



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 151 No. 287
Wednesday, February 28, 2024

Speaker: The Honourable Greg Fergus



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, February 28, 2024

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*]

HOUSING

Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP): Mr. Speaker, it is another day and another renovation in my community. This time it is folks at 250 Frederick Street in Kitchener who are being made to fear that they will be on the street if they do not vacate their unit by May 31. Folks who pay around \$1,000 a month in rent can go online and see fake pictures of units in their own building being posted for rents starting at \$1,800, while others are being pressured into signing new leases at the higher amounts. Bad faith landlords are taking advantage of people across the country because there is no where else for them to go.

After three decades of underinvestment, social housing stock is down to 3%. The federal government must show that it is prepared to at least double social housing across the country.

In the meantime, I send my thanks to ACORN Canada and the Social Development Centre Waterloo Region for organizing folks at 250 Frederick Street. By sticking together, they can stand up to their landlord and fight to keep their housing. Local organizations are doing their part. It is past the time for the federal government to do its part.

* * *

HUMAN RIGHTS IN RUSSIA

Hon. John McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Alexei Navalny was killed on February 16 by Vladimir Putin. Putin ordered him killed in the same manner a mafia don orders a hit. Navalny's only crime was to challenge Putin's illegiti-

mate claim to power and his illegal war on Ukraine. Alexei Navalny was a brave man. He knew the risks of challenging a murderous mafia thug. In fact, he anticipated his murder in a documentary entitled *Navalny*.

Vladimir Kara-Murza shares the same courage. He too has challenged the murderous thug. It may be hoped that he may not be murdered, but weak, pathetic people such as Vladimir Putin cannot let courageous people live. While we mourn Alexei Navalny, let us hope that Vladimir Kara-Murza will not suffer the same fate.

* * *

JACK DONALD

Mr. Blaine Calkins (Red Deer—Lacombe, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honour the life of my dear friend Jack Donald.

In 1964, Jack moved his family to Red Deer, where they opened a service station business called Parkland Oil Products Ltd. Through the years, Jack and his wife Joan grew that service station into Canada's largest independent marketer and distributor of fuels, known today as Parkland Fuel Corporation. There is no denying that Jack excelled at business, but Jack was also a community builder. He was president of the Optimist Club, city alderman, citizen of the year and prominent philanthropist. He, along with Joan, donated millions to causes in Red Deer and central Alberta, such as the Donald School of Business at Red Deer Polytechnic.

Most importantly, Jack was a husband, father, grandfather, great-grandfather and friend. I will say to Joan, John, Kathy and all of the family that we share in their sorrow. They should know in this difficult time that Jack left an indelible mark on central Alberta and his smile will never fade from our memories.

* * *

CANADA-NEPAL RELATIONS

Ms. Sonia Sidhu (Brampton South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada and Nepal have deep ties, and the impact of this friendship can be felt in both our countries as we recognize 59 years of our friendship. In Nepal, Canadian organizations, such as Canadian Foodgrains Bank, help fight climate change, support businesses, protect the environment and support women. In Canada, and in my city of Brampton, we have a strong and vibrant Nepalese-Canadian community.

Statements by Members

As the chair of the Canada-Nepal Parliamentary Friendship Group, I was honoured to have welcomed the chairperson of the National Assembly of Nepal to Canada and to have attended many community events led by Canada-Nepal community groups, women's groups and the local cricket team. Earlier this month, I also attended the opening of Hakka Desi Spice restaurant in Brampton.

As we celebrate vibrant Nepalese culture and cuisine in our city, let us continue to celebrate and nurture the traditions and culture of Nepal here in Canada.

* * *

[Translation]

**CENTRE D'ÉCOUTE ET DE PRÉVENTION SUICIDE
DRUMMOND**

Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Centre d'écoute et de prévention suicide Drummond, or CEPS, is celebrating its 40th anniversary. It has spent 40 years promoting life, 40 years working to reduce suffering, 40 years awakening hope. That is what they call sowing the seeds of happiness.

Last year alone, CEPS answered over 8,000 calls from men, women, adults, teenagers, and even children. Vulnerability can affect all age ranges. Someone is on the other end of the line 24/7 to lend an empathetic ear to those who can see no end to their distress.

They defuse crises, provide support for those in mourning and reignite the flame of life. CEPS volunteers have a gift for bringing light to the darkest corners. I call that working miracles. If listening is an art, CEPS members are artisans; artisans of life.

Happy 40th anniversary to CEPS Drummond. Thank you for being there to foster happiness in our community.

* * *

[English]

PINK SHIRT DAY

Ms. Emmanuela Lambropoulos (Saint-Laurent, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today is Pink Shirt Day. In Canada, this day is devoted to raising awareness against bullying in schools, in workplaces, at home and online. People may be wondering how Pink Shirt Day came to be.

[Translation]

It all started in a small town in Nova Scotia when two teenagers saw a new kid being bullied at school for wearing a pink shirt. They could have watched from the sidelines, but they did not do that. They decided to take action. They handed out 50 pink shirts for their classmates to wear in solidarity with the bullied kid.

[English]

This is the story of how one act of kindness had a ripple effect, and now, on this day, people across the country wear pink shirts to stand up against bullying.

[Translation]

Bullying violates a person's right to human dignity and safety. It affects the victim's physical, emotional and social well-being. It is a problem we are seeing in every school and workplace.

● (1410)

[English]

Let us all be kind and make this world a better place, one act of kindness at a time.

* * *

MEMORIAL PARK IN LISTOWELL

Mr. John Nater (Perth—Wellington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, February 28, 1959, would come to be known as Listowel's darkest day. It was a Saturday morning, like any other, and the town's pee-wee hockey team was on the ice, but at 9:27 a.m., the arena's roof collapsed, killing seven boys and the town's recreation director. The town came together and supported those who were injured, grieved with the families of those lost and pledged to remember the eight lives lost.

Today, 65 years later, the land where the arena once stood is now vacant, but not for long. The Friends of '59 and the Memorial Arena Park 59 Committee are working to create a permanent park where the arena once stood. The memorial arena park would ensure that Listowel's darkest day is never forgotten and the light of the eight lives lost will always be remembered.

* * *

ORDER OF CANADA

Mr. Michael Coteau (Don Valley East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker as we come to the end of Black History Month, it is important to recognize that Black Canadians continue to make important gains and contributions to our country. They continue to make history, and yesterday, history was made.

Ms. Lillie Johnson was awarded the Order of Canada for her outstanding work in health care and advocacy for sickle cell awareness. At 101 years old, Ms. Johnson has already received many awards and recognitions throughout her long-standing career as nurse, midwife and educator.

Her experience and accomplishments in health care made her a vital resource, eventually leading to her becoming the first Black director of Public Health Ontario. While taking care of patients with sickle cell disease, who were disproportionately Black, she realized the impact of the lack of awareness, which led to the creation of the Sickle Cell Association of Ontario.

I send Ms. Johnson my congratulations on this well-deserved achievement, and I thank her for her continued advocacy and support for those with sickle cell.

*Statements by Members***FOREIGN AFFAIRS**

Ms. Lena Metlege Diab (Halifax West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, constituents have reached out to me to raise the plight of their loved ones in Gaza and the heart-wrenching humanitarian crisis unfolding there. They have asked me to advocate on their behalf for the immediate provision of aid, including food, clean water, medication and medical supplies. They are pleading for Canada to use all our influence to support the passage of aid into Gaza for civilians.

This is about our humanity. Canadians are rightly proud of our peacekeeping tradition, and I, like many, am disturbed by what we are seeing on the ground. Gazans need humanitarian aid, and that requires allowing the unobstructed delivery of the essentials for life.

Canada has provided \$100 million in aid, but we have to ensure our support and the support that others have stepped up to provide can actually make it to those who are suffering. We cannot fail, and lasting peace is the only solution.

* * *

CARBON TAX

Mr. Martin Shields (Bow River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, while the common-sense Conservatives would axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime, after eight years, the NDP-Liberal Prime Minister is not worth the cost, crime or corruption.

On April 1, and this is not an April Fool's Day joke, we can get ready for another 23% carbon tax increase from the NDP-Liberal government, which will rob money from hard-working Canadians, increase food prices and not lower emissions.

People such as Ann, Neil and Scott have called me in desperation, and they have shared with me the costs of their skyrocketing energy bills. Some are paying nearly double in carbon tax than the energy they use, but it does not seem to matter to these NDP-Liberals. If the radical environment minister had his way, all Alberta families would be forced to freeze inside or walk to work in -40°C on roads and bridges that would no longer exist.

Common-sense Conservatives would axe the tax for everyone, everywhere, so Canadians could afford to heat their homes, drive their kids to school, get to work and get the government to butt out of their lives for good.

* * *

ST. PATRICK'S PARADE

Mr. Peter Schiefke (Vaudreuil—Soulanges, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is almost that time of year once again, and thanks to an army of volunteers led by Jay de la Durantaye, Rob Dumas, Ken Bell, Mark Noonan and Eileen McAleese, and the entire team at the Soulanges Irish Society, our community of Vaudreuil—Soulanges will become Irish for a day at the 13th annual St. Patrick's Day parade in Hudson.

This year, our grand marshal, renowned Canadian musician Brian Greenway will lead the parade, a parade that will feature Irish woman of the year, Kim Sullivan; parade queen, Veronica Gilmore; princesses Shawnessa Doyle-Guiliani, Vanessa Mooney and Addie Derouin; and reviewing officer, Hudson's mayor, Chloe Hutchison.

• (1415)

[Translation]

As always, this is a cannot-miss event. On Saturday, March 16 at 1 p.m., everyone is invited to Main Street to celebrate Irish heritage and culture. Let us make the 13th annual Saint Patrick's parade a cannot-miss event. *Sláinte!*

* * *

[English]

CARBON TAX

Mr. Randy Hoback (Prince Albert, CPC): Mr. Speaker, while common-sense Conservatives will axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime, the NDP-Liberal Prime Minister is not worth the cost, crime or corruption after eight years.

A typical family of four will now pay \$700 more in groceries in 2024 because of the Prime Minister's carbon tax. On April 1, he is increasing the carbon tax yet again, by 23%, as part of his plan to quadruple it, increasing the misery for Canadian families.

Families in Saskatchewan cannot afford this increase, yet the NDP-Liberal Prime Minister will keep hiking this tax, regardless of how expensive groceries and fuel become. He does not understand that if one taxes the farmer that grows the food and the trucker who ships the food, the tax passes down to the person who buys the food.

The Prime Minister is not worth the cost.

* * *

[Translation]

ARRIVECAN APP

Mr. Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, CPC): Mr. Speaker, while the common-sense Conservatives will axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime, after eight years, this Prime Minister is not worth the cost, the crime or the corruption.

The failed ArriveCAN app was initially supposed to cost \$80,000, but we have learned that this Prime Minister ended up wasting at least \$60 million on it. The Prime Minister shamelessly dipped into Canadians' pockets at a time when they are struggling to make ends meet and having a hard time paying their mortgage and when prices just keep going up. This is not the first time. He has been doing this throughout his term in office.

Statements by Members

How did the ArriveCAN app end up costing over 750 times the initial price? I cannot even imagine. We, the common-sense Conservatives, have made it our mission to get to the bottom of this new scandal. Canadians deserve answers and they will get them.

After eight years of this Prime Minister, things need to change. The only way to achieve that is with our common-sense leader.

* * *

[English]

BLACK AND INDIGENOUS ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mr. Andy Fillmore (Halifax, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week I had the privilege of meeting with Tribe Network in Halifax, including CEO and founder Alfred Burgesson. Tribe Network is an organization committed to supporting Black and indigenous people and people of colour in pursuit of their entrepreneurial aspirations.

Tribe provides invaluable support by offering the necessary knowledge, tools and resources for its network to thrive and innovate. Its mission comes to life through concrete actions. Recently, it has joined forces with Volta in Halifax, which nurtures tech industry talent in Atlantic Canada.

Tribe is also co-organizing a pitch competition encouraging racialized youth to contribute to the development of clean energy innovations. This month, it is hosting a series of online workshops on financial literacy, bringing together experts in the field and facilitating access to knowledge.

Halifax has a rich history of Black entrepreneurship, and I am thankful to witness the legacy of pioneers like Viola Desmond being carried on today, thanks to the dedicated work of Tribe Network.

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Ms. Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): *Uqaqtittiji*, Inuit, indigenous and northern women have great strength. They deal with many hardships, including the effects of the lack of federal investments. They deal with overcrowded homes and so much more. Inuit, indigenous and northern women make beautiful clothing from caribou, seal and other materials. They work in partnership with hunters and many others. Funding for Inuit, indigenous and northern women has never been enough, but now they are forced to worry about whether even those meagre funds will continue.

Pond Inlet has overcrowded schools. They must be funded for another. In Cambridge Bay, they ask for funds to keep passing on traditional knowledge. In Kivalliq, economic development programs must continue.

The Liberals are planning to sunset programs like the Inuit child first initiative. They need more supports, not less.

[Translation]

MIRABEL, MAPLE CAPITAL OF THE WORLD

Mr. Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, a year ago, right here in the House, I proclaimed the riding of Mirabel as “Maple Capital of the World”.

I call it the capital because quality reigns supreme and pride courses through our veins like sap. To the naysayers I say that a change of capital is nothing short of a revolution. I salute all the maple metropolises across Quebec.

On February 21, I, alongside Mirabel mayor Patrick Charbonneau, Tourisme Mirabel president Stéphane Michaud and several maple producers, kicked off the season by awarding the prize for Mirabel's biggest maple to the Vermette family of Saint-Augustin. It is a beautiful sight to behold, over 15 feet in circumference and over 200 years old. Now that is a maple. It would not surprise me if it is the biggest in Quebec, and maybe even the biggest in the world.

Our maple syrup producers are fully prepared to welcome people properly, with all the know-how they have.

I welcome my colleagues to the maple capital of the world and wish them a happy maple syrup season.

* * *

● (1420)

[English]

ARRIVECAN APPLICATION

Mr. Damien Kurek (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the NDP-Liberal Prime Minister is not worth the cost, crime or corruption after eight years, especially with revelations related to arrive scam. While common-sense Conservatives will axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime, the Prime Minister wasted at least \$60 million on his ineffectual app.

After fighting for weeks to get witnesses to committee, we have new information that GC Strategies' contract resulted in an expense for \$19 million to a company that does not do IT work, for an app that sent more than 10,000 Canadians forcibly into quarantine with no justification. Today's motion, which Conservatives brought forward, is essential, as it calls out the lack of transparency from the Liberals and will require accountability for this injustice inflicted upon taxpayers.

While Liberals use every trick in the book to stop the truth from coming to light, Conservatives will bring accountability back to this country.

COLDEST NIGHT OF THE YEAR

Ms. Iqra Khalid (Mississauga—Erin Mills, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this past weekend I joined thousands of people across Canada taking part in the Coldest Night of the Year, a family-friendly walk organized to raise funds supporting those experiencing homelessness and fleeing violence and abuse, families experiencing hunger, and the most vulnerable in our communities. Whether it was a two-kilometre or five-kilometre walk, our communities stepped up and out into the cold to really support our neighbours who are struggling.

I want to recognize Eden Food for Change, an awesome not-for-profit community kitchen in my riding, and Armagh House, a transitional housing shelter for women, whose teams organized their own family-friendly walks and raised thousands of dollars for our communities this year. I thank all participants and the hosts of this year's Coldest Night of the Year walk for the critical work they do in keeping our communities safe.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[Translation]

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, while common-sense Conservatives fight to axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime, this Prime Minister is not worth the cost or corruption.

We have just learned that the RCMP is investigating arrive scam. The RCMP commissioner revealed that the Prime Minister blocked them from obtaining documents in the SNC-Lavalin affair.

Will he lift PMO confidentiality so the RCMP can get all the facts in this criminal investigation?

• (1425)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the ArriveCAN situation is obviously unacceptable. That is why authorities are reviewing its procurement process.

Anyone who took advantage of our COVID-19 response to save Canadian lives should face the consequences if they abused the system. It will be automatic. That is why there will be consequences, based on what the authorities find.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that non-answer proves once again that this Prime Minister is not worth the cost or the corruption.

The question was whether he would let the RCMP see cabinet documents. We know that in another criminal investigation into this Prime Minister's scandals, the SNC-Lavalin scandal, he blocked the police from seeing all the documents.

Once again, if he has nothing to hide, will he hand over all the documents, including PMO documents, to the police?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, the Conservative leader's desperation and penchant for personal attacks are on full display as he brings up problems that were completely resolved four years ago.

Oral Questions

The truth of the matter is that we take the ArriveCAN matter extremely seriously. That is why authorities are responsibly following up on it. Anyone who took advantage of a situation where everyone was there to help Canadians in a global pandemic crisis will face the consequences.

[English]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, while common-sense Conservatives fight to axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime, the Prime Minister is not worth the cost or corruption.

We found yesterday that his government is under RCMP investigation again, this time for arrive scam. The commissioner of the RCMP revealed, however, that the last time they were investigating him for criminal activity, in the SNC-Lavalin affair, he blocked them from getting cabinet documents.

Will he lift cabinet confidentiality and hand over all the documents to the police so they can investigate any of his potential crimes?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the situation around ArriveCAN is obviously unacceptable, which is why authorities are looking into this procurement process. Anyone who took advantage of everything we were doing to try to keep people safe during COVID to get rich will face consequences. That is the way our system works.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is not the way the system has worked since he took office eight years ago.

According to the RCMP commissioner, not only did he refuse to be questioned in the SNC-Lavalin criminal investigation and in the Aga Khan billionaire island investigation, but he blocked key cabinet documents from being included in those investigations.

We now know that an app that was supposed to cost \$80,000 went up to \$60 million after the NDP helpfully voted for those extra funds. We do not know who criminally benefited from that, so once again, will the Prime Minister waive cabinet confidentiality and turn over all the documents, yes or no?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is digging into the past to try to bring up things that were settled many years ago.

If he really wants to talk about the past, he should talk about the fact that the Conservative leader was at Transport Canada, working hand in hand with the minister, as the founders of the company involved in ArriveCAN were getting millions of dollars in contracts from the department he was working for.

Oral Questions

We are taking seriously any concerns around procurement. The authorities are looking into it. There will be consequences for anyone who took advantage of our COVID protection efforts to get rich.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that answer proves again that he is not worth the cost or the corruption.

We know that after eight years of the Prime Minister, the cost of everything has gone up, in part because he has given away money for nothing.

Arrive scam, an app that was supposed to cost \$80,000, was actually \$60 million at least, and counting, because the Auditor General said she does not have the documentation to do the full calculation today.

We have a common-sense Conservative motion that requires the Prime Minister to release the full cost of the app and recover the money for Canadians within the next hundred days. Will he vote for that common-sense motion, yes or no?

● (1430)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is choosing to fling mud at a question that I have said is unacceptable. The authorities are looking into it.

He does not want to talk about the housing investments that we are making across the country. He does not want to talk about the fact that he voted against dental care that seniors are going to be benefiting from as of May. He does not want to talk about child care. He does not want to talk about Ukraine. He does not want to talk about all the things where Conservatives are out of line with Canadians.

We are going to continue focusing on the things that matter to Canadians, every single day.

* * *

[Translation]

PHARMACARE

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the government and the NDP want to bring in a pharmacare plan that does absolutely nothing for Quebec, since we already have such a plan, which was actually the inspiration for their program. I have no problem with this, as long as Quebec has the right to opt out with full financial compensation and no strings attached.

The member for Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, a member of that alliance, says that Quebec can opt out. The minister says it is not all that clear-cut.

The Prime Minister must know the answer. Which is it?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the reality is that too many Canadians across the country are still being forced to make impossible choices between paying for groceries or paying for the medication they need.

We are here to make sure that people everywhere can pay for their medication. We will work with the provinces, including Quebec, to make sure that Canadians have the coverage they need.

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I agree that there are likely many Canadians who do not have this service, but Quebecers do. That is why Quebecers are talking about the right to opt out with compensation.

Should the NDP and the Liberals not have made sure that they were on the same page? Before deciding whether to go into a tango or a nice slow dance, maybe partners should renew their vows by being clear with each other.

Can the Prime Minister, in one of his oh-so-clear answers, tell me whether Quebec has a right to opt out, yes or no, as my friend from Richmond—Arthabaska would say?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, across the country, including in Quebec, people are dealing with inadequate prescription drug coverage. That is why we are there to work hand in hand with the provinces and ensure that people can pay for their drugs from coast to coast to coast.

We are always there to work constructively with the provinces to ensure that there is support and coverage for all Canadians.

* * *

[English]

HEALTH

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, New Democrats have long said that corporate greed is driving up the cost of living. It is also hurting our health care system.

Galen Weston's Shoppers Drug Mart, which the corporate-controlled Conservatives love, is now ripping off our health care system. That means more money in the pockets of Galen Weston and less money for frontline health care workers.

Why does the Prime Minister continue to let Galen Weston get richer while Canadians cannot get the health care that they need?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will let the Leader of the Opposition answer why he has a high-profile lobbyist for Galen Weston sitting in his caucus meetings.

We are focused on creating more competition for lower prices, more choice, and more innovative products and services for Canadians. Our government recently passed new legislation that empowers the Competition Bureau to hold grocers accountable and prioritize consumers' interests.

The fall economic statement would also crack down on predatory pricing, and I urge all parties to vote in favour.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canadians do not have to choose between parties that are both controlled by corporations.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

The Prime Minister allocated over \$4 billion to the Northvolt plant, a project that poses serious environmental risks and that will not generate any economic spinoffs until 2037.

Before he committed to spending so much money, did the Prime Minister conduct environmental assessments or did he just listen to the CEOs?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is the largest private investment in the history of Quebec. We are talking about a company that is creating not just jobs but also the products of the future.

We do need to continue to fight climate change and protect our environment. We are doing that hand in hand with the Government of Quebec and companies like Northvolt. We are building careers, building a future, and fighting climate change at the same time.

I would expect the NDP to understand that fighting climate change and building a strong economy go hand in hand.

* * *

• (1435)

[English]

CARBON PRICING

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, common-sense Conservatives want to axe the tax. The Prime Minister wants to hike the tax. First of all, he wants to quadruple it between now and 2030, and on April 1 he plans to hike it by 23% with the support of the NDP. The tax hike will be bigger than increases in the rebate, and therefore the average families in all the provinces will be bigger net losers under the tax than they were before.

With Canadians unable to eat, to heat, and to house themselves, will the Prime Minister cancel his plan to hike the tax on April 1?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do believe this might be one of the first times the Leader of the Opposition has ever recognized that there is a Canada carbon rebate that he would cancel: cheques that he would prevent being delivered to Canadians right across the country.

Eight out of 10 Canadian households get more money than they pay in carbon pricing in the provinces in which it applies. In Alberta it is \$1,800 a year to a family of four. It is \$1,200 a year in Manitoba, and even in Ontario it is \$1,120 to a family of four. That is money in their pockets that he wants to take—

The Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am glad he mentioned his phony rebates, because \$1,800 in Alberta is the rebate. That is what he said; we heard him. Here is the gross cost: \$2,943. Therefore he is going to take away \$2,943 but give back \$1,800 and then ask them to be thankful for it.

Is that not just proof that the carbon tax is just like him: not worth the cost?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Budget Officer himself recognized that

the \$1,800 in rebate that we are sending, for example to a family of four in Alberta, is more than that family of four pays in the price on pollution. That is the calculation that is done right across the country that shows that eight out of 10 families are better off with the Canada carbon rebate than what they pay in the price on pollution in areas in which it is brought in.

We are both fighting climate change and delivering more money to households across the country, money that he wants to take away.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Budget Officer's report is in my hands. The information is on page 3 of "A Distributional Analysis of the Federal Fuel Charge under the 2030 Emissions Reduction Plan". Google it. Look it up. It is on the Parliamentary Budget Officer's website. Members do not have to believe me, and they certainly do not want to believe him; they can go look for themselves. The average Ontario family will pay \$1,674 in carbon taxes next year. That is \$630 more than they get back in the rebate.

Why does the Prime Minister not google it, look up the report, check the facts and axe the tax?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the first conclusion of the Parliamentary Budget Officer is, in the math, on the face of it, that eight out of 10 families get more back on the price on pollution through the Canada carbon rebate.

The reality is that if one wants to talk about longer-term and broader economic consequences of a price on pollution, they have to talk about the cost of inaction and about the benefits of investing and innovating in carbon reduction technologies. That is the full picture that the Leader of the Opposition does not want to look at because he does not think one can build a strong economy and fight climate change at the same time.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is doing neither at the same time. I should catch what he said: "on the face of it", the carbon tax is terrific.

While the Parliamentary Budget Officer actually did the calculation of the full fiscal and economic cost for the average family, he found that every family in the middle class is worse off under the carbon tax. For example, in Ontario, the net cost for the average family, above and beyond rebates, is \$627 this year.

How are they going to pay for that—

• (1440)

The Speaker: The right hon. Prime Minister.

Oral Questions

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, families in Ontario are going to be getting a Canada carbon rebate worth \$1,120 this year for a family of four. A family in Nova Scotia will get \$824, and a family in Saskatchewan will get \$1,500 this coming year. That is more, for eight out of 10 families, than the price on pollution actually is.

We are fighting climate change. We are innovating and creating the jobs of tomorrow. We are putting more money in the pockets of Canadians through cheques that the Leader of the Opposition would take away.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, here is a very simple way to measure it up, from the Parliamentary Budget Officer's report: The total gross cost of the carbon tax in Ontario is \$1,674 for the coming year.

How much is the rebate?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with record-setting wildfires last year, with floods, with climate—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: The hon. Prime Minister has the floor, from the top.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, with record-setting wildfires across the country, with droughts and with floods, Canadians know the costs of the impacts of climate change. The Leader of the Opposition has no plan to fight climate change. He is not proposing anything except to pull away the price on pollution that forces polluters to pay right across the country and puts more money, through cheques that arrive four times a year, in Canadians' pockets in jurisdictions where there is a carbon price.

We have a plan to fight climate change and put money in people's pockets. He has no plan.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister does not need to get angry about it. I am just asking for some numbers here.

He was very anxious to talk about these wonderful rebates up until a moment ago, and now he does not want to say a thing about them. He even gave them a fancy new name. I am going to say it again: In Ontario, the gross cost of the carbon tax is \$1,674 for the average family.

How much is the rebate?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member suggests that I do not have to get angry about climate change. I am sorry; Canadians are worried and angry about climate change. They saw the wildfires that cut across this country last summer and that have already started up in Alberta. They see the droughts. They see the floods.

The Conservatives have no plan. Their plan is to withdraw the four-times-a-year cheques that land in the bank accounts of Canadians and that the Parliamentary Budget Officer demonstrated give more money to eight out of 10 families right across the country in jurisdictions where the rebate is applied.

We have a plan. He does not.

[Translation]

SENIORS

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, there was a unanimous vote in committee to support the bill introduced by my colleague from Shefford, which seeks to end the discriminatory treatment of seniors with respect to old age pensions; this discrimination is between those aged 65 to 75 and those over 75.

Since the vote was unanimous, it is safe to assume that the Liberal members were instructed to vote in favour of the bill. Consequently, that it will likely be part of the budget.

My question for the Prime Minister is this: Will increasing the pension and putting an end to age discrimination be included in the budget?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when it comes to seniors, we have taken steps to recognize seniors who face higher costs, namely those who are 75 and older, and to give them a little more support.

On top of that, we are implementing dental care for seniors. This week, seniors aged 70 and over can register to start receiving their dental care in May.

We are here to help seniors. We are here to invest. We are here to help the most vulnerable. We will continue to be here to support our seniors across the country.

● (1445)

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, that is all well and good, but it is in the past. I want to know what he is going to do in the future.

I would remind the Prime Minister that his committee members voted in favour of the bill, which will be sent back to the House. I am therefore going to assume that the Prime Minister is not leading us on, that he is not leading on those who were the most vulnerable during the pandemic, who are the most vulnerable in general and who are the most vulnerable to inflation.

Will he use the budget as an opportunity to end age discrimination between seniors and to increase benefits for all seniors?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since 2015, we have increased benefits, we have increased the guaranteed income supplement and we have recognized that, yes, seniors are facing difficult times, especially older seniors. Vulnerable seniors over the age of 75 have more expenses.

That is why we are in the process of giving more targeted help to those seniors while also helping all seniors through investments in housing, dental care, the new horizons for seniors programs and so on. We are investing across the country to help seniors. That said, we are always going to recognize those who are the most vulnerable.

* * *

[English]

CARBON PRICING

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the NDP-Liberal Prime Minister is not worth the cost of food, as we were reminded by a tragic report by Second Harvest that came out this week showing that there will be another million extra visits to food banks above last year's record-breaking numbers. This is because of the collusion of the NDP and the Liberals on price fixing that is the carbon tax.

Will the Prime Minister cancel his April 1, 23% carbon tax hike on food?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as one of the Conservative leader's own MPs recognized, there is absolutely no data or proof to link their theory around the price on pollution and the price of groceries.

However, if the Conservatives actually cared about affordability for Canadians, they would have voted in favour of dental care for our most vulnerable seniors and for young families who cannot afford to send their kids to a dentist. That is what we are delivering and what they are voting against. They would not be stalling on the competition reforms to ensure that we are actually moving forward on greater competition to stabilize grocery prices.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after eight years, this NDP-Liberal Prime Minister is just not worth the cost of food. It is not just that two million people a month cannot afford groceries and are forced to line up at food banks, but also that now those food banks are running out of food, and Canadians are diving into dumpsters, literally. There is an 8,000-member Facebook group called the "Dumpster Diving Network". How can the Prime Minister look those people in the eyes and raise taxes on their food when they are eating out of garbage cans?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we recognize that many Canadians are facing extremely difficult times, which is why we are continuing to step up our supports across the country for food banks, for programs and for supports for vulnerable Canadians. This is something that we have taken seriously, and we will continue to.

At the same time, we are continuing to move forward on concrete measures to help Canadians, such as dental care, pharmacare and child care. These are things the Conservative Party continues to vote against in terms of helping vulnerable Canadians and in helping with affordability. The Leader of the Opposition is there to instrumentalize vulnerable Canadians and to try to play politics off of them. He is not there to help them.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is the best answer he can come up with after eight

Oral Questions

years of record food price increases that has forced people not just to food banks, but to literally jump into dumpsters and to bring their phones so that they network on Facebook to share tips on how to eat out of garbage cans in Canada.

Life was not like this before the Prime Minister, and it will not be like this after he is gone. In the meantime, will he at least have the humanity to cancel his April 1, 23% tax hike?

• (1450)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, farmers across this country know the impacts of climate change on the food supply in Canada and on the growing and the production of food. These are things that we are fighting against by fighting against climate change and by putting more money in the pockets of Canadians right across the country.

We will continue to be there with support for food banks. We will continue to be there with support for vulnerable Canadians. Now, the Leader of the Opposition loves to talk about them and to try to score political points off of these vulnerable people, but he is offering no real solutions for them as we continue to step up and to deliver supports for people from coast to coast to coast.

[Translation]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, according to Second Harvest, food banks can expect a million more visits this year because of the food inflation caused by this Prime Minister.

Professor Sylvain Charlebois, an agri-food expert, says the Prime Minister should at least freeze the carbon tax. The Bloc Québécois voted to drastically increase taxes on the farmers who produce our food.

Will he ignore the Bloc Québécois for once, cancel the costly coalition and stop raising the taxes on our food?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, no party in the House is about to take any lessons from the Conservative Party on helping people in need.

The Conservative Party is still the party that lowers taxes for the rich and gives benefits to the wealthy. Whether we are talking about food banks, dental care, child care or seniors, its goal is not to help the vulnerable. We know that the Conservatives offer nothing but austerity and cuts to programs that Canadians need.

We will continue to be there for people by fighting climate change and by providing them with direct support.

Oral Questions

[English]

HOUSING

Ms. Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): *Uqagtittiji*, northerners continue to experience the worst housing crisis in the country. Overcrowding is so bad that families sleep in shifts. One home was cracking in half from the melting permafrost and was only held together by duct tape. This cannot continue. For years, the government has ignored the territories' calls for investments to housing. They need the housing funding now.

Will the Prime Minister respect the territorial governments and deliver the funding they need to build homes?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my thanks to the hon. member for her work as she speaks up for the people in the north. We are always going to be there to invest in housing, to work hand in hand with Premier Akeegok and others, to make sure we are delivering for people in a situation that is extremely difficult for them.

We recognize these challenges, which is why we have sent millions and millions of dollars to the territories for the building of new housing. We will continue to be there with even more.

* * *

GROCERY INDUSTRY

Ms. Lisa Marie Barron (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, sky-high food prices are driving people to food banks. This did not happen overnight. It is because consecutive Liberal and Conservative governments put the profits of rich grocery CEOs before people. Visits to Nanaimo's Loaves & Fishes food bank were up 44% in just six months. Loaves & Fishes is beyond capacity and requires federal support in building a distribution centre to keep up with demand.

Will the Prime Minister provide this funding so that people on Vancouver Island are not left to go hungry?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have stepped up our supports, as a federal government, to food banks and organizations serving the most vulnerable right across the country, and we will continue to.

In terms of grocery prices, more competition means lower prices, more choices and more innovative products and services for Canadians. We are going to continue to work on our new legislation that empowers the Competition Bureau to hold grocers accountable and to prioritize consumers' interests.

There is much more to do. We are going to continue to do it, working alongside anyone in the House who wants to tackle affordability and ensure that we are helping the most vulnerable across the country.

* * *

LABOUR

Mr. Peter Fonseca (Mississauga East—Cooksville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have heard loud and clear from unionized workers in my riding about how excited they are about the government's bill to ban the use of replacement workers in federally regulated work-

places. Yesterday marked another significant step in the right direction as Bill C-58 received unanimous support in the House. Workers know that our Liberal government stands with them, because the best deals and the most powerful paycheques are made at the bargaining table.

Will the Prime Minister update the House on progress on this historic legislation to ban replacement workers?

● (1455)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Mississauga East—Cooksville for his continued advocacy for Canadian workers. Indeed, the best deals are made at the bargaining table.

However, when Canadian workers see Conservative politicians like the members for Battlefords—Lloydminster, Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan and Louis-Saint-Laurent parrot corporate talking points, they know that the Conservative Party of anti-union bills, Bill C-377 and Bill C-525, is still alive and kicking.

Canadians will not be fooled by the Conservative leader caving to pressure after a steady 19-year political career opposing unions.

* * *

HOUSING

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our common-sense plan will axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime. Meanwhile, the Prime Minister has doubled housing costs since he promised to bring them down. A National Bank report, out Thursday, revealed that in Victoria and Toronto, it now takes an astonishing 25 years for the average family to save for a down payment. In Vancouver, it would take 29 years. This is after he has created \$80 billion of new housing spending that has been vaporized by bureaucracy.

Will the Prime Minister finally follow our common-sense plan to cut the bureaucracy and build the homes?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we just announced two more housing accelerator agreements today in Whitehorse and in Saskatoon, adding to the dozens of agreements we have signed across the country to fast-track the construction of housing, over 600,000 homes. The Conservative Party's plan, which he is talking about, is to insult mayors and to cut critical infrastructure funding. It will not get any more homes built.

Oral Questions

Cities understand that we need to change the rules to get more homes built faster. Indeed, the only one gatekeeping this progress is the Conservative leader himself.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister pretends he has not been in government for the last eight years. He acts like this is his first day on the job. The fact that he has to read off notes would suggest it is his first day on the job.

The reality is that housing costs have doubled since he promised to lower them. Yes, he has created massive programs with wonderful new agreements and beautiful photo ops, where politicians pat each other on the backs and smile while they cut ribbons. The problem is that after eight years, nothing is getting built.

Why will the Prime Minister not get out of the way and cut the bureaucracy so that we can build the homes?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, 19 years as a politician is the Leader of the Opposition, including some time as the housing minister, and his plan to fix housing is anything but a plan. It will not build homes fast enough. It does not reach enough cities, and it creates unnecessary bureaucracy. He would also, get this, rip up the housing accelerator agreements, which are unlocking over 600,000 new homes, and he would put the GST back on apartment construction.

Housing experts like Mike Moffatt say that the Conservative leader's plan is exceptionally weak, and it is a sign that the Conservatives do not understand the urgency or the scale of the housing crisis.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister brags that there is a housing crisis after he has been in power for eight long years. He quotes the same failed Liberal academics who gave him the advice that helped him double the price in the first place.

The Conservatives' common-sense plan will incentivize cities to speed up and to lower the cost of building by requiring that they permit 15% more homes as a condition of getting the money. The more they build, the more they get; the less they build, the less they get. We pay builders based on the number of homes they build and realtors for the number that they sell. We should pay municipalities based on the number they permit.

Is that not common sense?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, slogans and buzzwords do not get housing built; constructive deals with municipalities and provinces do. We see time and time again that Conservatives have nothing to propose but cuts, conditions and fights with municipalities, fights with community organizations, crossing their arms and tossing insults at people, instead of actually proposing a real plan.

We are busy working on delivering hundreds of thousands of new homes over the coming years. This is the work that needs to get done. The Conservative leader just needs to get out of the way.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this just goes to show once again that the Prime Minister

is not worth the cost of housing. He says that housing will be built over the coming years. He has been the Prime Minister for eight years. What has happened? He has doubled the cost of housing. Housing prices in Montreal have actually tripled in eight years.

My common-sense plan will incentivize municipalities to build more housing by giving them bonuses if they build more and penalties if they build less. That is just common sense.

Will the Prime Minister finally follow through on a plan for more housing and less red tape?

● (1500)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative leader is offering budget cuts, austerity and disputes with municipalities and non-profit organizations, or NPOs, across the country. We are choosing to work hand in hand with the municipalities, the provinces and NPOs to build more housing, lower rents and create more opportunities for families and young people to purchase a home.

We have a concrete plan that we are implementing. He has nothing to offer but insults, attacks, budget cuts and austerity.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICES AND PROCUREMENT

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the government is mired in one of the worst financial scandals in the public service. It happened somewhere in the public service, yet to be determined. It is the worst scandal since the sponsorship scandal, which relegated the Liberal Party to obscurity for many years.

We have made four clear requests: that the Prime Minister acknowledge his responsibility; that he call an independent inquiry in addition to, but more limited than, that of other authorities; that he recover the money, for goodness' sake; and that he put the CBSA under administrative supervision after this massive mistake.

Let us start with the first. Will the Prime Minister admit that, as Prime Minister, he is accountable and responsible to the people of Quebec and Canada?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, obviously this situation is unacceptable. That is why the authorities are looking into this procurement project, which obviously did not work as it should have. We expect anyone who took advantage of and personally profited from the activities of a government, whose priority was to save lives during the COVID-19 pandemic, to face the consequences. We are ensuring that the authorities can do their work.

Oral Questions

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, at least there is one thing we agree on: This is unacceptable. That means that the Prime Minister is responsible for something unacceptable. Take some action, please.

What is he going to do to recover the tens of millions of misspent dollars? Will he put the Canada Border Services Agency under administrative supervision and launch an independent inquiry, one that has the added appeal of going back as far as the Harper years?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said, we agree. This situation is unacceptable. That is why the authorities are closely examining the procurement process and looking at all the years when individuals involved in these companies may have benefited from government procurement projects. This is something that we obviously have to take seriously and that the authorities are taking seriously.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have to wonder what was going through the mind of the Bloc Québécois leader when the Prime Minister asked him to spend \$24 million on an app that was supposed to cost \$80,000. He said that he would vote yes, regardless of the cost. That is what the Bloc Québécois said.

In fact, the Bloc Québécois House leader said that it is not the Bloc Québécois's job to scrutinize everything the government spends. Its members just tell the government, "Go ahead".

What is the point of the Bloc Québécois?

The Speaker: I see the right hon. Prime Minister rising to answer that question. I would just like to remind all members that questions must concern the administration of government or committee business.

The right hon. Prime Minister.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Conservative Party asked me what the point of the Bloc Québécois is. I think that question shows contempt for Quebecers. Although I disagree with the Bloc Québécois and the way it is constantly trying to pick fights, Quebecers in many ridings voted for Bloc Québécois members, who are just doing their job here in the House of Commons.

We saw this same contempt for Quebecers shown to mayors Marchand and Plante. It is something we see from the Conservative Party all the time.

The fact is, we all have a job to do, and we do it here in the House.

• (1505)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this new Liberal-Bloc marriage is a sight to behold. The Prime Minister compliments the Bloc Québécois, who in turn applauds the Prime Minister. The Bloc Québécois votes to give more money for arrive scam and to radically increase the taxes imposed by this Prime Minister. The Bloc Québécois votes for housing policies that have doubled the cost of housing for Quebecers. The Bloc Québécois votes with the Prime Minister to release criminals back onto the streets.

What is the point of this Liberal-Bloc marriage?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is another very clear display of the Conservative Party's contempt not only for Quebecers, but also for democracy.

I have spent my entire political career fighting for federalism in Quebec and for a united Canada, quite often against the Bloc Québécois. However, I have always had a deep respect for anyone who runs for office to serve their community and to be elected to the House of Commons.

The Conservatives' contempt for democracy should be worrisome to Quebecers and to all Canadians.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am simply asking the same question the Quebec premier did. It was François Legault who asked what the point of voting for the Bloc Québécois was. I know it helps the Prime Minister, because the Bloc Québécois voted with the Prime Minister to radically increase taxes on gasoline and diesel. The Bloc Québécois supported the ban on hunting rifles for Quebecers in the regions. The Bloc Québécois is voting to release criminals and cause a crime wave on the streets. That means voting for the Bloc Québécois helps the Prime Minister.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I heard another display of utter contempt for democracy and for Quebecers, but I did not hear a question.

* * *

JUSTICE

Ms. Anju Dhillon (Dorval—Lachine—LaSalle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, protecting children is a priority for our government.

On Monday, we introduced the online harms act. Before the House even had the opportunity to look at the bill, the Conservatives indicated that they would oppose this protection. Even more shocking is the fact that they want to make Canadians share their personal information with dubious websites.

Can the Prime Minister tell Canadian families how the act will protect them?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Dorval—Lachine—LaSalle for her important question.

We are working hard to fight the very real impacts and tragic consequences of online harms. We are doing that by ensuring that social media platforms adhere to their own security policies. The Conservative leader's plan involves forcing Canadians to have a digital ID and expecting them to share their personal information with dubious websites.

Canadians, especially children, deserve to be safe in every aspect of their lives, including online.

TAXATION

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is not worth the cost of everything going up. He increased a tax on energy with the support of the Bloc Québécois, which wants to drastically increase it. He increased payroll taxes, once again with the support of the Bloc Québécois. He has driven up inflationary spending with the support of the Bloc Québécois, which voted in favour of all this discretionary spending.

Now he wants to increase taxes on beer, wine and all other alcoholic beverages as of April 1. People need a drink after all the taxes this Prime Minister makes them pay.

Will he cancel these increases?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, we see how badly the leader of the Conservative Party wants to pick a fight.

We are here to invest to support vulnerable Canadians, whether it is with dental care or child care spaces. We are here to invest in our seniors and to protect their pensions when he attacks the pension plan. We are here to help Canadians every step of the way. We will always put the most vulnerable Canadians first.

• (1510)

[English]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our Conservative common-sense plan will axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime.

Meanwhile, the NDP-Liberal Prime Minister has raised taxes on gas, heat, groceries and paycheques; raised income taxes on middle-class and lower-income Canadians; and raised taxes on small businesses. He keeps raising taxes. It is enough to drive a man to drink, but he wants to tax that too on April 1 with another 5% increase on beer, wine and spirits that will kill jobs for those workers and raise costs for consumers.

Will he have the humanity to let someone have a drink in peace?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while the Conservative leader continues to figure out catchy slogans and buzzwords, we are rolling up our sleeves to deliver for Canadians with more housing, dental care, supports for seniors, supports for young families and fighting against climate change while putting more money in their pockets.

We are doing the hard work of delivering for Canadians while he proposes nothing but cuts to programs, austerity and catchy slogans. We need a continued, responsible approach to government, and that is exactly what we are delivering.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after reports that the RCMP had to intervene at the Winnipeg Lab due to a security breach and the great public speculation of espionage by a foreign dictatorship at that Canadian lab, the Prime Minister fought tooth and nail to prevent any of the documents from coming out, including by defying a motion of this House. We found out from a letter written by all parties that had

Oral Questions

seen the documents, including a Liberal MP, that this was to cover up embarrassment, not protect national security.

What did the Prime Minister have to hide?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the ministers will be tabling the documents resulting from this process after question period.

I will note in this question period, following the two-year anniversary of Russia's invasion of Ukraine, that the Leader of the Opposition had nothing to say about this war raging in Ukraine, nothing to say to Ukrainian Canadians as Canada signed security assurances guaranteeing support to Ukraine for the next 10 years. He demonstrates once again he is non-committal in his support toward Ukraine and his support toward Ukrainians.

It is shameful that the Leader of the Opposition will not talk about—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Halifax West.

* * *

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Ms. Lena Metlege Diab (Halifax West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the lobster industry is a crucial part of the economy in the Atlantic provinces. Last week, Conservative MPs from Ontario and Alberta saw fit to shockingly attack this industry, the economy of our region and, by definition, the women and men who make the industry thrive.

Can the Prime Minister tell fishers from my region why, contrary to the opposition, we will always promote this important industry abroad?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Halifax West for her advocacy on behalf of Atlantic Canadians.

On this side of the House, we are proud that Canadian lobster is being exported around the world, bringing \$2.6 billion to our economy and supporting the livelihoods of communities across the Atlantic.

Last week, Conservative leadership demonstrated that it does not care to understand the economic importance of this industry for our east coast. Atlantic Conservative MPs who stand with their constituents should demand an apology from their leader and their deputy leader for the disdain they showed toward hard-working Atlantic—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley.

*Points of Order***EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS**

Mr. Taylor Bachrach (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, people across northwest B.C. are deeply concerned about the ongoing drought. Last summer saw record wildfires across Canada. Farmers could not get their crops. Wild salmon were stranded on their way to spawn. Right now, with very little snow in the mountains, next summer could look even worse. While the Conservatives remain silent around the harsh impacts of climate change, the Liberals appear to be satisfied with business as usual.

Is there a concerted national plan to address the droughts and wildfires we expect this summer and, if there is, what is it?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last year was one of the worst wildfire seasons on record. We saw droughts. We saw floods. We know that the impact of climate change is real right across the country, something that the Conservative Party continues to deny. The reality is that our Minister of Emergency Preparedness was there to engage with ministers across the—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

• (1515)

The Speaker: Order.

Colleagues, it is important not to be disruptive in the House and to cause disorder in the House. This applies to all members from all sides. I encourage you, please, to conduct yourselves accordingly, to allow questions to be asked and for answers to be given.

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

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, Conservative MPs just demonstrated their complete lack of respect for their constituents who face the direct impacts of climate change in floods, wildfires and droughts right across the country. The fact is that they have no solutions, no plan to deal with it.

Our Minister of Emergency Preparedness has already engaged with partners across the country in provision of what may be a very bad season for climate impacts and for wildfires. That is why we are going to continue to fight against climate change while we grow the economy and be there to support Canadians from coast to coast to coast, something that Conservatives have no plan for.

* * *

CLIMATE CHANGE

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, to the Prime Minister, who is so concerned about the wildfires and the zombie fires still under the snow, the wildfire season has already started and yet, quietly, on Friday, February 16, Environment Canada posted an extension to consultation on clean electricity regulations. The David Suzuki Foundation has posted a warning. Does this mean more delay? Does this mean that clean electricity regulations are to be weakened?

Can the Prime Minister assure all Canadians that we have more than rhetoric to throw at the wildfires in this country?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, following consultations that started in August 2023, we recently released an updated draft of the clean electricity regulations. A net-

zero grid will serve as the basis for climate actions across the economy, like helping Canadians switch to electric transportation and heating. Our government is committed to working closely with all provinces, territories and partners on delivering the benefits of a clean grid in a way that ensures reliability and affordability for all Canadians.

* * *

NATIONAL MICROBIOLOGY LABORATORY

Hon. Mark Holland (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I am tabling, in both official languages, documents from the Public Health Agency of Canada and the Canadian Security Intelligence Service related to the investigation into the activities and subsequent termination of the employment of two scientists at the National Microbiology Laboratory.

These documents are being tabled in accordance with the memorandum of understanding agreed to by the government and three opposition parties in the House in October 2022. They have been reviewed and vetted by the ad hoc committee of parliamentarians, with the support of an independent panel of arbiters, in accordance with the terms of the memorandum of understanding. This process has demonstrated that the parties of this House can work together to ensure accountability and transparency to Canadians.

I would also draw members' attention to the departmental statement that will be issued by the Public Health Agency today, which outlines the actions that have been taken by the agency since 2019 to address and highlight these documents.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

ORAL QUESTIONS

Mr. Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. During question period, the member for Elmwood—Transcona issued a repulsive, vulgar and unparliamentary remark to members of the Conservative opposition.

I would like you to ask him to withdraw that remark.

• (1520)

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in the course of expressing concern for the tongues of certain Conservative members that I feared would get stuck in the backside of their leader as he exited the chamber, I did indeed use unparliamentary language, and for that—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: The hon. member is an experienced member of this House. His language evokes an image that is clearly unparliamentary. I will ask the member to withdraw those comments forthwith.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I unconditionally apologize for the comments, although I insist—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: The Chair has heard the hon. member apologize, which is appropriate.

That brings us back to the original point; the hon. member was in the middle of, I hope, withdrawing his comment.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: I do, Mr. Speaker. I withdraw the comments.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think we just witnessed a very disgraceful, disrespectful display in question period today, which is clearly against the Standing Orders. The members across the aisle here owe an apology to the member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley, who gets to ask a question just like everyone else in this House.

I ask that you, Mr. Speaker, consider what you might do in the event that this occurs again.

The Speaker: I will take that matter under advisement.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—ARRIVECAN APP

The House resumed from February 27 consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: It being 3:23 p.m., the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion of the Leader of the Opposition relating to the business of supply.

The question is as follows. Shall I dispense?

Some hon. members: No.

[Chair read text of motion to House]

• (1535)

[Translation]

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

(Division No. 648)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Angus	Arnold
Ashton	Bachrach
Baldinelli	Barlow
Barrett	Barron
Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu

Bergeron	Berthold
Bérubé	Bezan
Blaikie	Blanchet
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney
Block	Boulerice
Bragdon	Brassard
Brock	Brunelle-Duceppe
Calkins	Cannings
Caputo	Carrie
Chabot	Chambers
Champoux	Chong
Collins (Victoria)	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	Davies
DeBellefeuille	d'Entremont
Desbiens	Desilets
Doherty	Dowdall
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Ferreri	Findlay
Fortin	Gallant
Garon	Garrison
Gaudreau	Gazan
Généreux	Genuis
Gill	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Gray
Green	Hallan
Hoback	Hughes
Idlout	Jeneroux
Johns	Julian
Kelly	Khanna
Kitchen	Kmiec
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kurek	Kusie
Kwan	Lake
Larouche	Lawrence
Lehoux	Lemire
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
MacGregor	Maguire
Majumdar	Martel
Mathysen	May (Saanic—Gulf Islands)
Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLean	McPherson
Melillo	Michaud
Moore	Morantz
Morrice	Morrison
Motz	Muys
Nater	Normandin
Patzner	Paul-Hus
Pauzé	Perkins
Perron	Poilievre
Rayes	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Richards	Roberts
Rood	Ruff
Savard-Tremblay	Scheer
Schmale	Seeback
Shields	Shipley
Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
Singh	Small
Soroka	Steinley
Ste-Marie	Stewart
Strahl	Stubbs
Thériault	Therrien
Thomas	Tochou
Tolmie	Trudel
Uppal	Van Popta
Vecchio	Vidal
Vien	Viersen

Private Members' Business

Vignola	Villemure
Vis	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Weber	Williams
Williamson	Zarrillo — 170

NAYS**Members**

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Atwin
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Battiste
Beech	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Blois	Boissonnault
Bradford	Brière
Carr	Casey
Chagger	Chahal
Champagne	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Damoff	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Dong	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Fry
Gaheer	Gainey
Gerretsen	Gould
Hajdu	Hanley
Hardie	Hepfner
Holland	Housefather
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Ien
Jaczek	Joly
Jones	Jowhari
Kayabaga	Kelloway
Khalid	Khera
Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lattanzio	Lauzon
Lebouthillier	Lightbound
Long	Longfield
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
May (Cambridge)	McDonald (Avalon)
McGuinty	McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod
Mendès	Mendicino
Miao	Miller
Morrissey	Murray
Naqvi	Noormohamed
O'Connell	Oliphant
O'Regan	Petitpas Taylor
Powlowski	Qualtrough
Robillard	Rogers
Romanado	Rota
Sahota	Sajjan
Saks	Samson
Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)

Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sorbara
Sousa	St-Onge
Sudds	Tassi
Taylor Roy	Thompson
Trudeau	Turnbull
Valdez	Van Bynen
van Koeverden	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Virani
Weiler	Wilkinson
Yip	Zahid
Zuberi — 149	

PAIRED**Members**

Deltell	Dreeshen
Guilbeault	LeBlanc
Ng	Plamondon
Rodriguez	Zimmer — 8

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

● (1540)

[*English*]

CANADIAN RADIO-TELEVISION AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION ACT

The House resumed from February 15 consideration of the motion that Bill C-354, An Act to amend the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission Act (Quebec's cultural distinctiveness and French-speaking communities), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Deputy Speaker: The House will now proceed to the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading on Bill C-354 under Private Members' Business.

● (1550)

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

(*Division No. 649*)

YEAS**Members**

Aboultatif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Angus	Arnold
Ashton	Bachrach
Baldinelli	Barlow
Barrett	Barron
Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Bergeron	Berthold
Bérubé	Bezan
Blaikie	Blanchet
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney
Block	Boulerice
Bragdon	Brassard
Brock	Brunelle-Duceppe
Calkins	Cannings
Caputo	Carrie
Chabot	Chambers
Champoux	Chong
Collins (Victoria)	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	Davies

Private Members' Business

DeBellefeuille
Desilets
Dowdall
Ellis
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Findlay
Gallant
Garrison
Gazan
Genuis
Gladu
Goodridge
Gray
Hallan
Hughes
Jeneroux
Julian
Khanna
Kmicic
Kramp-Neuman
Kusie
Lake
Lawrence
Lemire
Lewis (Essex)
Liepert
Lobb
Maguire
Martel
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McPherson
Michaud
Morantz
Motz
Nater
Patzner
Pauzé
Perron
Rayes
Reid
Richards
Rood
Savard-Tremblay
Schmale
Shields
Simard
Singh
Soroka
Ste-Marie
Strahl
Thériault
Thomas
Tolmie
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vignola
Vis
Waugh
Williams
Zarrillo— 167

Desbiens
Doherty
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Ferreri
Fortin
Garon
Gaudreau
Généreux
Gill
Godin
Gourde
Green
Hoback
Idlout
Johns
Kelly
Kitchen
Kram
Kurek
Kwan
Larouche
Lehoux
Leslie
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lloyd
MacGregor
Majumdar
Mathysen
Mazier
McLean
Melillo
Moore
Morrison
Muys
Normandin
Paul-Hus
Perkins
Poilievre
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Roberts
Ruff
Scheer
Seeback
Shipley
Sinclair-Desgagné
Small
Steinley
Stewart
Stubbs
Therrien
Tochor
Trudel
Van Popta
Vidal
Viersen
Villemure
Wagantall
Webber
Williamson

NAYS**Members**

Aldag
Ali
Anandasangaree
Arya
Badawey
Baker

Alghabra
Anand
Arseneault
Atwin
Bains
Battiste

Beech
Bittle
Blois
Bradford
Carr
Chagger
Champagne
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Coteau
Damoff
Dhillon
Dong
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser
Gaheer
Gerretsen
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Jaczek
Jones
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Lattanzio
Lebouthillier
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)
Maloney
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Miao
Morrice
Murray
Noormohamed
Oliphant
Petipas Taylor
Qualtrough
Rogers
Rota
Sajjan
Samson
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sorbara
St-Onge
Tassi
Thompson
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandal
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid

Bibeau
Blair
Boissonnault
Brière
Casey
Chahal
Chatel
Chiang
Cormier
Dabrusin
Dhaliwal
Diab
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fry
Ganey
Gould
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hutchings
Ien
Joly
Jowhari
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lauzon
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martinez Ferrada
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod
Mendicino
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
O'Connell
O'Regan
Powlowski
Robillard
Romanado
Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Schieffe
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sousa
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Trudeau
Valdez
van Koevreden
Vandenbeld
Weiler
Yip
Zuberi— 150

Private Members' Business

PAIRED

Members

Deltell	Dreeshen
Guilbeault	LeBlanc
Ng	Plamondon
Rodriguez	Zimmer— 8

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried. Accordingly, the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage.

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

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed from February 16 consideration of the motion that Bill C-321, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (assaults against persons who provide health services and first responders), be read the third time and passed.

The Deputy Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at third reading stage of C-321 under Private Members' Business.

• (1600)

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

(Division No. 650)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	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	Bergeron
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	Carr
Carrie	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Chambers
Champagne	Champoux
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Chong
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cooper	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Dalton	Damoff
Dancho	Davidson

Davies	DeBellefeuille
Desbiens	Desilets
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Doherty
Dong	Dowdall
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Epp
Erskine-Smith	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Ferreri	Fillmore
Findlay	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Fry
Gaheer	Gainey
Gallant	Garon
Garrison	Gaudreau
Gazan	Généreux
Genuis	Gerretsen
Gill	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gould	Gourde
Gray	Green
Hajdu	Hallan
Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Hoback
Holland	Housefather
Hughes	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Ien	Jaczek
Jeneroux	Johns
Joly	Jones
Jowhari	Julian
Kayabaga	Kelloway
Kelly	Khalid
Khanna	Khera
Kitchen	Kmiec
Koutrakis	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Kusmierczyk
Kwan	Lake
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lamoureux	Lantsman
Lapointe	Larouche
Lattanzio	Lauzon
Lawrence	Lebouthillier
Lehoux	Lemire
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lightbound	Lloyd
Lobb	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maguire	Majumdar
Maloney	Martel
Martinez Ferrada	Mathysen
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLean	McLeod
McPherson	Melillo
Mendès	Mendicino
Miao	Michaud
Miller	Moore
Morantz	Morrice
Morrison	Morrissey
Motz	Murray
Muys	Naqvi

Private Members' Business

Nater
 Normandin
 Oliphant
 Patzer
 Pauzé
 Perron
 Poilievre
 Qualtrough
 Redekopp
 Rempel Garner
 Roberts
 Rogers
 Rood
 Ruff
 Sajjan
 Samson
 Savard-Tremblay
 Scheer
 Schmale
 Serré
 Shanahan
 Shields
 Sidhu (Brampton East)
 Simard
 Singh
 Sorbara
 Sousa
 Ste-Marie
 St-Onge
 Stubbs
 Tassi
 Thériault
 Thomas
 Tochor
 Trudeau
 Turnbull
 Valdez
 van Koeverden
 Vandal
 Vecchio
 Vien
 Vignola
 Virani
 Wagantall
 Waugh
 Weiler
 Williams
 Yip
 Zarrillo

Noormohamed
 O'Connell
 O'Regan
 Paul-Hus
 Perkins
 Petipas Taylor
 Powlowski
 Rayes
 Reid
 Richards
 Robillard
 Romanado
 Rota
 Sahota
 Saks
 Sarai
 Scarpaleggia
 Schiefke
 Seeback
 Sgro
 Sheehan
 Shipley
 Sidhu (Brampton South)
 Sinclair-Desgagné
 Small
 Soroka
 Steinley
 Stewart
 Strahl
 Suds
 Taylor Roy
 Therrien
 Thompson
 Tolmie
 Trudel
 Uppal
 Van Bynen
 Van Popta
 Vandenbeld
 Vidal
 Viersen
 Villemure
 Vis
 Warkentin
 Webber
 Wilkinson
 Williamson
 Zahid
 Zuberi — 318

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Members

Deltell
 Guilbeault
 Ng
 Rodriguez

Dreeshen
 LeBlanc
 Plamondon
 Zimmer — 8

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

* * *

[*Translation*]

CORRECTIONS AND CONDITIONAL RELEASE ACT

The House resumed from February 27 consideration of the motion that Bill C-320, An Act to amend the Corrections and Condi-

tional Release Act (disclosure of information to victims), be read the third time and passed.

The Deputy Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at third reading stage of Bill C-320 under Private Members' Business.

• (1615)

[*English*]

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

(*Division No. 651*)

YEAS

Members

Abouitaif
 Albas
 Alghabra
 Allison
 Anandasangaree
 Arnold
 Arya
 Atwin
 Badawey
 Baker
 Barlow
 Barron
 Battiste
 Beech
 Berthold
 Bezan
 Bittle
 Blair
 Blanchette-Joncas
 Block
 Boissonnault
 Bradford
 Brassard
 Brock
 Calkins
 Caputo
 Carrie
 Chabot
 Chahal
 Champagne
 Chatel
 Chiang
 Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
 Cooper
 Coteau
 Dalton
 Dancho
 Davies
 Desbiens
 Dhaliwal
 Diab
 Dong
 Drouin
 Duclos
 Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
 Ehsassi
 Ellis
 Erskine-Smith
 Falk (Provencher)
 Ferreri
 Findlay
 Fonseca
 Fortin
 Fraser
 Gaheer
 Aitchison
 Aldag
 Ali
 Anand
 Angus
 Arseneault
 Ashton
 Bachrach
 Bains
 Baldinelli
 Barrett
 Barsalou-Duval
 Beaulieu
 Bergeron
 Bérubé
 Bibeau
 Blaikie
 Blanchet
 Blaney
 Blois
 Boulterice
 Bragdon
 Brière
 Brunelle-Duceppe
 Cannings
 Carr
 Casey
 Chagger
 Chambers
 Champoux
 Chen
 Chong
 Collins (Victoria)
 Cormier
 Dabrusin
 Damoff
 Davidson
 DeBellefeuille
 Desilets
 Dhillon
 Doherty
 Dowdall
 Dubourg
 Duguid
 Dzerowicz
 El-Khoury
 Epp
 Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
 Fast
 Fillmore
 Fisher
 Fortier
 Fragiskatos
 Fry
 Gainey

Routine Proceedings

Gallant	Garon	Schiefke	Schmale
Garrison	Gaudreau	Seeback	Serré
Gazan	Généreux	Sgro	Shanahan
Genuis	Gerretsen	Sheehan	Shields
Gill	Gladu	Shiple	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Godin	Goodridge	Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
Gould	Gourde	Sinclair-Desgagné	Singh
Gray	Green	Small	Sorbara
Hajdu	Hallan	Soroka	Sousa
Hanley	Hardie	Steinley	Ste-Marie
Hepfner	Hoback	Stewart	St-Onge
Holland	Housefather	Strahl	Stubbs
Hughes	Hussen	Sudds	Tassi
Hutchings	Iacono	Taylor Roy	Thériault
Idlout	Ien	Therrien	Thomas
Jaczek	Jeneroux	Thompson	Tochor
Johns	Joly	Tolmie	Trudeau
Jones	Jowhari	Trudel	Turnbull
Julian	Kayabaga	Uppal	Valdez
Kelloway	Kelly	Van Bynen	van Koeverden
Khalid	Khanna	Van Popta	Vandal
Khera	Kitchen	Vandenbeld	Vecchio
Kmiec	Koutrakis	Vidal	Vien
Kram	Kramp-Neuman	Viersen	Vignola
Kurek	Kusie	Villemure	Virani
Kusmierczyk	Kwan	Vis	Wagantall
Lake	Lalonde	Warkentin	Waugh
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux	Webber	Weiler
Lantsman	Lapointe	Wilkinson	Williams
Larouche	Lattanzio	Williamson	Yip
Lauzon	Lawrence	Zahid	Zarrillo
Lebouthillier	Lehoux	Zuberi— 319	
Lemire	Leslie		
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)		
Liepert	Lightbound		
Lloyd	Lobb	Nil	
Long	Longfield		
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)		
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacGregor		
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maguire		
Majumdar	Maloney		
Martel	Martinez Ferrada	Deltell	Dreeschen
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)	Guilbeault	LeBlanc
May (Saanic—Gulf Islands)	Mazier	Ng	Plamondon
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McDonald (Avalon)	Rodriguez	Zimmer— 8
McGuinty	McKay		
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLean		
McLeod	McPherson		
Melillo	Mendès		
Mendicino	Miao		
Michaud	Miller		
Moore	Morantz		
Morrice	Morrison		
Morrissey	Motz		
Murray	Muys		
Naqvi	Nater		
Noormohamed	Normandin		
O'Connell	Oliphant		
O'Regan	Patzer		
Paul-Hus	Pauzé		
Perkins	Perron		
Petitpas Taylor	Poilievre		
Powlowski	Qualtrough		
Rayes	Redekopp		
Reid	Rempel Garner		
Richards	Roberts		
Robillard	Rogers		
Romanado	Rood		
Rota	Ruff		
Sahota	Sajjan		
Saks	Samson		
Sarai	Savard-Tremblay		
Scarpaleggia	Scheer		

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Members

Deltell
 Guilbeault
 Ng
 Rodriguez

Dreeschen
 LeBlanc
 Plamondon
 Zimmer— 8

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: I wish to inform the House that because of the deferred recorded divisions, Government Orders will be extended by 51 minutes.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

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

While I am on my feet, I move:

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

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on the motion.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, we request a recorded division.

The Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

• (1700)

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

(Division No. 652)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Atwin	Bachrach
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Barron
Battiste	Beech
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blaney	Blois
Boulerice	Bradford
Brière	Cannings
Carr	Casey
Chagger	Chahal
Champagne	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
Davies	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Fry	Gaheer
Gainey	Garrison
Gazan	Gerretsen
Gould	Green
Hajdu	Hanley
Hardie	Hepfner
Holland	Housefather
Hughes	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Idlout	Ien
Jaczek	Johns
Joly	Jones
Jowhari	Julian
Kayabaga	Kelloway
Khalid	Khera
Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Kwan	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lattanzio
Lauzon	Lebouthillier
Lightbound	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada

Mathysen
 May (Saanic—Gulf Islands)
 McGuinty
 McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
 McPherson
 Mendicino
 Miller
 Murray
 Noormohamed
 Oliphant
 Petitpas Taylor
 Qualtrough
 Rogers
 Rota
 Sajjan
 Samson
 Scarpaleggia
 Serré
 Shanahan
 Sidhu (Brampton East)
 Singh
 Sousa
 Suds
 Taylor Roy
 Trudeau
 Valdez
 van Koeverden
 Vandenbeld
 Weiler
 Yip
 Zarrillo

Routine Proceedings

May (Cambridge)
 McDonald (Avalon)
 McKay
 McLeod
 Mendès
 Miao
 Morrissey
 Naqvi
 O'Connell
 O'Regan
 Powlowski
 Robillard
 Romanado
 Sahota
 Saks
 Sarai
 Schiefke
 Sgro
 Sheehan
 Sidhu (Brampton South)
 Sorbara
 St-Onge
 Tassi
 Thompson
 Turnbull
 Van Bynen
 Vandal
 Virani
 Wilkinson
 Zahid
 Zuberi— 170

NAYS

Members

Aboutaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Bergeron	Berthold
Bérubé	Bezan
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins
Caputo	Carrie
Chabot	Chambers
Champoux	Chong
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	Davidson
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Desilets	Doherty
Dowdall	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Ellis	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Fast	Ferreri
Findlay	Fortin
Gallant	Garon
Gaudreau	Généreux
Genuis	Gill
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Hoback	Jeneroux
Kelly	Khanna
Kitchen	Kmiec
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kurek	Kusie
Lake	Lantsman
Larouche	Lawrence
Lehoux	Lemire
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)

S. O. 57

Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Maguire	Majumdar
Martel	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Melillo	Michaud
Moore	Morantz
Morrice	Morrison
Motz	Muys
Nater	Normandin
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Pauzé	Perkins
Perron	Poillievre
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Roberts	Rood
Ruff	Savard-Tremblay
Scheer	Schmale
Seeback	Shields
Shipley	Simard
Sinclair-Desgagné	Small
Soroka	Steinley
Ste-Marie	Stewart
Strahl	Stubbs
Thériault	Therrien
Thomas	Tochor
Tolmie	Trudel
Uppal	Van Popta
Vecchio	Vidal
Vien	Viersen
Vignola	Villemure
Vis	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Williams	Williamson— 144

PAIRED

Members

Deltell	Dreeshen
Guilbeault	LeBlanc
Ng	Plamondon
Rodriguez	Zimmer— 8

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa, Carbon Pricing; the hon. member for Courtenay—Alberni, Taxation; the hon. member for Calgary Nose Hill, Public Safety.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS NO. 35—EXTENSION OF SITTING HOURS AND CONDUCT OF EXTENDED PROCEEDINGS

MOTION THAT DEBATE BE NOT FURTHER ADJOURNED

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in relation to the consideration of Government Business No. 35, I move:

That debate be not further adjourned.

[English]

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 67(1), there will now be a 30-minute question period. I invite hon. members

who wish to ask questions to rise or use the “raise hand” function so the Chair can have some idea of the number of members who wish to participate in this question period.

The hon. member for Barrie—Innisfil.

Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what a tangled web we weave and how cynical the government has become over the years.

I recall, in 2015, when the Prime Minister, with hand over heart, said that better was possible and things were going to be different. In the 2015 election, one of the things Liberals talked about was making Parliament more functional and allowing the opposition parties to be the voices of their constituents, yet here we are again with this motion, which is effectively controlling this place, just as the Prime Minister has had a propensity to do in the past.

Does the government House leader not understand the significance of his actions for future Parliaments and what this could mean for the future of this place? In this place, things, as they relate to the Standing Orders, are built on consensus. This is anything but. This is the government strong-arming itself over the will of Parliament.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I reject the premise of the member's question. I fail to see how a motion that expands the time available for members to debate bills, budgets and motions in this chamber is somehow undemocratic. In fact, we would be giving the opposition more opportunity to do so.

However, as the member well knows because he attends caucus meetings, the word from on high, from the Leader of the Opposition, is to block everything and not allow any progress on any bill. It does not matter if it is child care. It is does not matter if it is for supports for Canadians. It does not matter if it is dental care. It does not matter if these things are positive and could positively impact Canadians' lives. They are to obstruct all the time.

We would be allowing members of the opposition to debate these things for a longer period of time, and I fail to see how that creates anything but a healthy precedent of the hours we spend in this chamber.

• (1705)

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have said many times that there are two bloc parties in the House of Commons, the Bloc Québécois and the “block everything” party, which is the Conservatives, who have systematically blocked every piece of legislation.

Now, if the Conservatives read the motion, and I am not sure that my colleague from Barrie—Innisfil actually read what is before the House, they would see that there are two aspects to it. First, of course, is the fact that we would be working into the evening, which would allow more time for debate in the evenings and more time for members of Parliament to be heard. Second, and this is perhaps the most important aspect, is that it would eliminate the toxic overnight voting, which has been propelled by the member for Carleton, who did not even show up last time. During 30 hours of votes, he showed up for an hour. This just shows—

The Deputy Speaker: I cannot believe we are getting into this discussion once again of underlining who is here and who is not. I will say that, when we bring up who voted, when they voted, whether they were here or whether they were not, we are not supposed to say that part. How members voted and what is on the public record are full game.

The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, absolutely, the member for Carleton voted six times in person and the rest of the time voted, I guess, online.

The reality is that we need to ensure that the employees of the House of Commons, who are really the bastion of this democracy, are not forced to work overnight for 25 or 30 hours straight. The nine-hour health break would actually make a big difference in ensuring the health and safety of the employees who work here, as well as members of Parliament. What happened to my colleague and good friend, the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands, last June has to be a wake-up call for all of us.

As a result, I would simply ask my colleague across the way why the Conservatives have been blocking a motion that would basically do two things. It would allow more members of Parliament to speak in evening sessions, and it would stop toxic overnight voting, which the member for Carleton always seems to run away from.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to thank my colleague for his excellent summary of what this motion would accomplish. It would, simply put, allow more time for debate.

Every time we have discussions among parties, it is often stressed, from parties in any corner of the House, that we require more time to debate bills. Sometimes that is constructive, but sometimes it is obstructive. Sometimes members across the way simply talk things out that they know perfectly well would be good for Canadians and would impact positively on Canadians' lives in an immediate fashion, but they still persist in blocking and obstructing. Therefore, we are looking to give them more opportunities to speak and we will see whether they can, in fact, bring some constructive elements to the debate.

As to the health break, as with long-haul truckers, nurses and hard-working Canadians, and with the advances of the past few years in working conditions, no Canadian is expected to work 30 hours around the clock, much less to vote on billions of dollars of public expenditures. If we want to talk about irresponsibility with public expenditures, that would be the Conservatives asking 338 members of Parliament to opine on important matters at 3 a.m. or 4 a.m. That is not a reasonable proposition. No Canadian expects that. It is unhealthy, and it is unhealthy for the people who are forced to be in the chamber or around the parliamentary precinct to protect and support us as we do our work. Therefore, it is important that we move from this very toxic, obstructive environment to one that is healthier for all members in the House.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. friend from New Westminster—Burnaby for his really heartfelt concern for my health.

S. O. 57

I did have a hemorrhagic stroke after working, straight, seven days a week, for 51 days. For May and June, we were sitting until midnight. I can remember well when a different Speaker would say, "It now being 1:15 in the morning, the question is that the House do now adjourn. The hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands." He did not stop for a breath because I was doing adjournment proceedings.

I think that, if we are going to work those long hours, and everyone knows that I am not afraid of hard work, I want a nurse's station in the foyer. I want some health care professionals checking the blood pressure of members of Parliament, checking to see if their health needs attention. This would also be very important, as the hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby has said, for the workers in this place, who are not elected and who do not have the fantastic salaries we have to do this work.

I also believe if that, if we were to use the rules that exist, for instance, against reading a speech, as they do in the Parliament of Westminster, we could more expeditiously schedule our work so that we would have meaningful debate, as opposed to what sometimes, although I hate it to say it and I should not say it, resembles bad high school theatre.

I think we really do need to focus on debates and take our time to do it right. It is not about being afraid of hard work, but about not being forced into late night sessions, which are inevitably bad for everyone's health.

I thank all of my friends across all party benches who let me know that they prayed for me. I am miraculously healed.

• (1710)

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands for her observations. I know all of us are happy that she is back, hale and hearty, and that she is participating in this debate.

I would also say that, like so many other members on this side of the House, the member is not afraid of hard work and, more importantly, of putting in the preparation and study required to bring constructive ideas to the House and positive contributions to debate. Way too often, we fall into the trap of what we call dilatory motions. Those are things such as proceedings to consider committee reports from six months ago. They are designed just to block and obstruct, and obstruct what? They are designed to obstruct positive things, such as child care.

We are on the cusp of adopting a national child care plan for Canadians. Conservatives even voted for the bill in previous iterations, yet they will refuse to allow these things to come to a vote. Moms and dads out there watching need to know that the people standing in the way of putting a national child care program into law are Conservatives.

S. O. 57

Ms. Michelle Ferreri: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, just to reiterate to the hon. member opposite speaking about child care, that is already in place. There does not need—

The Deputy Speaker: That is debate.

The hon. government House leader.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I think we will all note that, once again, the member is standing up and refusing to allow a debate on child care and a vote on child care to occur in this chamber.

I want to finish my remarks and my thanking the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands for her many contributions and for her eternal concern for the respect of the rules of this place, as well as for the health and well-being of the people who inhabit this place from all parties and those who support us here. I think that her contributions have been very positive.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House that the opposition day designated for Thursday, February 29 has been undesignated and will now take place on Friday, March 1.

* * *

CANADA EARLY LEARNING AND CHILD CARE ACT

NOTICE OF CLOSURE MOTION

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that, with respect to the consideration of the motion relating to the Senate amendment to Bill C-35, an act respecting early learning and child care in Canada, at the next sitting of the House a minister of the Crown shall move, pursuant to Standing Order 57, that debate be not further adjourned.

* * *

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS NO. 35—EXTENSION OF SITTING HOURS AND CONDUCT OF EXTENDED PROCEEDINGS

MOTION THAT DEBATE BE NOT FURTHER ADJOURNED

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened to the member for Barrie—Innisfil talking about the Prime Minister's committing to doing things differently in Parliament. Perhaps the Prime Minister was giving too much credit to the Conservatives when he was making those comments, but they rely on the assumption that everybody, all 338 of us, comes here to do the job we were elected to do. The problem is that Conservatives have come here and think that their job is to obstruct absolutely everything.

The House leader has already mentioned that Conservatives, even if they agree with the bill, obstruct at every possible opportu-

nity. The member for Peterborough—Kawartha was just going on about the child care bill, a bill that she routinely got up to criticize the government on. Time after time, Conservatives would get up to criticize the bill. Then what did they do at the end of it? They voted in favour of it.

The same thing can be said regarding the scab legislation. They spoke against it and put up all the roadblocks to prevent it from being actually voted on, then when it came time to vote, they just really quietly yesterday stood up and started voting in favour of it. I am wondering whether the House leader can provide some insight as to why Conservatives are so genuinely interested in just obstructing absolutely everything.

• (1715)

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not reject the premise of that question. I cannot speak to their motivations, but I can speak to the phenomenon we see. We see it south of the border. We see it in some parts of Europe. We see it in the populist right wing that seeks to toxify our democratic institution, that seeks to conflate minor things and that seeks to make so toxic and so negative the proceedings of places like this, the most solemn of our democratic chambers in this country, so that Canadians turn away in anger or in sorrow from the debates we have in this place and tune out the very important things we discuss here. That is because the Conservatives think that if they make it toxic and negative, throw in enough vitriol, Canadians will turn away.

That is why we want to give more space for debate in this place. That is why we want to make sure members come to work healthy and prepared to seriously debate the issues, as many members choose to do in this chamber. However, on the right, we see more and more unfortunate efforts to toxify our politics, to make it negative and to make Canadians turn away and recoil in horror from the very important democratic debates we have in the chamber.

Mr. Scot Davidson (York—Simcoe, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether the member is the government House leader or whether the member for New Westminster—Burnaby is the government House leader; I have not had that clarified. However, I have listened to his comment.

Our job is to be the opposition. With all due respect to my colleague from Saanich—Gulf Islands, I listened to her saying we need a doctor and we need a nurse, but these are the very things we are in the House of Commons fighting for. The people in York—Simcoe cannot even ask for that. They do not have a doctor. They do not have a nurse. It is the very government across the aisle that is shutting down debate.

In my riding, we are sitting there fighting, wanting to talk about getting the rural top-up on the carbon tax. Here we are, and the current government is classifying my first nations, our first nations in York—Simcoe, as urban and part of Toronto. These are the debates we want to have, and again we see the government shutting down debate.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, the member ridiculed the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands for her very appropriate concern for the well-being of all members of the House. Let me point out to him once again a very ironic fact—

Mr. Scot Davidson: Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a point of order. I have to clarify that. With all due respect, I did not ridicule the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands.

The Deputy Speaker: Even though that is a point of debate, I appreciate the clarification.

The hon. government House leader has the floor.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member, however, for his concern for health care. I would really have appreciated it if he had been concerned enough about health care to go to his leader, on the eve of the estimates we just finished voting on before Christmas, to tell him to not vote against the 3.1 billion additional dollars we have provided for doctors, nurses and personal care workers in the member's home province of Ontario. This makes the point so eloquently.

He talks about health care; we have addressed health care. Who else thinks we have addressed it in Ontario? Doug Ford does. He was at the hospital with the Prime Minister, signing for the \$3.1 billion that the member, who professes to care about doctors and personal care workers, voted against. That is shameful. It is obstructive. It is toxic. It is cynical, and it does not help the people in York—Simcoe or the people anywhere in this country.

• (1720)

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I find it comical when I come in here and hear my Conservative colleague talk about people working hard, like my colleague from Saanich—Gulf Islands, for whom it takes 12 and a half hours, as it does for me, and three flights, on average, to get here. Members know we will be here tonight in late Adjournment Proceedings, dragging the Speaker and the government here. It is not a question of working hard. It takes some Conservative colleagues two hours to get here, and they are complaining about how hard we work.

The Conservative member talked about health care. Conservatives cut funding to health care. Ask people who live in Ontario, where Doug Ford lives, or people where Danielle Smith of the UCP lives. They do not stand up for workers. What we are talking about here is ensuring that workers are not working 30 hours, or from midnight to 9 a.m.

The member for Saanich—Gulf Islands talked about ensuring health supports for somebody. We cannot wait until somebody dies of a heart attack. “It is not worth the cost” is what the Conservatives keep talking about. Someone losing their life here by working from midnight until nine in the morning is not standing up for workers' rights. It is not being responsible and is not showing leadership.

If we listen to experts, a medical doctor or a mental health doctor, they would say this is not sustainable and is not appropriate. If we are going to show leadership in this country, it is time we stop sitting all night, from midnight until nine in the morning. I want to be here until midnight. I want to work; I came here to work, but we have to take responsibility and show leadership. This is the right decision and long overdue.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for Courtenay—Alberni, because it is time to actually address this in a very serious manner.

S. O. 57

There are 338 members of the chamber. It is not healthy for any single one of us to be forced to vote on billion-dollar items for 30 straight hours. It is not healthy for anyone, and there are members of the House with health conditions, issues that quite predictably make their families, friends and constituents anxious because they should not be here voting for 30 consecutive hours, forced by the Leader of the Opposition and an obstructive, toxic force across the way. That is not okay. Someone could be seriously harmed by that.

I used to be the chief government whip, and the welfare of the members was very important to me, as it is to our current chief government whip and, I am sure, to all whips. The fact is that we cannot make sure the resources such as the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands was calling for, or any of the other supports that are required, are here so we can be certain all members are safe. We need members to be safe. No one sends us here to be unsafe and to enjoy unsafe working conditions. Those are unsafe working conditions. Who knew they were unsafe? The Leader of the Opposition did. He did six votes from his seat and 124 of them from a McDonald's franchise and a Conservative fundraiser.

• (1725)

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, the member was a lobbyist for numerous multinational corporations, and has since been in the House for a long time and knows he cannot refer to whether a member is or is not in the House.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: On that point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is of public record how a member voted, whether in person or on the app. All the House leader did was reference that.

The Deputy Speaker: I think I have said on many occasions in the last few days that the record is fair game. If it is on the books, it is actually on the public record, but we just cannot say whether somebody is in the chamber or not.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when I look at what is being proposed by the government, one thing is the response to the need to have additional debate time on government legislation. That is really what this is all about, in addition to not having to sit or vote for 30 hours straight, including between midnight and 9 a.m.

This would be to enable members to address and debate more on government legislation. I would think that having more time would be a good thing that members opposite would want to support, because I often see them on the other side crying and saying they want more time. We would be giving them more time, and I would think they would support the motion to extend the time. Many Canadians from coast to coast to coast work into the evenings. There is nothing wrong with members of Parliament having to work a few extra hours in the evening to allow for more debate.

Could I get the government House leader's thoughts on that?

S. O. 57

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, that is of course exactly why we reject the premise that this in any way would undermine the rights of parliamentarians; in fact, it would expand them. It would allow members more time and more opportunity, potentially, to debate bills that are contentious.

We hope the time available and afforded to the members of the official opposition would allow them to participate in debate a little more constructively rather than obstructively and putting up all of the fake roadblocks and obstacles they like to put up to toxify the environment here and have Canadians turn away from the proceedings of this institution and disengage from the public life of our country. We do not want that. We want members of the opposition to make positive, constructive interventions in the debate, and we would be allowing them the time to do that.

Mrs. Karen Vecchio (Elgin—Middlesex—London, CPC): Mr. Speaker, hopefully we will get an answer on this, because I know, working on the subcommittee and as the chair, that I saw a lot of cancellations of committee meetings due to the fact that resources were tight. Committees are where we find out about some of the horrible things that are happening, sometimes in the community and sometimes because of the government's actions.

I wonder how much time would be cancelled from committee work, where we are unfolding and finding out all of the information on government programs and scandals. How much would the government be taking away from committee work to be able to resource this?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, the answer is this: not nearly as much as was taken away by making interpreters work for 30 hours straight.

Mrs. Karen Vecchio: So no answer—

The Deputy Speaker: Questions and comments, the hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have a rhetorical question for my colleague, which is simply this: What boss would force their employees, the interpreters, administrative assistants, clerks and parliamentary security staff, to work 30 hours straight, but would run off after one hour of voting? I am not pointing fingers at anybody in particular, like the member for Carleton, but it does seem to me that is an abusive boss.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, to extend the hypothetical situation, what kind of boss says that he is not letting anyone leave the chamber until Christmas, that he is going to make sure that everyone stays in the House and votes until Christmas until he gets his way, then five minutes later, hypothetically, goes to a fundraiser on the Island of Montreal, and on his way back visits a McDonald's franchise and makes a big, gaudy spectacle of coming in here with bags of french fries and hamburgers for the skeleton crew that is left behind?

While 158 or so Liberal members and people from the Bloc Québécois and the New Democratic Party were here protecting the things Canadians hold dear, the guy who wanted to keep us here until Christmas and was not going to flinch flinched awfully fast.

• (1730)

Mrs. Anna Roberts (King—Vaughan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are the opposition. We are here to protect all Canadians. They talk about health. They talk about the fact that 3.17 million meals were served by a food bank in Toronto, and 3,000 deliveries made to seniors because they cannot afford to buy food because of the tax implications.

They have to axe the tax. If they care about health, then they should care about feeding the people who cannot afford to eat.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, that member voted against the Canada child benefit or her party did. That member voted against dental care for our most vulnerable children and seniors. That member voted against child care. That member regularly obstructs and voted against 130 measures before Christmas that would have supported the very people she professes to want to help.

This will be a recurring debate in this chamber. These people like to talk in slogans with glib lines—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mrs. Anna Roberts: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, first of all it is not “these people”—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Deputy Speaker: That is descending into debate.

Maybe just to finish up the thought, the hon. government House leader.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, those members are good with the fake outrage, but they are also very good at blocking needed supports for the people they profess to care about, but do not. They are very good at obstructing all of the things that this government proposes that will help those very people.

Mr. Scot Davidson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The government is so concerned about this, yet have not asked for a body break. We should have a body break.

The Deputy Speaker: That is not a point of order, but I appreciate the thought.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Red Deer—Lacombe.

Mr. Blaine Calkins (Red Deer—Lacombe, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I just want to remind members of this House, many of whom, including the member for Courtenay—Alberni, were not here when I first learned about all-night voting. That was back when Stephen Harper was the prime minister and the NDP moved hundreds, if not thousands, of amendments to a piece of legislation to discuss Canada Post and forced all-night voting. As a matter of fact, if the record is checked, I believe that voting went on for in excess of 24 hours. I even believe the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands has moved a number of motions and amendments that created long-term marathon voting as well.

I just want to remind everybody that this is where we are actually at. The issue that the government House leader does not understand is that it is the agenda that it is trying to get passed that is actually causing the frustration in the House. The government can monkey around with all of the Standing Orders that they want, but it actually has to be an agenda that Canadians want. Canadians are rejecting the government's agenda right now. The polling numbers clearly indicate that the government and its coalition partners do not have the support of the Canadian public so everything it is doing is actually against where the Canadian public is at. If the government would just change its agenda, it would actually have the support of this House and the support of the Canadian public. If it has the support of the public, it will have the support in the House. It does not have the support of the House because the public does not support its agenda. The government can monkey with the Standing Orders all they want, but it is not going to change the fact that the government has bad ideas. That is why those ideas are not getting through the House.

• (1735)

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my former counterpart, who was the chief opposition whip. I know of his very legitimate concerns for members and I thank him for pointing out that perhaps he too objects to all-night voting. I know that, in an honest moment, that member would probably agree that it is a very bad idea.

I will say this, though. I do reject the premise that giving that member and his colleagues more time to present their constructive ideas to Canadians is somehow a danger for the rules of this place. We are allowing time for more debate and allowing that member more time to put his ideas across.

Mr. Damien Kurek: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I raise this as a technical concern in this place. A vote took place, and the timer associated with the app was not accurate. Those members may think it is user error. For those who do not understand the concept of blockchain technology, that is really rich.

Before we proceed to another vote, the timing issue on the app is of the utmost concern. I did vote early in the process to ensure that I would have time to verify my vote. The 10-minute voting period does indicate an allowance for votes to be cast later in that process. When I did look back at the app, there was 30 seconds left on the screen in the lobby, but three and a half minutes left on the voting app. To further emphasize the seriousness of this technical concern, it was about 20 minutes after the vote finished that I got the confirmation email that said my vote was, in fact, nay.

I raise serious concerns about the ability of members to fulfill their constitutional parliamentary functions in this place, especially on an issue as important as the future of our democracy, which the Liberals are certainly putting at—

The Deputy Speaker: I think that is enough on the point of order. I understand the concern. I am going to talk to the desk for a moment.

I appreciate the input. We will look closely at what transpired. There were 100 or so votes cast in a proper manner. We are going to go back and look at the system while the bells are ringing so that

we can make sure the system works as well as possible for the members voting online.

The hon. member for Battle River—Crowfoot.

Mr. Damien Kurek: Mr. Speaker, just to ensure the table has the information that emphasizes some of the technical challenges, including the email that arrived late, I would ask for unanimous consent to table the particular email and therefore indicate—

The Deputy Speaker: I am already hearing a number of noes. I will ask the hon. member to come up to the desk, when the bells are ringing, so he can share that information and we can make sure this does not happen to other members.

It is my duty to interrupt the proceedings at this time and put forthwith the question on the motion now before the House.

[Translation]

The question is on the motion.

[English]

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Mr. Damien Kurek: Mr. Speaker, I would ask for, in the preservation of democracy, a recorded vote.

The Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

• (1820)

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

(Division No. 653)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Battiste
Beech	Bibeau
Bittle	Blaikie
Blair	Blaney
Blois	Boulerice
Bradford	Brière
Cannings	Carr
Casey	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Collins (Victoria)	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos

S. O. 57

Fraser	Fry	Cooper	Dalton
Gaheer	Gainey	Dancho	Davidson
Garrison	Gazan	DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Gerretsen	Gould	Desilets	Doherty
Green	Hajdu	Dowdall	Ellis
Hanley	Hardie	Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Hepfner	Holland	Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Housefather	Hughes	Ferri	Findlay
Hussen	Hutchings	Fortin	Gallant
Iacono	Idlout	Garon	Gaudreau
Ien	Jaczek	Généreux	Genuis
Johns	Jones	Gill	Gladu
Jowhari	Julian	Godin	Goodridge
Kayabaga	Kelloway	Gourde	Gray
Khalid	Khera	Hallan	Hoback
Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk	Jeneroux	Kelly
Kwan	Lalonde	Khanna	Kitchen
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux	Kmiec	Kram
Lapointe	Lattanzio	Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Lauzon	Lebouthillier	Kusie	Lake
Lightbound	Long	Lantsman	Larouche
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	Lawrence	Lehoux
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)	Lemire	Leslie
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada	Liepert	Lloyd
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)	Lobb	Maguire
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty	Majumdar	Martel
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	May (Saaneich—Gulf Islands)	Mazier
McLeod	McPherson	McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Mendès	Medicino	Melillo	Michaud
Miao	Miller	Moore	Morantz
Morrissey	Murray	Morrice	Morrison
Naqvi	Noormohamed	Motz	Muys
O'Connell	Oliphant	Nater	Normandin
O'Regan	Petitpas Taylor	Patzner	Paul-Hus
Powlowski	Qualtrough	Pauzé	Perkins
Robillard	Rogers	Perron	Poilievre
Romanado	Rota	Rayes	Redekopp
Sahota	Sajjan	Reid	Rempel Garner
Saks	Samson	Richards	Roberts
Sarai	Scarpaleggia	Rood	Ruff
Schiefke	Serré	Savard-Tremblay	Scheer
Sgro	Shanahan	Schmale	Seeback
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Shields	Shiple
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Singh	Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
Sorbara	Sousa	Small	Soroka
St-Onge	Sudds	Steinley	Ste-Marie
Tassi	Taylor Roy	Stewart	Strahl
Thompson	Turnbull	Stubbs	Thériault
Valdez	Van Bynen	Therrien	Thomas
van Koeverden	Vandal	Tolmie	Trudel
Vandenbeld	Virani	Uppal	Van Popta
Weiler	Wilkinson	Vecchio	Vidal
Yip	Zahid	Vien	Vierson
Zarrillo	Zuberi — 168	Vignola	Villemure
		Vis	Wagantall
		Warkentin	Waugh
		Webber	Williams
		Williamson — 145	

NAYS

Members

Aboultarif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Bergeron	Berthold
Bérubé	Bezan
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins
Caputo	Carrie
Chabot	Chambers
Champoux	Chong

PAIRED

Members

Deltell	Dreeshen
Guilbeault	LeBlanc
Ng	Plamondon
Rodriguez	Zimmer — 8

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.
(Motion agreed to)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Waterloo, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 61st report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs. The committee advises that, pursuant to Standing Order 91.1(2), the Subcommittee on Private Members' Business met to consider the items added to the order of precedence on Tuesday, February 13, and recommended that the items listed herein, which it has determined should not be designated non-votable, be considered by the House.

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

(Motion agreed to)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-318, An Act to amend the Employment Insurance Act and the Canada Labour Code (adoptive and intended parents), as reported (without amendment) from the committee.

The Deputy Speaker: There being no motion at report stage, the House will now proceed, without debate, to the putting of the question on the motion to concur in the bill at report stage.

• (1825)

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster, CPC) moved that the bill be concurred in.

(Motion agreed to)

The Deputy Speaker: Before the House proceeds to Private Members' Business, the Chair wishes to remind members that pursuant to statements made on Thursday, May 4, 2023, and Monday, February 26, a royal recommendation is required for Bill C-318, an act to amend the Employment Insurance Act and the Canada Labour Code, since the bill would appropriate part of the public revenue.

[Translation]

Accordingly, if the bill is concurred in at report stage, the question on the motion for third reading will be put only if a royal recommendation is produced at the appropriate time.

[English]

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

She said: Mr. Speaker, as all parents know, the arrival of a new child is life-changing. It comes with great joys and excitement. It is a precious time of bonding and many firsts, but it also comes with added expenses, time constraints and new challenges. While we all know that Canada's employment insurance program helps to ease some of those pressures, we must confront the fact that not all fami-

Private Members' Business

lies are treated equally. It is not a fair program, and it does not reflect the diversity of families here in Canada.

Families formed through adoption and surrogacy continue to be entitled to 15 fewer weeks of leave, and this is a disadvantage that must be rectified. My private member's bill, Bill C-318, does that through the creation of a new 15-week time-to-attach benefit for adoptive and intended parents. It also adjusts entitlement leave accordingly in the Canada Labour Code. It is a common-sense bill; addressing the inequity in our EI system should truly be a non-partisan issue.

Unfortunately, the Liberal government has instead chosen to politicize it. While it claims to support equal access to EI leave for adoptive and intended parents, the Liberal government's actions suggest otherwise. At second reading, the member for Winnipeg North indicated that this was not a priority for the Liberal government when he said, "We might have had to put some limitations on some of the things we wanted to do as a result of the pandemic". The member for Kingston and the Islands said that this bill would not get a royal recommendation because his own bill did not get one. Of course, this was followed by all but a handful of Liberal members of Parliament voting against the bill at second reading.

Following the committee's consideration of this bill, the Liberal government challenged amendments that sought to remove any ambiguity around parental benefits for indigenous peoples. The opposition to this from the Liberals raises concerns about their intentions around achieving equal access to EI benefits for indigenous families with customary care arrangements.

Now, at third reading, this bill risks being dropped from the Order Paper altogether if a royal recommendation is not provided by the Liberal government. By all indications, unfortunately, this does not seem to be forthcoming. The Liberal government's decision to include a benefit for adoptive and intended parents in Bill C-59 was a clear declaration that it does not intend to collaborate on this issue and that it is more focused on political games than rectifying the discrimination in our EI system in a timely manner.

Bill C-59 is an omnibus budget bill that would not correct the harmful policies of the NDP-Liberal government, which are fuelling the affordability crisis in this country. The Liberal government not only tied its proposed benefit to a costly and convoluted omnibus bill but also did not even make this legislation a priority. It is the Liberal government that sets the agenda in this place, and it has not brought Bill C-59 up for debate since January. Frankly, it has just not been a priority for the Liberals. In fact, they have never made it a priority to address the discrimination in our EI system.

Private Members' Business

They have been promising this to adoptive parents since 2019; they extended this promise to intended parents last year, after I introduced Bill C-318. Providing equal access to EI leave for adoptive and intended parents should not be a complicated problem to solve, especially with the agreement of all opposition parties. However, the Liberal government has voted against Bill C-318, failed to provide the royal recommendation needed, refused to work collaboratively and failed to exercise the political will necessary to just get the dang job done.

● (1830)

Shamefully, the Liberal government's broken promises, delays and political games are happening at the expense of families. These families are hopeful and anxiously waiting to know if they will get the time they need and deserve with their child. The children who do not get the time they need with their parents are the greatest victims.

Adoptive and intended parents are not less deserving, and they certainly do not need less time with their children. It is often the case that these families face additional challenges in bonding and attachment. Access to equal leave can go a long way to support them.

The Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities heard compelling testimony from adoptive parents and adoptees about the challenges they experienced attaching. We heard repeatedly how meaningful additional time to form strong and secure attachments would have been for their families and how 35 weeks was not enough time.

We need to listen to those voices and act in a timely manner. Cassandra Eisner, an adoptee herself, shared with the human resources committee: "Moving in with people who were recently strangers is intimidating and very scary. Time to attach is something that would have helped that 11-year old little girl."

Shelley Rottenberg, also an adoptee, shared that, if there had been more time early on, her mother would not have had "to worry about going to work and leaving me with someone else" and that it "would have sped up that process of growing and building that trust and the bond to have a more secure attachment."

Cathy Murphy shared that it took three and a half years for her son to call her mama instead of "Hey, lady."

Julie Despaties shared that she ultimately did not return to work after her leave, because she needed more time to support her three adopted children.

Erin Clow wrote that, near the end of her leave, she felt "a weight which is difficult to articulate, laden with the emotions of sadness, fear, guilt, and grief, knowing that we as a family need more time to attach."

There are many more examples.

Providing adoptive families with an extra 15 weeks of leave is not only fair but will also help improve their long-term outcomes and help set these children up for success.

I have also heard from a lot of intended parents who are growing their families through surrogacy. These parents need to make a decision about their leave options in the immediate term; many are expecting their child and are hopeful that they will have access to an additional 15 weeks of leave.

I have also heard from parents who have made the decision to take the extended parental leave, at a significant financial disadvantage. Often it is not because they want to take a two-year leave, but rather because they want the same opportunity to be home with their child in the first year of their life. Canadians growing their families via surrogacy face a lot of added costs, and the disparity in benefits add to those financial pressures.

Child care is another consideration. It is more costly to get child care for an infant under a year old, and the reality across the country is that there are limited infant child care spaces. These added costs are made even worse given the growing affordability crisis.

Baden Colt shared with the human resources committee: "Having a child through surrogacy poses challenges that are not faced by most new parents, and these financial obstacles are compounded by the inability to access the same 15 weeks of maternity leave that most new parents get." She said that children like her daughter "deserve every opportunity that her peers have in life and that begins with having the same amount of time to bond with her parents as any other Canadian child." Her daughter does deserve the same time with her parents that is afforded to other children.

The Liberal government needs to set aside the partisanship and the political games that are costing families across this country the time to attach and bond with their children. It is well past time that all families, including adoptive and intended parents, get the time they need and deserve with their child.

● (1835)

Mr. Damien Kurek (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC): Madam Speaker, I really appreciate the speech that my friend, colleague and neighbour from Saskatchewan made regarding this issue.

I would ask the member if she could share additional stories of examples in which the practical change she has proposed would be truly life-changing to adoptive parents and the adopted children who are given that chance to form the appropriate bonds and what-not that are required for the development of children in those essential relationships.

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Madam Speaker, there are countless stories that I have heard from adoptive and intended parents.

I have one here from Luke, who says, "The existing leave time was insufficient to help me build an attachment relationship with my son, who had a history of abandonment and childhood trauma, and needed to have additional time with me as his new parent in order to feel secure and settle into my home...As such, I needed to take additional time off at expense to my family."

Hearing from Canadians across the country, this is not just a regional issue, but literally from coast to coast, from every area of the country. These parents just want time to attach with their children in a safe and secure environment.

Mr. Irek Kusmierczyk (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Official Languages, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to thank my hon. colleague across the way for her excellent speech and advocacy for this really important policy change.

Could the member talk about the importance of having leave time between parent and child before the arrival, to prepare the home and the family for the arrival of the child?

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Madam Speaker, leave is important, as is that time to prepare for a baby or an older child to come, because a lot of children who are adopted are not necessarily infants but of ages all the way up to 18. Yes, it is important to have that time to prepare as well as the time to attach.

Ms. Michelle Ferreri (Peterborough—Kawartha, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for all of her hard work on this file and this bill. As a mom of four herself, she has done incredible work.

My question for the member is this: What is different in the member's bill versus what was in the Liberals' Bill C-59? Why is it still really important that this bill get passed and get royal recommendation, so that intended and adoptive parents will get the leave they deserve?

• (1840)

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Madam Speaker, it is very important. I would actually say that this bill is more important than the provisions that are put into the FES. As I mentioned in my remarks, the Liberal government has not even brought forward that piece of legislation to debate. With my legislation, there is actually an enactment on royal assent.

We have no idea at all when this would be enacted, if it is like anything that they have done, such as child care, which is a mess, or the disability benefit, which Canadians with disabilities still have not received. It would do Canadians, especially adoptive and intended parents, a great service if they just gave Bill C-318 a royal recommendation, which would make sure that these intended and adoptive parents would know the date that they could apply for these benefits.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the member knows well, because she has already made reference to it, that the changes are actually incorporated into the fall economic statement, which will in fact be passing. It does seem to cover a bit more in terms of the concerns that have been raised by parents of adopted children. We recognize the value. In fact, it was part of our election platform and part of the mandate letter.

The question I have for the member is this: Does she support that aspect of the budget, and, if so, can we anticipate that she will be voting in favour of it?

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Madam Speaker, this promise was in the Liberal Party's 2019 and 2021 mandate letters, and nothing got

done until I and my office did the work. We actually wrote legislation. Then the Liberals scooped it up.

The member across the way is being a little presumptuous—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): We are way over time.

Resuming debate, the hon. parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Official Languages.

Mr. Irek Kusmierczyk (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Official Languages, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity today to participate in this debate on the bill introduced by the hon. member of Parliament for Battlefords—Lloydminster.

I want to thank the member for bringing attention to an issue that matters to Canadians. Adoptive parents have been telling us that they want a new employment insurance benefit that provides them with the same number of weeks as birth parents. Currently, under the EI program, workers who are pregnant or have recently given birth, including surrogates, can receive 15 weeks of maternity benefits to support their recovery from pregnancy and childbirth. This is in addition to the 40 shareable weeks of standard benefits, or up to 69 shareable weeks under the extended option.

Adoptive parents also have access to support under the EI program. However, parents of adopted children are eligible for only 40 shareable weeks of standard benefits, or up to 69 weeks of support. In short, the difference lies in the fact that adoptive parents do not have access to the 15 weeks of benefits that parents who give birth do.

In 2024, this needs to change. That is why these improvements to the EI program are included in Bill C-59, the fall economic statement implementation act, 2023. The measures in Bill C-59 would create a new 15-week EI benefit that would add flexibility and better address the needs of adoptive parents and parents of children through surrogacy during the weeks surrounding the actual placement of the child.

The comprehensive measures in Bill C-59 reflect what we heard during our consultations with Canadians on the EI program in 2021 and 2022. They reflect the diverse and inclusive way families are formed today, and they provide needed flexibility.

Private Members' Business

Before I go into more detail about Bill C-59, let me outline how it resonates with the consensus we heard at the EI consultations on the issue of an inclusive program. In particular, the government absolutely acknowledges in Bill C-59 that adoptive parents and parents of children conceived through surrogacy have income support needs that are related to their unique processes. Time devoted to a child helps create a family bond. This is true for birth and adoptive parents.

In the case of adoptive parents, it can help the child make up for any developmental delays or health setbacks and give that child a better chance to reach their full potential. Every extra week spent with an adoptive child in the first year after adoption has an impact on their development and their lifelong relations with others.

There is no question that for any new parent, having the time and resources to welcome and care for their child or children is precious and requires support. Also, additional time for adoptive parents to be with their children can be beneficial for their employers, as it would put these parents in a better state of mind when they return to work.

There is no doubt that what the member opposite proposes, and what we propose, is important. Leave with income support for adoptive and intended parents, so they can welcome and care for their children, needs to be part of a modern and inclusive EI program.

The proposal in Bill C-318 does this in part, but we consider our approach in Bill C-59 to offer the better, more flexible and more responsive solution to address this important need.

We expect that each year, the government's proposed benefit would provide approximately 1,700 Canadian families with additional time and flexibility as they welcome a new child in their home. Parents through surrogacy, including 2LGBTQI+ families, would also be eligible for this benefit, and rightly so.

The government's proposed EI adoption benefit would make EI benefits inclusive and reflective of families in Canada. It would support parents going through adoption or surrogacy by providing temporary income support before the child arrives at home, for example, while they are finalizing the placement or travelling abroad to bring the child or children to Canada. That support would also extend to the early weeks of the child's arrival into the new family.

This equalization was a key ask by our stakeholders. It is the right thing to do, and it is an idea whose time has come. All of this will happen if Bill C-59 receives royal assent.

• (1845)

I also want to note, as we were told during the EI consultations, that the profiles of children and youth being adopted are often unique. Adopted kids are typically older, have sibling groups and have special needs. Cathy Murphy, chairperson of the Child and Youth Permanency Council of Canada, told us this during the consultations:

Even if a youth is joining their family at age 12 or 13, it's really important for that parent or caregiver to be there, to be able to meet them after school or to maybe take them out to their favourite lunch spot over lunch hour once a week, because that's usually the only way you're going to get them out to lunch.

By continually showing up and being actively involved in their life, they are going to realize after an extended period of time that their parents are there for them.

For the past eight years, we have been busy improving important programs so that life is more affordable for Canadians. From day one, the government has kept its promise to protect all Canadians, and we are using all the tools at our disposal to do so.

Canadians want an EI system for the 21st century. The government has heard these calls. It is a long-haul commitment, but we are taking the time to get it right, and we are not waiting for a grand reveal to make improvements along the way. Let me reassure my colleague opposite that the Government of Canada is taking a thorough approach to EI to ensure its continuous improvement for the benefit of all Canadians. Adoptive parents have asked for equal treatment. They deserve equal treatment, and the government has answered.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marie-Hélène Gaudreau (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ): Madam Speaker, I rise this evening to speak to Bill C-318, which seeks to amend the Employment Insurance Act and the Canada Labour Code with respect to adoptive and intended parents.

We know that when a child comes into our life, it is a huge moment that changes everything, but that also comes with a lot of stress. Those of us here who are parents have all been there. When we enter our home for the first time with our infant and our partner, we tell ourselves that it is time to step up to the plate.

I had the good fortune of carrying my two daughters. I had easy pregnancies. I even worked as a coach during one of my pregnancies. Not every woman is so lucky, however. Sometimes, nature forces some of us to put our dream of pregnancy aside and turn to alternatives such as adoption or surrogacy. It is not easy for these women to grieve their infertility. I have a great deal of empathy for them.

However, these women will become mothers, maybe not in a traditional way, but they will experience motherhood. They will have a chance to know what it means to love and be loved unconditionally.

At this time, women and couples in Canada who adopt a child are entitled to only 35 weeks, or eight months, of EI benefits. They have eight months to bond with their child, which does not sound like much. The bonding process needs to happen under the best possible conditions. In the case of adoption or surrogacy, the process is equally important, precisely because it is atypical. Every story is different. Every family is different.

Private Members' Business

I would like to quote Julie Despaties, the executive director of Adopt4Life, who appeared before the Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities:

Today, children who are waiting to be adopted are often over the age of 7, and often in their teens and part of sibling groups. In fact, across Canada, we are seeing an overrepresentation of children with coexisting medical and neurodevelopmental challenges within the child welfare system.

It takes time to integrate a child into a new family environment, and it takes selflessness, compassion, kindness, patience and tenderness. The government's primary mission should be to give every child, regardless of their history or place of birth, an equal chance. This requires a solid foundation, first and foremost.

I want to read another quote, this time from Anne-Marie Morel, president of the Fédération des parents adoptants du Québec. Here is what she said when she appeared before the Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities:

Every extra week spent with an adopted child in the first year after adoption has an impact on their development and their lifelong relations with others.

As elected officials, we have the responsibility to make that possible. We must restore equality and fairness.

The changes proposed in the bill would also have a major impact on male couples. Although, in 2024, our society is open to the rights of members of the LGBTQ community, we still have a way to go when it comes to same-sex parenting. Gay men who want to have a family are discriminated against by their very nature. They cannot have children unless they adopt or use a surrogate. However, we know that international adoption is an extremely difficult process. I have many friends who have tried it. It is basically impossible for same-sex couples.

The countries that still allow international adoption are often ones where the mores are such that the state discriminates against members of the LGBTQ community.

● (1850)

Surrogacy is not the easiest option, either. When a gay couple decides to have a child, the process can be long, arduous and expensive. Although neither parent can claim to carry a child, they should not be relegated to a separate parental category. As legislators, we have a duty to ensure that the parent-child bond is deep, enduring, strong and unshakable.

These new parents have the same rights, duties, feelings and questions. Most of all, they share the same desire to give their child everything.

A healthy bond helps children cope with a variety of situations as they grow, including separation from their parents—when they start day care or school, for example—co-operation with other children, and self-control. Bonding teaches children to trust others, which helps them form healthy relationships later in life.

I felt like sharing my thoughts this evening. That said, this is clearly an issue that only affects Canada, because Quebec introduced the Quebec parental insurance plan in 2006. Once again, Quebec was a forerunner; once again, Quebec took care of its peo-

ple; once again, Quebec showed empathy. In 2020, Quebec went a step further by ending benefit discrimination for new parents.

Tonight, I call on my colleagues to show the same kind of compassion and kindness shown by the members of the Quebec National Assembly. We must give women and couples who use adoption and surrogacy the same rights as those who have natural pregnancies. Let us stop creating two classes of parents; stop with the injustice, inequity and discrimination; and stop basing benefits on a certain method of starting a family.

Motherhood, fatherhood and parenthood must be respected, no matter the path that is used to get there.

● (1855)

[*English*]

Ms. Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Madam Speaker, my thanks for your guidance today as I start my speech on Bill C-318.

This is a very important bill. I want to congratulate the member of Parliament who put forward this bill, as well as all the family members and advocates who pushed to make this a reality today.

This was a very good bill in its original form. However, I was deeply disappointed that the amendments to the bill, which I pushed forward at committee, to uphold Canadian law were thrown out. Those amendments would have ensured that this new piece of legislation, which hopefully will go forward, would be consistent with Bill C-15. That was adopted in the last Parliament, and it ensures that all legislation going forward is consistent with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Rather than upholding that law and upholding our constitutional obligations to ensure they are reflected in this current legislation, the Liberals at committee, first of all, voted against it, and then the member for Winnipeg North brought forward a point of order to throw out my amendments.

This is a pattern of behaviour I have witnessed from the government, a failure for this current government, to uphold the very law that it put forward in the last Parliament, a government bill. I want to point specifically to Bill C-15, section 5, which states, "The Government of Canada must, in consultation and cooperation with Indigenous peoples, take all measures necessary to ensure that the laws of Canada are consistent with the Declaration." By failing to uphold Bill C-15, the current government is wilfully not respecting Articles 19, 21 and 22 of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

I want to read into the record Articles 19, 20 and 21 so that we can have a permanent record of the specific human rights that the government is flippantly violating in refusing to amend this bill, even though the sponsor of the bill supported the amendments I put forward at committee and indicated that they were in the scope of the bill.

Article 19 of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples reads:

Private Members' Business

States shall consult and cooperate in good faith with the indigenous peoples concerned through their own representative institutions in order to obtain their free, prior and informed consent before adopting and implementing legislative or administrative measures that may affect them.

I would like to remind the government that when we are talking about adoption and when we are talking about child welfare systems, in Manitoba alone, 90% of kids currently in child welfare are indigenous. Many families choose customary and kinship care arrangements. We have so many grandmothers in our communities who look after their loved ones without financial assistance, without the option of leaving work, doing double duty with no financial resources.

The Liberal government has been held in non-compliance over 14 times with the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal, and it was to immediately stop racism against first nations kids on reserves. Once again, the government is showing a commitment to having a two-tiered system in this country: one for indigenous children and one for everybody else. The current government is demonstrating, through throwing out these amendments, that the human rights of indigenous kids are still not being respected.

● (1900)

Indigenous peoples have the right to maintain and develop their political, economic and social systems or institutions, to be secure in the enjoyment of their own means of subsistence and development, and to engage freely in all their traditional and other economic activities.

Traditional means parenting. They need to be given the resources to be able to parent kids the way they choose. Let us not forget that there are more kids in care now than at the height of residential schools. It was well reported in the TRC report that we need systems reform in our child welfare system. The residential school system has left a legacy of intergenerational trauma and healing within our nation.

Not only did they throw out my amendments, but they are also throwing out the calls to action of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. If the government is not ready to respond to the calls to action from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, which is mainly giving our kids back, the government is far from reconciling with indigenous peoples in this country.

Article 20(2) states, "Indigenous peoples deprived of their means of subsistence and development are entitled to just and fair redress." That includes financial resources so we are able to raise our kids in the way that we choose, not in poverty, so that we do not have to go to the Human Rights Tribunal and go after the government for years for it to finally settle \$17 billion, more than what was asked. It is abhorrent what has happened in this House.

Article 21(2) states:

States shall take effective measures and, where appropriate, special measures to ensure continuing improvement of their economic and social conditions. Particular attention shall be paid to the rights and special needs of indigenous elders, women, youth, children and persons with disabilities.

I would like to remind the government, which threw out amendments to ensure that human rights of indigenous peoples would be upheld, to ensure we would be upholding Canadian law and to ensure that it is consistent with section 5 of Bill C-15, that the child welfare system has been named the pipeline to murdered and missing indigenous women and girls in this country.

We have a legacy of sixties scoop survivors who were separated from family and community, who have nowhere to return home to. However, on the very subject of our children, the government, once again, fails to take the opportunity to reconcile with indigenous peoples in Canada by giving us the resources we need to uphold our human rights to be able to raise our children in kinship and customary care arrangements.

Although the Speaker ruled my amendments as being out of scope, I would like to remind the House that they, in fact, were in scope because the government has the legal obligation to make sure all legislation going forward is consistent with Bill C-15. I am going to urge the government because it still has the power to make a royal recommendation, with the amendments I put forward, to make sure it is consistent with human rights law. If it is serious about reconciliation, it will give our kids back.

● (1905)

Ms. Michelle Ferreri (Peterborough—Kawartha, CPC): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Battlefords—Lloydminster for this incredible bill, which will bring parity and equity in mental health and attachment to adoptive and intended parents.

What we are talking about today, for folks watching, is Bill C-318, which was created by my friend and colleague, the member for Battlefords—Lloydminster.

I will give an overview and some compelling testimony that we heard at the human resources committee today. I am really going to hammer home how common-sense this bill is and how it should have been done long ago. However, like so many things in this House, here we are.

Bill C-318 introduces a new 15-week benefit for adoptive and intended parents through the employment insurance program, and adjusts the Canada Labour Code accordingly. A lot of people, including me, did not know this was an issue. I have biological children and just assumed that adoptive parents, or intended parents, which means parents through surrogacy, were entitled to the same amount of unemployment leave, or mat leave or paternity leave, which are the common names a lot of people know. I was entitled to 52 weeks, but the reality is that the way the current system works is that they do not have access to that. They are cut 15 weeks short.

One would ask why, which is a great question. It does not put any more financial stress on the system, and we know these parents need this time to attach. I want to tell members a bit about the politics that always bleeds into this place and why common sense often gets left behind.

Private Members' Business

It was an election platform promise by the Liberals in the last two elections that they would have this in their policy. Here we are, and it is still not here, which is not a shock. That is the reality of what we have in this country.

The bill has gone through first reading. What we are asking for in this debate today in the House is royal recommendation. Nothing will happen if we do not get that. We have had the support of the House; the bill has passed through first reading. In fact, everybody voted in favour of it except the Liberals. Four Liberals supported it. I thank those who did and parked their partisan politics for the greater good and for parity.

I want to go through this article with members, because I think it really highlights the human component of this. I think sometimes, when we talk about policy and legislation, it feels very clinical, but there are very real human consequences to the decisions made in the House. Everything does come back to policy. This is an article that was written by Erin Clow. It was posted in *The Province*, which is a news publication.

I want to read some of the words she has written:

At the end of my first leave in 2020, I longed for more time with our son. Nearing the end of this leave, I feel a weight that is difficult to articulate, laden with sadness, fear, guilt, and grief, knowing that we as a family need more time to attach. In the early days of both parental leaves, the hours, days and weeks seemed long. Honestly, we were strangers who overnight became a family. We knew very little about each other and, most importantly, we didn't know how to trust, let alone love one another. Each day was a monumental exercise in courage. We spent our time learning about one another. Learning about routines, what they liked and what they didn't like. Learning how to be parents. Learning to love one another.

Again, I come back to my own experience as a first-time mom, and that is exactly how it feels when one gives birth, but imagine adopting a child who has already lived in the world and formed feelings and emotions, and trying to attach and make up for all of that time. Ideally, adoptive and intended parents should have more, if we think about the biology and physiology of what they have to overcome, yet they have less under this legislation. It makes no sense.

She continues, "It took months for me to start becoming the parent they deserved." I would challenge Erin on that. I bet she was exactly the mother they needed from the day they were born and they were meant to be together, but I know that feeling of mom guilt.

She goes on, "Now all that remains are 27 days. This supported parental leave will end in 27 days and I can say without a doubt we need more time."

• (1910)

Is that not the most valuable commodity we have on this planet? She continues, "Our daughter and son need additional time. We need months, not days, to continue the process of facilitating secure, enduring attachment for all members of our family." She has written a very powerful article that really reiterates what it is like for these adoptive parents.

I want to go through some of the testimony that we heard in committee. I want to reiterate the common sense of this, in terms of the financial piece. Parents are already paying into the system. It is not like we would be trying to find this money. It is already funded.

So many programs that we see the Liberals pushing out to people right now are not funded, such as their pharmacare program and their child care program, which are underfunded and not working. They are not funded. This is. This is a really common-sense bill that would make it easy to give the foundation for kids and families to thrive.

Quite frankly, another conversation a lot of people do not want to have in this country is that the cost of living is increasing so much. My daughter has said to me that she could not have kids, that she could never afford it. What a feeling to have. What a feeling to have in this country, to not feel like one can afford to have a house, to feed one's family or to choose to have children, which is the greatest gift in the world. For people who choose not to have children, it is totally fine, but I am saying that, to take away that choice, is a realist issue in our country.

Another quote details, "Most children adopted in Canada are over the age of 10 at the time of placement and many have a history of trauma or serious loss. Having their new parent or caregiver(s) at home longer, in the critical first year, gives them time to form attachments and begin processing their grief and loss."

I believe the member opposite may be able to chime in, and I know that she is over my shoulder. There was one woman in particular, and I think it was Cathy Murphy, who talked about how her child did not call her "mama" for three years.

It was three years of just "Hey lady". That is so powerful because, whether one is an adoptive parent, an intended parent or a biological parent, showing up for one's kids when they are having a hard time is tough. It is the toughest responsibility any of us parents will ever face in our lives. Their behaviour is communication. These kids need so much more time to build trust. They do not have that. They have never had that. The trauma that many of them have faced is very real.

Financial stress is one of the biggest stressors in a family dynamic. If one is sitting there worried about how one is going to pay the mortgage, pay for food, pay for groceries or put gas in the car, guess what? One cannot be the parent one needs to be to the kid who needs one.

It is so simple to say to not worry, that one's EI, which one has already paid into, is here to help one be the best parent they can be. This is a very simple bill.

Private Members' Business

Another quote is that, “Of the 63,000 children currently in care, 30,000 are eligible for permanent adoption by loving families—” and listen to this, “only 2,000 children are adopted each year.” How many of those children are out there who do not know where they fit, who do not know that they have somewhere they belong? What a feeling. Maybe if more parents knew that there were incentives and help for them to give the love that they have in them to give, that number would go up.

Kyla Beswarick was adopted at age 10 with her two siblings. She said, “It took me two or three years to form that attachment.” An article explains, “Her mom had to quit her job to take care of Kyla’s high needs, including doctor and therapist appointments and adjusting to school, and couldn’t access parental leave.” Kyla, who is now 21, and who is amazing, said, “Imagine how I perceived the world, enduring such big breaks in trust and new environments. I was so young. That extra time would have helped me”.

Ashley Bach also testified at committee.

● (1915)

I will read this final one into the record because I think it is most powerful. It is from Julie Despaties, executive director of Adopt4Life:

I would like to leave you with these thoughts.

If we want a stronger tomorrow for our children, we must do right by them. As my good friend Irwin Elman, a former Ontario child and youth provincial advocate, says, you can’t legislate love, but you can legislate the conditions in which love can flourish.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise to speak to what is a very important issue. I trust there are many people following this debate, and for good reason. Our young people and children today are in fact a treasure. The member referred to love at the end of her speech, saying we cannot legislate love, but there are certain things we can do to provide supports that would enhance the relationships that are so critically important.

Many of the comments that have been made with regard to Bill C-318 are really good, and all members of the House, no doubt, would support them. When I listen to many members talk about the importance of the legislation, I cannot help but reflect on the last election. When we spoke with our constituents and voters, one of the issues that people enjoyed talking about was our children and how we can improve the system.

The government has demonstrated in that past a commitment to look at ways we can make changes to the EI system. We would love to be able to do more, and we constantly look at ways to improve EI and the resources affiliated with it. During the election, we as a political party made a commitment to do what is, in essence, being proposed by the member through her private member’s bill.

What surprises me is that there is legislation today on this very topic that is at second reading. If the member proposing Bill C-318 were to look at the fall economic statement, she would find that there would be even more of a benefit for those who are adopting. It talks about having supports even before the date on which the family is united. I would suggest it is healthier legislation all around.

When the member introduced the bill for third reading, I posed a question with regard to what she and others are saying. Why would we not support that aspect, at the very least, of the fall economic statement? I would argue that there are lots of wonderful things in the fall economic statement, but that one is specifically there. The discussions and debates on the floor here should be a good indication of support for Bill C-59, the fall economic statement, and although I was not at the committee, I suspect there were good, healthy discussions there also. We know the bill is going to pass.

Because Bill C-318 was at report stage today, we could have very easily played a game and said we wanted a recorded vote, but we did not do that. We supported the Conservatives because they wanted to get to third reading today. There will often be recorded votes on private members’ bills, but we did not request one because we recognize it was important for the member to have the debate, and it allowed us to have the discussion we are having right now, which is a good thing.

The changes, which are even greater and more beneficial for adoptive parents, are in Bill C-59. Today, where is Bill C-59, the fall economic statement, which was introduced last year? It is still at second reading. Why is it? It is because the Conservative Party is playing games with it.

● (1920)

Her own party is actually preventing Bill C-59 from passing. If Bill C-59 were to pass, then I suggest that the type of benefits that we are all talking about would be there, because it was not only an election platform issue for us as a government but was also supported by all members of the House. It was also in the mandate letter. It was referenced indirectly through the budget of 2023 a year ago and then brought in through the fall economic statement, so it is there. People can open it up and read it. The real issue is, why did it not pass in December 2023, or even earlier this month? The answer to that question is that the Conservatives, as we are going to find out shortly when we get into the next step after Private Members’ Business—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The time provided for the consideration of Private Members’ Business has expired and the order has dropped to the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS NO. 35—EXTENSION OF SITTING HOURS AND CONDUCT OF EXTENDED PROCEEDINGS

The House resumed from February 26 consideration of the motion.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, as I was saying when I was interrupted a couple of days ago, the motion is absolutely essential to doing two things. The first is for us to work harder on behalf of our constituents, allowing more time for debate in the evenings, which is something the NDP has always called for. Also, we believe absolutely fundamentally that we need to be respectful of our employees and staff who run the bastion of democracy here in the House of Commons and who have been forced into 30-hour voting marathons by the member for Carleton.

I will just remind you, Madam Speaker, that the member for Carleton, after voting six times in person, basically bolted from this place and ran away. The kind of boss that one sees—

• (1925)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member knows that members cannot make reference to presences in and absences from the House. I know that the virtual Parliament has given some leeway on that, but I would remind the hon. member to please refrain from making references.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, that is fair enough.

We know what the agenda of the member for Carleton is: Axe services, build up billionaires, fix elections and stop democracy. We hear this every day. That is what the Conservatives stand for. We saw this when the Harper regime was in power; there was \$30 billion for billionaires each and every year, according to the Parliamentary Budget Officer, as a result of the Harper tax-free treaties for billionaires with tax havens.

There was axing of services; the Conservatives did that very well. They forced seniors to work longer. They axed every single program that actually helped people. There was fixing of elections as well, with myriad violations of the Canada Elections Act. The Conservatives stopped democracy, including cutting back and strangling the Auditor General's department and refusing to fund the Auditor General for the important work that the Auditor General does.

That is the Conservatives' mandate and mantra. That is what they have done: Axe the services, build up the billionaires, fix elections and stop democracy. That is why New Democrats will oppose the Conservative agenda each and every day, and that is why we support the idea that we work smarter and not harder, that we actually show the respect that we need to show to the employees who keep Parliament running, and that we have a health break every day rather than running into the health problems we have seen.

I am looking forward to questions and comments from my colleagues. I just want to remind the House again, though, that the

Government Orders

member for Carleton, after an hour, bolted from the House rather than going through the 30-hour marathon.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member knows, and I just reminded him, that we cannot make references to presences in and absences from the House. This is not a new thing, and it is something all members are aware of.

The hon. member for Courtenay—Alberni.

Mr. Gord Johns: Madam Speaker, I just want some clarity here in terms of identifying people who we know are voting virtually, which is seen by the public, and people who are voting in the House. When two-thirds of the Conservatives voted virtually to end virtual Parliament, for example, people saw that Conservatives were voting virtually against something that they want to use. They were against using the app, but they used it to vote against.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I take the hon. member's point, and I did mention that, obviously, virtual Parliament has blurred the lines a bit. However, it remains a fact that we do not, on purpose, make reference to absence or presence in the House.

Questions and comments, the hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the question I have for my colleague across the way is on recognizing that there is a finite amount of time that is available for debate on government bills and that the motion we are actually debating would greatly enhance the amount of time for members of Parliament to debate. This way, with respect to government legislation and budgetary matters that come before the chamber, members on all sides of the House would be provided a lot more time. Given that many Canadians work well past six or seven o'clock in the evening, does he see anything wrong with extending the hours to allow for more debate time and being reasonable by saying that it is not going to go past midnight? I see that as a positive win for democracy. Could the member provide his thoughts on that?

• (1930)

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, there is no doubt that we need to work harder and smarter. New Democrats have always said that; this is why we believe in, and I have always supported, having evening sessions. This is not new for New Democrats.

Government Orders

However, what I find perplexing is the Conservatives' opposition to the idea that we would provide health breaks for employees and that we would work through evening sessions. I find it equally perplexing that Conservatives oppose dental care. The NDP's plan for dental care helps, on average, 30,000 constituents of each and every Conservative MP, yet they voted against it. Affordable housing helps thousands of people. We saw, under the Harper regime, that they destroyed 800,000 affordable housing units. Now, the NDP is fighting to put those housing units back, and Conservatives vote against it. They voted against the grocery rebate, and I gather that they are going to vote against pharmacare, which would help, on average, 15,000 constituents in each and every Conservative riding.

If Conservatives are not standing up for their constituents, why are they here?

Mr. Damien Kurek (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC): Madam Speaker, what has been very interesting in this discussion is that we are seeing the NDP desperate to distract from the fact that its members are forced to abandon their principles and prop up one of the most corrupt regimes in Canadian history. We have corruption on one side and lazy corruption in the leader of the NDP over there.

Why is that member forcing, through limiting debate on standing orders, something that should be done through consensus? Why is he showing Canadians that the NDP and the Liberals are allergic to work? That member has obviously never pulled a calf on a cold March morning, and he certainly never sat in a combine at 3 a.m. in September, when we know that the weather is turning. Why are they so terrified of working for Canadians in this place? Why is that member specifically so bent on propping up the corruption we see within the Liberal Party?

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, first off, the Harper regime was the most corrupt in Canadian history. I do not need to mention that members of that regime went to jail. Does the member not remember Conservative members of Parliament being led away in handcuffs?

Second, for that member to raise the issue of working people to a person like me, who worked as a labourer for many years, worked the midnight shift in factories, worked in an oil refinery and did real, hard work, when the member for Carleton's sum total of work experience, before he arrived at the incredible Conservative milk machine of pouring all kinds of money into Conservative candidates, was one month at a Dairy Queen. That is all he brought. He had no work experience whatsoever, yet the member tries to question the work experience of real working MPs who are here. There is a member who worked as a farmer behind me, and the member for Elmwood—Transcona worked as an electrician. These are people who did real work, who got their boots dirty. Meanwhile, the member for Carleton actually shows, on Twitter, his boots with a little bit of mud—

Mr. Damien Kurek: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, Canadians demand an answer from the MP as to whether or not he is saying that younger Canadians should not be involved in politics because that is an absolute disgrace—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): That is debate. That is not a point of order.

I will allow the hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby to finish his answer.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, the sum total of his work experience, outside the Conservative Party and all this money that comes from billionaires for Conservatives, was a month in a Dairy Queen. For somebody to run, saying that they have the experience to run a country, when all they have done, aside from work in the very Conservative infrastructure, is worked in a Dairy Queen, is a little too rich.

The member for Burnaby South, who is the leader of the NDP, brings a rich work experience, not only working from in a whole variety of manual labour and service jobs, but also from working as a lawyer.

We will put our—

● (1935)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): It is time for the next question.

The hon. member for Cowichan—Malahat—Langford.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am going to try to lower the temperature.

I really want to put today's motion in the context of Bill C-50 because I think that bill in particular illustrates the reasoning behind the motion. When Bill C-50 was at committee, the Conservatives, I highly suspect, used ChatGPT's AI technology to generate 20,000 amendments. Their plan failed, and those amendments were actually cleared in about an hour's time because they did not do their homework. The Conservatives are now trying the same thing at the report stage with 200 amendments.

I think some people watching this debate may get the incorrect idea that we are doing away with votes. I am wondering if the member for New Westminster—Burnaby could be clear that we are still going to have those votes, but the motion would allow members to have those health breaks and would allow the important staff who support this place to have those health breaks as well, so we are not putting anyone's health at risk while still conducting the democratic needs of the nation in the House.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, the member is asking the kind of thoughtful questions that should be asked in this place.

Unfortunately, the Conservatives never seem to ask a question that has any depth at all. In the case of the member for Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, he does extraordinary work in the agriculture committee, and he has done work in a wide variety of areas that help to really advance public policy in Canada.

Government Orders

The member is absolutely right, that what the Conservatives are endeavouring to do is to basically stop Parliament and stop getting legislation through that would actually help people. They want to block everything. Bill C-50 would actually provide for energy workers good well-paying jobs in the energy industry. I come out of the energy industry, having worked in an oil refinery, the Shelburn oil refinery, sadly now closed, in Burnaby, B.C. I know for a fact that it is important for energy workers to have access to good, unionized, well-paying jobs.

What was the Conservative response? A little like Danielle Smith in Alberta, who wants to shut down clean energy and ensure that those jobs do not come to Albertans, Conservatives want to block legislation and make sure that those good, clean energy jobs are not available.

That is why it is important to get it right. That is why it is important to have the health breaks when the Conservatives provide for obstruction. The members of the NDP, as the adults in the room, are going to make sure that we get the job done, and we do it in a way that does not harm the health and safety of the many employees who keep this place running.

Mr. Damien Kurek: Madam Speaker, something needs to be cleared up here.

The member is suggesting that somehow young people should not be involved in politics. The Leader of the Opposition is proud to be involved, in this case, in Conservative politics. That member is suggesting, somehow, that young people do not have a role to play in our democracy. That is certainly disgraceful and something that the old NDP, which used to have principles, would have resoundingly rejected.

When is the NDP going to stand up for the namesake of its party and actually defend democracy, as opposed to simply being lackeys for the Liberals and supporting their corruption?

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, it is hard to take that question seriously.

The point I was making is that the member for Carleton is simply a workplace tourist. When he shows videos of himself with a little mud on his shoes, and he has only worked in a real private sector job for one month of his life, in a Dairy Queen, he does not bring a lot of depth or *gravitas* to the job of running what is a G7 or G8 country. That is the point I was making.

Also, in contrast to the member, I started volunteering for the NDP at the age of 14. I did not have money poured on me. I worked by day in a brewery. At night, I was a volunteer, knocking on doors—

• (1940)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): We are out of time.

Resuming debate, the hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise to talk about how this motion is

good for democracy. It is good, and I would anticipate that we should actually be receiving—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I have to interrupt the hon. parliamentary secretary.

The hon. member for Barrie—Innisfil is rising on a point of order.

Mr. John Brassard: Madam Speaker, I would gladly accept if the hon. member wanted to split his time with me.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Maybe on another day, Madam Speaker.

I am pleased to talk about the motion we have before us, which one would think every member of the House of Commons would support. People who are following the debate should have an appreciation of what the motion would do, which is fairly straightforward.

On the one hand, we are seeing a lot of legislation. The government has a very healthy and progressive legislative agenda, and there is a limited amount of time during normal work hours, because the hours are set. The motion would give the opportunity, where there is a great level of interest, to have more debate on specific legislation or an agenda item from the government by allowing an extended sitting. This means we would have the evenings to continue debate.

Why would anyone believe having more debate is not a good thing here on the floor of the House of Commons? When we factor in all the whining and complaining we hear from the Conservatives at times about wanting more debate time on legislation, we would be giving them what they want. However, I suspect the Conservatives are likely going to be voting against that. When they take their time to stand or register their vote on the hybrid system, they will likely be voting against having more time for debate.

This is one important thing that the legislation would do.

The other thing it would do is provide the opportunity for us to prevent 24-hour voting sessions. The last time this happened, back in December, I can recall coming into the House early in the morning, starting debates and so forth and then the Conservatives saying that they wanted a standing vote and were going to force everybody to vote for the next 20 hours or so. I am going to go into this in a bit and talk about some of the things we voted on.

At a workplace where one is literally dealing with billions and billions of tax dollars and is expected to be aware of the content being voted on, or at least I would like to think members are aware of what they are voting on, it would be reasonable to expect one would not have to vote around the clock.

I had seen a nice graph provided by the member for Kingston and the Islands. If one looks at the graph, one sees there is fairly good participation until it became bedtime for the Conservatives. All of a sudden, instead of having 90% participation, it starts to drop. Once 11 o'clock hit, or getting close to midnight, it really plummets on the Conservatives' side. The good news is I think they stayed just above the 50%. I am not 100% sure of that, but I think it was just above. It might have dipped below, but I do not know for sure.

Government Orders

The point is the Conservatives saw the light back then, because at least half of them did not have a problem taking a health break so they could be more awake for the remaining votes. What we are proposing is to put in place a rule that would enable not only the Conservative Party members to have their sleep time but all members of the House to have a health break. I see that as a good thing. At least half of the Conservatives should be voting in favour of that one; otherwise, they may have a tough time looking in the mirror because that is exactly what they did the last time we had a voting marathon.

• (1945)

The other thing it provides for is for third reading to take place on the same day for which report stage is approved. That is an important aspect. Let me make it relevant to something that happened today where we had a sense of co-operation. There was, for example, a Conservative private member's bill that came up for report stage. All it would have taken was for any group to stand up when report stage was called, and say they would like a recorded vote. In fact, that happens. As a direct result, debate ends, or technically, does not even start, and then it is dropped until the next time it appears for third reading.

Instead of doing that, because we understood that the member wanted to have the private member's bill, Bill C-318, debated, we agreed, and then debate started at third reading. If we as a government recognize the value of that, and if private Conservative members recognize the value of it, then one would think there has to be a good percentage of Conservatives who would agree that the government should be able to have the same sort of treatment. It is a common courtesy. It was in the best interest of all concerned to have that take place.

From my perspective, those are the three big things taking place in the motion. It begs the question why any member of the House of Commons would vote against the measures being proposed. The short answer is that there is, I will not say a hidden agenda, because it is actually quite obvious, but a tactic that the Conservative Party has been using for years. I often refer to it as a destructive force here on the floor of the House of Commons. There are some people, especially from the far right, and we can call them the MAGA element or whatever we want, who at times have a disdain for institutions like the House of Commons. They want to show as much as possible that it is dysfunctional, believing they benefit by that.

I want people to think about this: There is an opposition party that criticizes the government for not getting its legislation through, but the reason we cannot get it through is that the Conservative Party, the opposition party, is playing games and preventing it from going through. It does not take much to prevent legislation from going through in the normal process. We could allow 12 students from Sisler High School, Maples Collegiate, R.B. Russell, Children of the Earth or St. John's High School, any school in my riding, to sit in the chamber, and that could prevent legislation from passing. It does not take much at all.

I remind my Conservative friends to realize what a majority of members in the chamber have realized, and that was that in the last election, a minority government was elected. That means that the government has to, as there is no choice, work on consensus and

build with at least one willing partner in order to get things through. Otherwise it is not going to happen. That is one of the things the government should take away from the last election.

• (1950)

The official opposition also has a role to recognize. The official opposition, in particular its current leader, has not recognized the responsibility given by the people of Canada back in 2021. That member has a responsibility that I have not witnessed. I have seen the games by members of the Conservative Party. They do whatever they can to prevent legislation from passing and then criticize the government for not getting legislation passed. There are so many examples of that. We just finished an hour of debate on Bill C-318. In fact, I was the last to speak to it. There is no doubt that Bill C-318 is a very important piece of legislation. Listen to what people actually say about Bill C-318. Is there anyone in the chamber who does not support the principles being proposed? I would argue no.

We understand the value of Bill C-318. That is why, as a political party, with the Prime Minister, we made an election promise to follow through with the principles of Bill C-318. Let us look at the last budget. There was some preliminary work a year ago on this same issue about adoptive parents and how we could ensure they would get EI benefits. If we look at the mandate letters the Prime Minister gives to ministers, we can see that those principles are incorporated in them. Everyone knows that the government is moving forward on the issue.

The kicker is that it is actually in legislation today, Bill C-59, the fall economic statement. It is a very important piece of legislation that would support Canadians in a very real and tangible way. Where is that legislation today? It is still in second reading. The Conservatives refuse to pass it. When we call it forward, they come up with games. They do not want that legislation to pass.

Let us look at what happened during the previous fall economic statement. We were debating the budget of 2023-24 while we were still on the 2022 fall economic statement. That is bizarre. The Conservative Party members refused to pass the legislation. They would rather filibuster, knowing full well that there is a limited amount of time. Any group of grade 12 students would be able to do what they are doing, so it is no great achievement, unless, of course, they are trying to prove something. They are trying to say that the government is ineffective because the institution is broken.

The problem with this institution is that we do not have an opposition party that recognizes its true responsibilities. Conservative members' major objective is to be a destructive force on the floor of the House of Commons. What is the impact of that? Let us go back to the private member's bill, Bill C-318. If they had passed the fall economic statement when it should have been passed, then Bill C-318 would be virtually redundant and not be a necessary piece of legislation. In fact, it would have provided even more for adoptive parents in a family unit than Bill C-318.

Government Orders

• (1955)

However, it is not the first time, if we think of the types of legislation we have brought through. Sometimes, Conservatives will even filibuster legislation they agree with, as well as legislation they oppose. I remember my first speech on the Canada-Ukraine trade agreement. I was very generous with my comments. I honestly thought everyone was going to support it. It is a trade agreement that even the NDP, the Bloc and the Green Party supported. For the first time ever, Conservatives voted against a trade agreement and slowed down the debate on that legislation. Here we have a country at war, whose president came to Canada in September to sign the first trade agreement for Ukraine, sending a powerful message during a time of war, and the Conservative Party turned their backs on Ukraine and ultimately prevented the bill from passing as soon as it can—

The Deputy Speaker: I believe we have a point of order. The hon. member for North Okanagan—Shuswap.

Mr. Mel Arnold: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not see the relevance of this conversation to the debate at hand. I would like the member to get on with the actual debate at hand.

The Deputy Speaker: I thank the hon. member for bringing that up. I would remind colleagues to keep their conversations relevant to the bill at hand.

The hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I would say it is a rookie mistake, but it is actually not a mistake; it is absolutely relevant when we are talking about the need to extend debating hours. The Conservatives were crying because they were not getting enough hours, and I am giving examples of how they would prevent debate by bringing concurrence motions. I cited the Ukraine trade agreement, which is about as relevant as one can be regarding the motion at hand.

We can talk about the extension of the hours, but I have a better one for the member opposite: Voting. Members will recall when close to 50% of the Conservatives, not necessarily that member, were sleeping during the last vote-a-thon, assuming that is what they were doing between midnight and eight o'clock in the morning, we continued to vote? The Conservative Party continued to vote, not necessarily all its members. Some highlights of what they actually voted on are interesting. Let us remember that some members had been up for 24 hours, and we were voting on a whole lot of tax dollars.

To give members a few examples of what was being voted on, there was the construction of 71,000 new rental homes through the apartment construction loan program, the construction of 12,000 new affordable homes through the rapid housing initiative and the crackdown on terrorism financing. There was the federal housing advocate. There was a vote on the Ukrainian immigrants settling in Canada, helping them find accommodations and initial financial support. There was the training of Ukrainian soldiers through Operation Unifier, not to mention Canada's NATO mission. There is a long list here, and a good portion of it took place while half the Conservative caucus was not even around to vote because it was nighttime. This motion would make sure that not only the Conser-

vatives would have that health break between midnight and nine o'clock, but also all members would have the same treatment. What is wrong with that?

As I pointed out, with those three main aspects, I would think the Conservative Party would support that. All one needs to do is to reflect on many of the tactics the Conservative Party has used over the years. I can cite that the biggest one is probably the concurrence motions. One that really gets me is when one Conservative member stands up, and then another member stands up to say that they move to now be heard, so there are two Conservatives fighting about who can speak. As a result, the bells ring for a half hour. What about when they move a motion to adjourn the House, which then causes the bells to ring? Those are all attempts to prevent debate from occurring.

We want debate. We want a healthier democracy. If we support a healthier democracy here in Canada, here on the floor of the House of Commons, I would hope Conservatives would recognize and would support this motion. Not supporting it sends a message to their constituents that they are not prepared to work hard, and they are quite frankly part of a Conservative far right MAGA movement that wants to destabilize our institutions.

• (2000)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: It being 8:01 p.m., pursuant to order made earlier today, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of Motion No. 35 under Government Business, which is now before the House.

The question is on the motion.

[*English*]

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or that a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

The hon. member for Battle River—Crowfoot.

Mr. Damien Kurek: I would ask for a recorded vote.

The Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

• (2040)

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

(*Division No. 654*)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badaway
Bains	Baker
Battiste	Beech
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blaney	Blois
Boissonnault	Boulerice

Government Orders

Bradford	Brière		
Cannings	Carr		
Casey	Chagger		
Chahal	Champagne	Aboultaif	
Chatel	Chen	Albas	
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Arnold	
Collins (Victoria)	Cormier	Barlow	
Coteau	Dabrusin	Barsalou-Duval	
Damoff	Davies	Bergeron	
Dhaliwal	Dhillon	Bérubé	
Diab	Drouin	Blanchette-Joncas	
Dubourg	Duclos	Bragdon	
Duguid	Dzerowicz	Brock	
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith	Calkins	
Fillmore	Fisher	Carrie	
Fonseca	Fortier	Chambers	
Fragiskatos	Fraser	Cooper	
Fry	Gaheer	Dancho	
Gainey	Garrison	DeBellefeuille	
Gazan	Gerretsen	Desilets	
Gould	Green	Dowdall	
Hajdu	Hanley	Ellis	
Hardie	Hepfner	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	
Holland	Housefather	Fast	
Hughes	Hussen	Fortin	
Hutchings	Iacono	Garon	
Idlout	Ien	Généreux	
Jaczek	Johns	Gill	
Joly	Jowhari	Godin	
Julian	Kayabaga	Gourde	
Kelloway	Khalid	Hallan	
Khera	Koutrakis	Jeneroux	
Kusmierczyk	Kwan	Khanna	
Lalonde	Lambropoulos	Kniec	
Lamoureux	Lapointe	Kramp-Neuman	
Lattanzio	Lauzon	Kusie	
Lebouthillier	Lightbound	Lantsman	
Long	Longfield	Lawrence	
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)	Lemire	
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacGregor	Lewis (Essex)	
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney	Liepert	
Martinez Ferrada	Mathysen	Lobb	
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	Majumdar	
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty	Mazier	
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	Melillo	
McLeod	McPherson	Moore	
Mendès	Mendicino	Motz	
Miao	Miller	Nater	
Morrice	Morrissey	Patzer	
Murray	Naqvi	Pauzé	
Noormohamed	O'Connell	Perron	
Oliphant	O'Regan	Redekopp	
Petitpas Taylor	Powlowski	Rempel Garner	
Qualtrough	Robillard	Roberts	
Rogers	Romanado	Ruff	
Rota	Sahota	Scheer	
Sajjan	Saks	Seeback	
Samson	Sarai	Shipley	
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke	Sinclair-Desgagné	
Serré	Sgro	Soroka	
Shanahan	Sheehan	Ste-Marie	
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)	Strahl	
Singh	Sorbara	Thériault	
Sousa	St-Onge	Thomas	
Sudds	Tassi	Tolmie	
Taylor Roy	Thompson	Uppal	
Trudeau	Turnbull	Vecchio	
Valdez	Van Bynen	Vien	
van Koeverden	Vandal	Vignola	
Vandenbeld	Virani	Vis	
Weiler	Wilkinson	Warkentin	
Yip	Zahid	Webber	
Zarrillo	Zuberi — 170	Williamson — 139	

NAYS

Members

Aitchison
Allison
Baldinelli
Barrett
Beaulieu
Berthold
Bezan
Block
Brassard
Brunelle-Duceppe
Caputo
Chabot
Champoux
Dalton
Davidson
Desbiens
Doherty
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Ferrerri
Gallant
Gaudreau
Genuis
Gladu
Goodridge
Gray
Hoback
Kelly
Kitchen
Kram
Kurek
Lake
Larouche
Lehoux
Leslie
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lloyd
Maguire
Martel
McCaughey (Edmonton West)
Michaud
Morantz
Muys
Normandin
Paul-Hus
Perkins
Poilievre
Reid
Richards
Rood
Savard-Tremblay
Schmale
Shields
Simard
Small
Steinley
Stewart
Stubbs
Therrien
Tochor
Trudel
Van Popta
Vidal
Viersen
Villemure
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams

Government Orders

PAIRED

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Members

It being 8:45 p.m., the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

Deltell
Guilbeault
Ng
Rodriguez

Dreeshen
LeBlanc
Plamondon
Zimmer — 8

(The House adjourned at 8:45 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Wednesday, February 28, 2024

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Housing	
Mr. Morrice	21423
Human Rights in Russia	
Mr. McKay	21423
Jack Donald	
Mr. Calkins	21423
Canada-Nepal Relations	
Ms. Sidhu (Brampton South)	21423
Centre d'écoute et de prévention suicide Drummond	
Mr. Champoux	21424
Pink Shirt Day	
Ms. Lambropoulos	21424
Memorial Park in Listowell	
Mr. Nater	21424
Order of Canada	
Mr. Coteau	21424
Foreign Affairs	
Ms. Diab	21425
Carbon Tax	
Mr. Shields	21425
St. Patrick's Parade	
Mr. Schiefke	21425
Carbon Tax	
Mr. Hoback	21425
ArriveCAN App	
Mr. Martel	21425
Black and Indigenous Entrepreneurship	
Mr. Fillmore	21426
Indigenous Affairs	
Ms. Idlout	21426
Mirabel, Maple Capital of the World	
Mr. Garon	21426
ArriveCAN Application	
Mr. Kurek	21426
Coldest Night of the Year	
Ms. Khalid	21427

ORAL QUESTIONS

Royal Canadian Mounted Police	
Mr. Poilievre	21427
Mr. Trudeau	21427
Mr. Poilievre	21427

Mr. Trudeau	21427
Mr. Poilievre	21427
Mr. Trudeau	21427
Mr. Poilievre	21427
Mr. Trudeau	21427
Mr. Poilievre	21428
Mr. Trudeau	21428
Pharmacare	
Mr. Blanchet	21428
Mr. Trudeau	21428
Mr. Blanchet	21428
Mr. Trudeau	21428
Health	
Mr. Singh	21428
Mr. Trudeau	21428
The Environment	
Mr. Singh	21428
Mr. Trudeau	21429
Carbon Pricing	
Mr. Poilievre	21429
Mr. Trudeau	21429
Mr. Poilievre	21429
Mr. Trudeau	21429
Mr. Poilievre	21429
Mr. Trudeau	21429
Mr. Poilievre	21429
Mr. Trudeau	21430
Mr. Poilievre	21430
Mr. Trudeau	21430
Mr. Poilievre	21430
Mr. Trudeau	21430
Seniors	
Mr. Blanchet	21430
Mr. Trudeau	21430
Mr. Blanchet	21430
Mr. Trudeau	21430
Carbon Pricing	
Mr. Poilievre	21431
Mr. Trudeau	21431
Mr. Poilievre	21431
Mr. Trudeau	21431
Mr. Poilievre	21431
Mr. Trudeau	21431
Mr. Poilievre	21431
Mr. Trudeau	21431
Mr. Poilievre	21431
Mr. Trudeau	21431
Housing	
Ms. Idlout	21432
Mr. Trudeau	21432

Grocery Industry	
Ms. Barron.....	21432
Mr. Trudeau.....	21432
Labour	
Mr. Fonseca.....	21432
Mr. Trudeau.....	21432
Housing	
Mr. Poilievre.....	21432
Mr. Trudeau.....	21432
Mr. Poilievre.....	21433
Mr. Trudeau.....	21433
Mr. Poilievre.....	21433
Mr. Trudeau.....	21433
Mr. Poilievre.....	21433
Mr. Trudeau.....	21433
Public Services and Procurement	
Mr. Blanchet.....	21433
Mr. Trudeau.....	21433
Mr. Blanchet.....	21434
Mr. Trudeau.....	21434
Mr. Poilievre.....	21434
Mr. Trudeau.....	21434
Mr. Poilievre.....	21434
Mr. Trudeau.....	21434
Mr. Poilievre.....	21434
Mr. Trudeau.....	21434
Justice	
Ms. Dhillon.....	21434
Mr. Trudeau.....	21434
Taxation	
Mr. Poilievre.....	21435
Mr. Trudeau.....	21435
Mr. Poilievre.....	21435
Mr. Trudeau.....	21435
Public Safety	
Mr. Poilievre.....	21435
Mr. Trudeau.....	21435
Fisheries and Oceans	
Ms. Diab.....	21435
Mr. Trudeau.....	21435
Emergency Preparedness	
Mr. Bachrach.....	21436
Mr. Trudeau.....	21436
Climate Change	
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands).....	21436
Mr. Trudeau.....	21436
National Microbiology Laboratory	
Mr. Holland.....	21436
Points of Order	
Oral Questions	
Mr. Strahl.....	21436
Mr. Blaikie.....	21436

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Business of Supply

Opposition Motion—ArriveCAN App

Motion.....	21437
Motion agreed to.....	21438

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission Act

Bill C-354. Second reading.....	21438
Motion agreed to.....	21440
(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee) ..	21440

Criminal Code

Bill C-321. Third reading.....	21440
Motion agreed to.....	21441
(Bill read the third time and passed).....	21441

Corrections and Conditional Release Act

Bill C-320. Third reading.....	21441
Motion agreed to.....	21442
(Bill read the third time and passed).....	21442

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions

Mr. Lamoureux.....	21442
Motion.....	21442
Motion agreed to.....	21444

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Government Business No. 35—Extension of Sitting Hours and Conduct of Extended Proceedings

Motion That Debate Be Not Further Adjourned

Mr. MacKinnon.....	21444
Motion.....	21444
Mr. Brassard.....	21444
Mr. Julian.....	21444
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands).....	21445

Business of the House

Mr. MacKinnon.....	21446
--------------------	-------

Canada Early Learning and Child Care Act

Notice of Closure Motion

Mr. MacKinnon.....	21446
--------------------	-------

Government Business No. 35—Extension of Sitting Hours and Conduct of Extended Proceedings

Motion That Debate Be Not Further Adjourned

Motion.....	21446
Mr. Gerretsen.....	21446
Mr. MacKinnon.....	21446
Mr. Davidson.....	21446
Mr. Johns.....	21447

Mr. Lamoureux	21447
Mrs. Vecchio	21448
Mr. Julian	21448
Mrs. Roberts	21448
Mr. Calkins	21448
(Motion agreed to)	21450

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Committees of the House

Procedure and House Affairs

Ms. Chagger	21451
Motion for concurrence	21451
(Motion agreed to)	21451

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Employment Insurance Act

Bill C-318. Report stage	21451
Mrs. Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	21451
Motion for concurrence	21451
(Motion agreed to)	21451

Third reading	21451
Mr. Kurek	21452
Mr. Kusmierczyk	21453
Ms. Ferreri	21453
Mr. Lamoureux	21453
Mr. Kusmierczyk	21453
Ms. Gaudreau	21454
Ms. Gazan	21455
Ms. Ferreri	21456
Mr. Lamoureux	21458

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Government Business No. 35—Extension of Sitting Hours and Conduct of Extended Proceedings

Motion	21459
Mr. Julian	21459
Mr. Lamoureux	21459
Mr. Kurek	21460
Mr. MacGregor	21460
Mr. Lamoureux	21461
Motion agreed to	21465

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>