



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

43rd PARLIAMENT, 2nd SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 150 No. 109
Wednesday, June 2, 2021

Speaker: The Honourable Anthony Rota



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, June 2, 2021

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 Timmins—James Bay.

[*Members sang the national anthem*]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

ITALIAN HERITAGE MONTH

Ms. Patricia Lattanzio (Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, June has been officially recognized as Italian Heritage Month. As such, I would like to turn our attention toward the contributions made by Italian Canadians not only within their local communities, but across Canada.

Within just the last few generations, there have been many Italian Canadians who have worked tirelessly and have been successful in the fields of business, science, education, law and politics. Every day, because of their dedication and innovative characters, they have made invaluable contributions to the lives of countless Canadians and have shaped the societal, economic and cultural landscape of Canada as we know it today.

I am incredibly honoured to represent my riding of Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel, which is home to one of the largest Italian communities in Canada. This vibrant community serves as a constant reminder of the incredible ways in which new immigrants to our country can have an everlasting impact.

Happy Italian Heritage Month. [*Member spoke in Italian*]

[*English*]

* * *

FILIPINO HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. Jamie Schmale (Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my warmest congratulations to all Filipino

Canadians as they celebrate the first official Filipino Heritage Month here in Ontario.

I want to commend the wonderful contributions that Filipinos have made to communities in Ontario and throughout Canada. Filipinos are known for being incredibly warm, hard-working and compassionate, which has naturally drawn Filipinos to successfully work in many frontline jobs such as nursing, health care, child care and caregiving. This allows them to help all Canadians, starting from childhood all the way up to our esteemed leaders. Filipinos have also consistently ranked first in the independent immigrants category, a group selected on the basis of their skills and ability to contribute quickly to Canadian society and the Canadian economy.

I am proud to represent over 600 Filipinos who have made their home in Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock and of the ongoing contributions they are making to improve their community.

* * *

RED SHIRT DAY

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today, June 2, is Red Shirt Day, an annual event when people across Canada come together and wear red to show their support for persons who are living with disabilities.

An initiative of Easter Seals Canada, Red Shirt Day takes place each year on the Wednesday of National AccessAbility Week, which this year runs from May 30 to June 5. Wearing red today represents a pledge that we will help create a fully accessible and inclusive society by educating ourselves, by removing barriers, whether they are physical, social or systemic, and by honouring and valuing the contributions of people of all abilities, in all aspects of life in Canada.

I encourage my fellow parliamentarians and all Canadians to don something red today. They should be sure to share their photos when doing that on social media using #RedShirtDay or #EasterSeals.

* * *

• (1410)

[*Translation*]

AMYOTROPHIC LATERAL SCLEROSIS

Ms. Marie-Hélène Gaudreau (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ): Mr. Speaker, today, June 2, is Lou Gehrig Day, and I would like to share something about myself.

Statements by Members

Twenty-three years ago, my father, Gaston Gaudreau, was diagnosed with a fatal disease at the age of 54: amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, or ALS.

This horrible disease is a long, slow road to death. Every muscle in the body atrophies, rendering the person immobile. As my father used to say, “I am alive in my coffin.” He died three years ago, but he never stopped hoping that a cure would be found for this fatal disease.

That day has finally come. There is now a treatment for ALS. Unfortunately, it is taking a long time for this treatment to become available here in Quebec and Canada. These people cannot wait. Time is running out for them.

I implore the government to act now because this is urgent.

I would like to pay tribute to all those who are living with this disease, as well as to their families and caregivers, like my mother, Françoise Lajeunesse.

* * *

[English]

AMYOTROPHIC LATERAL SCLEROSIS

Mr. Francis Drouin (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today is Lou Gehrig Day and June is ALS awareness month. Every year, more than 1,000 Canadians are diagnosed with ALS and 1,000 pass away from this terrible disease.

[Translation]

The life expectancy after diagnosis for a person with ALS is two to five years on average.

There are only two medications for ALS that have been approved in Canada.

[English]

It is important that all governments fund research to make ALS a treatable disease. There are currently 16 clinical trials in Canada. It is important all governments work together to reduce the time frame for drugs approval in Canada as patients do not have the luxury to wait.

I thank the Major League Baseball and Baseball Canada for raising ALS today through Lou Gehrig Day. I encourage all Canadians to get involved in their local ALS walks and get their neighbours to donate.

Finally, I thank my colleagues from all parties who are part of the ALS caucus and are advancing issues on behalf of the ALS patient community.

* * *

CANADIAN FAIRS AND EXHIBITIONS

Mr. Tony Baldinelli (Niagara Falls, CPC): Mr. Speaker, before the onset of COVID-19, Canadian fairs and exhibitions generated an estimated \$2.9 billion in annual economic impact. With over 17,000 events and programs held across Canada every year, these fairs and exhibitions would attract over 35 million visitors annually.

However, since the pandemic began, Canadian fairs and exhibitions have been among the hardest hit. Many of them are seasonal operations run by non-profit community boards, which depend on mass gatherings to operate and generate the revenues they need to continue. In fact, the Canadian Association of Fairs and Exhibitions, CAFE, believes its industry members will only reach a recovery next summer, the summer of 2022.

Despite this pandemic lasting nearly 15 months now, no federal funding has yet been made accessible to the majority of CAFE members. Canada's Conservatives recognize the great importance and impact fairs and exhibitions have on our tourism sector and on our local communities. As such, we call on the federal government to provide better access and greater support for Canadian fairs and exhibitions through these most challenging of times.

* * *

DAVE BRENTON

Mr. Churence Rogers (Bonavista—Burin—Trinity, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I want to pay tribute to a constituent of mine, Mr. Dave Brenton, of Marystown.

Dave was a strong community leader and always strived to make things better. He was a mentor to many and an advocate for all. He was a high school teacher and principal. He formed local sports teams. He was a lifetime member of the Kinsmen Club of Canada and a member of the Marystown town council for years. As a member of his local health care foundation, he helped raise millions of dollars through radiothons and other initiatives to better the health care system on the Burin Peninsula.

I would need much more time to go into a full list of Dave's accomplishments. His loss leaves a large void among his community and all who knew him. Please join me in sending sincere sympathies to his wife Anne, their three children and grandchildren and everyone in Marystown and the surrounding region who was so positively affected by his hard work and goodwill.

May he rest in peace.

* * *

● (1415)

ITALIAN HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. Francesco Sorbara (Vaughan—Woodbridge, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Italian Heritage Month has arrived in Canada. Today, June 2, Italy celebrates the 75th *Festa della Repubblica* and the founding of the Italian Republic.

[Member spoke in Italian and provided the following text:]

Buona Festa della Repubblica a tutti.

[English]

Here in Canada, we proudly celebrate and share our Italian heritage, as well as our vast contributions to building this country we are blessed to call home.

[Member spoke in Italian and provided the following text:]

Ma anche quest'anno, rispettiamo e onore il passato. Il 27 maggio, il nostro Primo Ministro ha presentato

[*English*]

the formal apology for Italian Canadians interned during the Second World War.

This Italian Heritage Month, I wish to honour the resilience of these immigrants who endured so much.

As the Prime Minister stated:

What better way to prove that they loved the country they had chosen to call home. It would have been so easy to turn their backs on Canada. Instead, they put their backs into building it.

Happy Italian Heritage Month.

[*Member spoke in Italian*]

* * *

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY

Mr. Martin Shields (Bow River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is no secret the government lacks accountability. Last week, we learned that third party consultation fees cost \$1.3 billion more than an earlier estimate of just two months ago, totalling \$17 billion in 2022.

Since the Prime Minister took office, the public service bureaucracy has ballooned by 10,000 employees per year, totalling 380,000 employees and costing \$47 billion in 2020 alone.

The government believes it can spend its way out of trouble using money taken from the people it governs, then the Prime Minister tells people that they are taking on the burden so that we do not have to. Well, these are hard-earned dollars of the taxpayers, not the government's money.

The Conservative Party has a plan to secure accountability in government and reel in this irresponsible spending so that government serves its people once again, not the reverse.

* * *

FILIPINO HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Winnipeg North is the heart of Canada's Filipino heritage community.

Yesterday morning, I was on the corner of Keewatin and Adsum, below the Dr. Jose Rizal statue, and only a couple of blocks from the Dr. Jose Rizal Park. Three blocks south of me, on Keewatin Street, the local MLA, Cindy, who happens to be my daughter, was in a jeepney. We participated in a live social media event as we wanted to encourage people of all backgrounds to take note that June was national Filipino Heritage Month in Canada.

Today, Canada has approximately one million people of Filipino heritage. From coast to coast to coast, the community is growing and contributing to Canada in a very real and special way.

For over 30 years, I have been attending fiestas, debutants, birthdays, spiritual events, concerts, pavilions, homes, workplace environments and so on, where I have witnessed kindness, hard work, love, fun and so much more.

Statements by Members

I would encourage all Canadians to recognize the true value of how our Filipino heritage community has made Canada a better country to call home.

* * *

PRIDE MONTH

Mr. Kyle Seeback (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, June is pride month and every June we celebrate and embrace the values of pride. It is also a time to remember the many struggles that have been overcome and the considerable achievements made, but also the work that still needs to be done to achieve equality and inclusivity. While we celebrate the many achievements of the LGBTQ+ community and how far we have come as a society, let us not forget our work is not done.

In Dufferin—Caledon, we are extremely fortunate to have community groups that continuously strive for inclusivity, equality and diversity for all. I want to express my gratitude to groups like Pride Orangeville, LGBTQ+ Dufferin County and Jim Waddington, who organizes Orangeville pride. Their tremendous efforts are building strong, more inclusive communities, and their hard work inspires us all.

I wish Dufferin—Caledon a happy pride day.

* * *

● (1420)

[*Translation*]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is Canadian Environment Week, and it is a great time to remind ourselves that our country's natural beauty needs protection. That is why the Conservative Party released its plan, "Secure the Environment".

This plan will protect our environment and uphold our commitments without pitting one region against another, the way the Liberal government does. We will ban the disposal of plastic in our oceans thanks to the bill introduced by the member for York—Simcoe.

[*English*]

Bill C-204 would ban the export of plastic waste to other countries to be dumped in the ocean and instead handle it here at home. Sadly, the Liberals oppose the bill and would rather see us export our plastic waste around the world.

Statements by Members

The Liberal government sees the environment as a way to create divisions between Canadians. On our side, we will secure the environment and secure the future for all Canadians.

I wish everyone a happy Environment Week.

* * *

AMYOTROPHIC LATERAL SCLEROSIS

Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, ALS is a devastating disease that affects thousands of Canadians. Today, on Lou Gehrig Day, we think about the brave people who faced ALS with profound dignity and strength, people like Gehrig, Stephen Hawking and jazz great, Charles Mingus.

Today, I would like to recognize those who tend to remain unseen and unheralded, the caregivers, the ones caring for their parents, spouses and children who are battling this disease. These are often women facing daunting physical and emotional challenges, women like Marie-Christine Tremblay, who supports her husband with ALS and her mother with Alzheimer's. These women hold their families together through love and determination, and through back-breaking and heart-wrenching work.

Since ALS is such a relentless disease, robbing their loved ones of their most basic functions day by day, their struggles are often overlooked. We thank them for their commitment in the face of unimaginable obstacles. They share the strength of Gehrig, the determination of Hawking and the creative genius of Mingus.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CATHERINE RAÏCHE

Mr. Denis Trudel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, last week, another glass ceiling was shattered in the world of sports. Quebec's Catherine Raïche became the first woman in NFL history to be named vice-president of football operations by the Philadelphia Eagles.

Originally from La Prairie on Montreal's south shore, Catherine studied law at the Université de Sherbrooke and earned a master's degree in taxation. Her career changed course when she did an internship with the Montreal Alouettes in 2015. By 2017, she was the team's assistant general manager. Now promoted to the rank of vice-president of football operations for the Philadelphia Eagles, Catherine Raïche will be involved in all areas of football operations for the team.

Her recent promotion serves to inspire all women and girls who want to work in pro sports, an industry still heavily dominated by men, unfortunately. Catherine Raïche is open about her ambition to become the NFL's first female general manager someday. It is thanks to hard-working, ambitious women that things change.

Congratulations, Catherine, and keep it up. Quebec is behind you all the way.

[*English*]

THE ECONOMY

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC): Mr. Speaker, provinces will be reopening soon. There are signs of hope again despite all the many losses associated with COVID-19 and living under prolonged restrictions.

For almost a year and a half now, families, seniors, youth, workers and many vulnerable groups have struggled. Canadians have already been through so much, and there is still a lot of work left to be done. It was always true that when the worst fears and immediate damage from COVID were over, more people would need attention and support as they worked through the aftermath.

A full recovery for Canada will take time and serious effort. It cannot be done without ensuring we bring back the million jobs that were lost. This has to be done in every sector and every region of the country. However, the Prime Minister's mind is elsewhere, trying to "reimagine" the economy instead of focusing on the basics.

Canadians can count on the Conservatives based on our strong record in the last recession. We will work to make it happen for small business, women, youth and all Canadians in one year.

This is our recovery plan: secure jobs and secure the future.

* * *

TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION COMMISSION

Mr. Michael McLeod (Northwest Territories, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today marks the anniversary of the release of the TRC's 94 calls to action, which was an appeal to mobilize all levels of government, organizations as well as individuals to advance reconciliation through concrete changes in society.

Today, we acknowledge the courage of the former students and families that came forward to share their truth and leadership, and the guidance of the commissioners who provided us with a path forward.

The commission's findings revealed the heartbreaking details of the role that residential schools played in the unacceptable colonial history of Canada and the tragic legacy that continues today. While almost 80% of the calls to action under the sole responsibility of the federal government, or a shared responsibility with provinces, territory governments and other key partners, are completed or well under way, we are committed to accelerating progress on these essential steps toward reconciliation.

Today, we honour and support the survivors and reflect on how all Canadians can support reconciliation.

ORAL QUESTIONS

• (1425)

[English]

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we do not think of Canada as a country with mass grave sites and because we do not, this week has changed us all. However, we were warned they were there. Children disappeared from families without any closure of what happened to them.

Will the government commit to urgent action on calls to action 71 to 76 from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission report so these families can have some closure?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have fully accepted all the recommendations of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, which includes working with indigenous communities to locate their missing loved ones and their unmarked burial places in a culturally informed way.

In 2019, we invested \$33.8 million in this work, and we have been engaging with indigenous communities impacted by residential schools on how best to proceed. We will continue to move forward, recognize the horror and the tragedy of the past, and fix the wrongs of the present in partnership with indigenous peoples.

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister, in 2015, said that he would move on all calls to action. This morning, the minister reannounced funding that was two years old: no new plan, no new resources, no sense of urgency.

This week has changed the country. Canadians need to know that it has also changed the urgency with the government.

Again, will the Prime Minister commit to announcing a plan to deliver on calls to action 71 to 76, dealing with missing children, from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission report by Canada Day?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yes, we have been and we will continue to be. From 2015 onward, we have taken this extraordinarily seriously and have worked with the partners in indigenous communities across the country on the important work of reconciliation. We accepted all the TRC recommendations and calls to action. We have been moving forward on them. We will continue to do that.

We recognize the fresh urgency that non-indigenous Canadians are feeling because they are seeing this tragedy, which, unfortunately, is horrific and is terrible, but is not a tremendous surprise to many indigenous families that have known this reality for far too long.

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what is not a tremendous surprise to families, indigenous communities and many Canadians is that we hear nothing but talk in Ottawa, including from the Prime Minister who, six years ago, said he would move on all plans.

These children, the families and the communities deserve a precise and clear road map, with funding and timelines, to deliver on

Oral Questions

calls to action 71 to 76 dealing with these sites. If we are really going to embrace the country that is Canada, the Prime Minister needs to announce this before Canada Day.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, since 2019, we have been working on this issue with indigenous communities, with indigenous leadership to ensure we are moving forward in a culturally appropriate, trauma-informed way.

We understand that there is new urgency and pressures to move on this, and we will continue to invest as much as is necessary to support communities on that path forward.

I will not take lessons from the Conservatives on this. They were the ones who refused to give any money at all on this issue, refused \$1.5 million to help with this. We have been there, and we will continue to be there.

• (1430)

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Prime Minister, we all need to take lessons from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission report, the recommendations on which, six years ago, the Prime Minister said he would act and deliver. We have, collectively, not done that.

I wrote to him on moving forward on Bill C-8, and I appreciate the effort to move that forward. However, we need to show urgency now to give closure to these families and to indigenous communities. It is not the time for political rhetoric in Ottawa; it is time to come together with a plan.

Will the Prime Minister commit to delivering that plan to Canadians ahead of Canada Day?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as a government, we will continue to move forward on this reconciliation journey in partnership with indigenous peoples. That means, yes, moving forward on Bill C-8, and I appreciate the Leader of the Opposition's support on that, but it also means moving forward on the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, which is still problematic for the Conservative Party.

It means continuing to move forward on ending boil water advisories, which we are working hard on and will continue to. It means continuing to respect indigenous languages and indigenous culture and fighting systemic racism right across the country, and doing it at all orders of government.

[Translation]

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this morning, the minister reannounced funding that was two years old: no new plan, no new resources, no sense of urgency. Canadians want to know what the government will do differently.

Oral Questions

Once again, will the Prime Minister commit to act on calls to action 71 to 76 of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission before Canada Day?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, unlike the Conservative Party, we accepted all of the recommendations of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission.

In particular, we will continue to work in collaboration with indigenous communities to locate their missing loved ones and their unmarked burial places in a culturally informed way.

In 2019, we invested \$33.8 million in this effort, and we opened a dialogue with the indigenous communities affected by the legacy of residential schools to find the best possible approach for them. They will continue to be at the centre of everything we do.

* * *

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, 17 days ago, the current member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie accepted my proposal to limit time for debate to ensure the passage of an act to amend the Broadcasting Act.

The goal is to make sure it passes before the end of the parliamentary session in order to protect Canadian ownership, new Canadian content and new French-language content, thanks to amendments the Bloc Québécois successfully introduced.

Instead, the Prime Minister prefers to bicker with the Conservatives on the sidelines, perhaps so that Bill C-10 will be defeated without him having to take the blame.

Are the Liberals really serious about protecting Canadian, Quebec and francophone artists and creators?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the cultural community and artists know full well that this government has always been and will always be there for them and with them to provide support not only in these difficult times during the pandemic, but also in an increasingly digitized era.

We deplore the games the Conservatives are playing in committee to block this bill.

We will continue to push this bill forward, as it will help protect Canadian culture across the country, and we hope it will pass by the end of this parliamentary session.

Mr. Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is all hope and no action.

Last week the Prime Minister made numerous statements about recognizing once and for all and without conditions the Quebec nation as a nation whose only official language and only common language is French.

However his commitment to French in Quebec and across Canada needs to be meaningful. He needs to put his proverbial money where his mouth is. Bill C-10 is a measure that also helps protect and promote French, creators who create in French and performers who act and sing in French.

Does the Prime Minister not believe that he has a duty to bring in everything—

• (1435)

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

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I sincerely thank the leader of the Bloc Québécois for recognizing that protecting language is important to the Liberal Party, to the Liberal government.

That is why there are measures in Bill C-10 to protect culture, the French language and the French expression we find in our artistic community. That is absolutely another reason why we are working so hard to move this bill forward.

Obviously we deplore the fact that the Conservatives continue to block this bill, but we will work with everyone in the House to get through this.

* * *

[*English*]

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the discovery of 215 indigenous children at a former residential school has shocked the nation. It is another example of clear proof of the genocidal actions of Canada. It is a moment where we need to move beyond condolences to clear action.

How can the Prime Minister take reconciliation seriously when he is sending his lawyers to fight indigenous kids in court? In fact, the next date is in two weeks.

My question is directly for the Prime Minister: Will he call off his lawyers? Will he stop fighting indigenous kids in court?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we have said many, many times, every single survivor deserves compensation. That is something this government is committed to. We are working with communities, with families and with indigenous leadership to move forward on the right way to get that support to them.

We also understand that on top of just compensation and supports, we need to end the problem. We need to create institutions and supports and culturally informed ways of moving forward to support these kids now and into the future.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the country was shocked by the discovery of the remains of 215 indigenous children at a former residential school. This is yet more proof of Canada's genocidal actions, but what we need now is meaningful action. How can the Prime Minister take reconciliation seriously when he is continuing to fight residential school survivors in court?

My question is the following: Will he stop fighting residential school survivors in court, yes or no?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the entire country is grappling with the news of this awful tragedy, the deaths of these children and the horrors of the residential schools. That is why we unequivocally recognized that the children who were abused in our systems and institutions must receive compensation. It is just a matter of working with the communities, families and leaders to ensure not only that the compensation is received, but also that we bring about institutional change to improve the lives of these children.

* * *

[English]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is clear the government has failed to protect national security. It granted a scientist from China's military, Feihu Yan of the People's Liberation Army, access to its level 4 Winnipeg lab, where the world's most dangerous viruses and pathogens are handled. How did this individual get access to the lab? Will the Prime Minister ensure that no scientist from China's military is granted access again in the future?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we take very seriously the responsibilities around national security, which is why we work very closely with national security organizations like CSIS and the Communications Security Establishment to ensure that people are protected and that people who have the proper security clearances are the right people indeed. I cannot comment specifically on the individuals in question, but I can assure the House that every step of the way this government has treated and always will treat national security with the utmost importance.

Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government has failed to comply with two orders from committee asking for the production of documents related to this matter, orders that he himself supported while he was in opposition but now opposes. The Prime Minister is accountable to this House. He came to office promising greater democratic oversight and promising open and accountable government. When will he respect this House and its committees and deliver the documents we are asking for, related to these national security breaches at the Winnipeg lab?

• (1440)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): I find that a little rich, Mr. Speaker, coming from a member of the former government, which refused to bring in national security oversight with a committee of parliamentarians, which is exactly what we did. That was not there when I was in opposition under a Conservative government. That is why we brought in the National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians, which has the security clearances and is able to look into issues of the highest delicacy and the highest national security. There are two outstanding members on that committee from the Conservative Party, and we certainly hope that all parliamentarians will be able to look into these matters.

Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the National Security and Intelligence Committee of Par-

Oral Questions

liamentarians is accountable to the Prime Minister, not the other way around. He appoints the members of that committee and they serve at his pleasure. He can block information to the committee and block its reports.

When will the Prime Minister be accountable to this House and deliver the documents that we have been asking for? When will he commit to co-operating with the U.S. investigation about the origins of the coronavirus that President Biden ordered last week and ensure that government scientists in Winnipeg and their documents, including lab notes, are made available to U.S. investigators?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we can all agree that national security issues should be dealt with by parliamentarians through the appropriate venue. This is exactly the kind of thing that the National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians was created for. They should examine these issues. We created NSICOP to allow for proper scrutiny of national security issues by parliamentarians from all parties.

In regard to the Biden government's announcement on investigations, we will, of course, completely support them. It is important to get the truth of the matter.

* * *

[Translation]

HEALTH

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, all of us on this side of the House acknowledge that asking questions about Communist China and the pandemic is very unpleasant but absolutely essential. Last week, when we asked the Prime Minister questions about this issue, he called us racist. It is disgraceful for a prime minister to act that way.

The very next day, the President of the United States decided to launch an investigation into the origins of the pandemic. He stated that, as part of the report, he has asked for areas of further inquiry that may be required, including specific questions for China. Does the Prime Minister consider President Biden to be racist because he is asking questions about China?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, from the start of this pandemic, we have demanded clearer answers from the international community and China on the origins of this pandemic. We are working with our allies and with the United States. We will keep asking the World Health Organization to pursue its investigation in order to truly understand what happened, identify those responsible and, above all, determine how to prevent such events from happening in the future. We will always be there to ask these difficult questions.

*Oral Questions***PUBLIC SAFETY**

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it would be nice if the Prime Minister could answer some difficult but necessary questions concerning what happened at the National Microbiology Laboratory in Winnipeg.

A researcher with ties to the Chinese People's Liberation Army was given a Canadian security clearance and worked at this laboratory. Two deadly viruses were shipped from Winnipeg to the Wuhan Institute of Virology in Communist China. After this shipment, two researchers who worked at the Winnipeg lab were marched out under RCMP escort.

Is the Prime Minister prepared to get to the bottom of these three matters, which are important and essential to our national security, yes or no?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we have already pointed out, those two individuals no longer work for the Public Health Agency of Canada, and we cannot comment because of our privacy obligations. However, I fully understand that it is important for parliamentarians to be able to follow up and ask questions, even on extremely delicate national security files.

That is why we set up a special committee of parliamentarians, with the latitude and ability to handle the most sensitive matters. I recommend that the member follow up on this question with the committee, because that is what it is there for.

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is curious to hear the Prime Minister say that he cannot talk about this case because the two people lost their jobs at the lab in Winnipeg, when that is exactly why we are asking questions. We want to know why those people were expelled and escorted out by the RCMP. These are sensitive issues, but they are essential.

I will ask my question again. Could the Prime Minister at least promise that never again will anyone with any ties to Communist China or the Chinese military be given a level 4 Canadian security clearance, as was the case in Winnipeg?

• (1445)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we can all agree that parliamentarians should be able to debate matters of national security in the proper forum. That is exactly why the National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians was created. It should be able to examine these issues.

We set up that committee so that parliamentarians from every party could examine issues of national security properly. Two fine members of the Conservative Party sit on that committee and do important work.

* * *

AIRLINE INDUSTRY

Mr. Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, everyone in Quebec was disgusted to learn that the fat cats at Air Canada gave themselves \$20 million in bonuses while the company was depending on public money to survive. Those greedy executives needed \$6 bil-

lion of our money and certainly did not deserve taxpayer-funded bonuses.

Yesterday I asked the government to take action. All the Liberals said in reply was that they were proud of their agreement with Air Canada. That is not good enough for Quebeckers. Will the Prime Minister hold back some of the money promised to Air Canada until those fat cats pay back their bonuses?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we all know, this crisis has hit workers in the air sector particularly hard, and we have been there to support them.

We signed an agreement with Air Canada that limited executive compensation, including stock options, among other things. We have since learned that, perhaps even while Air Canada was negotiating its contracts with us, the airline was giving huge bonuses to executives, which is completely unacceptable.

I hope Air Canada plans to explain its decision and its rationale to Canadians, who are rightly shocked by Air Canada's decision.

Mr. Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the government decided back in October that it would support Air Canada.

The first thing that the freeloaders at Air Canada decided to do was to pocket \$20 million, knowing that it would ultimately be replaced with taxpayers' money. Public funds were going to be used.

What did they do in the meantime? They laid off 20,000 people, workers who lost their jobs and became unemployed. They refused to refund regular folks' plane tickets. The worst thing is that the government let them do it. Way to go.

What does the Prime Minister plan to do today to ensure that these freeloaders pay back the \$20 million?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I completely understand why many Canadians are feeling confused or even angry in response to this news about Air Canada.

Air Canada executives certainly owe Canadians some explanations. Why is that? It is completely unacceptable that executives received bonuses like that while many workers, such as in-flight staff and mechanics, were laid off and left struggling.

We all expect Air Canada to provide an explanation.

*Oral Questions**[English]***PUBLIC SAFETY**

Mr. Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today the Canada-China committee received more illegally redacted documents from this government. It also got a letter from the president of the Public Health Agency of Canada that included the government talking points. Canadians do not want talking points. They deserve answers.

Why are they getting more black ink and more whiteout from this government?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we can all agree that parliamentarians deserve to be able to look into all sorts of different facets of what the government does, including, and particularly, around issues of national security.

When I was in opposition, we were not able to do that because the Conservative government had a secretive approach that refused any sort of oversight. This is why we brought in the National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians, which would allow parliamentarians from all parties to get the kinds of clearances involved to be able to follow up. That is the right venue for that level of transparency, and we hope that parliamentarians will use it.

Mr. Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians send us here to get accountability from the government, and the Prime Minister is very careful in his words. That is a committee of parliamentarians, not a committee of Parliament. A committee of Parliament has legally ordered those documents. This government even saw fit to redact the lines for the media that were included in the package today. That is how far the Liberals will go to hide the truth from Canadians.

Is the Prime Minister going to be voting today for the motion to have the documents handed over to the committee, or is he going to continue his cover-up?

• (1450)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again, these issues came up many times when Stephen Harper was prime minister because on issues of national security, there was very little accountability. There was no oversight and there was no transparency.

We created a National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians on which sit members from different parties who are given security clearances so that they can look into the most sensitive issues around national security. They have done extraordinary jobs and put out many important reports, and that is exactly the way for all parties to get accountability and insight into—

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

Mr. Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it does not sound like openness by default, as this government promised us. It sounds like the Prime Minister should be charging Stephen Harper rent for living inside his head for the last six years.

The documents show that this government refuses to answer very simple questions. We know that Dr. Feihu Yan was a Chinese national associated with the Chinese military. We know that the students who were escorted from the lab were also reported to be Chinese nationals.

Why is it that the passports of the two scientists who were walked out are all of a sudden a national security concern?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we all understand that there are certain elements that are at the level of national security interests. Governments deal with those around the world all the time. What Canada has finally done since 2015 is equip itself with the same kind of oversight by elected parliamentarians that other countries have long had.

We have looked at the ways that the U.K., the U.S. and others handle sensitive national security issues. We created a national security committee of parliamentarians to do just that. That is the oversight that we have provided.

Mr. Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes, CPC): Mr. Speaker, allow me to educate the Prime Minister. The U.K. uses a committee of Parliament, not a committee made of parliamentarians that reports only to the Prime Minister. Let me offer a quote from the Chief of Special Pathogens at the lab in Winnipeg: “Historically, it has also been easier to obtain material from us, as opposed to U.S. labs.” Do not worry, he is only talking about why China would ask Canada for the Ebola virus. The government’s approach to China from the beginning has been incredibly naive.

Is all that black ink just covering up the government’s biggest national security failure?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again, issues of national security are of utmost importance to all Canadians. That is why they elect parliamentarians to hold governments to account, but on issues of national security, it is important that there be higher levels of clearance given to parliamentarians who can properly dig into them and ask all the right questions. That is why we moved forward on creating a National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians so that they could do the excellent work they have been doing over the past many years, including with outstanding representation from the Conservative Party of Canada.

*Oral Questions***INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS**

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today the United Nations is calling for investigations into the deaths of indigenous students at residential schools, maybe because the United Nations does not have confidence in the government because of its lack of action. In over six years of being in government, the Prime Minister has only implemented a fraction of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's calls to action. Maybe if the Prime Minister was not so busy fighting indigenous kids in court and fighting indigenous survivors of residential schools, he would have more time to implement the calls to action.

When will the Prime Minister implement all 94 calls to action?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when we came into office we accepted all of the recommendations: all of the calls to action by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. We have been working on moving forward on all of them, recognizing that a number of them are in areas of provincial jurisdiction. One of them is for the Vatican to do, but we have been moving forward in a strong way in partnership with indigenous peoples on getting these things done. It obviously takes time.

I am impatient. Indigenous communities are impatient, but we are working together to get them done right, and we will continue to. Canada needs to recognize the past. We need to act now to protect the future.

• (1455)

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in six years, having a fraction of the calls to action be done is not “moving forward in a strong way”. It has been two years since the missing and murdered indigenous women and girls inquiry put forward calls for justice. There is no national plan to implement those. It is so bad that the Native Women's Association of Canada says that it is going to have to come up with its own plan, citing the Liberal government's approach as “toxic and dysfunctional”.

How can the Prime Minister claim to take reconciliation seriously when he continues to fail indigenous women and girls?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when we took office in 2015, we launched the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls after many years of inaction by all different stripes of government. This is something that we have been committed to and something that we continue to work with as we stand with survivors and families of missing and murdered indigenous women, girls, two-spirit and LGBTQIA people.

In response to the first-ever national public inquiry into this ongoing tragedy, we are working with provinces and territories, indigenous leaders, and survivors and families to ensure that indigenous women and girls are safe. We will continue to do that work in partnership with them.

* * *

WOMEN AND GENDER EQUALITY

Ms. Iqra Khalid (Mississauga—Erin Mills, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is 2021, yet there are still those who would debate a woman's right to choose what happens to her own body. Today we will be

voting on a Conservative MP's bill, Bill C-233, which is yet another attempt to police women's bodies. It is an attack on women's autonomy over their bodies by the Conservatives.

Canadian women need to know. Will the Prime Minister stand against Bill C-233 and stand up for women's rights across our country?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Mississauga—Erin Mills for her leadership of the Liberal Women's Caucus.

Let me be clear. Women and women alone have the right to make decisions about their own bodies. It is disappointing, but not surprising, to see Conservative politicians try to open this debate once again, for the seventh time since 2007. Our government will always defend a woman's right to choose. The Liberal caucus will be voting against this harmful attack on women's rights and I encourage all parties to do the same.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Justice Fish's report on the Liberal government's failure to protect our women and men in uniform was scathing and to the point. He said sexual misconduct in Canada's military is “as rampant in 2021 as in 2015”. This is a direct result of the defence minister's failure to follow the Prime Minister's 2015 mandate letter, which directed him to implement the recommendations of the Deschamps report.

Why did the Prime Minister ignore the Deschamps report instead of standing up for victims in the Canadian Armed Forces?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know that our institutions are not living up to the needs of those who have experienced misconduct, including our military justice system. We have taken concrete actions to address this. We named Lieutenant-General Jennie Carignan as the Chief, Professional Conduct and Culture. We appointed Louise Arbour to conduct an independent review of the treatment of sexual misconduct and we will be immediately implementing dozens of recommendations from Morris Fish's review of the military justice system.

These are just some of the first steps. We know there is much more to do.

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is more Liberal dithering and delaying.

Oral Questions

Justice Fish's report yesterday and Justice Deschamps' report in 2015 clearly stated the sexual misconduct response centre had to be independent and outside of National Defence. After five years and two reports, the Liberal government now wants to rag the puck and wait for a third opinion from a third retired Supreme Court justice. Our soldiers, sailors and aviators have been calling on the government for results, not more reports. The Prime Minister's cover-up of sexual misconduct by our top generals has gotten so bad his Liberal MPs are now obstructing the defence committee to stop its investigation.

What is the Prime Minister trying to hide?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me be clear, as I have been from the very beginning. Every woman or man who serves in our armed forces or works anywhere across the country deserves a safe work environment and deserves to be supported with the proper resources if they ever need to come forward to report misconduct or misbehaviour.

This is something that we have made significant progress on over the years, but as we have seen recently there is so much more to do. That is why we have taken strong steps to continue to move forward and to make sure that we transform the culture of our military and demonstrate proper support for all who serve.

• (1500)

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is all talk and no action.

Justice Fish explicitly calls on the government to implement the Victims Bill of Rights provisions in Bill C-77. It is a bill that was passed by this Parliament two years ago this month and still has not been brought into force. He states that until those victims' rights are put in place, "sexual assaults should not be investigated or prosecuted under the National Defence Act".

Why has the Prime Minister dragged his feet for years and failed to implement the rights for victims of sexual assault so they can finally get justice in our armed forces?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, over the past number of years, we have taken significant steps to improve support for women and men in our military coming forward with allegations of misconduct, but we know there is much more to do. That is why we thank Justice Fish for his report and will be moving forward immediately on a number of those recommendations, but it is also why we have tasked Lieutenant-General Carignan to be there to support anyone who has issues right now, while at the same time we have moved forward with actions by Justice Arbour to ensure we are changing the culture for good.

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that report will just collect dust on the Prime Minister's desk like the last report.

Justice Fish's explosive report shows that only 25% of regular force members who were victims of sexual assault stated someone in authority found out about the crime, and 57% said no one in authority was even aware. The morale of our women and men in uniform is at an all-time low and their trust in reporting sexual assault to the military is abysmal. The Prime Minister's fake feminist credentials are on trial.

Will the Prime Minister immediately implement a military Victims Bill of Rights and make the sexual misconduct reporting centre truly independent?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is why we moved forward immediately with appointing Lieutenant-General Carignan to be someone who people in the military can turn to to start the change right away, but we know that to change the culture of the military, which has for far too long tolerated misogyny, sexual harassment and abuse, we need to go deeper than that. The work that Justice Arbour is doing will be that transformative element necessary to change our military for the better and support the women and men who serve.

* * *

[Translation]

JUSTICE

Mr. Rhéal Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice seemed to be having technical problems on Monday. He was unable to answer my question about the appointment of his generous donor to the Superior Court, as he announced on Twitter.

Today I am asking the Prime Minister to apologize for his minister and commit to ensuring that donating to the Liberal Party is no longer a criterion for a judicial appointment.

Will he make that commitment in no uncertain terms?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is not a criterion whatsoever.

In 2006, we made major reforms to the process to close the loopholes in the process under the previous government. We strengthened the role of the independent judicial advisory committees. We implemented a more rigorous, more open and more accountable system that better reflects Canada's diversity. Our appointments are based on merit and on the needs of the courts and each candidate's area of expertise.

We are proud of the highly qualified jurists we have appointed. They are from different backgrounds and of different political stripes.

Mr. Rhéal Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ): Mr. Speaker, that is more of the same.

Oral Questions

The process is not independent and it never will be as long as the Prime Minister's Office and cabinet keep interfering in it. Members will recall that, in 2019, this supposedly independent process led to five of the six judges appointed in New Brunswick having ties to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. Three of them were personal donors, and the other two were the wife of his brother-in-law and a neighbour. There is a word for that and it is called patronage, systemic patronage.

Will the Prime Minister finally make the process for appointing judges impartial, or will he continue to defend patronage?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when we came to power in 2015, we implemented a more rigorous, more open and more accountable system that better reflects Canada's diversity when appointing high-quality jurists to our federal courts.

Our appointments are always based on merit, the needs of the courts and each candidate's area of expertise. We are proud of the highly qualified jurists we have appointed since we implemented our enhanced system. They are from different backgrounds and of different political stripes.

* * *

• (1505)

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, through Bill C-10, the Liberals are attacking freedom of expression and web neutrality. On Monday, the Liberal members of the committee voted against our motion to protect Canadians' freedom on social media.

Can the Prime Minister tell us why he insists on giving the CRTC more power to regulate the web and thereby attack the freedom of expression of thousands of Canadians?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are all disappointed, but not surprised, to see the Conservatives attack the cultural sector once again. The justice department's analysis confirms that Bill C-10 is consistent with the freedom of expression protected by the Charter.

Bill C-10 seeks to level the playing field between Canadian creators and web giants. It forces powerful foreign broadcasters to provide information on their revenues, make financial contributions to Canadian stories and music and enable different audiences to discover our culture. It is not an attack on freedom of expression.

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, here is what Canadian Heritage officials said. They clearly stated that removing proposed section 4.1 allowed the CRTC to legislate the content of social media platforms, training apps, video games, websites and even audio books. Former senior CRTC officials said it was a big mistake. Experts in the field have condemned the Liberal attempt to attack net neutrality, and thousands of Canadians have spoken out against the Liberal government's attempt to take control.

Why is the Prime Minister refusing to listen to common sense?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the real question is why the Conservatives keep attacking the cultural sector, content creators, our artists and our musicians.

It defies explanation. Not only do these artists contribute to our sense of identity and pride, but they also make a huge contribution to our economy. We recognize that, in an increasingly digital world, Internet giants are not doing their part to support content creators in Canada. That is why the cultural sector supports our bill.

We will proceed, and we hope the Conservatives will stop blocking assistance the cultural sector needs.

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is depressing to hear our Prime Minister. The fact is that he is proving his opposition to net neutrality, he is attacking the freedom of expression Canadians enjoy on social media and he is looking for any means possible to give the CRTC more powers.

If he had been sincere in his desire to help the country's artists, he would have accepted our amendment on Monday. The Prime Minister is himself solely responsible for the failure of Bill C-10, along with his Minister of Canadian Heritage.

Why is he insisting on going down this path?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we would like to see the Conservatives be more constructive during committee deliberations, and not filibuster as they are doing now.

Several representatives of the creative industries offered this bill their complete support, and we will continue to move forward on their behalf.

With regard to net neutrality, Bill C-10 seeks to promote Canadian music, stories and creative works. It does not affect the work nor the activities of Canadian Internet service providers and therefore has no impact on Canada's commitment to net neutrality.

* * *

SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. Emmanuel Dubourg (Bourassa, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to launch the Black entrepreneurship loan fund earlier this week, alongside the Minister of Small Business. The fund is the first of its kind in Canada. Black entrepreneurs can apply for loans of up to \$250,000 to start, grow and expand their businesses.

Can the Prime Minister explain how this fund fits into our government's approach to empowering these entrepreneurs?

• (1510)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would first like to thank the hon. member for Bourassa for his hard work to combat systemic racism.

The loan fund is just one of the three pillars of the Black entrepreneurship program. To ensure that the program supports the success of Black entrepreneurs and business owners, we have increased its funding to \$400 million. We recognize that systemic racism also exists in the business world, and the loan fund is a step towards meaningful, long-term change.

* * *

[English]

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Ms. Rachael Harder (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, with Bill C-10, the government would promote and demote content based on its level of Canadianness.

Last week, I asked the Prime Minister if he thought the film *Ultimate Gretzky* fit within this category of Canadian. He seemed to think so, and of course most Canadians would also think so. After all, it is a film about a famous Canadian, and it is largely filmed in Canada. However, surprisingly, it is not. It is not Canadian. It does not make the cut, which is odd.

Under Bill C-10, what exactly will make the cut, Mr. Prime Minister?

The Speaker: I would like to remind hon. members to place their questions through the Speaker and not directly to each other.

The Right Hon. Prime Minister.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-10 aims to level the playing field between creators and web giants. It requires big, powerful foreign streamers to provide information on their revenues in Canada, contribute financially to Canadian stories and music, and make it easier for individuals to discover our culture.

That is the part this government has always stood for, defending Canadian creators, defending Canadian content and promoting it the same way Canada has for decades by ensuring that there is a Canadian proportion on radio shows and TV networks. It is something we have always done to protect Canadians and Canadian culture, and we will continue to do so.

Ms. Rachael Harder (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is clear the Prime Minister has zero clue as to what is in this bill and the consequences it will have for creators in Canada.

Let us just try another one. Again, we are just having fun here. *Canadian Bacon* is a movie featuring all things Canada and stars our very own John Candy, a famous actor from Canada.

I am just curious. Does the Prime Minister think that *Canadian Bacon* makes the cut?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I remember well that movie, filled with quite horrible stereotypes about Canadians and Americans. I will not pronounce on it because we have a CRTC and we have a system that has established very clear rules in order to protect Canadian content and Canadian creators.

Over the years, many artists have been able to succeed because Canadian radio plays a percentage of Canadian music and because Canadian networks have to put forward Canadian shows. It is

Oral Questions

something we have done to create a Canadian media and content creator industry in this country. We will continue to do that even into a more digital—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Lethbridge.

Ms. Rachael Harder (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure it gets any easier than this. I mean, I am just asking some simple Canadian cultural questions to a Prime Minister who wants to protect Canadian culture. I thought this was going to be pretty simple, but he is right. It is not considered Canadian content, which is interesting.

This is important because, under Bill C-10, the government will instruct the CRTC to regulate what is Canadian and what is not, what makes the cut and what is out. Under the current stipulation as we have explored, *Ultimate Gretzky* does not make it and *Canadian Bacon* does not count.

Again, what is Canadian enough to make the cut under Bill C-10?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is interesting because now we are seeing the Conservatives go into an area where we have long suspected them of wanting to go, which is the idea that we should not be supporting and protecting Canadian culture, that we should not be ensuring that Canadian artists can succeed, particularly when faced with the extraordinary weight of the American cultural industry.

Certain Conservative Canadians are no doubt frustrated that Canadian radio stations always play about one-third Canadian content and that Canadian TV networks have to put forward Canadian content. It is something that has created and supported Canadian artists such as—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Cape Breton—Canso.

* * *

HEALTH

Mr. Mike Kelloway (Cape Breton—Canso, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, access to health care is a big issue in my community of Cape Breton—Canso, with many of my constituents having trouble getting access to a family doctor. As we know, COVID-19 has put additional pressure on health care systems across this country and the federal government has stepped up to keep Canadians safe and healthy in these challenging times.

My constituents want to know that their government has their back. Could the Prime Minister update us on how the federal government is supporting health care in Nova Scotia?

Private Members' Business

• (1515)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for Cape Breton—Canso for this important question and for his tremendous work for Canadians at the health committee. Every Canadian should be able to rely and have access to our health care systems, no matter where they live.

We provided \$290 million to Nova Scotia through the safe restart agreement, and this year, Nova Scotia will receive over \$1.1 billion through the Canada health transfer. We will keep working with Nova Scotia and other partners to keep Canadians safe and healthy during COVID-19 and beyond. We made a promise that we would have Canadians' backs, and that is exactly what we have done.

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the horrible discovery of 215 indigenous kids demands action. That is what our opposition day motion lays out.

I am asking the Prime Minister if he will support this motion, which lays out that he is to stop taking indigenous kids and residential school survivors to court, implement all 94 calls to action from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, support the residential school survivors with the supports they need, and make sure that a progress report is put forward, so we know that progress is being made.

Will the Prime Minister support our motion, yes or no?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when we first came into office, we accepted all the calls to action from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, which is something that the Conservatives and the NDP criticized us heartily for.

We have moved forward consistently on delivering on those. We have moved forward on funding new schools and new health systems, settling land claims, moving forward on self-government agreements, ending boil water advisories. However, with all that we have done, we know there is so much more to do. We look forward to working with all parliamentarians to continue to deliver as we walk toward reconciliation together.

The Speaker: I am afraid that is all the time we have for question period.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for La Prairie on a point of order.

Mr. Alain Therrien: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Prime Minister to correct the record. He said a number of times that all parties were represented on the National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians. That is incorrect. The Bloc Québécois is not represented on that committee, and we have been calling on the government to give us a seat for months. There is a seat available, but we—

The Speaker: I must interrupt the hon. member because I think he is continuing the debate even though question period is over. We will continue.

Mr. Alain Therrien: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, he said that all of the parties were represented on the committee. I just wanted to say that that was not true. I would like him to correct the record.

The Speaker: After consultation, I have determined that this is not a point of order but a matter of debate. The hon. member can bring this matter up during oral question period.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR DIABETES ACT

The House resumed from May 26 consideration of the motion that Bill C-237, An Act to establish a national framework for diabetes, be read the third time and passed.

The Speaker: It being 3.18 p.m., pursuant to order made on January 25, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at third reading stage of Bill C-237, under Private Members' Business.

Call in the members.

• (1535)

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

(*Division No. 124*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultailf	Aitchison
Albas	Alghabra
Alleslev	Allison
Anand	Anandasangaree
Angus	Arnold
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bagnell	Bains
Baker	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bendayan	Bennett
Benzen	Bergen
Bergeron	Berthold
Bérubé	Besette
Bezan	Bibeau
Bittle	Blaikie
Blair	Blanchet
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Block
Blois	Boudrias
Boulerice	Bragdon
Brassard	Bratina
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe
Calkins	Cannings
Carr	Carrie
Casey	Chabot
Chagger	Champagne
Champoux	Charbonneau
Chen	Chiu
Chong	Cooper
Cormier	Cumming
Dabrusin	Dalton

Private Members' Business

Damoff	Dancho	Melillo	Mendès
Davidson	Davies	Mencicino	Michaud
DeBellefeuille	Deltell	Miller	Monsef
d'Entremont	Desbiens	Moore	Morantz
Desilets	Dhaliwal	Morrison	Morrissey
Dhillon	Diotte	Motz	Murray
Doherty	Dong	Nater	Ng
Dowdall	Dreeshen	Normandin	O'Connell
Drouin	Dubourg	Oliphant	O'Regan
Duclos	Duguid	O'Toole	Patzer
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Paul-Hus	Pauzé
Duvall	Dzerowicz	Perron	Petitpas Taylor
Easter	Ehsassi	Plamondon	Poilievre
El-Khoury	Ellis	Powlowski	Qualtrough
Epp	Erskine-Smith	Ratansi	Rayes
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)	Redekopp	Regan
Fast	Fergus	Reid	Rempel Garner
Fillmore	Findlay	Richards	Robillard
Finnigan	Fisher	Rodriguez	Rogers
Fonseca	Fortier	Romanado	Rood
Fortin	Fragiskatos	Ruff	Sahota (Calgary Skyview)
Fraser	Freeland	Sahota (Brampton North)	Saini
Fry	Gallant	Sajjan	Saks
Garneau	Garrison	Samson	Sangha
Gaudreau	Gazan	Sarai	Saroya
Généreux	Genuis	Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia
Gerretsen	Gill	Scheer	Schiefke
Gladu	Godin	Schmale	Schulte
Gould	Gourde	Seeback	Serré
Gray	Green	Sgro	Shanahan
Guilbeault	Hajdu	Sheehan	Shields
Hallan	Harder	Shin	Shipley
Hardie	Harris	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Hoback	Holland	Simard	Simms
Housefather	Hughes	Sloan	Sorbara
Hussen	Hutchings	Soroka	Spengemann
Iacono	Ien	Stanton	Steinley
Jacek	Jansen	Ste-Marie	Strahl
Jeneroux	Johns	Stubbs	Sweet
Joly	Jones	Tabbara	Tassi
Jordan	Jowhari	Therrien	Tochor
Julian	Kelloway	Trudeau	Trudel
Kelly	Kent	Turnbull	Uppal
Khalid	Khera	Van Bynen	van Koeverden
Kitchen	Kmiec	Van Popta	Vandal
Koutrakis	Kram	Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Kurek	Kusie	Vecchio	Vidal
Kusmierczyk	Kwan	Viersen	Vignola
Lake	Lalonde	Virani	Vis
Lambropoulos	Lalonde	Wagantall	Warkentin
Lamoureux	Lametti	Waugh	Webber
Lattanzio	Larouche	Weiler	Wilkinson
Lawrence	Lauzon	Williamson	Wilson-Raybould
Lebouthillier	LeBlanc	Wong	Yip
Lehoux	Lefebvre	Young	Yurdiga
Lewis (Essex)	Lemire	Zahid	Zann
Lighbound	Liepert	Zimmer	Zuberi — 330
Lobb	Lloyd		
Longfield	Long		
Lukiwski	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)		
MacGregor	MacAulay (Cardigan)		
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	MacKenzie		
Maloney	Maguire		
Marcil	Manly		
Martinez Ferrada	Martel		
Mathyssen	Masse		
May (Saanic—Gulf Islands)	May (Cambridge)	Nil	
McCauley (Edmonton West)	Mazier		
McCrimmon	McColeman		
McGuinty	McDonald		
McKenna	McKay		
McLean	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)		
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)		
	McPherson		

NAYS

PAIRED

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

Private Members' Business

[English]

SEX-SELECTIVE ABORTION ACT

The House resumed from May 28 consideration of the motion that Bill C-233, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (sex-selective abortion), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Monday, January 25, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-233 under Private Members' Business.

● (1545)

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

(Division No. 125)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Benzen	Bergen
Bezan	Block
Bragdon	Brassard
Calkins	Carrie
Chiu	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
d'Entremont	Diotte
Doherty	Dowdall
Dreeshen	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Fast	Findlay
Gallant	Genuis
Glada	Gray
Hallan	Harder
Hoback	Jansen
Kitchen	Kmiec
Kram	Kurek
Kusie	Lake
Lawrence	Lewis (Essex)
Lloyd	Lobb
Lukiwski	MacKenzie
Mazier	McCaughey (Edmonton West)
McColeman	Moore
Motz	Patzer
Redekopp	Reid
Rood	Saroya
Scheer	Schmale
Seeback	Shields
Shin	Sloan
Soroka	Steinley
Strahl	Stubbs
Sweet	Tochor
Uppal	Van Popta
Vidal	Viersen
Vis	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Williamson	Wong
Yurdiga	Zimmer— 82

NAYS

Members

Aitchison	Albas
Alghabra	Alleslev
Anand	Anandasangaree
Angus	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Atwin	Bachrach

Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baker
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bendayan	Bennett
Bergeron	Berthold
Bérubé	Besette
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Blois	Boudrias
Boulerice	Bratina
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe
Cannings	Carr
Casey	Chabot
Chagger	Champagne
Champoux	Charbonneau
Chen	Chong
Cormier	Cumming
Dabrusin	Damoff
Davidson	Davies
DeBellefeuille	Deltell
Desbiens	Desilets
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Dong	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Duval
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Fergus	Fillmore
Finnigan	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Garneau
Garrison	Gaudreau
Gazan	Généreux
Gerretsen	Gill
Godin	Gould
Gourde	Green
Guilbeault	Hajdu
Hardie	Harris
Holland	Housefather
Hughes	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Ien	Jaczek
Jeneroux	Johns
Joly	Jones
Jordan	Jowhari
Julian	Kelloway
Kelly	Kent
Khalid	Khera
Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Kwan	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Larouche
Lattanzio	Lauzon
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Lefebvre	Lehoux
Lemire	Liepert
Lightbound	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maguire
Maloney	Manly
Marcil	Martel
Martinez Ferrada	Masse
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
May (Saanic—Gulf Islands)	McCrimmon
McDonald	McGuinty

*Private Members' Business**(Division No. 126)*

YEAS

Members

McKenna
McLean
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Melillo
Mendicino
Miller
Morantz
Morrissey
Nater
Normandin
Oliphant
O'Toole
Pauzé
Petipas Taylor
Poilievre
Qaqqaq
Ratansi
Regan
Richards
Rodriguez
Romanado
Sahota (Calgary Skyview)
Saini
Saks
Sangha
Savard-Tremblay
Schieffe
Serré
Shanahan
Shipley
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Ste-Marie
Tassi
Trudeau
Turnbull
van Koeverden
Vandenbeld
Vecchio
Virani
Weiler
Wilson-Raybould
Young
Zann

McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
McPherson
Mendés
Michaud
Monsef
Morrison
Murray
Ng
O'Connell
O'Regan
Paul-Hus
Perron
Plamondon
Powlowski
Qualtrough
Raves
Rempel Garner
Robillard
Rogers
Ruff
Sahota (Brampton North)
Sajjan
Samson
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Sorbara
Stanton
Tabbara
Therrien
Trudel
Van Bynen
Vandal
Vaughan
Vignola
Webber
Wilkinson
Yip
Zahid
Zuberi— 248

Aboultatif
Albas
Alleslev
Anand
Angus
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bagnell
Baker
Barlow
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bendayan
Benzen
Bergeron
Bérubé
Bezan
Bittle
Blair
Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Blois
Boulerice
Brassard
Brière
Calkins
Carr
Casey
Chagger
Champoux
Chen
Chong
Cormier
Dabrusin
Damoff
Davidson
DeBellefeuille
d'Entremont
Desilets
Dhillon
Doherty
Dowdall
Drouin
Duclos
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Duvall
Easter
El-Khoury
Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Fillmore
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Fry
Garneau
Gaudreau
Généreux
Gerretsen
Gladu
Gould
Gray
Guilbeault
Hallan
Hardie

Aitchison
Alghabra
Allison
Anandasangaree
Arnold
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Bains
Baldinelli
Barrett
Battiste
Beech
Bennett
Bergen
Berthold
Bessette
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blanchet
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Block
Boudrias
Bragdon
Bratina
Brunelle-Duceppe
Cannings
Carrie
Chabot
Champagne
Charbonneau
Chiu
Cooper
Cumming
Dalton
Dancho
Davies
Deltell
Desbiens
Dhaliwal
Diotte
Dong
Dreeshen
Dubourg
Duguid
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Erskine-Smith
Falk (Provencher)
Fergus
Findlay
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gallant
Garrison
Gazan
Genuis
Gill
Godin
Gourde
Green
Hajdu
Harder
Harris

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

* * *

COPYRIGHT ACT

The House resumed from May 31 consideration of the motion that Bill C-272, An Act to Amend the Copyright Act (diagnosis, maintenance or repair), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Monday, January 25, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-272 under Private Members' Business.

● (1600)

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

Business of Supply

Hoback	Holland
Housefather	Hughes
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Ien
Jaczek	Jansen
Jeneroux	Johns
Joly	Jones
Jordan	Jowhari
Julian	Kelloway
Kelly	Kent
Khalid	Khera
Kitchen	Kmiec
Koutrakis	Kram
Kurek	Kusie
Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Lake	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Larouche
Lattanzio	Lauzon
Lawrence	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lefebvre
Lehoux	Lemire
Lewis (Essex)	Liepert
Lightbound	Lloyd
Lobb	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
Lukiwski	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor	MacKenzie
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maguire
Maloney	Manly
Marcil	Martel
Martinez Ferrada	Masse
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
May (Saanic—Gulf Islands)	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McColeman
McCrimmon	McDonald
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLean	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	McPherson
Melillo	Mendès
Mendicino	Michaud
Miller	Monsef
Moore	Morantz
Morrison	Morrissey
Motz	Murray
Nater	Ng
Normandin	O'Connell
Oliphant	O'Regan
O'Toole	Patzer
Paul-Hus	Pauzé
Perron	Petitpas Taylor
Plamondon	Poilievre
Powlowski	Qualtrough
Ratansi	Rayes
Redekopp	Regan
Reid	Rempel Garner
Richards	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Rood
Ruff	Sahota (Calgary Skyview)
Sahota (Brampton North)	Saini
Sajjan	Saks
Samson	Sangha
Sarai	Saroya
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia
Scheer	Schiefke
Schmale	Schulte
Seeback	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Shields
Shin	Shipley
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)

Simard	Simms
Sloan	Sorbara
Soroka	Spengemann
Stanton	Steinley
Ste-Marie	Strahl
Stubbs	Sweet
Tabbara	Tassi
Therrien	Tochor
Trudeau	Trudel
Turnbull	Uppal
Van Bynen	van Koeverden
Van Popta	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Vecchio	Vidal
Viersen	Vignola
Virani	Vis
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Weiler	Wilkinson
Williamson	Wilson-Raybould
Wong	Yip
Young	Yurdiga
Zahid	Zann
Zimmer	Zuberi— 330

NAYS

PAIRED

Nil

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried. Accordingly, the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology.

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

GOVERNMENT ORDERS[*Translation*]**BUSINESS OF SUPPLY**

OPPOSITION MOTION—DOCUMENTS RELATED TO THE TRANSFER OF EBOLA AND HENIPAH VIRUSES TO THE WUHAN INSTITUTE OF VIROLOGY

The House resumed from June 1 consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Monday, January 25, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion of the hon. member for Wellington—Halton Hills relating to the business of supply.

● (1615)

[*English*]

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

(Division No. 127)

YEAS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Alleslev
Allison	Angus
Arnold	Atwin
Bachrach	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu

Business of Supply

Benzen	Bergen	Therrien	Tochor
Bergeron	Berthold	Trudel	Uppal
Bérubé	Bezan	Van Popta	Vecchio
Blaikie	Blanchet	Vidal	Viersen
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Vignola	Vis
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Block	Wagantall	Warkentin
Boudrias	Boulerice	Waugh	Webber
Bragdon	Brassard	Williamson	Wilson-Raybould
Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins	Wong	Yurdiga
Cannings	Carrie	Zimmer— 179	
Chabot	Champoux		
Charbonneau	Chiu		
Chong	Cooper		
Cumming	Dalton		
Dancho	Davidson	Alghabra	Anand
Davies	DeBellefeuille	Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Deltell	d'Entremont	Arya	Badawey
Desbiens	Desilets	Bagnell	Bains
Diotte	Doherty	Baker	Battiste
Dowdall	Dreeshen	Beech	Bendayan
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Duvall	Bennett	Besette
Epp	Erskine-Smith	Bibeau	Bittle
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)	Blair	Blois
Fast	Findlay	Bratina	Brière
Fortin	Gallant	Carr	Casey
Garrison	Gaudreau	Chagger	Champagne
Gazan	Généreux	Chen	Cormier
Genuis	Gill	Dabrusin	Damoff
Gladu	Godin	Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Gourde	Gray	Dong	Drouin
Green	Hallan	Dubourg	Duclos
Harder	Harris	Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Hoback	Hughes	Dzerowicz	Easter
Jansen	Jeneroux	Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Johns	Julian	Ellis	Fergus
Kelly	Kent	Fillmore	Finnigan
Kitchen	Kmiec	Fisher	Fonseca
Kram	Kurek	Fortier	Fragiskatos
Kusie	Kwan	Fraser	Freeland
Lake	Larouche	Fry	Garneau
Lawrence	Lehoux	Gerretsen	Gould
Lemire	Lewis (Essex)	Guilbeault	Hajdu
Liepert	Lloyd	Hardie	Holland
Lobb	Lukiwski	Housefather	Hussen
MacGregor	MacKenzie	Hutchings	Iacono
Maguire	Manly	Ien	Jaczek
Marcil	Martel	Joly	Jones
Masse	Mathysen	Jordan	Jowhari
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	Mazier	Kelloway	Khalid
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McColeman	Khera	Koutrakis
McKay	McLean	Kusmierczyk	Lalonde
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	McPherson	Lambropoulos	Lametti
Melillo	Michaud	Lamoureux	Lattanzio
Moore	Morantz	Lauzon	LeBlanc
Morrison	Motz	Lebouthillier	Lefebvre
Nater	Normandin	Lightbound	Long
O'Toole	Patzer	Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
Paul-Hus	Pauzé	MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Perron	Plamondon	Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
Poilievre	Ratansi	May (Cambridge)	McCrimmon
Rayes	Redekopp	McDonald	McGuinty
Reid	Rempel Garner	McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Richards	Rood	McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Ruff	Sahota (Calgary Skyview)	Mendicino	Miller
Sangha	Saroya	Monsef	Morrissey
Savard-Tremblay	Scheer	Murray	Ng
Schmale	Seeback	O'Connell	O'Regan
Shields	Shin	Petitpas Taylor	Powlowski
Shipley	Simard	Qualtrough	Regan
Sloan	Soroka	Robillard	Rodriguez
Stanton	Steinley	Rogers	Romanado
Ste-Marie	Strahl	Sahota (Brampton North)	Saini
Stubbs	Sweet	Sajjan	Saks

NAYS

Members

Private Members' Business

Samson
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sorbara
Tabbara
Trudeau
Van Bynen
Vandal
Vaughan
Weiler
Yip
Zahid
Zuberi— 149

Sarai
Schieffe
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simms
Spengemann
Tassi
Turnbull
van Koeverden
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wilkinson
Young
Zann

DeBellefeuille
d'Entremont
Desilets
Doherty
Dreeschen
Duvall
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Fortin
Garrison
Gazan
Genuis
Gladu
Gourde
Green
Harder
Hoback
Jansen
Johns
Kelly
Kitchen
Kram
Kusie
Lake
Lawrence
Lemire
Liepert
Lobb
MacGregor
Maguire
Marcil
Masse
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLean
McPherson
Michaud
Morantz
Motz
Normandin
Patzner
Pauzé
Plamondon
Ratansi
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Rood
Sahota (Calgary Skyview)
Saroya
Scheer
Seeback
Shin
Simard
Soroka
Steinley
Strahl
Sweet
Tochor
Uppal
Vecchio
Viersen
Vis
Warkentin
Webber
Wilson-Raybould
Yurdiga
Zimmer— 179

Deltell
Desbiens
Diotte
Dowdall
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Findlay
Gallant
Gaudreau
Généreux
Gill
Godin
Gray
Hallan
Harris
Hughes
Jeneroux
Julian
Kent
Kmiec
Kurek
Kwan
Larouche
Lehoux
Lewis (Essex)
Lloyd
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
Manly
Martel
Mathysen
Mazier
McColeman
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Melillo
Moore
Morrison
Nater
O'Toole
Paul-Hus
Perron
Poilievre
Rayes
Reid
Richards
Ruff
Sangha
Savard-Tremblay
Schmale
Shields
Shiple
Sloan
Stanton
Ste-Marie
Stubbs
Therrien
Trudel
Van Popta
Vidal
Vignola
Wagantall
Waugh
Williamson
Wong
Zann

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[Translation]

CANADIAN ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT, 1999

The House resumed from June 1 consideration of the motion that Bill C-204, An Act to amend the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999 (final disposal of plastic waste), be read the third time and passed.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Monday, January 25, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at third reading stage of Bill C-204 under Private Members' Business.

• (1625)

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

(Division No. 128)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Alleslev
Allison	Angus
Arnold	Ashton
Atwin	Bachrach
Baldinelli	Barlow
Barrett	Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu	Benzen
Bergen	Bergeron
Berthold	Bérubé
Bezan	Blaikie
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Block	Boudrias
Boulerice	Bragdon
Brassard	Brunelle-Duceppe
Calkins	Cannings
Carrie	Chabot
Champoux	Charbonneau
Chiu	Chong
Cooper	Cumming
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	Davies

Alghabra
Anandasangaree

NAYS

Members

Anand
Arseneault

Routine Proceedings

Arya
Bagnell
Baker
Beech
Bennett
Bibeau
Blair
Bratina
Carr
Chagger
Chen
Dabrusin
Dhaliwal
Dong
Dubourg
Duguid
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Fergus
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Garneau
Gould
Hajdu
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Jaczek
Jones
Jowhari
Khalid
Koutrakis
Lalonde
Lametti
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Lefebvre
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martinez Ferrada
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Monsef
Murray
O'Connell
O'Regan
Powlowski
Regan
Rodriguez
Romanado
Saini
Saks
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simms
Spengemann
Tassi
Turnbull
van Koeverden
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wilkinson
Young

Badawey
Bains
Battiste
Bendayan
Bessette
Bittle
Blois
Brière
Casey
Champagne
Cormier
Damoff
Dhillon
Drouin
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser
Fry
Gerretsen
Guilbeault
Hardie
Housefather
Hutchings
Ien
Joly
Jordan
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAtulay (Cardigan)
Maloney
May (Cambridge)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendés
Miller
Morrissey
Ng
Oliphant
Petitpas Taylor
Qualtrough
Robillard
Rogers
Sahota (Brampton North)
Sajjan
Samson
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sorbara
Tabbara
Trudeau
Van Bynen
Vandal
Vaughan
Weiler
Yip
Zahid

Zuberi— 151

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS*[Translation]***HOUSE OF COMMONS CALENDAR**

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):
Pursuant to Standing Order 28(2)(b), I have the honour to lay upon the table the House of Commons calendar for the year 2022.

* * *

● (1630)

*[English]***GOVERNOR GENERAL'S ACT**

Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-305, An Act to amend the Governor General's Act (retiring annuity and other benefits)

She said: Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to introduce my private member's bill.

Canadians were outraged when the former governor general left the office in disgrace and was able to collect pension and benefits of over \$300,000. This private member's bill would ensure that anyone who does not serve for the full five-year term, for reasons other than medical, would not be entitled to those benefits.

It is time to fix this. This private member's bill would do that.

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

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, I move that the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development, presented to the House on Monday, April 12, be concurred in.

Today, we are asking the House of Commons to agree to the following report from the foreign affairs committee:

That the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development strongly condemn the unacceptable sanctions imposed by the People's Republic of China against one of the Committee's Vice Chairs, the Member of Parliament for Wellington—Halton Hills, and the House of Commons Subcommittee on International Human Rights which represent an affront to Canada's democracy and parliamentary system; as parliamentarians, we will continue to actively denounce human rights violations and breaches of international law in keeping with our respect for basic human rights; and that this motion be reported to the House.

Routine Proceedings

This motion had unanimous support at committee, and I am hopeful that this concurrence motion will have the unanimous support of the House. I will be sharing my time with the hon. member for Wellington—Halton Hills, a member who is, himself, substantively the subject of the motion.

I know that this member is a humble person who is much more interested in talking about principles and substantive issues than in talking about himself. However, I do think it is important to start this speech by acknowledging the principled leadership shown by this member that has led to him being sanctioned by a foreign state.

The member for Wellington—Halton Hills has been a member of this House for over 15 years. In that time, he has been totally fearless in taking positions that reflect deeply held convictions, regardless of the consequences. He has always done so graciously and without malice. From time to time, he took principled positions that were different from those taken by his government. I, myself, around the same time he was undertaking these efforts, was serving as one of those kids in short pants in Stephen Harper's PMO. I think it is fair to say that even when we were on different sides of an issue, all staff always maintained deep admiration for the intensity, thoughtfulness and seriousness of this member.

In particular, the passage of the Reform Act was a watershed moment for our parliamentary democracy in the effort to reverse the tide of ever-increasing centralization of control in the Prime Minister's Office. Although it does not seem to be being followed in the caucuses of all parties, the Reform Act is having a profound impact as party caucuses can now opt to take on the power to elect their own leader, elect their own caucus chair and control their membership. This is a credit to the member for Wellington—Halton Hills.

One common thread in this member's career is clearly a consistent and relentless fight for democratic values. Whatever challenges and entrenched interests this member has taken on in the past, his leadership today within our caucus, within this Parliament and globally in the fight against the Chinese Communist Party is a fight of such defining importance that it outshines all of the battles of the past.

The world is at a critical point in the battle between authoritarianism and democracy, because there are those, on the one hand, who see the individual as a mere extension of the materialistic political order, and those who believe that society exists to serve individuals who have inherent and immutable value and dignity.

In this struggle, the Chinese Communist Party has identified the member for Wellington—Halton Hills as a globally significant enemy of authoritarian values and a globally significant defender of democratic values. I can think of no greater recognition of an individual's commitment to democratic values than having been directly singled out by the Chinese Communist Party. Congratulations.

We appreciate the government support for this motion, but it must also be acknowledged that it was a member of the official opposition, not a member or minister within the government, who was recognized in this way for global leadership in defence of democratic values. I look forward to the day when that kind of leadership being exercised from the opposition benches can be exercised from the government side, when this same member has all of the tools

and opportunities of government to continue his important work. Then it will truly be possible to say that Canada is back on the world stage.

Just as Conservatives under Brian Mulroney, like Canada in the global fight against apartheid, Conservatives today are ready to lead the world in the fight for justice, human rights and democratic values.

The most important lesson from the fact that sanctions have been imposed on the member for Wellington—Halton Hills is that the work he is doing is having a profound impact. When it comes to our work on human rights in this place, there can sometimes be a certain cynicism, "Does it really matter? Does anyone really see or notice what we do or say in this place?"

These sanctions prove the cynics wrong. They prove that it does matter. They prove that when we choose to take a stand, the Chinese Communist Party feels the pain and feels the need to retaliate. The stands that we take in this place have an impact on what happens in China, on the global tenor of the discussion.

• (1635)

The immediate trigger of these sanctions was a motion put forward by the member for Wellington—Halton Hills to recognize that Uighurs and other Turkic Muslims in China are subject to an ongoing genocide. Conservatives put forward this motion. All members who voted, voted for it, although the Prime Minister, his cabinet and many other Liberals, sadly, abstained. Just as the leadership of some members, the votes of all members, the abstentions of the cabinet were noticed here in Canada. They were noticed and seen around around the world. It is tragic that the government failed to join the House of Commons in taking this critical step.

The fact is that, as we speak, the world is seeing the largest mass detention of a minority community since the Holocaust; a genocide that involves putting people in concentration camps, that involves forced sterilization, forced abortion, forced insertion of IUDs; systematic sexual violence; and organ harvesting. These are horrors that we were supposed to never see again, and yet the world has failed to deliver on the promise of never again when the world's most populous nation and second-largest economy is seeing a genocide deploying the most sophisticated technology to destroy an entire people group.

In the face of these events, Parliament had a moral obligation to act. I am so glad that Parliament did act. Canada was the first country to have a parliamentary resolution adopted, recognizing the Uighur genocide. The parliaments of the Netherlands, Great Britain and Lithuania have followed. More actions are taken, more resolutions are expected in other states, but the leadership of the Canadian Parliament touched off a global response, which is continuing to gather momentum. Two U.S. administrations have also recognized this genocide and many other countries are stepping up with various new measures to counter and deter these horrific abuses.

Routine Proceedings

New legislation is being passed around the world. New policies are being proposed to confront these abuses, game-changers in terms of standing up for fundamental human rights and countering the actions of the CCP. New bills are being proposed to prevent the importation of products made from slave labour, such as the Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act in the United States. There are new sanctions, new sanctions regimes; new efforts to combat forced organ harvesting and trafficking, and new international mechanisms and agreements for calling out the Chinese state for its abuses.

What we have seen again is that the democratic world can be a sleeping giant, sometimes slower to mobilize but fierce when awakened. It is no exaggeration to say that the passing of the genocide recognition motion by this House has played a critical role in awakening the conscience of a democratic world and in inspiring a stronger global response.

It has not been one member alone. Parliament, as an institution, has found its voice speaking over and ahead of the government. This has been a powerful victory for those seeking justice for human rights, yes, but also a victory for Parliament. When it comes to responding to the Chinese Communist Party, while Canada's government has failed to lead, Canada's Parliament has stepped up to lead instead and, indeed, Canada's Parliament has led the world.

In the final moments of my speech, I would like to call on the government to do more. Voting for this motion, recognizing and standing in solidarity with those who have been sanctioned, yes, but more importantly, we must stand in solidarity with the victims, the people who we have sought to represent in this ongoing advocacy.

We need genocide recognition by the Government of Canada.

We need stronger legislation and policy around supply chains to prevent the importation of products made by Uighur slave labour and other slave labour.

We need to pass legislation to combat forced organ harvesting and trafficking.

We need to impose sanctions targeting those involved in gross violations of human rights in East Turkestan, as well as in Hong Kong and other parts of the People's Republic of China.

The government has continually been reluctant to use Magnitsky sanctions and that is a tool that Parliament has given to the government, but the government must choose to use it.

We need to support the immigration of vulnerable Uighur refugees and we need to do more to combat foreign state-backed interference and support victims of foreign state-backed interference.

For democratic values to endure, we need leaders who are willing to stand up to face down the critics and do what is right, no matter what the cost. The member for Wellington—Halton Hills is one such person. We need to see leadership finally from the government benches in this critical fight for democratic values.

Canadians have found their voice. Parliament has found its voice. It is time for the government to find its voice.

• (1640)

Mr. Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is always a privilege to stand in the House of Commons and represent the good people of Peace River—Westlock. It is springtime and the crops are all coming up nicely. Bringing the plight of the Uighur people to the world's attention has been an important aspect of this, and I want to thank my hon. colleague for that.

What are some of the things that Canada can do to increasingly bring more action to this? When we say “never again”, we mean “never again”. What do we need to do now?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, since I know the member for Peace River—Westlock has been particularly active on the issue of human trafficking, both domestically and internationally, let me focus my response to his question on one particular point, and that is recognizing the way that slave labour and forced labour, targeting Uighurs, is impacting Canadian supply chains.

There are products that are being produced in East Turkestan or Xinjiang that are very likely being imported to Canada. The government, under pressure to take some action, announced some new policies last year, but they were very weak. They included, for instance, ensuring that businesses are being told about these issues. If businesses are operating in this part of China and they are unaware of these issues, then they are being willfully blind, because this has been all over the news. People should already be aware.

The government put in place mechanisms that theoretically could stop importation of slave-made products, but there are no effective review or enforcement mechanisms. As far as we know, not a single shipment of products has been stopped since these new policies were put in place, so the policies are not working. I would support implementing something like what the United States has done with the bipartisan Uighur Forced Labour Prevention Act, which creates a presumption that slave labour is involved—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Questions and comments.

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Queen's Privy Council.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan is very much familiar with the fact that we are in the month of June and there is a limited amount of time for the government to deal with legislation.

Routine Proceedings

The concurrence report that the member is bringing forward is yet another attempt by the Conservative Party, the official opposition, to cause frustration of legislation or to play that destructive force inside the legislative chamber. My question to the member is: If this issue is so very important to the Conservative Party, why would they not bring it up in the form of a day of a motion coming from the official opposition? Why do they choose to continue to play the games on the floor of the House of Commons to prevent legislation from passing?

• (1645)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, that is an utterly ridiculous question from the member for Winnipeg North, who does not think that the global defence of democratic values is something worth debating in this place.

Let me tell him something.

He wishes we had brought this topic forward as an opposition day. Perhaps we could have brought it forward as an opposition day yesterday, if the government had willingly provided documents that a parliamentary committee had requested with respect to the infiltration, or the possible infiltration, of Chinese government activity in Canadian labs. The government's lack of respect and regard for democratic values requires us to continually bring these issues up yesterday, today and, if necessary, tomorrow, because the defence of democratic values is critically important. There is no more important issue to be bringing forward today, and if the government was prepared to work with us, we would be able to accomplish—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Questions and comments. The hon. member for Lac-Saint-Jean.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Madam Speaker, I want to acknowledge my colleague's passion and the work he has done with respect to the Uighur people. We worked together on the Subcommittee on International Human Rights of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development. I therefore want to commend him and acknowledge his passion and commitment on this issue.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons just criticized us for having this discussion here in the House, when the entire executive of this government, the parliamentary secretary, the ministers and the Prime Minister, refused to vote on the motion of the member for Wellington—Halton Hills.

My question for my hon. colleague is this: Do the Liberals think that the vote of a backbencher is less important than that of one of their members in the executive of this government?

[*English*]

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, I recognize the member's leadership, in particular, on the issue of the Olympics. We have called on the government not to send government representatives to the Beijing Olympics, if they proceed. We would, of course, prefer relocation, but the government must take a stand and not send government representatives to attend Olympics in a country where—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): 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 Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon, Housing; the hon. member for Edmonton Strathcona, Pharmacare; the hon. member for Fredericton, Diversity and Inclusion.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Wellington—Halton Hills.

Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills, CPC): Madam Speaker, China is trying to silence the truth abroad after having silenced it at home.

Several months ago, I woke up to the news that China's government had sanctioned me, adding me to a list of officials in the United States, Europe and the United Kingdom who have been sanctioned simply for speaking against Beijing's genocide of its Uighur Muslim minority and speaking against the crackdown in Hong Kong. The sanctions ban me and others who have been sanctioned from visiting China and prohibit Chinese citizens and institutions from doing business with me. Having no plans to travel to China and having no business ties there, they will have no effect on me.

Nevertheless, they should be taken seriously as an attempt to silence the growing criticism of the Chinese government's human rights record and its violations of international law. Since President Xi Jinping came to power in 2012, the Chinese government has become increasingly assertive in shutting down criticism. Increasing threats have accompanied this increasing assertiveness.

[*Translation*]

China's actions are a threat to Canada.

[*English*]

Michael Kovrig and Michael Spavor have now been detained for over two years. Robert Schellenberg has been put on death row. The fate and whereabouts of Hussein Jalil are unknown. The Chinese government has arbitrarily banned the imports of products that target Canadian farmers. Canada is not the only target of China's regime. From its growing intimidation of Taiwan to its recent border skirmishes with India and the unilateral extension of its boundaries into the South China Sea, the Chinese Communist Party is increasingly threatening its neighbours.

It is not only abroad where the Chinese government is challenging the rules-based international order. In its crackdown on Hong Kong, it is violating the Sino-British Joint Declaration of 1984, which guaranteed Hong Kong's autonomy for 50 years from 1997. In its mass detention and sterilization of the Uighur Muslim minorities, it is violating the 1948 genocide convention, the very first international human rights treaty adopted at the United Nations. The abuse of other minorities continues with its treatment of Tibetans, practitioners of Falun Gong and Christians.

We must wake up to the reality in liberal democracies that in recent years, instead of improving their record on human rights, democracy and the rule of law, authoritarian governments have used their new-found prosperity to reinforce that authoritarianism. Here in Canada, CSIS has warned that state-sponsored espionage, through 5G technologies and biotechnology, threatens our national security and intellectual property regime. The government should advise Canadian universities against partnerships with Huawei, and it should issue a directive to the federal granting councils banning such partnerships. It is time that Canada joins our four Five Eyes allies in banning Huawei from participating in our 5G telecommunications network.

In 2016, the government joined the China-led Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank. So far, it has contributed \$50 million of public money to that bank and is asking for another \$49 million to contribute to that bank through the estimates. It is part of China's strategy to export its model of authoritarian governance throughout the Indo-Pacific region. It is why President Obama and vice-president Biden at the time, in 2016, asked the Canadian government not to join. Canada should suspend payments to the bank and withdraw.

The Chinese government is intimidating Canadians here at home, particularly those in the Chinese community. Hong Kong pro-democracy activists and students on university campuses across the nation have been subject to threats. A robust plan is needed from the government to counter these intimidation operations, increase enforcement and make it clear to China's diplomats accredited here in Canada, some several hundred of them, that any role in these intimidation operations here on Canadian soil is grounds to be declared *persona non grata* and expelled from this country.

In China, there is evidence that Uighurs in Xinjiang province are being forced to pick cotton and produce tomatoes through a coercive state-run system. The government needs to introduce new, effective measures to ban the importation of products from China that have been produced using forced labour.

● (1650)

These gross violations of human rights and international law, the treatment of the Uighur people and the treatment of the people of Hong Kong cannot go unanswered. If we do not work with our democratic allies to counter these violations, we will allow the Chinese Communist Party to export its model of authoritarianism and undermine the rules-based international order that has provided relative peace and security since 1945.

The sanctions imposed on me and others have brought us together. They have backfired. I have met with elected parliamentarians who have been sanctioned in the United Kingdom, the European Union and members of national parliaments throughout Europe. The sanctions have brought us together and have brought us together in action.

We are working more closely together now because of these sanctions to counter China's threats to Liberal democracies. For example, recently a European Parliament delegation meeting chaired by a member of the European Parliament, Mr. Reinhard Bütikofer, invited me and a dozen and a half members of the European Parliament, as well as members of national parliaments in the United Kingdom, Belgium, the Netherlands, Lithuania and here in Canada,

Routine Proceedings

to talk about countering China's threats. We had a productive meeting, albeit at four o'clock in the morning, since it was on European time. Nevertheless, with copious amounts of coffee, we had a productive meeting and endeavoured to work together.

Out of these discussions has come action. On May 20, the European Parliament overwhelmingly passed a motion freezing ratification of the European Union-China comprehensive agreement on investment, a treaty concluded on December 30 of last year and a treaty that is a signature effort of President Xi Jinping of China.

Just several weeks ago, Australia cancelled two belt and road initiatives of China because of China's threats to Australia. That is the kind of action this House and the government should be taking in response to these sanctions and to the threats China is posing to our citizens, our economy and our values.

The sanctions imposed on me and others are a clumsy effort by the People's Republic of China to silence the free speech and open debate at the heart of Liberal democracies. They will work if we are silent. We cannot be silent. We cannot lose the hard-won and hard-fought-for ideals that underpin our democracies: a belief in liberty and freedom, a belief in human rights, a belief in democratic institutions and a belief in the rule of law. For if we are silent, we will let these hard-won and cherished beliefs be lost to a new ascendant model of authoritarianism, repression and fear.

● (1655)

Mr. Pat Kelly (Calgary Rocky Ridge, CPC): Madam Speaker, the member for Wellington—Halton Hills is modest and will not say it perhaps, so I will. He is truly a champion of freedom and Canadian ideals of rule of law, democracy and pluralism.

It is curious that the Chinese government singled out a member of the opposition as worthy of sanction for opposing the regime's authoritarianism, rather than a member of the government. I wonder if the member for Wellington—Halton Hills can comment further on the need for the government to do better in support of the Michaels, who remain in prison, and to stand up for Canadian values.

Hon. Michael Chong: Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my hon. colleague for his work on this important issue.

These sanctions are an opportunity for Liberal democracies to work more closely together, for their governments to work more closely together and for their elected legislatures to work more closely together to counter these threats.

Routine Proceedings

The European Parliament's decision to freeze the investment treaty with China several weeks ago and the Australian government's decision several weeks ago to cancel two belt and road agreements with China are indicative of this, and I would encourage the government to use these sanctions as an opportunity to suspend payments to the China-led Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank and to withdraw Canada as a member from that bank.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Madam Speaker, I want to once again thank my colleague from Wellington—Halton Hills for his efforts and his commitment to this issue. I also want to point out that he agreed to let the Bloc Québécois amend his motion, which was unanimously adopted here. He was happy to do it, and I think it added something to the motion that was adopted by the House.

The Subcommittee on International Human Rights issued a statement on October 21, 2020, saying that the Chinese regime committed a genocide in Xinjiang. There was an open letter, signed by members of all parties in the House, calling for the Olympics to be relocated if those acts of genocide continued. A motion was adopted in the House of Commons to that effect, asking the government to recognize that a genocide is currently being committed in Xinjiang.

Can my colleague tell us why the Prime Minister is still refusing to admit that a genocide is being committed there?

Hon. Michael Chong: Madam Speaker, I will start by thanking my colleague for his work on this important issue.

I think there is another measure the Government of Canada could take to combat the Chinese threat, which also relates to the genocide against the Uighur people. This measure has to do with the Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games in Beijing.

Specifically, this would entail the Government of Canada announcing publicly that it has decided not to send a government representative to the Olympic and Paralympic Games, to show China that its actions against the Uighur people are completely unacceptable.

● (1700)

[*English*]

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, I thank the member for Wellington—Halton Hills for his commitment on human rights. I think this is an important debate that has been started today. What concerns me, frankly, is the reaction from the government. We heard from the member for Winnipeg North just a few minutes ago, who seemed irritated about the discussion around human rights.

We have certainly seen this with the government when we raise issues such as the export of Canadian military goods to Saudi Arabia and human rights violations there. The government seems perturbed, seems angered when human rights are issues that are front and centre in the House of Commons.

I want to ask my colleague from Wellington—Halton Hills, why does the government react this way on fundamental issues of human rights?

Hon. Michael Chong: Madam Speaker, I think there is a pattern with the government, and that is a big gap between its rhetoric on issues like democracy, the rule of law and human rights, and reality. The government came to office promising to make Canada a leader on foreign aid around the world, for example. The fact is that foreign aid has been cut by 10% relative to the average under the previous government.

The government promised to do better on climate change, yet emissions have risen each and every year that the government has been in power, including the most recent year for which data is available, which is 2019. So too on human rights: The government has said it would do a better job on human rights, but its actions and its record say otherwise.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Madam Speaker, today, I rise as the member for Lac-Saint-Jean, the vice-chair of the Subcommittee on International Human Rights of the House of Commons, and the vice-chair of the Canada-Uighur Parliamentary Friendship Group, but, above all, I rise as a human being who cares about other human beings, no matter who they are or where they live on this planet.

It is important to know why we are having this debate today, despite what government members might say, since they do not agree on the reason for this debate. Every other member of the House knows why we are having this important debate.

Why are we here? We are here because a report of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development has been tabled. It is important to know what it says, because these are the words that will guide our subsequent actions. This report, which is barely a paragraph long, says the following:

That the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development strongly condemn the unacceptable sanctions imposed by the People's Republic of China against one of the Committee's Vice Chairs, the Member of Parliament for Wellington—Halton Hills, and the House of Commons Subcommittee on International Human Rights which represent an affront to Canada's democracy and parliamentary system; as parliamentarians, we will continue to actively denounce human rights violations and breaches of international law in keeping with our respect for basic human rights; and that this motion be reported to the House.

When I rise in the House, I often ask who we work for. We should also ask ourselves what we are working for. In this case, we are working for international human rights, for those who are experiencing genocide. We have evidence. The Subcommittee on International Human Rights did studies in 2018 and 2020, and the evidence is mounting around the world. The BBC did reports on this issue and is no longer allowed to broadcast in China. We know a genocide is happening. The question is not whether it is happening, but how to put a stop to it.

I will read the statement that the subcommittee made on October 21, 2020, which went somewhat unnoticed. It says, and I quote:

Routine Proceedings

The Subcommittee unequivocally condemns the persecution of Uyghurs and other Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang by the Government of China. Based on the evidence put forward during the Subcommittee hearings, both in 2018 and 2020, the Subcommittee is persuaded that the actions of the Chinese Communist Party constitute genocide as laid out in the *Genocide Convention*.

There are some Liberal members on that committee, which, as we know, does not operate by vote but by consensus. That means that all of the members of the committee agreed with the statement that was made. A press conference was even held, even though the media did not really pick up on it.

I would like to remind members of the recommendations that the subcommittee made and that were adopted on March 12, 2021, by the standing committee it reports to, namely the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development. This is important, and I want to make sure that the House is aware of the recommendations that the subcommittee made to it.

Here is the first recommendation:

The Subcommittee recommends that the Government of Canada, in coordination with international allies, condemn the Government of the People's Republic of China's use of concentration camps to unjustly detain Uyghurs and other Turkic Muslims.

Here is the second recommendation:

The Subcommittee recommends that Global Affairs Canada coordinate an international campaign calling on the Government of the People's Republic of China to immediately release unjustly detained Uyghurs and other Turkic Muslims from its concentration camps.

Here is the third recommendation:

The Subcommittee recommends that Global Affairs Canada coordinate an international effort to pressure the Government of the People's Republic of China to allow independent observers unfettered access to Xinjiang to evaluate the situation of Uyghurs and other Turkic Muslims.

● (1705)

Here is the fourth recommendation:

The Subcommittee recommends that Global Affairs Canada enhance its import control mechanisms to ensure products made with forced labour are not entering the Canadian market. This should include strong punitive measures for individuals and companies that benefit from the use of forced labour.

Here is the fifth recommendation:

The Subcommittee recommends that the Government of Canada enhance the mandate of the Canadian Ombudsperson for Responsible Enterprise to ensure the office has the power to conduct independent investigations, the authority to compel documents and testimony from companies and their executives, and the resources to investigate alleged human rights abuses.

Here is the sixth recommendation:

The Subcommittee recommends that the Department of Justice develop a comprehensive human rights due diligence law that compels businesses to respect the most current international human rights standards across their global operations and supply chains and be held accountable for harms caused in relation to their operations.

Here is the seventh recommendation:

The Subcommittee recommends that Global Affairs Canada undertake a review of Canadian equipment and technologies exported to China to better understand how they are being utilized by end-users in that country. Further to that review, the Government of Canada should implement measures to ensure Canadian individuals, companies and public bodies are not supplying information or technologies that could be used in support of the violation of fundamental human rights.

Here is the eighth recommendation:

The Subcommittee recommends that Public Safety Canada systematically track cases of harassment, by Chinese authorities, of Uyghurs and other Turkic Muslims living in Canada, as well as individuals and groups advocating on their behalf. The Subcommittee also urges the Government of Canada to respond punitively to attempts to repress freedom of expression in Canada and urges it to continue raising the issue with the Government of the People's Republic of China officials.

Here is the ninth recommendation:

The Subcommittee recommends that Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada use existing refugee programs and create an exceptional stream to expedite entry into Canada for Uyghurs and other Turkic Muslims in need of protection, especially human rights defenders, because they are fleeing persecution in Xinjiang and elsewhere. The Canada Border Services Agency should suspend the removal of Uyghurs and other Turkic Muslims to China or other states where they are at risk of deportation.

Here is the 10th recommendation:

The Subcommittee recommends that Global Affairs Canada use all the tools at its disposal to secure the release of Huseyin Celil, including but not limited to the appointment of a special envoy specifically tasked with seeking his release and return.

Here is the 11th recommendation:

The Subcommittee recommends that the House of Commons adopt a motion recognizing the Government of the People's Republic of China's persecution of Uyghurs and other Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang as constitutive of genocide.

This was done, but without the support of the executive of the government.

Here is the 12th recommendation:

The Subcommittee recommends that the Government of Canada declare the Government of the People's Republic of China's oppression of Uyghurs and other Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang as constitutive of genocide. As such, the Government of Canada should also condemn the Government of the People's Republic of China for its organized and systematic persecution of Uyghurs and other Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang.

This has not been done.

Here is the 13th recommendation:

The Subcommittee recommends that the Government of Canada support the request of Canada's ambassador to the United Nations Human Rights Council to gather evidence and investigate the Government of the People's Republic of China's persecution of Uyghurs and other Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang.

Here is the 14th recommendation:

The Subcommittee recommends that the Government of Canada call for the establishment of an impartial and independent United Nations mechanism to monitor and report on the human rights situation of Uyghurs and other Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang.

Finally, here is the 15th recommendation:

The Subcommittee recommends that the Government of Canada apply targeted sanctions under the *Justice for Victims of Corrupt Foreign Officials Act* against officials responsible for committing gross violations of human rights against Uyghurs and other Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang. The Government of Canada should also encourage international allies and like-minded countries to pursue similar sanctions.

These words are of immense importance. However, they elicited zero response from the government and its executive, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Prime Minister. Every time we asked them a question in the House, they answered that they were working on it and that they are worried about the situation.

● (1710)

Being worried is all well and good, but we are well past that now.

Routine Proceedings

On Saturday, the Uighurs will be protesting in front of the Canadian Olympic Committee's offices, calling for the relocation of the Olympic Games. That is the idea behind the motion moved by the member for Wellington—Halton Hills, which we amended. The government is refusing to comment. It is still worried.

The Uighur genocide started to get more media attention when it became associated with the idea of moving the 2022 Olympics out of Beijing. Suddenly, the media decided to take a closer look at the issue. However, the government is still telling us it will not comment, even though Liberal members who are not part of the executive voted in favour of that motion. I asked my colleague about this earlier. I wanted to know if a Liberal backbencher's vote is worth less than that of a member who is in the executive of the Liberal government.

It is a valid question. If parliamentary secretaries, ministers and the Prime Minister decide not to comment on the issue, what does that tell us as MPs? It tells us that there is a lack of courage, of political will. It tells us that, once again, our government is knuckling under to what can only be described as the tyrannical regime currently in power in China.

We are speaking with Uighurs every day. We are writing to them every day. My Conservative and New Democrat colleagues are doing it, and so are my Liberal colleagues, the ones who are not part of the executive. How can anyone look themselves in the mirror knowing that they are part of a government that cannot call a spade a spade?

If we are to address a problem, we need to be able to name it. The Prime Minister is unable to name the problem. This is not a minor problem. It is a genocide. Genocide is the most serious crime that a human being can perpetrate against another human being. The evidence of this genocide is there, all over the world. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Foreign Affairs cannot bring themselves to say the word "genocide", even though members of their own party can.

We need to ask ourselves again: What are we working for, and who are we working for? When I get up in the morning, I do not have any trouble looking myself in the mirror. I, too, am on China's blacklist. Honestly, that does bother me, because I have no ties to China and no intention of travelling there in the near future. However, some members of the House who were put on that list have family in China. Perhaps they would have liked to go visit those family members because they are concerned about them, but those members stood up and took that risk. They can look themselves in the mirror every morning.

We wrote an open letter. I think I am pretty lucky, because that open letter was signed by members from all parties of the House, members of the Quebec National Assembly, and Jean-Luc Brassard, who won an Olympic gold medal for Canada in 1994. They signed this letter calling for the Beijing Olympics to be relocated if China continues its genocidal campaign.

Everyone is telling me that I am crazy because it is impossible to relocate the Olympics with just one year's notice. My answer is that where there is a will, there is a way. That is the first thing. Scien-

tists created a vaccine in short order. Everyone told them it was impossible, yet they did it.

Politicians only need the political will. It could have been done. The Tokyo Olympic Games were delayed one year because of the pandemic. Everyone agreed, and no one asked questions when it was announced that the Tokyo Olympics would be postponed for one year. When the Olympics are delayed because of a pandemic, everyone is all right with it, but when we go after the 2022 Olympics because of a genocide, I am told it cannot be done.

• (1715)

Where is the logic in that? If we were able to do it for Tokyo, why can we not do it for Beijing? It is not a pandemic, it is a genocide. Is that not important enough?

I do not understand why any members would be against this idea, given that they get up in the morning telling themselves that they work for their voters and for what is right. What is right is to fight against a tyrannical regime and protect the people who are being oppressed by this regime.

Personally, I am happy, because when I look myself in the mirror, my conscience is clear. There are members on the other side of the House who are going to have to ask themselves a question of vital importance: Why do we enter politics?

Politicians always have to make difficult decisions. They are difficult to make because obviously we know full well what kind of country China is. We know that it is a force to be reckoned with, a global power, and no one wants to upset a global power, considering the economic repercussions. There are also the two Michaels and Huawei to think of.

Do people go into politics expecting it to be easy? No, people go into politics knowing they will have to make difficult decisions. Still, they must be fair. Just because it is hard does not mean it is not fair.

The Prime Minister needs to take a hard look in the mirror. This government needs to look in the mirror and decide whether it will name the problem or not. Once it names the problem, it will be a lot easier to tackle it.

A genocide is currently being carried out in Xinjiang against Uighurs and Turkic Muslims. The government needs to name it and stand up to China. I hope the Liberals will be able to take a good hard look at themselves once they do.

• (1720)

[*English*]

Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am tabling the responses to Order Paper Questions Nos. 622 to 628.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills, CPC): Madam Speaker, my hon. colleague has been working on the issue of Canada's role at the Olympic and Paralympic Games in Beijing next winter.

I would like to know what he thinks the government should do about the Olympics and Paralympics to send a message to China concerning the genocide being committed against the Uighur people.

Mr. Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe: Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague, whom I admire, for his question.

Earlier he posited that it would be easy for the government not to send diplomatic personnel to the next Olympic and Paralympic Games in Beijing.

That is a first step, of course, but I also think that it is not too late for the government to exert even more pressure and use even more of the leverage at its disposal. The thing that hurts China the most is its image at home and abroad. Going after the Olympic Games in Beijing will help the Uighur people.

We will work hand in hand with all my friends from all the parties, with anyone who is so inclined.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I do not know how many times I have listened to members of the opposition say they want to have more time to speak to a bill, whatever that bill might be. It happens consistently.

At the same time, the at-times-unholy alliance of opposition members will bring forward issues to prevent the government from bringing forward legislation. On one hand, they say they want more time to speak to government legislation and are critical of government for not allowing more time, then on the other they do what they can to prevent government legislation from passing.

For example, today we were supposed to be debating Bill C-22. Is the Bloc comfortable seeing that bill pass? Do the Bloc members want more time on government legislation? If not, then maybe we should be debating this issue more often than is being suggested.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe: Madam Speaker, it is funny to hear the member talk about an opposition alliance. The way I see it, there is an alliance between the Liberal government and their NDP farm team on numerous issues.

As far as speaking time is concerned, the government has imposed time allocation a few times and even prorogued Parliament for six weeks. The member opposite better not talk to me about speaking time. The government shut down Parliament for six weeks and systematically filibustered at the Standing Committee on National Defence and the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics.

If the Liberals want to be serious and tell me that we are currently talking about things that do not suit their taste, then they can do the honourable thing and look at their own track record. Their record on speaking time in the House is not looking so good.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, we have seen the government's reaction. It does

Routine Proceedings

not want to talk about these fundamental human rights issues. That worries me. We saw the same thing with military materiel exports to Saudi Arabia. Several MPs asked why Canada was supporting the possible violation of human rights over there. It is inconsistent. The government is always talking about the fact that it wants to support human rights, but it does not want to have that debate today.

What are the member's thoughts on the government's refusal to discuss human rights and take the necessary measures?

Mr. Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

I have not been an MP for long, but I have a pretty good sense of how it works because my father was one, and I kept tabs on the debates for 20 years. I think that, when it comes to human rights and international co-operation, this government is the epitome of hypocrisy. It loves to present itself as some kind of Superman, a supporter of human rights and defender of Canadian values all around the world.

When the Liberals complained about the Harper Conservatives not giving enough money to international development, the contribution at that time was 0.32% of GDP. Under this Prime Minister, it is 0.27% of GDP.

Again, the government is passing itself off as Superman and a human rights champion, but when it comes time to deal with real issues and make hard decisions, it falls apart and crumbles, totally spineless. It is always the same thing with this government.

● (1725)

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend for his excellent speech and acknowledgement of the importance of this debate. Recognizing genocide means that we have a responsibility to protect, to recognize and to act.

I am pleased that he shared specific recommendations made by the Subcommittee on International Human Rights.

Could he say more about what the government must do to respond to the Chinese Communist Party?

What is his number one priority for new government policies in this area?

Mr. Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

First, as I said earlier, I believe that we must recognize that this is a genocide. The government must do so, and that is the first step. If we want to move in a certain direction, we must take the first step. It is essential and significant, and the Prime Minister and the Minister of Foreign Affairs must do it.

Second, we absolutely must get international observers on the ground in Xinjiang, and they must be impartial observers, of course. Once again, that is essential.

Private Members' Business

The Chinese government says that Xinjiang is not closed, unlike Tibet, but it is not allowing international observers to enter the area.

I believe that once the government can bring itself to utter the word “genocide”, it will be able to move in that direction, ask its ambassador to the UN, the Hon. Bob Rae, to put this issue on the table, and work on getting people on the ground.

Once that happens, we will have a chance to free the Uighur people from the yoke of Chinese oppression.

Mr. Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Madam Speaker, I congratulate my colleague on his excellent speech.

I am having a hard time understanding the Liberals' behaviour. What is behind this hypocrisy? Their hypocrisy is evident in a number of areas, but this case is particularly bad.

Are they simply trying to protect specific economic interests? What are the consequences of agreeing to collaborate like this with a country that is committing genocide for economic reasons?

I do not see where they are going with this, so I would like to hear my colleague's thoughts.

Mr. Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe: Madam Speaker, this is nothing new.

I remind members that in the 1930s, when a boat filled with Jewish refugees arrived on our shores, the Canadian prime minister turned it away, saying, “None is too many”. A Canadian prime minister said that. Should history be repeated today? I do not think so. I do not think anyone wants to be on the wrong side of history on the issue we are debating today, which affects all of us.

I have to tell my colleague that I also cannot understand the government's position on this. We could give our Uighur friends some hope by calling it a genocide. Hope is what they need now, and the government could make a difference.

I still have faith that the government will come to its senses and do that. I believe that the government is capable of doing it. What I do not know is whether it wants to.

• (1730)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): It being 5:30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

GREENHOUSE GAS POLLUTION PRICING ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-206, An Act to amend the Greenhouse Gas Pollution Pricing Act (qualifying farming fuel), as reported (with amendment) from the committee.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): There being no motions 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.

Mr. Philip Lawrence (Northumberland—Peterborough South, CPC) moved that the bill be concurred in.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): If a member of a recognized party present in the House wishes to request a recorded division or that the motion be adopted on division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Madam Speaker, I request that the motion pass on division.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I therefore declare the motion carried on division.

(Motion agreed to)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): When shall the bill be read a third time? By leave, now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Philip Lawrence moved that bill be read the third time and passed.

He said: Madam Speaker, it is always a privilege to be in this House. It is an even greater privilege to be here with respect to Bill C-206, which of course is my private member's bill. Although I misspeak when I say it is mine. It really belongs to the farmers. That is what this bill is all about.

Our agriculture workers are tremendous. They produce some of the best agriculture products in the entire world. They work so hard every day. They get up early, go to bed late, and in between, continue their fantastic work.

Of course, we have all been challenged by the pandemic, and farmers are the same. Farmers have pushed through, even through the pandemic. Through all the barriers and challenges of the pandemic, they continued to plant their fields, tend their crops and take care of their animals, so we could always have a full belly here in Canada. During the pandemic, and really at any time in the recent past, farmers and Canadians have never had to worry about their food supply, and that is because we have the best farmers in the entire world.

Talking about the importance of agriculture, it is more than 7% of our GDP. More than that, farmers are really the heart of our community. They are the engine of our economy. Nearly one in eight Canadians are employed in agriculture and agri-food. That is an important statistic. That is the type of impact this industry has. On the whole, it employs more than 2.3 million Canadians.

We are one of the world's largest producers of flax seed, canola, pulses and durham wheat. We have some of the best beef, poultry and pork in the entire world produced right here in Canada, the greatest country in the world.

Private Members' Business

However, farmers have done this not in easy circumstances. In fact, in 2019, they had to go through what was dubbed, and I excuse the language, the “harvest from hell” when their crops were incredibly difficult to harvest due to the moisture and rainfall of 2019. This was an absolute challenge. Farmers had to run their grain dryers for nearly 24 hours straight at some points to save as much of their agriculture product as they could.

In 2019, the rain out west was not the only weather condition that farmers faced. That year a hurricane flattened fields in Atlantic Canada. Fields in Quebec faced unprecedented rainfall during harvest and planting times. There were snow-covered fields out west earlier on. Manitoba was in a state of emergency. Alberta and Saskatchewan faced drought.

In my riding, the fabulous riding, and I might say, perhaps the best riding in the entire world, Northumberland—Peterborough South, we faced an almost unprecedented late frost. Generally, after May 24 is the frost-free zone, but we had frost in our riding, and in other parts of southern Ontario, and if farmers had planted, they had to deal with that as well. As we can see, farmers are not without their challenges.

It goes beyond weather. There are issues that farmers are facing such as global trade issues. Currently, there are various trade issues where farmers in Canada are not getting appropriate, equitable treatment. They are often at the short end of the stick and in a highly subsidized industry. It is subsidized nearly throughout the world, in the EU and the United States. During the pandemic, the EU and the United States of America stepped up for their farmers. They gave millions, if not billions, of dollars to farmers to help them get through the pandemic.

In Canada, I would love to say it was the same, but that is just not the case. Unfortunately, the current government went through its tried and true strategy of making an announcement, having that policy or platform item fail and then reannouncing it again. It recycles failed announcements over and over again, and our farmers got precious little compared to other farmers around the world.

That, in a nutshell, is why I am so passionate about Bill C-206. When we boil it down, it is about giving farmers a fair shake. They need to have the same opportunities as farmers around the world. The carbon tax here in Canada is not imposed internationally, and because of that, they face barriers that other farmers in other countries simply do not face.

• (1735)

Bill C-206 would give those farmers a fair shake, an opportunity to compete globally. What would it do?

Currently, the Greenhouse Gas Pollution Pricing Act absolutely exempts certain types of fuel. It exempts gasoline and diesel, but it does not currently exempt natural gas and propane. In the spirit of team Canada and non-partisanship, I would like to give the government the benefit of the doubt that perhaps this was an oversight. This is the government's opportunity to correct that oversight. In fact, I would like to invite it to do so.

There is no logical reason why natural gas and propane would not be exempt when gasoline and diesel are. Natural gas and

propane are cleaner fuels than diesel and gasoline. In fact, in my humble estimation, natural gas and propane are actually part of the solution.

For example, if we were to take all the coal-producing power plants in China and convert them to natural gas, the savings from that, the amount of carbon savings, the reduction in output, would be dramatically more than if we were to take Canada to net zero. If we were to convert China completely to natural gas from coal, that would be much more beneficial to the environment than even if Canada went to net zero tomorrow.

Natural gas and propane are a part of the problem and they are arguably cleaner than the exempt fossil fuel equivalents, which are diesel and gasoline.

When I look at natural gas and propane, who do we impact if it is not exempt? We are affecting a wide range of farmers, but particularly our grain farmers. As I said, we are among the leaders in grain farmers in the entire world. Those prices are set by international markets.

By having this bill in place, we will give those grain farmers a break. The Saskatchewan Association of Agricultural Societies and Exhibitions, the Manitoba Association of Agricultural Societies and the CFIB have various numbers, as does the PBO, but those numbers range anywhere from thousands to tens of thousands of dollars in costs for farmers. I saw them. I was emailed droves and droves receipts for the carbon tax, amounting to tens of thousands of dollars. Then to add insult to injury, they are charged GST on the carbon tax.

When I was at the public accounts committee, I asked the assistant deputy finance minister how the government could justify charging the GST on top of carbon tax, that the carbon tax was punitive enough. He said that it was not. He was wrong. The government does not even know how much damage it is inflicting on our farmers. To me, that is so damaging and so challenging.

When we look at this, we know farmers want to, and I definitely want to, fight climate change. Is there a more environmentally friendly way? Is there a better way than burning natural gas and propane?

We had session after session of expert witnesses. While they said that perhaps there were fledgling technologies and that there were opportunities for the future to perhaps burn biofuels or use other types of more environmentally friendly fuels and energy, right now there was not. The Grain Farmers of Ontario said, “there are no readily available grain drying technology replacement alternatives that are cost effective. Drying grain is essential for marketing grain.”

From these witnesses, we learned that farmers greatly care about the environment. For those folks who maybe are not in an agriculture setting, like I am, a one degree difference in temperature can make the difference for a season. An entire year, whether it is profitable or not, can be based on whether there is frost or not. That can be the difference of one degree.

Private Members' Business

There is no one more sensitive to environmental changes, to environmental concerns than our farmers. That testimony came out again and again. When I think about the environmental impact, and I will talk a little about that, it really affects them.

● (1740)

I was actually sleeping at six a.m. in my house. I rent out my property to a farmer. Of course, farmers, because they work immeasurably harder than politicians, were not asleep at six a.m. I heard a “rap, rap, rap,” and I came down to the door in my pyjamas, with the farmer knocking at my door. He rents the field from me. He said there was a tree down and asked if I had a chainsaw. I asked him to give me five minutes so I could get changed and get my chainsaw. We went ahead and cut up that tree. In there, I started off a conversation with one of our local farmers, a great guy.

Members might wonder what we talked about. Did we talk about the fact that the Leafs are definitely going to win and that this was their year? No, we did not talk about that. Maybe we talked about Montreal and that maybe it would be their year. No, what we talked about was actually the GPS in his tractor and how he had two different GPS options, and he picked the one that was one inch as opposed to five inches. It was calibrated to one inch, and he said he had to do that, because it made his farms and fields more productive and because he did not want to use one extra ounce of chemical or fertilizer that he did not have to use. This is how much our farmers care about our environment. I think that is a bit of an undersold issue.

Of course, farmers are some of the first stewards of our lands. They protect so much. Other technology they have been involved in includes no-till technology, precision agriculture and satellite-driven agriculture. The farmers want to get this right. They want to do everything they can to preserve that land, because, quite frankly, their livelihood and the livelihood of the coming generations depend on it.

There is great news, too, with respect to farmers. They are actually ahead of the curve. What do we hear about from industries, even the oil industry and, of course, the government here? It is net-zero, and this is a fabulous concept and something we can all drive to, but most industries say “net-zero, 2050; net-zero, 2060; net-zero, 2040,” or, maybe, if they are really ambitious, “net-zero, 2030”. How about, “net-zero, now”? That is what farmers are. They are net-zero now. They plant millions of these little devices, these terrific, amazing little carbon-capture devices. I like to call them “plants”. There are millions of them every single year, and they sequester this carbon. It is unbelievable. It is such an advance in science. They sequester this carbon in their fields, and yes they burn some fossil fuels in their tractors and in drying grain and keeping their barns heated, but overall they are net-zero and above, and farmers want to do even more.

I am so passionate here, I am happy to hopefully get through half of my speech here. I just could talk about this PMB all day.

When we look at the overall picture, we see farmers who want to do the right thing. We see Canadians who want to do the right thing and protect the environment, but we have to do it in a way that makes economic sense, as well. First, we have to make sure that farmers stay competitive in the global market and that we do not

make our farmers pay an undue burden, as opposed to other industries and other countries around the world. The other part is that farmers want to do the right thing. The challenge is that agriculture has been, and is even more so now, an undercapitalized sector of our economy. In testimony at the agriculture committee, one of the individuals said that if money was not an object, they would put in high-efficiency grain operation tomorrow, but they simply do not have the capital. Farmers are stretched out more thinly than they ever have been before, so that is why.

The idea of the carbon tax is that we are going to make less environmentally friendly solutions more expensive, so that we will naturally be pushed, in a free market system, to those that are more environmental. However, in this situation the reverse is true, because farmers want to do the more environmentally friendly thing. Members can trust me, as I was talking to my farmers on Saturday morning. They want to do that; they just do not have the money, so when we take more money from them, and it can literally be tens of thousands of dollars, they do not have the money to invest.

Farmers want to do the right thing. We want to do the right thing. Let us collaborate together. Let us vote together. Let us pass the PMB, Bill C-206.

● (1745)

Mr. Kody Blois (Kings—Hants, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for Northumberland—Peterborough South. His passion is evident, and having had a chance to sit on committees with him, I know that his intent is right in this bill.

One thing the member did not mention in his speech was the significant investment that our government is making in this domain to work with farmers so they are able to make this transition and to keep that price signal in effect.

One of the issues that came up in committee was that, although this would be opening opportunities for natural gas and propane, it did not change the definition of “eligible farming activity”, which is part of the fatal flaw in this piece of legislation.

Can the member speak to that? That was a big piece of the underlying work in the committee before this came back to the House.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Madam Speaker, I also want to congratulate the member as he is a very passionate representative for the agriculture sector, and I think that he works very hard for his constituents.

However, I fundamentally disagree with him. In fact, it is nearly unanimous, except for the government. Stakeholders agree. Nearly everyone we spoke with at the agriculture committee agrees, the parliamentary drafting lawyers agree and we agree that, in fact, the definition is really quite simple: It is a piece of machinery that operates in farming.

If anyone has ever been to a farm where there are grain dryers, they would know that grain dryers are pieces of farming equipment used on farms. They are not used for tanning: They are actually used for farming.

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Madam Speaker, I commend my colleague from Northumberland—Peterborough South for his speech, for his passion and for his bill.

I would like to give him a chance to respond to the concerns raised at committee by people who thought that reducing the impact of the price on pollution might send a bad message.

Could he say a few words about the amendment that was adopted in committee?

[English]

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Madam Speaker, indeed, the agriculture committee is blessed with another fantastic member, and I appreciate him stalling a little while I listened to the interpretation. My French is almost there, I promise, but it is still a work in progress.

We added an amendment that the bill would expire in 10 years, which is a reasonable and good amendment in my opinion. We are hopeful that in five or 10 years there will be more environmental solutions, perhaps using biofuels or solar power. Perhaps the energy grid will be completely clean at that point. We could look at it then, but right now we need this solution.

As I said, we agreed to and voted for the amendment because in 10 years, maybe the technology will exist. Right now it does not.

• (1750)

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Madam Speaker, it is always a pleasure to hear the member for Northumberland—Peterborough South, and he was certainly a welcome addition at our committee.

I want to ask the member about some of the testimony we heard concerning the carbon tax, and how it is to be used as an incentive to get people to change their ways, but it only really works when we have a viable alternative. The reason diesel fuel is exempt from the carbon tax is because there is no current replacement for diesel tractors on farms.

Could the member elaborate a bit more on why there are just no viable alternatives at this moment? If we were not to make this amendment, especially with rising farm debt, we would really be trapping farmers into a cost that they could not escape from.

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Madam Speaker, I also thank the member for his great service to the agriculture committee. He is another great advocate for it.

Private Members' Business

I am from the country. I liken this to an individual who owns an old pickup truck and knows they could save money if they bought a more fuel-efficient car. They want to do that, but they just do not have the money. That actually puts them in a poverty trap, which is what the carbon tax is doing with our farmers. They want to be more efficient, because if they are they make more money. However, they just do not have the capital to do it.

At the agriculture committee, we did an in-depth study. We heard from many witnesses, and they all said that there could be future technology, but it does not exist right now. These were some of the greatest experts in all the land who testified, and they said there just is not an economically viable alternative right now. That is why we have a sunset on this bill in 10 years, because hopefully that will change.

Mr. Kody Blois (Kings—Hants, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank again the member for Northumberland—Peterborough South for highlighting the key role that our farmers play for our economy, our environment and indeed our very well-being.

However, since this is the first time that I have had the opportunity to speak in this House since the finding of 215 bodies at the Kamloops residential school, if you will permit me, Madam Speaker, just for one moment I would like to touch on that. I have three indigenous communities in my own riding, including Sipekne'katik, Annapolis Valley First Nation and Glooscap, with particular emphasis that the Shubenacadie Residential School system was the largest in Atlantic Canada.

I had the opportunity to join members of the indigenous community in my riding on Sunday. We know that we had an important emergency debate yesterday. I was not able to be recognized, but I look forward to speaking on this in the days ahead, including, perhaps, tomorrow with the opposition day motion. I continue to work in concert with our indigenous communities, as I know all members of this House will do with their respective constituents.

Private Members' Business

Climate change is one of the greatest challenges of our time, and our farmers are on the front lines. Canadian farmers are both innovators and environmentalists at heart and they farm their land with an eye to future generations: farmers like Jacques Lamontagne, who is working with researchers to explore the benefits of planting trees along the river that runs through his dairy farm in Quebec's Eastern Townships; or Manitoba's Robert McNabb who was inducted into the Canadian Conservation Hall of Fame for being a pioneer in zero-tillage; or Alberta's Deer Creek livestock winners of the 2020 Environmental Stewardship Award for their efforts to conserve species at risk and use solar-electric fences to keep cattle off riverbanks and preserve grasslands. Let me also say that my own farmers in Kings—Hants are doing tremendous work to ensure that they are being environmental stewards of the land and to reduce their respective environmental and GHG footprints as a result.

Thanks to innovators like the ones I have mentioned and others, over the past two decades, Canadian farmers have doubled the value of their production while stabilizing greenhouse gas emissions. In that time, the amount of agriculture emissions per dollar of GDP generated by the sector has dropped by half.

However, we know that there is more work to be done and we have to be there to work with industry in the days ahead. Our government has ambitious emission targets, with the goal of cutting Canada's greenhouse gas emissions by 40% to 45% by 2030 in comparison to 2015.

One of the things that I asked my hon. colleague about during his remarks was the fact that he did not touch on the budget investments that were made in budget 2021. That is an important nuance for members to consider. This well-intending legislation was introduced, but really our government has responded in a way to try to ensure that there are mechanisms and tools in place to support our farmers in their transition to reducing emissions. I want to highlight some of them for the members of this House.

Grain drying was one of the key central points that was raised by the member opposite as being a *raison d'être* of his PMB. Our government recognizes that there are emerging technologies, but we are not at the point that there is a whole host of opportunities to be able to move forward.

That is why, in budget 2021, we are investing \$100 million to be able to rebate farmers who are in the federally backstopped jurisdictions, such that we can make sure that money is returned to farmers and we can still maintain the price signal of the price on pollution, which was deemed very important by a number of witnesses in our committee study on this particular piece of legislation. There is also \$50 million dedicated solely toward supporting innovative technologies around grain drying, and I will speak more to that in a moment.

The clean agriculture tech fund is \$165 million of support that the government has, in the days ahead, to roll out. One of the key elements in this is the opportunity to work with farmers to adopt renewable energy on farm as a way to offset fossil fuel practices. We know farmers are already doing good work. The member opposite talked about the means to be able to make this transition. Farmers want to be part of this, but we want to be a government that is

working with farmers to be able to help make this transition. Programs like this are going to matter.

• (1755)

Finally, the agriculture climate solutions program will have \$385 million dedicated to it over the next 10 years to help farmers transition to do this important work. This includes programs such as the living labs, where there are opportunities for farmers, researchers and innovation experts to come together to make important investments and do important research on what else can be done.

I would be remiss if I did not talk about some of the opportunities that exist. I know the debate in the House will include measures that farmers are already doing. We as a government agree. We look at things such as the clean fuel standard and the opportunity that exists for the canola sector. We look at the offset mitigation efforts, essentially the offset credits, that Environment and Climate Change Canada is working toward. This presents an incredible opportunity for our sector to reward the practices that are being adopted. It is important that we continue to support these practices and ensure that farmers have the opportunity to benefit from the environmental stewardship they are already taking on.

I want to give some reflections from my perspective as a member of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food, where we had conversations with experts on Bill C-206. One of the elements in a lot of testimony that I thought was particularly important was the importance of maintaining a price signal. The member for Cowichan—Malahat—Langford introduced an amendment that is reasonable, but misses the point that we want to keep that price signal now to continue to make innovation possible and help drive technology and innovation in this space.

The member for Northumberland—Peterborough South mentioned in his remarks that farmers would make the transition to the most efficient grain dryers today if they had the means to do it. Our government is focused on maintaining that price, being able to hub the support programs that are in place, such that we are able to help farmers make the transition today because we need to continue to move in this regard. That is extremely important.

I would also talk about the fact that the agriculture committee is doing a study right now on environment, agriculture and the intersection between the two. One of the things that was pointed out yesterday by witnesses is that there are opportunities for things such as wood pellets to help drive the energy that is necessary to support grain drying.

This is something that the ECCC is looking at in conjunction with the industry because the life-cycle analysis of these types of products is significantly lower than fossil fuels. These are the types of innovative practices that we can continue to do to help support farmers, so they are able to get around the price on pollution and lower their own costs and support rural industries at the same time.

I mentioned in my question to the member opposite that one of the things we heard loud and clear was that, although it is laudable in its intent to open up natural gas and propane as eligible fuels, because this was about grain drying, at least as I understand it, there is no explicit mention in the proposed legislation that would change the definition of the eligible farming activity. I take notice that the member opposite feels that, under the interpretation he takes, this would be included, but we have heard from the Department of Finance Canada that they do not share that view. That is one part of the fatally flawed elements in this bill.

Simply put, our position as a government is that we are going to continue to maintain a price. We are going to rebate where it makes sense, where it is difficult to find the innovative technologies that exist. The intent of this particular legislation was well-meaning, but it was introduced before the government made significant investments to partner with industry to get to the outcomes we all know are so crucial and important.

● (1800)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech. I will pick up on some of the points he raised and perhaps make some slight corrections.

I would like to begin my statement by commending farmers. I have the greatest respect for these people who work on the land week in and week out, all year long, in the cold and the heat, come rain, snow or drought. Their priority is to ensure that their children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren can work on the same land. They want to preserve it. I just wanted to share that with the House. Let us not forget that.

Let us not forget the efforts that the farming community is already making, either. Of course we all want to do more. We all want to do better, and we all want to improve our track record. That is essential, but let us acknowledge what is being done and encourage the good students. In a few minutes, my colleagues will understand why I am using that metaphor.

If any members of Parliament have not been to a farm, either because it is not their file or because they are from an urban riding, I urge them to go visit a farm, meet with farmers and see what a day in their life is like. I will leave it at that.

My colleagues know that the Bloc Québécois is in favour of reducing greenhouse gas emissions and supports the principle of pollution pricing. When it comes to fighting climate change, there are two possible approaches: the stick and the carrot. We agree that a combination of the two is necessary, but, in this case, where everyone knows there is no other viable short-term solution, it only makes sense to us to pass this bill. That is why we spoke in favour of the bill, right from the start.

I would be lying if I said the bill did not give me a headache the first time I read it. The Bloc Québécois wants to move away from fossil fuels and invest in green energy. We believe in the principle of pollution pricing. However, we must be rational and smart about the measures we take.

Private Members' Business

In committee, the obvious example of grain drying showed that there is no economically viable alternative at this time due to a number of factors. One key factor is the need for massive investments to use new technologies, such as biomass or electricity. Electric power does not generate sufficiently intense heat quickly enough to dry grain efficiently. On top of that, power lines often cannot even carry the amount of power needed to the farms. Despite our attempts to think scientifically and our desire to make it happen in the near future, the infrastructure is just not there.

If I want to drive around town in a four-wheel-drive SUV with an eight-cylinder engine, that is my choice. If I have to pay a fuel tax, it is my choice to continue driving a big four-wheel-drive vehicle around town, even if I do not need it. Since other options are available, it makes sense to add that fuel tax in that context. Perhaps in the short to medium term, it will force people to switch to an electric vehicle, or at least to one that is smaller and that does not have four-wheel drive, since no one really needs that in the city.

In this case, however, I am talking about farmers who depend on world market prices. Grain farmers have no control over the market and therefore cannot increase their selling prices, but they cannot use an alternative fuel, either. Taxing the propane they use to dry grain will increase their higher production costs and reduce their already slim margins. Remember, these are agricultural entrepreneurs, and they have no wiggle room.

● (1805)

What do they do as soon as they have a little wiggle room? They invest in their business. They innovate, and we need to give them the opportunity to do so. Since there are currently no other options, we agree. We think the bill is reasonable. Looking at the bill, we might think this is an oversight. It is only logical to add propane and natural gas to the list of other fuels. However, we must act.

My colleagues have certainly noticed that, in the last few minutes, the members who sit on the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food have been calling each other “my very esteemed colleague”. What my colleagues may not know is that there is a rather special sense of camaraderie and non-partisanship on this committee. I am a new member and I have not been witness to any major arguments in committee, but I sometimes hear things from other members who sit on other committees. In fact, I want to give credit to the members of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food, because they are able to collaborate constructively.

The representatives of *Équiterre* were among the first witnesses the committee heard from. Obviously, they opposed the bill. They think putting a price on carbon is essential. When we asked them questions, they answered that the problem was the absence of a timeframe. We listened to them and proposed an amendment to the bill. It has a limited duration of 10 years. All members hope it will take less than 10 years, but we have to give our producers a bit of breathing room.

Private Members' Business

In my introduction I said that we need to acknowledge the work that our farmers do. I, like everyone, want us to improve. The member who spoke before me said that a new study on the environment had been started.

During testimony yesterday, representatives from the Department of the Environment said that the planned offset credit system would not recognize innovations or improvements that were implemented before 2018. I am sounding the alarm here, because that is not something we can do.

Some farmers have been bending over backwards over the past 25 years to make their products organic. They have lower yields than their neighbours who use chemical fertilizers. They have developed techniques. We cannot turn around and tell them now that everything they have done so far does not count and that they will have to innovate more. Actually, we will be telling them that they need to innovate more, but we need to recognize what has been done.

I am a former teacher. If a class is made up of good students and one disruptive student, I cannot tell them that, because the disruptive student is less disruptive than before, I will provide that student with more encouragement than I give the other students. What message would it send if I said that to my grade nine students? The good students would not be okay with that, and the same is true for our farmers. This is an extremely important principle.

It is also important to maintain the principle of pollution pricing and to come back to that.

I encourage our colleagues and the provincial governments that do not have their own system to implement one. This law will not apply in Quebec. It will apply in the provinces that did not pass their own regulations. I encourage them to do so, and I encourage them to come and see what is being done in Quebec. Quebec has partnered with British Columbia and California with regard to the carbon exchange, and it is working rather well. The provinces need to take charge of that aspect of their development.

In the future, I hope that the Government of Canada will invest the money that it collects from the tax in research, development and support. We need to recognize the role our farmers play in protecting the environment. Until then, let us be rational and adopt intelligent measures. Speaking of which, let us pass Bill C-206.

• (1810)

[*English*]

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Madam Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to once again speak to Bill C-206. For those who are just catching the debate tonight, this bill would make an amendment to the Greenhouse Gas Pollution Pricing Act and specifically broaden the definition of what a qualifying farm fuel would be. In this case, it is about adding natural gas and propane to the definition. This is important, as I will elaborate later on, because propane and natural gas are two fuels that are quite important to farmers for specific uses.

As I made mention in my second reading speech on the bill, it is also important to underscore the challenges that will be faced by

our agricultural sector in the decade ahead from the effects of climate change.

I have heard from farmers both in my own riding and at committee about how they are on the front lines of climate change. I represent a rural riding. The riding of Cowichan—Malahat—Langford is roughly 4,700 square kilometres in size. It is a beautiful piece of real estate on southern Vancouver Island. Also, the Cowichan Valley has a very long and storied history in agriculture. We are very proud of the climate we have, which allows us to grow an abundance of amazing produce and fruit. I know the farmers here are very cognizant of the effects of climate change just as they are right across Canada.

It is important that when we are crafting policy, we keep in mind what is going to be the greatest challenge of the 21st century and we really start to focus our efforts on combatting this great threat. It is not just having environmental concerns, not just causing environmental damage, but it is going to have significant impacts on our future tax dollars. The amount of money that we are going to have to pay out of future tax revenues in dealing with the damage from climate change, in trying to adapt to it and mitigating its effects, is going to grow if we do not significantly reduce our emissions. I understand the purpose of carbon pricing and I, for one, am absolutely in support of it.

I also want to acknowledge that too often in debate farmers are treated as bystanders and that is a gross mistake. Farmers are not only very well aware of what the effects of climate change will be, but are also one of our greatest tools in fighting climate change.

I have heard some of my colleagues make mention in their speeches on how good agricultural practices can be a major source of carbon sequestration. We need to take carbon out of the atmosphere where it causes havoc and put it into the soil. When we put it into the soil, we have healthier soil, we need less input through better agricultural methods and we get better yields. We also have soil that is better able to withstand droughts, flooding and it just builds a resilience into the system. There is nothing but positives with healthy soil management.

We have to look at those agroecological practices and regenerative farming techniques. I am glad our committee is engaged in this study, but we really need to focus federal government policies, and I acknowledge the budget is starting to do that, on making this a priority and putting farmers front and centre as one of our greatest allies in combatting this threat.

I want to take time to acknowledge the important work that our agricultural sector is already doing and the potential it has not only in renewable energy generation and the significant possibility on farms of harnessing the wind, the sun and biomass, but also what farmers are doing with their careful soil management.

The bill is back before us after spending some time at the agriculture committee. I have been a proud member of that committee for over three years now, and I will echo the previous speaker's comments. It is a wonderful committee of which to be a part. We are probably the most non-partisan committee in the House. A lot of what we do there is reached by consensus, and it is always a very respectful dialogue.

I think every member of the committee realizes that no matter what our partisan political stripe is, we all represent farmers in our ridings. We have New Democrats, Conservatives, Bloc members, Liberals and Green Party members. We all recognize the importance of the sector, not only to our individual ridings but to our country as a whole.

• (1815)

It was one of those rare moments when we as a committee finally got to study a bill, and we did a thorough job in investigating Bill C-206. We had six meetings and heard from 29 witnesses, and eight briefs were submitted. These witnesses included quite a variety of people from across the spectrum. We got to hear from several federal departments, the David Suzuki Foundation, the Canadian Canola Growers Association, the National Farmers Union, Farmers for Climate Solutions and the Grain Growers of Canada, just to name a few.

I have heard a lot of the debate about the intention of the carbon price. It is meant to establish a price signal to encourage people to change their ways to a less expensive and more environmentally friendly method. The focus of today's debate is the subject of grain drying, because that is where propane and natural gas are used quite frequently.

I mentioned this in my second reading speech, but it was confirmed time and time again: If the intention of the carbon price is to change behaviour, we need a viable alternative that we can change our behaviour to. I only recently made a switch to a zero-emission vehicle, and I know that many people in my riding of Cowichan—Malahat—Langford are doing the same. They made the switch because there is a price signal. It is a lot cheaper to operate a zero-emission vehicle, an electric car, than it is to operate a gasoline-powered one. However, they also made the switch because there were viable alternatives. We have so many options to choose from in the zero-emission vehicle market right now that it is quite easy, especially with government rebates, to find something that is practical for day-to-day use.

When it comes to grain drying and alternative technologies, farmers do not have that option. We did hear that there are some emerging technologies with respect to electric heat pumps and possibly the use of biomass from crop residue. However, we also heard that those technologies are still many years away from being commercially viable and efficient enough to actually replace natural gas and propane. If we have no viable alternative to force farmers into and are simply levying a carbon tax on their activities, the price is not going to do what it is intended to do.

I do respect the fact that the government is offering rebates, which I think were placed in the budget on page 174 in response to Bill C-206. Bill C-206 did have an impact, I guess, in helping to rewrite a part of the budget. However, we did hear from farmers

Private Members' Business

that they would prefer not to have the price in there at all until we have viable technologies.

That brings me to the amendment. I would like to thank members of the committee, because the one and only amendment that was passed to the bill was brought forward by me. I was trying to find a reasonable halfway point between the two sides to this argument by establishing a sunset clause of 10 years, after which the definition in this bill will revert to the original. I felt that 10 years was a long enough time to allow for these emerging technologies to become commercially viable so that hopefully by the year 2031 farmers will have a choice to go to. I think that is incredibly important when we put it in the context of carbon pricing.

I would like to thank my colleagues again, reflecting on what a joyful committee it is to be a member of, for agreeing to the amendment and allowing us to get to a stage where hopefully we will see the bill passed in the House and sent to the other place.

In conclusion, I think we need to remember, as has been detailed by the National Farmers Union, that Canadian farm debt has nearly doubled since the year 2000. It is made up of billions of dollars and, increasingly, farmers are paying more and more money in fertilizer costs, machinery fuels, new technologies, credit services and so on. They are really only left with a very small portion of gross farm revenues. I think the measure contained in Bill C-206 is going to help them out, and it gives us an opportunity to give them some price relief on a very important aspect of their business.

I appreciate the time. I look forward to hearing other speeches on Bill C-206.

• (1820)

Mr. Dave Epp (Chatham-Kent—Leamington, CPC): Madam Speaker, with Moraviantown and Caldwell First Nation in my riding, I want to begin by acknowledging the tragedy of 215 unmarked graves discovered at the Indian residential school in Kamloops, now the adopted home of my daughter and her family.

It does, however, give me pleasure today to speak to my enthusiastic colleague from Northumberland—Peterborough South's private member's bill that affects many constituents and myself and my own family farm, but before getting into the specifics of this bill, I want to note four general points to frame my remarks.

First of all, as individuals, farmers are environmentalists by nature and by necessity. The drive to leave the land and surrounding areas in better condition than when they found it is innate to the vast majority of farmers I know. It is the condition of the land, flock or herd that supplies the farm family with return on its labour, investments and inputs, so it is in their own self-interest to leave the vehicle of their own prosperity in better condition for the next generation.

Private Members' Business

Second, collectively, agriculture has a strong track record of reducing its environmental footprint, be it through the adoption of low- or no-till, saving moisture and reducing erosion; through the refinement of and working with nutrients; through the lens of the four “R”s, using the right product at the right time, placing it in the right place and at the right rate—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Excuse me, there seems to be a little distortion with the mike for the interpreters, so I just want to ask the hon. member to maybe try to unplug it and plug it back in.

Mr. Dave Epp: Madam Speaker, be it through the use of more intensive use of cover cropping or rotational grazing, recently we had officials from Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada testify at committee. They acknowledged that greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture have remained steady since 2005, despite increased production.

By my own personal experience farming in a sandy vegetable production area, it was not uncommon to experience sandstorms in spring as the soils were being plowed to prepare them for potato, tomato and other vegetable seedlings. Having to turn on headlights to drive at midday happened more than once, I am sorry to say, in the mid-1980s. That does not happen anymore. Windbreaks have been planted, cover crops are managed far more intensively, and the use of strip tillage has virtually removed wind erosion as a concern.

Third, ag has a strong record of innovation, of adopting new technologies, such as the use of GPS technology on the farm, the growing adoption of variable rate application, both in seeding and in crop protection products, robotics in our dairy sector, automation and climate controls in our greenhouse sector and many other innovations.

Why is this? It is because farmers know they have to compete. To paraphrase John F. Kennedy, this industry has often been described as one of the few that buys their inputs retail, sells their outputs wholesale and pays the freight both ways. This leads me to my final framing point.

By and large, farmers are price takers. They cannot effectively pass along imposed cost increases to their buyers. Let these four points set the stage for my remarks of Bill C-206, An Act to amend the Greenhouse Gas Pollution Pricing Act (qualifying farming fuel), adding propane and natural gas to be exempted qualifying farm fuels from the carbon tax.

We have heard much in this House about the harvest from hell in 2019. Particularly, in Western Canada, this very difficult harvest, which saw extensive and prolonged rainfall, as well as early snowfalls and frost right before and during harvest, necessitated the use of natural gas and propane to dry the grain into a storable condition. Farming in Ontario requires the use of grain dryers every year, particularly for grain corn, though it is often also needed for soybeans, wheat, barley, oats and canola.

During a recent conversation with Dr. Alan Mussell, he reminded me that farmers have been extremely focused on their use of energy since the very beginnings of organized agriculture. They have focused on maximizing yield and quality, and maximizing the feed conversion as plant energy is converted to protein. They have been

focused on the 99% of the energy used on the farm, the energy received from the sun, solar energy. By maximizing the efficiency of this energy, by maximizing yield, quality and conversion, and by achieving greater plant growth per hectare, as a consequence, they have also increased carbon sequestration.

In fixing CO₂ as a consequence of driving yield, it is heavily influenced by the management techniques employed by progressive farmers. It has only been in the last decade or so that there have been whispers about agriculture as being a dirty industry. Since the use of electrical and fossil fuel energy sources comprises only a small component of energy use, farmers have rightfully been historically focused on maximizing efficiencies through increasing the yield and quality of their crops by maximizing the use of the sun, by driving yield and consequently, sequestering carbon.

Incidentally, the movement to reducing or eliminating tillage provided improvements in moisture retention and a reduction in erosion and, of course, increased sequestration, all without the imposition of a tax, something also not acknowledged in the Greenhouse Gas Pollution Pricing Act. However, then to increase agriculture's focus, even on the relatively small use of energy from fossil fuel sources, does it not make sense that adding a carbon tax would drive a reduction in its use? The answer is no for three reasons.

First, imposing a carbon tax on farm fuels used for grain drying could induce a logical response by the industry that reduces yields and then is at cross-purposes with the goals of the tax. Particularly, with respect to the growing of corn, farmers have chosen varieties that require the most growing degree days that can be grown in their region with acceptable risks to maturity so as to maximize the conversion of solar energy into yield, which then also maximizes carbon sequestration.

They could choose to grow shorter-season varieties, which would be drier at harvest, to avoid carbon tax costs. This would require less energy to dry the crop into a storable state. However, this comes with a corresponding reduction in yield, less fixing of CO₂ and requires more land to grow the same amount of grain for their markets.

● (1825)

Second, commercially viable, scalable alternatives to using natural gas and propane simply are not available today. Because there are not any viable alternatives, the demand for fuel tends to be unaffected by price, making additional fuel charges in the form of an additional tax an ineffective policy tool to lower emissions. The additional fuel charge as presently applied is punitive. It taxes our farmers, with little to no benefit for the environment.

It has been mentioned that the recent budget did contain some funding, with \$50 million for research to explore and develop viable alternatives. This initiative can be supported. If and when viable alternatives are commercially available, they are usually more expensive than the status quo. Incentivizing their adoption rather than taxing a present practice with no alternatives is a far better policy tool.

If possible, use the carrot rather than the stick. As mentioned earlier, farmers cannot pass this additional cost on to consumers, and this leads me to my final point, which is basic fairness in the market.

Our Canadian grains compete directly with American grains and are priced off the Chicago Board of Trade. Our own farm is primarily a processing-vegetable farming operation, but Lycoland Farms also produces grain and oil seeds. Because our volume of production is too low presently to warrant an investment in drying and storage facilities, we deliver our grains to Tec-Land, a farming operation and elevator in Wheatley, and receive a price based in U.S. dollars off of Chicago plus a local basis.

This basis takes into account the exchange rate, local supply and demand factors and freight considerations to market. Tec-Land has options for marketing to customers such as Hiram Walker or ADM in Windsor, Greenfield Global, an ethanol producer in Chatham here in my riding, Cargill in Sarnia or Ingredion in London, but none of these customers will pay more basis to Tec-Land to cover the carbon tax and drying cost. Why is that? Each of these end-users can also buy American corn or soybeans, and they often do, and these grains do not incur a carbon tax on the drying or on the farm fuels used to produce them.

The Greenhouse Gas Pollution Pricing Act did exempt gasoline and diesel fuel, and Bill C-206 is looking to correct the oversight regarding natural gas and propane used for drying.

Many of my neighbours and most farmers in our riding, unlike Lycoland, have grain and oil seeds as the focus of their operations. Many have invested in their own drying and storage facilities. I recently spoke with neighbours, such as Paul Tiessen, Tom Dick, Walt Brown, Doug Mills and many others, who have all had the same experience as Tec-Land: When they were marketing last season's crops, they were unable to pass along any additional carbon tax costs to buyers.

Recent research from the Grain Farmers of Ontario has estimated that by 2030 the carbon tax on fuel used for drying will cost the average farm an additional \$46 an acre. On an average 800-acre Ontario grain farm, it is a tax of \$36,800 that cannot be passed along.

In conclusion, I urge all members of the House to support passing a bill that would remove the potential of being at cross purposes with the goal of lowering greenhouse gas emissions. Please support the removal of a tax for which users have no viable options, and please support basic fairness in the market for the ag sector.

Adjournment Proceedings

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

• (1830)

[*English*]

HOUSING

Mr. Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon, CPC): Madam Speaker, the other day I raised a question in Parliament based off an article from The Hamilton Spectator.

I asked, “What is happening in our country?” The Liberals' first-time home buyers plan is not doing enough to address the high cost of housing. I asked what the government was doing to actually address the craziness of the Canadian housing market.

What I am looking for are some basic answers, which the minister was unable to provide in the House last week, to these straightforward questions: How many homes has the national housing strategy actually built? Why has the failed first-time home buyer program not been completely reformed or simply scrapped? What will the government do to stop money laundering in Canadian real estate?

We have a government whose much vaunted commitment to transparency does not actually progress beyond the lip service it gives in its place. Do not get me wrong, aspirational policies are commendable. We need to aspire to much more when it comes to housing in this country, but these programs, policies and commitments must all be accounted for and defended by concrete results.

When policies of the Liberal government are clearly not working, instead of fixing them, efforts are made to change internal metrics, superficially tweak criteria and downplay failure. The Liberals' first-time home buyer incentive program is a prime example. Originally purported to help 200,000 Canadians in three years, that number was quietly cut in half to 100,000, but it has still only helped 10,000 people. Even with the recent but very delayed changes to extend the income threshold to \$150,000 and the purchase price to 4.5 times one's annual income, most first-time homebuyers still would not qualify for the program in our large cities.

Have the Liberals given up on the dream of home ownership for young people in urban centres and the suburbs? Continuing to prop up this failed program suggests they have.

Adjournment Proceedings

Then there are some topics the Liberals claim to be tackling, but their announcements are simply window dressing to distract from their complete inaction on the real problems. For instance, the effects of money laundering in Canadian real estate, which negatively affects our economy, our reputation on the world stage, and most significantly, regular Canadians trying to rent or buy homes.

The last budget did not address this at all. It did not include the comprehensive changes to the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act that are necessary. These necessary changes have been outlined by numerous reputable experts in report after official report, such as Peter German's "Dirty Money" reports on laundering 1 and 2, the report of the expert panel on money laundering in B.C.'s real estate, and the interim report of the ongoing Cullen commission of inquiry into money laundering in British Columbia.

The government has long turned a blind eye to money laundering in Canadian real estate. Why is this continuing? Why is it not taking action on this matter?

I am going to pose just one of my initial basic questions again, and give the minister or parliamentary secretary the opportunity to do the right thing and be transparent with Canadians. Again, how many homes has the national housing strategy actually built, meaning that construction is complete and families are living in them? How many are there?

Finally, where I live in Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon, the cost of housing is just going up and up. In fact, since the pandemic, it has gone straight up. People have lost hope, and they are not getting straight answers from the government. We need straight answers. We need a comprehensive plan to address the high cost of housing right now, because regular families, people who went to university, cannot get by anymore. They make—

• (1835)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member's time is up. He will have time to respond in a few minutes.

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Diversity and Inclusion and Youth and to the Minister of Canadian Heritage (Sport).

Mr. Adam van Koevorden (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Diversity and Inclusion and Youth and to the Minister of Canadian Heritage (Sport), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to thank my hon. colleague for raising the very important issue of affordable housing. I am a co-op kid and a huge advocate for affordable housing, and I am happy to take this question today.

For many Canadians, the most important investment they will ever make is the purchase of a home and, increasingly, that dream is becoming unaffordable and less attainable. High housing costs, especially in urban centres, continue to place middle-class and low-income Canadians under huge financial pressure and, for some, high housing costs have become a barrier to pursuing promising opportunities in a new community. That is why our government is committed to taking action that will help as many Canadians as possible afford a safe and adequate place to call home.

Since 2015, our government has made historic investments to increase supply and make housing more affordable. For example, under Canada's first national housing strategy, we are on track to deliver over \$70 billion by 2027-28 to help more Canadians find a place to call home. However, more still needs to be done.

Making more affordable housing available will require significant investments. That is why our government announced in budget 2021 a plan to invest \$2.5 billion and reallocate \$1.3 billion in existing funding to speed up the construction, repair or support of 35,000 affordable housing units. We will soon support the conversion to affordable housing of the empty office space that has appeared in many of our downtown cores by reallocating \$300 million from the rental construction financing initiative. This will help families, young people, low-income Canadians, people experiencing homelessness and women and children fleeing violence to find a safe and affordable place to call home.

Our government understands that maintaining the health and stability of Canada's housing market is essential to protecting middle-class families and to Canada's broader economic recovery. That is why my colleague, the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, recently announced that the government would align with OSFI by establishing a new minimum qualifying rate for insured mortgages. Subject to review and periodic adjustment, the qualifying rate is now the greater of the borrower's mortgage contract rate plus 2% or 5.25%.

However, our actions do not stop there. Speculative demand from foreign non-resident investors is contributing to unaffordable housing prices for many Canadians in some of our biggest cities. That is why, on January 1, 2022, our government will introduce Canada's first national tax on vacant property owned by non-residents. The tax will require all owners other than Canadian citizens and permanent residents of Canada to file a declaration as to the current use of the property, with significant penalties for failure to file.

It is vitally important that Canadians be able to have an affordable place to call home, which is why we will continue to make all the necessary investments to increase housing supply and affordability in Canada.

• (1840)

Mr. Brad Vis: Madam Speaker, let us start from the top.

Adjournment Proceedings

Last week, the new head of CMHC, Romy Bowers, said that the government's national housing strategy would not be enough to address affordability because the government had done nothing to engage the private sector in the construction of affordable housing and housing for middle-class Canadians, which the government purports to support. Romy Bowers said that the biggest impediment to affordability was addressing the supply issue we faced in Canada, which was not addressed in the last federal budget.

The stress test that the member for Milton has raised actually makes it harder for young families that have saved and are priced out of the market from ever getting in. It just means they have to wait that much longer in this crazy housing market to find an affordable place to live. Also, the 1% tax, as per the Parliamentary Budgetary Officer, will have a minimal impact on addressing affordability concerns. Also, the co-investment fund has failed to deliver the number of units it purported to do at the very beginning under the national housing strategy—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I am sorry, but I did give the hon. member a bit more time, as I thought he was wrapping up.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Adam van Koevorden: Madam Speaker, I really do appreciate the advocacy on affordable housing, but I could not agree less with my colleague about the results.

Our government has made significant investments for affordable housing in budget 2021, and we are on track to deliver over \$70 billion by 2027-28 through the national housing strategy, with great investments in ridings close to mine in Hamilton and in Mississauga. Downtown Toronto has seen great results from the rapid housing initiative.

Clearly, our long-term plan for growth includes historic investments, more than any previous government, which will ensure that all Canadians, especially middle-class families and first-time homebuyers, as the member mentioned, will have a place to call home. By taking those actions right now, our government is ensuring that the economic recovery is inclusive and helps as many Canadians as possible join the middle class. Access to affordable homes will give Canadians opportunities to find better jobs and create better futures in all communities across the country.

Once again, I thank my colleague for Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon for his advocacy on affordable housing.

PHARMACARE

Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, I asked a question some time ago and today, on Lou Gehrig Day, I want to share my discontent with the answer I received.

I owe my life to our public health care system. I simply would not be here today without it, so, like most Canadians, I cherish our public health care system. It is a system that is based on the principle of “access to health services without financial or other barriers”. However, our system has massive holes in it, holes that belie the principle, holes that force Canadians to choose between their health and their other basic needs.

It is time to fix the holes in our health care system. It is time to live up to the promise of access without financial barriers. It is time for a national pharmacare program so no Canadian should have to face the impossible choice between paying for groceries and filling a prescription, and yet that is exactly what happens for one in five families in Canada.

In my riding of Edmonton Strathcona, I listened to a woman describe cutting her pills in half, hoping for relief while hanging on to the few remaining pills she has left until the end of the month. One senior told me how she is sharing her medication with her husband, two trying to get by on the medicine for one. A young man in my riding urged me to get pharmacare passed, not because he needed prescription drug coverage for his own family, but because his daughter's friend was going without her medication due to cost. Too many Canadians know exactly what I am talking about, and when COVID-19 hit, even more became aware. Millions of Canadians who lost their employment also lost their prescription drug coverage, at least temporarily. They suddenly got a glimpse of what their neighbours experience on a daily basis. Our eyes are open. We know now how vulnerable we really are.

Canadians have been waiting nearly 60 years to get prescription medications included in our health care system. Twenty-three years ago, the Liberals first promised Canadians a national pharmacare program, and they have been repeating that promise ever since. We have had five public commissions on pharmacare, study after study, including the Liberals' own Hoskins report in 2019, all saying the same thing: Canadians need pharmacare and pharmacare will save Canadians money. I do not know what is more disappointing, 23 years of broken promises or the stubborn refusal to even acknowledge the reality of so many Canadians.

The Conservatives' position on pharmacare is one of the most cynical things I have ever heard. The Conservatives have said in this House that 98% of Canadians already have access to prescription drug coverage, so we do not need pharmacare, but what they are really saying is that 2% of Canadians live with pre-existing conditions that make them uninsurable, and everyone else who does not have a drug plan should just go out and buy one from a private insurance company. I have news for the Conservatives. The seven million Canadians who cannot afford to pay for their medications cannot afford to pay for private insurance either. Telling these Canadians that they have access to medications is a slap in the face. I mean, we all have access to a Lamborghini, right?

Adjournment Proceedings

The cynical nonsense has to stop. In February, this House debated Bill C-213, sponsored by the NDP member for New Westminster—Burnaby, which would have created a national pharmacare act. In a survey conducted by the Angus Reid Institute, nearly nine in 10 Canadians support a national pharmacare program. Only big pharma and the insurance industry are opposed, and yet the government joined with the Conservatives to vote this bill down.

Canadians are done with excuses. The time is up. Canadians want and deserve a national universal pharmacare plan now.

• (1845)

Mr. Adam van Koevorden (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Diversity and Inclusion and Youth and to the Minister of Canadian Heritage (Sport), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend and colleague from Edmonton Strathcona for her advocacy on ALS, or Lou Gehrig's disease, and certainly on pharmacare. I will tell her that this is the first job I have ever had that has a drug plan. Olympic athletes do not have drug coverage in Canada, and my father, who does not have ALS but has Parkinson's, pays out of pocket for prescription drugs that he requires every single day.

It is a shared commitment among Liberals and members of the New Democratic Party, and many other members of the House, to ensure that when we leave this place, there will be a pharmacare plan. I agree that it has been too long and that promises have been held for too long, but I thank the member for the opportunity to speak tonight on the government's actions to make prescription drugs more affordable for Canadians. No one should have to choose between paying for prescription drugs and putting food on the table. Unfortunately, too many Canadians still have to make this impossible choice.

That is why we have done more than any other government in a generation to lower drug prices, and we are committed to implementing a national universal pharmacare program. The groundwork for this was laid in the achievements of the last Parliament and reaffirmed in the Speech from the Throne, the fall economic statement and, most recently, in budget 2021.

While we recognize the importance of a national pharmacare program, our government also respects the division of jurisdictional powers that exists in this country and the benefits of harnessing the expertise that exists across the provinces and the territories. That is why our government will continue to use the measured and thoughtful approach that we have taken on this issue. We are moving forward with willing provinces and territories in accelerating steps to achieve this system and build on the foundational elements of national pharmacare that are already in place so that Canadians can have the drug coverage they need.

Allow me to describe our government's recent efforts to advance a national pharmacare system.

On rare diseases, we recognize that for many Canadians who require prescription drugs to treat rare diseases, the cost of medications can be astronomically high. I want to take a moment to acknowledge the advocacy work that my friend Simon Ibell did throughout his life, which was too short. When he passed, I made a personal commitment to ensure that people who are advocating for

a variety of rare diseases have their voices heard in the House. I want to take a moment to thank Simon Ibell and his family and friends for all of his advocacy.

To help Canadians get better access to effective treatments, we are working with provinces, territories and other partners to move forward on developing a national strategy for high-cost drugs for rare diseases. Our government announced in budget 2021 that it would proceed with the plan, as originally proposed in budget 2019, to invest up to \$1 billion over two years, starting in 2022-23, and up to \$500 million per year thereafter to support this strategy. I am pleased to inform the House that stakeholder consultations are under way and our aim is to launch the strategy by 2022.

The creation of a national formulary, which would list the drugs covered under a national pharmacare program, is another vital area in which our government is taking action. Support for a national formulary was first announced in budget 2019 and was reaffirmed in budget 2021. The development of a comprehensive evidence-based national formulary will allow a consistent approach to formulary listing and patient access across the provinces and territories.

Finally, we have established a national Canadian drug agency transition office. Budget 2019 proposed \$35 million in funding to create this office with Health Canada. Its mandate is to advance work on pharmacare-related priorities through co-operation with key partners and stakeholders. The office will strengthen and better align all parts of the system in keeping with the government's commitment to establish a Canadian drug agency.

In closing, I will again say thanks for the opportunity to speak to this important issue. Through the actions described above and through other avenues, the government has worked diligently and productively to implement national pharmacare. I look forward to the day when my friend from Edmonton Strathcona and I can high-five in the House of Commons when we get it done.

• (1850)

Ms. Heather McPherson: Madam Speaker, with all due respect, there was an opportunity for the Liberal government to support pharmacare when a bill was brought forward. The member will forgive me if I am cynical about the government's commitment to pharmacare, as the Liberals voted with the Conservative Party not to support a pharmacare program. My colleague will forgive me if I feel that he is likely, as with so many other Liberal promises, putting something forward so that the Liberals can campaign on it in the next election. Is there an actual desire to put pharmacare in place, or do they just want to string out these promises over and over again so they can continue to campaign on them?

There was a bill, the member voted against it and Canadians still do not have pharmacare. Talking about how we are going to build that back is not helpful and is not going to get us the pharmacare that Canadians need and deserve.

Mr. Adam van Koevorden: Madam Speaker, I will forgive my colleague's cynicism. This is a political place that we live and work in, but the Government of Canada is committed to strengthening Canada's health care system, as we all are, and supporting the health of Canadians and working together with provinces, territories and stakeholders. To improve that access to prescription medications is really important.

That is why in budget 2019, budget 2021 and the 2020 Speech from the Throne and the fall economic statement we reaffirmed that commitment to implement national pharmacare, beginning with the creation of a Canadian drug agency, a national formulary and a national strategy for high-cost drugs for rare diseases. There is a process. It will take time and it is important that we get this one right. It is simply not a light-switch that we can flick on and make happen immediately. That process is well under way and I cannot wait, once again, to celebrate when it is all done.

DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION

Mrs. Jenica Atwin (Fredericton, GP): Madam Speaker, today I am highlighting the question I asked on March 25 about the federal government's position regarding the Black civil servants lawsuits where claimants have courageously come forward to expose the wrongdoing and systemic discrimination they face throughout their careers.

In the weeks since I asked that question, we have learned that over the years some public servants were offered money to keep quiet and withdraw racial discrimination complaints. It is never easy to confront racism. It should be uncomfortable. We cannot ask people to push aside their injustice, to sweep things under the rug. This is gaslighting. We cannot ask them to be silent and we cannot be complicit with our own silence.

My goal tonight is not to place blame and to wag my finger, rather it is to better understand exactly what the government is doing to fight systemic racism. I wish to be a partner in this work. I wish to highlight the incredible voices from my riding and from the Maritimes that are changing the conversation and driving real actions in my home community.

We are now coming to a sudden realization that Canada has a problem with racism. People of colour, Black and indigenous peoples have been telling us for so long that our society, our institu-

Adjournment Proceedings

tions, our collective behaviours and biases continue to cause harm, even kill.

So far, the performative gestures from the government are accomplishing nothing. In just the last few weeks, I read the following headline: "RCMP is losing Indigenous officers—and some former Mounties blame racism in the ranks".

The Nova Scotia government balked at paying for extra RCMP during the fisheries conflict where Mi'kmaq fishers were attacked, their possessions set on fire and their catches destroyed. The army strategies to promote diversity and inclusion were ineffective. Temporary migrant workers working in fields across the country helping to ensure our food sovereignty are working in unsanitary and dangerous conditions, living in overcrowded rooms, some sleeping on the floor.

Symbolism does not target the root cause of the problem. Canada must institute specific reparations and strategic actions with measurable outcomes. I know that my colleague will point to the implementation of the Anti-Racism Secretariat and I am thankful for that division and I am fully in appreciation for the minister and her commitment. However, this would be the time to let Canadians know about the concrete work being undertaken to dismantle systems of oppression. I would argue that there should be a full ministerial department dedicated to the mission of anti-racism.

Many Canadians do not even have a basic understanding of what racism is, how it operates, what gives it power. Some still debate its existence and shy away from comparison with our neighbours to the south. Our children must learn the critical thinking skills to ask tough questions, challenge narratives and deconstruct the lies that support white supremacy.

We are told that change is slow, that these things take time. As a suggestion, if I may, perhaps we could listen to the Black voices showing us the way right here, right now. The class-action lawsuit seeks long-term solutions to permanently address systemic racism and discrimination in the Public Service of Canada, which would undoubtedly create ripple effects across the communities. Damages include the wrongful failure to promote, intentional infliction of mental suffering, constructive dismissal, wrongful termination, negligence and in particular, violations of employment law, human rights law and charter breaches.

Adjournment Proceedings

In the fulfillment of the goal of workplace equality, Canada has failed to correct the conditions of disadvantage and employment experienced by Black Canadians. Will the Anti-Racism Secretariat commit to addressing specific wrongs?

● (1855)

Mr. Adam van Koeverden (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Diversity and Inclusion and Youth and to the Minister of Canadian Heritage (Sport), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I just cannot thank my hon. colleague and friend from Fredericton enough for her speech and her advocacy on this very important topic. I admire her willingness to come out here and always confront difficult topics of conversation.

I share her satisfaction with the fact that we are the first government that has a Minister of Diversity and Inclusion and Youth, that does the hard work and commits to the hard work. The Anti-Racism Secretariat is a good start.

However, from the start, our government has acknowledged that millions of Canadians continue to face systemic racism in different facets of our society. I acknowledge that it is not a universally held conviction yet in the House or in this country. That is an important thing to focus on also, whether it is going to the store or the bank, applying for a job, or even taking public transit, racialized Canadians have told us in unequivocal terms that racial discrimination is unfortunately still a daily reality here in Canada.

[*Translation*]

This is particularly true for Black Canadians who face the scourge of systemic racism against Black people. The data we have paints a bleak picture of the impact of racism across the country. For example, we know that the unemployment rate is disproportionately high among Black Canadians, compared to their non-racialized counterparts. However, recent studies from Statistics Canada show that Black Canadians aged 25 to 54 are more likely to have a university degree than non-racialized Canadians.

[*English*]

Rather than sitting idly by, our government has taken concrete actions to address systemic anti-Black racism. In 2018, we officially recognized the International Decade for People of African Descent, which serves to guide the international community in the advancement of human rights and freedoms of Black communities by focusing on recognition, justice and development.

This was then followed by a \$44-million investment to advance the objectives of the decade through supporting projects that empower Black youth, address mental health in Black communities and drive capacity building for Black-led organizations.

As the parliamentary secretary on this file, I get to make some of those calls to these organizations to thank them for their good work and congratulate them on the funding. I cannot tell members how grateful we are, as a government and as a nation, for their extraordinary efforts.

[*Translation*]

We have invested millions of dollars to launch Canada's anti-racism strategy, which advances the federal leadership's fight

against systemic racism by supporting communities and focusing on awareness and changing attitudes.

Since then, we have worked closely with the Federation of African Canadian Economics, an entrepreneurship program run by Black people, to launch the Black entrepreneurship loan fund, a public-private investment worth \$291.3 million. This fund will provide financing of up to \$250,000 to help Black business owners and entrepreneurs develop their businesses and achieve success now and in the future.

● (1900)

[*English*]

Lastly, because our government recognizes the need to remove barriers to achieving a diverse and inclusive workplace, including addressing anti-Black racism, we are investing \$12 million to support the centre on diversity and inclusion in the public service, lodged directly in the—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Unfortunately, the hon. member's time is up. I did allow for a bit more time. I thought maybe he would be wrapping up.

The hon. member for Fredericton.

Mrs. Jenica Atwin: Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. parliamentary secretary for his efforts in these adjournment proceedings. It has been a busy night for him.

If members can tell, I am extremely passionate about anti-racism, and I come to this as a cis, white ally. I will never know the full extent of the pain inflicted upon indigenous peoples, Black peoples, people of colour or 2SLGBTQIA+, and I live, work and learn with this immense privilege.

During the past weeks we have been hearing the difficult testimony, trying to piece together the death of Joyce Echaquan. I will not repeat the myriad of insults flung at her by staff who were supposed to be caring for her while she was fighting for her life. Then, of course, there are the 215 little souls whose remains have finally been discovered. There are not enough words in the English language to account for such horrors.

These are not dark chapters in Canadian history. These realities are woven throughout the whole story, and the consequences continue to play out today. This is not about guilt. It is about responsibility.

Will the government stand up and recognize the immense responsibility we have in addressing racism in all its forms? Will it stand up for the Black civil servants? Will it stand up for Joyce and all the children who never came home from residential schools?

Adjournment Proceedings

Mr. Adam van Koeverden: Madam Speaker, I would also like to acknowledge my role as an ally in this place. As a white, cisgender, straight man, I have never experienced racism, homophobia or bigotry in any form, and I do feel like I have a role, as an ally, to stand up.

We are taking steps to review the Employment Equity Act, particularly in light of comments that it does not address the distinct experiences of Black employees. From the very start, our government has shown an unwavering commitment to tackling systemic racism head on, including anti-Black racism.

[*Translation*]

The data is clear. There are major systemic barriers that continue to limit opportunities for Black communities.

[*English*]

Here in Canada, these discrepancies are simply unacceptable.

[*Translation*]

This is why, since 2018, we have committed to investing more than \$177 million in initiatives that support Black communities. We are investing in initiatives within the federal public service to create a fully diverse and inclusive workplace.

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

(The House adjourned at 7:04 p.m.)

National Defence

Mr. Bezan	7822
Mr. Trudeau	7822
Mr. Bezan	7822
Mr. Trudeau	7823
Mr. Bezan	7823
Mr. Trudeau	7823
Mr. Bezan	7823
Mr. Trudeau	7823

Justice

Mr. Fortin	7823
Mr. Trudeau	7823
Mr. Fortin	7823
Mr. Trudeau	7824

Canadian Heritage

Mr. Rayes	7824
Mr. Trudeau	7824
Mr. Rayes	7824
Mr. Trudeau	7824
Mr. Rayes	7824
Mr. Trudeau	7824

Small Business

Mr. Dubourg	7824
Mr. Trudeau	7824

Canadian Heritage

Ms. Harder	7825
Mr. Trudeau	7825
Ms. Harder	7825
Mr. Trudeau	7825
Ms. Harder	7825
Mr. Trudeau	7825

Health

Mr. Kelloway	7825
Mr. Trudeau	7826

Indigenous Affairs

Mr. Singh	7826
Mr. Trudeau	7826

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**National Framework for Diabetes Act**

Bill C-237. Third reading	7826
Motion agreed to	7827
(Bill read the third time and passed)	7827

Sex-Selective Abortion Act

Bill C-233. Second reading	7828
Motion negatived	7829

Copyright Act

Bill C-272. Second reading	7829
Motion agreed to	7830
(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee) ..	7830

GOVERNMENT ORDERS**Business of Supply****Opposition Motion—Documents Related to the Transfer of Ebola and Henipah Viruses to the Wuhan Institute of Virology**

Motion	7830
Motion agreed to	7832

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999**

Bill C-204. Third reading	7832
Motion agreed to	7833
(Bill read the third time and passed)	7833

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**House of Commons Calendar**

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès) ..	7833
---	------

Governor General's Act

Ms. Gladu	7833
Bill C-305. Introduction and first reading	7833
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	7833

Committees of the House**Foreign Affairs and International Development**

Mr. Genuis	7833
Motion for concurrence	7833
Mr. Viersen	7835
Mr. Lamoureux	7835
Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe	7836
Mr. Chong	7836
Mr. Kelly	7837
Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe	7838
Mr. Julian	7838
Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe	7838
Mr. Chong	7840
Mr. Lamoureux	7841
Mr. Julian	7841
Mr. Genuis	7841
Mr. Beaulieu	7842

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**Greenhouse Gas Pollution Pricing Act**

Bill C-206. Report stage	7842
Mr. Lawrence	7842
Motion for concurrence	7842
(Motion agreed to)	7842
Bill C-206. Third reading	7842
Mr. Blois	7844
Mr. Perron	7845
Mr. MacGregor	7845
Mr. Blois	7845

Mr. Perron	7847
Mr. MacGregor	7848
Mr. Epp	7849

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Housing

Mr. Vis	7851
---------------	------

Mr. van Koeverden	7852
-------------------------	------

Pharmacare

Ms. McPherson	7853
Mr. van Koeverden	7854

Diversity and Inclusion

Mrs. Atwin	7855
Mr. van Koeverden	7856

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>