgets is the least a government can do. However, we do not agree with the measures that the Conservative Party is promising to take. Eliminating the carbon tax is the wrong thing to do. I would even say that it should be increased.

Could the Conservative Party propose more realistic solutions?

[English]

Mrs. Kelly Block: Madam Speaker, I believe that at every step of the way, Conservatives have been providing solutions to this place and to the current government.

The fact of the matter is that after eight years under the Liberal government, Canadians are struggling. We are hearing from our constituents in our ridings. Although the government assures Canadians that they have never had it so good, it only really shows how out of touch it is. It is time for the government to take economic policy seriously and return to balanced budgets. It needs to start paying attention to monetary policy.

Ms. Lisa Marie Barron (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Madam Speaker, I always like to point out where we have common ground. One thing on which I definitely agree with the member is that people are struggling to make ends meet. However, the solutions seem to be where we differ. For example, why do we never hear from the Conservatives about taxing the ultra-rich large corporations? With consecutive Liberal and Conservative governments, we saw the corporate tax rate decrease from 28% in the year 2000 to 15% today.

When will we see the Conservatives finally call out large corporations and the ultra-rich to pay their fair share so that we can see that money go where it belongs? This seems like a good, tangible solution to move forward with.

Mrs. Kelly Block: Madam Speaker, as the official opposition, we have been very clear about what Conservatives would do. The priorities of the Conservative plan are to make Canada work for the people who work. We want to see powerful paycheques with lower taxes so that hard work pays off again. We want to bring home low-

er prices by ending inflationary carbon tax 1, carbon tax 2 and deficit spending that drives up inflation and interest rates.

We want to bring in homes people can afford by removing government gatekeepers to free up land and speed up building permits. I know that only Conservatives can bring home a country that works for people who work and is a place for people to invest in.

• (1955)

Mr. Francesco Sorbara (Vaughan—Woodbridge, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is always wonderful to rise in this most honourable and esteemed House and be with my wonderful colleagues.

Before I begin, I would like to take 40 seconds, as I understand we are nearing the end of the session, just to say some thanks. First I will thank my wife Rose at home, and our three daughters Eliana, Natalia and little Leia, because there is a bit of an age difference there. I want to thank them. We can only travel to Ottawa and do our jobs and be away from our families with the support of our families, so I want to give a quick shout-out to them and tell them that I love them very much and that daddy will see them soon back home.

Second, I say thanks to Pina and Evelina and Francesco and Dima, my team back in Vaughan. I will see them tomorrow at our job fair, where we will be together. I want to say thanks as well to Natalia, Anthony and Sashalie, the team here in Ottawa. Sashalie has been with me for a number of years and has seen me at my best and worst and in my ups and my downs. I want to give a special shout-out to this individual, because she is exceptional in every way. My wife and I treat her like family, and she is a very special individual for our family.

As I begin this evening to speak to the opposition party's opposition day motion, I need to reflect on what our party has put in place since day one in 2015, when I was elected and we formed government. I reflect on everything we have done to move Canada forward, to invest in Canadians, to strengthen our middle class and to assist those working hard to join the middle class. I think about the Canada child benefit and what we have done there. I think about the Canada workers benefit, which we have strengthened three times now. Cheques will be arriving to the hard-working, low-income and middle-income Canadians who will benefit from this.

I will be splitting my time with one of the most honourable and learned scholars I have the pleasure to work with, the member for London North Centre.

Business of Supply

Getting back to the measures we put in place, I reflect on the Canada child benefit, which has lifted hundreds of thousands of children out of poverty, and the Canada workers benefit, which benefits working-class and lower-income Canadians. This measure was first introduced prior to our government, but we have strengthened it so much. I reflect on the climate action incentive plan, on the \$10-a-day child care plan, on eliminating interest on student loans and apprenticeships, and the list goes on. It includes raising the basic personal exemption amount to \$15,000, which is a tax cut literally in the billions of dollars for Canadians. In 2015, the government lowered the tax rate for middle-income Canadians, which was billions of dollars back in the pockets of Canadians, and asked the most wealthy in our society to pay a bit more. That is how we build an inclusive economy.

We signed trade deals. We completed CETA and got it across the finish line to see trade between Canada and Europe. We signed CUSMA, ensuring that we came out with a strong free trade deal with the United States and Mexico. We completed CPTPP, again putting measures in.

We lowered the small business tax rate from 11% to 9% for small businesses across this country. We put in place a volunteer agreement and then a second agreement to lower credit card user transaction fees for small and medium-sized enterprises across this country, saving business owners literally billions of dollars in the coming years so they can invest back into their businesses.

Since day one, our government has been focused on investing in Canadians and investing in Canada, ensuring we have a strong, favourable investment climate to create jobs. We have seen over 900,000 jobs created here in this beautiful country since the pandemic ended. We have seen our GDP recover. We have had the backs of Canadians and we will continue to do so.

[Translation]

I thank my colleagues for providing me with the opportunity to participate in today's debate.

First, I would like to point out that, contrary to what the opposition would like us to believe, Canadians are not the only ones facing this economic reality. Inflation is a global phenomenon. With the key investments in the economy that were announced in the 2023 budget and also in the 2022 fall economic statement, the government is ensuring that those most in need get support.

• (2000)

I would also like to remind the official opposition that well before this tough economic time started, our government was already investing in the middle class in order to grow the economy and enhance Canada's social safety net, all with a view to making life more affordable for Canadians.

We brought in the Canada child benefit, which has helped lift hundreds of thousands of children out of poverty.

[English]

Yes, we lifted Canadians and children out of poverty with the Canada child benefit.

[Translation]

We increased the guaranteed income supplement for single seniors, increased old age security for seniors 75 and over, and enhanced the Canada pension plan with provincial partners to allow more seniors to have the secure and dignified retirement they deserve.

[English]

Yes, we came to an agreement with all 10 provinces to enhance and expand the Canada pension plan, which will benefit Canadian workers for generations to come. Unlike the official opposition, which views the Canada pension plan as a tax, we have used it in investing in hard-working Canadians so that they can have a secure and dignified retirement.

[Translation]

In 2021, we made a historic investment in a Canada-wide early learning and affordable child care system. This has already helped reduce the fees for regulated child care by 50% on average and lower fees to only \$10 a day in six provinces and territories.

[English]

In the province of Ontario, we have already seen a reduction of 53%.

The education minister in the Province of Ontario applauded this agreement. We have worked together on this. Our investment is saving families thousands of dollars of after-tax money. That is their money, and we are going to help them out.

We are going to ensure that kids have the best start in life and we are going to ensure that the national day care plan, with the bill that was passed, will ensure it for generations.

[Translation]

To ensure that every Canadian has safe and affordable housing, we proposed a plan that will help double the number of new homes built in Canada within a decade, help more Canadians buy their first home, and stop the unfair practices that are driving up prices.

With the time I have today, I want to focus on this last point, housing. We know that for too many Canadians, including young Canadians and new Canadians, the dream of home ownership is drifting further and further out of reach, while rent is now more expensive across the country. This shortage of affordable housing is affecting our economy.

Business of Supply

Without more homes in our communities, companies have a hard time attracting the workers they need to grow and succeed. When people spend more of their income on housing, they spend less in our communities. The problem is complex and long-standing, and a solid plan is needed to tackle the many different factors that are making housing more expensive in Canada.

First, we believe that homes should be for Canadians to live in, not a financial asset class. The federal government remains concerned with the financialization of housing across Canada, and introduced important measures in budget 2022 to address it, including a two-year ban on foreign investment in Canadian housing, a tax on underused foreign-owned homes, the taxing of assignment sales, and ensuring that property flippers pay their fair share.

Although investors own a significant share of Canada's rental units and will play an important role in building new homes, the government recognizes that too many Canadians have experienced excessive renovations.

• (2005)

[*English*]

I look forward to questions and comments, and I want to wish all of my hon. colleagues a wonderful and safe summer for them and their families and all of their loved ones.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Mark Holland (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I believe you have received advance notice, and that if you seek it you will find unanimous consent for the following motion.

I move:

That, notwithstanding any standing order, special order or usual practice of the House, when the House adjourns later today, it shall stand adjourned until Monday, September 18, 2023, at 11:00 a.m., pursuant to Standing Orders 24(1) and 28(2), provided that, for the purposes of any standing order, it shall be deemed to have sat on Thursday, June 22, 2023, and Friday, June 23, 2023.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I have received notice from all recognized parties that they are in agreement with this request.

All those opposed to the hon. Leader of the Government in the House of Commons moving the motion will please say nay.

[*English*]

It is agreed.

The House has heard the terms of the motion. All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY**OPPOSITION MOTION—BALANCED BUDGET**

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Madam Speaker, the Liberals seem to have two contrary positions. In budget 2022, it talked about a strategic policy review, and said, “These efforts would target savings of \$6 billion over five years, and \$3 billion annually by 2026-27.” That is coincidentally when, in last year's fall economic update, the Liberals showed there would be a return to balance.

Could the member say whether he supports a return to balance and believes we need to have those guardrails in place? Does he also think that the Prime Minister's characterization of anything that denotes a responsible spending review as austerity is a bad situation for a Canadian government?

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Madam Speaker, my hon. colleague is someone I have known for many years in the House, and I have travelled with him. I can say the member for Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola is a dear friend.

That is a very important question that I, as an economist, would definitely like to address. I have always believed in Canada maintaining its AAA credit rating. Our deficit-to-GDP ratio should always be on a declining trend, as our deficit-to-GDP ratio is now and is being maintained. I also believe that we must always review our spending. I think that is a natural thing to do. In the budget, we have identified a number of savings, and that was in budget 2023, so we should continue to do that.

We have maintained fiscal prudence in our government. We have done the right thing in having the backs of Canadians during the pandemic. That is why we have recovered so quickly. That was the right thing to do, and any economist I ask would state that. At the same time, we must be fiscally prudent. I have always believed in that. I will continue to believe in that, and I will continue to advocate for that. That is the path we are going on, and we will continue to be on that path.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech. However, I would like to talk to him about something he did not cover, namely the fiscal imbalance. The Liberal government has too much money for its budget items, so it is spending like there is no tomorrow in areas under the jurisdiction of Quebec and the provinces. Then it tells us it has no money for critical expenses like health transfers.

I hope no one will try to tell me that Quebec and the provinces wanted it this way. In classic style, they were given no alternative.

What does my colleague think about the fiscal imbalance?

Business of Supply

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Madam Speaker, that was an important question about relations between the provinces and the federal government. Our government has made a lot of progress with the provinces on health agreements that add up to nearly \$200 billion. We worked hard during the pandemic to help all the provinces with their expenses and their health care systems. It is very important that we continue to do so. Collaborating with all of the provinces in our beautiful country is very important.

• (2010)

[English]

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Madam Speaker, we have heard the Liberals say that they have everybody's back. I do not know about other members, but where I live, when I drive around, I see more homeless people than I have ever seen in my entire life. It can be seen right across the country. At least with the Conservatives, we know they are not going to build purpose-built housing. However, that is what the government promised. It is building approximately 7,000 units a year, on average. There are 300,000 people who have core housing needs right now. How is that having people's backs?

This is a crisis. When is the government going to stop propping up its wealthy friends and its real estate income trusts and make sure it invests that money into making sure people have a place to live?

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Madam Speaker, housing is a core issue for all Canadians. What we are seeing here in Canada is what we are seeing worldwide. As part of the Canada-Europe delegation when we were in France two weeks ago, I saw the headline on *Le Monde* was "*La crise du logement...*". It is an issue not only here in Canada.

We are addressing it. We have the \$4-billion accelerator fund. We have the rapid housing initiative. We are working with municipalities. We are working with provinces to ensure they receive the resources they need. We do know there are a lot of issues with zoning and housing that are at the city level. The cities are the creatures of the provinces. We understand it is in our Constitution.

We ask members to please understand that our government is seized with this issue. We have been for many years. We will continue helping Canadians to ensure that, if they wish to purchase a home and have a roof over their heads, that we will be there for them.

[Translation]

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to be here this evening to talk about a motion that is very clear and simple, but that has many negative consequences for my community of London and our country.

To begin with, what was our government's approach during the pandemic? It was a compassionate and fair approach.

[English]

It is compassionate and fair. So much so, that former Conservative prime minister Brian Mulroney, just two days ago, entirely endorsed the approach taken by the Liberal government during the

pandemic, and the leadership of the Prime Minister in particular. That speaks volumes about the current state of the Conservative Party. It is not the Progressive Conservative Party, obviously, as it is something that has existed officially for many years now after dropping the progressive part from the official name, but something, also more importantly, that its former leader now sees very clearly. Not once did former prime minister Mulroney mention the Leader of the Opposition's name in his comments, which I thought was quite interesting and quite telling, based on what is happening on the other side.

I mention all of this, and my intent here tonight is not to be overly partisan, but since the motion itself is partisan from start to finish, I think it is quite fair to point out where current Conservatives stand in relation to giants of the Canadian Conservative political tradition. I mentioned Brian Mulroney. I could have also mentioned Joe Clark.

What we ultimately have at stake here, if we look at the motion and think about it in broad terms, is a debate about the view of government. What is the place of government, particularly during trying times, during a time of inflation, which does exist? Not a single member on this side, not a single member in the House, regardless of their party affiliation, would deny that. It remains a hard time out there. I hear it from constituents. I make a point of regularly engaging the community. I do hear about the challenges they are facing paying for gas, rent and groceries.

It begs the question of what approach should be taken during this time to address the challenges that Canadians are facing. On the one hand, we have an approach offered by the Conservatives, which very clearly states, and it is not even subtle as it is quite direct, that regardless of the context, regardless of the circumstances, people should fend for themselves. Every individual is responsible for their own actions. Therefore, if one takes that seriously, as my Conservative colleagues do, then individuals need to find their own way. While government should exist, it should provide the very basics in the form of a military, a police force and basic infrastructure, but apart from those things, it is up to the state to get out of the way to allow individuals to succeed or to fail.

It entirely ignores, within that context, within that frame, the economic plight and position that one might be in to get to that outcome, whether it is success or failure. It is something devoid of context altogether.

Business of Supply

My friends on the other side and their leader are known to quote philosophers from time to time, including people such as Adam Smith, who they will use as justification for their policies. If one were to look at the work of Adam Smith, they would immediately recognize someone who had a very responsible point of view. He placed incredible priority not only on the rights of the individual but also on the community and the need of the community to support the individual. That is the context. That is the missing link from what Conservatives offer when they try to justify their policies. I just referenced a philosopher. There are other examples that one could give, where this approach is taken, unfortunately.

On the other hand, we have the approach taken by the government. It is an approach that I support, and an approach that I think colleagues in other opposition parties, by and large, take seriously as well. It is the idea, the notion, that one needs to be there for individuals during very difficult times, particularly those who are most vulnerable.

● (2015)

We can look at what the government has done, particularly in recent years and during this session of Parliament. Since it is our last day here, I think it is important to reflect on what has been achieved during the latest session of Parliament. Dental care, child care and things like this, which social champions for years have advocated for, have been put into place by this government and other parliamentarians. Yes, I look to colleagues in the NDP and thank them for their support.

The government acted on these things and we see thousands of Canadians benefiting. Child care fees have been brought down already, cut in half at least, or even more in many provinces. I am quite confident that we will get to the level of \$10 per day, certainly by 2026 if not sooner, across the country.

Dental care is for children to start with, but it will be expanded. All Canadians who fall within the eligibility criteria will get access to a dentist, which they did not have before. There should never be a time when a Canadian lacks access to that very important part of health care. Dental care is health care. Oral health care is as important as the rest of health care.

Those are some examples. I have limited time, but I could give many other examples of how the government is there for people. It needs to be there during trying times, particularly for the most vulnerable among us.

The motion, as we see, calls for the budget to be balanced. On the face of it, how could one stand up against that? One has to think in terms of the consequences. For every action there is a reaction. It is a timeless truth. It is true of the sciences; it is true of public policy.

I have asked this of my Conservative friends. Never once have they had an answer for what they would cut to get to a balanced budget. Would they cut pensions? They would have to. Would they cut unemployment insurance? They would have to. What about the historic health care deal that was finalized by this government in support of provinces and territories? They would cut that as well. The Conservatives voted for child care the other night at third reading. I was quite surprised, but I think it is a political ploy, because I

know that if they were ever to form government, they would cut child care as well.

What about the most important crisis of our time? Inflation is certainly the challenge if not the crisis of the moment. However, if we were to look more broadly and think in those terms, we would recognize immediately that climate change is our most important challenge. We have an obligation as parliamentarians to put that front and centre. Members can disagree with the actions taken with respect to carbon pricing, among other things, but this government has made it a priority.

It has been said before that this government has followed the example of Brian Mulroney. It has been the government that, compared to others, has done the most in Canadian history to advance a climate change agenda. That would end should a Conservative government form, in particular under the opposition leader. I take it from his comments that he does believe in climate change, but I wonder if he really does, because if the solutions he has offered say anything, he in fact only believes in it as a slogan. He says this to get the attention of centrist voters and nothing more.

These are the issues at stake. What would the Conservatives cut to get to a balance? They would cut all of it and leave behind a country that would be entirely changed. Stephen Harper made that commitment. He almost made it a reality. He said that if he became Prime Minister, we would not recognize Canada. Thankfully we recognize Canada still. However, we know the opposition leader would take that approach and multiply it tenfold.

That is why I as a member of Parliament, joining with fellow colleagues on this side of the House, want to make clear that we stand against that every step of the way. We also stand against it for another reason. That side is completely irresponsible in offering anything concrete, apart from things like cryptocurrency as some sort of hedge against inflation. That is deeply irresponsible. It makes no sense in the current context. I wonder what colleagues on the other side are trying to do when they advocate for it.

● (2020)

I will end my comments there. I look forward to questions on this important issue.

Mr. Marty Morantz (Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to clarify one thing. The member said the motion called for the government to balance the budget. Actually, the motion simply calls for a plan from the government to balance the budget. I thought it had one, because in November it tabled the fall economic statement, which called for a balanced budget in 2027-28.

The member has equated, somehow through his warped logic, that balancing the budget equates to cuts. Given the fact that the government's plan is to balance the budget by 2027-28, what is it going to cut?

Business of Supply

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos: Madam Speaker, I want to thank the member, because when we worked together on the finance committee a number of years ago, I thought we worked very well together. I am not sure what has happened for him to take a negative tone here tonight, but I think I see his sense of humour. I know where he is coming from. I know he raises those points in good nature.

I will simply offer back what is very clear, and that is that the deficit is coming down in a very pronounced way. That is what happens when one focuses on setting the table in a way that encourages economic growth. That will continue.

Where are the Conservatives on issues like the Volkswagen plant in the community of St. Thomas? That is just down the road from London, Ontario. They are against that investment and the 3,000 jobs it would create, not to mention the billions of dollars of economic growth that comes as a result of investments like that. What they are calling for in this motion would prevent Volkswagen from going forward.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Madam Speaker, I put the question to a Conservative colleague earlier. I am going to ask my colleague the same question because he tells us that he is concerned about the fight against climate change.

In 2022, \$275 billion was spent to clean up the mess. That same year, the five big oil companies made \$220 billion in profits.

This government, which spends a lot, but also very badly, because it prioritizes bad things, doled out \$20 billion to big oil. It also put \$30 billion into Trans Mountain.

Does my colleague think that this is consistent with a desire to fight climate change? Does he consider this to be acceptable, wise spending?

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos: Madam Speaker, our government's approach is very responsible. My colleague and I disagree on this issue. What other option is there? I am not hearing any alternatives in my colleague's comments.

• (2025)

[*English*]

Yes, he did raise concerns with what the government has done with respect to a number of things, namely Trans Mountain, but I would submit to him that if the government would have gone in the direction he prefers, we would have had thousands of Canadians out of work. The government made the right choice in that case. It was a choice in the national interest, a difficult one, but our environmental policy certainly provides a balance.

Ms. Lindsay Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Madam Speaker, I notice that my colleague said the “support” of the NDP, and I would like to say the “leadership” considering that only a few years ago, in the last government, he voted against that same dental care bill. However, I am really glad to see that he is now for it and sees the value of it.

One of the issues we in London share, which is shared across the country, is the issue of affordable housing and renovictions. In my riding, which is very close to his, tenants at the Webster Street

apartments have been facing renovictions, and there are serious consequences.

We have called on the government to create a housing acquisition fund to ensure that rent remains affordable so that not-for-profits or cities can buy buildings that are being bought up by large market-based corporations. This is another great idea by the NDP. Could he comment on that?

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos: Madam Speaker, it is always interesting to hear from my colleague down the way in London—Fanshawe.

First of all, on the specific issue she just raised, I need to see more in the way of that. We all care about housing here, and I did see her and the leader of the NDP in London raising this idea, but there is not much detail. There is precious little detail, so one cannot comment on that in any meaningful way.

On the other issues raised, when the NDP raised dental care in the past, it was not an approach that left a lot of detail. I could not support it then. There is more detail now and I support it of course.

Mr. Philip Lawrence (Northumberland—Peterborough South, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is a privilege and honour to rise tonight in this House of Commons, perhaps on the last of this cohort of Parliament. I will be splitting my time with the fabulous member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, who was first elected in 2000 when she was 12 years old, the youngest parliamentarian in Canadian history.

It is an honour and privilege to serve and to talk about this motion today. Of course, this is the Conservative Party's opposition motion, and I must say that it is very reasonable. I am hoping we will get unanimous support across the aisles on it.

The motion raises the concept that we need a balanced budget. In fact, it does not even ask that the government commit to a balanced budget. We are merely asking it for a plan to get to a balanced budget.

As my colleague from Manitoba said earlier, it is something the Liberals had in their plans less than nine months ago. In their fall economic statement, they actually called for a balanced budget in 2027-28. However, much has changed since then, including \$60 billion in new spending and an increase in the debt-to-GDP ratio, despite the fact that the finance minister said just nine months or so ago that we would not see an increase in the debt-to-GDP ratio. She said, “This is a line we will not cross.” Well, the line was crossed, and now the trajectory is for the debt-to-GDP ratio to go up.

Business of Supply

Our motion notes the IMF has warned that Canada is at the most risk for a massive mortgage default. That is just a fact. I am sure everyone can agree with that. Average mortgage payments are up 122% since the Prime Minister took office. That is a fact too, just like saying the grass is green and the sky is blue. Canadian households also have the most debt as a share of GDP out of any country in the G7. Once again, that is just a fact.

As I said, I am hopeful that we will get unanimous support for our motion. We are not even saying that the government needs to balance the budget. We are asking for a plan to balance the budget.

Let me explain this a bit and give some context as to why the government may not support this motion.

When we look at balancing the budget of a government, it is really, in high-level terms, not much different from balancing the budget of a household or a business. We have revenue on one side and expenses on the other. I am going to start by talking about revenue and the struggles the government is no doubt having and why it may not be able to get to a balanced budget.

According to Philip Cross, former lead statistician for Statistics Canada, in the last decade, we have had the lowest economic growth since the Great Depression, since the 1930s in other words. It is 0.8% per capita over the last 10 years, which is basically stagnant or no growth over the last 10 years. That is a fraction of what it is in the United States, a fraction of what it is in Switzerland and a fraction of what it is in Ireland. We are an outlier given our poor economic growth per capita.

It is true that if we look at the entire GDP of the country, there is a bit more of a positive note, but that is simply because we have had high levels of immigration. It is not really a great thing to say that even though we are bringing in newcomers, which is fantastic, we are not actually increasing the GDP per capita. We have newcomers coming in, but unfortunately they have economic struggles. They cannot find housing. Of course, we have had the recent immigration scandal with students. We need to be much more accommodating and welcoming to our newcomers, in my opinion, but that is a digression. The reality is that per capita GDP is at 0.8% over the last 10 years. That is the lowest in the G7 and the lowest in the OECD, and it is an absolutely abysmal number.

Why is revenue so low on the government side? Why are we not getting that economic growth? Well, there are some policy reasons for that. One is that our productivity is among the lowest in the OECD and among the lowest in the G7. Productivity is measured in contribution to GDP per worker per hour. If we look at Switzerland, it is at \$55. If we look at the United States, it is at \$65. If we look at Ireland, it is at \$84. These are 2018 numbers, and members can source them.

● (2030)

These are countries without our land and without our incredible resources. Most notably, we have the hardest-working, most educated and smartest people in the world here in Canada, yet we have a lower productivity than most of the advanced economies. We are, to finish my story, at \$50.

There is a notable exception in Canada. We do have one sector of our economy that is absolutely blowing out the roof and doing fabulously. That is our energy sector, which is well over \$500 per hour, 10 times as much as the average.

What is the government doing? It is trying to eliminate Canadian energy. If our productivity numbers do not look good now, and they do not, in the absence of our energy sector we would be in deep trouble. Our prosperity as a country would be in jeopardy.

We have that productivity issue. If we look under the hood at what is creating that productivity, that is another problem. There are a number of issues. One is we are forecast to have the lowest capital investment in the OECD over the next 20 years. All the numbers I am saying can be sourced and cited.

When we do not have capital coming into the country to refurbish machines in factories, to build new buildings and to create new infrastructure, the infrastructure, equipment and buildings all go out of date, and that reduces our competitiveness.

If we have a machine in a factory that was built in 2023 and we are competing against another factory that has a machine built in 1960, obviously the one built in 2023 is going to have a huge advantage, and the government is pushing away capital. How is it doing that? It is by adding uncertainty.

Just in the most recent budget alone, there were two provisions for retroactive taxation. Retroactive taxation is going back in time and saying that someone was told their bill was X, but now it is being changed to Y.

That is something we see in economies that are not advanced, something we see in countries with poor economic performance. That is something, quite frankly, that we see in authoritarian regimes. We cannot just go back in time and change what the bill was on the customer. In this case, it is the taxpayer. We are pushing away that capital.

Another significant issue that is undermining our productivity numbers is our innovation framework. Our innovation framework in Canada is among the worst in the G7 and among the worst in the OECD.

Canadians are producing great ideas. I say “ideas” instead of “intellectual property” because our ideas are not becoming intellectual property, as we do not have the appropriate government regulation and framework in place to capture those ideas and make sure that Canadians prosper from them.

What is actually happening today, unfortunately, is that while our universities, our young people, our innovators and our entrepreneurs are coming up with amazing ideas and those ideas are actually becoming commercial successes, the trouble is that it is not in Canada.

They are becoming successes in the United States of America. They are becoming successes in Ireland. They are becoming successes around the world, but not here in Canada, because we do not have the government framework to capture those ideas to put in place the precedent conditions to make sure we exploit those resources fully.

Business of Supply

Our ideas go offshore. They manufacture products and create services, with no money going to the Canadian public, and then they are sold back to us at an incredibly high price. We get hurt both ways.

I wish I had another 20 minutes to talk, but I only have a minute left. I have only talked a little about the revenue side, but I will talk briefly about the expense side.

The Prime Minister came into office saying that he would balance the budget within a couple of years. We never saw the budget get balanced. In the fall economic statement, we saw that there was a plan to balance the budget, yet we see no balance in sight now, according to the budget.

When we have a government that is sucking the oxygen out of the economy, that is pulling the fuel from the economy and taking it out, it is slowing down the private sector, which is leading to a productivity crisis in Canada, which is putting the prosperity of our nation at risk.

We need a leader and a government in this country that will balance our budget and turn hurt into hope for your home, my home, our home. Let us bring it home.

• (2035)

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the whole notion of productivity can be a little slippery. It is GDP per inhabitant, but especially in a country with a strong oil and gas sector like Canada, if the price of oil and gas goes up, then the productivity numbers will go up. The member was citing 2018 figures when the price of oil was rather low, so naturally Canada's productivity, using that simple measure of GDP per person, would have been low.

The other thing about productivity is this. To ensure long-term productivity, we need innovation. Just having our productivity go up because the price of oil goes up does not mean we are innovating. To innovate, we need to invest in technology, especially green technology. To invest, we need money, and sometimes we need government money, so we are spending in the budget to invest in a clean technology revolution that is going to increase Canadian productivity in the long term in a sustainable way. That is what is important.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Madam Speaker, Winston Churchill perhaps said it best when he said, "For a nation to try to tax itself into prosperity is like a man standing in a bucket and trying to lift himself up by the handle."

The government does not create wealth; the private sector does. As the government takes more fuel from the private sector and wastes it on things like Asian infrastructure, "arrive scam" and numerous other government fiats, it will destroy our economy and continue to put the future of Canadians at risk.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am going to make a few suggestions to my colleague.

When he was finishing his speech, he said that he only had one minute left and that he wanted to speak about revenues. The Conservatives talk about returning to balanced budgets, which is the

right thing to do, but I would like to know how they will do that. Their speeches indicate that they want to embrace austerity. I have a few suggestions for my colleague that will not require austerity and will generate a lot of revenue. For example, funding and the extension of Trans Mountain could stop immediately. More than \$30 billion has been spent on that project. We could also fight tax havens. To govern is to plan and anticipate.

It is right and conscientious to have a plan to return to balanced budgets. However, will that happen? How will we achieve balanced budgets?

What does my colleague think of my two suggestions?

• (2040)

[*English*]

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Madam Speaker, my answer is relatively easy. There are millions of dollars of waste. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been sent to the Asian infrastructure bank. There was \$50 million to MasterCard. Millions of dollars went to Loblaws. There were millions of dollars for "arrive scam".

I am confident that when the Conservative Party forms government, we will be able to put in place the savings necessary to maintain the great social safety network we have while being prudent and ensuring our prosperity for years to come.

With respect to pipelines, we would have never socialized the pipeline; we would have allowed the private sector to do it. We need Canadian energy because Canadian energy is keeping our economy afloat.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais (Edmonton Griesbach, NDP): Madam Speaker, the member spoke largely in slogans, and here is one for him.

In the year 2000, 28% of just 15% was the difference in the corporate tax rate at that time. That difference made up a loss of revenue for the country. That loss of revenue disproportionately impacted our ability to fund and create programs.

Another fact is that 1% of Canadians own 25% of Canada's wealth today. New Democrats are calling for a windfall tax to ensure what the member said would be made true or even truer, the idea that the private sector creates wealth. It is not the private sector; it is workers who create it. Why do they not have the advantage of getting good paycheques? It is because of the policies being put forward by the member from the Conservative Party, which are to just slash and burn and make sure that those who are poor continue to get less, while the wealthiest in this country continue to get away with the tax loopholes that continue to occupy their minds. What amount of money is enough?

Business of Supply

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Madam Speaker, the marginal effective tax rate for people making under \$50,000 is more than 50%, so when the member is calling for tax hikes, he is hurting the most vulnerable. The reality is that in Canada the corporate tax rate is 12% and in the rest of the OECD it is 9%, which is 30% to 40% higher.

Neil Brooks, NDP member and my law professor, said to me many years ago that corporations do not pay taxes, but workers, shareholders and employees do. Therefore, when the member wants to slash and burn corporations, he is hurting workers, and that is what the NDP desperately needs to understand.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise on behalf of the fiscally responsible constituents of Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke.

The Ottawa Valley is as diverse as it is beautiful. The average day of a soldier in Petawawa is very different from a farmer's day. A nuclear scientist in Deep River has challenges very different from those of a logger in Wilno. Despite their different backgrounds and different daily routines, every single one of them understands what it means to be fiscally responsible.

Listening to the Liberals and my colleagues, it seems as though the government has a different understanding. For most Canadians, to be responsible with money is to live within their means. Our finance minister's understanding of fiscal responsibility seems to be torn from the pages of a Disney fairy tale. Like a naive, entitled Disney princess, the finance minister has advice to Canadians struggling with inflation: "Let them eat Netflix." Canadians should set aside the minister's advice on how to save on streaming costs.

As with every other policy priority, the Liberals' goal is to make life unaffordable. This costly coalition's online streaming tax will only increase the cost of enjoying a movie. This costly coalition's carbon tax will triple the costs of anything that requires energy, which is everything. This costly coalition's clean fuel regulations will make gasoline more expensive, while simultaneously ruining two-stroke engines as a result of the added ethanol. This costly coalition's latest budget will only spur more inflation. Every extra dollar the out-of-control socialist coalition borrows and spends puts pressure on the Bank of Canada to increase interest rates. Every rate hike means more money going to wealthy bondholders and less money for critical services and national security. Canadians are drowning in a sea of rising inflation, and the Liberal plan is to throw water bottles at them.

During his recent speech on the budget, the Conservative leader quoted from *Ecclesiastes*:

What has been will be again,
what has been done will be done again;
there is nothing new under the sun.

When it comes to the government, that quote hits hard. Canadians are learning that there is nothing new under the son of Pierre Trudeau. Just like his father, he swept to power with a mania that seemed to capture the spirit of the times. Within four years, that spirit was dead, and disillusioned Canadians returned a minority government.

Like father, like son: Both cut expensive deals with the NDP. Both of them repudiated the fiscal policies of their Liberal predecessors. If someone told me when I was first elected that I would feel pity for the legacy of Paul Martin, I would have suggested they seek professional help, and here we stand in the wreckage and ruins of Canada's consensus that budgets should be balanced.

After eight years of Pierre Trudeau, Canadians found themselves living with stagflation. After 16 years of Pierre Trudeau, Canada was on the brink of bankruptcy. Pierre Trudeau was in power for 16 years, and it took another 16 years just to get back to balance. After eight years of the current Prime Minister, the situation might be even worse than it was in 1984.

As much as the Prime Minister would like to live in a fantasy world where budgets balance themselves, Conservatives believe in reality-based policy. The hard truth some Canadians will need to relearn is that progressive socialism always fails everywhere it is tried, because eventually they run out of other people's money. Unfortunately, progressive socialists never admit that they are economically illiterate and historically blind.

When they have taxed away all of Canadians' income, they will come for their savings next. When progressive socialists turn government into a gravy train, we should not be surprised that groups of people begin to fight for the best seats on board, but it does not have to be this way, and it is not too late for the government to change course. That is why Conservatives are calling on the government to come back with a plan to balance the budget.

Canadians should remember that the Liberals claimed that they did have a plan. Originally, the plan was to run itsy-bitsy deficits of \$10 billion for two years.

• (2045)

That extra \$20 billion over two years was supposed to be invested in infrastructure. What happened when the plan met reality? They doubled their deficits and managed not to spend a single dollar on infrastructure. The Prime Minister thought he could snap his fingers and force the public service to get shovels in the ground.

When that plan failed, he hired his friends at McKinsey to form a special advisory council, which recommended that the Liberals create an infrastructure bank as a way to leverage pension funds into investing in public infrastructure. In 2017, when the budget was supposed to be balanced, the Liberals announced plans for an infrastructure bank and even bigger deficits.

Coincidentally, when the Liberals needed someone to run their expensive new bank, they appointed one of the members from the special advisory council, who just happened to be the head of the pension fund. At this point, Canada had taken on twice as much debt as the Liberals had promised; still, not a single new infrastructure project had been built.

Business of Supply

Coincidentally, when the fake infrastructure bank finally announced the first project it would be funding, it just so happened that the project was the very same one the head of the bank had previously lobbied for. The Liberals were so impressed that they made the head of the infrastructure bank the deputy finance minister. That would be the same deputy who oversaw this terrible budget, which commits massive subsidies to foreign tech companies and provincial electricity utilities. Coincidentally, that deputy finance minister and former infrastructure bank head has now left Ottawa to head up a provincial electricity utility.

It is just truly remarkable how many coincidences pile up around Liberals and tax dollars, as when some advertising agencies all started making large donations to Liberals after receiving large contracts from the Liberals, or when the government ignored warnings about Communist interference, while former communist cabinet minister and defrocked ambassador John McCallum was encouraging the Communists to support the Liberal Party and warning them of the threat posed by a Conservative government. It is all just a coincidence.

I can see from the angry faces across the aisle just how much they appreciate hearing the hard truth. I expect one will jump up shortly to ask me when I stopped beating my husband and how much I want to cut from child care and dental care. After eight years, they have become tired and predictable.

The spending on child care and dental care is a tiny fraction of the government's massive deficits. The real money is spent on giant foreign corporations and provincial electricity utilities. This is all part of their green grift. This is the Telford and Butts game plan.

In Ontario, they brought the Green Energy Act into force. It drove up the cost of electricity. It forced thousands of manufacturers to leave the province and destroyed 60,000 net jobs, according to the Auditor General. They used tax dollars to subsidize green energy corporations, which coincidentally were all run by well-connected Liberals. After that disaster, they packed up their taxpayer-funded moving vans and came to Ottawa to repeat the plan all over again.

The federal government has been saddled with massive deficits to pay for massive subsidies to well-connected companies. Eventually, these progressive socialists will run out of other people's money, but it will be too late by then. They will have hopped on a private jet to go surfing in Tofino.

Just like in 1984, Conservatives will have to come in and clean up the mess. It took 16 years of Chrétien slashing public sector payrolls to get Canada back to balance after 16 years under Pierre Trudeau. The longer it takes to throw out this costly socialist coalition, the longer it will take to clean up this mess.

Conservatives have a saying: If it is not broken, do not fix it. In 2015, Canada was not broken, and we had a balanced budget. We had passport services we could rely on. Crime was continuing on a 25-year decline. However, the Prime Minister saw Canada as a racist oppressor state that needed fixing. Now our country is broken. Our social fabric is frayed, and our democracy is under attack.

It does not have to be this way. Conservatives are ready to get to work. We will balance the budget, restore order and get Canada working again.

● (2050)

Mr. Ken McDonald (Avalon, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the member opposite gave a somewhat exciting speech condemning the current Liberal government, but I suppose somewhere down the road, the Conservatives will realize that not everything is as it seems.

The Bloc members, for example, are saying we are supporting the oil companies too much. The Conservatives say we are ruining the oil industry by not helping it more. How do they square that circle?

Yes, I will ask, what program would the Conservative Party cut to help balance the budget? Would the Conservatives cut the Canada child benefit or just make seniors work until 67 or maybe 70? That is what the Conservatives are made of; that is what they have always been made of.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Madam Speaker, I do not know how I am supposed to put a circle around the Bloc, but suffice it to say that we are not in agreement with the separatists on what they want to do by taxing and making fossil fuels more unaffordable when that is what is driving people to poverty and making them unable to pay for food. Our people are going hungry specifically because the Liberals are decreasing the availability of our resource, oil and gas. As far as the green experiment goes, we have lived that in Ontario. It drove up the cost of hydro to the point where people had to choose, back then, whether to heat or eat.

● (2055)

Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP): Madam Speaker, the member spoke about a grift. How is this for a grift? Oil and gas companies, last year alone, raised the price of fuel, on their margins alone, by 18¢ a litre. That helped the five biggest oil and gas companies to create profits of over \$38 billion. On top of that, the federal government gave them what the member would call a handout of \$22 billion more. How is that not the biggest grift in the country? Is the member going to stand up and say that it is time to get rid of that grift?

Business of Supply

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Madam Speaker, let us talk about “grift”, or should we call it “dark green money”? Not half an hour outside of Ottawa, there is what at one time was the most massive solar farm in Ontario. It was owned and leased by the government of France. Ontario Hydro maps out all the electricity generators in Ontario; it also puts on this map how much electricity they have produced. We have been paying all the hundreds of millions, and every month, we continue to pay this green grift to the country of France. In turn, France puts it in different foundations. These foundations make it into family trust funds to eventually reward the people who directed the money in the first place. After all those millions, not one single watt of electricity has ever been generated in what used to be the largest solar farm in Ontario.

Mr. Blaine Calkins (Red Deer—Lacombe, CPC): Madam Speaker, could my valued colleague from Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke just remind Canadians why a carbon tax is a tax on everything, why 61¢ a litre for the cost of fuel is going to make life even more unaffordable? Would she remind them that the policies of the current government are a disaster for inflation and that we need to get back to balanced budgets?

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Madam Speaker, the cost of fuel impacts the cost of everything. In fact, it takes fuel to manufacture fertilizer. Then they have to use energy to force the fertilizer, spread it across and ship it to the different farmers. Then it costs money to spread the fertilizer. It costs energy that comes from people's money to plant the crops. It takes energy to harvest the crops, ship the crops to the processors, process the crops into food and ship the food to stores. All this costs energy. When the Liberals drive up the taxes on energy, Canadians starve.

Mr. Michael Coteau (Don Valley East, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is an honour, as always, to be in the House of Commons to speak to this opposition day motion. I will be sharing my time with the member for Richmond Centre. What the House will be hearing from for the next 10 minutes is pretty much a direct contrast to what we heard for the last 15 minutes from the member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke.

I am pleased to speak to this motion, because this allows me to reinforce the objective of the 2023 budget that just recently passed. We know that the Conservatives voted against that budget because they saw that the investments we were making were the opposite of the direction they feel this country should be going in. They see it as a waste of money. I have always seen this budget as an investment in people.

I am proud to stand in the House of Commons and speak to this motion, because it allows me to speak about the direction of the Liberal government. There is no question that we have a challenge in Canada. I think we could all agree, on all sides of the House. There is an affordability challenge. Anywhere one goes in the country, many people are struggling. We see it every single day. If one were to go into my community, one would see that people are challenged. We agree on that.

What we disagree on is how to respond to that challenge. When we can take resources and invest in children, families, health care, education, seniors and the people of Ontario, it is the best investment we could make. When we invest in our economy and infrastructure, and when we support the belief that polluting is not good

for our environment, and therefore not good for our economy, these are the types of things that help define who I am and what brought me to this House.

I have been elected for 20 years. It was not all in this House; I have only been here for two years. I was elected to the school board, and I was elected to the Ontario legislature. I have seen the two different responses happen over and over again. One could be at the local municipal level and see Conservative ideology jump in, of course at the Ontario legislature and here. This is nothing new to me.

The Conservative game plan is always the same. If they are in opposition, they attack the way in which government is spending. They will criticize and do something to portray that there is a better way going forward, that they could offer a better solution to the challenges that we have.

However, we can just look to the past and remember Harper's time in government. When we went through one of the worst economic challenges, back in 2008 and 2009, we saw how the Conservatives responded, and we paid a huge price for it. On that side of the House, people forget that Stephen Harper ran the largest deficit in the history of this country. I do not know if Conservatives remember that. Maybe they have forgotten.

Stephen Harper ran the largest deficit in the history of Canada, up until COVID. This is 100% true. One just has to check the records. It seems that Conservatives have forgotten this. During that time, when we were going through our worst economic challenge, back in 2008-09, the Conservatives responded by cutting, not investing. I was around. I was at the school board and then the Ontario legislature, and I saw the cuts that the House made. I will give a couple of examples.

They made the largest single cuts in the history of this country for literacy and basic skills. It is hard to imagine. When 42% of our country was struggling with some form of literacy back in 2008-09, the Harper government decided to make the largest cuts ever to literacy and basic skills. Even the statistics by the Conference Board of Canada, a decade ago, said that a 1% increase in literacy and basic skills was like a 2.5% increase in our economy. I do not think there is anyone in the House who could deny the correlations among literacy, education and economic output. No one could deny that. However, the Conservatives made cuts.

Business of Supply

• (2100)

Let us talk about immigration. In 2011-12, during that challenging time, the Harper government decided to cut health care services to immigrants. Anyone in Canada knows that part of our economic success in this country has been from bringing newcomers into the country, having them working in the economy and boosting the economy. It is what has made Canada great since its inception. However, during those economically challenging times, the former Harper government decided to do what was unthinkable: cut health care services to immigrants and refugees. That was the response by a Conservative government.

Our approach has always been different. Liberals in this country invest in education. They invest in the economy. They invest in people. I want to remind anyone who is watching that, during COVID, the Conservatives voted against investing in people. Think of their rhetoric today. They do not want to invest in people. They would rather take the approach of cutting taxes and giving money to big corporations to generate more wealth and more economy. It is based on 1978 Reagan economics, the 1980 Reaganomics ideology, which is so old. It does not work. We know it does not work, because we have seen that. We have seen it fail in the United States and we have seen it fail in Canada.

What we decided to do as Liberals is to invest in people. We decided to make sure the young people in our country today have the type of investments necessary so that, when they get older, they can actually contribute to the economy. I brought this up during debate on the fall economic statement. We heard the rhetoric from the other side of the House, rhetoric that said we should not invest in dental care for children. We heard rhetoric around not investing in child care. How about a \$500 rebate to help with the affordability issue of housing or different types of incentives that help Canadians, like the grocery rebate? People were debating these, saying they are not good. I will tell members that when people are down, when people are feeling like they are struggling to get by, what they need is investment so they can go ahead and build themselves up to contribute to our great economy.

I want to talk about some of the changes we have seen over the last few years. Since COVID, we have seen an increase of almost 900,000 jobs in this country. Correct me if I am wrong, but something must be working if 900,000 jobs have been created since the pandemic. I will go from saying 900,000 to almost a million jobs. If almost a million jobs have been created in that time period, how can anyone on that side of the House argue that the strategy that has been put in place is not working? With a million folks working in the economy, and taking down interest levels from 8.5% to 4.4%, we are doing the best compared to other jurisdictions around the world. Almost a million jobs and cutting the inflation rate by half suggests that something is working, and our economy, the numbers, say everything.

The Conservatives will twist things; it is part of the strategy they use. Conservatives will use any tool necessary to divide Canadians in order to seize power. Rather than running on ideas, beliefs and approaches, what Conservatives do is to pick and poke at anything that is frustrating a person out there in Canada, and they leverage it in such a way as to divide Canadians. Once they divide Canadians, they use that to get back into power without offering any solutions.

I challenge the Conservatives' approach to building our economy. I will always stand here as a Liberal and speak about how we can invest in people, in this country and in families, and support our seniors and students. I believe without question that the approach we have taken by investing in people will be the approach that will help build Canada up to even stronger economic outputs in the future.

• (2105)

Mr. Marty Morantz (Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley, CPC): Madam Speaker, I listened with interest to the member's speech. He said something to the effect that Liberals do not cut anything, that they never cut anything and they always make investments. I wonder if he is aware of the most draconian budget in Canadian history, by a government that did not just cut program spending but actually also cut health transfers and education transfers to provinces. It was delivered on February 27, 1995, by then finance minister Paul Martin. I wonder if he could advise us whether he is aware of those cuts.

Mr. Michael Coteau: Madam Speaker, if one goes out there and speaks to the average Canadian, they will tell us they appreciate the work of Jean Chrétien. He is probably one of the most loved prime ministers we have had in this country, so he must have been doing something right. It is wrong for the member to take one specific incident and apply it to everything Liberals do. I can take hundreds of incidents when Conservatives have made cuts and made them part of the way they actually run government. That is just their ideology; it is what their approach has always been, and I do not think it is something the member can actually use as a comparable.

• (2110)

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Madam Speaker, today I stood with the Canadian Association of Fire Chiefs, and its members talked about the emergency we find ourselves in in Canada. We are short 15,000 volunteer firefighters. They have seen a rapid decline, while the government has been in power, of 29% of volunteer firefighters.

We know they are dealing with inflation. They have not seen an increase in their firefighter tax credit since 2013, which is a decade. They are asking for \$30 million to be spread out over the 90,000 firefighters each year. We are talking about less than a 5% increase in overall firefighting costs since 2013. We know public servants have seen it, and we have seen it with the private sector. Liberals continue to find billions of dollars to finance corporations. Does he not agree the government should be increasing the volunteer firefighter tax credit to help with recruitment, respect for firefighters and retention of firefighters?

Business of Supply

Mr. Michael Coteau: Madam Speaker, I am happy the member opposite brought up firefighters and acknowledged their value in our country, our provinces and our municipalities. In fact, I was proud to work with firefighters for many years to look for ways to increase the number of types of cancer for which firefighters or their families would be able to claim some type of compensation should a firefighter be afflicted with cancer.

I know there are members on this side of the House who have been championing these issues. Firefighters in Canada are valuable, and without question, as a government and as members, we should continue to look for ways to support them and invest in them.

Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP): Madam Speaker, I really appreciate that the member for Don Valley East spoke about needed investments. I know he is a supporter of investing in people with disabilities. We are on the verge of seeing Bill C-22 receive royal assent, but we still do not have any money in the budget to deliver the Canada disability benefit. Can he speak about what he can be doing over the coming months to ensure that in next year's budget we see a historic investment in Canadians with disabilities being lifted out of poverty through the Canada disability benefit?

Mr. Michael Coteau: Madam Speaker, I am a fan of much of the advocacy work the hon. member does. The question was what we should do over the next few months to build more supports for people with disabilities, and it is to do exactly what we have been doing in the last year. It is to identify the issues that are important to us, build it into a budget, consult people and come back to the House and vote for a budget that actually invests in people.

Mr. Wilson Miao (Richmond Centre, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am privileged to rise in the House today on behalf of the people of Richmond Centre, and I am grateful for the trust and support from my constituents that allows me to be their representative in the chamber.

Before I speak to the opposition motion, I have very exciting news I would like to share with Canadians. On July 1, as we know, it is Canada Day. However, the first-ever Chinese Canadian museum in Canada will officially open for exhibition in Vancouver's Chinatown. This July 1 is also the 100-year anniversary of the enactment of the Chinese Exclusion Act.

As a Chinese Canadian, I am proud of my Chinese heritage. Chinese Canadians have made remarkable sacrifices and shaped our national fabric. We are excited to see our rich history and foundational contributions to Canada showcased at the newly opened, first-ever Chinese Canadian museum. We shall not forget the story of the determination of Chinese Canadians. We must continue our commitment to reconciliation and continue our efforts to build a stronger and more inclusive Canada for everyone.

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

• (2115)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order.

There seems to be a member online who has his mike open. I think we have remedied that now.

The hon. member for Richmond Centre can continue.

Mr. Wilson Miao: Madam Speaker, this government has been working on creating a more inclusive Canada since day one. I am pleased to note the opposition party is as focused as our government on cost of living issues.

In the current global inflationary environment, it is appropriate that we are discussing the issue of the rising cost of living, but it is also important to bear in mind that this issue has been top of mind for our government since long before the global pandemic struck and before Russia's illegal invasion of Ukraine. In fact, making life more affordable has been a central focus of our government's effort from day one. The measures we have introduced to make life more affordable include reduced child care costs, the Canada child benefit, the Canada dental benefit and tax relief through an increased basic personal amount. Through climate action incentive payments, our government is keeping affordability in mind as we fight climate change.

Since 2015, close to 2.3 million fewer Canadians are living in poverty. Income inequality has continued to fall. The labour force participation rate for women aged 15 to 64 years is at record highs, and young Canadians have access to a greater number of good-paying jobs than before the pandemic. There are 890,000 more Canadians employed than before the pandemic, which is more people than the entire population of New Brunswick. These are strong fundamentals, but we know there are challenges ahead.

We must contend with a slowing global economy and elevated interest rates around the world, and we will continue to take action to do so. We are fortunate that Canada's inflation rate is lower than that of our G7 partners, such as the U.K., Germany and the United States. Also, inflation is down from its peak last year, but it is still high. This means that, despite Canada's strong recovery from the pandemic, and despite all the new supports we have provided, there are still too many Canadians who are struggling with the impact of the recent ongoing wave of global inflation, especially lower-income Canadians, who are more exposed to the impact of rising costs.

This is precisely why, by introducing the one-time grocery rebate in budget 2023, our government is providing much-needed relief to those who need it most and helping to ensure they can continue to put food on the table. We know that it would not be reasonable to provide this support to everyone, as it would put pressure on prices for everyone and complicate the Bank of Canada's effort in addressing inflation, so the new, one-time grocery rebate will deliver targeted inflation relief to 11 million low- and modest-income Canadians and families who need it the most. The grocery rebate is being delivered to eligible Canadians on July 5 by direct deposit or cheque. I ask those who are watching to please make sure to check their account or mailbox. The royal assent of Bill C-46 has made this benefit a reality.

Business of Supply

The passage of Bill C-46 is also allowing us to deliver a one-time top-up to the Canada health transfer for provinces and territories, which is worth an additional \$2 billion. This will allow them to reduce wait times for surgery and support emergency rooms across Canada. This funding is to be used to improve and enhance the health care Canadians receive and is not to be used by provinces and territories in place of their planned health care spending. However, as announced by the Prime Minister in February, we will be providing nearly \$200 billion in additional federal health funding to provinces and territories over the next decade.

• (2120)

Our actions show that health care is a top priority for our government because health care is a priority for all Canadians. Canadians are proud of our universal publicly funded health care system. It is at the very heart of our identity as a country. Dental care is an important component of our health, too, but seeing a dentist can be very expensive. That is why our government has committed to fully implementing a permanent Canadian dental care plan by 2025.

Currently, the Canada dental benefit is providing eligible parents and guardians with direct, upfront, tax-free payments to cover the costs of dental care for their children under 12 and has supported more than 305,000 children to the current date. However, it is not just children who need affordable dental care. That is why budget 2023 delivered a transformative investment to provide dental care to Canadians who need it, with \$13 billion over the next five years and \$4.4 billion ongoing to implement the permanent Canadian dental care plan.

The plan will provide dental coverage for uninsured Canadians with annual family incomes of less than \$90,000, with no copays for families with incomes under \$70,000. The plan will begin to roll out by the end of 2023, which will both improve the health of Canadians and make life more affordable. Of course, it is not just the cost. There are also other factors that may prevent Canadians from accessing dental care, such as living in a remote community or requiring specialized care due to disability, which is why budget 2023 proposed funding to establish an oral health access fund. This fund will complement the Canadian dental care plan by addressing oral health gaps among vulnerable populations and reducing barriers to accessing dental care, including in rural and remote communities.

Our government is investing in health care because it matters to Canadians. It matters to their children, parents, seniors, friends and neighbours. Investing in health care is critical to building healthier and safer communities across Canada. Whether they are ensuring they have money to put food on the table or the health care they need when they need it, Canadians can be sure of one thing: Our government will continue to support them.

We will continue to be there to provide more help to those who need it most. We will continue to make life more affordable. We will continue to support the middle class. We will continue to build a stronger economy, and we will continue to make sure no one is left behind.

Mr. Marty Morantz (Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley, CPC): Madam Speaker, that seemed like a very well-reasoned, well-thought-out speech. However, the motion that we

are debating right now has a question, and the question is whether or not the government should be called upon to table a plan to return to balanced budgets.

I wonder if the member would agree that governments, no matter what their political stripe, should strive to at least create a plan to have balanced budgets?

Mr. Wilson Miao: Madam Speaker, it is my understanding that we are still paying the debt from the Great Depression, and it is important for us to understand what the biggest priority is right now to serve Canadians in need.

We understand that prices have been inflated after the pandemic for many reasons, and we are here to debate how we can deliver more supports and resources to those in need across our country. It is always top of mind with our government to understand the needs of Canadians. That is why we implemented the CCB, the dental care plan and other supports to help Canadians get through this hard time.

• (2125)

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the member talked about getting help to people, but what has the government done? When it comes to seniors, the government increased the OAS by 10%, but only for those who are over 75. It created two tiers of seniors. The Liberals decided to neglect those seniors who are between 65 and 75. This is despite the fact that over a third of women over 65 are living in poverty. That is actually shameful in a country like this. The PBO costed out expanding it to include those seniors who are between 65 and 75, and it would cost \$1.4 billion. Guess how much that is. It is a half-point increase in corporate tax.

What did the Liberals decide to do? They decided to choose corporate welfare instead of taking care of seniors, leaving the third of women who are over 65 hung out to dry. The GST rebate that people are going to see in July is to help just with inflation and groceries, never mind this increase that is needed. When will the government decide to increase corporate taxes to take care of those who need help the most, including seniors over 65, women and single women, one-third of whom are living in poverty in this country? It is unacceptable, and it is an injustice.

Mr. Wilson Miao: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his concern. I have full respect for seniors across Canada.

Here is a little background about seniors in my riding of Richmond Centre. We have the highest poverty in our seniors community. Before I was elected, this was already the case. Understand that our government has also implemented the new horizons program to support seniors in need, adjusted the age from 67 back to 65 and supported our seniors with a one-time GIS support. These are things that our government is considerate of in helping and supporting seniors in Canada.

Mr. Greg McLean (Calgary Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the member about something he said in his speech right at the end. He said that they will leave no one behind. That is what the Liberals said in 2017 when they talked about the just transition for the coal workers. I have looked at that program very thoroughly, and every one of those coal workers got left behind.

We know we have to transition off coal, and we have been transitioning off coal. However, the Liberals said they had \$185 million for coal workers. They spent \$58 million of it, and all of that went into a slush fund for government revenue. If members take a look at what happened to the actual workers, they will see that unemployment in those cities went up by 10% and the value of people's houses went down by two-thirds. Can the member across the way tell me how that actually translates into not leaving anybody behind, like the Liberals promised to do? It is completely false.

Mr. Wilson Miao: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if I can really listen to opposition members saying this because, when they were in government, they cut off a lot of support for Canadians. Although, yes, there was a lot of tax being cut, let us keep in mind that there are a lot of families who also suffered from these tax cuts.

What I meant, personally, by saying that no one is left behind is that we are there to listen to all Canadians and to understand their needs so that our government can address the solution directly. This is important because we want to make sure that all Canadians are being served.

Mr. Marty Morantz (Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to take a moment to thank the great folks of Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley for placing their trust in me to represent them in this august chamber, as we have reached the last day of the session. It has really been the honour of a lifetime, I have to say.

The topic we are discussing today, at the end of the day, is a fairly simple concept. The motion is just asking the House to call upon the government to table a plan to return to balanced budgets. I have been listening patiently to the speeches from opposition parties tonight, and other than in the Bloc, it is difficult to find a member in the Liberal or NDP caucuses who can even really say the words “balanced budget”. It is almost like it is sacrilege to even raise the topic or it is somehow a partisan argument to say that governments should strive to balance their books. It is like they are allergic to the concept.

However, it has not always been that way. Liberals have not always been this way, and the NDP has not always been this way. I remember back in the early 2000s, in my home province of Manitoba, when Gary Doer was Premier of Manitoba. He was Premier of Manitoba for just over 10 years. It is interesting. I know the members of the NDP caucus are fans of Gary Doer, and many Manitobans

Business of Supply

are still to this day fans of Gary Doer. In fact, he was appointed as the Canadian ambassador to the United States by Prime Minister Stephen Harper, a very well-respected parliamentarian.

Do members know what Gary Doer did for 10 years between 2000 and 2010, every year? He brought in balanced budgets: 10 of them.

Another interesting thing about Mr. Doer, and the reason I am talking about him, is that one of his MLAs was a lady by the name of Jennifer Howard. Jennifer was a very popular MLA. She was part of that government that brought in 10 balanced budgets, and she voted every year, 10 years in a row, for all these balanced budgets. Today, Ms. Howard is the chief of staff to the leader of the NDP, so I am hoping that at least Ms. Howard might have a conversation with the leader of the NDP and talk to him about the real history of the NDP and the sense of fiscal responsibility that the NDP has had throughout its history.

When it comes to the Liberal Party, we do not have to go back very far to find the desire to have balanced budgets. I mentioned earlier in one of my questions that Paul Martin recognized this. Unfortunately, he was forced to recognize it. The Government of Canada had hit the wall by 1995. It could not borrow any more on international markets; news media sources were calling Canada an economic basket case.

The government had no option to get things under control, so contrary to the partisan spin many of the Liberals like to say, that Liberals would never cut anything, the fact of the matter is that the deepest cuts in Canadian history were made by finance minister Martin and Prime Minister Jean Chrétien in 1995 cut transfers to provinces. I remember it very well, because Gary Filmon was the Premier of Manitoba, and he was all of a sudden looking at billions of dollars in shortfalls to fund health care in Manitoba, and provinces across the country were scrambling.

To be fair to Paul Martin, I do not think he did it because he wanted to. He did it because he had to, but the problem is that it should have never gotten to that point, and that is the point of my speech.

We have the chance to right the ship. All we are asking the government, and it is a very reasonable request that I do not see how one could say is partisan in any way, is just to come up with a plan to say how it is going to balance the budget. It is actually not so remote, even for the current government, at all, or for the finance minister, because in November she tabled the fall economic update.

• (2130)

In the fall economic update, she projected a balanced budget, in fact, a \$4.5-billion surplus in the 2027-28 fiscal year. Obviously, the Liberals had a plan to bring the budget back into balance. I really think this was a very reasonable request.

Business of Supply

I want to talk a little more about the motion. It basically says that budget 2023 adds more than \$60 billion of new spending, or \$4,200 per family, and that inflation in Canada increased following the introduction of the \$60 billion in new Liberal spending.

I should have mentioned earlier that I will be splitting my time with my esteemed colleague, the member for Calgary Centre. I apologize for not mentioning that earlier.

The reality is that members opposite will make the argument that inflation has come to our shores. It is not the government's fault, it is a worldwide phenomenon that Canada is certainly not immune to. The problem with that is that many economists have now confirmed that inflation is homegrown. In fact, one of them is the Governor of the Bank of Canada. We had the opportunity to question him in the finance committee. I asked him if government spending had been less, would inflation have been less. He said that, yes, inflation would have been less.

Clearly, fiscal policy has an impact on inflation, as does monetary policy. I know members opposite do not want to take it from me. They view all Conservatives as coming at this from a partisan perspective, but maybe they will take it from the IMF, which just released a report. The International Monetary Fund, which Canada has a member of since 1944, put out a report that urged Canada to bring back a debt anchor—

• (2135)

The Speaker: I am just going to interrupt the hon. member. I am going to ask the Sergeant-at-Arms to step outside. I know it is the year-end and people are having a fun time in the hallway, but the sound is echoing into the chamber and it is making it difficult to hear everything the hon. member has to say. I am sure everyone is listening with bated breath.

The hon. member for Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley, who has two minutes and 22 seconds remaining.

Mr. Marty Morantz: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the compliment. I know everybody is waiting with bated breath to hear what I have to say next. I will try not to disappoint.

The fact of the matter is the IMF is now urging Canada to bring a debt anchor and to keep fiscal policy tight. What does that mean, keeping fiscal policy tight? It means moving toward balanced budgets, not just relying on what they might call fiscal guardrails or reducing debt-to-GDP ratios, but actually having a hard fiscal anchor. This is the IMF talking, not me. A hard fiscal anchor. What they mean is a plan to get back to balanced budgets.

The Bank of Canada, to its credit, has been engaged in a policy of fiscal tightening, trying to reduce the money supply and raising interest rates, trying to grapple with the scourge of inflation. The problem is that the fiscal policy of the Government of Canada is running counter to that.

We have loose fiscal policy in this country, meaning that billions and billions of dollars are still going out the door of the budget this year. It was \$495 billion, almost half a trillion dollars. Mr. Speaker, I know you have been here for a while, and I know you know that is a lot of money. It is way more than it was even in 2019.

We have a real issue in this country, and I think we need to bridge the gap. We need the government and its coalition partners to take this concept seriously, go back to the drawing board and at least come back with a plan. That is all this motion asks for, not to balance the budget tomorrow or at two o'clock this morning when we are voting on the appropriations, but to come back soon with a plan, just like they had for 2027, to bring the budget back into balance.

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we often hear from the other side that the price on carbon is fuelling inflation. However, I look at reports of the Bank of Canada Governor Tiff Macklem's appearance before the finance committee in February.

I will quote a newspaper article. In terms of the impact of the price on carbon on inflation, he said that, "prescribed annual increases to the price on carbon add about 0.1 percentage points to headline inflation." That is not very much. Also, "He added later that scrapping the carbon tax completely would reduce inflation by half a percentage point in the year that it was done, but would not have any impact on inflation in future years."

The idea of always coming back to the price on carbon as the culprit contributing to inflation is a bit misleading, really. It does not reflect the thoughts of the Bank of Canada's governor.

• (2140)

Mr. Marty Morantz: Mr. Speaker, I do not think there was a question in that. I will take it as a comment. I did not talk about the price of carbon in my speech.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my colleague talked about a plan to return to balanced budgets. We agree that governments need to be able to plan ahead. It is only right for us to be able to see a plan.

My colleague is worried about inflation. Pensioners on fixed incomes and seniors are struggling to make ends meet. Does he not think that instead of giving \$20 billion in subsidies to oil companies that made \$220 billion in profits in 2022, we should take some of that money and increase old age pensions and ensure that our seniors can live better?

[*English*]

Mr. Marty Morantz: Mr. Speaker, finally I hear another member of Parliament say it is a good idea to have a plan to balance the budget.

I hope that the members of the Liberal Party are paying attention to the good common sense of the Bloc MP, the instruction of the IMF, and not just relying on how they view partisan interests of other members of Parliament.

Business of Supply

Ms. Lindsay Mathysen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I actually really enjoyed the hon. member's speech, especially at the beginning when he talked about how incredible the NDP has been in balancing provincial budgets. It is because, at the time, the NDP ensured all people were paying their fair share, including CEOs and corporations. The share they paid was equal to what they owed.

Considering the NDP's incredible record of good fiscal management, building a social safety net and ensuring there was balance while supporting people, I want to ask the hon. member this. Why will the Conservative Party not follow our lead and call on this government to implement a windfall tax on excess profits?

Mr. Marty Morantz: Mr. Speaker, only the NDP members could think that increasing taxes on Canadians will make life more affordable for Canadians. I do hope they pay attention to Mr. Doer's record, and come around and support our motion.

Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP): Mr. Speaker, to be fair, the question was not on raising taxes on the average person but on the largest oil and gas companies in the country, which have made over \$38 billion in profit this year alone.

Is the hon. member not supportive of making sure that kind of money goes to support Canadians who need it most?

Mr. Marty Morantz: Mr. Speaker, again, only the NDP and obviously the Green Party could think that increasing taxes will make life more affordable for Canadians.

Mr. Greg McLean (Calgary Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I think I am the last speaker in this session of Parliament before we take a summer break, and it is my pleasure to be serving here for the constituents of Calgary Centre. I hope I have represented what I said I would represent in the House for them. If I have let them down in anything I have done or said in the House or anything I have done publicly, I apologize to them for that. I hope to represent them well on all these things, with the highest regard for this House.

Let me take 10 minutes, and this will be as concise as I can make it, to talk about where we are going in the financial future of this country. We need to link here exactly what is happening with the government. It is about truth and consequences. The truth, of course, is that we are running bigger and bigger deficits. Our debt is getting higher and higher. There are consequences to this going forward, and those consequences are going to be borne not by the government in power here but by the Canadian people, who are going to continue to face mounting debts, deficits, interest payments and household debts going forward.

Three months ago, we had a Liberal finance minister deliver a budget. In it, there was a lot that she put in front of Parliament, including another \$40 billion-plus deficit added to Canada's debt, which has now reached \$1.3 trillion. That is only federal government debt. Layer the provincial government debt on top of that, of all the combined provincial governments, and there is another \$900 billion. We are talking about a society that, from a government perspective, is very much in debt.

The government, in its fiscal wisdom, says that the provincial governments are starting to actually get more money. There is one

provincial government that received money last year, and that was my home province of Alberta, because of a boom in oil prices that led to a whole bunch of royalties. This translated into over \$21 billion being forwarded to various governments across Canada as a result of a prosperous industry. We need to make sure we understand what is happening here. This is an industry that suffered for a number of years before it actually made any profit. This is the economic basis of what is holding up the social welfare of this country at this point in time.

I am going to go back to the finance minister's speech. There was federal debt and provincial debt, but she was also facing an inflation regime at that point in time that was around 4%. It had come down from last summer from about 8.2% to 4%. How did that happen? It happened because the Bank of Canada, an instrument of the Government of Canada, had raised interest rates from 0.25% to 4.5%. It had done its job in trying to control inflation. This is the mandate of the Bank of Canada. It performed that mandate, but it had to do so because of government overspending.

The Bank of Canada did what it had to do to bring that rate back down. It came down to 4%. What happened in April? The consumer price index went back up. Inflation in Canada's economy went back up. Why did it go back up in April? It is because the government imposed a 30% increase on the carbon tax upon the backs of Canadians. Of course, that rippled all the way through the economy and caused inflation at the pumps, inflation at the food stores and inflation in everything we do that involves energy.

There is something the government does not seem to have a hold on. If it increases the costs in the economy, it is going to increase inflation. It is doing this in two ways. It is increasing the costs to Canadians, and it is increasing deficits. These are all monetary mechanisms, fiscal mechanisms, that increase inflation. The government asked the Bank of Canada if it could come in and fix its mess from imposing more costs upon Canadians.

When the minister delivered her budget, the Bank of Canada rate was 4.5%. That went up this month, on June 7, to 4.75%. What was declining in both respects has gone up. The cost of inflation has gone up, and the cost to Canadians has gone up again. They are all refinancing their mortgages, and it is another 0.25%. Where will this end? We do not know at this point in time. It is costing Canadians more and more.

What is the principal cause of this inflation? The number one cause of inflation in the economy is money printing. The government continues to print money. It has doubled Canada's debt in eight years.

Business of Supply

• (2145)

The government is going to say that we had to do that to keep people safe during the pandemic. I say to my friends on the other side that the pandemic is over. We have to get back to some sort of balance, where we are actually paying for the goods we consume in society today with today's dollars. We keep taxing the future generation of Canadians to pay for our spending today, and that is something that has to change. That is something my party is asking the government to change, because it is a necessity for the future of this country.

Now, I will talk about this recipe for inflation that the government has imposed upon this country at this point in time. It has asked the Bank of Canada to come in and fix our mistakes again and again.

What is the consequence of the Bank of Canada coming in and raising the interest rates throughout the economy? It is having higher mortgage rates. This means that the actual cost of maintaining the mortgage on the same house has risen by 122% in the last eight years, which is significant. I will explain what the issue is.

When mortgage rates are low, as they were up to a year ago, people buy houses. However, we have a saying in finance that we do not really buy the house that we need; rather, we buy the house the payment will afford. A 25-year mortgage at 0.25% with a \$100,000 down payment, for instance, will equate to a bigger house than if the mortgage payment is around 4.75%-plus, which is what we have done to Canadians. We have added four and a half points of interest to mortgages, which is hundreds of thousands of dollars to the average Canadian. We have actually picked their pocket here, or pulled a bait and switch as to the house they can buy. The end result for many Canadians is that they are going to have to walk away from their house, because the equity in their house is not going to equal what it was when they bought the house. They are losing value in their house because of the current government.

However, there is not enough housing in this country anyway. We have to get building again, and we have to make sure we get back to balance. We have to ensure that we serve Canadians to make sure that they have the ability to build a life in Canada going forward.

Canada's GDP is \$2.3 trillion at this point in time, and the consumer debt of Canadians equals 107% of that; therefore, it is over \$2.3 trillion, and about 75% of that is mortgage debt. This is the most indebted ratio in the G7. We are more exposed to a downturn in the economy than any other economy in the world is at this point in time. This is on the cusp of danger.

We call it moral hazard. The government has not faced the fact that, in supposedly good times, it is supposed to balance the budget, pay back some of the debt and bring down interest rates so that people can actually get the economy going. However, it continues to spend more money, ramp up the cost of everything and make sure that Canadians are bearing it on their backs. The back it is going to bear the most on is mortgage rates, which are going to push many Canadians out of their homes as the rates rise and Canadians have to refinance. That is the great tragedy we are visiting upon Canadians without balanced budgets.

My party has actually been pushing the government for a long time to show us a plan where it gets back to balance, because in every budget it has shown us so far, it says, "Well, you know, we are going to continue to spend more and more." A \$10-billion temporary budget deficit in 2016 has turned into hundreds of billions of dollars per year. There is another \$40 billion-plus this year and more of that going down the road. This is to say nothing of the debt service charge, which has doubled in the last two years. We are up to \$44 billion that we are going to have to pay as interest. All of this is contributing to inflation. We have to get back on track.

I will tell the government to please bring us a plan so Canadians can see that they will actually get back on track.

• (2150)

Ms. Leah Taylor Roy (Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, through you, I would like to ask the member opposite some questions.

First, I thank him for that very fact-filled discourse. He spoke authoritatively on a number of fronts, and I would just like to check some of those facts.

He started off by saying that we were running bigger and bigger deficits every year. In 2021, the deficit was \$328 billion; in 2022, it was \$90 billion; and it is projected to be \$40 billion this year. Could he reconcile his statement with these facts?

Second, he said that we do not know where this is all going to end, and it is true, we do not; the future is always uncertain. However, the Bank of Canada expects inflation to come down below 3% by the end of the summer and interest rates to follow in decline.

Third, he said that printing money was the cause of inflation. I understand that this is one economic theory, and it is the economic theory that the Conservatives follow. However, many economists have said that, in fact, the war in Ukraine and the COVID pandemic have been the causes of inflation worldwide.

Could you comment on a few of those apparent contradictions to what you said?

• (2155)

The Speaker: I would remind hon. members that when they ask questions or make comments, they should do it through the Chair and not directly to each other. It makes things run a little more smoothly.

The hon. member for Calgary Centre.

Mr. Greg McLean: Mr. Speaker, I have been corrected. The member is correct that there were larger deficits during the pandemic than there were after the pandemic. Every year, we look at the deficit the Liberals put on the table for the next year, and it always rises. This is the point I was trying to make, and if I misspoke in that respect, I owe her an apology.

Business of Supply

There were three questions, but the member talked about economists, Conservative theories and all this stuff. These are not Conservative theories; these are economic theories. I know that, sooner or later, the Liberals will have to start paying attention to economics and finance. The numbers will actually matter at the end of the day.

I apologize to the member because I have forgotten her second question out of the three. If she could ask me again later, I would appreciate it.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ): Madam Speaker, the Conservative Party stated in its motion what is wrong, and I think it has a good read on the situation. The problem is the solutions it proposes, because it seems to think they would magically solve all the problems.

I want to talk about one problem in particular, and that is the price of oil. History has shown us that the biggest factor in price fluctuations is the price of oil, over which we have no control. It is a global price. It depends on wars, like the war in Ukraine. It depends on the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries, which just said it is going to reduce output. It depends on all sorts of things.

Does the member not think that the best way to stabilize prices would be to end our dependence on oil as soon as possible?

Mr. Greg McLean: Mr. Speaker, the theory that there is no more need for oil is very interesting. The world uses a lot of energy, and over 80% of it comes from fossil fuels. I am sure that Canada's oil companies do not have much say over the price of oil. That is determined by global markets, which set world oil prices. The prices of other forms of energy also depend on the price of oil.

[*English*]

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we keep hearing from the Conservatives about their corporate and free market-driven housing policies. Nowhere in the world has the free market solved an affordable housing crisis. We even heard from the member that his own city council rejected the Conservative Party's Ottawa-knows-best proposals.

Will the Conservatives get on board with building non-market housing to solve the housing crisis to ensure that people have affordable, safe and secure housing in the long term?

Mr. Greg McLean: Mr. Speaker, I do not know where my colleague got that fact about the city council in Calgary and Conservative policy, because we are all about building affordable houses.

I will point out to the member that there was a solution before there was a problem. There was not a housing crisis for either affordable housing or housing for Canadians who had the money to buy houses eight years ago. How did this problem arise? Let me figure it out. What happened eight years ago?

I will ask my colleague who asked that question why he is supporting a government that has created the problem that Conservatives need to get in power to solve.

• (2200)

The Speaker: The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby is rising on a point of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, since we have already passed the motion to adjourn the House this evening, on behalf of our leader, the member for Burnaby South, and the entire NDP caucus, I would like to take a few moments to praise the people who work here in the House. These people make our democracy work. I am talking about the pages, who do an exemplary job—

The Speaker: That is very kind of the hon. member, but it is not really a point of order. It sounds more like a speech.

I will give the hon. member another chance. If it has something to do with the Standing Orders, I will let him continue.

[*English*]

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, there is a tradition at the end of the session that each of the parties takes a moment to thank the people who really make our democracy work, so I would ask you for unanimous consent for two minutes to do that on behalf of the NDP.

The Speaker: Does the member have unanimous consent to move the motion?

An hon. member: Nay.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS CALENDAR

Mr. Chris Bittle (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

While I am on my feet and before I get to the point of order, I want to thank all staff and all hon. members and wish them a very happy summer, including the Minister of Seniors and the member for Kingston and the Islands.

I believe you have received advance notice, and if you seek it, I believe you will find unanimous consent for the following motion.

I move:

That, notwithstanding Standing Order 28 or any other usual practice of the House, the following proposed calendar for the year 2024 be tabled and that the House adopt this calendar.

The Speaker: I have received a notice from all recognized parties that they are in agreement with this request.

All those opposed to the hon. member moving the motion will please say nay.

It is agreed.

The question is on the motion. All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

(Motion agreed to)

*Business of Supply***BUSINESS OF SUPPLY**

OPPOSITION MOTION—BALANCED BUDGET

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. Adam van Koeverden (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and to the Minister of Sport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to stand in the House this evening on the final day of this parliamentary session. I am extremely happy to take part in today's debate to speak to our country's economic situation and the measures we are taking to make life more affordable from coast to coast to coast.

Before I do that, I have two things to say.

Today is National Indigenous Peoples Day, so I would like to recognize that. I would also like to recognize all first nations, Métis and Inuit people across the country who are celebrating their heritage, culture and language. We must do more to ensure those are upheld in this country. As it is the longest day of the year, being the summer solstice, it is an appropriate day to celebrate that. I was at the flag-raising this morning and heard lovely speeches from a lot of elders, the Prime Minister and the Governor General, who is the first-ever indigenous Governor General in this country, which is certainly something to celebrate on a day like today.

Also, like members before me, I would like to take a moment to recognize family and staff, such as my partner Emily, who when I am away a lot is in charge of the dog, and oftentimes when I am there too. I miss Cairo and I miss home, so I am looking forward to going back to the riding for a couple of months and spending time with my family, my dog and my girlfriend, as well as my mom, my brother and my dad, of course.

I miss my staff too and I am looking forward to getting back there. I thank them for holding down the fort in Milton over the last couple of months. There has been a lot of Ottawa time, and I am really grateful for all of the great work my constituency team does, as well as the people here in Ottawa. We really would not be able to do any of the work we do as members of Parliament without our extraordinary teams.

With respect to the substantive debate this evening on the Conservatives' opposition day motion, our government understands that many Canadians are struggling right now. These are tough financial times, with rising interest rates and global inflation, as well as quite a lot of uncertainty in the economic markets. We recognize that it is tough to make ends meet these days, and in these times of high inflation, our government has been there to support Canadians.

We have been witnessing a gradual decline in inflation in Canada, which is worth acknowledging is happening because we want to ensure that it continues to occur. The OECD predicts that it will return to its target level by the end of 2024, which is good news. Inflation in Canada reached a high of 8.1% in June of 2022, and has now fallen to the mid-fours, which is good news.

● (2205)

[*Translation*]

The inflation rate is still too high, but it is lower than what we are seeing in many comparable economies. For example, the inflation rate is 6.1% in the eurozone and 8.7% in the United Kingdom.

In fact, as we continue navigating through these difficult times, our country is faring much better than most other G7 countries. Canada is facing the same global economic headwinds from a position of fundamental economic strength, thanks in large part to our government's targeted investments to support Canadians and our economy.

Since 2015, our government has been making investments to make life more affordable. The most recent federal budget tabled by our colleague, the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, is an excellent example of that.

[*English*]

In budget 2023, our government introduced new targeted inflation relief supports for Canadians who are still struggling to make ends meet. When I knock on doors in Milton, I talk to my neighbours often and I recognize that these are tough financial times, but things like investments in child care, an enhanced Canada child benefit and supports for seniors, families and dental care are making a huge impact in ridings like mine and ridings right across this country. The support has been carefully designed to avoid exacerbating inflation and is aiming to support those who need it the most when they need it the most.

Very soon, Canadians who need it the most will be receiving their grocery rebate, which is a fantastic initiative that will not encourage any more inflation, recognizing that the toughest bills are those found at the grocery store and for rents and mortgages, and we have been there on those examples. Through the new one-time grocery rebate, budget 2023 delivers targeted inflation relief for over 11 million lower- and modest-income Canadians and families, with up \$467 for eligible couples with two children, an extra \$234 for single Canadians without children and an extra \$225 for seniors, on average. Eligible Canadians will receive their grocery rebate payment in just a little less than two weeks, on July 5.

We are also working hard to crack down on junk fees, which could include things like higher telecom roaming charges and fees for events and concerts. Pretty much every time someone swipes their credit card, there are added costs associated with that, and we want to crack down and make sure those little things do not add up. We are also helping small businesses with their credit card charges. It is a good time to look at some of those little things that really do add up, because it is an easy way to save a bit of money.

I would like to talk about our supports for seniors and how they are felt in Milton.

Business of Supply

When I talk to seniors at Allendale or at any of the seniors homes or I talk to seniors who live at home, which is something we are supporting by making sure that seniors can live at home more comfortably and safely for longer, they recognize that the OAS increases and the GIS increases are having an impact, but so is the New Horizons program for seniors.

One of the most important things that we can do as a government is combat loneliness and isolation that a lot of seniors experience, particularly when they are single. One of the reasons we chose to increase the OAS for older seniors is that they are disproportionately single, and they are more often disabled and far less able to work when they are over 75 as well. Making sure that financial support goes to people who really need it has been a priority for our government, and it has had a really great impact. Those supports are also indexed to inflation, and that indexing is important in times of high inflation, given that we have been experiencing high inflation over the last little while.

Speaking of interest and inflation and the relationship between the two, I was at a graduation ceremony in my riding recently. I was talking to some high school students who were going on to college, university and apprenticeship programs next year. They were thrilled to hear that Canada's student loans and Canada's apprenticeship loans would not include any interest on the federal portion any longer.

This is a cost burden that students will never need to experience. They are not going to see a minus symbol or a red colour on their invoice. They will just never know that cost burden. That is an investment I was very proud of. I am glad to know that students in the future, whether they are pursuing an apprenticeship, a university degree or a college diploma, will not have to pay federal interest on their student loans.

This evening we have been hearing a lot from Conservatives. Oftentimes, Conservatives will talk as if they are stewards of the economy and Canada's experts on things such as balanced books. I think it is important to examine their record and look back at the Harper years. Those are the years when I started getting involved and more interested in politics personally because I recognized that it had started affecting our lives, and it was a tough time. I was travelling a lot internationally, and Canada did not have the greatest reputation internationally, specifically when it came to climate change and action on it.

We also were not encouraging any international investment. We were considered a low-competitiveness nation at the time. There was really stagnant economic growth, and we had really high unemployment. To compare it to today's numbers of 4.8% unemployment, back in the Harper years there was 7.3% unemployment. We are talking almost double the number of people who were not working in this country.

We had low competitiveness, low exports, low international investment, higher rates of poverty and lower rates of economic growth. I would question what the Conservatives got for all that. They might say they balanced the books; they in fact did not. They ran deficits year after year, deficits as high as almost \$60 billion. Over the course of the six years that they ran deficits, they ran a deficit of, on average, \$24.1 billion. For the Conservatives to sug-

gest that the books would be balanced if we could just flick a switch and have them in power is actually absurd, because their record disproves that idea entirely.

The other topic that the Conservatives have been focusing on a lot, and I think it is a good thing, is talking about inflation, but they have not been talking about the root causes of inflation. Their only speaking point with respect to inflation is to say that government spending is causing inflation. I would challenge that assertion.

Is the government's spending on dental care programs causing inflation? No. Is the government's spending on COVID, buying vaccines and making sure that businesses could stay open, causing inflation? No, it is not. Is making sure that students do not have to pay interest on their student loans causing inflation? No, it is not.

Some of the things that are causing inflation that the Conservative side does not want to talk about, for some reason, are climate change, the pandemic, supply and demand, and Russia's illegal war on Ukraine and its invasion of that country.

• (2210)

How about the fact that inflation continues to be global, and that Canada's inflation numbers are actually lower than those of all our peer nations? Despite all that, we also have the strongest economic position in the G7. We are expected to grow at a higher rate than all of our counterparts in the G7. We have the lowest unemployment in the G7. Our economy is working, and that is because Canadians are working. More than 900,000 more Canadians are working today than before the pandemic.

Our economy is growing despite the economic headwinds globally. Our Canadian economy is working because Canadians work hard. They push through hard times. I think about it like paddling into a headwind. I had the opportunity to get on the water this afternoon, while over at Petrie Island Canoe Club to talk about some of our investments in community-level sport. I was lucky. I got on the water with some young paddlers in the riding of Orléans. It was windy. I was thinking that paddling into a headwind is tough, but we have to keep paddling; otherwise, we get pushed backward. That is something relevant.

If people do not push forward when they are working in a headwind, they will actually get pushed backward. That is what the Conservatives want us to do; they want us to stop investing in ourselves. Confident countries invest in themselves. We invest in our future. We believe that a stronger Canada is possible if we are willing to make sure we lay the economic groundwork and the foundation for that better future, and that is something the Conservatives have never understood. They have never been courageous enough to invest in our own country, our own sectors, our industries, and our future.

Business of Supply

However, Liberals will not apologize for making sure we are laying the economic groundwork for a better future for all our children. I thank the hon. members for the encouragement; it is nice. I feel very well encouraged. As members can see, we have delivered a lot of new support in budget 2023 to help make life more affordable throughout our country. However, the reality is that we started introducing such measures as soon as we formed the government. We go back a couple of years, and I will give a few examples. We have provided one-time inflation relief payments to about 11 million low- and modest-income Canadians—

Mr. Peter Julian: Thanks to the NDP.

Mr. Adam van Koevorden: Mr. Speaker, it is now worth up to \$467 for a couple with two children, and up to \$234 for a single Canadian without children.

My hon. NDP colleague down the way pointed out that it required a little collaboration, and I think that is actually the best part about this place. We come together, find solutions and talk about things that are going to help Canadians. I thank the New Democratic Party for contributing to the conversation, making sure its constituents' voices are heard, making sure we have good policies that actually help people, rather than just dragging people through the mud, talking down the Canadian economy and our workers, and ignoring things like climate change and Russia's illegal invasion of Ukraine.

It has been a tiresome spring hearing from the Conservatives about all the ways that Canada's economy is just not working, because it is not true. Canada's economy is working, and that is because Canadians are working. Let us talk about the Canada workers benefit. The Canada workers benefit means that new families could receive up to \$2,616, and single Canadians without children could receive up to \$1,518.

Another thing we collaborated on in the House, and I am very proud of it, is the Canada disability benefit. Just in the last couple of days, we have made it a reality. We are taking steps towards ending disability poverty in this country, and it is about time. Some members will say that we should do less for people who need more. Some members on the Conservative side do not understand the idea of equality versus equity and what we are actually trying to fight for when we invest in people and make sure they have the supports they need. I will say that members of the Bloc Québécois, the NDP, the Liberal Party and the Green Party do understand the difference between equity and equality, and how we fight for those individuals who need a little extra support because of their circumstances.

We have also provided direct, tax-free payments of up to \$1,300 per child over two years to eligible families, to cover dental expenses for their children who are under 12, and work is under way to make sure that the age goes up to 18, so that children under 18 could receive dental care. Also, because a lot of provincial governments do not adequately fund their social safety net with regard to dental care for seniors, our government is looking at solutions to ensure that seniors are also covered under our Canada dental benefit.

We have also provided a tax-free payment of \$500 to help low-income people who are struggling with the cost of rent, through the Canada housing benefit.

It is important to recognize that, when parties work together, we make progress happen for our neighbours. If more parties would come to the table with great ideas and solutions, then we could probably make even more progress happen. I love democracy. When people vote for parties that care about people, we make good progress, so I thank the NDP for that progress, and, indeed, I thank my colleague from British Columbia.

● (2215)

We have also increased the old age security, as I mentioned earlier, which is providing over \$800 in new supports to full pensioners just in the first year.

[*Translation*]

We are going to launch the tax-free Canada child benefit to support some 3.5 million families a year. That means that families will receive up to \$7,000 per child under the age of six and up to \$6,000 per child between the ages of six and 17 per year.

In order to fight climate change while making life more affordable, we put a federal price on pollution that puts more money back into the pockets of eight out of 10 Canadians in the provinces where the fuel charge applies.

[*English*]

We spent a lot of time in the chamber talking about carbon pricing. I think there are some members in the House who perhaps do not believe in the institution of the Nobel Prize. I, however, think it is an institution that is fairly good at identifying when huge steps forward in progress and innovation have occurred. That prize was given to somebody named William Nordhaus for his excellent work on pricing carbon and recognizing a price on pollution is just the foundation for fighting climate change around the world, which is an existential threat, and the climate emergency is causing a public health emergency in many places, including here in Ottawa. Just a couple of weeks ago, despite the fact that the clouds of fire smoke were rolling in, the Conservative side was still talking about how we could do less to fight climate change in this country. It was very disappointing.

However, I am glad we are making progress. We are fighting climate change in various ways, from promoting green technologies and ensuring that we are investing in the right ways for green jobs of the future, to promoting more tree planting. We are also ensuring that we are reducing emissions. We are putting a cap on emissions for the oil and gas sector. We are creating solutions so people can afford to put in a heat pump to get off home heating oil. They can more adequately afford an electric vehicle because of our zero-emission vehicle subsidies. These are all important programs that invest in Canadians and make sure solutions for existential threats like the pandemic or climate change are less of a burden for Canadians.

Business of Supply

I know that the Conservative side will stand up in a moment or two to ask me a couple of questions about my speech, and I welcome that. Before they do, I would ask them to maybe identify one or two of the programs they think are superfluous. Which program is it that they would cut? Which program would they think is not helping Canadians? Is it dental? Is it the old age security? Is it our Canada child benefit, which supports families in my riding with \$106 million every year back to the families who need it most, in a cost-effective and means-tested manner? It is a great program and it has pulled over 400,000 children out of poverty. I stand behind it.

I know that all members of the House do stand behind great programs, like our child care subsidy, for example, which I was thrilled to see pass through the House unanimously. I would like to thank my colleague from Burlington for all her extraordinary hard work on that program. As a parent of a young one, she knows full well how important it is to make sure that there is good, high-quality child care available to parents across the country. My mom relied on our neighbours. I went next door when I got home from school, and then, when I was a bit too old for a babysitter but too young to take care of myself, she relied on the canoe club. My colleague says that was two years ago; that is probably true, actually. The canoe club was our solution to child care, but I am glad we have something that meets the needs of Canadians. Before Conservatives stand up and say that all these programs should be cut so we can balance the books, I would ask them why they voted unanimously for something like child care.

In closing, we recognize that times are tough. Financially, families are struggling right now. It has a lot to do with inflated costs and global inflation, but we are meeting the moment. We are meeting Canadians where they are and finding solutions with an open mind. We are fighting inflation, and it is slowly going down. I want to recognize that it is still too high, as are interest rates for many Canadians. That is why our government is investing and finding ways to provide inflation relief to those who need it most: the most vulnerable and those who are most exposed to inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I wish you a great summer. I look forward to spending some time back in my riding and maybe taking a little vacation. I am looking forward to getting home after a long spring here in the House of Commons. I want to congratulate everybody on passing so much legislation this spring.

• (2220)

Mr. Michael Kram (Regina—Wascana, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I was surprised when I heard the hon. member accuse the Conservatives of ignoring the war in Ukraine. Conservatives have been calling, for some time now, for an increase in Canadian oil and gas exports to western Europe so it can stop buying its oil and gas from Russia. This is something the Liberals have promised but not delivered on.

I was wondering if the hon. member can explain whether he feels that an increase in Canadian oil and gas exports to western Europe to displace Russian oil and gas is a policy worth pursuing.

Mr. Adam van Koeverden: Mr. Speaker, once again, I am shocked that the Conservatives would say one thing but then do another. With all of the support for Ukraine in our budget, the Conser-

vatives voted against it. With all of the supports for Ukraine through the most difficult time in that country's existence, they voted against it. Then, they stand in the House and suggest that the one way we should help Ukraine is by exporting more oil and gas to western Europe.

There is an energy crisis around the world. We need solutions, and we need innovations, but to stand up and suggest that the only thing we should be doing for Ukraine is voting against a budget with all that aid, all those supports and all those defence mechanisms that the minister has applied, and that what we should be doing is sending more oil and gas, is so myopic that I cannot wait to get to summer so I do not have to hear that type of argument anymore.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by wishing you and all my colleagues here in the House a wonderful summer.

Regarding my colleague's speech, I would like to share one of the conclusions reached by the Centre of Excellence on the Canadian Federation, which has analyzed federal spending since 2015. It found that “the current trend is toward a more directive and less collaborative use of the spending power....Partnership seems to be conditional on a province accepting the federal government's policy vision”.

I would call that federal paternalism. In other words, if the provinces want money, they have to do what the federal government wants. The federal government can behave this way because it has too much revenue for its budget items.

I would like my colleague to comment on the fiscal imbalance, which is precisely why the government is increasing its initiatives in areas of jurisdiction that are not its own.

• (2225)

Mr. Adam van Koeverden: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her question and for her interest in this very important issue.

I believe it is a question of collaboration and responsibility. The constituents of my riding of Milton want a better education system and better health care. Over the past six years under the current premier of Ontario, we have seen cuts to the education system and the health care system.

It is a question of responsibility and collaboration between the provinces, the territories and the federal government. It is not a question of paternalism, as my colleague stated.

*Business of Supply**[English]*

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the reality is that the Conservative motion today would cut tens of thousands of jobs, including those of the folks who make Parliament work. I would like to pay tribute now to the pages; the administration; the interpreters and translators; the clerks; the analysts; the librarians; those involved in maintenance, food service and cleaning; the drivers; the ITT; and the Parliamentary Protective Service. Of course, we paid tribute earlier to Nora Daigle, who after 20 years in the House of Commons, is going to be taking her retirement, and of course we wish her a terrific retirement. The member for Burnaby South and the entire NDP caucus pay tribute to those workers.

My question to my colleague is this: Why do Conservatives hate workers so much that they would not even allow thank yous for those House of Commons workers?

Mr. Adam van Koeverden: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friend and colleague from New Westminster—Burnaby for doing what I did not do during my 20 minutes, which is to thank the resources of the House and the people who work so hard to make sure everything about democracy that we all love and hold so dear happens. I would also add the analysts, the Library of Parliament and all the clerks. The whip is saying I should include the whip.

I thank the pages especially, because we played soccer against the pages, and I will not talk about the score. Should I talk about the score? Is it fair to talk about the scores? The MP side did win this time, by only one point, but my favourite part of that was that the pages held up a sign during the game that said, “Get your own water!”, so for the next three months I am going to get my own water. I appreciate that.

I would reiterate the kind gesture from my friend and colleague from New Westminster—Burnaby. I thank all the workers. I thank all the people who are supporting workers across our country, and I thank everybody in Ottawa who works so hard. We will see them in September.

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Minister of Official Languages and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Milton had a great speech. I listened to it attentively.

I wonder if he could elaborate a bit on the impact of the investments our government has made in the area of early learning and child care, the impact on families and the impact on our economy. We certainly know it is going to make a huge difference by making sure that more women enter the workforce.

[Translation]

Mr. Adam van Koeverden: Mr. Speaker, first, I want to congratulate my colleague for the passage of Bill C-13. There is a small, but very strong francophone community in Milton. On Monday, I plan to attend a graduation ceremony at that school.

[English]

I thank the hon. minister for her hard work passing historic legislation for minority language rights in Canada.

Once again, I would like to acknowledge how historic our investments in affordable child care. Six provinces and territories across this country have achieved \$10-a-day day care. Parents are now spending more time with their children over the course of the summer, but come September, they will be accessing that child care.

Once again, I thank everybody in the House for making this session possible.

● (2230)

[Translation]

The Speaker: It being 10:30 p.m., pursuant to order made earlier today, and since today is the last allotted day in the supply period ending June 23, 2023, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forth with every question necessary to dispose of the opposition motion.

[English]

The question is as follows.

May I dispense?

Some hon. members: No.

[Chair read text of motion to House]

The Speaker: If a member of a recognized party present in the House wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Hon. Kamal Khara: Mr. Speaker, we would like a recorded division.

The Speaker: Call in the members.

● (2315)

[Translation]

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

(Division No. 396)

YEAS

Members

Aboultouf	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Berthold	Bérubé
Bezan	Blanchet
Blanchette-Joncas	Block
Bragdon	Brassard
Brock	Brunelle-Duceppe
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chabot
Chambers	Champoux
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	DeBellefeuille
Deltell	d'Entremont
Desbiens	Desilets
Doherty	Dowdall

Business of Supply

Dreeshen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Casey	Chagger
Ellis	Epp	Chahal	Champagne
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)	Chatel	Chen
Fast	Ferrieri	Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Findlay	Fortin	Cormier	Coteau
Gallant	Garon	Dabrusin	Damoff
Gaudreau	Généreux	Desjarlais	Dhaliwal
Genuis	Gill	Dhillon	Diab
Gladu	Godin	Dong	Drouin
Goodridge	Gourde	Dubourg	Duclos
Gray	Hallan	Duguid	Dzerowicz
Jeneroux	Kelly	Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Kitchen	Kmiec	Erskine-Smith	Fergus
Kram	Kramp-Neuman	Fillmore	Fisher
Kurek	Kusie	Fonseca	Fortier
Lake	Lantsman	Fragiskatos	Freeland
Larouche	Lawrence	Fry	Gaheer
Lehoux	Lemire	Garrison	Gazan
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Gerretsen	Gould
Liepert	Lloyd	Green	Guilbeault
Lobb	Maguire	Hajdu	Hanley
Martel	Mazier	Hardie	Hepfner
McCaulley (Edmonton West)	McLean	Holland	Housefather
Melillo	Michaud	Hughes	Hussen
Moore	Morantz	Hutchings	Iacono
Morrison	Motz	Idlout	Ien
Muys	Nater	Jaczek	Johns
Normandin	O'Toole	Jones	Jowhari
Patzer	Paul-Hus	Julian	Kayabaga
Pauzé	Perkins	Kelloway	Khalid
Perron	Poilievre	Khera	Koutrakis
Rayes	Redekopp	Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Reid	Rempel Garner	Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Richards	Roberts	Lametti	Lamoureux
Rood	Ruff	Lapointe	Lattanzio
Savard-Tremblay	Scheer	Lauzon	LeBlanc
Schmale	Seeback	Lebouthillier	Lightbound
Shields	Shipley	Long	Longfield
Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
Small	Soroka	MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacGregor
Steinley	Ste-Marie	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Stewart	Strahl	Martinez Ferrada	Masse
Stubbs	Thériault	Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
Therrien	Thomas	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	McDonald (Avalon)
Tochor	Tolmie	McGuinty	McKay
Trudel	Uppal	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod
Van Popta	Vecchio	McPherson	Mendès
Vidal	Vien	Mendicino	Miao
Viersen	Vignola	Miller	Morrice
Villemure	Vis	Morrissey	Murray
Vuong	Wagantall	Naqvi	Ng
Warkentin	Waugh	Noormohamed	O'Connell
Webber	Williams	Oliphant	O'Regan
Zimmer—145		Petitpas Taylor	Powlowski
		Qualtrough	Robillard
		Rodriguez	Rogers
		Romanado	Sahota
		Saks	Samson
		Sarai	Scarpaleggia
		Schiefke	Serré
		Sgro	Shanahan
		Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)
		Sidhu (Brampton South)	Singh
		Sorbara	Sousa
		St-Onge	Sudds
		Tassi	Taylor Roy
		Thompson	Trudeau
		Turnbull	Valdez
		Van Bynen	van Koeverden
		Vandal	Vandenbeld
		Virani	Weiler
		Wilkinson	Yip
		Zahid	Zarrillo

NAYS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Battiste
Beech	Bendayan
Bennett	Bibeau
Bittle	Blaikie
Blair	Blaney
Blois	Boissonnault
Boulerice	Bradford
Brière	Cannings

Business of Supply

Zuberi— 177

PAIRED

Members

Hoback

Joly— 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

[English]

The next question in on the motion to adopt the main estimates.

* * *

[Translation]

MAIN ESTIMATES, 2023-24

Hon. Mona Fortier (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved

That the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2024, less the amounts voted in the interim supply, be concurred in.

The Speaker: If a member of a recognized party present in the House wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division or wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

[English]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I request a recorded vote.

● (2325)

[Translation]

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Speaker, our dean, the member for Bécancour—Nicolet—Saurel, encountered a serious issue. He was unable to connect to vote. Could we have his vote count? He is voting in favour.**The Speaker:** I am sorry, but the Standing Orders of the House do not allow it. He must connect.

● (2330)

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

(Division No. 397)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Bennett
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blanchet
Blaney
Boissonnault
Bradford
Brunelle-Duceppe
Casey
Chagger
Champagne

Alghabra
Anand
Angus
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bendayan
Bérubé
Bittle
Blair
Blanchette-Joncas
Blais
Boulerice
Brière
Cannings
Chabot
Chahal
Champoux

Chatel
Chiang
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeBellefeuille
Desilets
Dhaliwal
Diab
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Garrison
Gazan
Gill
Green
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Jones
Julian
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lametti
Lapointe
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Lemire
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Mendicino
Michaud
Morrice
Murray
Ng
Normandin
Oliphant
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Qualtrough
Robillard
Rogers
Sahota
Samson
Savard-Tremblay
Schieffe
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sinclair-Desgagné
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Sudds

Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Coteau
Damoff
Desbiens
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Dong
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Fry
Garon
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Gould
Guilbeault
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Larouche
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor
Maloney
Masse
May (Cambridge)
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod
Mendès
Miao
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
O'Connell
O'Regan
Perron
Powlowski
Rayes
Rodriguez
Romanado
Saks
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Singh
Sousa
St-Onge
Tassi

Business of Supply

PAIRED

Members

Hoback

July— 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Hon. Mona Fortier moved that Bill C-54, An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the federal public administration for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2024, be read the first time.

(Motion deemed adopted and bill read the first time)

[English]

Hon. Mona Fortier moved that the bill be read the second time and referred to a committee of the whole.

[Translation]

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I believe that if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the results of the previous vote to this vote with Liberal members voting yes.

[English]

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree to apply the vote and vote nay.

[Translation]

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will vote in favour.

[English]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply and will be voting in favour.

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Greens agree to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

Mr. Kevin Vuong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the results of the previous vote, voting against.

[Translation]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the vote and I will vote in favour.

[English]

Mr. Han Dong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and vote in favour.

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

(Division No. 398)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Bennett
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blanchet

Alhabra
Anand
Angus
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bendayan
Bérubé
Bittle
Blair
Blanchette-Joncas

Taylor Roy
Therrien
Trudeau
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandal
Vignola
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 209

Thériault
Thompson
Trudel
Valdez
van Koevorden
Vandenbeld
Villemure
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albas
Arnold
Barlow
Berthold
Block
Brassard
Calkins
Carrie
Chong
Dalton
Davidson
d'Entremont
Dowdall
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Ferrer
Gallant
Genius
Godin
Gourde
Hallan
Kelly
Kmiec
Kramp-Neuman
Kusie
Lantsman
Lehoux
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lloyd
Maguire
Mazier
McLean
Moore
Morrison
Muys
O'Toole
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Reid
Richards
Rood
Scheer
Seeback
Shiely
Soroka
Stewart
Stubbs
Tochor
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vis
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams

Aitchison
Allison
Baldinelli
Barrett
Bezan
Bragdon
Brock
Caputo
Chambers
Cooper
Dancho
Deltell
Doherty
Dreeshen
Ellis
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Findlay
Généreux
Gladu
Goodridge
Gray
Jeneroux
Kitchen
Kram
Kurek
Lake
Lawrence
Lewis (Essex)
Liepert
Lobb
Martel
McCaulley (Edmonton West)
Melillo
Morantz
Motz
Nater
Patzner
Perkins
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Roberts
Ruff
Schmale
Shields
Small
Steinley
Strahl
Thomas
Tolmie
Van Popta
Vidal
Vierson
Vuong
Warkentin
Webber
Zimmer— 114

Business of Supply

Blaney	Blois	Sgro	Shanahan
Boissonnault	Boulerice	Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Bradford	Brière	Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings	Sinclair-Desgagné	Singh
Casey	Chabot	Sorbara	Sousa
Chagger	Chahal	Ste-Marie	St-Onge
Champagne	Champoux	Sudds	Tassi
Chatel	Chen	Taylor Roy	Thériault
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Therrien	Thompson
Cormier	Coteau	Trudeau	Trudel
Dabrusin	Damoff	Tumbull	Valdez
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens	Van Bynen	van Koeverden
Desilets	Desjarlais	Vandal	Vandenbeld
Dhaliwal	Dhillon	Vignola	Villemure
Diab	Dong	Virani	Weiler
Drouin	Dubourg	Wilkinson	Yip
Duclos	Duguid	Zahid	Zarrillo
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi	Zuberi— 209	
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith		
Fergus	Fillmore		
Fisher	Fonseca		
Fortier	Fortin		
Fragiskatos	Fraser	Aboultaif	Aitchison
Freeland	Fry	Albas	Allison
Gaheer	Garon	Arnold	Baldinelli
Garrison	Gaudreau	Barlow	Barrett
Gazan	Gerretsen	Berthold	Bezan
Gill	Gould	Block	Bragdon
Green	Guilbeault	Brassard	Brook
Hajdu	Hanley	Calkins	Caputo
Hardie	Hepfner	Carrie	Chambers
Holland	Housefather	Chong	Cooper
Hughes	Hussen	Dalton	Dancho
Hutchings	Iacono	Davidson	Deltell
Idlout	Ien	d'Entremont	Doherty
Jaczek	Johns	Dowdall	Dreeshen
Jones	Jowhari	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Julian	Kayabaga	Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Kelloway	Khalid	Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Khera	Koutrakis	Ferreri	Findlay
Kusmierczyk	Kwan	Gallant	Généreux
Lalonde	Lambropoulos	Genius	Gladu
Lametti	Lamoureux	Godin	Goodridge
Lapointe	Larouche	Gourde	Gray
Lattanzio	Lauzon	Hallan	Jeneroux
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier	Kelly	Kitchen
Lemire	Lightbound	Kmiec	Kram
Long	Longfield	Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)	Kusie	Lake
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacGregor	Lantsman	Lawrence
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney	Lehoux	Lewis (Essex)
Martinez Ferrada	Masse	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)	Lloyd	Lobb
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	McDonald (Avalon)	Maguire	Martel
McGuinty	McKay	Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod	McLean	Melillo
McPherson	Mendès	Moore	Morantz
Mendicino	Miao	Morrison	Motz
Michaud	Miller	Muys	Nater
Morrice	Morrissey	O'Toole	Patzner
Murray	Naqvi	Paul-Hus	Perkins
Ng	Noormohamed	Poilievre	Redekopp
Normandin	O'Connell	Reid	Rempel Garner
Oliphant	O'Regan	Richards	Roberts
Paupé	Perron	Rood	Ruff
Petitpas Taylor	Powlowski	Scheer	Schmale
Qualtrough	Rayes	Seeback	Shields
Robillard	Rodriguez	Shipley	Small
Rogers	Romanado	Soroka	Steinley
Sahota	Saks	Stewart	Strahl
Samson	Sarai	Stubbs	Thomas
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia	Tochor	Tolmie
Schieffe	Serré	Uppal	Van Popta

NAYS

Members

Vecchio
Vien
Vis
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams

Vidal
Viersen
Vuong
Warkentin
Webber
Zimmer— 114

PAIRED

Members

Hoback

Joly— 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Accordingly, this bill stands referred to a committee of the whole. I do now leave the chair for the House to go into committee of the whole.

(Bill read the second time and the House went into committee of the whole thereon, Mrs. Carol Hughes in the chair)

(On clause 2)

Mrs. Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC): Madam Chair, I wonder if the President of the Treasury Board could confirm that the supply bill is in its usual form.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Mona Fortier (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Madam Chair, I have good news for my colleague: The presentation of this bill is identical to that used during the previous supply period.

• (2335)

[*English*]

The Deputy Chair: Shall clause 2 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 2 agreed to)

The Deputy Chair: Shall clause 3 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 3 agreed to)

The Deputy Chair: Shall clause 4 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 4 agreed to)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Chair: Shall clause 5 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 5 agreed to)

The Deputy Chair: Shall schedule 1 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

Business of Supply

(Schedule 1 agreed to)

The Deputy Chair: Shall schedule 2 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Schedule 2 agreed to)

[*English*]

The Deputy Chair: Shall clause 1, the short title, carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 1 agreed to)

The Deputy Chair: Shall the preamble carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Preamble agreed to)

The Deputy Chair: Shall the title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Title agreed to)

The Deputy Chair: Shall the bill carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Bill agreed to)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Chair: Shall I rise and report the bill?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Bill reported)

Hon. Mona Fortier moved that the bill be concurred in.

[*English*]

The Speaker: If a member of a recognized party present in the House wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division or wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, once again, I believe that if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the results of the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting yes.

[*English*]

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree to apply the vote, with Conservatives voting nay.

Business of Supply

[Translation]

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the results of the previous vote to this vote, adding the member for Bécancour—Nicolet—Saurel, and will be voting in favour of the motion.

[English]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will be voting shockingly in favour.

[Translation]

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Greens agree to apply the vote and will be voting in favour of the motion.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Vuong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the results of the previous vote, voting against.

[Translation]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the vote and will be voting in favour of the motion.

[English]

Mr. Han Dong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the vote and vote in favour.

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

(Division No. 399)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra	Fortier	Fortin
Ali	Anand	Fragiskatos	Fraser
Anandasangaree	Angus	Freeland	Fry
Arseneault	Arya	Gaheer	Garon
Ashton	Atwin	Garrison	Gaudreau
Bachrach	Badawey	Gazan	Gerretsen
Bains	Baker	Gill	Gould
Barron	Barsalou-Duval	Green	Guilbeault
Battiste	Beaulieu	Hajdu	Hanley
Beech	Bendayan	Hardie	Hepfner
Bennett	Bérubé	Holland	Housefather
Bibeau	Bittle	Hughes	Hussen
Blaikie	Blair	Hutchings	Iacono
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas	Idlout	Ien
Blaney	Blois	Jaczek	Johns
Boissonnault	Boulerice	Jones	Jowhari
Bradford	Brière	Julian	Kayabaga
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings	Kelloway	Khalid
Casey	Chabot	Khera	Koutrakis
Chagger	Chahal	Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Champagne	Champoux	Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Chatel	Chen	Lametti	Lamoureux
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Lapointe	Larouche
Cormier	Coteau	Lattanzio	Lauzon
Dabrusin	Damoff	LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens	Lemire	Lightbound
Desilets	Desjarlais	Long	Longfield
Dhaliwal	Dhillon	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
Diab	Dong	MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacGregor
Drouin	Dubourg	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Duclos	Duguid	Martinez Ferrada	Masse
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi	Mathyssen	May (Cambridge)
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	McDonald (Avalon)
Fergus	Fillmore	McGuinty	McKay
Fisher	Fonseca	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod
		McPherson	Mendès
		Mendicino	Miao
		Michaud	Miller
		Morrice	Morrissey
		Murray	Naqvi
		Ng	Noormohamed
		Normandin	O'Connell
		Oliphant	O'Regan
		Pauzé	Perron
		Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon
		Powlowski	Qualtrough
		Rayes	Robillard
		Rodriguez	Rogers
		Romanado	Sahota
		Saks	Samson
		Sarai	Savard-Tremblay
		Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
		Serré	Sgro
		Shanahan	Sheehan
		Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
		Simard	Sicclair-Desgagné
		Singh	Sorbara
		Sousa	Ste-Marie
		St-Onge	Sudds
		Tassi	Taylor Roy
		Thériault	Therrien
		Thompson	Trudeau
		Trudel	Turnbull
		Valdez	Van Bynen
		van Koeverden	Vandal
		Vandenbeld	Vignola
		Villemure	Virani
		Weiler	Wilkinson
		Yip	Zahid
		Zarrillo	Zuberi— 210

Business of Supply

NAYS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Berthold	Bezan
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chambers
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	Deltell
d'Entremont	Doherty
Dowdall	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Ferreri	Findlay
Gallant	Généreux
Genuis	Glada
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Gray
Hallan	Jeneroux
Kelly	Kitchen
Kmicc	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lehoux	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Maguire	Martel
Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLean	Melillo
Moore	Morantz
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
O'Toole	Patzer
Paul-Hus	Perkins
Poilievre	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Richards	Roberts
Rood	Ruff
Scheer	Schmale
Seeback	Shields
Shipley	Small
Soroka	Steinley
Stewart	Strahl
Stubbs	Thomas
Tochor	Tolmie
Uppal	Van Popta
Vecchio	Vidal
Vien	Viersen
Vis	Vuong
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Williams	Zimmer— 114

PAIRED

Members

Hoback	Joly— 2
--------	---------

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Hon. Mona Fortier moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

[*Translation*]

The Speaker: If a member of a recognized party present in the House wishes to request a recorded division or that the motion be adopted on division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, again, I believe that if you seek it you will find agreement to apply the results of the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting yes.

[*English*]

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Mr. Speaker, we also agree to apply the vote, with Conservatives voting nay.

● (2340)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

[*English*]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply and will be voting in favour.

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Greens also agree to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

Mr. Kevin Vuong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the results of the previous vote, voting against.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

[*English*]

Mr. Han Dong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and am voting in favour.

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

(*Division No. 400*)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Bendayan
Bennett	Bérubé
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney	Blois
Boissonnault	Boulerice
Bradford	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Casey	Chabot
Chagger	Chahal
Champagne	Champoux
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier	Coteau

Business of Supply

Dabrusin	Damoff	Trudel	Turnbull
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens	Valdez	Van Bynen
Desilets	Desjarlais	van Koeverden	Vandal
Dhaliwal	Dhillon	Vandenbeld	Vignola
Diab	Dong	Villemure	Virani
Drouin	Dubourg	Weiler	Wilkinson
Duclos	Duguid	Yip	Zahid
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi	Zarrillo	Zuberi— 210
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith		
Fergus	Fillmore		
Fisher	Fonseca		
Fortier	Fortin		
Fragiskatos	Fraser		
Freeland	Fry	Aboultaif	Aitchison
Gaheer	Garon	Albas	Allison
Garrison	Gaudreau	Arnold	Baldinelli
Gazan	Gerretsen	Barlow	Barrett
Gill	Gould	Berthold	Bezan
Green	Guilbeault	Block	Bragdon
Hajdu	Hanley	Brassard	Brock
Hardie	Hepfner	Calkins	Caputo
Holland	Housefather	Carrie	Chambers
Hughes	Hussen	Chong	Cooper
Hutchings	Iacono	Dalton	Dancho
Idlout	Ien	Davidson	Deltell
Jaczek	Johns	d'Entremont	Doherty
Jones	Jowhari	Dowdall	Dreeshen
Julian	Kayabaga	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Kelloway	Khalid	Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Khera	Koutrakis	Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Kusmierczyk	Kwan	Ferreri	Findlay
Lalonde	Lambropoulos	Gallant	Généreux
Lametti	Lamoureux	Genius	Gladu
Lapointe	Larouche	Godin	Goodridge
Lattanzio	Lauzon	Gourde	Gray
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier	Hallan	Jeneroux
Lemire	Lightbound	Kelly	Kitchen
Long	Longfield	Kmieć	Kram
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)	Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacGregor	Kusie	Lake
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney	Lantsman	Lawrence
Martinez Ferrada	Masse	Lehoux	Lewis (Essex)
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
May (Saanic—Gulf Islands)	McDonald (Avalon)	Lloyd	Lobb
McGuinty	McKay	Maguire	Martel
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod	Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McPherson	Mendès	McLean	Melillo
Mendicino	Miao	Moore	Morantz
Michaud	Miller	Morrison	Motz
Morrice	Morrissey	Muys	Nater
Murray	Naqvi	O'Toole	Patzer
Ng	Noormohamed	Paul-Hus	Perkins
Normandin	O'Connell	Poilievre	Redekopp
Oliphant	O'Regan	Reid	Rempel Garner
Pauzé	Perron	Richards	Roberts
Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon	Rood	Ruff
Powlowski	Qualtrough	Scheer	Schmale
Rayes	Robillard	Seeback	Shields
Rodriguez	Rogers	Shipley	Small
Romanado	Sahota	Soroka	Steinley
Saks	Samson	Stewart	Strahl
Sarai	Savard-Tremblay	Stubbs	Thomas
Scarpaleggia	Schieffe	Tochor	Tolmie
Serré	Sgro	Uppal	Van Popta
Shanahan	Sheehan	Vecchio	Vidal
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)	Vien	Viersen
Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné	Vis	Vuong
Singh	Sorbara	Wagantall	Warkentin
Sousa	Ste-Marie	Waugh	Webber
St-Onge	Sudds	Williams	Zimmer— 114
Tassi	Taylor Roy		
Thériault	Therrien		
Thompson	Trudeau		

NAYS

Members

PAIRED

Members

Hoback

Joly— 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

* * *

[Translation]

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (A), 2023-24

Hon. Mona Fortier (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That the Supplementary Estimates (A) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2024, be concurred in.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find unanimous consent once again to apply the results of the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting yes.

[English]

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives also agree to apply the vote with Conservatives voting nay.

[Translation]

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will vote in favour.

[English]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and we will be voting in favour.

[Translation]

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, once again, the Greens agree to apply the vote and will vote in favour.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Vuong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the results of the previous vote, voting against.

[Translation]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the vote once again and I vote in favour.

[English]

Mr. Han Dong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply, voting in favour.

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

(Division No. 401)

YEAS

Members

Aldag

Alghabra

Ali

Anand

Anandasangaree

Angus

Arseneault

Arya

Ashton

Atwin

Bachrach

Badawey

Bains

Baker

Barron

Barsalou-Duval

Battiste

Beaulieu

Beech

Bendayan

Bennett

Bérubé

Bibeau

Bittle

Blaikie

Blanchet

Blaney

Boissonnault

Bradford

Brunelle-Duceppe

Casey

Chagger

Champagne

Chatel

Chiang

Cormier

Dabrusin

DeBellefeuille

Desilets

Dhaliwal

Diab

Drouin

Duclos

Dzerowicz

El-Khoury

Fergus

Fisher

Fortier

Fragiskatos

Freeland

Gaheer

Garrison

Gazan

Gill

Green

Hajdu

Hardie

Holland

Hughes

Hutchings

Idlout

Jaczek

Jones

Julian

Kelloway

Khera

Kusmierczyk

Lalonde

Lametti

Lapointe

Lattanzio

LeBlanc

Lemire

Long

Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)

MacDonald (Malpeque)

MacKinnon (Gatineau)

Martinez Ferrada

Mathysen

May (Saarich—Gulf Islands)

McGuinty

McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)

McPherson

Mendicino

Michaud

Morrice

Murray

Ng

Normandin

Oliphant

Pauzé

Petipas Taylor

Powlowski

Rayes

Rodriguez

Romanado

Saks

Business of Supply

Blair

Blanchette-Joncas

Blois

Boulerice

Brière

Cannings

Chabot

Chahal

Champoux

Chen

Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)

Coteau

Damoff

Desbiens

Desjarlais

Dhillon

Dong

Dubourg

Duguid

Ehsassi

Erskine-Smith

Fillmore

Fonseca

Fortin

Fraser

Fry

Garon

Gaudreau

Gerretsen

Gould

Guilbeault

Hanley

Hepfner

Housefather

Hussen

Iacono

Ien

Johns

Jowhari

Kayabaga

Khalid

Koutrakis

Kwan

Lambropoulos

Lamoureux

Larouche

Lauzon

Lebouthillier

Lightbound

Longfield

MacAulay (Cardigan)

MacGregor

Maloney

Masse

May (Cambridge)

McDonald (Avalon)

McKay

McLeod

Mendès

Miao

Miller

Morrissey

Naqvi

Noormohamed

O'Connell

O'Regan

Perron

Plamondon

Qualtrough

Robillard

Rogers

Sahota

Samson

Business of Supply

Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Singh
Sousa
St-Onge
Tassi
Thériault
Thompson
Trudel
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vandenbeld
Villemure
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

Savard-Tremblay
Schieffe
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sinclair-Desgagné
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Therrien
Trudeau
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandal
Vignola
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi—210

Tochor
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vis
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams

Tolmie
Van Popta
Vidal
Viensen
Vuong
Warkentin
Webber
Zimmer—114

PAIRED

Members

Hoback

Joly—2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Hon. Mona Fortier moved that Bill C-55, An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the federal public administration for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2024, be now read the first time and be printed.

(Motion deemed adopted and bill read the first time)

Hon. Mona Fortier moved that the bill be read the second time and referred to a committee of the whole.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the result from the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting yes.

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Mr. Speaker, we have given this a lot of thought and, in so doing, Conservatives agree to apply the vote, voting nay.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will vote in favour.

[*English*]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

• (2345)

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Greens agree to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

Mr. Kevin Vuong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the results of the previous vote, voting against.

Mr. Han Dong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting in favour.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Speaker, I completely agree with applying the results of the previous vote and will again be voting in favour of the motion.

[*English*]

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

(*Division No. 402*)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton

Alghabra
Anand
Angus
Arya
Atwin

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albas
Arnold
Barlow
Berthold
Block
Brassard
Calkins
Carrie
Chong
Dalton
Davidson
d'Entremont
Dowdall
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Ferrerri
Gallant
Genuis
Godin
Gourde
Hallan
Kelly
Kmiec
Kramp-Neuman
Kusie
Lantsman
Lehoux
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lloyd
Maguire
Mazier
McLean
Moore
Morrison
Muys
O'Toole
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Reid
Richards
Rood
Scheer
Seeback
Shiple
Soroka
Stewart
Stubbs

Aitchison
Allison
Baldinelli
Barrett
Bezan
Bragdon
Brock
Caputo
Chambers
Cooper
Dancho
Deltell
Doherty
Dreeshen
Ellis
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Findlay
Généreux
Gladu
Goodridge
Gray
Jeneroux
Kitchen
Kram
Kurek
Lake
Lawrence
Lewis (Essex)
Liepert
Lobb
Martel
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Melillo
Morantz
Motz
Nater
Patzer
Perkins
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Roberts
Ruff
Schmale
Shields
Small
Steinley
Strahl
Thomas

Business of Supply

Bachrach	Badawey	Pauzé	Perron
Bains	Baker	Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon
Barron	Barsalou-Duval	Powlowski	Qualtrough
Battiste	Beaulieu	Rayes	Robillard
Beech	Bendayan	Rodriguez	Rogers
Bennett	Bérubé	Romanado	Sahota
Bibeau	Bittle	Saks	Samson
Blaikie	Blair	Sarai	Savard-Tremblay
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas	Scarpaleggia	Schieffe
Blaney	Blois	Serré	Sgro
Boissonnault	Boulerice	Shanahan	Sheehan
Bradford	Brière	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings	Simard	Simclair-Desgagné
Casey	Chabot	Singh	Sorbara
Chagger	Chahal	Sousa	Ste-Marie
Champagne	Champoux	St-Onge	Sudds
Chatel	Chen	Tassi	Taylor Roy
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Thériault	Therrien
Cormier	Coteau	Thompson	Trudeau
Dabrusin	Damoff	Trudel	Turnbull
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens	Valdez	Van Bynen
Desilets	Desjarlais	van Koeverden	Vandal
Dhaliwal	Dhillon	Vandenbeld	Vignola
Diab	Dong	Villemure	Virani
Drouin	Dubourg	Weiler	Wilkinson
Duclos	Duguid	Yip	Zahid
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi	Zarrillo	Zuberi — 210
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith		
Fergus	Fillmore		
Fisher	Fonseca		
Fortier	Fortin		
Fragiskatos	Fraser	Abouttaif	Aitchison
Freeland	Fry	Albas	Allison
Gaheer	Garon	Arnold	Baldinelli
Garrison	Gaudreau	Barlow	Barrett
Gazan	Gerretsen	Berthold	Bezan
Gill	Gould	Block	Bragdon
Green	Guilbeault	Brassard	Brock
Hajdu	Hanley	Calkins	Caputo
Hardie	Hepfner	Carrie	Chambers
Holland	Housefather	Chong	Cooper
Hughes	Hussen	Dalton	Dancho
Hutchings	Iacono	Davidson	Deltell
Idlout	Ien	d'Entremont	Doherty
Jaczek	Johns	Dowdall	Dreeshen
Jones	Jowhari	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Julian	Kayabaga	Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Kelloway	Khalid	Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Khera	Koutrakis	Ferreri	Findlay
Kusmierczyk	Kwan	Gallant	Généreux
Lalonde	Lambropoulos	Genuis	Gladu
Lametti	Lamoureux	Godin	Goodridge
Lapointe	Larouche	Gourde	Gray
Lattanzio	Lauzon	Hallan	Jeneroux
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier	Kelly	Kitchen
Lemire	Lightbound	Kmiec	Kram
Long	Longfield	Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)	Kusie	Lake
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacGregor	Lantsman	Lawrence
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney	Lehoux	Lewis (Essex)
Martinez Ferrada	Masse	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)	Lloyd	Lobb
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	McDonald (Avalon)	Maguire	Martel
McGuinty	McKay	Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod	McLean	Melillo
McPherson	Mendès	Moore	Morantz
Mendicino	Miao	Morrison	Motz
Michaud	Miller	Muys	Nater
Morrice	Morrissey	O'Toole	Patzer
Murray	Naqvi	Paul-Hus	Perkins
Ng	Noormohamed	Poilievre	Redekopp
Normandin	O'Connell	Reid	Rempel Garner
Oliphant	O'Regan	Richards	Roberts

NAYS

Members

Business of Supply

Rood	Ruff
Scheer	Schmale
Seeback	Shields
Shipley	Small
Soroka	Steinley
Stewart	Strahl
Stubbs	Thomas
Tochor	Tolmie
Uppal	Van Popta
Vecchio	Vidal
Vien	Viersen
Vis	Vuong
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Williams	Zimmer— 114

PAIRED

Members

Hoback Joly— 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried. Accordingly, the bill stands referred to a committee of the whole. I do now leave the chair for the House to go into committee of the whole.

(Bill read the second time and the House went into committee of the whole thereon, Mrs. Carol Hughes in the chair)

(On clause 2)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC): Madam Chair, I wonder if the President of the Treasury Board could confirm that the supply bill is in its usual form.

Hon. Mona Fortier (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Madam Chair, I have good news again. The presentation of this bill is identical to that used during the previous supply period.

The Deputy Chair: Shall clause 2 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division

(Clause 2 agreed to)

The Deputy Chair: Shall clause 3 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 3 agreed to)

The Deputy Chair: Shall clause 4 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 4 agreed to)

[*English*]

The Deputy Chair: Shall clause 5 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 5 agreed to)

The Deputy Chair: Shall the schedule carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Schedule agreed to)

The Deputy Chair: Shall clause 1, the short title, carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 1 agreed to)

The Deputy Chair: Shall the preamble carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Preamble agreed to)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Chair: Shall the title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Title agreed to)

The Deputy Chair: Shall the bill carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Bill agreed to)

[*English*]

The Deputy Chair: Shall I rise and report the bill?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Bill reported)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Mona Fortier moved that the bill be concurred in.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I believe that if you seek it, you will find unanimous consent to apply the result from the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting yes.

[*English*]

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives agree to apply the vote, and this time we are going to vote nay.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the result of the previous vote and is voting in favour of the motion.

[*English*]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply and will be voting in favour.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Greens again agree to apply and will be voting in favour of the motion.

*Business of Supply**[English]*

Mr. Kevin Vuong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the results of the previous vote, voting against.

[Translation]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and I will be voting in favour of the motion.

• (2350)

[English]

Mr. Han Dong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting yes.

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

(Division No. 403)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Bendayan
Bennett	Bérubé
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney	Blois
Boissonnault	Boulerice
Bradford	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Casey	Chabot
Chagger	Chahal
Champagne	Champoux
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Dong
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fergus	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Gaheer	Garon
Garrison	Gaudreau
Gazan	Gerretsen
Gill	Gould
Green	Guilbeault
Hajdu	Hanley
Hardie	Hepfner
Holland	Housefather
Hughes	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Idlout	Ien
Jaczek	Johns

Jones	Jowhari
Julian	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Khera	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Larouche
Lattanzio	Lauzon
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Lemire	Lightbound
Long	Longfield
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Martinez Ferrada	Masse
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	McDonald (Avalon)
McGuinty	McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod
McPherson	Mendès
Mendicino	Miao
Michaud	Miller
Morrice	Morrissey
Murray	Naqvi
Ng	Noormohamed
Normandin	O'Connell
Oliphant	O'Regan
Pauzé	Perron
Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon
Powlowski	Qualtrough
Rayes	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Sahota
Saks	Samson
Sarai	Savard-Tremblay
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
Singh	Sorbara
Sousa	Ste-Marie
St-Onge	Sudds
Tassi	Taylor Roy
Thériault	Therrien
Thompson	Trudeau
Trudel	Turnbull
Valdez	Van Bynen
van Koeverden	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vignola
Villemure	Virani
Weiler	Wilkinson
Yip	Zahid
Zarrillo	Zuberi — 210

NAYS

Members

Aitchison
Allison
Baldinelli
Barrett
Bezan
Bragdon
Brock
Caputo
Chambers
Cooper
Dancho
Deltell
Doherty
Dreeshen

Business of Supply

Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Ferreri	Findlay
Gallant	Généreux
Genuis	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Gray
Hallan	Jeneroux
Kelly	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lehoux	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Maguire	Martel
Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLean	Melillo
Moore	Morantz
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
O'Toole	Patzer
Paul-Hus	Perkins
Poilievre	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Richards	Roberts
Rood	Ruff
Scheer	Schmale
Seebach	Shields
Shipley	Small
Soroka	Steinley
Stewart	Strahl
Stubbs	Thomas
Tochor	Tolmie
Uppal	Van Popta
Vecchio	Vidal
Vien	Viersen
Vis	Vuong
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Williams	Zimmer— 114

PAIRED

Members

Hoback Joly— 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Hon. Mona Fortier moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I believe that if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the result from the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting yes.

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives agree to apply the vote, and we are going to vote nay.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply and will be voting in favour.

[*English*]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, Greens continue to agree to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

Mr. Kevin Vuong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the result of the previous vote, voting against.

Mr. Han Dong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the vote and will be voting yes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Speaker, I am really pleased that we could apply the results of the vote this evening, and I will be voting in favour.

[*English*]

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

(*Division No. 404*)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Bendayan
Bennett	Bérubé
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney	Blois
Boissonnault	Boulerice
Bradford	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Casey	Chabot
Chagger	Chahal
Champagne	Champoux
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Dong
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclous	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fergus	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Gaheer	Garon
Garrison	Gaudreau
Gazan	Gerretsen
Gill	Gould
Green	Guilbeault
Hajdu	Hanley
Hardie	Hepfner
Holland	Housefather
Hughes	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Idlout	Ien
Jaczek	Johns
Jones	Jowhari
Julian	Kayabaga

Government Orders

Kelloway	Khalid	Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Khera	Koutrakis	Ferreri	Findlay
Kusmierczyk	Kwan	Gallant	Généreux
Lalonde	Lambropoulos	Genius	Gladu
Lametti	Lamoureux	Godin	Goodridge
Lapointe	Larouche	Gourde	Gray
Lattanzio	Lauzon	Hallan	Jeneroux
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier	Kelly	Kitchen
Lemire	Lightbound	Kmieć	Kram
Long	Longfield	Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAtuly (Cardigan)	Kusie	Lake
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacGregor	Lantsman	Lawrence
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney	Lehoux	Lewis (Essex)
Martinez Ferrada	Masse	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Mathysse	May (Cambridge)	Lloyd	Lobb
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	McDonald (Avalon)	Maguire	Martel
McGuinty	McKay	Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod	McLean	Melillo
McPherson	Mendés	Moore	Morantz
Medicino	Miao	Morrison	Motz
Michaud	Miller	Muys	Nater
Morrice	Morrissey	O'Toole	Patzner
Murray	Naqvi	Paul-Hus	Perkins
Ng	Noormohamed	Poilievre	Redekopp
Normandin	O'Connell	Reid	Rempel Garner
Oliphant	O'Regan	Richards	Roberts
Pauzé	Perron	Rood	Ruff
Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon	Scheer	Schmale
Powlowski	Qualtrough	Seeback	Shields
Rayes	Robillard	Shiple	Small
Rodriguez	Rogers	Soroka	Steinley
Romanado	Sahota	Stewart	Strahl
Saks	Samson	Stubbs	Thomas
Sarai	Savard-Tremblay	Tochor	Tolmie
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke	Uppal	Van Popta
Serré	Sgro	Vecchio	Vidal
Shanahan	Sheehan	Vien	Viersen
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)	Vis	Vuong
Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné	Wagantall	Warkentin
Singh	Sorbara	Waugh	Webber
Sousa	Ste-Marie	Williams	Zimmer — 114
St-Onge	Sudds		
Tassi	Taylor Roy		
Thériault	Therrien		
Thompson	Trudeau		
Trudel	Turnbull		
Valdez	Van Bynen		
van Koeverden	Vandal		
Vandenbeld	Vignola		
Villemure	Virani		
Weiler	Wilkinson		
Yip	Zahid		
Zarrillo	Zuberi — 210		

PAIRED

Members

Hoback Joly — 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

* * *

[Translation]

ONLINE NEWS ACT

The House resumed from June 20 consideration of the motion in relation to the amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-18, An Act respecting online communications platforms that make news content available to persons in Canada, and of the amendment.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made earlier today, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the amendment to the motion to concur in the Senate amendments to Bill C-18.

[English]

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I believe that if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the result from the previous vote to this vote, sadly with Liberal members voting nay.

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Berthold	Bezan
Bloch	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chambers
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	Deltell
d'Entremont	Doherty
Dowdall	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)

Government Orders

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree to apply the vote, and just to change it up, this time we are voting yea.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will vote no.

[*English*]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will be voting strongly against.

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Greens agree to apply the vote and will be voting against.

Mr. Kevin Vuong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the result of the previous vote, voting strongly in favour.

Mr. Han Dong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the vote and will be voting against.

• (2355)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the vote and I vote no.

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

(*Division No. 405*)

YEAS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Berthold	Bezan
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chambers
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	Deltell
d'Entremont	Doherty
Dowdall	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Ferreri	Findlay
Gallant	Généreux
Genuis	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Gray
Hallan	Jeneroux
Kelly	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lehoux	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Maguire	Martel
Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLean	Melillo
Moore	Morantz
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater

O'Toole
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Reid
Richards
Rood
Scheer
Seeback
Shiple
Soroka
Stewart
Stubbs
Tochor
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vis
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams
Patzer
Perkins
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Roberts
Ruff
Schmale
Shields
Small
Steinley
Strahl
Thomas
Tolmie
Van Popta
Vidal
Viersen
Vuong
Warkentin
Webber
Zimmer— 114

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Bennett
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blanchet
Blaney
Boissonnault
Bradford
Brunelle-Duceppe
Casey
Chagger
Champagne
Chatel
Chiang
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeBellefeuille
Desilets
Dhaliwal
Diab
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Garrison
Gazan
Gill
Green
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Idlout
Alghabra
Anand
Angus
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bendayan
Bérubé
Bittle
Blair
Blanchette-Joncas
Blois
Boulerice
Brière
Cannings
Chabot
Chahal
Champoux
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Coteau
Damoff
Desbiens
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Dong
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Fry
Garon
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Gould
Guilbeault
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien

Government Orders

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives request a recorded vote.

● (2405)

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

(Division No. 406)

YEAS

Members

Jaczek
Jones
Julian
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lametti
Lapointe
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Lemire
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Mendicino
Michaud
Morrice
Murray
Ng
Normandin
Oliphant
Pauzé
Petipas Taylor
Powlowski
Rayes
Rodriguez
Romanado
Saks
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Singh
Sousa
St-Onge
Tassi
Thériault
Thompson
Trudel
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vandenbeld
Villemure
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

Johns
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Larouche
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor
Maloney
Masse
May (Cambridge)
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod
Mendès
Miao
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
O'Connell
O'Regan
Perron
Plamondon
Qualtrough
Robillard
Rogers
Sahota
Samson
Savard-Tremblay
Schieffe
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sinclair-Desgagné
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Therrien
Trudeau
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandal
Vignola
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 210

PAIRED

Members

Hoback

Joly— 2

The Speaker: I declare the amendment defeated.

[*English*]

The next question is on the main motion.

If a member of a recognized party present in the House wishes the motion be carried or carried on division or wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Aldag
Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Bennett
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blanchet
Blaney
Boissonnault
Bradford
Brunelle-Duceppe
Casey
Chagger
Champagne
Chatel
Chiang
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeBellefeuille
Desilets
Dhaliwal
Diab
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Garrison
Gazan
Gill
Green
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hughes
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Julian
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lametti
Lapointe
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Lemire
Long

Alghabra
Anand
Angus
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bendayan
Bérubé
Bittle
Blair
Blanchette-Joncas
Blois
Boulerice
Brière
Cannings
Chabot
Chahal
Champoux
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Coteau
Damoff
Desbiens
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Dong
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Fry
Garon
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Gould
Guilbeault
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hussen
Idlout
Jaczek
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Larouche
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Longfield

Government Orders

Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)	Lake	Lantsman
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacGregor	Lawrence	Lehoux
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney	Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Martinez Ferrada	Masse	Liepert	Lloyd
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)	Lobb	Maguire
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	McDonald (Avalon)	Martel	Mazier
McGuinty	McKay	McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod	Melillo	Moore
McPherson	Mendès	Morantz	Morrison
Mendicino	Miao	Motz	Muys
Michaud	Miller	Nater	O'Toole
Morrice	Morrissey	Patzer	Paul-Hus
Murray	Naqvi	Perkins	Poilievre
Ng	Noormohamed	Redekopp	Reid
Normandin	O'Connell	Rempel Garner	Richards
Oliphant	O'Regan	Roberts	Rood
Pauzé	Perron	Ruff	Scheer
Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon	Schmale	Seeback
Powlowski	Qualtrough	Shields	Shipleigh
Rayes	Robillard	Small	Soroka
Rodriguez	Rogers	Steinley	Stewart
Romanado	Sahota	Strahl	Stubbs
Saks	Samson	Thomas	Tochor
Sarai	Savard-Tremblay	Tolmie	Uppal
Scarpaleggia	Schieffe	Van Popta	Vecchio
Serré	Sgro	Vidal	Vien
Shanahan	Sheehan	Viersen	Vis
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)	Vuong	Wagantall
Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné	Warkentin	Waugh
Singh	Sorbara	Webber	Williams
Sousa	Ste-Marie	Zimmer— 113	
St-Onge	Sudds		
Tassi	Taylor Roy		
Thériault	Therrien		
Thompson	Trudeau		
Trudel	Turnbull		
Valdez	Van Bynen		
van Koevorden	Vandal		
Vandenbeld	Vignola		
Villemure	Virani		
Weiler	Wilkinson		
Yip	Zahid		
Zarrillo	Zuberi— 208		

NAYS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Berthold	Bezan
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brook
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chambers
Chong	Cooper
Dancho	Davidson
Deltell	d'Entremont
Doherty	Dowdall
Dreeshen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Ellis	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Fast	Ferreri
Findlay	Gallant
Généreux	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Jeneroux	Kelly
Kitchen	Kmieciak
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kurek	Kusie

PAIRED

Members

Hoback Joly— 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

CANADA BUSINESS CORPORATIONS ACT

The House resumed from June 20 consideration of the motion that Bill C-42, An Act to amend the Canada Business Corporations Act and to make consequential and related amendments to other Acts, be read the third time and passed.

The Speaker: Pursuant to an order made earlier today, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at the third reading stage of Bill C-42.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it, you will find unanimous consent to apply the results of the previous vote to this vote, with Liberals members voting in favour.

[*English*]

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree to apply the vote and, in a spirit of collegiality, Conservatives are voting yea.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will vote in favour.

[*English*]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply and will be voting in favour.

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Greens agree to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

Mr. Kevin Vuong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the results of the previous vote, voting in favour.

Mr. Han Dong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting yes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

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

(*Division No. 407*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultarif	Aitchison	Fonseca	Fortier
Albas	Aldag	Fortin	Fragiskatos
Alghabra	Ali	Fraser	Freeland
Allison	Anand	Fry	Gaheer
Anandasangaree	Angus	Gallant	Garon
Arnold	Arseneault	Garrison	Gaudreau
Arya	Ashton	Gazan	Généreux
Atwin	Bachrach	Genius	Gerretsen
Badawey	Bains	Gill	Gladu
Baker	Baldinelli	Godin	Goodridge
Barlow	Barrett	Gould	Gourde
Barron	Barsalou-Duval	Gray	Green
Battiste	Beaulieu	Guilbeault	Hajdu
Beech	Bendayan	Hallan	Hanley
Bennett	Berthold	Hardie	Hepfner
Bérubé	Bezan	Holland	Housefather
Bibeau	Bittle	Hughes	Hussen
Blaikie	Blair	Iacono	Idlout
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas	Ien	Jaczek
Blaney	Block	Jeneroux	Johns
Blois	Boissonnault	Jowhari	Julian
Boulerice	Bradford	Kayabaga	Kelloway
Bragdon	Brassard	Kelly	Khalid
Brière	Brock	Khera	Kitchen
Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins	Kmiec	Koutrakis
Cannings	Caputo	Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Carrie	Casey	Kurek	Kusie
Chabot	Chagger	Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Chahal	Chambers	Lake	Lalonde
Champagne	Champoux	Lambropoulos	Lametti
Chatel	Chen	Lamoureux	Lantsman
Chiang	Chong	Lapointe	Larouche
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Cooper	Lattanzio	Lauzon
Cormier	Coteau	Lawrence	LeBlanc
Dabrusin	Damoff	Lebouthillier	Lehoux
Dancho	Davidson	Lemire	Lewis (Essex)
DeBellefeuille	Deltell	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
d'Entremont	Desbiens	Lightbound	Lloyd
Desilets	Desjarlais	Lobb	Long
Dhaliwal	Dhillon	Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
Diab	Doherty	MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Dong	Dowdall	MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Dreeshen	Drouin	Maguire	Maloney
Dubourg	Duclos	Martel	Martínez Ferrada
Duguid	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Masse	Mathysen
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi	May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
El-Khoury	Ellis	Mazier	McCaughey (Edmonton West)
Epp	Erskine-Smith	McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)	McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Fast	Fergus	McLean	McLeod
Ferreri	Fillmore	McPherson	Melillo
Findlay	Fisher	Mendès	Mendicino
		Miao	Michaud
		Miller	Moore
		Morantz	Morrice
		Morrison	Morrissey
		Motz	Murray
		Muys	Naqvi
		Nater	Ng
		Noormohamed	Normandin
		O'Connell	Oliphant
		O'Regan	O'Toole
		Patzer	Paul-Hus
		Pauzé	Perkins
		Perron	Petitpas Taylor
		Plamondon	Poilievre
		Powlowski	Qualtrough
		Rayes	Redekopp
		Reid	Rempel Garner
		Richards	Roberts
		Robillard	Rodriguez
		Rogers	Romanado
		Rood	Ruff

Government Orders

Government Orders

Sahota	Saks
Samson	Sarai
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia
Scheer	Schiefke
Schmale	Seeback
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Shields	Shipley
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
Singh	Small
Sorbara	Soroka
Sousa	Steinley
Ste-Marie	Stewart
St-Onge	Strahl
Stubbs	Sudds
Tassi	Taylor Roy
Thériault	Therrien
Thomas	Thompson
Tochor	Tolmie
Trudeau	Trudel
Turnbull	Uppal
Valdez	Van Bynen
van Koeverden	Van Popta
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vecchio	Vidal
Vien	Viersen
Vignola	Villemure
Virani	Vis
Vuong	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Weiler
Wilkinson	Williams
Yip	Zahid
Zarrillo	Zimmer
Zuberi — 321	

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Members

Hoback

Joly — 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

* * *

*[English]***PUBLIC SECTOR INTEGRITY COMMISSIONER**

The Speaker: Pursuant to an order made earlier today, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the appointment of Harriet Solloway as Public Sector Integrity Commissioner.

● (2410)

[Translation]

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you, all the parliamentary staff and all my colleagues in the House, and, one last time, I believe if you seek it, you will find unanimous consent to apply the results of the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting in favour.

[English]

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Mr. Speaker, again, for it seems the final time this evening, Conservatives agree to apply the vote and we are voting nay.

[Translation]

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will vote in favour.

[English]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

[Translation]

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party once again agrees to apply the vote and will vote in favour.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Vuong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the results of the previous vote, voting against.

[Translation]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the vote and I vote in favour.

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

(Division No. 408)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Bendayan
Bennett	Bérubé
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney	Blois
Boissonnault	Boulerice
Bradford	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Casey	Chabot
Chagger	Chahal
Champagne	Champoux
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Dong
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fergus	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin

Government Orders

Fragiskatos	Fraser	Albas	Allison
Freeland	Fry	Arnold	Baldinelli
Gaheer	Garon	Barlow	Barrett
Garrison	Gaudreau	Berthold	Bezan
Gazan	Gerretsen	Block	Bragdon
Gill	Gould	Brassard	Brock
Green	Guilbeault	Calkins	Caputo
Hajdu	Hanley	Carrie	Chambers
Hardie	Hepfner	Chong	Cooper
Holland	Housefather	Dancho	Davidson
Hughes	Hussen	Deltell	d'Entremont
Iacono	Idlout	Doherty	Dowdall
Ien	Jaczek	Dreeshen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Johns	Jowhari	Ellis	Epp
Julian	Kayabaga	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Kelloway	Khalid	Fast	Ferreri
Khera	Koutrakis	Findlay	Gallant
Kusmierczyk	Kwan	Généreux	Genuis
Lalonde	Lambropoulos	Gladu	Godin
Lametti	Lamoureux	Goodridge	Gourde
Lapointe	Larouche	Gray	Hallan
Lattanzio	Lauzon	Jeneroux	Kelly
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier	Kitchen	Kmiec
Lemire	Lightbound	Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Long	Longfield	Kurek	Kusie
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)	Lake	Lantsman
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacGregor	Lawrence	Lehoux
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney	Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Martinez Ferrada	Masse	Liepert	Lloyd
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)	Lobb	Maguire
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	McDonald (Avalon)	Martel	Mazier
McGuinty	McKay	McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod	Melillo	Moore
McPherson	Mendès	Morantz	Morrison
Mendicino	Miao	Motz	Muys
Michaud	Miller	Nater	O'Toole
Morrice	Morrissey	Patzer	Paul-Hus
Murray	Naqvi	Perkins	Poilievre
Ng	Noormohamed	Redekopp	Reid
Normandin	O'Connell	Rempel Garner	Richards
Oliphant	O'Regan	Roberts	Rood
Pauzé	Perron	Ruff	Scheer
Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon	Schmale	Seeback
Powlowski	Qualtrough	Shields	Shipley
Rayes	Robillard	Small	Soroka
Rodriguez	Rogers	Steinley	Stewart
Romanado	Sahota	Strahl	Stubbs
Saks	Samson	Thomas	Tochor
Sarai	Savard-Tremblay	Tolmie	Uppal
Scarpaleggia	Schieffe	Van Popta	Vecchio
Serré	Sgro	Vidal	Vien
Shanahan	Sheehan	Viersen	Vis
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)	Vuong	Wagantall
Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné	Warkentin	Waugh
Singh	Sorbara	Webber	Williams
Sousa	Ste-Marie	Zimmer— 113	
St-Onge	Sudds		
Tassi	Taylor Roy		
Thériault	Therrien		
Thompson	Trudeau		
Trudel	Turnbull		
Valdez	Van Bynen		
van Koeverden	Vandal		
Vandenbeld	Vignola		
Villemure	Virani		
Weiler	Wilkinson		
Yip	Zahid		
Zarrillo	Zuberi— 208		

PAIRED

Members

July— 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.*[English]*

I wish all hon. members a wonderful summer break, and that they and their families enjoy themselves so that in September, they come back in full form.

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif

Aitchison

*Adjournment Proceedings***ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS**

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

[English]

DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC):

Mr. Speaker, my question, originally, was on the foundation Trudeau And a meeting that took place in the PMO.

Apparently there was a wall with the Trudeau Foundation, And PMO was just a convenient downtown location. That is obvious nonsense and we will drill for the truth, Even with committee tactics that have been called uncouth.

But it is late in the night and the session is near done, So I will suspend some outrage and try for some fun. Let us instead discuss the session that was, And get caught up on the latest buzz.

There was foreign interference in our election, Which led to David Johnston's appointment, then ejection. The Minister of Public Safety has ignored foreign spies And covered his faults by selling white ties.

There was markedly less discussion of vaccines and bugs, Though much more debate on the government giving away free drugs. This place has seen its fair share of wit, Even as government services are completely in need of substantial improvement.

All of the taxes are going up in size, As spending and debt continues to rise. Canadians are living with more and more stress, While Liberals keep promising government largesse.

But the money has to come from somewhere, you see, And a country only thrives when the people are free. Let us once again be a country flowing with milk and honeycomb, Because a Conservative government will be there to bring it home.

While I am on my feet, since it is all the rage, I want to thank each hard-working Page, And to appreciate all those who work on the Hill. I am sure the experience has long lost its thrill. But for keeping us safe and bringing us food, And dealing with us when we are harried and rude, Thanks to the staff who make this place work, And transcribe our references to Churchill, Paine and Burke.

It seems that our debates just get dumber and dumber, So let us get lost, go home and have a good summer.

● (2415)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons (Senate), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to respond to the member's original question that he is raising about the meeting that occurred some seven years ago that was organized by the Privy Council office in a building occupied by the Privy Council office.

The member knows this, yet persists in repeating his false narrative about some purported conspiracy theory that involves the Prime Minister. There were no political officials at the meeting in question, and the member knows this well.

Why do I say that the member knows this? It is because the issue was the subject of a meeting of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts on June 12. Perhaps that is why he is now taking a more light-hearted approach to the question. At the meeting, where several retired deputy ministers and some current deputy ministers appeared, individuals had no concrete recollection of the subject matter of the meeting.

In fact, let me reference what a current deputy minister said at the meeting. Mr. Graham Flack said that he now serves in a completely different role than in the year of the meeting in question, and indicated that he recalled something discussed about pluralism.

I know it must be difficult for the member to realize that this wild goose chase yielded no geese. The fact is simple, there were no geese to chase in the first place. The matter the member is raising amounts to nothing more than a flawed assumption about a meeting that occurred seven years ago, which nobody who attended seemed to recall anything of substance about.

Sometimes when one scrapes the bottom of the barrel, they have to realize that there is nothing to be found. I do credit the member for his obstinance to keep scraping away. There have been numerous meetings on this issue. Numerous witnesses have appeared, and the member has nothing of substance to show for it. The only conclusion to draw is that there is nothing untoward to be found.

There was a meeting seven years ago. There was an access to information request that stated something about the foundation in question. Only a genius could contrive a controversy where there is none, but perhaps not a genius. I will leave that to members to make their own determination on. To the extent of the logic that the member is making, any meeting that happens in the Justice Building, for example, on the parliamentary precinct, must have been attended by the Minister of Justice.

The member keeps scraping and scraping, and is left in the dark of the night with nothing to grasp at. I salute the member for his persistence on the matter.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker,

Just as I conclude this late show, I will remind the member that the meeting was in PMO. The PS thinks that his response is a zing, That those at the meeting don't remember a thing. On a serious subject we can be a bit funny, It's clear the government's ways are anything but sunny.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, yes, a meeting happened in the PMO, but for some reason the opposition, and this member particularly, assume that just because a meeting happened in a building that is the Prime Minister's Office, he was there. It is a wild assumption to jump to the conclusion that the Prime Minister must have been there himself. It goes without saying, and I think all members know this, that we are really beating a dead horse, so I will leave that one.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

Mr. Michael Kram (Regina—Wascana, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity tonight to voice my opposition to the proposal to close down the RCMP training depot in Regina, Saskatchewan, as was recommended in the Mass Casualty Commission report.

Adjournment Proceedings

Thousands of Canadians die every year from medical malpractice, but when someone dies because the doctor in the emergency room made an incorrect split-second decision, we do not shut down the medical school where the doctor studied 20 years ago. Why would we do that with a police academy?

That is the analogy an RCMP trainer made when I visited and toured Depot last month. One could say that it does not make sense to throw the baby out with the bathwater or reinvent the wheel. Whatever expression we choose, the conclusion remains the same: The RCMP training depot in Regina, Saskatchewan, is a world-class police training facility and should not be made a scapegoat for the events that transpired in Nova Scotia three years ago.

To be clear, the Mass Casualty Commission has done a lot of good work and made some very reasonable recommendations. It makes sense that people should not be able to buy an RCMP cruiser at auction, that people should not be able to buy an RCMP officer's uniform on eBay and that a public alert system should be activated whenever there is an active shooter situation in progress.

Last month, I was pleased to see that the Public Safety Minister had appointed a chair of the committee responsible for implementing the recommendations of the Mass Casualty Commission. However, when asked by reporters about Depot, I was concerned when the Public Safety Minister answered that he was keeping an open mind about which recommendations would and would not be implemented. I had hoped that the minister would use that opportunity to clarify that the RCMP training depot in Regina would not be shut down. Regrettably, he did not do so.

What I disagree with very strongly is the idea that the physical location of Depot in Regina, Saskatchewan, is somehow a problem that needs to be corrected. When I visited Depot last month, I had the opportunity to visit with the management, the staff and the cadets. Despite my best efforts, I could not find a single person who was ever consulted by the Mass Casualty Commission about cadet training. That is why the recommendation to close Depot came as such a shock to everyone.

If there are improvements that need to be made to the training of RCMP cadets, those improvements can and should be made at the existing location in Regina. It is not just me who is saying that; this same position has been articulated by the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle and the member for Regina—Lewvan. Similar statements have been made by the mayor of Regina, Sandra Masters; the premier of Saskatchewan, Scott Moe; and Saskatchewan's NDP official opposition leader, Carla Beck.

The Regina community is united in wanting to keep this 150-year-old institution at its current location. I ask the Prime Minister, the Minister of Public Safety or the parliamentary secretary to put people's minds at ease and commit to not shutting down the RCMP training depot in Regina, Saskatchewan.

• (2420)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons (Senate), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, following the release of the Mass Casualty Commission report, which examined the tragic events that occurred in Nova Scotia in 2020, the hon. member opposite has asked whether the

government would commit to keeping open the RCMP training facility in Regina, also known as Depot.

The hon. member for Regina—Wascana has asked the question based on recommendation 56 of the report, which called for changes to the RCMP training standards, including reimagining the RCMP's Depot training model. This would include the creation of a new training regime centred around a three-year degree-based model of police education that is more responsive to the needs of under-represented groups, research-based and accessible in different regions of Canada.

Any new training approaches or initiatives could take months or years to implement and would require multi-level government involvement agreements, consultation and direction prior to implementation. A collaborative approach between the federal, provincial, territorial partners and indigenous stakeholders will be vital to complete this work.

With these points in mind, please allow me to speak further about the recent and ongoing advances in the Depot's training approaches.

It is important to acknowledge that the RCMP training academy has been on Treaty 4 land since 1885. The training academy is funded to train 40 troops per year and graduates approximately 1,000 police officers per year in preparation for servicing communities from coast to coast to coast.

Many of the recommendations from the Mass Casualty Commission report that the specific training is consistent with the work that is already under way to modernize and enhance RCMP professionalization to meet expectations for accountability, transparency and excellence in policing.

Over the past three years, ongoing reviews have resulted in improvements to the Depot training curriculum in areas linked to anti-racism, intercultural competence, unconscious bias awareness, leadership conflict management and de-escalation skills.

In 2019, the RCMP management advisory board was engaged to provide advice and guidance on a variety of matters related to the RCMP. This was a critical step in continuing to support its modernization efforts. In 2020, the RCMP welcomed the management advisory board's recommendations related to cadet training at the Depot. As a result, steps are currently being taken to diversify Depot's instructor cadre and to modernize the content of the training program to ensure it is relevant and effective.

Adjournment Proceedings

The Depot training program is also informed by long-standing partnerships with several prominent learning and research institutions across Canada and abroad. It leverages these relationships in an ongoing search for the best modern police training approaches, with a view to improving police responses to people in mental health crises, adding new reconciliation-based training and enhancing cultural competencies for police officers. The government is seriously and carefully reviewing the final report of the Mass Casualty Commission and its wide-ranging recommendations, including recommendation 56 to modernize the RCMP training and research.

The government is committed to improving the safety and well-being of Canadians by working with all partners to make necessary changes to the RCMP training approaches and standards. As we do this, the RCMP will continue its work to keep Canadians and communities safe.

• (2425)

Mr. Michael Kram: Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that no one from the Liberal government will clear the air and make a firm commitment to keep Depot open as the RCMP training centre in Regina. I am sure there are a lot of people in Regina who would sleep easier tonight if the Liberal government would just make that commitment.

As I mentioned earlier, no one from Depot was asked to testify at the Mass Casualty Commission about police training. If the commission had actually visited Depot, talked with the instructors and reviewed the training programs, I am confident that the recommendation to close Depot never would have made it into the final report.

If no one from the Liberal government will commit to keeping Depot open, will the minister or the parliamentary secretary at least commit to visiting Depot before making a final decision to close it?

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, let me say once again that the government fully recognizes the importance of Depot to the RCMP as Canada's national police service, the province of Saskatchewan and the local community.

The evolution of the RCMP Depot training program in Regina reflects the impressive history of the RCMP's policing in Canada. From its early days as a training camp to its current status as a world-class training centre, the government has always been committed to providing RCMP members with the skills and knowledge they need to serve and protect Canadian communities with professionalism and integrity.

The RCMP will continue to modernize its police training services, as it has done for the past 150 years. This government is committed and will continue to ensure our national police force remains relevant and is consistently evolving in order to meet the current and future demands in the Canadian public.

Let me assure members that thanks to the continuous evolution of this strengthened RCMP police training regime, officers will be suitably trained throughout this process.

The Speaker: The motion that the House do now adjourn is deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, pursuant to order made earlier today, this House stands adjourned until Monday, September 18, at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Orders 28(2) and 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 12:28 a.m.)

CONTENTS

Wednesday, June 21, 2023

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Hockey Achievements	
Mr. Sheehan	16391
End of the School Year	
Ms. Koutrakis	16391
National Indigenous Peoples Day	
Mr. Savard-Tremblay	16391
LGBTQ Community	
Ms. Bendayan	16392
Community Churches	
Mr. Viersen	16392
National Indigenous Peoples Day	
Mrs. Wagantall	16392
Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis	
Mr. Fragiskatos	16392
End of the School Year	
Mr. Bains	16392
National Indigenous Peoples Day	
Mr. Dalton	16393
National Indigenous Peoples Day	
Mr. Badawey	16393
Liberal Party of Canada	
Mr. Warkentin	16393
Carbon Tax	
Mrs. Gray	16393
Quebec's National Holiday	
Ms. Martinez Ferrada	16393
National Indigenous Peoples Day	
Ms. Ashton	16394
Quebec's National Holiday	
Mr. Blanchet	16394
Finance	
Mr. Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	16394
Graduation and Retirement Congratulations	
Mrs. Lalonde	16394
National Indigenous Peoples Day	
The Speaker	16395

ORAL QUESTIONS

Housing	
Mr. Poilievre	16395
Mr. Trudeau	16395
Mr. Poilievre	16395

Mr. Trudeau	16395
Mr. Poilievre	16395
Mr. Trudeau	16395
Mr. Poilievre	16395
Mr. Trudeau	16396
Mr. Poilievre	16396
Mr. Trudeau	16396
Small Business	
Mr. Blanchet	16396
Mr. Trudeau	16396
Mr. Blanchet	16396
Mr. Trudeau	16396
Indigenous Affairs	
Ms. Idlout	16396
Mr. Trudeau	16396
Ms. Idlout	16397
Mr. Trudeau	16397
Housing	
Mr. Poilievre	16397
Mr. Trudeau	16397
Mr. Poilievre	16397
Mr. Trudeau	16397
Mr. Poilievre	16397
Mr. Trudeau	16398
Mr. Poilievre	16398
Mr. Trudeau	16398
Government Priorities	
Mr. Poilievre	16398
Mr. Trudeau	16398
Housing	
Mr. Poilievre	16398
Mr. Trudeau	16398
Climate Change	
Ms. Pauzé	16398
Mr. Trudeau	16399
Ms. Michaud	16399
Mr. Trudeau	16399
Carbon Pricing	
Mr. Poilievre	16399
Mr. Trudeau	16399
Mr. Poilievre	16399
Mr. Trudeau	16399
Mr. Poilievre	16399
Mr. Trudeau	16400
Mr. Poilievre	16400
Mr. Trudeau	16400
Indigenous Affairs	
Ms. Gazan	16400
Mr. Trudeau	16400

Ms. Gazan	16400
Mr. Trudeau	16400
Government Priorities	
Mrs. Shanahan	16400
Mr. Trudeau	16401
Housing	
Mr. Poilievre	16401
Mr. Trudeau	16401
Mr. Poilievre	16401
Mr. Trudeau	16401
Financial Institutions	
Mr. Poilievre	16401
Mr. Trudeau	16402
Mr. Poilievre	16402
Mr. Trudeau	16402
Democratic Institutions	
Mr. Villemure	16402
Mr. Trudeau	16402
Ms. Gaudreau	16402
Mr. Trudeau	16402
Financial Institutions	
Mr. Poilievre	16402
Mr. Trudeau	16402
Mr. Poilievre	16403
Mr. Trudeau	16403
Finance	
Mr. Poilievre	16403
Mr. Trudeau	16403
Government Accountability	
Mr. Poilievre	16403
Mr. Trudeau	16403
Public Safety	
Mr. Poilievre	16404
Mr. Trudeau	16404
Mr. Poilievre	16404
Mr. Trudeau	16404
Indigenous Affairs	
Mr. Weiler	16404
Mr. Trudeau	16404
Housing	
Mr. Desjarlais	16404
Mr. Trudeau	16404
Taxation	
Mr. Vuong	16405
Mr. Trudeau	16405
RCAF Helicopter Crash	
The Speaker	16405
Business of the House	
Mr. Holland	16405
Motion	16405
(Motion agreed to)	16405

Judges Act	
(Bill C-9: On the Order: Government Orders)	16405
(Motion respecting Senate amendments agreed to)	16405
Immigration and Refugee Protection Act	
(Bill S-8: On the Order: Government Orders)	16405
(Bill read the third time and passed)	16405
Miscarriage of Justice Review Commission Act (David and Joyce Milgaard's Law)	
(Bill C-40: On the Order: Government Orders)	16406
(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee) ..	16406
An Act respecting the recognition of certain Métis governments in Alberta, Ontario and Saskatchewan, to give effect to treaties with those governments and to make consequential amendments to other Acts	
(Bill C-53: On the Order: Government Orders)	16406
(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee) ..	16406
Points of Order	
Oral Questions	
Mrs. Vecchio	16406
Mr. Trudeau	16406
Mr. Blois	16406
The Speaker	16406

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Health of Animals Act	
Bill C-275. Second reading	16408
Motion agreed to	16409
(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to a committee)	16409
Criminal Code	
Bill C-321. Second reading	16409
Motion agreed to	16411
(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to a committee)	16411
Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Act	
Bill C-282. Third reading	16411
Motion agreed to	16412
(Bill read the third time and passed)	16412
Points of Order	
Order and Decorum in the House—Speaker's Ruling	
The Speaker	16412

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission	
The Speaker	16413
Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Gerretsen	16413
Interparliamentary Delegations	
Ms. Fry	16414
Ms. Dzerowicz	16414

Mrs. Mendès	16414
Committees of the House	
National Defence	
Mr. McKay	16414
Health	
Mr. Casey	16414
Indigenous and Northern Affairs	
Mrs. Atwin	16414
Constitution Act, 1867	
Mr. Arseneault	16414
Bill C-347. Introduction and first reading	16414
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	16414
Somali Heritage Month Act	
Mr. Baker	16415
Bill C-348. Introduction and first reading	16415
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	16415
National Strategy for the Eradication of Rabies Act	
Mr. Hanley	16415
Bill C-349. Introduction and first reading	16415
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	16415
Combatting Torture and Terrorism Act	
Mr. Genuis	16415
Bill C-350. Introduction and first reading	16415
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	16416
Petitions	
Myanmar	
Mr. Morrice	16416
Rail Transportation	
Mr. Brock	16416
Myanmar	
Mrs. DeBellefeuille	16416
Expanded Polystyrene	
Ms. Blaney	16416
Climate Change	
Mr. Fragiskatos	16416
Russia	
Mr. Berthold	16416
Air Transportation	
Ms. Zarrillo	16417
Accessible Parking	
Mr. Gerretsen	16417
Carbon Pricing	
Mrs. Gray	16417
Access to Midwives	
Ms. Idlout	16417

Myanmar	
Mr. Zuberi	16417
Bangladesh	
Mr. Waugh	16417
Nuclear Weapons	
Ms. Mathysen	16418
Bereavement Care	
Mr. Richards	16418
Firearms	
Mr. Richards	16418
Carbon Pricing	
Mr. Richards	16418
Climate Change	
Mr. Julian	16418
Burma	
Mr. Genuis	16418
Foreign Affairs	
Mr. Kram	16419
Elections in Pakistan	
Mr. Kram	16419
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Gerretsen	16419
Questions Passed as Orders for Returns	
Mr. Gerretsen	16428
Motions for Papers	
Mr. Gerretsen	16430

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Business of Supply	
Opposition Motion—Balanced Budget	
Mr. Poilievre	16430
Motion	16430
Mr. Gerretsen	16432
Ms. Michaud	16432
Mr. Blaikie	16432
Mr. Williams	16432
Mr. Gerretsen	16434
Mr. Desilets	16435
Mr. Angus	16435
Mr. Beech	16435
Mr. Deltell	16437
Ms. Zarrillo	16437
Mr. Morantz	16438
Mr. Gerretsen	16438
Mrs. Gallant	16439
Mr. Ste-Marie	16439
Mr. Angus	16439
Mr. Ste-Marie	16440
Mr. Morantz	16441
Mr. Fragiskatos	16442
Ms. McPherson	16442

Mr. Therrien	16442	Ms. Pauzé	16471
Mr. Godin	16444	Mr. Johns	16471
Mr. Fragiskatos	16444		
Mr. Blaikie	16444	House of Commons Calendar	
Mr. Blaikie	16444	Mr. Bittle	16471
Mr. Fragiskatos	16447	Motion	16471
Mr. Lawrence	16448	(Motion agreed to)	16471
Ms. Pauzé	16448		
Ms. Mathysen	16448	Business of Supply	
Mr. Albas	16449	Opposition Motion—Balanced Budget	
Mr. Godin	16449	Motion	16472
Mr. Samson	16450	Mr. van Koeverden	16472
Mr. Thériault	16451	Mr. Kram	16475
Mr. Johns	16451	Ms. Pauzé	16475
Mrs. Block	16451	Mr. Julian	16476
Mr. van Koeverden	16452	Ms. Petitpas Taylor	16476
Ms. Pauzé	16453	Motion negated	16478
Ms. Barron	16453		
Mr. Sorbara	16453	Main Estimates, 2023-24	
		Mrs. Fortier	16478
Business of the House		Motion for concurrence	16478
Mr. Holland	16455	Motion agreed to	16479
Motion	16455	Bill C-54. First reading	16479
(Motion agreed to)	16455	(Motion deemed adopted and bill read the first time)	16479
		Bill C-54. Second reading	16479
Business of Supply		Motion agreed to	16481
Opposition Motion—Balanced Budget		(Bill read the second time and the House went into committee of the whole thereon, Mrs. Carol Hughes in the chair)	16481
Motion	16455	(On clause 2)	16481
Mr. Albas	16455	Mrs. Kusie	16481
Ms. Pauzé	16455	Mrs. Fortier	16481
Mr. Johns	16456	(Clause 2 agreed to)	16481
Mr. Fragiskatos	16456	(Clause 3 agreed to)	16481
Mr. Morantz	16457	(Clause 4 agreed to)	16481
Mr. Thériault	16458	(Clause 5 agreed to)	16481
Ms. Mathysen	16458	(Schedule 1 agreed to)	16481
Mr. Lawrence	16458	(Schedule 2 agreed to)	16481
Mr. Scarpaleggia	16460	(Clause 1 agreed to)	16481
Ms. Pauzé	16460	(Preamble agreed to)	16481
Mr. Desjarlais	16460	(Title agreed to)	16481
Mrs. Gallant	16461	(Bill agreed to)	16481
Mr. McDonald	16462	(Bill reported)	16481
Mr. Morrice	16462	Motion for concurrence	16481
Mr. Calkins	16463	Motion agreed to	16483
Mr. Coteau	16463	Third reading	16483
Mr. Morantz	16464	Motion agreed to	16485
Mr. Johns	16464	(Bill read the third time and passed)	16485
Mr. Morrice	16465		
Mr. Miao	16465	Supplementary Estimates (A), 2023-24	
Mr. Morantz	16466	Mrs. Fortier	16485
Mr. Johns	16466	Motion for concurrence	16485
Mr. McLean	16467	Motion agreed to	16486
Mr. Morantz	16467	Bill C-55. Introduction and first reading	16486
Mr. Scarpaleggia	16468	(Motion deemed adopted and bill read the first time)	16486
Mr. Thériault	16468	Second reading	16486
Ms. Mathysen	16469	Motion agreed to	16488
Mr. Morrice	16469	(Bill read the second time and the House went into committee of the whole thereon, Mrs. Carol Hughes in the chair)	16488
Mr. McLean	16469		
Ms. Taylor Roy	16470		

(On clause 2)	16488	Amendment negatived	16493
Mrs. Kusie	16488	(Motion agreed to)	16494
Mrs. Fortier	16488	Canada Business Corporations Act	
(Clause 2 agreed to)	16488	Bill C-42. Third reading	16494
(Clause 3 agreed to)	16488	Motion agreed to	16496
(Clause 4 agreed to)	16488	(Bill read the third time and passed)	16496
(Clause 5 agreed to)	16488	Public Sector Integrity Commissioner	
(Schedule agreed to)	16488	Motion agreed to	16497
(Clause 1 agreed to)	16488		
(Preamble agreed to)	16488	ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS	
(Title agreed to)	16488	Democratic Institutions	
(Bill agreed to)	16488	Mr. Genuis	16498
(Bill reported)	16488	Mr. Gerretsen	16498
Motion for concurrence	16488	Royal Canadian Mounted Police	
Motion agreed to	16490	Mr. Kram	16498
Third reading	16490	Mr. Gerretsen	16499
Motion agreed to	16491		
(Bill read the third time and passed)	16491		
Online News Act			
Motion	16491		

Published under the authority of the Speaker of
the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the Copyright Act. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the Copyright Act.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: <https://www.ourcommons.ca>

Publié en conformité de l'autorité
du Président de la Chambre des communes

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la Loi sur le droit d'auteur. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre des communes.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la Loi sur le droit d'auteur.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante :
<https://www.noscommunes.ca>