



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 148 • NUMBER 427 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, June 5, 2019
(Part A)

Speaker: The Honourable Geoff Regan

CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, June 5, 2019

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayer

• (1405)

[English]

The Speaker: We will now have the singing of *O Canada* led today by the pages.

[Members sang the national anthem]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[Translation]

D-DAY

Mr. Michel Boudrias (Terrebonne, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on June 5, 1944, at 9:15 p.m., Radio Londres alerted the French resistance that Operation Overlord was about to begin by broadcasting the first stanza of Verlaine's poem *Chanson d'automne*:

The autumn's throbbing
 Strings moan, sobbing
 Drone their dole;
 Long-drawn and low,
 Each tremolo
 Sears my soul.

The next day, the Normandy landings began. The brave soldiers, some as young as 18, came under intense enemy fire. Too many young men fell on the beaches of Normandy, but their sacrifice freed Europe from Nazi rule. Many units from Quebec, like the Régiment de la Chaudière, the Black Watch and the Régiment de Maison-neuve, took part in the Normandy invasion.

On this day, we honour their sacrifice and their outstanding courage. They died for our freedom, which we so often take for granted.

I thank all our veterans. Lest we forget.

* * *

[English]

JIM DOLAN

Mr. Vance Badawey (Niagara Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in Niagara Centre you would be hard-pressed to find many people who do not know Jim or Mary Dolan.

Married for 46 years, Jim and Mary not only raised a loving family but were the very definition of community service. Always willing to volunteer, in 1994, they saw a need and stepped up to champion the Kacey-Lynn Fund. Under their stewardship, the program is thriving and has grown to offer assistance to many families throughout the Niagara region with sick or disabled children.

Their generosity and caring spirits have been felt throughout our community. It is with a heavy heart that I share the news that Jim Dolan passed away on May 28. Jim will be greatly missed by his wife Mary, their children James, Kim, Scott and Tammy, as well as his many grandchildren and one great-grandchild.

Despite our loss, I am certain that Jim's legacy will live on through the many people whose lives he touched.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Glen Motz (Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals continue to mismanage the public safety of our country. Now they are considering a firearm ban in an attempt to deal with gangs and gun violence. This plan will also fail as it threatens licensed, law-abiding Canadian firearm owners and ignores the obvious problem: criminals.

News flash: criminals already ignore the law. As gang violence increased, Liberals failed to deliver funding to the police to combat it. As rural crime increased, Liberals turned their backs on rural Canada. Their border security mismanagement has led to dangerous foreign criminals entering our country. What is worse, the Liberals are watering down sentences for some violent crimes.

The first step to address any problem is admitting that there is one. Right now, many Canadians understand that Liberals are actually the problem.

The Conservatives have a plan to tackle crime by focusing on criminals and gang violence. It is time to replace Liberal failures with Conservative action.

* * *

CORNER BROOK PULP AND PAPER MILL

Ms. Gudie Hutchings (Long Range Mountains, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my hometown of Corner Brook is the largest community in the Long Range Mountains. The reason the town exists is the pulp and paper mill, which has been an economic stimulator since 1925.

Statements by Members

I was so proud to stand alongside mill manager, Darren Pelley, to announce nearly \$11 million from the strategic innovation fund for Corner Brook Pulp and Paper. The mill will use this investment to install a new system to dry and use low-quality biomass to limit the need to cut trees for fuel. It will reduce waste sent to landfills, reduce water use by 50% and allow the mill to avoid burning tens of thousands of barrels of oil each year.

This funding benefits the environment and strengthens the forestry and paper product trades in all of Newfoundland, ensuring our forest sector will continue to be a leader in my province for years to come.

Corner Brook was a mill town, is a mill town and will continue to be a mill town because of this investment.

* * *

[Translation]

Laurier—Sainte-Marie

Ms. Hélène Laverdière (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I will likely have a chance to speak in the House again, but since this is my last official member's statement, I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to a number of people.

I want to thank all of the members of the big parliamentary family, including my colleagues, the staff, the pages and the press. I will miss you.

I want to thank the community groups and organizations in my riding for their creativity and their commitment to making Laurier—Sainte-Marie a place where everyone is able to live a good life.

I thank my team, Jean-François, Ariane, Christine and Marianne, and everyone else who has come through my office. I thank Jennifer Pedersen, Lili and Roxane. Good luck, Roxane.

I sincerely thank the people of Laurier—Sainte-Marie for their trust, their kindness and for inspiring me.

Finally, I want to thank my husband, Germain Bélanger. We have been together for over 40 years and he is the wind beneath my wings.

* * *

● (1410)

[English]

STATUS OF WOMEN

Mr. Terry Duguid (Winnipeg South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Maya Angelou once said, "Each time a woman stands up for herself, without knowing it possibly, without claiming it, she stands up for all women."

This week in Vancouver, thousands of women and people of all genders are doing just that. They are standing up at Women Deliver and some of its side events: Feminists Deliver and the pre-conference on indigenous women and girls.

Thanks to their tireless work, the women's movement has made some hard-fought gains. While some would like to roll back those gains, our government will remain focused on leaving a lasting legacy for women and girls, a legacy of empowerment, a legacy of gender equality, a legacy of change that will benefit us all.

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY

Mr. John Nater (Perth—Wellington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, June 6 marks the 75th anniversary of D-Day and the Normandy invasions. Fourteen thousand Canadians landed at the beaches of Normandy that morning, and by day's end 359 had fallen. In the coming weeks, 5,000 more would die. We, as Canadians, owe a debt of gratitude to the heroes of D-Day that we will never be able to fully repay.

Among those heroes was a young man named Art Boon. At age 19, Art had already been in the war effort for four years, having enlisted at just 15 years of age. He would go on to participate in the liberation of Holland and would serve his country in uniform for decades to follow.

Today, Art Boon is back in Europe. Where he arrived 75 years ago to liberate a continent, he returns once more as a hero. History must never forget the heroes of D-Day. Today and always, we honour those who have served and those who made the ultimate sacrifice. We will remember them.

* * *

CULTURAL UNITY

Mr. Gordie Hogg (South Surrey—White Rock, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we Canadians are generally accepting and tolerant people. We celebrate our multicultural and pluralistic society, we value our diversity and we live in relative harmony with many different traditions, religions and cultures.

Throughout the world, most people, like us, care about the same things. They care about family, friends and their communities and they care about having a better life for themselves and for those they care about, whether it is better physically, emotionally or spiritually. By recognizing this sameness, we recognize a value that unites us.

While multiculturalism and pluralism tend to emphasize our differences, we can celebrate our sameness from our diverse traditions, religions and cultural beliefs, and that sameness can help us to understand our complex, difficult and sometimes disparate world from our common aspirations, a place not of differences but a place of connections and hope.

* * *

LEVI OAKES

Mr. Marc Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs, Lib.):

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

Levi Oakeskénha tehonwaká:nere ne raohwá:tsire, wa'thatsha'tí: ia'ke tsiahiáksera tsi nahe ratironhia'kehronón:ke shiiothétston. Karonhiá:ke tethaká:nere ó:nen. Ronkwe'tiióhne, tóhske, tahnnon raweientehtón:ne ahaiéntho.

Ohnakénkha Kanien'kehá:ka Code Talker roio'téhkwe ne tekení-haton shiwatéri:io. Tsi tewateriioskó:wá tékeni watón:tha, wá:ratste' onkwehonwehnéha ahshakowennohetstánion ne tehotirihwaienawá: kon ronatenróhshon. Iah ónhka tehotitokén:se oh nahò:ten rotithar-ahkwèn:ne ne Code Talkers.

Akwé:kon waharihwáhsehte' tsi nihoié:ren ihsi nón:we ne tsiá:ta niwáhsen niiohsérá:ke nikari:wes. Akwáh í:ken tsi enhonwaia'tí: sake' ne raohwá:tire tahnnon raonkwe'ta'shòn:a í:kehre aonsahih-sennakará:tate' éhskat ó:ya nenkahá:wi'te' né:'e tsi katá:tis ne owén:na nè:ne wá:ratste' ne káti aón:ton akwé:kon skén:nen actewanonhntoniónsheke.

[Mohawk text interpreted as follows:]

Mr. Speaker, Levi Oakes crossed over the clouds last Tuesday. There, there was his family when he passed away. He is looking down now from sky world. He was a good man, truly, and he was good at gardening.

Levi was the last Mohawk code talker; none remain. He used his indigenous language during World War II. He used a secret code to protect his family. No one broke the code talker's code.

He will very much be missed by his people and his family. I want to honour his name again on one more occasion, by using the language that he used so that we could live in peace.

* * *

• (1415)

STATUS OF WOMEN

Mrs. Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is masquerading as a feminist, willing to tear down any woman who opposes him. As the member for Whitby said when she ran afoul of him, “He was yelling that I didn't appreciate him, that he'd given me so much”.

Earlier this week, the Prime Minister stated that the history of women's rights shows that every step forward is met by another push back, but it is his divisive actions and words that have pushed back progress for all women.

It is one thing to describe oneself as a feminist and claim to value gender equality, but quite another to walk the talk, just ask the former attorney general and the former president of the Treasury Board.

If a woman disagrees with the Prime Minister, she can forget about civil discourse. He will undermine and then dismiss her. Canadian women are not being fooled by his virtue signalling. This Prime Minister is not as advertised.

* * *

STATUS OF WOMEN

Ms. Anita Vandenbeld (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to talk about the real and tangible way this government is improving the lives of women and girls. I am talking about the equality fund that our government announced this week. To tackle gender issues, we have to act as a team, because together everyone achieves more.

Statements by Members

We are investing \$300 million to build a funding platform and bring together the granting, philanthropic and investment worlds and make Canada the leading donor to women's rights and gender equality organizations in the world.

[Translation]

Over the next 15 years, we hope to allocate \$1 billion to gender equality. In addition to funding, we will play a leadership role. When we act as a driver of change, other countries are bound to follow.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Mr. Emmanuel Dubourg (Bourassa, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the riding of Bourassa, which I represent in the House of Commons, is teeming with talent, knowledge and expertise.

For the second year in a row, on International Women's Day on March 8, 2019, I had the privilege of awarding a certificate of honour and merit and recognizing eight women from the riding of Bourassa. I am absolutely delighted to welcome them to Ottawa today. The recipients are Micheline Cantave, Gaetana Colella, Julie Demers, Kerline François, Khadija Jyad, Diane Lecouëdic, Sister Pierre-Anne Mandato and Brunilda Reyes.

I ask my hon. colleagues to join me in extending a warm welcome to these eight extraordinary women.

* * *

2019 GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Alupa Clarke (Beauport—Limoilou, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this Liberal government is more centralist, paternalistic and, quite simply, arrogant than any other Liberal government in the history of our federation.

For the past four years, the government has repeatedly shown that it is out of touch with the spirit of federalism. It refuses to honour the tradition of appointing a political lieutenant for Quebec and instead made a minister from Toronto responsible for the economic development of our province. It is imposing political conditions on federal transfers. It refuses to give Quebec greater powers in the area of immigration. It refuses to respond favourably to the National Assembly's request for a single tax return, something all Quebecers want.

I could go on and on. Following in the footsteps of founding fathers Cartier and MacDonald, we the Conservatives will continue to properly honour federalism. In 2008, we recognized that Quebecers form a nation within a united Canada.

In 2019, when we form the government, we will respond favourably to the demands of Quebecers and Quebec.

Statements by Members

[English]

PITT MEADOWS—MAPLE RIDGE

Mr. Dan Ruimy (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it has been almost four years since I first took my seat in the House. It has been privilege to serve the constituents of Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge. I have loved building the relationships that are so important to understanding the needs of my communities.

There are groups like Pathfinder Youth Centre Society, which supports at-risk youth, and Alisha's Wish Child & Youth Advocacy Centre, which provides services to children and youth who are victims of abuse.

Groups such as Alouette River Management Society, KEEPS and Watershed Watch work hard to restore fish habitat, advocate education on our diverse wildlife and try to find ways to reverse the damage to our fish and salmon stock.

Our Seniors Network is a group of individuals and organizations with a shared goal of providing support and resources for our seniors.

There are all the businesses and non-profits that hire summer students so they can gain valuable experience.

When we both build and sustain relationships with the grassroots people in our communities, we can work together to create better outcomes. From the words of Helen Keller, alone we can do so little; together we can do so much.

* * *

● (1420)

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canada committed deliberate race, identity and gender-based genocide against indigenous peoples and we can see the impact of this in every sphere of life: the violence, the loss of life, the child apprehensions, the marginalization, the deliberate exclusion, the poverty, the homelessness rate, the lack of protection, the Indian Act, the sex-based discrimination, the racism and it goes on. This is Canada's shame.

If we are to show that we have actually heard family members and survivors, we must have an indigenous-led action plan, with a dedicated budget and a timeline for implementation, that is publicly accountable. We must address indigenous land titles and indigenous people's right to self-sufficiency and self-governance.

We have a duty to address this historic and intergenerational trauma, social and economic marginalization and the ongoing dismissal of their expertise. The calls for justice are not just recommendations, but are legal imperatives that must be implemented.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's sunny climate plan was supposed to save the environment and boost the economy. Well, it did neither. In reality, all it did was punish

Canadians for getting groceries, driving the kids to hockey or even running small businesses.

In reality, the carbon tax is a money grab. The Prime Minister has to pay for his consecutive deficits and reckless spending, so he is making hard-working Canadians pay for it under the guise of a climate plan. If the Prime Minister really cared about the environment, he would not be exempting Canada's largest emitters from the carbon tax and he certainly would not be spending more time flying to his vacations than most Canadians have actually spent on a vacation in the last five years.

The Liberal government is nowhere near meeting its climate goals and now we are at the point where the United States is closer to reaching its targets than Canada. The sunny ways are over and we are left with a money-grabbing carbon tax. The Liberals' climate plan is not as advertised.

* * *

CANADA CHILD BENEFIT

Mr. Randy Boissonnault (Edmonton Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when I knock on doors in my riding and meet families with young children, I ask them about the Liberal baby bonus and they tell me they love it.

Early in our mandate, families in Edmonton Centre hoped that the Canada child benefit would do better for them, and it has. In April alone, we issued over 7,000 payments to over 12,000 children, for a total of \$4.6 million into the riding. That is over \$55 million tax-free directly to Edmonton Centre families each year.

Three years into the program, we have lifted 17,000 children in Edmonton out of poverty. That is equivalent to a Rogers Place full of children out of poverty. When we add their parents, it is a Commonwealth Stadium full of people able to make ends meet.

Across Canada, we have reduced poverty from 13% to 9%. What do we call that in Edmonton? We call that better than advertised.

The Speaker: Order, please. There are likely to be disagreements here, and there should be, but we cannot all speak at the same time and we should show respect for this place, for each other and for different opinions. Members should not all speak at once and interrupt.

ORAL QUESTIONS

•(1425)

[English]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Hon. Candice Bergen (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's failures when it comes to dealing with the Government of China are escalating, and his gross mismanagement of our relationship with China will now hurt even more Canadians.

This time, Canadian meat producers are being punished, after China's customs agency announced that it is going to dramatically increase inspections and open all containers of Canadian meat and meat products.

Does the Prime Minister not realize that Canadian producers are suffering as a result of his failures? What is he prepared to do about this?

[Translation]

Hon. Marie-Claude Bibeau (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are working very closely with producers and the entire agriculture industry. Our main objective is to reopen markets in China, which we are doing in various ways in collaboration with my colleagues at the Department of Foreign Affairs and the Department of International Trade and my provincial counterparts.

We were informed that China would be increasing pork inspections. That is why we are encouraging all members of the industry to be extremely vigilant as they continue exporting.

* * *

[English]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Hon. Candice Bergen (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): As if it is the producers' fault, Mr. Speaker. That is absolutely incorrect.

Five months ago, former Liberal cabinet minister John McCallum had to resign in shame as our ambassador to China. We are now in June and the Prime Minister has not appointed a replacement. Canadians are being detained on bogus charges, soybean producers are facing new barriers, canola producers are having shipments blocked, and now the Chinese government is going after our meat producers. This is going from bad to worse.

Why has the Prime Minister not appointed an ambassador to China?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Tourism, Official Languages and La Francophonie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our relationship with China is extremely important. We are very concerned with the detention of Canadians in China, which is why we are rallying a number of friendly countries. Also, we were able to make sure that we had a joint statement with the United States, calling for the immediate release of Michael Spavor and Michael Kovrig and rejecting their wrongful detention.

Hon. Candice Bergen (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is not working. This relationship and the impact are getting worse. The Prime Minister's failure when it comes to the Chinese

Oral Questions

government is causing real pain and real suffering for Canadians. He has failed to appoint a new ambassador. He is refusing to pick up the phone and call the Chinese premier. Canadian lives are at risk and agriculture producers are suffering.

When will the Prime Minister finally start treating this crisis with the seriousness, urgency and attention it requires?

[Translation]

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Tourism, Official Languages and La Francophonie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying that the relationship with China is important. That is why this file is a priority for the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Prime Minister.

We are particularly concerned about the unjustified detention of Canadians in China. That is why we established an international coalition of countries that support our position. We have also signed a joint statement with the United States calling for the immediate release of the Canadians held in China.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are all talk and no action when it comes to the China crisis, which keeps getting worse. The Chinese government is now targeting the pork industry. Two factories had their permits suspended, and each container of Canadian pork is now being heavily scrutinized by the Chinese government.

What are the Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture doing to protect our market access? They are doing absolutely nothing.

When will the Prime Minister finally stand up for our ranchers and farmers?

Hon. Marie-Claude Bibeau (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our team is working non-stop across the country to fix this situation. Our priority is reopening the Chinese markets for agricultural products.

We have increased our support for farmers through the advance payments program. Farmers will be able to submit their application as of June 10. They already had access to \$400,000 loan advances and will now be eligible for \$1 million. As for canola producers, they are entitled to \$500,000 interest free.

[English]

The Speaker: I want to remind my hon. friend from Prince Albert that I can hear him from way down there, but I would prefer to hear him only when he has the floor, of course, as he would understand.

The hon. member for Mégantic—L'Érable.

[Translation]

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the canola crisis is not about quality. There is no issue with the quality of Canadian pork and yet the Liberal government stubbornly refuses to deal with this crisis politically. As the director of the China Institute of the University of Alberta clearly said, "I think it is veiled political retaliation".

Oral Questions

Why is the Minister of Agriculture hiding behind a delegation of experts that is incapable of going to China, and so-called administrative errors?

Why is the Prime Minister refusing to appoint an ambassador and file a complaint with the WTO?

• (1430)

Hon. Marie-Claude Bibeau (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is cause for celebration because I rarely agree with my colleague. The quality of our Canadian products is absolutely not at issue. We offer agricultural products of the highest quality and our inspection system is very reliable and internationally renowned.

Our representative raised this issue at the last general council of the World Trade Organization.

* * *

[English]

TAXATION

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government has created the most unequal tax system in the industrialized world. The Liberal system of tax havens and tax loopholes lets millionaires and Canada's most profitable companies get off the hook from paying their fair share.

Canadians have just found out that the revenue minister has let yet another millionaire tax evader off the hook through the KPMG offshore tax scam. The Liberals have created one set of rules for millionaires and another for everyone else.

Why do the Liberals always reward wealthy tax dodgers? Why do they not make them pay their fair share?

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government is firmly committed to fighting tax evaders. Out-of-court settlements are reached through a fully independent process within the Canada Revenue Agency, in collaboration with the Department of Justice, to ensure the integrity of the tax system.

While we understand that settlements can be used appropriately in certain circumstances, we are concerned about the lack of transparency associated with them. That is why the minister has directed the CRA to review its processes to allow for greater transparency on the reasons why a settlement is reached.

[Translation]

Ms. Ruth Ellen Brousseau (Berthier—Maskinongé, NDP): Mr. Speaker, wealthy KPMG clients accused of using a fraudulent scheme to avoid paying their fair share of taxes were granted amnesty by none other than the revenue minister.

This is not the first time KPMG clients have obtained a lenient settlement from the federal government. This settlement is proof of the federal government's total lack of transparency.

When will the government take action, stop giving the wealthiest Canadians special treatment, and force them to pay their fair share of taxes?

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government is fully committed to fighting tax evaders.

Out-of-court settlements are reached through a fully independent process within the Canada Revenue Agency in collaboration with the Department of Justice to ensure the integrity of the tax system.

While we understand that the rules can be used appropriately in certain circumstances, we are concerned about the lack of transparency associated with them. That is why the minister has directed the CRA to review its processes to allow for greater transparency on the reasons why—

The Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Berthier—Maskinongé.

* * *

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Ms. Ruth Ellen Brousseau (Berthier—Maskinongé, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this government supports big business to the detriment of SMEs, workers and particularly taxpayers.

Today, Groupe TVA announced 68 layoffs. It is saying loud and clear that the unfair competition from web giants is the main reason for these job losses. The NDP has been calling on the government for a long time to force web giants to pay their fair share of taxes.

Why does the Liberal government not take action to force web giants to pay their fair share of taxes?

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez (Minister of Canadian Heritage and Multiculturalism, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our thoughts are with the employees and their families. The loss of even just one job is a tragedy, particularly when it affects the culture and communications sector.

The NDP should be asking the Conservatives that question. They sat on their hands for 10 years while they were in office. They did absolutely nothing, but we are addressing the problem. There is a committee that is looking into this. We are going to legislate and ensure that, in the end, all those who participate in the system contribute to the system, with no exceptions.

[English]

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have been in power for four years. It is about time they took some responsibility for that. In the past, people and large companies paid equal amounts of income tax. Since then, Liberal and Conservative governments have shifted the balance in favour of the richest companies, and people have been forced to make up the difference. The Liberals and the Conservatives seem to always put the profits of the wealthiest ahead of people trying to get ahead.

Why do the Liberals not have the courage to make sure the richest in Canada, including the web giants, pay their fair share?

Oral Questions

●(1435)

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez (Minister of Canadian Heritage and Multiculturalism, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, the question should be asked of the Conservatives. For 10 full years, they did nothing. On our side, we work. We put in place a panel that will give recommendations, and we will change the law, a law that predates the Internet. While they did nothing, we will make sure that anybody who participates in this system contributes to the system, without any exception.

* * *

[Translation]

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, all parties at the National Assembly of Quebec spoke out against the paternalistic and centralist approach of this Liberal government. All parties of the Government of Quebec condemned the fact that this government wants to try to bypass the government to allocate funding to the municipalities. That is unacceptable. This law has been on the books since 1867.

Why are the Prime Minister and the Liberal government so disrespectful—

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Infrastructure and Communities.

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my colleague opposite that respecting the provinces means investing in the provinces. That is why we are proud to have announced an investment of over \$500 million in the Louis-Hippolyte-La Fontaine tunnel. We are proud of our investment in users' safety. We are proud of our investment to modernize Montreal's critical transportation infrastructure, to bring it out of the 20th century and into the 21st century.

We will continue to invest with the provinces and across the country to improve the quality of life of Canadians.

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am not making this up. His Prime Minister told the Federation of Canadian Municipalities last Friday that he was prepared to bypass the provinces to get his way.

Act M-30 makes it clear that any agreement regarding municipal infrastructure must go through the Government of Quebec. This Prime Minister has no respect for provincial jurisdiction. He is a centralizing and paternalistic Prime Minister.

Does the minister agree with his Prime Minister about bypassing the Government of Quebec, yes or no?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing I know for sure, it is that we heard the Leader of the Opposition say yesterday that "Ottawa knows best". Those are the leader of the official opposition's own words.

However, we think Canadians know best. We think users know best. That is why we are going to keep investing in public transit and green, modern, resilient infrastructure across the country. We are going to keep investing for Canadians.

[English]

INTERPROVINCIAL TRADE

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are sick and tired of the protectionism within their own country and the Liberal government's failure to do anything about it. We are one country from sea to sea to sea, and Canadians should be able to buy and sell goods between provinces.

In the Prime Minister's free trade plan, half the agreement is 130 pages of exceptions. It is time for action, not more Liberal failures.

Premiers are stepping up for genuine interprovincial trade. When will the Prime Minister do the same?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I hope there are many Canadians watching TV today, because only the Conservatives can pretend that Ottawa knows best. In 10 years, Mr. Harper's government failed to move interprovincial trade forward.

The Leader of the Opposition's promise is more empty words and more big promises, with no plan to deliver. Canadians have seen that movie when it comes to the environment: all talk, no plan.

We will continue to make sure that we have free trade between Canadian provinces.

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has failed miserably when it comes to free trade between provinces. In fact, he has fought against it in court. Half the Liberals' Canada free trade agreement is a list of exemptions for things that cannot be traded. This is not free trade. In fact, much like the Prime Minister, his no-trade agreement is not as advertised.

Interprovincial trade barriers are costing the Canadian economy \$130 billion. When will the Prime Minister get out of the way and allow free trade between provinces?

●(1440)

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again, for viewers at home, that is the "Ottawa knows best" side of the House. Let me remind Canadians who are watching that beyond failed promises, the Leader of the Opposition remains consistent on one thing alone, and Canadians know that. Be it on the environment, the economy or the unity of our country, he has no real plan for Canada and for Canadians.

We have a plan to move goods across Canada. We have a plan to grow the economy. We have one million jobs to show.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Oral Questions

The Speaker: Order, order. There might be more viewers tonight for the Raptors game. I do not know. I think we need to listen to each other. This show needs to improve its decorum a little.

* * *

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Jamie Schmale (Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Kawarthas lost 300 jobs when the Liberals killed the west to east pipeline. Tens of thousands of jobs have been lost in Alberta and across the country because of Liberal indecision and a lack of planning on TMX.

Conservatives have a plan. We will work up front with the provinces and indigenous communities on an energy corridor, a plan that will lower assessment costs, improve certainty for investors and create jobs.

When will the Prime Minister quit attacking the energy sector and allow job-creating projects to move forward?

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member and members of the Conservative Party of Canada were really concerned about the energy sector and pipeline projects, they would not have voted to kill and end the process we have put in place to move forward on the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion.

We are consulting in a meaningful way with indigenous communities, and we are scheduled to make a decision on this project by June 18.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals already killed two pipelines outright, and zero new ones are in service. Getting the Trans Mountain expansion built will lower sky-high gas prices in B.C. and get western and Atlantic Canadians back to work. It will create thousands of jobs outside of Alberta and benefit all of Canada. It will support the 100,000 jobs in Ontario and Quebec that depend on oil and gas.

The Liberals already approved it once in 2016, and their mistakes have held it up. The majority of Canadians and indigenous communities want the Trans Mountain expansion. This time, what exactly is the plan for construction to start on June 19, and when will it be in service?

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is a good opportunity to remind the members of the official opposition that their broken system led to failure on northern gateway. Their broken system led to the exclusion of the impact on marine shipping and its impact on the marine environment from the NEB review.

We are fixing the system that has led to failures. We are engaging with indigenous communities in a meaningful way, in a two-way dialogue, to ensure that we are listening to their concerns. We are offering accommodations on the issues they have identified. We are moving forward on this project.

The Speaker: I have to ask the hon. member for Chilliwack—Hope and the hon. member for Lakeland not to interrupt when someone else has the floor. I would ask all members to listen when someone else has the floor.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order. It is very hard to hear.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Robert Aubin (Trois-Rivières, NDP): Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, under the pretext of giving us an update, the Liberal government proudly stated that the Canada Infrastructure Bank would be involved in the high-frequency train project.

That means that if the Liberal Party ever moves forward one day, it will guarantee lucrative profits for its friends instead of providing affordable services to the public. Through its public climate bank, the NDP will ensure the best value for money.

Can the Liberals try to imagine a day where they fight the climate emergency without lining the pockets of their friends?

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again my colleague is raising the issue of the high-frequency train. He does that every week.

I am pleased to announce that we will continue to work on this very serious project that could have an impact on many Canadians.

My colleague should know that our government is doing its due diligence on this project. When we have something to announce, we will announce it.

* * *

● (1445)

[*English*]

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, provisions in Bill S-3 would eliminate the discrimination against first nations women and their descendants once and for all. All that is needed is for this self-proclaimed feminist Prime Minister to bring those provisions into force with an order in council. It has been 18 months since this bill passed, and there is still no action.

Will the Prime Minister get on with it and immediately enact recommendation 1.3 of the calls for justice so that the 270,000 first nations women and their descendants can finally be free of this sex-based discrimination?

Hon. Carolyn Bennett (Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, gender equality is a fundamental human right, and Bill S-3 eliminates sex-based discrimination from the Indian Act.

*Oral Questions***AUDITOR GENERAL OF CANADA**

Ministerial special representative Claudette Dumont-Smith and departmental officials have held over 200 engagement sessions with communities and have received over 100 consultation reports from our partners on Indian Act registration reform, including recommendations for an implementation plan to remove the 1951 cut-off. She is currently finalizing her report. We look forward to her final recommendations, and I will be reporting to Parliament within the next couple—

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

* * *

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness did not listen carefully to my question. I hope he does today.

We know that the Canada Border Services Agency intercepted 238 individuals, that 27 of them were inadmissible and that three were members of Mexican cartels. That is what we know.

The problem is that there are 400 other individuals, Mexicans or foreigners travelling on Mexican passports, with ties to organized crime, who have come to Canada and are now operating in our communities.

My question is simple. Is the minister taking steps to arrest and deport them?

[*English*]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the figures the hon. gentleman refers to are anonymous. They are unverified. There is no obvious source for those allegations.

The fact of the matter is that the CBSA has reported the hard data both to me and to the parliamentary committee, and the hon. gentleman knows very well what those figures are. If there is anyone in Canada who is inadmissible to this country on the basis of criminality or any other cause, the CBSA and the RCMP take the appropriate steps to investigate and remove them.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for his answer. We know that people were intercepted. The issue now is whether 400 Mexican cartel members are actually operating here in Canada.

I have another question for the minister. Can he confirm that Mexican cartels are currently selling drugs in Canada and that they are very active, yes or no?

[*English*]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has continued for days to repeat the same unfounded, unverified, anonymous allegation. If he has any proof, if he has any evidence that in any way supports the allegation he has made, he should stop the rhetoric and submit it to the RCMP.

Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC): Mr. Speaker, like everything else with the current Prime Minister, he says one thing and does another. The so-called transparent and accountable-by-default Liberals are at it again. This time it is not redacted documents or withholding documents for Liberal cover-ups and scandals they are engaged in. This time they are trying to prevent the Auditor General from doing his work to hold these Liberals to account, because for the first time in Canadian history, he will be unable to complete audits as a result of the Prime Minister's refusal to fund his important work. Why?

Hon. Joyce Murray (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of Digital Government, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first permit me to reconfirm our deep appreciation and respect for the work of the Auditor General and his staff.

I have to ask if the Conservatives are gluttons for punishment. Let us look at the accounts. They cut the budget of the Auditor General. The Liberals voted against that. We added \$41 million to the budget of the Auditor General. The Conservatives voted against that. What is so difficult to understand? We support the Auditor General.

• (1450)

Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC): I asked why, but there was no answer, so I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker. It is because the Liberals know that they are failing at just about everything they are doing, except looking after their well-connected, well-heeled friends while attacking anyone, including the Auditor General, who would expose the rot within the Liberal Party. At no time in Canadian history have any auditors general ever said that they could not do the job and would have to cancel audits for a lack of funding, until now.

Is it not true that the Prime Minister is afraid of the truth of his failures being exposed, and that is the reason he has moved in to silence the Auditor General?

Hon. Joyce Murray (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of Digital Government, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, of all the reports written by the Auditor General in this mandate, over 70% were directly related to the failures of Conservative policy, and we will be through that batch soon.

I want to thank the member for giving us multiple opportunities to remind this House of the muzzling of scientists, the cutting of the long-form census and the obstruction during the previous government. Where was this member when his party voted to cut the budget of the AG?

Oral Questions

[Translation]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Ms. Brigitte Sansoucy (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have asked our self-proclaimed feminist Prime Minister many times to reform his sexist EI program. This program is failing far too many workers, and especially women workers. Fifty percent of men are eligible for benefits, but just 35.2% of women, many of them mothers, are eligible. Workers are tired of the Liberals' inaction and want a government that is on their side.

When will the Liberals take action and reform this sexist EI program?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy for the opportunity to answer this question.

Since 2015, we have asserted many times that the EI regime is essential to middle-class families, which is why we have improved it in many ways. We made maternity, parental, caregiver and compassionate care benefits more flexible and more generous. We also created the Canada child benefit, which predominantly helps women, mothers, across Canada by helping nine out of 10 families and lifting 300,000 children out of poverty every month.

[English]

Ms. Niki Ashton (Churchill—Keewatinook Aski, NDP): Mr. Speaker, despite the Liberals so-called feminist cred, they have done nothing for women who need to access EI.

Only one-third of unemployed women can access employment insurance. When they finish their maternity leave, they have to work hundreds of hours to become eligible again. A growing number of women are stuck in precarious employment and cannot access EI.

Women in Canada are paying the price of an EI system that discriminates against them.

Why have the Liberals failed to deliver for working women and what will they do to fix this injustice?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have more time to talk about our investments through the EI system that are supportive of gender equality.

We are in 2019. Gender equality is a key feature of our economic growth. We have introduced a new parental sharing benefit that gives five extra weeks to parents that share their EI benefits, therefore encouraging greater equal participation of mothers and fathers.

We are in 2019. We look forward to working more for women and mothers across Canada.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Mike Bossio (Hastings—Lennox and Addington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today is World Environment Day, a day for encouraging worldwide awareness and action to protect our environment.

While Conservative politicians still have no plan to tackle climate change, our government knows that protecting our environment and

fighting climate change is the challenge of our generation. That is why we are taking real action.

Could the Minister of Environment please update the House on the actions our government is taking to fight climate change and protect our environment?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his advocacy to protect the environment. I would like to wish everyone across Canada a happy World Environment Day.

We understand that taking action to protect the environment and tackle climate change is good for the environment, is good for the economy and is good for our kids. It is unfortunate that Conservative politicians do not understand that.

The Leader of the Opposition says that he knows best, that Ottawa knows best. What the Conservatives know best is how to do nothing on the environment and nothing on climate change.

Today, we announced \$15 million to support Forests Ontario, to support 50 million trees being planted in Ontario. That is good for the environment, it is good for the climate—

• (1455)

The Speaker: The hon. member for Lévis—Lotbinière.

* * *

[Translation]

GOVERNMENT PRIORITIES

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after giving Loblaw's \$12 million, this Liberal government is in hot water again for showering \$50 million on a handful of Canadian venture capital funds.

However, two of the three winning funds that applied to the program said they were not in particularly dire need of Ottawa's money. That is totally backwards. This is a gross injustice to those who really need this money.

Why does the Liberal government not just mind its own business? Why is it giving money to investment funds that do not even need it?

Mr. Joël Lightbound (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to get this opportunity to remind the House that giving money to those who do not need it is a Conservative specialty.

For 10 years, they lavished handouts and tax breaks on the wealthy. They doubled the TFSA limit. I wonder how many people in my colleague's riding had \$11,000 left over at the end of the year to put into a TFSA. We changed all that and chose an approach that works. We have cut poverty in Canada by 20% by introducing the Canada child benefit and lowering taxes for the middle class. This is a plan that works.

*Oral Questions**[English]*

Mr. Blake Richards (Banff—Airdrie, CPC): Mr. Speaker, under the Liberals, the national debt is growing by over \$2 million an hour, yet it is not stopping them from finding new ways to squander Canadians' hard-earned tax dollars.

First, the Liberals gave Loblaws \$12 million for fridges. Now it is giving \$50 million to an investment fund that when asked if it needed the money, said “No, but it's great to have it”. Those are words that most Canadian small businesses would only dream of being able to say.

Why are the Liberals handing out money to giant companies that literally do not need it, instead of helping small businesses by reducing taxes and cutting red tape?

Mr. Joël Lightbound (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to rise in the House to remind the member opposite that our plan, unlike theirs for 10 years, has been working for Canadians. While the Conservatives were giving tax break after tax break to the wealthiest, we decided to take a different approach and give more to those who needed it most.

We have reduced taxes for the middle class. We have made the Canada child benefit the most progressive social policy in a generation, which has lifted hundreds of thousands of kids out of poverty and reduced poverty in the country by 20%.

I know that was never the policy intent of the Conservatives. That was never their intent to reduce inequalities in the country. We are taking that very seriously.

* * *

*[Translation]***THE ENVIRONMENT**

Mr. Joël Godin (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have asked the Minister of Environment several times to tell Canadians the truth about the Paris targets. Why is she refusing to answer and be transparent?

We know that this government's so-called environmental plan is not working. The government has to take its head out of the sand. It must be honest and confirm that the Paris targets will not be met.

I have a very simple question. When will this Liberal government clearly say to Canadians that Canada will not meet its Paris targets?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to hear the Conservatives' questions. I want to wish them a happy World Environment Day and ask them if they will stand with us and vote in favour of our motion on the climate emergency. We must take immediate action on climate change and accept that we must meet our Paris Agreement targets.

Will they vote with or against Canadians?

[English]

Hon. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal climate plan is a massive failure. In fact, every expert, including the minister's own department, says that the Liberals are not going to meet their Paris targets. The minister continues to deny the truth and mislead Canadians.

Two weeks ago, during a very candid moment, the minister admitted what she was trying to do. She said, “if you repeat it, if you say it louder, if that is your talking point, people will totally believe it.”

Canadians are smarter than that. Will the minister now admit that her plan—

The Speaker: Order, please. The hon. Minister of Environment.

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when we are talking about talking points, look at the other side. Who is reading the talking points about how they are going to do less and less to protect the environment and tackle climate change?

We are committed to taking action to tackle climate change. We have created one million jobs. While we are doing it, we are making life affordable.

At the end of the day, we all have an obligation. On World Environment Day, I would ask all Canadians to think about how we can tackle the biggest challenge of our generation, climate change, and how we can do it in a way that grows our economy and creates good jobs for Canadians.

* * *

● (1500)

*[Translation]***CANADIAN HERITAGE**

Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Google spent \$47 million on lobbying to roll back copyright in Europe. Here in Canada, the Liberal government is leaving the door wide open to giants such as Facebook, Google and Netflix. The government says nobody gets a free ride. Give me a break. It has been singing the same tune for four years now.

The consequences are very real. Today, TVA announced it is cutting 68 jobs because of Liberal favouritism and the government's refusal to ensure a level playing field for everyone.

I am ashamed of Parliament for handing our culture, our democracy and our jobs over to Big Brother in the states on a silver platter. The Liberals have not done a thing for four years.

Why not? God dammit!

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez (Minister of Canadian Heritage and Multiculturalism, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleague is in fine form today. As I said earlier, he should be saying those things to the Conservatives, who were in power for 10 years and did absolutely nothing.

Oral Questions

Since taking office, we have created a committee that is in the process of analyzing all of this in order to eventually change the law. We will have one system that will be the same for everyone and will ensure that everyone who participates in the system contributes to the system.

No government has done more for culture than our government.

Mr. Pierre Nantel: You only have a month left before it's over!

The Speaker: Order. Let me remind the hon. member for Longueuil—Saint-Hubert that he may speak only when it is his turn. The other members listened while he was speaking, so he should listen while others are speaking.

[English]

The hon. member for Cowichan—Malahat—Langford.

* * *

DAIRY INDUSTRY

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Mr. Speaker, last year, the Minister of Foreign Affairs promised compensation for Canadian dairy workers after three successive free trade deals with thousands of Canadian jobs at risk.

While budget 2019 promised compensation for dairy farmers, dairy processors who employ 24,000 in Canadian rural communities received nothing. Not one dollar was allocated for dairy processors to compensate them for economic harm stemming from these free trade agreements.

When will the Liberals deliver on their promise to fairly compensate Canadian dairy processors?

[Translation]

Hon. Marie-Claude Bibeau (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for giving me the opportunity to provide an update on our commitment to supply management.

We are indeed firmly committed to supply management and to our dairy, poultry and egg farmers as well as to our processors. We will soon be announcing the mechanisms that will be used to provide our industry with the compensation it was promised.

* * *

[English]

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Manitoba produces a lot of clean energy, so we can help other jurisdictions reduce their environmental impact with our clean energy resources.

Minnesota is prepared to buy renewable clean hydroelectricity from Manitoba to displace coal generation in its state. The National Energy Board and the province have both approved the transmission line, but the Prime Minister refuses to allow the project to go forward.

We know the Prime Minister regularly shows his disrespect for the provinces, but why is he punishing all Manitobans and preventing them from realizing the benefits of this fantastic clean energy opportunity?

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government is supporting clean energy projects that are reducing emissions and creating good, well-paying middle-class jobs. However, it has become clear that because of the agreement that Manitoba Hydro proposed with indigenous communities, Manitoba Hydro was forced to cancel that agreement by the Manitoba government.

There are issues that we are trying to resolve to ensure we are concluding our meaningful consultation with indigenous communities in the right way, in a meaningful way, to ensure good projects can move forward.

* * *

FORESTRY INDUSTRY

Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the community of Vavenby received devastating news on Monday when the Canfor sawmill closed and 178 people were out of work. This follows the Tolko Industries closure, where 240 people in Quesnel are out of work. This is the second major shutdown in the last 30 days. We have an industry in crisis.

Why did the government fail to make resolving the softwood lumber issue a priority when it renegotiated NAFTA?

• (1505)

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our hearts go out to the people and the workers who are impacted by the closures of the sawmills. We know about the reduction in logging and forestry in that area because of the issues of the wildfire as well as the infestation of the pine beetle that have been caused by climate change.

We are ensuring that proper support is available for the industry and for workers who are impacted by these closures.

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in signing the last softwood lumber agreement, the former Conservative government put an end to the longest and most costly trade dispute with the U.S. We expanded overseas markets, we championed a wood-first initiative.

However, when the deal expired, the Liberals refused to make securing a new softwood lumber agreement a priority. In my province, over 140,000 jobs are forestry-dependent, 140 communities are forestry-dependent. In the past three weeks, seven mill closures have been announced or are imminent.

How many more families have to lose their livelihoods before it becomes a priority for the Prime Minister?

Mr. Robert Oliphant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives simply do not know what they are talking about. Our government saw the consequences of the horrendous quota deal they accepted on softwood lumber.

Our government will continue to vigorously defend our industry and its workers against protectionist trade measures accepted by the Conservatives. We are continuing our legal challenges against the U.S. duties through NAFTA and through the WTO, where Canadian softwood has always won in the past, and we will win again.

Our government will always defend our workers and this industry.

* * *

TOURISM INDUSTRY

Mr. John Aldag (Cloverdale—Langley City, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in my 32-year career with Parks Canada, I dealt with tourism operators and agencies across Canada. As a result, I know how important tourism is to our economy, particularly in B.C. where it represents over 300,000 tourism workers.

Can the Minister of Tourism, Official Languages and La Francophonie please explain how the new tourism strategy works to champion job creation in the tourism industry, especially in B.C.?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Tourism, Official Languages and La Francophonie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Cloverdale—Langley City for his hard work. Not one week goes by without him talking to me about tourism.

After being abandoned by the Conservatives, the 1.8 million workers in the tourism sector know that we have their backs. We just invested nearly \$60 million in a new Canadian experiences fund to boost our tourism season in the wintertime and to make sure that we have tourists outside our three major cities to empower our regions. We will also support LGBTQ tourism, culinary and—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Beauport—Limoilou.

* * *

[Translation]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Alupa Clarke (Beauport—Limoilou, CPC): Mr. Speaker, everyone remembers the huge mistake the Minister of Official Languages made two years ago when she concluded an agreement with Netflix that did not guarantee any French-language cultural production. Quebeckers and francophones across the country were so frustrated that the Prime Minister removed her from that position and she lost the heritage portfolio.

Here is what she is telling us today. She made a plan for tourism two weeks ago. It contains no guarantees, no investments for the francophone minority communities across Canada. She just made an announcement today and, once again, there is nothing for francophones.

Was this an oversight on the part of the minister or does this government just not take official languages seriously?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Tourism, Official Languages and La Francophonie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, francophones in Ontario and across the country know full well that our government is there for them. It was the Conservatives who let them down and decided to protect Doug Ford in Ontario, rather than protecting francophones across the country.

Oral Questions

It goes without saying that we will always stand with our linguistic minorities. We invested \$2.7 billion in linguistic minorities. This is the first time that so much money has been allocated to support official languages in Canada. We are proud of our track record and we will continue on that same path.

* * *

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Matthew Dubé (Beloeil—Chambly, NDP): Mr. Speaker, with hundreds of people taking to the streets and thousands of petitioners, public engagement in Otterburn Park is strong, for it is clear that the cell tower Telus wants to build in a sensitive woodland does not have social licence.

The minister offered to meet with city officials, but they are hesitating because the matter is currently before the courts. Will the minister opt for the simplest solution, which is to listen to local citizens and revoke the permit to build the tower, since it clearly does not have social licence?

● (1510)

Mr. Rémi Massé (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his question.

Our government believes that communities should have a say in where these cellphone towers are located in their jurisdictions. Telecommunications companies must consult communities in an open and transparent manner regarding the location of towers. The government has processes in place to respond to every reasonable and relevant concern raised during the consultations. This process guarantees that Canadians can stay connected, without having to pit them against cell tower construction in their communities.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. David de Burgh Graham (Laurentides—Labelle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my riding, Laurentides—Labelle, has an estimated 10,800 lakes and bodies of water, and many of them are used recreationally during the summer. We are working on a number of issues concerning the management and protection of our lakes, but we hear less about boating safety.

According to the Red Cross, every year there are about 160 boating-related fatalities in Canada.

Can the Minister of Transport talk about what is being done to raise awareness about pleasure craft safety?

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Laurentides—Labelle for his excellent question.

Points of Order

As members know, we want to promote the best boating safety practices when Canadians take to the water. We want to reach as many people as possible. That is why we are very pleased to have announced additional funding for public awareness programs that will reach as many Canadians as possible and contribute to boating safety.

We want Canadians to enjoy water-related activities. We want them to know the rules and to have a chance to take to our beautiful waterways.

* * *

[English]

PRIVACY

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government has repeatedly broken laws by sharing reporters' private information and their questions on the multi-billion dollar Irving shipbuilding project. Now the government has refused to release a 200-page access to information request on the Liberals' sharing of this private information with Irving.

Why is the government continuing to break the law and what is it trying to hide?

Hon. Carla Qualtrough (Minister of Public Services and Procurement and Accessibility, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our goal is to provide Canadians, including media, with timely, factual information, while ensuring sensitive information remains protected. I directed my department to ensure that we provide accurate information regarding ongoing conduct with industry partners, while ensuring the privacy of all individuals who deal with my department is respected.

* * *

[Translation]

RAIL TRANSPORTATION

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the people of Lac-Mégantic called for a public inquiry into the 2013 rail disaster. The minister told them that they were spreading conspiracy theories. The fact that 47 people were burned alive in Lac-Mégantic is not a conspiracy. In February there were three deaths in a similar accident in British Columbia; that is not a conspiracy. The increase in rail accidents since the tragedy in Lac-Mégantic is not a conspiracy.

Will the minister retract his statements, stop insulting the people of Lac-Mégantic and order a public inquiry into rail safety?

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois is the only one spreading this conspiracy. The Transportation Safety Board of Canada fully investigated the Lac-Mégantic tragedy.

I met with families who lost a son or daughter, a father or mother, a brother or sister. I can honestly say that the people of Lac-Mégantic want to look to the future, and that is what we will do.

[English]

POINTS OF ORDER

ORAL QUESTIONS

Ms. Rachael Harder (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as you have said often in this place, official opposition members ask questions and government members answer those questions, or at least give it their best shot. In that exchange, sometimes opinions are shared or questions are asked that maybe other members disagree with. You have asked us to be respectful toward one another, nevertheless.

I would like to bring to your attention an incident that took place earlier.

Mr. Speaker, actually, I would like to bring to your attention the incident taking place right now. I am being heckled by members opposite who want to shut my voice down at this moment. I will wait for you to bring them to order.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

● (1515)

The Speaker: Order. The hon. member has not finished her point of order. I will need to hear the rest of her point of order. We all need to hear it.

The hon. member for Lethbridge.

Ms. Rachael Harder: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that you are upholding the rules equally in this place.

During question period, my colleague, the member for Lakeland, asked a question. My colleague is a grown woman. She was elected by the constituents of Lakeland, who brought her here to represent them. She has been given the opportunity to carry a portfolio that has to do with energy and natural resources in Canada. She is very knowledgeable about that file.

During question period, she asked a question with regard to that file, which is her privilege in this place. After asking her question, she was heckled by a member opposite. It was the member for Shefford, who told my hon. colleague this.

I will wait for the members opposite to stop heckling me once again.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Ms. Rachael Harder: Mr. Speaker, the member for Shefford told my colleague, the member for Lakeland, to be quiet. He then said, "Sit down, kid."

That is incredibly demeaning, it is incredibly degrading and it is incredibly sexist to tell my female colleague this. She is a grown woman who understands her file very well and was elected by the people of Lakeland to represent them in this place. To call her a kid and infantilize her in that way is absolutely inappropriate in this place. I would ask that the member opposite apologize to my colleague.

The Speaker: I do not see the hon. member for Shefford rising.

Government Orders

I will review the recording of question period. I did not hear that comment or a comment like it, but I will certainly review it to determine, if I can, what was said. I thank the member for raising this point.

I would ask all members, as I appreciate the member mentioning, to show respect for each other and not to interrupt when someone else has the floor. This is a consistent problem.

The hon. member for Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie is rising on a point of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice: Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the other parties, I hope and believe that you will find unanimous consent for the following motion: That the House of Commons recognize the unanimous motion of the National Assembly stating that any project that may have an environmental impact on Quebec territory, especially those related to the transportation of oil and gas, must be subject to a Quebec environmental assessment process—

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: I thank the hon. member. He knows that, according to procedure, he has to first request permission to move a motion for which he did not give notice. If permission is granted, he may proceed. Also, putting notice on the Order Paper is always an option. It is now clear that there is no unanimous consent for the motion.

[*English*]

Ms. Jenny Kwan: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There has been talk among the parties, and I am very hopeful that if you seek it, you will find unanimous consent for the following motion:—

Some hon. members: No.

Ms. Jenny Kwan: Mr. Speaker, that in light of the tabling of the final report of the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls, the government recognize the genocide committed against indigenous women and girls—

• (1520)

The Speaker: Order. It is important that I hear the member who is asking for consent and it is important that we hear the topic, which we have heard, and it is clear that members have indicated that there is no unanimous consent.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Rivière-des-Mille-Îles is rising on a point of order.

Ms. Linda Lapointe: Mr. Speaker, all members of the House deserve the same respect we owe to our constituents. I would therefore like the member for Longueuil—Saint-Hubert to withdraw his insulting, unparliamentary remarks.

Mr. Pierre Nantel: Mr. Speaker, I wish my colleague would tell me what I did that she found so disrespectful. I did indeed say the word “dammit”, but I could just as easily have said “thorn” or “lemon”. I do not see how that is disrespectful towards the Minister of Canadian Heritage and Multiculturalism, who, truth be told, has not done anything these past four years.

The Speaker: That sounds like debate to me.

The hon. member for Repentigny on a point of order.

Ms. Monique Pauzé: Mr. Speaker, 3,800 people have signed a petition demanding a public inquiry into the Lac-Mégantic rail tragedy. Over a year ago, a motion calling for a public inquiry was unanimously adopted by Quebec's National Assembly.

I think the Minister of Transport should retract his comments about conspiracy theories.

The Speaker: That also sounds more like debate.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2019, NO. 1

The House resumed from June 4 consideration of Bill C-97, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 19, 2019 and other measures, as reported (with amendments) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

The Speaker: It being 3:22 p.m., pursuant to order made on Tuesday, May 28, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded divisions on the motions at report stage of Bill C-97.

Call in the members.

And the bells having rung:

• (1535)

[*English*]

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 1. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 2 to 17.

• (1545)

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

(*Division No. 1335*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultiaf	Albas
Albrecht	Anderson
Arnold	Barlow
Barrett	Benzen
Bergen	Bernier
Berthold	Brassard
Calkins	Carrie
Chong	Cooper
Davidson	Diotte
Doherty	Dreeshen
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Finley
Généreux	Genius
Gladu	Godin
Gourde	Harder
Jeneroux	Kent
Kmiec	Leitch
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	Lukivski
Maguire	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Motz	Nater
Nicholson	Nuttall
O'Toole	Paul-Hus

Government Orders

Rayes
Richards
Schmale
Shipley
Sorenson
Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga

Reid
Saroya
Shields
Sopuck
Stanton
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Wagantall
Waugh
Wong
Zimmer — 72

Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)

Moore
Morneau
Murray
Nassif
O'Connell
Oliver
Ouellette
Pauzé
Peterson
Picard
Quach
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Ruimy
Saini
Sangha
Sarai
Schieffe
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann
Stetski
Tan
Thériault
Vaughan
Weir
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 197

Morrissey
Nantel
Nault
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Philpott
Poissant
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Tabbara
Tassi
Vandenbeld
Virani
Whalen
Yip

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Amos
Arseneault
Ashton
Ayoub
Bagnell
Beaulieu
Bendayana
Benson
Bittle
Blair
Bossio
Boulerice
Bratina
Brosseau
Caron
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Choquette
Cullen
Dabrusin
DeCoursey
Dhillon
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dusseault
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Garrison
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hajdu
Hardie
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Jolibois
Jones
Jowhari
Kang
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacGregor
Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino

Alghabra
Anandasangaree
Arya
Aubin
Badawey
Baylis
Beech
Bennett
Bibeau
Blaikie
Boissonnault
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Cormier
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Duvall
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hardcastle
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Johns
Joly
Jordan
Julian
Khalid
Kwan
Lamoureux
Laverdière
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Manly
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk

PAIRED

Members

Gill
Plamondon

LeBlanc
Zahid — 4

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 2 to 17 defeated.

[*Translation*]

The question is on Motion No. 18. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 19 to 33.

● (1550)

(The House divided on Motion No. 18, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 1336*)

YEAS

Members

Ashton
Beaulieu
Blaikie
Boulerice
Brosseau
Choquette
Dubé
Dusseault
Fortin
Harcastle
Johns
Julian
Laverdière
Manly
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Nantel
Quach
Ste-Marie
Thériault

Aubin
Benson
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Caron
Cullen
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Duvall
Garrison
Hughes
Jolibois
Kwan
MacGregor
Masse (Windsor West)
Moore
Pauzé
Sansoucy
Stetski
Weir — 38

*Government Orders***NAYS**

Members

Aboultaif
 Albrecht
 Alghabra
 Anandasangaree
 Arnold
 Arya
 Badawey
 Barlow
 Baylis
 Bendayan
 Benzen
 Bernier
 Bibeau
 Blair
 Bossio
 Bratina
 Caesar-Chavannes
 Carrie
 Casey (Charlottetown)
 Champagne
 Chong
 Clement
 Cormier
 Dabrusin
 Davidson
 Dhaliwal
 Diotte
 Dreeshen
 Dubourg
 Duguid
 Dzerowicz
 Eglinski
 El-Khoury
 Erskine-Smith
 Eyolfson
 Falk (Provencher)
 Fergus
 Finnigan
 Fonseca
 Fragiskatos
 Fraser (Central Nova)
 Génèreux
 Gerretsen
 Godin
 Goodale
 Gourde
 Hajdu
 Hardie
 Hébert
 Hoback
 Holland
 Hussien
 Iacono
 Joly
 Jordan
 Kang
 Khalid
 Kmiec
 Lamoureux
 Lefebvre
 Leslie
 Liepert
 Lloyd
 Lockhart
 Longfield
 Lukiwski
 Maloney
 May (Cambridge)
 McCrimmon
 McGuinty
 McKenna
 McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
 Mendès
 Mihychuk
 Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
 Morneau
 Morrissey
 Murray
 Nater
 Nicholson

Albas
 Aldag
 Amos
 Anderson
 Arseneault
 Ayoub
 Bagnell
 Barrett
 Beech
 Bennett
 Bergen
 Berthold
 Bittle
 Boissonnault
 Brassard
 Breton
 Calkins
 Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
 Chagger
 Chen
 Clarke
 Cooper
 Cuzner
 Damoff
 DeCoursey
 Dhillon
 Doherty
 Drouin
 Duclos
 Duncan (Etobicoke North)
 Easter
 Ehsassi
 Ellis
 Eyking
 Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
 Fast
 Finley
 Fisher
 Fortier
 Fraser (West Nova)
 Garneau
 Genuis
 Gladu
 Goldsmith-Jones
 Gould
 Graham
 Harder
 Harvey
 Hehr
 Hogg
 Housefather
 Hutchings
 Jeneroux
 Jones
 Jowhari
 Kent
 Khera
 Lambropoulos
 Lapointe
 Leitch
 Levitt
 Lightbound
 Lobb
 Long
 Ludwig
 Maguire
 Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
 McCauley (Edmonton West)
 McDonald
 McKay
 McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
 McLeod (Northwest Territories)
 Mendicino
 Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
 Motz
 Nassif
 Nault
 Nuttall

O'Connell
 Oliver
 O'Toole
 Paradis
 Peschisolido
 Philpott
 Poissant
 Ratansi
 Reid
 Rioux
 Rodriguez
 Romanado
 Rudd
 Sahota
 Samson
 Sarai
 Scarpaleggia
 Schmale
 Serré
 Shanahan
 Shields
 Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
 Sikand
 Sohi
 Sorbara
 Cooper
 Spengemann
 Strahl
 Sweet
 Tan
 Tilson
 Van Kesteren
 Vaughan
 Virani
 Warkentin
 Webber
 Wong
 Yip
 Yurdiga

Oliphant
 O'Regan
 Ouellette
 Paul-Hus
 Peterson
 Picard
 Qualtrough
 Rayes
 Richards
 Robillard
 Rogers
 Rota
 Ruimy
 Saini
 Sangha
 Saroya
 Schiefke
 Schulte
 Sgro
 Sheehan
 Shipley
 Sidhu (Brampton South)
 Simms
 Sopuck
 Sorenson
 Stanton
 Stubbs
 Tabbara
 Tassi
 Trost
 Vandenbeld
 Viersen
 Wagantall
 Waugh
 Whalen
 Wrzesnewskyj
 Young
 Zimmer — 234

PAIRED

Members

Gill
 Plamondon

LeBlanc
 Zahid — 4

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 18 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 19 to 33 defeated.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 34. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 35 to 43.

• (1600)

(The House divided on Motion No. 34, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 1337*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
 Albrecht
 Arnold
 Aubin
 Barrett
 Benson
 Bergen
 Berthold
 Boudrias
 Boutin-Sweet
 Brosseau
 Caron
 Chong
 Clarke
 Cooper
 Davidson
 Doherty
 Dubé

Albas
 Anderson
 Ashton
 Barlow
 Beaulieu
 Benzen
 Bernier
 Blaikie
 Boulterice
 Brassard
 Calkins
 Carrie
 Choquette
 Clement
 Cullen
 Diotte
 Dreeshen
 Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)

Government Orders

Dusseault	Duvall	Lambropoulos	Lametti
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Lamoureux	Lapointe
Falk (Provencher)	Fast	Lefebvre	Leslie
Finley	Fortin	Levitt	Lightbound
Garrison	Généreux	Lockhart	Long
Genuis	Gladu	Longfield	Ludwig
Godin	Gourde	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Hardcastle	Harder	Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Hoback	Hughes	May (Cambridge)	
Jeneroux	Johns	McCrifmon	McDonald
Jolibois	Julian	McGuinty	McKay
Kent	Kmiec	McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Kwan	Laverdière	McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Leitch	Liepert	Mendicino	Mihychuk
Lloyd	Lobb	Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Lukiwski	MacGregor	Morneau	
Maguire	Manly	Morrissey	Murray
Masse (Windsor West)	May (Saanic—Gulf Islands)	Nassif	Nault
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	O'Connell	Oliphant
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)	Moore	Oliver	O'Regan
Motz	Nantel	Ouellette	Paradis
Nater	Nicholson	Peschisolido	Peterson
Nuttall	O'Toole	Picard	Poissant
Paul-Hus	Paupé	Qualtrough	Ratansi
Philpott	Quach	Rioux	Robillard
Rayes	Reid	Rodriguez	Rogers
Richards	Sansoucy	Romanado	Rota
Saroya	Schmale	Rudd	Ruimy
Shields	Shipley	Sahota	Saini
Sopuck	Sorenson	Samson	Sangha
Stanton	Ste-Marie	Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Stetski	Strahl	Schiefke	Schulte
Stubbs	Sweet	Serré	Sgro
Thériault	Tilson	Shanahan	Sheehan
Trost	Van Kesteren	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Viersen	Wagantall	Sikand	Simms
Warkentin	Waugh	Sohi	Sorbara
Webber	Weir	Spengemann	Tabbara
Wong	Yurdiga	Tan	Tassi
Zimmer— 115		Vandenbeld	Vaughan
		Virani	Whalen
		Wrzesnewskyj	Yip
		Young— 159	

NAYS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Amos	Anandasangaree
Arseneault	Arya
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Baylis
Beech	Bendayan
Bennett	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Boissonnault	Bossio
Bratina	Breton
Caesar-Chavannes	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Champagne	Chen
Cormier	Cuzner
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeCoursey	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Eyking	Eyolfson
Fergus	Finnigan
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Garneau	Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones	Goodale
Gould	Graham
Hajdu	Hardie
Harvey	Hébert
Hehr	Hogg
Holland	Housefather
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Joly
Jones	Jordan
Jowhari	Kang
Khalid	Khera

PAIRED

Members

Gill	LeBlanc
Plamondon	Zahid— 4

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 34 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 35 to 43 defeated.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 44. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 45 to 51, 53 and 54.

● (1605)

(The House divided on Motion No. 44, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 1338*)

YEAS

Members

Abouttaif	Albas
Albrecht	Anderson
Arnold	Ashton
Aubin	Barlow
Barrett	Benson
Benzen	Bergen
Bernier	Berthold
Blaikie	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Brassard
Brousseau	Caesar-Chavannes
Calkins	Caron
Carrie	Chong
Choquette	Clarke

Government Orders

Clement
Cullen
Diotte
Dreeschen
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Duvall
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Garrison
Genius
Godin
Hardcastle
Hoback
Jeneroux
Jolibois
Kent
Kwan
Leitch
Lloyd
Lukiwski
Maguire
Masse (Windsor West)
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Motz
Nater
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Quach
Reid
Sansoucy
Schmale
Shipley
Sorenson
Stetski
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Wagantall
Waugh
Weir
Yurdiga

Cooper
Davidson
Doherty
Dubé
Dusseault
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Généreux
Gladu
Gourde
Harder
Hughes
Johns
Julian
Kniec
Laverdière
Liepert
Lobb
MacGregor
Manly
May (Saenich—Gulf Islands)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Moore
Nantel
Nicholson
O'Toole
Philpott
Rayes
Richards
Saroya
Shields
Sopuck
Stanton
Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Wong
Zimmer — 110

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Amos
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Beaulieu
Bendayan
Bibeau
Blair
Bossio
Bratina
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Garneau
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hajdu
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hussen
Iacono

Alghabra
Anandasangaree
Arya
Badawey
Baylis
Beech
Bennett
Bittle
Boissonnault
Boudrias
Breton
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCoursey
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duguid
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hardie
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Hutchings
Joly

Jones
Jowhari
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Morneau
Morrissey
Nassif
O'Connell
Oliver
Ouellette
Paupé
Peterson
Poissant
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Ruimy
Saini
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Tan
Thériault
Vaughan
Whalen
Yip

Jordan
Kang
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
Maloney
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Murray
Nault
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Picard
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sarai
Schieffe
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann
Tabbara
Tassi
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 164

PAIRED

Members

Gill
Plamondon

LeBlanc
Zahid — 4

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 44 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 45 to 51, 53 and 54 defeated.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 52.

● (1615)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 52, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 1339*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Arnold
Aubin
Barrett
Benzen
Bernier
Blaikie
Boutin-Sweet

Albas
Anderson
Ashton
Barlow
Benson
Bergen
Berthold
Boulerice
Brassard

Government Orders

Brosseau	Calkins	Hussen	Hutchings
Caron	Carrie	Iacono	Joly
Chong	Choquette	Jones	Jordan
Clarke	Cooper	Jowhari	Kang
Cullen	Davidson	Khalid	Khera
Diotte	Doherty	Lambropoulos	Lametti
Dreeshen	Dubé	Lamoureux	Lapointe
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	Dusseauit	Lefebvre	Leslie
Duvall	Eglinski	Levitt	Lightbound
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)	Lockhart	Long
Fast	Finley	Longfield	Ludwig
Garrison	Généreux	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Genuis	Gladu	Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Godin	Gourde	May (Cambridge)	
Hardcastle	Harder	McCrimmon	McDonald
Hoback	Hughes	McGuinty	McKay
Jeneroux	Johns	McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Jolibois	Julian	McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Kent	Kmiec	Mendicino	Mihychuk
Kwan	Laverdière	Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Leitch	Liepert	Morneau	
Lloyd	Lobb	Morrissey	Murray
Lukiwski	MacGregor	Nassif	Nault
Maguire	Manly	O'Connell	Oliphant
Masse (Windsor West)	May (Saanic—Gulf Islands)	Oliver	O'Regan
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Ouellette	Paradis
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)	Moore	Pauzé	Peschisolido
Motz	Nantel	Peterson	Philpott
Nater	Nicholson	Picard	Poissant
Nuttall	O'Toole	Qualtrough	Ratansi
Paul-Hus	Quach	Rioux	Robillard
Rayes	Reid	Rodriguez	Rogers
Richards	Sansoucy	Romanado	Rota
Saroya	Schmale	Rudd	Ruimy
Shields	Shipley	Sahota	Saini
Sopuck	Sorenson	Samson	Sangha
Stanton	Stetski	Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Strahl	Stubbs	Schiefke	Schulte
Sweet	Tilson	Séré	Sgro
Trost	Van Kesteren	Shanahan	Sheehan
Viersen	Wagantall	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Warkentin	Wagh	Sikand	Simms
Webber	Wong	Sohi	Sorbara
Yurdiga	Zimmer — 106	Spengemann	Ste-Marie
		Tabbara	Tan
		Tassi	Thériault
		Vandenbeld	Vaughan
		Virani	Weir
		Whalen	Wrzesnewskyj
		Yip	Young — 166

NAYS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Amos	Anandasangaree
Arseneault	Arya
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Baylis
Beaulieu	Beech
Bendayan	Bennett
Bibeau	Bittle
Blair	Boissonnault
Bossio	Boudrias
Bratina	Breton
Caesar-Chavannes	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Champagne	Chen
Cornier	Cuzner
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeCoursey	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dzerowicz	Easton
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Eyking	Eyolfson
Fergus	Finnigan
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Garneau
Gerretsen	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Graham	Hajdu
Hardie	Hébert
Hehr	Hogg
Holland	Housefather

PAIRED

Members

Gill	LeBlanc
Plamondon	Zahid — 4

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 52 defeated.

● (1620)

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 55.

● (1630)

(The House divided on Motion No. 55, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 1340*)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Amos	Anandasangaree
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Aubin
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Baylis
Beech	Bendayan

Government Orders

Bennett
Bibeau
Blaikie
Boissonnault
Boulerice
Bratina
Brosseau
Caron
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Choquette
Cullen
Dabrusin
DeCoursey
Dhillon
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dusseault
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hardcastle
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Johns
Joly
Jordan
Julian
Khalid
Kwan
Lametti
Lapointe
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacGregor
Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Moore
Morneau
Murray
Nassif
O'Connell
Oliver
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Philpott
Poissant
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara

Benson
Bittle
Blair
Bossio
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Cormier
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Duvall
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Garrison
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hajdu
Hardie
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Jolibois
Jones
Jowhari
Kang
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Laverdière
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Manly
Masse (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Saenich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Morrissey
Nantel
Nault
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Peterson
Picard
Quach
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Ruimy
Saini
Sangha
Sarai
Schieffe
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann

Stetski
Tan
Vandenbeld
Virani
Whalen
Yip

Aboultarif
Albrecht
Arnold
Barrett
Benzen
Bernier
Boudrias
Calkins
Chong
Cooper
Diotte
Dreeschen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Fortin
Genius
Godin
Harder
Jeneroux
Kent
Leitch
Lloyd
Lukiwski
McCaughey (Edmonton West)
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Nater
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Rayes
Richards
Schmale
Shiple
Sorenson
Ste-Marie
Stubbs
Thériault
Trost
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga

Tabbara
Tassi
Vaughan
Weir
Wrzesnewskyj
Young— 192

NAYS

Members

Albas
Anderson
Barlow
Beaulieu
Bergen
Berthold
Brassard
Carrie
Clarke
Davidson
Doherty
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Généreux
Gladu
Gourde
Hoback
Kelly
Kmieć
Lierpert
Lobb
Maguire
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Motz
Nicholson
O'Toole
Pauzé
Reid
Saroya
Shields
Sopuck
Stanton
Strahl
Sweet
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Wagantall
Waugh
Wong
Zimmer— 82

PAIRED

Members

Gill
Plamondon
LeBlanc
Zahid— 4

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 55 carried.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 56. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 57.

● (1635)

(The House divided on Motion No. 56, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 1341*)

YEAS

Members

Ashton
Beaulieu
Blaikie
Boulerice
Brosseau
Caron
Aubin
Benson
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Caesar-Chavannes
Choquette

Government Orders

Cullen
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Duvall
Garrison
Hughes
Jolibois
Kwan
MacGregor
Masse (Windsor West)
Moore
Paupé
Quach
Ste-Marie
Thériault

Dubé
Dusseau
Fortin
Hardcastle
Johns
Julian
Laverdière
Manly
May (Saaneich—Gulf Islands)
Nantel
Philpott
Sansoucy
Stetski
Weir— 40

Maloney
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Morneau
Morrissey
Murray
Nater
Nicholson
O'Connell
Oliver
O'Toole
Paradis
Peschisolido
Picard
Qualtrough
Ratansi
Richards
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Ruimy
Saini
Sangha
Saroya
Schieffe
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
ShIPLEY
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sopuck
Sorenson
Stanton
Stubbs
Tabbara
Tassi
Trost
Vandenbeld
Virani
Warkentin
Webber
Wong
Yip
Yurdiga

Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)

Motz
Nassif
Nault
Nuttall
Oliphant
O'Regan
Ouellette
Paul-Hus
Peterson
Poissant
Raitt
Reid
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Schmale
Serré
Shanahan
Shields
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Sorbara
Spengemann
Strahl
Sweet
Tan
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vaughan
Wagantall
Waugh
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Young
Zimmer— 230

NAYS

Members

Aboulaif
Albrecht
Alghabra
Anderson
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Barrett
Beech
Bennett
Bergen
Berthold
Bittle
Boissonnault
Brassard
Breton
Carrie
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Chong
Cooper
Cuzner
Damoff
DeCoursey
Dhillon
Doherty
Drouin
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Easter
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Finley
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Garneau
Genois
Gladu
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Graham
Harder
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Joly
Jordan
Kelly
Khalid
Kmiec
Lametti
Lapointe
Leitch
Levitt
Lighthound
Lobb
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)

Albas
Aldag
Anandasangaree
Arnold
Arya
Badawey
Barlow
Baylis
Bendayan
Benzen
Bernier
Bibeau
Blair
Bossio
Bratina
Calkins
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Clarke
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davidson
Dhaliwal
Diotte
Dreeshen
Dubourg
Duguid
Dzerowicz
Eglinski
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Falk (Provencher)
Fergus
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Généreux
Gerretsen
Godin
Goodale
Gourde
Hajdu
Hardie
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Hutchings
Jeneroux
Jones
Jowhari
Kent
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lefebvre
Leslie
Liepert
Lloyd
Lockhart
Longfield
Lukowski
Maguire

Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Morneau
Morrissey
Murray
Nater
Nicholson
O'Connell
Oliver
O'Toole
Paradis
Peschisolido
Picard
Qualtrough
Ratansi
Richards
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Ruimy
Saini
Sangha
Saroya
Schieffe
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
ShIPLEY
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sopuck
Sorenson
Stanton
Stubbs
Tabbara
Tassi
Trost
Vandenbeld
Virani
Warkentin
Webber
Wong
Yip
Yurdiga

PAIRED

Members

Gill
Plamondon

LeBlanc
Zahid— 4

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 56 defeated. I therefore declare Motion No. 57 defeated.

● (1640)

[English]

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi (for the Minister of Finance) moved that Bill C-97, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 19, 2019 and other measures, as amended, be concurred in at report stage with further amendments.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And five or more members having risen:

• (1645)

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

(Division No. 1342)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Amos	Anandasangaree
Arseneault	Arya
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Baylis
Beech	Bendayan
Bennett	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Boissonnault	Bossio
Bratina	Breton
Caesar-Chavannes	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Champagne	Chen
Cormier	Cuzner
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeCoursey	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Eyking	Eyolfson
Fergus	Finnigan
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Garneau	Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones	Goodale
Gould	Graham
Hajdu	Hardie
Harvey	Hébert
Hehr	Hogg
Holland	Housefather
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Joly
Jones	Jordan
Jowhari	Khalid
Khera	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lefebvre
Leslie	Levitt
Lightbound	Lockhart
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)	McCrimmon
McDonald	McGuinty
McKay	McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendès	Mendicino
Mihychuk (Soeurs)	Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des- Morrissey)
Morneau	Morrissey
Murray	Nassif
Nault	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
O'Regan	Ouellette
Paradis	Peschisolido
Peterson	Philpott
Picard	Poissant
Qualtrough	Ratansi
Rioux	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers

Romanado	Rota
Rudd	Ruimy
Sahota	Saini
Samson	Sangha
Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Schulte
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand	Simms
Sohi	Sorbara
Spengemann	Tabbara
Tan	Tassi
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Virani	Weir
Whalen	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young— 160

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Abouttaif	Albas
Albrecht	Anderson
Angus	Arnold
Ashton	Aubin
Barlow	Barrett
Beaulieu	Benson
Benzen	Bergen
Bernier	Berthold
Blaikie	Boudrias
Boulerice	Boutin-Sweet
Brassard	Brousseau
Calkins	Caron
Carrie	Chong
Choquette	Clarke
Cooper	Cullen
Davidson	Diotte
Doherty	Dreeshen
Dubé	Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dusseault	Duvall
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Finley	Fortin
Garrison	Généreux
Genius	Gladu
Godin	Gourde
Hardcastle	Harder
Hoback	Hughes
Jeneroux	Johns
Jolibois	Julian
Kelly	Kent
Kmiec	Kwan
Laverdière	Leitch
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	Lukiwski
MacGregor	Maguire
Masse (Windsor West)	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Moore	Motz
Nantel	Nater
Nicholson	Nuttall
O'Toole	Paul-Hus
Pauzé	Quach
Raït	Reid
Richards	Sansoucy
Saroya	Schmale
Shields	Shiple
Sopuck	Sorenson
Stanton	Ste-Marie
Stetski	Strahl
Stubbs	Sweet
Thériault	Tilson
Trost	Van Kesteren
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Wong	Yurdiga
Zimmer — 111	

PAIRED

Members

Gill	LeBlanc
------	---------

Routine Proceedings

Plamondon

Zahid— 4

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

When shall the bill be read a third time? Pursuant to an order made on Tuesday, May 28, later this day.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): 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 Nanaimo—Ladysmith, Housing; the hon. member for Windsor—Tecumseh, International Trade; the hon. member for Bow River, Justice.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

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

* * *

CUSTOMS TARIFF

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi (for the Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-101, An Act to amend the Customs Tariff and the Canadian International Trade Tribunal Act.

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

* * *

• (1650)

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

Ms. Pam Damoff (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1) I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the report of the Canadian Parliamentary Delegation regarding its participation at the Bilateral Mission to the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia and the Republic of Rwanda, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia and Kigali, Rwanda, from March 10 to 16.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

INDIGENOUS AND NORTHERN AFFAIRS

Hon. MaryAnn Mihychuk (Kildonan—St. Paul, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 21st report of the Standing Committee on Indigenous and Northern Affairs, entitled “Main Estimates 2019-20”.

[*Translation*]

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Hon. Larry Bagnell (Yukon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 96th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs regarding amendments to the Standing Orders concerning the mandate of the

Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs and oversight of the Centre Block rehabilitation project, as well as the long-term vision and plan.

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Anthony Housefather (Mount Royal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 27th report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights, entitled “Striking of Passages from the Evidence of the Meeting Held on Tuesday, May 28, 2019”.

[*English*]

LIAISON

Hon. Judy A. Sgro (Humber River—Black Creek, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 107(3) I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 11th report of the Liaison Committee, entitled “Committee Activities and Expenditures - April 1, 2018 - March 31, 2019”.

HEALTH

Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 25th report of the Standing Committee on Health in relation to Bill S-248, an act respecting national physicians' day.

Bill S-248 would designate May 1 as national physicians' day. I would like to thank retired Hon. Senator Arthur Eggleton and the hon. member for Vancouver Centre for bringing the bill forward. The committee took studied bill and decided to report it back to the House with no amendments.

* * *

• (1655)

NET-ZERO GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS ACT

Mr. Nathaniel Erskine-Smith (Beaches—East York, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-454, An Act respecting net-zero greenhouse gas emissions.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to introduce the net-zero greenhouse gas emissions bill. This government has made significant and meaningful progress to tackle climate change, but greater ambition is now required to meet our national, intergenerational and our moral obligations. Science demands greater action.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change notes, “in model pathways with no or limited overshoot of 1.5°C, global net anthropogenic CO₂ emissions declined by about 45% from the 2010 levels by 2030, reaching net-zero by 2050.”

Our international allies are already undertaking this difficult work. The U.K., in early May, published a road map to net-zero by 2050. The EU Commission, and EU Parliament, have adopted the same standards.

Routine Proceedings

We have made important progress such as price on pollution, phasing out coal, slashing methane emissions, significant investments in public transit, clean energies and more, but the science demands greater ambition. That is why the bill is so important.

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

* * *

PETITIONS

PHYSICIAN-ASSISTED DYING

Mr. David Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have four petitions on three subjects. The first two petitions deal with Bill C-418.

The petitioners ask Parliament to support the bill. It would amend the Criminal Code to make it an offence to intimidate a medical practitioner, nurse practitioner, pharmacist or any other health care professional for the purpose of compelling them to take part in the provision of medical assistance in dying. It would also makes it an offence to dismiss from employment or to refuse to employ such practitioners for the reason only that they refuse to take part in that activity.

RURAL CRIME

Mr. David Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the third petition calls on the Government of Canada to fully fund the RCMP in order to deal with rural crime issues.

AGRICULTURE

Mr. David Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my last petition calls on Parliament to enshrine in legislation the inalienable right of farmers and other Canadians to freely save, reuse, select, exchange, condition, store and sell the seeds from their farms. It recognizes the inherent rights of farmers to freely do that.

[*Translation*]

IRAN

Ms. Hélène Laverdière (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by over 15,000 citizens and residents of Canada.

This petition points out that the closure of our embassy in Tehran and the expulsion of Iraqi diplomats had a serious impact on the consular services offered to Iranians living in Canada. There is no one to help them on the ground.

[*English*]

It has also had a negative impact on Iranian citizens who want to visit Canada and cannot access visa services, as well as on Canadian citizens who get into trouble in Iran and do not get the best consular service they can get. They remind us that our European allies, notably the United Kingdom, did renew links with Iran after the adoption of the the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

The petitioners ask the Canadian government to be true to its commitment and re-establish diplomatic relations with Iran, which would enable us to reopen an embassy in Tehran and have Iranian representatives in Ottawa.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I just want to remind the hon. members, as I see quite a few people who want to present petitions, to try to be as concise and precise as possible.

The hon. member for Brome—Missisquoi.

● (1700)

[*Translation*]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Hon. Denis Paradis (Brome—Missisquoi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Vermont Agency of Natural Resources has granted permit approval to expand the landfill in Coventry, Vermont. Right next door, Lake Memphremagog supplies drinking water to nearly 175,000 people in my region, including those from Compton—Stanstead and Sherbrooke.

The petitioners are calling on the Minister of Foreign Affairs to ask the International Joint Commission to conduct an environmental impact assessment of the plan to expand the landfill in Coventry, Vermont, by 51 acres.

[*English*]

PALLIATIVE CARE

Mr. Dave Van Kesteren (Chatham-Kent—Leamington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a number of petitions.

The first one is on palliative care. It is a petition to establish a national strategy on palliative care.

PHYSICIAN-ASSISTED DYING

Mr. Dave Van Kesteren (Chatham-Kent—Leamington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I also have a host of other petitions, which are on the same subject. These are petitions to establish conscience protections for physicians in health care institutions.

[*Translation*]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. François Choquette (Drummond, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition signed by hundreds of Canadian citizens who are upset about cuts to French-language services in Ontario.

Given that the Ontario government made cuts to services in French that will affect the the Franco-Ontarian community's development and quality of life, the petitioners are calling on the Government of Canada to show some leadership by engaging with the provinces and territories to ensure that people's constitutional language rights are respected across the country.

I would like to acknowledge the contribution of Ms. Chagnon, who collected signatures for several petitions to bring about this change.

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

Mr. John Nater (Perth—Wellington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present this petition signed by a number of petitioners in my riding of Perth—Wellington.

Routine Proceedings

The petitioners call on the government to allow farmers to save or use select, exchange and sell seeds.

STATUS OF WOMEN

Ms. Sheri Benson (Saskatoon West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition on behalf of the Women's March Canada and the Saskatoon members.

They point out that feminist women's organizations have been struggling for decades to keep the lights on and the doors open due to a lack of federal core funding. They point out that direct federal funding to women's organizations represents less than 0.01% of the total federal program, spending only \$1 for every woman in Canada.

The petitioners therefore ask the Government of Canada to immediately provide secure, multi-year core operational funding to feminist women's organizations and set national standards to ensure equality of access to services and protections for all women.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

Ms. Rachael Harder (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today I have the privilege of presenting two petitions, one that is an electronic petition and one that is paper-based. Both of these petitions are of the same nature.

The petitioners call on the government to support Bill C-419, which is a private member's bill that I have on the floor on the House of Commons, calling for greater consumer protection with regards to credit card use. Ultimately, this comes down to fairness and transparency on behalf of Canadians.

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have three petitions to table.

The first is e-petition 1984 on the protection of the environment. This petition was established by a retired physician and member of the Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment, Raquel Feroe. It represents 1,000 signatures in support of enacting an environmental bill of rights for Canada to impose public trust duty on the federal government to protect the environment and give a bundle of rights to citizens.

I am pleased to say that today e-petition 2172 was closed. I look forward to tabling that. It will be another 1,800 signatures, calling for an environmental bill of rights.

• (1705)

PHARMACARE

Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is signed by over 1,000 Albertans from across the province, calling on the government to take action to establish a universal prescription drug plan for pharmacare.

[*Translation*]

FORCED MIGRATION

Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the third petition has been signed by Franco-Albertans who say that, every minute, 31 people are forced to flee their homes. The majority of them live in the poorest countries on the planet under extremely difficult conditions: armed conflict, climate change, massive

development projects and persecution. The causes of forced migration are multiple, complex and interwoven.

The petitioners are calling on the House of Commons to support grassroots organizations working for peace, democracy and human rights and to invest more in diplomatic and peaceful solutions to armed conflicts.

Nobody should be forced to flee their home.

[*English*]

VISION CARE

Mrs. Carol Hughes (Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusking, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to once again rise to table petitions in support of a national framework for action to promote eye health and vision care.

The petitioners note that the number of Canadians with vision loss is expected to double in the next 20 years and that this is a crisis that affects all segments of the Canadian population, with Canada's most vulnerable population, seniors, children and indigenous peoples at particular risk. They note that a multi-stakeholder response should reflect the underlying issues common to the prevention of all eye disease and vision loss that will reduce risk, increase early detection and improve access to quality health care services.

[*Translation*]

The petitioners join thousands of Canadians across the country who recognize the importance of eye health and would like all levels of government to work together to develop a national eye health strategy and take action.

[*English*]

PLASTICS

Mr. Paul Manly (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, GP): Mr. Speaker, it is my honour to present two petitions.

The first petition is an electronic petition with 9,676 signatures. The petitioners are calling for a national plastic strategy, which includes an education and public awareness campaign highlighting the scope and impact of global plastic pollution; a ban on the manufacturing, distribution and use of all plastics that cannot be recycled; a ban on all single-use plastics that are hard to recycle and most often end up in landfills and waterways; a commitment to encourage a circular plastics economy by keeping recyclable plastics out of landfills and instead reusing them in a closed-loop system, effectively saving billions in manufacturing costs while producing less water waste; a commitment to invest in the infrastructure on a municipal, provincial and federal level to collect, sort, process, recycle and reuse all plastic packaging; and a zero plastic waste Canada by 2030 by ensuring all plastic packaging is 100% recyclable, reusable or compostable.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. Paul Manly (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, GP): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is for Veterans Affairs Canada.

The petitioners call upon the Minister of Veterans Affairs to remove any statutory limits on back pay eligibility for the disability allowance, and work with individual veterans to achieve just and due compensation for the disability allowance in a timely manner.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

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

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1710)

[*Translation*]

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2019, NO. 1

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi (for the Minister of Finance) moved that Bill C-97, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 19, 2019 and other measures be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Joël Lightbound (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise in the House today to speak to Bill C-97.

This bill will help implement major investments included in the 2019 budget. Most importantly, it will give the government new tools to help middle-class Canadians, reduce inequality and ensure that in Canada prosperity is truly inclusive.

I will stress that I am talking about new measures. Bill C-97 builds on our accomplishments and the progress we have made these last four years. We have to remember how we got here and how we achieved the results we see in Canada today. In 2015, the situation was very different. Economic growth was slow or even stagnant. Unemployment was up, and Canada was in a technical recession. Wages were not going up fast enough, but the cost of living, as we know, just keeps increasing.

Government Orders

[*English*]

Some families were having a tough time making ends meet, while saving for the future or for an emergency. In the fall of that same year, Canadians made a different choice. I think it was a very smart choice, in all impartiality. They chose a plan that would invest in the middle class, a plan that would make big investments in health, housing and the environment, while also staying fiscally responsible.

One of the first things Liberals did as a government was to ask the wealthiest 1% of Canadians to contribute a little more so that middle-class Canadians could have more money in their pockets. Today, over nine million Canadians are benefiting from the middle-class tax cut.

In 2016, we introduced the Canada child benefit. This measure has helped lift almost 300,000 children out of poverty. What is more, our government indexed the Canada child benefit payments two years ahead of schedule, so that benefits could keep pace with the rising cost of living. In July, benefits will increase with inflation to ensure that hard-working parents continue to have the support they need with the high cost of raising their kids.

With the CCB, nine out of 10 Canadian families with children are receiving more money than they received under the previous system of child benefits, where cheques were sent to families of millionaires, something that the Harper Conservatives and today's Conservatives fought to preserve while voting against the Canada child benefit.

For the 2019-20 year, on average, families benefiting from the CCB will receive around \$7,000 to help with the high cost of raising kids, an amount that will continue to rise with the cost of living, as I have mentioned. According to the OECD, and I understand it is not the Fraser Institute, which the Conservatives like to quote, even though the studies they refer to often in the House have been debunked by just about anyone serious who has taken a look at it, precisely, because they fail to take into account the Canada child benefit.

However, according to the OECD, when the CCB is combined with the middle-class tax cut, a typical, middle-class family of four in Canada, on average, now has \$2,000 more in their pockets than they did under the Harper Conservatives. This is significant progress.

We did not stop there. We replaced the old working income tax benefit with the more generous Canada workers benefit. The new benefit puts more money in the pockets of more than two million Canadian workers who are working hard to join the middle class.

Government Orders

In addition, to support Canada's hard-working entrepreneurs, we cut the small business tax rate twice, dropping it to 9% in January. It is now the lowest small business tax rate in the G7, and the fourth lowest of the 36 members of the OECD, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, which I just referred to.

[*Translation*]

The results of the measures adopted by our government since fall 2015 speak for themselves. More than one million jobs were created in the Canadian economy. Last year, all job gains were in full-time positions. The unemployment rate is at its lowest in more than 40 years, and salaries are increasing faster than the rate of inflation. In sum, the country is heading in the right direction and the Canadian economy is booming.

Moreover, employment gains have greatly benefited groups that are often under-represented in the labour market, such as new immigrants, single mothers, indigenous peoples living on reserve and young Canadians who do not have a high school diploma. This represents considerable progress, but a lot of work remains to be done to continue reducing inequality in this country and to ensure that the growth and prosperity we are enjoying benefit as many people as possible.

Some Canadians remain concerned about the future. They are worried about their job security because the nature of work is evolving. They are worried that they will not be able to buy a home because housing is too expensive. They are worried about their retirement and they wonder whether they will have enough savings. These are legitimate concerns, and we will leave no one behind.

● (1715)

Bill C-97 is the next step in our plan to invest in the middle class and grow the economy today and for years to come. I will take a moment to elaborate on this before getting into some of the details of Bill C-97. Over the past three years, the government's action was based on three main pillars. That is the plan we presented to Canadians and it is working very well.

One of these three main pillars is investment in infrastructure. We know there are infrastructure needs across the country, from coast to coast, and we know how serious they are. Our environment also demands investments in public transportation infrastructure, for example. We committed to investing \$180 billion over 12 years in infrastructure. These investments are paying off across the country and are helping many municipalities and provinces carry out meaningful infrastructure projects. Sometimes these projects appeal to the imagination, as is the case with public transportation. Others are a bit less glamorous, but just as important. Take waste water for example. We lose a lot of drinking water to aging waste water treatment systems.

The second pillar involves reducing inequalities through the measures I mentioned. These measures have helped reduce poverty by 20% in Canada. Child poverty was reduced by 40% in just three years. That is huge.

The third pillar is competitiveness. We are making sure that Canada has access to foreign markets, whether through the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership, CETA, the renegotiated NAFTA, reduced small-

business tax rates or strategic investments, all of which were sorely needed in Canada during the decade that Stephen Harper and the Conservative Party of Canada were in power. They neglected the sciences and stopped investing in science. This undermines our country's competitiveness and prosperity over the long term.

Those are the three main pillars. In budget 2018, we reaffirmed the importance we place on science by making the largest investment in science in Canadian history, after a dark decade for scientists, science, research and innovation under Stephen Harper's Conservative government.

The budget and Bill C-97 are based on these three main pillars, which are working and have made Canada one of the G7's leading economies since we came to power three years ago.

Speaking of competitiveness, let us talk about skills.

[*English*]

That is something that I would like to talk about. In the first quarter of 2019, there were more Canadians employed than at any moment in Canada's history, including more women employed than at any moment in Canadian history. That is great news but we cannot take anything for granted. We know that not everyone has the right skills to take advantage of some of the new well-paying opportunities.

The nature of work is changing around the world and the challenge for workers, employers and governments is to find new ways to make sure that people have the skills they need to succeed in the changing work environment. For example, automation is on the rise. The OECD estimates that about one in 10 Canadian jobs are at high risk of automation within the next 10 to 20 years and that one out of three jobs is likely to experience significant changes.

Canada is not alone in this. Other countries will face the same challenge, as workers try to figure out how to get the training they need to keep their existing jobs or to prepare for new jobs.

[*Translation*]

We are determined to ensure that Canadian workers have the skills they need to succeed on the job market of tomorrow. To get there, Canadians must have access to appropriate training. That is why we introduced a new program, the Canada training benefit, in budget 2019. It is a personalized, portable benefit that will help Canadians get the time and money they need to learn new skills.

Bill C-97 will implement an important element of the benefit, namely a \$250 annual credit for every worker to be put toward the cost of future training. This credit can add up to \$5,000 over the course of a career. Eligible workers will receive their first credit this year, in 2019, and may start using it next year to register for a course they may need.

● (1720)

The Canada training benefit will open more doors for workers, which will help them contribute to the Canadian economy and benefit from its growth. This measure will be equally helpful for employers because it will give them access to a more skilled workforce, which will help them grow their businesses and create more well-paying jobs.

Clearly, if we want to prepare Canadians for the high-quality jobs of tomorrow, we must pay close attention to my generation and to young Canadians, something our government fully understands. When the Minister of Finance introduced budget 2019, he highlighted the steps we have taken to remove barriers to education and training.

[English]

With the measures in this budget implementation act, students would not have to start repaying their Canada student loans until six months after they graduated, and interest would not accumulate during that period on these loans. Paired with the budget's commitment to lower the interest rate on Canada student loans, the interest-free grace period is expected to save the average borrower approximately \$2,000 over the lifetime of a loan.

We are taking these steps because young Canadians need our help. They are the most educated, connected and diverse generation this country has ever seen. They are changing our communities for the better and are taking the lead in building a fairer and more sustainable future.

At the same time, we are hearing from many young Canadians that they are still worried about what the future holds for them. Will they be able to afford college or university? Will there be good jobs ready for them when they graduate? Will they be able to afford a good place to live? We are taking action to answer more of these questions for young people and for all Canadians.

Let us take housing. Many young Canadians dream of owning their first home, a feeling shared by middle-class families. However, with rising house prices, it is getting increasingly harder for people to make that dream a reality. Our government believes that every Canadian should have a safe and affordable place to call home. That is why we are taking important steps to make housing more accessible and affordable, especially for first-time homebuyers.

The legislation we are debating proposes measures to help Canadians take their first step toward home ownership. It would amend the National Housing Act to allow the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation to offer shared equity mortgages to eligible first-time homebuyers. This important measure would be called the first-time homebuyer incentive. Through this new incentive, CMHC would provide 5% of the value of a home for a first-time homebuyer, helping to reduce the size of an insured mortgage and lowering monthly mortgage payments.

To encourage the construction of new housing, the incentive would increase to 10% for newly built homes. This could mean a lot for many young Canadians. For a middle-class family buying a new condo or new house worth \$400,000, the savings could be about \$225 a month. That could make a real difference. It is expected that this new incentive could help as many as 100,000 Canadian families buy their first home.

[Translation]

That is not all. The budget implementation bill also proposes to increase the limit on withdrawals from the home buyers' plan, or HBP. These amounts, which first-time homebuyers can withdraw tax-free, can help fund the down payment. As announced in budget 2019, the limit is being increased from \$25,000 to \$35,000 per

Government Orders

person, or from \$50,000 to \$70,000 for a couple. The maximum withdrawal amount had not been adjusted in 10 years, so we thought it was time to do so. Modernizing the homebuyers' plan will help more people purchase their first home or first condo.

In addition, Bill C-97 will enact the new legislation for the national housing strategy. In concrete terms, it will require the federal government to give priority to the housing needs of the most vulnerable Canadians.

The government will also be required to report back to Parliament on the progress made in implementing the strategy and in achieving the desired results with respect to housing. These targets, such as cutting homelessness in half in this country and building 100,000 new units, as well as repairing and renovating another 300,000, will make a real difference in the lives of many Canadians.

I think these reinvestments in housing are all the more important in light of the federal withdrawal from housing investment, which, I should point out, began before the Conservative government took office and escalated during the 10 years that Stephen Harper was in power.

• (1725)

I think it is time for the federal government to take responsibility for housing and make a bold, ambitious comeback. That is what the national housing strategy does.

The bill also offers meaningful assistance for Canadian seniors, because all Canadians deserve a secure and dignified retirement, free of financial worries. Sadly, retirement can be a daunting prospect for some seniors, especially those living on low incomes.

Since 2015, the government has taken a number of steps to make retirement more affordable. For instance, it restored the age of eligibility for old age security and the guaranteed income supplement to 65. The previous government had moved it up to 67, plunging hundreds of thousands of the most vulnerable Canadians into poverty.

We increased the GIS top-up for single seniors, a measure that benefited 900,000 Canadians.

[English]

Our government also reached an historic agreement with the provinces to enhance the CPP, which will raise the maximum retirement benefit by up to 50% over time. This will help more than one million families who would have faced a drop in their standard of living when they retired.

Private Members' Business

Budget 2019 and this BIA propose a series of new measures to help even more Canadians age with confidence in their finances. To help low-income working seniors, Bill C-97 proposes to increase the earnings exemption for the guaranteed income supplement and to expand the exemption to self-employment income. This means that more low-income working seniors would be able to keep more of their pay and their benefits.

We are also taking steps to ensure that everyone who is eligible receives her or his retirement benefit from the CPP. While the standard age to receive CPP benefits is 65, some people choose to delay receiving their retirement benefits until age 70, at which time they will receive a bit more each month. A small number of people, however, are currently missing out on receiving their CPP benefits. This happens because some apply too late, and some do not apply at all. To ensure that all Canadian workers receive the full value of the benefits they deserve, this BIA proposes to proactively enrol, as of 2020, CPP contributors who are age 70 or older who have not yet applied to receive their retirement benefits. It is estimated that approximately 40,000 Canadians would begin to receive a retirement pension as a result. They deserve that money. Making sure that they get it is the right thing to do, and this legislation would make it happen.

Budget 2019 and Bill C-97 are about investing in people, and I have given plenty of examples in this speech. However, it is also about investing in communities. That is why budget 2019 proposes to support local infrastructure priorities by providing a one-time top-up of \$2.2 billion, doubling the federal municipal infrastructure commitment in 2018-19. This \$2.2 billion injection of cash this year would help cities and towns of all sizes, as well as indigenous communities. It would provide them with much-needed funds to address short-term priorities and crucial repairs and help them finance other important projects, such as recreational arenas, soccer facilities, new roads, public transit extensions, improvements to drinking water infrastructure and so on. Transferring funds to communities will get projects built. Supporting this BIA will get projects built.

In recent years, this funding has supported approximately 4,000 projects each year that have contributed to productivity and economic growth, a cleaner environment and stronger communities. We promised this help, and we are delivering in this BIA.

I could go on about what is in this budget, because when it comes to investing in the middle class, there is a lot of good news to share. However, I will conclude with this. Canadians have made a lot of progress since the fall of 2015. They should be proud of the strong communities and the strong economy they have helped build.

[*Translation*]

I think it is a source of pride for Canadians, or it should be, that in three short years, we managed to turn around the situation that the Stephen Harper government ineptly and regrettably got us into. During that decade, we saw the lowest growth in employment since the Second World War, the lowest growth in exports and a disastrous economic record.

• (1730)

They also managed to add \$150 billion to the national debt.

We managed to turn around the country's fortunes with the best economy in the G7, the lowest unemployment rate in nearly 40 years, and a 20% reduction in poverty in 2017. It never occurred to them to reduce poverty and inequality. It was the right thing to do for the country. To us it is obvious that the more inclusive our prosperity is and the more we reduce inequality, the better off the entire Canadian economy will be.

That is what we have managed to do and that is what we will continue to do.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The hon. member will have 10 minutes for questions and comments when the House resumes debate on this bill.

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*]

HEALTH CARE DELIVERY IN RURAL CANADA

Hon. Robert Nault (Kenora, Lib.) moved:

That the House: (a) call on the Standing Committee on Health to undertake a study and report its findings to determine (i) the factors that contribute to significant disparities in the health outcomes of rural Canadians, compared to those in urban centres, (ii) strategies, including the use of modern and rapidly improving communications technologies, to improve health care delivery to rural Canadians; and (b) call on the government to work with the provinces and territories, and relevant stakeholders, to further address and improve health care delivery in rural Canada.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is an honour and a pleasure to get the chance to speak to my private member's motion, Motion No. 226, which relates to health care delivery in rural Canada.

As a representative of the Kenora riding, one of the largest rural ridings in Canada, which stretches from almost the American border all the way to Hudson Bay, I know this is probably one of the easiest ridings to use to explain what it means for an area to be remote and inaccessible, or accessible only by plane or a winter road when the lakes freeze over.

Private Members' Business

This is an important subject matter for all rural Canadians, because it is one of those issues all Canadians think about, which is their health care, the health care delivery and the ability of government to deliver health care products to all Canadians, particularly in the north. For these reasons, northwestern Ontario presents a unique case study in many ways. From infrastructure to environment, transportation and employment, the north forces us to think outside the box.

Health care can be approached from many different angles, including mental health treatment, health care providers and availability, prescription drug coverage and culturally appropriate care, just to name a few.

The 2016 Statistics Canada census data indicates that Canada's population was over 35 million individuals, of whom 16.8% live in rural Canada. The 2006 report by the Canadian Institute for Health Information entitled "How Healthy are Rural Canadians? An Assessment of Their Health Status and Health Determinants" found that rural Canadians have higher death rates, higher infant mortality rates and shorter life expectancies than their urban counterparts.

Health-related factors such as a higher proportion of smokers, lower consumption of fruit and vegetables, and obesity disproportionately affect rural residents. Additionally, the population in rural areas tends to be older than in urban areas.

The recruitment and retention of physicians and health care professionals are also a significant challenge. Throughout the years that I have been involved in this, it has never been easy to find enough professionals to work in rural Canada. According to 2016 data from the Canadian Institute for Health Information, there were approximately 84,000 physicians in Canada, of whom only 6,790, or 8% , practised in rural settings.

In 2006, the Canadian Institute for Health Information issued a report that found that populations living in rural areas had a shorter average life expectancy by almost three years for men, as well as higher smoking rates compared to their urban counterparts. These numbers are statistically significant, according to the report.

Mortality risk for diseases such as heart disease and heart attacks, as well as respiratory diseases like influenza and pneumonia, were also significantly higher in rural versus large urban areas. There is a variation in the levels of services available, as rural areas lack the population base to warrant the construction of extensive health infrastructure.

In addition, rural and remote communities face challenges in recruiting and retaining health care professionals. I will keep repeating that, because it is something we talk about in my riding almost weekly.

On the youth side, there is no process for measuring health disparities in Canada. If we look at the experience of rural children and youth in the health care system, we get a good idea of what is happening. Indigenous populations, particularly those that are rural and remote, are the most underserved communities in all of Canada.

● (1735)

I would like to take a minute to provide an example of health care delivery in the north so that we can see how different it is from the urban experience.

In September 2018, the Sioux Lookout First Nations Health Authority released "Our Children and Youth Health Report", which represents the experiences of 31 first nations communities in the Sioux Lookout area.

Since 1991, the population of the Sioux Lookout area first nations has grown by 74%. The primary point of care for the majority of these communities is the local nursing station, and in many cases, emergency services are available only by plane. For example, women from Sioux Lookout first nations leave their homes and families and travel hundreds of kilometres to give birth at a hospital. Can members imagine being put in a situation like that? In these communities, basically for all the births, families have to fly out, leave for weeks when it is close to the due date, and then be prepared to spend weeks waiting for the child to be born.

The primary point of care for the majority of these communities is their local nursing station, and in many cases, emergency services are available only by plane. For example, women from Sioux Lookout area first nations leave their homes, as I said, and if infants need emergency care, they are transported out by medevac, because there are no emergency departments in these communities. Since 2012, there has been an 11% increase in the rate of emergency room visits for infants.

In the Sioux Lookout area, first nations youth attend the emergency room department for mental health reasons at a rate five times greater than the Ontario average. Between 2012 and 2016, the rate of emergency department visits for mental health increased by 123%.

These are examples of just some of the issues faced by rural and remote communities when it comes to health care delivery. I am here to talk about how we can find a way to deal with the challenges that rural communities face in making sure that their health care and their standards are equal to the health care standards of urban centres.

Jurisdictional issues pose one of the largest roadblocks to providing quality health care in the north. What is the role of our levels of government in this game of what I would call jurisdictional football? The federal government is responsible for the delivery of health care to certain population groups. Of course, the provinces are responsible for the general population of the province.

Section 10 of the Canada Health Act stipulates that each province's health insurance scheme must be universal, which means that it "must entitle one hundred per cent of the insured persons of the province to the insured health services provided for by the plan". What does this mean? It boils down to the need for a collaborative approach. Rather than working from the top down, we need to approach these communities and regions to establish their unique needs and find those solutions.

Private Members' Business

Simply put, there is no cookie-cutter answer, and what works for one community may not work for another. The bottom line is that we need to listen to those who live and work within the system every day to make sure that we understand how to deliver health care in rural Canada.

When we have these discussions, sometimes it is hard for people to compare apples and apples or oranges and oranges, so I spent some time doing some comparisons between Canada and Australia. Like most developed countries, Canada and Australia have publicly funded, universal health care coverage. The two countries have similar population densities and geographic areas. As of June 2018, just under 25 million people resided in Australia, and 11.4% resided in remote or rural locations. The Australian federal government is playing an active role in addressing health disparities between urban and rural or remote populations.

• (1740)

The Australian government provides funding to incentivize physicians to work in rural or remote areas and to encourage the uptake of telemedicine technology in those areas. Like rural Canada, rural Australia is under-serviced with respect to the number of physicians. However, the Australian government also realizes that to change that, it needs to have a solution. This is what Australia is doing, and it is something that I think Canada should consider.

Like rural Canada, rural Australia is under-serviced, so in 2009, the Rural Health Standing Committee of the Australian Health Ministers' Advisory Council was asked to develop a national strategic framework for rural and remote health. It was published in 2011, and then updated in 2016.

In 2014, the Australian government implemented the indigenous Australians' health programme to improve access to health services that are culturally appropriate, throughout Australia.

In June 2017, the Government of Australia passed legislation to establish a national rural health commissioner, as part of the government's efforts to reform health care in rural and remote Australia. As in Canada, the indigenous population in Australia is more likely than non-indigenous Australians to have respiratory diseases, mental health problems, cardiovascular disease, diabetes and chronic kidney disease, as well as reduced life expectancy.

In the private members' business we are in, it is always good to try to do this from the perspective of making sure that it is non-partisan and that it crosses party lines. Last month, I was pleased to second Bill C-451, an act to establish a children's health commissioner of Canada, which was put forward by the member for Simcoe—Grey. Bill C-451 puts priority on the well-being, health, security and education of children and youth by recognizing that every child has the right to enjoy a standard of living that allows for the child's physical, mental and social development to flourish. To help see these measures through, the bill seeks to establish an independent commissioner to report, advise and provide recommendations to Parliament.

To complement Bill C-451, my motion seeks to shed further light on the health care delivery gaps between rural and urban Canadians. This area needs to be studied, because current evaluations of the health status of rural Canadians are very limited. Because we do not

have the population density to build some of the health infrastructure necessary to deliver adequate services, we must look at existing, new and emerging technologies to address this service gap. This particular type of study has never been undertaken in Canada, so I look forward to working with all parties to see that it takes place.

In my riding, we are working on an all nations hospital. We are looking at health care delivery in our region from the perspective of an all nations hospital health care system, to include everyone in the region. We have included all governments and the local communities to look at how best to deliver those kinds of services. This is a potential way forward.

I think that working together, as we did last week with the Minister of Indigenous Services when we announced our government's support for the all nations hospital health care system, we can find ways to better deliver health care in rural communities.

In conclusion, no matter whether a person is rich or poor, young or old, living in a rural or urban setting, Canada's public health care system must provide equal access and care to all. I believe very much that this government and this Parliament have a role to play in making sure that we do the right assessments and find the right structures to put in place good health care.

My last point is that if people are to be allowed to live their lives in rural Canada, including as seniors throughout their retirement years, we are going to have to find the right health care system to make sure that this takes place. Otherwise, as I hear from all my colleagues, a lot of seniors move to urban centres because they have few choices for places to live in rural Canada.

• (1745)

I thank the House for the opportunity to say a few words about this motion.

Hon. K. Kellie Leitch (Simcoe—Grey, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting this motion by the member for Kenora. It is a study that is long overdue.

I, like the member opposite, represent a rural riding, but I will also say as a physician that patients who live in rural communities have substantive and challenging issues. In Nunavut, if someone sprains their ankle, we can take care of that. However, if a child breaks their femur there, it is an expensive endeavour, both for the parents and the government, to bring them all the way to Ottawa to be treated.

I support the member's motion, but I would like to ask him if there are some specifics that we should be focusing on in the study to make sure that rural Canadians receive the health care they deserve.

Hon. Robert Nault: Mr. Speaker, there are some specifics I am looking for the health committee to review.

Private Members' Business

First of all, I would like to see the health committee go back and look at some of the reports and some of the commitments that were made by all levels of government in the early 2000s. In 2004 and 2006, the federal government was in the process of negotiating with the provinces, and part of the program for putting health care dollars in the hands of the provinces through equalization payments and through our social development program was to also include studies and/or analysis of health care throughout those provinces. In my case, in Ontario, it was intended to be an opportunity to look at and report on the success of health care delivery in Ontario, both rural and urban. That did not take place.

In fact, I am still wondering and questioning why no province has reported on that commitment that was made a number of years ago to tell Parliament and Canadians and rural Canadians just how their health care system was being delivered.

In answer to other questions that I will get in the next few minutes, I will elaborate on what I mean by that.

• (1750)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Christine Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to know why the member only moved one motion in the last four years. The motion was tabled last April.

Why is this the only motion he tabled? Why did he table a motion that is not binding instead of a bill that would have been a lot more binding? Why did he move a motion calling for study in committee, when we know that will never happen? The House will adjourn in two weeks and we will surely not have time to vote on the motion.

[*English*]

Hon. Robert Nault: Mr. Speaker, the member would be aware that I did not choose when I could present my motion. That is done by a process in this place. If I had been one of the first on the list, the motion would have been here two or three years ago. That is not the issue.

The real issue, as many of us know and as many of us will argue, is that we do not need to have this conversation, because it is a provincial jurisdiction. Health care being a provincial jurisdiction, the Government of Canada cannot move legislation to make things different in relation to rural care. We need a partnership with all the other levels of government, including provincial, municipal and first nations.

What I am looking for is co-operation from all governments, including indigenous and municipal, as I was talking about earlier in relation to my region, so that we can find better ways to deliver health care services.

I have said, and I will say again, that this is not a partisan issue. This is what Canada is all about. We have a huge piece of geography and we are trying our best to make sure that all citizens, no matter where they live, have good health care and better health care indicators, as I mentioned in my earlier comments. Our health care indicators in rural Canada are not as good as they are in the urban centres.

We need to work together. We need to start this debate. If I were the member, I would not worry so much about the election. Elections

come and go, and we will all be back in some form. We will want to continue to move on this conversation. I think rural Canadians deserve better than they are getting. We have not put enough time and emphasis on this issue.

I personally want to live my life in rural Canada, and I do not want to have to move when I get older because of health care or the lack of it. It is in the same way that this conversation is very fundamental and important for all rural Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak to Motion No. 226, which seeks to give instructions to the Standing Committee on Health regarding health care delivery in rural Canada.

There is an extremely concerning shortage of family doctors and nurses in Canada, particularly in rural areas. The lack of broadband Internet also prevents rural communities from accessing online health services. The committee should also consider the worrisome deterioration of rural hospitals in its study.

[*English*]

I want to thank the member for Kenora for bringing the motion before the House. My daughter was a nurse in his lovely riding, so she is well acquainted with its hospital and the health care services that are available there.

As the member for Sarnia—Lambton, I note that Sarnia is a mixture of urban and rural, so there are also quite a number of parts of my riding where services and transportation are not available.

I would like to start by talking about the current situation in health care in general in Canada.

We know there is already a shortage of doctors and nurses across the country. I have travelled from coast to coast to coast and spoken with people in various ridings. I would like to give members a few examples of the shortage, starting with what I think is one of the worst cases I have heard, which is Cape Breton.

Cape Breton was missing 52 emergency room physicians and a vascular surgeon. People who cut an artery in Cape Breton would lose a limb or die because they would not be able to get to Halifax in time to get the services.

Let us look across the country. Given the wait times in Ottawa, it takes six years to get a family doctor. The former member for Nanaimo—Ladysmith ran provincially, and one of the priority issues she brought up was the shortage of doctors in B.C. Truly, there is a shortage of health care workers.

This is particularly disturbing, as we have an aging population. Right now, one in six people is a senior, and that will be one in four in the next six to 10 years. With that comes a need for a number of different services.

Private Members' Business

First of all, we are seeing a movement toward more chronic disease, in part due to rising obesity rates, smoking issues and so on. Also, as people are living longer, we are seeing an increase in dementia, and there is a need for palliative care. Of course, I have been a strong advocate for palliative care during my time in the House. About 70% of Canadians do not have any access to palliative care, and this is especially true in rural and remote places. It is a pressing problem.

As I look to the government that has been in power for four years, I see absolutely no plan to address the gaps that exist regarding the resources for health care workers and all the infrastructure needed in places like Petrolia, which is one of the hamlets within my riding. Right now, the electrical and mechanical systems in place at the Charlotte Eleanor Englehart Hospital are so obsolete and so likely to fail that Petrolia is planning how it will shut down the hospital when the systems fail. All of the patients will have to be moved to the nearby high school. Petrolia needs \$5 million to repair that infrastructure.

I could tell members similar stories, from across the nation, of hospitals that have not received any funding for infrastructure. Clearly the provinces do not have money for that. One solution the government could bring forward in that light is a program that would specify rural hospitals and their infrastructure needs, which would address some of the outstanding issues there.

Another need in many rural and remote places is broadband Internet. As we move increasingly to using virtual services, such as virtual palliative care and virtual consultations, communities need broadband Internet to receive them. There is a huge need for this in the north. My riding has several places without good access to the Internet. I think it will be incredibly important to address this need.

• (1755)

One of the other problems with the rural and remote health care system is just accessing the services. Transportation can be very costly and, as the member for Kenora has mentioned, it can take a really long time. In Kenora, people transit by airplane. In my riding, even though there are many services, a lot of people have to go to nearby London, which is an hour away. For low-income people and those who do not have transportation, there is no service to take them for weekly cancer treatments or other procedures. Transportation is a big barrier, and we need to find solutions to address that.

There have been some really innovative solutions that I discovered when I was working on the palliative care private member's bill. One of them was the use of paramedics to deliver palliative care. Trained paramedics, during the hours they are not taking care of emergencies, would distribute pain medications and perform procedures that patients need. This is really cost-efficient, because they are already on the payroll, and it is a great service for people who have trouble accessing services and cannot get the transportation they need. It is those kinds of innovations that will be really important as we move forward.

Another issue in my riding—and I heard it is also an issue in Kenora—has to do with how to attract doctors, nurses and health care workers to go to rural places. There has to be some kind of incentive. One of the great innovations, also in Petrolia, was a clinic that was put together with multiple family physicians and nurse

practitioners providing various services. Because the doctors did not have to be sole family physicians working umpteen hours in practice and then being on call for emergencies, the balance of life and work was much better. There was a real effort made to attract doctors to that practice. They are doing a fine job and making services very accessible to people who live nearby. In fact, because of the quality, in some cases people are even coming from Samia to Petrolia to access services.

We need to come up with solutions on how to provide health care and work with the provinces and territories. Every region is different. We talked about some of the barriers, such as travel during bad weather, for accessing services, but in some places, the problems are different. Some places have an aging population. In my riding, 50% of people are over the age of 57, so care for seniors is a key issue, and I know that is true as well in Nova Scotia and a number of places across the country.

At the end of the day, I would be happy to have the health committee study this issue. I wish we had time in this parliamentary session, but, as has already been pointed out, it is unlikely that a study could be taken up at this point in time. Perhaps it will happen in a future Parliament.

This is an urgent need and something we need to consider. We need to put together a plan that will identify the health care workers required and how to get them. In some cases, there are enough workers in Canada; in some cases, we will have to change how we train doctors, for example. There was a very innovative example in New Brunswick, where, although there is no teaching hospital or university for residencies, the province partnered with Dalhousie University and Sherbrooke for a residency program that would provide medical services in New Brunswick and allow doctors to be certified. That kind of innovation is needed to address the health care worker issue.

In addition, there is a need for an infrastructure plan, as I have mentioned, for broadband Internet and hospital care and other services. For example, we see an increasing need for home care. Home care in rural and remote situations is increasingly difficult because of the amount of travel time and, in some cases, the weather, etc.

When we get this plan together with the resources and infrastructure and decide which services we will need as we move toward more chronic disease and an aging population with more dementia, thus requiring more palliative care, then we can start to execute that plan. It could not happen soon enough because, as I have said, one person in six being a senior now will be one in four within six to 10 years.

Private Members' Business

It is an urgent issue, and I am happy to support this motion.

• (1800)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Christine Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would first like to clarify something about the motion. Although the federal government does have jurisdictional powers over certain aspects of health care, including that of ensuring that all Canadians have equal access to health care services, the actual implementation of health services is a provincial responsibility.

The federal government provides health transfers to the provinces, but it is up to the provinces and the provinces alone to decide how to use those funds. Managing all health services falls under the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces. This motion is aimed at improving the delivery of health services. It therefore interferes directly in a provincial jurisdiction. The member himself even admitted it. Strategies and communications technologies pertain to health care management, so this motion extends beyond the federal government's general jurisdiction. Only the provinces can deliver health care directly to Canadians and are able to develop the strategies needed to change health care management.

The NDP recognizes the importance of respecting provincial jurisdiction, especially in Quebec. That is why we adopted the Sherbrooke declaration, which acknowledges Canada's asymmetry and affirms Quebec's right to opt out with compensation. The member's motion directly interferes in an area under provincial jurisdiction.

Let me say that the timing of this motion is peculiar. When the member answered my question, he said that he did not choose when to present his motion, but the fact is, he most certainly did have a choice. He could have chosen to present any number of measures over the past four years.

For example, I myself presented a number of bills and motions that I believed merited the attention of the House even though I was well aware they would not be debated. Unfortunately, members have only one chance to introduce a bill of their own, and that is if they are lucky. The member presented the motion a month ago knowing full well it would probably never be voted on. This motion would have to go to committee, but that will never happen.

If the member truly wanted to improve the health outcomes of rural Canadians, which, I recognize, is a very important issue, he could have chosen measures that do not overstep federal jurisdiction. For example, he could have asked that federal health transfers be increased by the amount requested by the provinces. The Quebec health minister has said that the federal government must stop meddling in provincial jurisdictions and that it start by increasing our health transfers.

Lack of money is one of the biggest obstacles to the implementation of different technologies that could help rural Canadians. Hospitals are already accumulating deficits because they pay nurses a lot of overtime due to the shortage of staff and staff burnout. Unfortunately, the increase in health transfers is not enough to meet provincial needs. That is one thing that the member could have requested and that would have fallen within federal jurisdiction.

With respect to the labour shortage, there is another useful measure that falls within federal jurisdiction: improving the immigration process and the recruitment of foreign professionals. I have often been told by hospital administrators that they had found a very interesting candidate, a specialist from abroad. The specialist was interested in the position but was discouraged by the process and chose to settle in another country where procedures are much less complex. The process is expensive and very complicated. Also, immigration services do not exist in rural regions.

• (1805)

A hospital board that wants to recruit abroad does not even have access to services in its region where it can get help and support and find out the most effective way of handling the process. If the board wants access to those services, it has to manage by telephone, by Internet or by talking to agents who do not really understand all the ins and outs of the process. It is extremely complex. The member could have asked for immigration services to be set up in rural areas. That would also have helped in terms of recruitment.

To help improve care and services in rural areas, the member could have done something about travel. Patients often have to travel long distances, which gets expensive. That is difficult from a financial perspective.

In order to be entitled to the medical expense tax credit, which can include travel expenses, a person must be making a certain income. If that person did not pay any taxes, he or she is not entitled to the tax credit. In the end, we are not helping those who would benefit the most from this help, those who cannot afford to pay for travel expenses.

There are quite a few concrete measures that the member could have chosen instead of moving a motion calling for a committee study that will never be done. That is why the motion does not sit well with me. I can see that the member is genuinely concerned about health care in rural areas, but I am having a hard time understanding why he chose such an ineffectual way to address the issue. It is most unfortunate, especially considering he has been an MP for four years. Some of us have been here longer, but the member has been in the House of Commons for four years. He could have sought advice. He knows enough about how things work that he should have realized this was not the best way to proceed.

If the member is really interested in what has been going on with new technologies, he could have asked the research service for help. All MPs have access to the services of the Library of Parliament for conducting research. For instance, the member could have asked the Library of Parliament to perform an exhaustive search for different strategies that have been used in various regions across Canada or around the world to improve services in rural areas. That would have generated plenty of fascinating reading material for him.

When new technologies become established, scientific, medical or nursing journals often publish articles highlighting their positive impact. The data on the methodology are already available and accessible to anyone who is interested.

Private Members' Business

Once again, I understand the member's desire to improve health care services in rural areas, but I do not think that we should be trying to make improvements by interfering in provincial jurisdictions.

I suggested a number of ways to find a much more effective solution for our rural areas. These methods fall within federal jurisdiction.

I strongly urge my colleague to talk to his colleagues and to listen to Quebec's minister of health and social services. She has suggested that the current government stop interfering in provincial jurisdiction over health care and immediately increase federal transfers to the provinces so that they can implement the measures that are already on the table but cannot be implemented because of a lack of money and commitment from the federal government.

● (1810)

[English]

Mr. Darrell Samson (Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to speak to Motion No. 226, concerning health care delivery in rural Canada. This is a very important motion.

A good part of the riding of Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook in Nova Scotia, just on the outskirts of Halifax-Dartmouth, is rural. In Nova Scotia, all surveys indicate that 24% to 26% of Nova Scotians feel that this is a top priority for Nova Scotia and so it is a big issue. One reason is that 70% of our communities in all of Atlantic Canada are rural. Therefore, we have some challenges and this is a good example of the challenges we have.

In my riding in the eastern shore area, the residents have been looking for a doctor and nurses for a number of years. We are in dire need of supporting the communities and helping them to find solutions. This discussion is moving that agenda forward. I and members of the Nova Scotia caucus have had discussions with the minister to try to find different incentives and strategies that we could put together to move this forward.

I like the motion that my colleague has brought forward. It would allow for various solutions to come to the table. Recruiting high school students from rural communities to get into medical school and bringing them to practise and do their residency in their rural communities, those factors could help act as different incentives. Again, I want to thank the member for Kenora for drawing this to the attention of the House. I also want to recognize his hard work on this agenda because he has been a strong member of the Liberal rural caucus for four years.

This motion has two major objectives. One is to have the committee conduct a study and bring witnesses to find solutions. In the second objective, the member calls on the government to further address and improve health care delivery in rural Canada by working with provinces and territories and stakeholders. When people talk about jurisdiction, we are all in here together. It is the responsibility of all levels of government, even if an area belongs to a particular jurisdiction, to work together to find solutions to make life better for Canadians right across this country. That is the opportunity this motion brings.

Although the percentage of Canadians living in rural Canada has continued to decrease over the centuries, there has been a major shift within Canada's economy from an agricultural-based and industrial-based economy. We can agree that rural Canada continues to be a very crucial part of Canada and contributes directly to Canada in many ways. That is why we have to find doctors, we have to bring in broadband and we have to do more for rural Canada and bring that lens. This is why our government just appointed a new minister for rural Canada. That guarantees us that we will focus even more on these issues.

Canadians take pride in the fact that we live in a country where we are fortunate enough to have a world-class medical system. However, while the health care system is successful, our government recognizes that there are some discrepancies that exist, especially in the rural context.

The Canadian institute of health 2006 report, "How Healthy Are Rural Canadians? An Assessment of Their Health Status and Health Determinants", found that rural Canadians have higher death rates, higher infant mortality rates and a shorter life expectancy than their urban counterparts. These health disparities are even more pronounced in indigenous communities located in rural areas. First nations men and women have average life expectancies that are 8.4 and 7.9 years shorter, respectively, than other Canadians. The determinants of health in rural populations in Canada differentiates their health needs and outcomes from urban populations. Health-related factors, such as higher proportions of smokers, lower consumption of fruit and vegetables, and obesity disproportionately affect rural residents.

● (1815)

The availability of medical professionals in rural areas is also a very important issue. A recent study of the medical profession, conducted by the Canadian Institute for Health Information, found that in 2017 only 8% of physicians was working in rural communities when 18% of Canadians lived there. Once again, for indigenous peoples living in rural communities the situation is even worse. According to a 2015-16 regional health survey, 22.6% of first nations people over the age of 18 face even more barriers in trying to find an available doctor.

The statistics demonstrate that the recruitment and retention of health care professionals, such as physicians, is a significant challenge in rural communities. This may be because personal and professional considerations, such as social isolation and longer work hours, are factors that disproportionately affect rural medical professionals compared to urban counterparts. Despite the challenges associated with rural medicine, there are many solutions available to us.

While primary responsibility for the provision and delivery of health care services falls under provincial and territorial governments, the Government of Canada recognizes that we also have a role to play and welcomes constructive feedback to help move this agenda forward.

For instance, it has been shown that medical graduates from rural backgrounds or who have practised or have had residencies in rural communities are more likely to stay. In order to retain more physicians in rural communities, governments could explore providing greater levels of support for high schools students, such as inviting them to take on the sciences, and increasing the acceptance rate of medical school applicants for rural areas. That would be a big help as well.

In 2018, a pre-budget submission of the College of Family Physicians of Canada, entitled “Advancing Rural Family Medicine”, also argued that more needed to be done to support specific competencies for rural family doctors and rural specialist medicine and to provide support for obtaining these competencies through physician training and practices.

Once again, I cannot enforce this point enough. It is very important to get together and get this job done to help rural communities with health care.

Health care delivery in rural areas is extremely important. Moving this agenda forward will require more research and coordination across all jurisdictions. Let us find out how we can help these communities on the ground.

I would like to thank my colleague from Kenora again for bringing the motion forward. I would also like to thank the House for providing me with the opportunity to speak to this important issue.

Nova Scotians, Atlantic Canadians and rural communities across the country need our support. It is our responsibility to work with the provinces and territories to find solutions so we can ensure we have more medical doctors and nurses in our rural communities.

● (1820)

Mr. Ben Lobb (Huron—Bruce, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise in the House of Commons today. As a lifetime resident of a rural community, it is a pleasure to talk about rural health care and rural issues.

Just talking with different health care providers in the riding, talking to farmers in our communities and what we see in the news, mental health issues in our rural communities are probably the most significant we have ever seen. I do not mean to point farmers out, but people in the agriculture sector feel this due to the stresses of finances, crop prices, trade, last year's harvest and this year's spring planting. Therefore, when we look at the entire package of health care, mental health needs to be a priority. Of course, the proposed study will not happen in this Parliament, but hopefully it will in the 43rd parliament.

Youth suicide is another issue. The youth suicide rate in rural communities is higher than anywhere else. Any information or strategies we can put together to dovetail mental health and youth suicide rates would be very important.

Another topic is addiction. There is an opioid addiction crisis from coast to coast in our small communities. Opioids are a big issue as is crystal meth. It does not really matter what part of the country we are in at this point in time, it is in every one of our communities. Therefore, addiction and mental health treatment and having facilities that are world class and state of the art would help people

Private Members' Business

of all ages deal with these issues, but primarily in a rural area where one has to go so far. People cannot just go down the street for their treatment; it could be several hours away.

Another issue is the number of health care providers who provide a certain service. If we look at mental health, people may require treatment, but they might be told it could take three months to get an appointment. When people are at the point where they have come forward and have asked for help, to tell them that can get that help in three months is not a solution to the problem. Getting hard data to put into this report would be fantastic and would build out these action plans. I know there is lot of it out there, but we need to hammer this home.

In rural Ontario, where I am from, there have been higher rates of diabetes, heart disease and obesity for years and decades. Numerous strategies have been put together with respect to this, but we need proactive health care in our rural communities. We need facilities that will promote a healthy lifestyle and get people out exercising.

COPD are is unique to communities as are some forms of cancer. We need further information on that moving forward.

Baby boomers are getting to the age where they have a different set of health care requirements than they once had. In my community, there is now a geriatrician, which is a vital specialist, to provide help to our aging population. I am from a rural community, Huron County and Bruce County, which is on Ontario's west coast. It is a favourite destination for retirees to head to when they are of that age. We have a higher proportion of seniors than other communities. Therefore, a geriatrician is a vital physician.

A couple of weeks ago, one of our beloved members from British Columbia talked about the issue of palliative care doctors. We could use a lot of palliative care doctors in our rural communities, which would help provide a fitting tribute to some of our hard-working Canadians.

Doctor attraction and retention has been an issue in our rural communities. Going back 20 years ago, for example, Goderich, with a population of over 10,000 people, needed doctors. It put together a great doctor attraction and retention program.

● (1825)

Many may know of Gwen Devereaux from Seaforth, Ontario. From coast to coast, she has been educating and informing Canadians on how to attract doctors to rural communities. She has been on CBC and different radio stations, talking about what she has done.

Someone else mentioned that having a beautiful state-of-the-art clinic would attract physicians to the area. Spouses having meaningful employment would go a long way in attracting a physician to a certain community. The provision of services, which can be as basic as broadband Internet or a community centre with a fitness centre, would also help. All of these things contribute to attracting well-educated physicians, nurses, radiologists or whatever position to go into communities, plant roots and live there.

Private Members' Business

When most doctors and other health practitioners make a commitment to rural communities, they love it and want to stay, and people are happy to have them.

There has been a lot of improvement with e-health records from coast to coast. It defies logic to look at our phones and see what the technology sector can do, yet health continues to lag behind. It is making innovations, but it is lagging behind. Another good innovation is the Ontario Telehealth Network, which we are happy to have. It is changing outcomes in people's lives.

I think we can all agree that we need hard infrastructure. For example, communities need CT scanners. For people who have strokes or heart attacks, scanners can make a difference in their lives. However, does it make sense that a community has to fundraise to have a CT scanner in its hospital? It defies logic. When we talk about ways the federal government can work with all jurisdictions, why make a community pay for that? There may be strategic ways to provide funding for CT scanners.

Something else communities desire are hospices. They are few and far between. Communities have to fundraise to build them. In Ontario, where I am from, if communities are fortunate enough to have funding for the land, which is only 60%, they have to continue to fundraise in perpetuity for the other 40%. The federal government could play a role in working on a national plan to change this and be a little more fair to communities.

It is the same thing for long-term care. Many long-term care facilities are way out of date and need serious upgrades. There are no addiction treatment centres in my area. They are regional, yes, but there is a whole pile of changes we could make to that.

Last, and probably most important, if we do this study in the 43rd Parliament, the Gateway Centre of Excellence in Rural Health should be invited. It is in my riding and it is the only research facility like this in Canada. It was modelled on a U.S. idea. It does rural health research in partnership with universities. The best and brightest minds come to my community every year to do rural health research, and people are so happy for it. Again, they do it on their own dime. It would be great if the federal government and the provinces could come together and provide operational funding to different research facilities like this, which provide great research to rural Canada and, in some cases, encourage these bright, young minds to stay in the area.

I look forward to coming back in the 43rd Parliament. I am sure my colleagues across the way would like otherwise. Regardless of the outcome, it would be great if the health committee would do this study and look at moving beyond jurisdictions.

National defence provides health care and we provide all sorts of health care to indigenous Canadians. There is a role for us. If we all work together, we could rise above the partisan lines.

I wish all my colleagues the very best this summer and in the election in October.

● (1830)

The Deputy Speaker: The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired and the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

[For continuation of proceedings see part B]

CONTENTS

Wednesday, June 5, 2019

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

D-Day	
Mr. Boudrias	28613
Jim Dolan	
Mr. Badawey	28613
Public Safety	
Mr. Motz	28613
Corner Brook Pulp and Paper Mill	
Ms. Hutchings	28613
Laurier—Sainte-Marie	
Ms. Laverdière	28614
Status of Women	
Mr. Duguid	28614
75th Anniversary of D-Day	
Mr. Nater	28614
Cultural Unity	
Mr. Hogg	28614
Levi Oakes	
Mr. Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)	28614
Status of Women	
Mrs. Block	28615
Status of Women	
Ms. Vandenberg	28615
International Women's Day	
Mr. Dubourg	28615
2019 General Election	
Mr. Clarke	28615
Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge	
Mr. Ruimy	28616
Indigenous Affairs	
Ms. Kwan	28616
The Environment	
Mr. Barrett	28616
Canada Child Benefit	
Mr. Boissonnault	28616

ORAL QUESTIONS

International Trade	
Ms. Bergen	28617
Ms. Bibeau	28617
Foreign Affairs	
Ms. Bergen	28617
Ms. Joly	28617
Ms. Bergen	28617
Ms. Joly	28617

International Trade	
Mr. Berthold	28617
Ms. Bibeau	28617
Mr. Berthold	28617
Ms. Bibeau	28618
Taxation	
Mr. Julian	28618
Mr. Garneau	28618
Ms. Brosseau	28618
Mr. Garneau	28618
Canadian Heritage	
Ms. Brosseau	28618
Mr. Rodriguez	28618
Mr. Julian	28618
Mr. Rodriguez	28619
Intergovernmental Relations	
Mr. Rayes	28619
Mr. Champagne	28619
Mr. Rayes	28619
Mr. Champagne	28619
Interprovincial Trade	
Mr. Albas	28619
Mr. Champagne	28619
Mr. Barlow	28619
Mr. Champagne	28619
Natural Resources	
Mr. Schmale	28620
Mr. Sohi	28620
Mrs. Stubbs	28620
Mr. Sohi	28620
The Environment	
Mr. Aubin	28620
Mr. Garneau	28620
Indigenous Affairs	
Ms. Kwan	28620
Ms. Bennett	28620
Public Safety	
Mr. Paul-Hus	28621
Mr. Goodale	28621
Mr. Paul-Hus	28621
Mr. Goodale	28621
Auditor General of Canada	
Mr. Brassard	28621
Ms. Murray	28621
Mr. Brassard	28621
Ms. Murray	28621
Employment Insurance	
Ms. Sansoucy	28622
Mr. Duclos	28622

Ms. Ashton	28622
Mr. Duclos	28622
The Environment	
Mr. Bossio	28622
Ms. McKenna	28622
Government Priorities	
Mr. Gourde	28622
Mr. Lightbound	28622
Mr. Richards	28623
Mr. Lightbound	28623
The Environment	
Mr. Godin	28623
Ms. McKenna	28623
Mr. Fast	28623
Ms. McKenna	28623
Canadian Heritage	
Mr. Nantel	28623
Mr. Rodriguez	28623
Dairy Industry	
Mr. MacGregor	28624
Ms. Bibeau	28624
Natural Resources	
Mr. Falk (Provencher)	28624
Mr. Sohi	28624
Forestry Industry	
Mrs. McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	28624
Mr. Sohi	28624
Mr. Doherty	28624
Mr. Oliphant	28624
Tourism Industry	
Mr. Aldag	28625
Ms. Joly	28625
Official Languages	
Mr. Clarke	28625
Ms. Joly	28625
Telecommunications	
Mr. Dubé	28625
Mr. Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia) ..	28625
Public Safety	
Mr. Graham	28625
Mr. Garneau	28625
Privacy	
Mr. McCauley	28626
Ms. Qualtrough	28626
Rail Transportation	
Ms. Pauzé	28626
Mr. Garneau	28626
Points of Order	
Oral Questions	
Ms. Harder	28626

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Budget Implementation Act, 2019, No. 1

Bill C-97. Report stage	28627
Motions Nos. 1 to 17 negatived	28628
Motions Nos. 18 to 33 negatived	28629
Motions Nos. 34 to 43 negatived	28630
Motions Nos. 44 to 51, 53 and 54 negatived	28631
Motion No. 52 negatived	28632
Motion No. 55 agreed to	28633
Motions Nos. 56 and 57 negatived	28634
Mr. Sohi (for the Minister of Finance)	28634
Bill C-97. Motion for concurrence	28634
Motion agreed to	28636

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions

Mr. Lamoureux	28636
---------------------	-------

Customs Tariff

Mr. Sohi (for the Minister of Finance)	28636
Bill C-101. Introduction and first reading	28636
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	28636

Interparliamentary Delegations

Ms. Damoff	28636
------------------	-------

Committees of the House

Indigenous and Northern Affairs

Ms. Mihychuk	28636
--------------------	-------

Procedure and House Affairs

Mr. Bagnell	28636
-------------------	-------

Justice and Human Rights

Mr. Housefather	28636
-----------------------	-------

Liaison

Ms. Sgro	28636
----------------	-------

Health

Mr. Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	28636
---	-------

Net-Zero Greenhouse Gas Emissions Act

Mr. Erskine-Smith	28636
Bill C-454. Introduction and first reading	28636
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	28637

Petitions

Physician-Assisted Dying

Mr. Anderson	28637
--------------------	-------

Rural Crime

Mr. Anderson	28637
--------------------	-------

Agriculture

Mr. Anderson	28637
--------------------	-------

Iran

Ms. Laverdière	28637
----------------------	-------

The Environment

Mr. Paradis	28637
-------------------	-------

Palliative Care

Mr. Van Kesteren	28637
------------------------	-------

Physician-Assisted Dying

Mr. Van Kesteren	28637
------------------------	-------

Official Languages	
Mr. Choquette	28637
Agriculture	
Mr. Nater	28637
Status of Women	
Ms. Benson	28638
Consumer Protection	
Ms. Harder	28638
The Environment	
Ms. Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	28638
Pharmacare	
Ms. Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	28638
Forced Migration	
Ms. Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	28638
Vision Care	
Mrs. Hughes	28638
Plastics	
Mr. Manly	28638
Veterans Affairs	
Mr. Manly	28639
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Lamoureux	28639

Motions for Papers	
Mr. Lamoureux	28639

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Budget Implementation Act, 2019, No. 1	
Mr. Sohi (for the Minister of Finance)	28639
Bill C-97. Third reading	28639
Mr. Lightbound	28639

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Health Care Delivery in Rural Canada	
Mr. Nault	28642
Motion	28642
Ms. Leitch	28644
Ms. Moore	28645
Ms. Gladu	28645
Ms. Moore	28647
Mr. Samson	28648
Mr. Lobb	28649

Published under the authority of the Speaker of
the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: <http://www.ourcommons.ca>

Publié en conformité de l'autorité
du Président de la Chambre des communes

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante : <http://www.noscommunes.ca>



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 148 • NUMBER 427 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, June 5, 2019
(Part B)

Speaker: The Honourable Geoff Regan

CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, June 5, 2019

[Continuation of proceedings from part A]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1830)

[English]

MEMBERS NOT SEEKING RE-ELECTION TO THE 43RD PARLIAMENT

The Deputy Speaker: It being 6:31 p.m., pursuant to order made on Tuesday, May 28, the House will now proceed to statements by members not seeking re-election in the 43rd Parliament.

Before we begin this evening's debate, I would like to remind hon. members of how the proceedings will unfold.

[Translation]

Each member speaking will be allotted 10 minutes. No time will be allotted for questions and comments.

[English]

The order also prescribes that tonight's debate will be interrupted after three hours or when no member rises to speak.

We will begin with the hon. member for West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country.

[Translation]

Ms. Pamela Goldsmith-Jones (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, dear parliamentary colleagues, I believe in a policy of inclusion and engagement.

[English]

In public life, I try to practise adaptation, reconciliation, obligation, understanding and compromise. I believe this is how we achieve lasting change, and today I would like to share some outcomes of this past term as a result.

Picture being on the west coast of Canada. In the Pacific northwest, salmon probably arrived first. Salmon best describe the co-evolution of human life with the natural world. They are the ultimate statement of being in this world together, which we all are.

In 2015, I was worried about the survival of the DFO lab on the waterfront in West Vancouver, because under the previous government, the property faced the very real possibility of being sold. Under the new name of the Pacific Science Enterprise Centre, which

was just a name, we reached out to science partners, community leaders, the Squamish, Tsleil-Waututh, and Musqueam nations, and local DFO staff to create a vision for renewed investment and scientific research. Our ideas had to gain acceptance from the minister and staff at DFO as well as from Public Services and Procurement Canada to justify a long-term reinvestment.

For me, working with staff behind the scenes in two departments in Ottawa was very challenging. I was asking them to create a major culture shift, and they were amazing.

The following are absolute firsts in the history of DFO.

The Coastal Ocean Research Institute has moved 18 scientists into the lab who use the new lab space for research into ocean plastics. West Vancouver's Streamkeepers and multiple stewardship groups use the facility now all the time.

The West Vancouver School District developed a senior curriculum, and the first class will graduate this June with high school diplomas in environmental studies, having spent all year long accessing the ocean, the creeks, the waterfront and the DFO scientists who work at the lab.

Squamish Nation children and elders have returned home with their ocean-going canoes, and there is a lineup of partners wishing to work with the Pacific Science Enterprise Centre.

Ocean plastics, glass sponge reefs, underwater vessel noise, habitat loss, cetaceans, ocean warming and marine protected areas: We know now that solving complex environmental challenges takes off when the federal government opens up.

In the same spirit, I am particularly proud that our government honours the knowledge of local governments. Investment in infrastructure means equality for all Canadians through clean drinking water, waste water treatment, public transportation, secure housing and access to digital technology. The national agenda has benefited from the inclusion of local priorities.

In health, collaboration and research is fundamental. I chair the all-party juvenile diabetes caucus, which garnered a \$15-million federal investment. Matched by a \$15-million contribution from the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation, a \$30-million health research partnership formed between JDRF and the Canadian Institute for Health Research, which was another first.

Government Orders

It is also obvious when we are missing the spirit of understanding and compromise, perhaps most profoundly felt today in the disconnect between British Columbia and Alberta. Western Canada needs to stick together. We matter: for our innovation, our enterprise, our experimentalism and our strong environmentalism. The hope for our energy future lies with innovation by the clean tech sector. It lies with companies that understand that a price on pollution drives innovation, with indigenous communities that want to work together to transition Canada to a clean energy future and share in the ownership and management of resource companies, and with investors who are already moving us toward a low carbon future. No amount of yelling comes close to innovation and inclusion.

Obligation means that no one should be afraid to expose money laundering in Canada. The Pacific caucus stressed this to the minister in 2015, and early studies began. I am very pleased that Minister Eby, in B.C., is pursuing this and that our government is supportive.

Our housing strategy responds directly to the values of equality and inclusion, as does the Canada child benefit.

I have always and will always be working toward truth and reconciliation. For me, we should be more afraid of exclusion than inclusion.

Turning to global affairs, I would like to thank two ministers of foreign affairs who I have had the privilege of serving as parliamentary secretary.

• (1835)

In 2015, on the first day I met with minister Dion, he said three things: one, I must know my files; two, I must not let him down in the House of Commons; and three, I must tell him one thing I wanted to achieve, and he would support me.

I said I would like to work on women, peace and security. Women play a marginal role, at best, in bringing peace in international conflict situations. It is short-sighted in the extreme. The research is clear: when women are involved in peace-building, peace negotiations, peace talks and the implementation of peace processes, outcomes are better. Today, under the leadership of our current Minister of Foreign Affairs, Canada's foreign policy is a feminist foreign policy, as is our international development policy.

The Government of Canada is committed to improving opportunities for women in defence and for women in policing. The Government of Canada has just launched the equality fund to leverage the philanthropic community and the private sector to build gender equality.

I would like to thank and extend my gratitude to the current Minister of Foreign Affairs. She leads with considerable knowledge and experience, with pragmatism and with understanding.

I would also like to thank the former minister of international trade because he placed his trust in me. He credited his whole team with our successes, and he led an effort that built and broadened free trade agreements with Europe and the trans-Pacific region. We worked hard to engage around the world, and our negotiators kept inclusivity and accommodation top of mind.

There seems to be a belief that a member of Parliament cannot speak up or deviate from the party. I can think of some occasions when I deviated. When the Minister of Finance brought in tax reforms that were not popular at home, I told him that I, no doubt, would be very engaged in serious public consultations. Over that summer, and as a result of expert advice, we submitted 10 solutions, of which eight were accepted by the minister.

When it comes to transitioning away from open net pen fish farms on the coast of British Columbia, I voted against our government. Everyone knows that, and my work to transition to closed containment will be ongoing.

I respect the leadership of the Prime Minister. In my experience, he encourages differing views, especially when offered in the spirit of compromise and a better way.

It will not surprise members to know that I am deeply disturbed by the stultifying and soul-destroying House of Commons rules that stipulate that the House sit on Fridays every week, or until midnight, or all night long. This is not democratic. This is not even humane. We should all be here in the House of Commons as our best selves, energized, not sleep-deprived; optimistic, not frustrated.

Finally, no MPs can give their very best without a great staff team. Stephanie, Deanna, Marjan, Lucie, Natasha, Rav, Diana, Alexandre and Morgan, and in global affairs, Jillian, Joshua, Jim, Kyna, Sher and Isabella, have all worked as an incredible team. Gruelling schedules, mountains of material, stressful conditions and multiple demands on their time somehow brought them together. I admire all of them. I thank them for the standard they have set for all we do.

As with most MPs, we have also been very pleased to support four interns over four summers, Marjan, Clio, Claire and Nicola. We throw them in the deep end and encourage them with every new ripple that comes along. May the four of them go on in their lives to ask: Who have I not included? What am I not seeing? Am I accommodating? Am I bringing a solution? If they do that, then Canada is in good hands, and they, and I, and those who hold the public trust in their daily work, will have been worthy of the office and the honour.

My heartfelt thanks to the people of West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country for the opportunity to serve them and for our opportunity to serve Canada. My personal commitment to them will never end. I will see them at home. *À bientôt.*

• (1840)

Mr. John Oliver (Oakville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am thankful for the opportunity to present a retiring statement.

Government Orders

It has been an honour to represent the residents of the riding of Oakville and to have served as a member of the 42nd Parliament. I want to begin by thanking the residents of Oakville for this opportunity.

It has been fascinating to be part of our democratic legislative process and to have worked beside, and sometimes against, other parliamentarians as we have debated and sought the best path forward for Canada. I have never gotten over the sense of responsibility that overcomes members as we walk up to the Parliament building, enter the door and take our seats in the chamber. I have also never gotten over the feeling of gratitude I have for the residents of Oakville for entrusting this responsibility to me.

I am proud of what our government has accomplished over this term. From renegotiating NAFTA, to supporting middle class families, to fighting climate change, to lifting 825,000 Canadians out of poverty and stimulating the creation of over one million new jobs, the government is making real and positive change in the lives of Canadians.

I entered this role with a focused set of priorities. I want to reflect on those briefly tonight, but I also want to talk about the unexpected things that have happened to me over the past years that have enriched my understanding of my community and, surprisingly, of my family.

When I was elected, at the top of my list was working to protect the Canadian health system. It was an honour to be asked by the Prime Minister to serve as the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Health and to speak on her behalf with Canadians and in the House of Commons. I was delighted to be part of the Standing Committee on Health. We issued numerous reports and recommendations on issues affecting the health of Canadians.

Another big priority for me was my concern that coverage of essential medicines is not part of our universal health care model. Canadians should not be denied access to essential medicines because they cannot afford them. I was part of the standing committee that issued a clear recommendation that universal, single-payer coverage is critical to ensuring that all Canadians have equal access to essential drug therapy. I was overjoyed to see provisions in the 2018 budget to appoint a council to study the implementation of national pharmacare and to see provisions in the 2019 budget to create a Canadian drug agency and to take steps toward the development of a national formulary.

I was honoured to chair the all-party health research caucus, which worked with Research Canada to profile in Ottawa the amazing health research that is happening across Canada.

Besides health, I was focused on jobs and ensuring that the government was creating the right conditions for success in the advanced manufacturing industry. In Oakville, Ford Canada is the largest employer. I was honoured to have chaired the Liberal auto caucus and to have fought hard for appropriate funding to stimulate innovation in the sector, including in zero emission vehicles and autonomous operations.

As vice-chair of the Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association, I participated in and once led a mission to promote trade between Canada and the EU.

Finally, with the leadership of Andrew Quinn, my executive assistant, I was happy to see our motion, Motion No. 168, protecting net neutrality in Canada, receive unanimous support in the House. Hey, Andrew, “Velociraptor.”

These are the things I set out to accomplish when I was elected, and I am happy with those achievements. However, what about the unexpected experience that I did not anticipate?

Here on the Hill, in the House, I have been struck by the integrity of all parliamentarians in representing their ridings and speaking passionately about their beliefs and aspirations for the future of Canada. Likewise, I have been impressed by the breadth and scope of committee work. This activity is invisible to most Canadians, yet I learned that it is at committee where most non-partisan discussions are held to amend legislation and make thoughtful recommendations to government. I will miss the collegiality and the give and take with my fellow parliamentarians.

Some of the most unexpected experiences and learning happened in the riding of Oakville.

I was invited as the member of Parliament to tour many businesses. I had no idea of the diversity of manufacturing enterprises in the riding. Do members know that every time people land at the Ottawa airport, it is highly likely that the landing gear that drops down and safely puts them on the tarmac was manufactured and assembled in Oakville? Every time a person buys a glazed donut product or fruit-filled product at Tim Hortons anywhere across Canada, the glaze and filling came from Oakville.

The restoration of the Pickering and Bruce nuclear plants was dependent on parts from Oakville. The raw products for Crisco, Becel margarine and other famous edible oil products are refined in Oakville. Of course, we also have the Ford assembly plant, which assembles over 270,000 vehicles a year and supports a rich ecosystem of parts manufacturers.

● (1845)

I move on now from learnings about the diversity of industry to learnings about the diversity of faith.

I am a long-time member of the United Church, and I was honoured to be invited and warmly welcomed at mosques, the synagogue, the temple, the gurdwara and the many churches of my community. I learned first-hand that although religious observances are different, people are drawn to their houses of worship for the same reasons: to seek a closer relationship with a sacred, holy spirit; to ask for atonement and reconciliation; to be part of a community of faith; and to unite their families in long traditions of religious celebration.

Then there is Sheridan College, a world-class education facility right in my backyard, producing Academy Award winners in animation and acting as a crucible to develop world-renowned artistic shows like *Come From Away*. What an amazing opportunity we have as MPs, and what a luxury to be introduced to so many aspects of our home community and to have those shared with us so openly. I wish everyone had that opportunity.

Government Orders

I mentioned learnings about my family. My wife's family members are refugees. They fled Poland in the early 1980s, when my wife was about 12 years old. They sought refuge in Austria for about six months and then received permanent refuge in Canada. My wife's younger sister married a Vietnamese gentleman who, along with his family, was likewise a refugee, so when I sit down to eat supper with my wife's family, I am the only non-refugee at the table, yet they do not think of themselves as refugees. They are Canadians who are hard at work building their families, running businesses, and in my wife's case, being a school board trustee.

While I have long known my wife's background, it was not until I met with refugee families from Syria and elsewhere in the world in Oakville that I fully realized the hardship and challenges the parents were facing: language barriers; unemployment; separation from family, loved ones and networks; and learning new cultures.

I want to say a huge thanks to Barbara and Waldemar Krasowski for having the courage to leave their homeland and for persevering through these challenges to seek a better opportunity for their children. Through them, I thank to all the refugee and immigrant parents who have known these challenges and shown such incredible courage and sacrifice. I hope they all know the successes that my wife's family has enjoyed.

In closing, I would like to say thanks and acknowledge the tremendous contributions made by my staff: Fiona Fraser, director of operations; Andrew Quinn, executive assistant; Nancy Buchan-Terrell; Valerie Campbell; Hannah Wieler; Lori Weston; and Mala Sharma. They have provided superb support not only to me but, more importantly, to the community we served over these past four years. I could not have done any of this without their tireless work. Most have been with me and supported me from the very beginning; way back when I sought the Liberal nomination. I thank each of them so much for their support and steadfastness.

I also thank the Oakville Federal Liberal Association, under the capable leadership of Alan Johnston, and the hundreds of volunteers who worked with me during the 2015 campaign.

Finally, the real burden of a parliamentarian's job falls hardest on our families, those who are closest to us and whom we love the most. We are absent from home while in Ottawa and often absent from family activity and being with family during constituency weeks. I hope every member is blessed with a family as supportive as mine, and I thank my family for its unwavering support. My family includes my loving and lovely wife, Joanna Oliver; my fabulous children, Rachel, whom I congratulate on the new job; Alexander, whom I congratulate on his film; and William, whom I look forward to hanging with; my inspirational mother, Ellice Oliver; and my sister and brother, Heather and Richard Oliver. Sadly, we lost my father, Peter Oliver, during this Parliament, but we remember him through his long-time friend Annie Chandler.

It has been said that families are the compass that guides us, our inspiration to reach great heights and our comfort when we falter. My family is my blessing. I thank each of them from the bottom of my heart for their ongoing love and encouragement.

• (1850)

Hon. K. Kellie Leitch (Simcoe—Grey, CPC): Mr. Speaker, being a Canadian is a privilege almost without equal in the world. To

be selected by our fellow Canadians as a representative in the House of Commons is as high an honour as there is. Thanks to the incredible people of Simcoe—Grey, who put their faith in me, I have been a member of Parliament for eight years. First and foremost, I want to thank them.

I grew up in a family where my parents, Lynne and Kit Leitch, lived certain values. My mom emphasized hard work every day. She was the most generous person I have ever known. None of my friends could leave our house without a toque on their head or a hug if they needed it. Sadly, after a strong fight, she lost her battle with breast cancer in 1989.

My dad continually challenges us to have free thoughts and develop new ideas every day. Even now, he challenges me to work harder and be better. Like so many who live and were born on the prairies, he believes that everyone is equal and should be treated respectfully. He is the epitome of tolerance.

In many ways, my parents are the embodiment of Canadian values, and these values matter. They are the reason Canada is a beacon of hope around the world for those fleeing persecution or seeking a better life. The values that Canadians share, that my parents taught us, are what make this country, Canada, the greatest country in the world, one that it has been an honour to represent.

The one question I get asked all the time as a member of Parliament is why a pediatric orthopaedic surgeon would run for office. There are three reasons.

First, my mom was insistent that public service is good for us.

Second, as a doctor, I would be helping dozens of kids every day. I loved my job, but in 2006, I was asked to chair the expert panel on the children's fitness tax credit. This opportunity allowed me to see first-hand how good public policy can have a positive impact on the health of thousands of Canadian kids, not just one child at a time, as I did as a doctor.

Third, I was asked. It was that simple. Jim Flaherty called me at the clinic one day on a Friday morning and said, "I hear you're running for office." I said, "No." We can see how well that worked out. On May 2, 2011, my name was on the ballot in Simcoe—Grey as the Conservative candidate the day the Conservative majority government was won.

I was appointed as a parliamentary secretary immediately after the election. As a PS, I was assigned the task to develop a new EI rate mechanism reform in the May budget. I also contributed to the creation of the Canada job grant.

As an Albertan, I heard every day from family and friends—especially my sister, who is a no-nonsense, super-smart engineer in Calgary—about the need for skilled labour. I led the consultations across the country related to this program, which revolutionized on-the-job training by providing incentives for employers to train people.

Government Orders

On my dad's birthday in July 2013, I was invited to meet with the Prime Minister. The PM appointed me Canada's first minister of status of women as well as minister of labour. I remember accepting and then immediately formulating in my head how to eliminate the department. I thought, as a professional woman, how ridiculous it was that the department even existed. My sister completely agreed. When I returned home that night and told my father, to my surprise he was ecstatic. He thought this was the best role ever. I thought he was crazy.

In retrospect, I will say that being the minister of status of women was one of the more meaningful and most fulfilling roles I have ever had. I learned so much, and realized that the department is in fact necessary and important. I have a strong belief that women are most successful in all aspects of their lives if they can be independent, when they can stand on their own two feet and make choices for themselves and families unencumbered by others and government. Our great team at Status of Women focused all its efforts on helping women of all backgrounds achieve this independence.

I am particularly proud of our focus on championing women entrepreneurs. Early in my term, I realized that for women to be successful, they needed three things: mentors, money and markets. As a young medical student, I benefited from mentors. Therefore, it was no surprise to me when I met with women across the country and heard they needed mentors and found it challenging to succeed without one.

The expert panel on championing and mentorship for women entrepreneurs was launched in 2013. Its work created "It Starts with One – Be Her Champion", an initiative to provide mentors for women in all fields. As I leave public life, I look forward to continuing to support and build this program so that young women across our country can reach their greatest potential.

●(1855)

I have always championed children. I am told that my face lights up when a child walks into the room, so it was not challenging for me to embrace the idea of the International Day of the Girl Child at the UN and become one of the driving forces of its creation in 2013. This experience is the reason that today I am passionate about organizations that help eliminate the practice of early, child, and forced marriages around the world, such as Girls Not Brides.

When I was growing up in Fort McMurray, Alberta, my father ran a construction company. My talented brother Michael now runs that firm, and it has never had unionized workers, nor was there ever a desire for our labourers to unionize, so being Minister of Labour in Canada was a new place for me.

I was determined to have Canada ratify the UN ILO Convention No. 138 on minimum age for admission to employment. As a pediatric surgeon, I was somewhat dumbfounded that Canada had not ratified this basic convention, which we finally did in 2014. Our team at labour also spearheaded changes to the Canada Labour Code to ensure that interns were covered by health and safety protections and that these young Canadians received the pay they were due when they worked hard.

I believe that we as Canadians need to lead internationally by example as well as practise what we preach. The changes to these policies did both.

Politics is a rough sport. I realized that during the challenging 2015 campaign, and during my leadership campaign I learned that in spades. During the leadership campaign, I learned many things. I now have a better wardrobe and I wear makeup, and sadly, I also learned how much these material items matter. How we look is often as important as, if not more important than, our ideas or intellect, especially as women.

I also learned that not all Canadians are tolerant.

In Canada, as children we are encouraged to have new ideas, talk about those ideas and encourage debate. That is not at all what I experienced. What most Canadians saw during the campaign was people slandering me and my reputation. They saw me bullied continuously. I was subjected to the worst type of threats online. My home was broken into. My constituency office was compromised with hate banners illegally hung. My staff was intimidated. My Parliament Hill office even received long letters in which people outlined in graphic detail their plans to sadistically rape me.

This was all fuelled by people who claimed they were champions of freedom of speech, champions of women and champions of a tolerant society. I can tell members that these people are anything but that. I acutely learned that when individuals are unwilling—or, more often, unable—to debate an issue in a tolerant and respectful way, they turn to bullying, intimidation or worse. I would not wish this treatment on anyone, even on those who subjected me to it.

My campaign sparked debate on issues that Canadians wanted to talk about. I am proud to say that unlike some, I am not afraid to tackle the elephant in the room. For me, health care will be one of those topics as we go forward. We need an open and healthy debate in this country about our health care system. Today, politicians get to say when and where we get our care, but they are not accountable to deliver that care in a timely manner. Canadians are ready for a thoughtful discussion about the future of health care. As elected leaders, we need to be ready too.

Canadians have always been the most successful in all fields when we embrace our responsibilities as well-educated and tolerant people who put forward bold ideas on important subjects. Canadians elected us in the House of Commons to be leaders. We are expected to speak about issues that matter. We are not supposed to be afraid of tackling the tougher issues, and we should be able to discuss issues like health care, climate change, abortion and immigration without name-calling, without bullying, without resorting to insults or character assassinations. If we are not prepared to tackle the tough issues in a respectful manner in this place, then who is?

Government Orders

Leadership is about courage and about having the courage to act. As one politician once accurately outlined, most politicians, with the exception of a few with great courage, wait to see how political events are breaking before they risk their own political capital. I can say that I now understand that. Even with my challenging experience during and following the leadership campaign, I will continue to talk about issues that matter to Canadians, like the ones they talk about every day at the dinner table and at Tim Hortons. This country and the responsibility we have as Canadians to help others both here and abroad is too important to me not to.

● (1900)

I challenge members in the House to not shy away from bold and controversial issues. Do not be afraid of the critics and the media, the trolls and the angry people. Have courage and move forward.

It is an honour to serve in this House. I have many friends in this place and I have had many conversations, some more animated than others. No matter what our beliefs or political backgrounds, we share a common dedication to this country and to making it better. For that I thank my colleagues.

I encourage the leaders in this place to remember to take courage and bring forward bold ideas. Canadians are expecting us to do so.

Mr. Jim Eglinski (Yellowhead, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as most of you know, I will not be running in the upcoming fall election. Tonight I will be saying goodbye to all my colleagues in this House on all sides. It is hard to say goodbye to fellow workers, to a job or a career that you really enjoy.

Retirement: this is not my first kick at the can. Over 50 years of public service have been very rewarding to me. Am I ending it now? I do not really know. I am not sure yet. I was blessed to be born in a great country and a prosperous province, Alberta. Life has been good to me. For me to give back was just natural.

I am a second-generation Ukrainian who grew up on a farm near Chipman, Alberta. After graduation, I joined the RCMP in April of 1968. I took a train and headed to Regina to be a Mountie. I think most of the farm boys did that back in the 1960s. It was a good choice for me. I served 35 years and had nine postings and five detachment commands. I went from a constable to staff sergeant and finished my career in the city of Fort St. John in B.C. Fort St. John is a great community in northern British Columbia.

I met my first wife, Stephanie, in 1968. We had two daughters, Kim and Susan. Stephanie was with me throughout my service. I lost her to cancer a month after I retired.

In 2002, municipal politics called me. I was elected to council and three years later re-elected as the mayor. This was a great place to learn about politics. I think it is the best politics. In 2004, I married Nancy, my current wife, who has been my strongest constituent, my right arm, my adviser and my critic. She loves politics. She gave me so much: time, love and support.

Nancy and I decided to move from B.C. to Edson, Alberta, in 2011. I was home again. My stepdaughter, Sommer, her spouse, Brad, and grandchildren Kaylynn, Jenessa, Brayden and Tyler lived there. They live there today. We built a new home on the McLeod River, just outside of Edson, to retire.

Then we met Rob Merrifield, who was the member of Parliament for Yellowhead. The next thing I knew, he asked me to join his EDA. Then I ended up being president. I never could say “no”. I have to learn that one day.

In the fall of 2014, Rob called me on a Sunday and said, “Jim, put together a special EDA meeting for tomorrow at 6 p.m.” I asked why and he said he could not tell me. He wanted to meet with Nancy and me at 4 p.m. before the meeting. I asked why. He said he could not tell me. Was I confused? I was. As the EDA president, he was telling me nothing and I had to phone everybody.

At 4 p.m. the next day, Rob and his wife, Brenda, met with Nancy and me and Rob told us he was retiring. When? Immediately. Nancy said, “What are we going to do?” Rob replied, “Jim, I think you should run. I spoke to Prime Minister Harper and it will be a great honour for you to serve as the federal MP for Yellowhead”. I said I could not, and to look at me, I was older. “No,” he said, “You’re great. You have lots of experience.” I asked how long I had to make up my mind. He answered, “Two hours” because he wanted to tell the EDA. Forty-five days later, I was the MP for Yellowhead riding.

● (1905)

I was so proud to serve the Yellowhead riding, and I want to thank all my supporters in Yellowhead for electing me in 2014 and again in 2015. What a year it was, with two elections and opening an office in Ottawa and an office in Edson.

I remember my first week in Ottawa, when I was walked down the corridor here by Prime Minister Harper, being sworn in. The administration gave me a set of keys and said my office was 301 Justice. I asked where that was and was told, “Down the hill”. I met with finance and was told I could only spend this, could not spend that and to be careful. I was told to hire someone to work in my office. When I asked where I would find someone, they said to look around and that I would find somebody. Then I was told, by the way, I was on the immigration committee and it sits on Tuesdays and Thursdays, so to make sure I was there tomorrow. Then it was, “Goodbye and good luck.”

How many of us did that happen to? That was day one. From there we learned as we went. I love challenges, but I have to say, thank God the men's washroom was across the hall from 301 Justice.

Government Orders

In politics, time quickly flies. I have flown back and forth about 100 times. I have spent around 800 days on the Hill, approximately 1,000 days in the Yellowhead riding, and 15 hours every weekend, transitioning back and forth between here and there. Will I miss it? You bet. It has been an honour to serve my riding of Yellowhead, my province of Alberta, and my country. The friendships we develop here, from all parties, I will always cherish.

The people Nancy and I met in our riding, the friendships we made, they are such great people. Yellowhead riding is large, 77,000 square kilometres. As an MP, I could not have represented this great riding if it were not for my staff in Edson. I was lucky that Rob's staff stayed on when I was first elected: Jude, Annette and Theresa. If Jude is listening, she was the nerve centre of the riding, the type of person who knows everyone and everything. She was a great help. I thank the staffers who are there today, Annette, Marsha and Sandra, and those who have moved on, Amy, Sylvie and Jude.

In Ottawa, I was lucky. I hired Jeannette. What a find and what a knowledgeable staffer. She trained me, guided me and kept me in line, and that was difficult. Her knowledge and wisdom on the Hill is awesome and I thank her. Through her, I became so much better. I hired her as an employee, but I consider her a friend. I thank Jamyn, a former staffer in my Ottawa office, and Volodymyr, who is there now, for their service to me and the Yellowhead riding. I thank the four Ukrainian interns I had during the summers.

I thank my Conservative colleagues. I have learned so much from them. It has been an honour to serve with them in the government and in opposition. I will always cherish the friendships we developed. I will miss them, all of them.

I will miss the Hill, the security people, the drivers, the people in the cafeteria, the personnel around here. I stop and talk to as many of them as I can in a day. I will miss my staff. I will miss my constituents. However, I will not miss that weekly flight riding from Ottawa to home and back.

I have been so lucky that Rob Merrifield asked me to run. I have been so lucky that my constituents supported me. I have been so lucky to have had a great campaign team. I am so lucky that my replacement candidate, Gerald Soroka is a great guy, a friend and, hopefully, he can have a good office, at 301 Justice, after the federal election when he joins our prime minister, Andrew Scheer.

I could not have done any of this if it were not for my wife Nancy. I know she is listening. I thank "Beebs" for travelling back and forth across the Yellowhead riding with me, for helping in speeches, counselling me, campaigning, etc. She is special. She represented me so many times in the riding when I was here in Ottawa, giving speeches and doing all those other things. I was getting worried because people were telling me that they were starting to like her more than me. Nancy is my soulmate, a friend, and I thank her so much.

• (1910)

People ask me what I am going to do when I retire. There is that word again: retire. I have my health, thank God. My motor home wants to travel. My motorcycle wants to be ridden. My restoration projects are begging to be finished. My grass continues to grow.

There are fish in the McLeod River that need to be caught. My deer need to be fed; I have a herd of about 15 of them.

However, mostly, I look forward to visiting my three sisters, my sister-in-law, their husbands and our four children, and spoiling our 11 grandchildren and one great-granddaughter who needs to see me more.

Canada is a great big country and I am about to hit the road, folks. Yes, I will go back to boring holes in the sky, enjoying the freedom of flight.

• (1915)

Mr. Brad Trost (Saskatoon—University, CPC): Mr. Speaker, first, I want to start with the thanks.

To my staff of over 15 years as a member of Parliament, I have been blessed to have wonderful, loyal staffers. Murray Heinzlmeir, Vikki Ruby and Brianne Toupin started with me 15 years ago and are still with the team today. Al Chant put in 13 years. When he retired, I was, in his words, "improving my staff" by hiring his wife Elizabeth. Mattea Merta joined the team these last few years. Denae Ferguson started out doing maternity leaves until her own maternity leave caused her to move on. I must also remember my Humboldt staff of previous years, Arlene Jule and Melanie Bain.

They have all been very loyal. I appreciate their putting up with the quirks and mannerisms of their boss. To have so many of them stay for so long has meant a lot to me.

I thank Lori Isinger, my first campaign manager, who was and is gracious and kind. She helped me put together a team in 2004 that won a riding that was considered unwinnable. I thank Ron Ardell, a very special friend, and we all miss him.

Volunteers like Denise Hounjet-Roth, campaign managers like Rod Meier, riding presidents, volunteers, supporters and donors who are too mention, in all my campaigns supported me. Thanks, my friends.

I thank my leadership campaign team, Russ, Joseph, Mike, Wally and Wayne, for all that we went through together.

I thank my family. My mom and dad were always there in each election. I thank my brothers and their families for their support. My service here was definitely a family accomplishment and the wins were theirs as much as they were mine.

Gerelt, my wife, joined me half-way through this adventure. I am not sure if it is what she expected, but she has embraced it with enthusiasm. I thank her for her support, love and encouragement. I love her very much.

Government Orders

I thank the voters of Saskatoon—Humboldt and Saskatoon—University for the privilege of being their voice. I have tried to serve them faithfully whether I received their vote or not. I was once told the Trost family motto should be, “A Trost is a majority of one”.

In my time in the House of Commons, I have striven to stick to the principles that I came here with. While it has been said that politics is about compromise, I have always believed politics should be about principle.

What are the some of the principles I have stood for during my years here?

Human life matters from conception to natural death. This is a fundamental right which should never be denied. To take away sweet human life as we do in our country is the greatest tragedy of Canada's history.

Freedom matters, in our economic system and in our political system. A government that is large and all-encompassing is not a government that is the servant of the people, but is the master of the people. Government aid is often to be feared more than government neglect.

Democracy matters: The price previous Canadians paid for our system of government is one that should not be forgotten. Even if we do not agree with everything this system has given us, it is still the best the world has ever seen.

Let me close my brief speech by saying something for Isabel Anu Trost and Helena Esu Trost, my two little girls. Their dad ran for office, not because he thought he could win, but because it was the right thing to do. I believe in my Canada. I believe in the values of freedom, faith, family and free enterprise. This is what has made Canada great. I have tried to uphold these values so that some day they will inherit a Canada that is moral, just and strong, a country that believes in the rule of law and the supremacy of God.

I thank everyone who has shared this journey with me. I did my best to serve. To everything there is a season and a time to every purpose under the heavens. To God be the glory.

• (1920)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach (Salaberry—Suroît, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I was first elected on May 2, 2011, as part of the famous orange wave. It came as a shock, but it was also an honour and a privilege to represent the people of my riding and stand up for my values in this honourable House.

I would like to thank the people of Beauharnois—Salaberry for giving me that first opportunity to dive into politics and have this fabulous, intense, enriching and altogether human life experience. It has been a pleasure to serve them.

My first speech in the House was on a topic that was as dear to my labour activist heart then as it is now. On June 24, 2011, Quebec's national holiday, I spoke out against the Canada Post bill. The NDP stood up to the Conservative government of the day for three days in a row so that unionized postal workers could negotiate their working conditions with the Crown corporation executives. That was my first ever three-day Thursday.

My second speech was just as emotional and powerful. In September 2011 we were debating Bill C-4, a Conservative government bill on boat people. This brought about a two-hour conversation with my mother on how my family came to Canada after fleeing persecution in the wake of the Vietnam War. She recounted their escape, the attacks by pirates, their fight to survive, their life at the refugee camp, their arrival in Salaberry-de-Valleyfield and the welcome they received. This is the Canada I know, a Canada that gives a family of refugees the opportunity to prosper and that allows their daughter to become a two-term member of Parliament.

As one of the few members of Parliament of Vietnamese origin, I had the opportunity to meet with diverse Vietnamese communities in Canada and to work with them to acknowledge how much the Vietnamese have contributed to the diverse Québécois and Canadian culture and to fight for human rights in Vietnam, in particular. During my eight years in the NDP, I was mentored by some formidable and passionate members of Parliament, colleagues with whom I grew up and with whom I learned to be more self-assured. Most of all, I laughed a lot in all of our battles here in Parliament. It takes a healthy dose of humour and self-deprecation to alleviate the stress of this frenzied political life.

My first challenge was to discover my riding. It took time and effort to understand the challenges of the different regions and also to discuss subjects that I knew little or nothing about: the world of agriculture ever present in the riding, the business world, which scared me to death, the Mohawk Nation at Akwesasne.

After the riding boundary was changed, the region of Soulanges was another area to be studied and understood. I travelled around the RCMs by bike, on foot and by car. I thank the 400 community organizations who work hard with limited means. I thank the mayors of the 31 municipalities who are the foundation of our democratic fabric and without whom nothing works, and the entrepreneurs, whom I found so intimidating at the beginning. I thank them all for giving me material for my speeches, for advising me, often at the last minute, when I was drafting my bills, or for turning my attention to the issues they were concerned about.

I thank all the constituents who attended the countless public consultations or sent comments on my work by responding to the monthly mailings. Their contribution was invaluable to democracy and my ability to represent them in House of Commons every day. I hope they will continue to be as active and involved with the next MP. I thank them for placing their trust in me a second time in the 2015 election. To me that second election was an acknowledgement of my ability to stand up for the interests of the riding.

When it comes to agriculture, I fought tooth and nail with my NDP colleagues to protect supply management in its entirety and ensure that dairy farmers received compensation every time they were sacrificed in the signing of free trade agreements. We worked hard with my colleague from Berthier—Maskinongé and others and used pressure tactics against diafiltered milk. Unfortunately, this could come up again because of the treaty negotiation with the United States and Mexico.

Government Orders

One of my personal victories is the agriculture investment announced in the last budget. My team came up with the slogan: at the federal level, we eat locally. For more than six years now, I have been fighting to get a local foods procurement policy. I introduced two bills on this and in the March 2019 budget, we finally see investments to buy local food in schools and to develop and support distribution channels such as public markets. Through the support of many organizations, nearly 3,000 signatures on my petition, and emails of support, we were able to put enough pressure on the government to agree to include these measures in its recent budget.

● (1925)

This is a step in the right direction, but I still dream of seeing a buy local policy take shape someday.

Lastly, an important aspect of my work has been solving problems, whether it is a constituent not getting a service they were entitled to or an issue like the *Kathryn Spirit*, which was a problem 114 metres long and weighing 12,300 tonnes. My office has handled over 1,500 constituent cases, problems involving the Canada Revenue Agency, old age security or the guaranteed income supplement, and temporary foreign worker files. More and more Canadians are calling their MPs for help when they are unable to get a response through the usual channels. After all the public service cutbacks, that is the unfortunate reality.

One major case was the *Kathryn Spirit*, my region's biggest headache. This huge wreck had been towed into Lake Saint-Louis in 2011 without proper authorization by the company Groupe St-Pierre. This was blatant proof that corporate self-regulation does not work. The wreck was resold to a Mexican company and then abandoned. This case also highlighted the limits of the federal government, which declined to get involved every time, up until the very last second. At the end of the day, the polluter won. The company that had brought in the vessel ended up with at least \$11 million of public money in its pockets. As they said on *Infoman*, this is like someone dumping trash in the neighbour's yard and then getting paid to take care of the mess they made. All in all, this incompetence and mismanagement of public funds cost taxpayers \$24 million. Fortunately, thanks to the efforts of Canadians, elected officials and local journalists, this problem is now behind us.

Now, let's talk about struggles and victories in Ottawa. As a young woman who has served in the House since 2011, I know what a challenge it was to get people to take women and young people seriously.

In 2014, four NDP female colleagues and I had to fight to have the right to bring our children inside Parliament and breastfeed them until the age of 18 months. We won that fight.

The next fight was to get a family room in Parliament. We won that one too. I would like to thank my colleagues, including Nycole Turmel, the former whip, for fighting alongside us and not only making this room a reality, but also creating better conditions for mothers who want to go into politics.

I am also proud to have launched the women in the lead event, which, since 2016, has welcomed 80 to 150 women every year to share what they have experienced in decision-making positions and

talk about female leadership. There is still a lot of work to do to attract more women to politics, especially in terms of work-life balance. It is hard when we must vote or sit until midnight, like we do at the end of each session. There has been some progress, but we need to keep going.

It is also important to highlight my efforts to promote the French language. I am proud to have debated in French in committee and in the House of Commons over the past eight years. I am also proud of having created the Réseau des jeunes parlementaires de la Francophonie.

I would be remiss if I did not talk about youth and their passionate commitment to a number of issues. It is often said that young people are the segment of the population that is the most active and involved in the community right now. That is true, and we need to listen to them, because they challenge our ways of thinking and doing things. However, our decision-making structures are still lacking in young voices. That is why I introduced a bill in the House of Commons to create a commissioner for young persons.

I also want the government's youth policy to include an action plan, instead of just paying lip service. I want the Prime Minister's Youth Council to let young people say what is going well and what is not without having to go through the Prime Minister's communications office.

Lastly, I want to talk about the environment, an issue that is of vital importance to young people. This issue has no colour. It is not green, red, blue or orange. It really is everyone's responsibility. I think the work that the NDP did by unveiling its green platform last week is very ambitious and worth exploring.

I am very proud to have started the first forum on clean energy and industry in 2014 with my colleagues from New Westminster—Burnaby, Drummond and Edmonton Strathcona.

In closing, I am honoured to have served as the member for Beauharnois—Salaberry and Salaberry—Suroît for eight years. I am going to get very emotional when I leave this place in a few weeks. I could never have done this work without the invaluable help of the dedicated assistants I have had the pleasure and privilege of working with over the past eight years.

● (1930)

I want to thank my current staff, Edith Gariépy, Glen Cyr, Amélie Leduc, Jean-Marc Fagelson and Katherine Massam.

I also want to thank everyone who has worked for me over the past eight years, including the assistants, volunteers and interns who made my work look good every day, in good times and bad. I also want to thank the teams in the House leader's office and the whip's office, who work behind the scenes and look after us so well every day. I will miss them, but I will see them again.

Government Orders

I will close by thanking my friends, my family and my in-laws for supporting me throughout this wonderful adventure. I will be eternally grateful to my love, my beloved, my sidekick, my poet, my confidant, Mathieu, who agreed to be a stay-at-home dad for the past five years so I could thrive as a woman, an MP and a mother. I want to thank my daughter, Mila, who often had to share me and did not always understand why, if I was my own boss, I was not staying at home to play with her instead of going to work. Mila, I will be home soon.

[English]

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this is quite an occasion for me, personally, and for my family. What a rare privilege this is, to stand, at any point, in the House of Commons, a place I consider sacred in our democracy. It is a privilege, as well, to be able to talk about life in politics.

This is called a farewell speech. I looked around, and I quite like this quote from Steinbeck:

Farewell has a sweet sound of reluctance. Good-by is short and final, a word with teeth sharp to bite through the string that ties past to the future.

I like the idea of farewell. The last number of weeks and months have been quite a strange experience for me. It has been a bit like being at my own funeral, actually. People come up to me and talk about how they feel about me, good and bad, and I get to hear comments that I think we do not share with each other nearly often enough.

I had some reluctance about giving this speech. I did not want to do it at all. My wife, Diana, said, “Don’t be stupid”, which is often the advice she has for me. How do I sum up 15 years in politics in a 10-minute speech? How do I, in a 10-minute speech, properly sum up all of the proper thanks that I have for the many volunteers, the staff, the people who support us and make what we do possible? How can I properly express, in a 10-minute speech, the gratitude I feel for the privilege and the opportunity to be a member of Parliament?

I can recall my first speech, which, to no surprise of my parents, Margarite and John, I was late to. I was rushing to the House. I was a new MP and was told that my staff would write my speech, and then I would read it. I bolted into the House, and as soon as my backside touched the seat, the Speaker said, “The member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley”. I popped up and started to read the text that had been prepared over many diligent hours by my staff, Jerry. Within the first paragraph, I was bored out of my mind. I thought that if I was bored, it was very unlikely that anybody else would be interested in what I was saying, so I turned the page over, and I just spoke as best as I could.

It was a bit intimidating, because in the front row, at the time, was Ed Broadbent, who had come back to politics. He turned around in his seat to watch. I thought that if I could get through this trial by fire, with the steely eyes of Ed Broadbent looking at me, then I would do okay.

I know I have been here quite a while now. I knew this as I was walking through the city just last year and saw construction projects that had been started and completed during my tenure as a member of Parliament, government projects. It was shocking. I do not want

anyone to look back, but it has been so long I actually had a full head of hair when I got here. I will ask that no one google that.

I thought of how to try to put this all together in my mind. A favourite quote of mine is from the great writer Thomas King, who said, “The truth about stories is, that’s all we are.” I firmly believe this. I think we are all stories. We all have our past. We all have our memories, our family, our connection to this place.

My story of getting into politics was a most improbable one. I was a working-class kid growing up with a single mom in Toronto, a cashier at a Dominion food store, with no political inclinations in our family whatsoever, and I ended up in the northwest of British Columbia through a very strange series of fortunate events.

I was asked by a good friend, Bill Goodacre, to consider running. I think many of us have this story, of a friend saying, “You should run.” I said the appropriate thing to Bill: “You’re crazy. That is a terrible idea.” He was quite skilled at convincing me that this might be a good idea.

I believe politics, at its best, is a vocation. It should be a calling, not a job. It is not something people show up to. It is something that people are called to do, to serve that calling as best they can.

My goals in coming to Parliament 15 years ago were quite modest. I wanted to leave with my health; I wanted to leave with my family; and I wanted to leave with the integrity I came with intact.

● (1935)

Now, those might seem like modest goals, but they are actually not that modest, as I learned, because this can be a brutal place. It can be hard on families. It can be hard on relationships. It can be hard on us as individuals, and we do not often talk about the strains of being away, the mental health struggles many of us have and do not talk about, maybe increasingly so now.

However, I am proud to represent a place like Skeena—Bulkley Valley. Those who have not been there should go, because it is a magnificent part of the world. It is vast. It is beautiful. It is breathtaking. It is the very best of our country, and even better still are the people who live there. We have an expression up north: “The people don’t make the land. The land makes the people.” We are informed by that place, and I am proud of the work we have done.

In this strange life, I have had opportunities to meet great, powerful men and women, such as presidents, kings and queens. They are all impressive in their own way, but the most impressive people to me have been the leaders I have been fortunate enough to encounter in the northwest of British Columbia: local mayors, local community activists and indigenous leaders, who have let me into their hearts and their worlds to express what their vocation is.

Government Orders

A number of years ago, I was attending a Nisga'a celebration called Hobiye. It is a beautiful, ancient celebration. It is the coming back of the salmon and the eulachon to the northwest. The ceremony goes on all night, and the chiefs at one point come into the hall. Members have to imagine a community hall in northwestern B.C. on a beautiful night, and the chiefs are all milling about outside in their beautiful regalia with amazing masks. One of the chiefs came to me and said, "Walk in with us", and I said, "This is not my place. This is your hall. This is your place. I am just an observer." He said, "We've talked about it, and you're walking with us."

As I came into the hall for Hobiye, the first three rows on either side were filled with women singing, and they sing into the middle, where the chiefs walk in. Outside of them are the drummers. The Nisga'a have a tradition of turning a bent wood box drum on its corner, and big Nisga'a dudes pound away in a heartbeat rhythm. I walked in with the chiefs. It is a very slow procession, and they sing to their leadership. They call their leadership forward and hold them up to represent them. I thought about what we needed to learn from that as parliamentarians, as people who purport to lead and speak on behalf of others.

I have been so blessed. We are a family, and there are many families that inform our politics. My political family is here, and in my riding in Skeena, executive and volunteers, far too many to name: Jennifer Davies, Rob Goffinet, Len and Irene, and Pat Moss. We all have dedicated Canadians who care and inform us. My political family was also Jack, whom I miss to this day.

We also have our parliamentary family, and that is not often spoken of. We, as colleagues, struggle with one another and disagree, but we also meet in this sacred place, and sometimes, not often enough maybe, we find common ground as we seek to make this country a better place.

Then I have my actual family, who are here: Diana and my beautiful boys, Isaac and Elliot. We have some plans. We have some time together, which I so look forward to.

We join together in the northwest to defend what we believe we must defend. We try to reach out across traditional political lines of interest and groups of interest to support one another and defend what is sacred to us, which is the land and the rivers that feed us, the very world that enriches us. For 15 years, the folks in the northwest have decided to put me forward as their voice, and no more of a humbling experience have I ever had.

I believe we are actors passing across the stage. We all have our moment here, and we can lose perspective as we pass across this stage, yet others will pass behind us. May we, in all of our efforts, seek to not only leave Parliament a better place, but leave this country a better place. For sure, I have been left better by this experience.

● (1940)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet (Hochelaga, NDP): Mr. Speaker, on May 2, 2011, I was granted the tremendous honour of being elected to represent Hochelaga. I was the first woman and the first New Democrat to represent that riding federally. The class of 2011

had to learn fast. Less than a month after we got here, the government was forcing Canada Post employees back to work.

During what Tom Mulcair called the week of four Thursdays, when NDP members fought for workers' rights day and night for 58 hours, the government misled the public by saying the strike was hurting small business, when it was really the employer that had locked employees out and had only to let them back in. In addition to forcing people back to work, the government also forced workers to accept a wage increase that was well below what the employer had offered. When it comes to interfering in the business of Crown corporations, the Conservatives cannot be beat.

My first speech in the House focused on the reason I had recently become involved in politics. I wanted to protect Canadians' rights and make their lives easier. I worked on that speech all night, but I was proud to be part of the NDP team on that day, June 24, even though it meant I would miss my first national holiday as the MP for my riding. On that day, the NDP proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that it stands up for workers and gives Canadians a voice.

I remember asking someone to sign a petition and hearing that it was the first time she felt that what she had to say was important and that she was being listened to. Listening to the public is supposed to be our job. I wanted to give the people a voice, a voice that would be heard by the Minister of Transport, so I agreed to sponsor a petition and take other steps to show that citizens are opposed to the proposed location of an overpass for trucks between the highway and the Port of Montreal in Hochelaga.

As my colleagues know very well, housing is a hobby horse of mine. My nationwide tour and my lengthy discussions with housing advocacy groups clearly showed me that the cuts and lack of ambitious investments by successive Liberal and Conservative governments are responsible for the current crisis. That is why I fought for years, using bills, motions, questions and statements, for the right to housing, the renewal of social housing agreements, an overall housing strategy and a targeted strategy for indigenous housing.

In order to properly represent Quebec's vision, I repeatedly told the minister responsible for housing that it was important to maintain a general and community-based homelessness partnering strategy. Unfortunately, the Conservatives do not believe that housing is a right, and when the Liberals finally came up with a housing strategy, they did not have the guts to make the budget choices that would have ensured its success.

Government Orders

In Hochelaga, an elected official who is not present in the community, who does not do his or her job, and who is not in touch with the people will soon be a former elected official. There have been many dedicated, loyal assistants who have helped build an excellent reputation for the NDP team in my riding over the years. They are François, Catheryn, Maxime, Chantal, Patrick, Philippe, Olivia, Éric, Julien, Ariane, Anne, Alexandre, Niall, Sandrine, Samuel and Émilie. I learned a lot from them. People from other ridings that I will not name regularly call us to get the help they could not get anywhere else, because they heard about the work that we were doing.

I owe a debt of gratitude to all of my colleagues. Thank you. It is because of their help that a homeless shelter was able to reopen, that Jessica got the federal funding she needed to help her take care of her children who have disabilities, and that Enet and her two young children were able to stay in Canada and escape the threats of Mexican cartels. Every year, my colleagues also helped plan the CAP St-Barnabé share store, which I believe is the largest share store on the island of Montreal and helps feed hundreds of local families in need.

With the help of some generous volunteers, including those from the NDP riding association in Hochelaga and some ingenious interns, my office has held many celebrations this year for new Canadian citizens to make them feel welcome and appreciated. We give everyone a certificate and take nice family portraits. They love this activity. Another very popular event is our lively annual brunch, where we get together and chew the fat. People talk about what their local MP can do for them and get a chance to meet their neighbours. The next one is scheduled for Saturday, and, like every year, we are expecting a full house.

We are also working on problems caused by gentrification and the opioid crisis. As you can see, we are always hard at work in Hochelaga.

● (1945)

I have learned a million things, and I have been very blessed in this job. I got to speak before the Council of Europe, through the Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association. I also visited every Canadian province.

I was NDP whip for three and a half years, and I had the opportunity to work with Rob, Anthony, Christian, Chuck, Theresa, Wassim and Audrey. These people are so generous and compassionate, and they are an endless source of information. With the help of them, some of my colleagues and the Speaker of the House of Commons, I was able to make Parliament more accommodating for young families, and I am very proud of that.

I must admit that we are spoiled in the House of Commons. The staff treats us like royalty, which makes our job much easier and much more pleasant. I thank them for that.

I want to apologize to my friends, and above all to my family and in-laws, for all of the events that I have missed. To my father Gilles, my mother Solange, Jacques, Elena, Michel, Karina, Claude, Sylvie, Guy, Manon, Lynda, Richard, Peggy and Marnie, I love you.

[English]

Without the support and love of my husband Doug, my sons Alec and Nicholas and their partners Lauren and Anne, I simply would not be here. They believed in me, gave me self-confidence and pampered me. Did I ever tell them I love them? Only a million times.

● (1950)

[Translation]

I urge the people of Canada to bring all these terrific NDP members, and more, back to Ottawa in October. They are here for their constituents, not for themselves. Working to make the world a better place is in their DNA. I know them well, for they have become my good friends over the years. Canadians can put their trust in them.

I thank the people of Hochelaga for being so warm, imaginative and genuine. They gave me the honour of allowing me to represent them, and they have been so delightful. I just hope I was able to help them in some way.

I will be 64 in October, so I have decided to retire. There are so many things I have not yet had time to do.

Before becoming a member of Parliament, I was an archaeologist and guide at a museum. I worked in the labour movement, but I had never been involved in politics. My uncle, Marcel Pelletier, was a clerk in the House of Commons for many years. My ancestor, Charles Alphonse Pantaléon Pelletier, served as an MNA, an MP, a senator, speaker of the Senate—no one is perfect—and lieutenant governor of Quebec. Perhaps Anne-Marie Aubert and Jack Layton sensed something, and my political career was foreordained.

[English]

Hon. Kevin Sorenson (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to deliver my farewell speech in the House of Commons, a place that I have been honoured to be in for 19 years, close to two decades.

Although there are a number of friends and family here tonight, one person is not here who I wish was. It is my seatmate, the member for Langley—Aldergrove, who is in a hospital tonight in Langley. If he is watching or listening, our prayers are with him tonight, not just those from me and my family but those from our entire caucus.

I also have another very close friend, Dale Markwart, who is lying on a bed in a hospital in Castor, Alberta tonight. He is in a tough battle. Dale is a close friend and he means a lot to us all.

After six elections, 19 great years and various positions in the official opposition and the government, it is now time for me to spend more time with my family, which had so selflessly and stoically stood by my side through this long and demanding journey. It is time for me to return to the farm and dedicate more time to those who mean the most to me: my family, those in my community of Killam, Alberta and those in the county of Flagstaff.

However, I do so with a very heavy heart, as I have so much enjoyed the privilege of being not only a member of Parliament, but a member of Parliament for the riding of Crowfoot, which later had its name changed to Battle River-Crowfoot.

Government Orders

I cannot thank the good people of my riding enough for their support. For 19 years, they were my boss. Every day I have received letters, emails, telephone calls and face-to-face words of encouragement and prayers that mean more to me than they will ever know.

I was first elected in November 2000. I stood in the House, on February 1, 2001, to deliver my maiden speech, in which I said:

I thank all the people of Crowfoot for bestowing their faith in me. I promise to respectfully and truthfully represent their views and concerns here. I pledge to work hard, with the same diligence that the majority of the people of Crowfoot demonstrate daily as they go about their occupations and their careers in our predominately rural riding.

I have worked hard to keep my word. I firmly believe that is why I was returned to Parliament in 2004, 2006, 2008, 2011 and 2015.

The people of my riding are important. However, it has been my faith in Jesus Christ and the hope he offers the world. That has been at the heart of my keeping my word, staying principled, serving with humility and respect and working hard every day to earn the trust of my constituents.

When I thought about writing this speech, I thought I better go to Wikipedia to see what it said about me. It sounds a little selfish and vain, but I just want to mention some of the things Wikipedia views as accomplishments.

It says I represent “a riding that is very conservative even by the standards of rural Alberta.” Well, as my staff has reminded me, a three-legged dog could win in Crowfoot as long as it is a Conservative. It also says, “most of his territory has been held by a centre-right MP without interruption since 1935.” I love Crowfoot. It goes on:

He has won the riding by some of the largest margins ever recorded in Canadian politics. He was first elected in 2000, taking 70.5 percent of the vote, and since then has never dropped below 80 percent of the vote. In January 2006, he was re-elected with 82.5 per cent of the popular vote, the highest total recorded by a Conservative candidate in that election.

Wikipedia also notes that I chaired the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security and the Special Committee on the Canadian Mission in Afghanistan while the Conservatives were in government. In opposition, I have received a remarkable amount of enjoyment out of chairing the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

These opportunities, as well as being the public safety critic while in opposition, have given me such an appreciation for the institutions and traditions that have shaped this place and such respect for the many and varied stakeholders who come to us to plead their cases for change, accountability and principled policy that makes a difference in the everyday lives of average Canadians.

● (1955)

Being appointed to these positions as a member of Parliament has been the greatest distinction in my working career. All of it is thanks to the tremendous support of the amazing constituents of Battle River—Crowfoot, the many volunteers on my election campaigns and the dedication and the sage advice of my board of directors and executives.

I want to mention some of my campaign managers: Norman and Marian Steinwand, Bill and Judy Wilson, and for the last five elections, Steven Snider, as well as my president, Martin West. There are so many people I could thank.

I thank my current and former staff for their outstanding work and support in running my Ottawa and constituency offices: Leslie Olson; Gail Nordstrom; John Howard, who passed away while he was employed in the office; Emily Gilroy; Kirsty Skinstead-Lutz; Amy Jackson; Damien Kurek; Jeannie Smith; Linda McKay; Nancy Stewart, Dan Wallace; Melissa Johnston; and Paula Wilkie. Without them and their tireless efforts and loyalty, we could not have provided the first-class assistance that my constituents so richly deserve and have received.

I am equally indebted to my former ministerial staff led by chief of staff, Bram Sapers, who also professionally helped me navigate cabinet committees, memoranda to cabinet, departmental briefings and the onerous and exhausting budget preparations.

I have had the privilege of serving under amazing leaders. Preston Manning was the one who got me excited about politics and interested in making a change in this country. Stockwell Day showed confidence in me after one year by appointing me as the public safety, or solicitor general in those days, shadow minister.

I also need to thank our former prime minister, the right hon. Stephen Harper for the faith that he placed in me as the minister of state for finance, a position I served to the very best of my ability. I am so proud to have called the hon. Stephen Harper my Prime Minister, my leader and more importantly, my friend.

He led his caucus and this country with unparalleled wisdom, humility and, yes, the tough veneer that is so necessary as a respected world leader of his calibre. I was proud to stand by his side and give him unconditional support as we negotiated trade agreements, steered through the recession and balanced successive budgets to ensure the future of this country and that of our children and grandchildren.

Serving in his government was the highlight of my political career. Likewise, it is an honour to serve with our current leader, Andrew Scheer. I campaigned for him in 2004. We saw him as the Speaker of the House and hopefully as our next Prime Minister.

For many of my colleagues and I there were some negatives. We will always remember the terrible day on October 22, 2014, when we feared for our lives and the life of our Prime Minister, as shots were fired just outside our caucus room doors. Corporal Nathan Cirillo had already been fatally shot at the Canadian National War Memorial before his killer made his way up here to Parliament and into Centre Block. Shots were fired. People were hit. All parties were in the midst of their caucus meetings. It was a long and scary day that is forever embedded in one of the darkest memories that I have of Parliament.

Government Orders

The other was 9/11. I remember my nine-year-old daughter running onto the deck and telling me that a plane had hit a building. Less than a year after being elected and six months after being made public safety critic for the official opposition, I was tasked with responding to the ministerial statement calling on the Liberal government for anti-terrorism legislation.

Those dark days are all but washed away by the many fond memories I have of Parliament Hill and the friendships I have forged. There are so many that I need to thank.

First of all, more than anyone, I will miss my good friend and roommate for 19 years, the member of Parliament for Cypress Hills—Grasslands. David and his wife, Sheila, have become lifetime friends. Thank you for all the late-night chats as we ate pizza and popcorn, solving all the problems of Canada and the world, sometimes frustrated with political correctness. Today is his anniversary and he has been together with Sheila a little longer than he has been with me.

● (2000)

To my parents, Ralph and Jean Sorenson, and my in-laws Ben and Alice Redekop, I thank them for their prayers and support. They have meant so very much to me and to my wife Darlene. My father, who watches most question periods with my mom, is now 93 years old and I am not hearing anymore, “Dad, it's time to get a life.”

To my wife Darlene, and our children Ryan, Kristen and her husband Matthew, and now my grandson Kayden, words are not enough to express the deep appreciation and love I have for them all. I am so proud of each one of them. Darlene has been my partner, my sounding board, the anchor that has kept our family grounded and so much more. She has given speeches on my behalf, has campaigned and has always been there beside me. I love her more now than I have ever loved her.

Once again, and in conclusion, I thank the people of Battle River—Crowfoot for bestowing their faith in me. They are truly the best constituents in all of Canada. I will miss this place. I will miss this job. It has been an honour to serve the people of Battle River—Crowfoot.

Finally, to my colleagues here this evening, I thank them for indulging me. I thank them for helping me along the journey of being a member of Parliament. I thank them for allowing me a few moments tonight to reflect and to give thanks. I want to give God praise. God bless everyone here tonight, and may God continue to bless this great land that is the greatest country in the world: Canada.

Mr. Dave Van Kesteren (Chatham-Kent—Leamington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I was born in Chatham, Ontario, in 1955 and have lived there all my life. I attended school in Chatham, was married in Chatham, raised a family in Chatham and started my business in Chatham. Chatham has always been my home. I have always been proud to live in the city that was once the site of the battle that claimed the life of the great Chief Tecumseh in 1813 in the War of 1812, that was the end of the Underground Railroad, and the city where John Brown came to recruit combatants before his fateful attack at Harper's Ferry. It is also the hometown of the great Baseball Hall of Fame inductee, Fergie Jenkins.

I had no formal training for the job, but I always had a unique fascination for politics. Therefore, finally at the age of 49 after narrowly losing my first election in 2004, I found myself elected to represent the people of Chatham-Kent—Essex on the eve of January 23, 2006. I am so privileged tonight to rise to give my final remarks in the House of Commons after serving here for over 13 years.

Let me first thank the constituents of Chatham-Kent—Leamington, as it is now known, for giving me this opportunity to serve them. It is an honour to have been chosen to represent them. Of course, this would not have been possible without the help of hundreds of volunteers manning phones, pounding signs, door-knocking and donating both their time and money during the past five writ periods.

After I was elected, I would never have been able to serve without the excellent staff who worked alongside of me. Let me speak about them.

Jill Watts-Declare joined me shortly after I arrived here in Ottawa in 2006. As a new member of Parliament, I had a lot to learn. She provided the office with stable and knowledgeable expertise on how to navigate my way around Parliament Hill. She has faithfully served in her role as an experienced office manager and has mentored several other staff members throughout her years here. She is greatly appreciated for all her service. I thank Jill for all her hard work.

Peter Roos was my first campaign manager, but also a loyal friend and confidante from the beginning. Peter joined the office team in 2010, and finally decided to hang them up just before his 80th birthday last year. That has not stopped him from continuing to run passport clinics and he still comes in to help when we are short-staffed. I thank Peter.

Another one of my friends and confidantes is George Paiciovich. I know George is listening. He is one of those political hacks we find around our circles, having been around Parliament since the 1970s. He served under several MPs and was the chief of staff to Garth Turner in the days of the debt clock; that was his brainchild. Early after my election, he offered me advice and guidance and then joined the team responsible for training our younger members and serving the riding with business, municipal needs and special projects. I thank George for his friendship and his tutoring throughout these years.

I could not forget Nate Veltkamp and Adam Roffle, who served as my special assistants. I thank them for their dedication and great work. They have each moved on to greater challenges and continue to serve in the community. Presently, this position is being carried out by Will Pennell, who is now in George's boot camp.

My Chatham office was served from day one by Julian Belanger, who also ran against me for the Conservative nomination. We all remember his professionalism and his political savvy, which were so important to me in those early days. Sadly, Julian was taken from us in 2014. We all miss him terribly.

Wayne Hasson has filled this vacancy, and also served as my campaign manager in the 2015 election. He is doing a tremendous job in the Chatham office, managing the constituency casework, and I thank Wayne.

Government Orders

Peter Bondy and Lisa Mitchell were also important leaders who served in the constituency and who helped me shape the office in those early years. I say thanks to Peter and Lisa.

Of course there is my EDA: Dale, Eldon, Bernice, Mike, Gary and so many more. They were all there right from the very beginning and are still there today. I thank them for their loyalty and their hard work.

● (2005)

Now let me talk about my family.

My wife Faye and I are blessed with eight children and their spouses—Jeremy and Jolene, Rachael and Justin, Mike and Angela, David and Katie, Joel and Shawna, Andrea and John, Adam and Mel, and Eric and Katie—and 39 grandchildren.

I only have 10 minutes, so I will not name them.

They were all there, helping and supporting me at every election, pounding signs, going door to door, making calls. With this devoted army, it is no wonder I have had success these past four elections. Thank you, and we do love you.

To Jeremy and Jolene, who under their leadership, and with David and Joel, grew a mom-and-pop dealership and faithfully built it into one of the finest Hyundai dealerships in the country, thank you for your sacrifice.

My wife Faye has travelled beside me these 44 years on some crazy paths, and yet has continued to support me, encourage me, advise me and keep me grounded throughout the trip. She is the one who has kept the home fires burning, tending to our children and grandchildren over all the years I was away. She is the unsung hero who helped make all of this possible. Many times I have advised those seeking political office that unless they have the full support of their spouse, they had better not consider this job. Faye, I love you and I thank you for your support.

I thank the office staff here in Ottawa who delivered the services that help make this great country work. I thank the many volunteers who make the passport clinics and other such events such a success. I thank my friends and family and supporters who have helped me through these years.

Lastly, I thank my God for giving me this opportunity to serve Him as a member of Parliament for my country. I thank God for holding me and keeping me these years. I thank God for sustaining my health when working the long hours and for protecting me on the road each week as I drove back and forth.

I know I must have forgotten to thank someone, but they should be sure to know that they are greatly appreciated. I am truly a blessed and fortunate man, and I owe it all to the goodness of others.

Now let me spend a little time on some of my experiences here in Ottawa.

This job has allowed me to travel to all parts of the world to meet with leaders and experts in many countries. I have witnessed the vibrant economy of Asia, honoured our soldiers in Europe, witnessed democracy at work in South America, encouraged peace in the Middle East, and saw extreme poverty but also hope in Africa.

I have served on many parliamentary committees—ethics, fisheries, industry, finance, foreign affairs, international trade, status of women, and health, and currently I serve as vice-chair on the Library of Parliament committee. Last but not least, I remember all the years as chair of the Ontario regional caucus.

I have shared these experiences with some extraordinary men and women. I want to talk about Steven Fletcher. Steven is a quadriplegic who overcame tremendous obstacles after an accident. He told me that he even had to relearn how to breathe. Although he does not experience sleep, he still arrived each day to serve as a member of Parliament and even achieved cabinet in the Conservative government.

I have met so many special people here, and many have become my closest friends. I will not begin to name them, as that would be unfair. Their friendship will always remain as we return to our private lives.

In closing, let me say that this has been a tremendous honour, but it is time to go back home, back to my family, back to Faye, back to the folks of Chatham-Kent—Leamington, and maybe some here will join me there soon so that Faye and I can give them some southwestern Ontario hospitality.

I thank you. May God bless you, and may God bless Canada.

● (2015)

Mr. Robert Sopuck (Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa, CPC):

Mr. Speaker, I should point out right off the bat that you were one of my team members yesterday, and thanks to your efforts, our team won. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It was a pleasure to serve with you on that team.

I had the honour of being elected in this House nine years ago this October. I was elected in 2010 with a minority government; again in 2011, five months after my first win, with a majority government; and then again in 2015. I have experienced being a member of a minority government, a majority government, and the opposition. I have had the honour of spending a lot of time in Centre Block. Over a nine-year career, I have been very fortunate.

Why does a person enter politics? Quite simply, it is to make a difference.

My political transformation from a wet-behind-the-ears, know-nothing teenager to a budding Conservative actually started in 1968. We lived in Winnipeg. I am of Czechoslovakian descent, and we were part of a small Czech community in Winnipeg. What happened in 1968 is the Soviets invaded Czechoslovakia. Our family took in refugees from Czechoslovakia. That gets a person thinking about the power of government and how government can be a force for evil, but if a person works hard enough, it can be a force for good.

Of course, being a Czech, we are made fun of a lot. I have been called a bouncing Czech, a cancelled Czech, a blank Czech. As long as I am not a phony Czech, I will be okay.

Government Orders

As the evolution of my political thought moved along, I bought a farm south of Riding Mountain National Park. I had a dream of becoming a farmer, living off the land, building a log house back in the woods, all that kind of stuff.

What went through my mind were the opportunities that this country offers. If people take risks, they can fail, but they can also succeed.

I am a Slavic person, as my mom was born in Poland. Slavic people like me have an inordinate fondness for property rights. We are visceral when it comes to owning our property. As I looked at the world around me, I could see that there were forces out there that were basically threatening my way of life and the way of life of all other property owners, and I do not just mean farmers; I mean people who have built something with their lives and how important that is to them. When government gets in the way of that, that is simply evil. People need a free society and the ability to take risks.

What comes with a free society? It is personal responsibility. I get a little tired when people talk about crime statistics all the time. I will be quite blunt: It is as if it is my fault when somebody commits a crime.

Personal responsibility lies within the individual, so as I recite these characteristics, what political party would someone possibly join? It's the Conservatives, of course. These are the things that we stand for.

I represent a large rural area of 66,000 square kilometres. Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa is one of the most beautiful places in Canada. My community is very diverse, with ranchers, farming, forestry, hunting, trapping, oil exploration and so on, yet with all that resource development, it remains an extraordinarily beautiful place.

Actually, conservation is one of the major activities of the communities in my constituency. People are harvesting trees in their day job, and then in the evening working with their fisheries habitat group to repair streams. Those are the kinds of people who are in my constituency, and I get very angry when people like that are attacked. Whether it is the animal rights movement, environmental extremists or people who want to take their firearms away, I get angry. We are not supposed to get angry in this job, but I simply could not help it. The injustice of what happened when those good people got attacked made me even more determined to defend that particular way of life.

I think we have a number of colleagues here who do exactly the same thing. I am very proud to be a colleague of members such as the member for Red Deer—Lacombe, the member for North Okanagan—Shuswap and the member for Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound.

I have been on the farm of the member for Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound. I would defy any environmentalist to go to his farm and see anything that he is doing wrong. He gently manages the land. He looks after it. He looks after the wildlife and cares about the world. The member for North Okanagan—Shuswap was the president of the B.C. Wildlife Federation and the member for Red Deer—Lacombe has a fisheries background just like mine, so Conservatives have absolutely nothing to apologize for in terms of our conservation ethics.

● (2020)

We are the people who actually get things done. Who negotiated the acid rain treaty? Brian Mulroney did. Who negotiated the ozone treaty? Brian Mulroney did. When I hear all this environmental stuff, all I know is that Conservatives can be very proud of our contributions to conservation.

I did not travel as far as my friend from Chatham-Kent—Leamington. I stayed at home and spent all my time on the fisheries and environment committees, and I very much enjoyed that. We had some very contentious bills to deal with such as Bill C-69, Bill C-68, CEAA 2012 and so on. I have to say, though, that I really enjoyed my time on the fisheries committee, because believe it or not, it worked across party lines. It is a very collegial group, and most of the reports were unanimous. I see the chair of the fisheries committee here, and I want to thank him for his efforts on behalf of Canada's fisheries.

Getting back to the constituency itself, what can I say about constituents? They place their faith in us. Nothing touches me more than when people I do not know comes up to me and says that they voted for me. Is that not something? We have all experienced that, because we cannot know everybody in our constituencies.

I want to thank my EDAs and the volunteers, of course. The late Jeff MacDonald was a mentor to me, as was Bob Lepischak. I thank all those people who worked so hard: the fundraisers, the EDA and so on.

What can I say about my family and my darling Caroline? I know she is watching—hello, darling. She was my best political adviser. As I said before, she is a spouse who praised me when it was required and made sure I knew what I was doing wrong when that was required as well.

Caroline texted me earlier. She was out today planting tomatoes in the garden. She is what we call a “bush chick”, which is a term that I use with the greatest respect. She lives in the woods and knows how to do things.

Tony and Marsha are our kids, and their spouses are Laine and Graham. We have three absolutely beautiful grandchildren, Eden, Senon and Esmee. One of the reasons I will be heading out is to spend time with the three grandchildren on the farm. They love the farm. They love taking the guts out of a duck, cleaning a fish, driving a quad and doing all those things with papa.

I want to thank my brother and sister, Tim and Joyce, for their support over the years. I also thank the neighbours. Those who live in rural areas know how important neighbours are. When my wife Caroline is by herself on the farm, I know the neighbours are there for her. That is a very important fact.

I want to thank my mom and dad, Joe and Ida Sopuck. They have sadly passed on. They were both born in eastern Europe, dad in Czechoslovakia and mom in Poland.

Government Orders

I want to thank my mentors. They include Alan Scarth, an environmental lawyer from Winnipeg, who is a deeply philosophical man who helped me; Ted Poyser, who was chief of staff to Duff Roblin—and I am going to talk about Duff in a minute; Charlie Mayer, whom many members know, as he represented part of my area; and the sainted Harry Enns, who was the longest-serving MLA in Manitoba's history.

Harry gave me some really political advice. He said, “Robert, my boy, there are two things a politician never passes up: a chance to give a speech and a chance to go to the bathroom.” When one has a constituency as big as I do, one knows where all those spots are. I will leave it at that.

I thank my Ottawa staff Branden and Alex, who are in the office now, as well as Duncan, Brett, Jay, Dan, Olivier, Kyle, and the constituency staff Judy, Janell, Megan, Grace, Nellie and Valerie. I am sorry to go so fast, folks, but I do not have time to stop.

I really want to thank the House of Commons staff, the security staff and the bus drivers. They are salt-of-the-earth folks. As the member for Battle River—Crowfoot said, I was there in October when Parliament Hill was attacked, and we can never forget that these people will take a bullet for us. They deserve all of our respect.

I want to end by thanking my colleagues all around the House. I made friendships that will last for years. The value of the team is so important. I especially want to thank the Manitoba caucus, the member for Brandon—Souris, the member for Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, the member for Portage—Lisgar and the member for Provencher for their help and support and indeed love over the years.

I too want to talk about what it was like to serve under Prime Minister Harper, who, as history will show, was one of the greatest prime ministers this country has ever seen.

It has been an honour and a privilege to serve with all members on all sides of the House as I end my political journey.

• (2025)

Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I hope I am not getting all this applause because my colleagues are glad to see the backside of me. I will have a few jokes about that later.

It has been a very interesting evening. It is fabulous hearing from all the members. I am really touched by the speeches of my colleagues. I thought I would start on a lighter note.

I was impressed by my former colleague, Libby Davies, who actually recounted in detail her first day as an elected member of Parliament on the Hill. I wondered how she remembered that, and then I remembered my first moment stepping onto the polished marble floors of Centre Block and almost doing the splits. My sage advice for all the new female MPs who will come in the next election is to make sure that they have rubber soles on their shoes.

I am so happy I could serve in Centre Block. I miss those stained glass windows.

I first want to thank my brother and my niece for being there for me, keeping me fed and my spirits high. The whole world deserves a brother like mine. I am equally indebted to my wonderful friend

Carol, who never thinks about politics. It is a delight to come home and talk to her, because we talk about everything else: the tulips being up or a beautiful walk in the forest. That is the kind of friend a politician needs. I thank Carol, who has kept my house and garden whole.

I thank my dear friends Donna and Hans, Frances, Cheryl, Darlene and Stephen for endless friendship and support, my friends from across Canada.

I extend my deep gratitude to my amazing campaign manager, Erica Bullwinkle, and my wonderful campaign teams for all four elections. I notice that not many people have talked about their campaigns, but that is a big part of who we are. We would not be here if we did not campaign. They donated incomparable amounts of time and energy to send me to Ottawa, and what fun we had in those campaigns. It is so much fun canvassing with youth. For those who have never canvassed with young kids, they should try it out. It will change their lives.

Among my fondest memories of an election win was dancing in a pub with the visiting Mexican soccer team, excited that a socialist had been elected for Alberta. As with my colleagues, I was the first NDP and the first woman elected in my riding, but I was also the first NDP elected in Alberta in 25 years, and then re-elected and re-elected again.

I continue to thank people who say they worked on my campaign, and far too often I have to say thanks, because I did not have a chance to thank them before, because Erica kept me out canvassing 24 hours a day.

Absolute, profound accolades are sent to the dedicated Edmonton Strathcona federal constituency association, which, for 11 years, helped at every constituency event, serving refreshments, flipping burgers or sweeping hall floors. These volunteers are the source of democracy in Canada. They are the unsung heroes. They never get volunteer awards, because they are “partisan”. We need to change that.

Too often, the unsung heroes of MPs' offices are their staff. I have been blessed with the most amazing group of dedicated people in my Hill office and in my constituency. There are too many, over the 11 years, to list in my Hill office, but I thank Lorena and Michelle. It is so great to finally have an Albertan working with me on the Hill. We need more Albertans here. There were many staff before that. Angela was my first fabulous legislative assistant, and I still consider her a dear friend.

Currently holding the fort in the riding are Lisa, Melissa and Nigel. Those who have moved on are Erica, Daniel, Niki, Helen and Adi, who is now with Amnesty International. I have had so many incredible staff. I kept saying, “Why are you wasting your time here, Adi? Get out and get a law degree.” He graduated from the University of Ottawa law school, organized all the rallies at the American embassy and is now articling with Amnesty International.

Government Orders

I thank my leaders: Jack Layton; Tom Mulcair; Nicole Turmel; and now the member of Parliament for Burnaby South. Where would we be without our leaders inspiring us?

• (2030)

I thank Rob, Christian, the incorrigible Anthony and Theresa, now at city hall. I know we drove her crazy, but she is in our hearts.

To my marvellous caucus colleagues, and I know they are laughing because they cannot believe I am saying this about them, but it has been my challenge to try to get them all to think like Albertans.

I like to think that I am also leaving behind a few friends from other parties.

I thank all the parliamentary officers and staff. I extend a heartfelt thanks to the parliamentary security officers, who, during the 2014 attack on the Hill, put their lives at serious risk to keep us safe. My deepest thanks to all of them.

Few Canadians fully comprehend the dual role of members of Parliament or the limitations on our capacity to tackle every need or concern constituents bring to us, despite our desire to remedy every frustration with a failed service or policy.

I must attest to the heavy hearts of my staff for our failure to resolve every immigrant or refugee claim and every request for better services or better policies that actually help people. However, we have so celebrated those moments of pure joy when our efforts helped a constituent gain long-awaited citizenship, obtain a federal grant or veterans benefit or win a dispute with CRA.

I remain surprised and grateful still when a constituent approaches me in the street, in airports, in the grocery store or when I am travelling overseas. Those Edmonton—Strathcona constituents are everywhere. They approach me to thank me for my service, and it is always unexpected and equally appreciated. It keeps me going, and I most certainly believe that is the same for all members of Parliament.

My 11 years serving as a member of Parliament were diverse and often had unexpected turns.

It has been a privilege serving on the executive of the Canada-Ukraine Parliamentary Friendship Group, supporting Ukraine through election monitoring and hosting fabulous young Ukrainian interns.

It has been my honour to represent the extraordinary Francophone community in my riding.

I was privileged as a lawyer to benefit from the support of University of Ottawa law school interns, who were invaluable in helping me craft my bills and motions. I encourage every university and every legislature to introduce the same kind of program.

I participated in many of the climate COPs, inspired greatly by the interventions of NGOs and indigenous peoples.

I had the honour of meeting with the Dalai Lama and the Tibetan government in exile during the commemoration of their 60 years in exile, and look forward to seeing the president again tomorrow here in Ottawa. I am blessed with a wonderful Tibetan Canadian intern.

I travelled to west Africa with the Governor General and to east Africa to meet with parliamentarians.

I held a remarkable array of critic portfolios: environment; indigenous affairs; western economic diversification; public works; natural resources; and international development. I do not know if I am missing any. I had a lot of them.

I advocated in the House and at the UN for a nuclear disarmament treaty and for enforceable measures for sustainability.

No surprise to those who know me well, I infused an environmental angle into every one of those portfolios. I issued a report on the impact of oil sands on water. I proposed strengthened public and indigenous rights in federal laws on toxins, impact assessments, energy regulation, navigable waters, sustainable development and trade deals.

In public works, I proposed investments in energy efficiency for federal buildings to save taxpayer dollars.

In transport, I proposed stronger measures to regulate dangerous rail cargo and engaged communities directly. That came because of my personal experience with a major CN derailment into Wabamun Lake. The government still has not taken action on that.

I have four times tabled an environmental bill of rights, and I will be debating that bill tomorrow for the last time.

I wish to thank all the environmental community and indigenous leadership who allowed me to be one of their voices for change. It has been an honour representing my constituents and having the privilege of fighting for environmental protection from the inside.

My retirement agenda is to get a rescue dog. My brother says it is my turn.

• (2035)

Mr. Murray Rankin (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I think I should sit down, because the hon. member for Edmonton Strathcona has said it all. All I am going to do is footnote what she has already so ably said in expressing her gratitude to so many people, on all sides of the House, the people who work here and make our lives easier every day.

Because this may be my last time to speak in the House, I want to say a few things. First, I have to thank a lot of people. Then I want to talk about some of the highs and some of the disappointments, before offering some general conclusions.

It has been almost seven years since I was elected, first in a by-election. It was not a particularly auspicious occasion. I just about lost, but I managed to squeak through, and then I happily did better the next time, in the 2015 election.

Government Orders

My list of people to thank must start, of course, with the people of Victoria who put their faith in me to represent them. The cliché, which has been said more than once this evening, is that it is an honour to have our fellow citizens go into a polling station and put an X beside our names, but I am so grateful to the people of Victoria and Saanich and Oak Bay, the nearby communities, who put their faith in me by doing just that. Every day I am mindful of the enormous responsibility that comes from that debt of gratitude.

In the very first speech I gave in this place, I used the Nuu-chah-nulth word *eesok*, or respect, because I think that has to be crucial in our role as parliamentarians every day.

The experience of being elected as a member of Parliament has really given me an enormous opportunity to know the amazing community of Victoria, where I live. I got to know people, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure it is the case for you, from all walks of life. I got to know people who make their living as so-called “binners”, people who get money from recycling bottles and cans, which is how they live, all the way to billionaires, because Victoria has both categories.

I am really proud of Victoria. I like to brag that it has the lowest unemployment rate in Canada but also has the people with the biggest hearts in Canada. It is a generous, compassionate community, and I am so proud to live there. It is quite a magic place, because it is both dynamic and gorgeous at the same time. Most people care deeply about their natural environment and about the well-being of their fellow citizens.

I promised I would thank a number of people, so bear with me.

First, I want to thank the people in my Victoria office who do the heavy lifting every day of navigating a sometimes cold and distant federal bureaucracy to help people. I want to start with Alisma Perry, Tony Sprckett and Lucy Mears.

Next I want to thank the front-line people in my Victoria and Ottawa offices over the years: Edward Pullman, Danielle Dalzell, Maura Parte, Andrew Johnson, Krystal Thomson, John Luton, Tyrone Lehmkuhl, Tabitha Bernard, Charlotte Smoley and Alana Cahill. It is quite a list.

Then I want to thank my Victoria political family: Erik Kaye, Ellen Godfrey, Samantha Montgomery, Sarah Bergen, Shannon Ash, Andrew Cuddy, Breanna Merrigan and especially the very talented Victoria councillor Laurel Collins, who I hope will succeed me as the member of Parliament for Victoria in the next election.

Finally, I want to thank my family, my two sons Ben and Mark, who I am so very proud of, my remarkably supportive spouse, Linda Hannah, who is here with me tonight, and my extended family, represented tonight by Leslie Hannah and Barry Lassiter, from Calgary, who have come all the way to be here.

I promised to say a few things I am proud of and then a few disappointments. Let me start with the good stuff.

One of the most important and meaningful things I had the pleasure to work on since coming here was to secure pensions for people who were the victims of thalidomide poisoning. It is serendipitous how this works in politics.

●(2040)

I got a call from a friend who was doing pro bono work for the Thalidomide Victims Association of Canada, the indomitable Mercedes Benegbi, who asked, “Can you help us?” I went to Libby Davies, which she talked about in her amazing book, and we went to Rona Ambrose, the then minister of health. We managed to get every single member of Parliament to vote in favour of long overdue pensions for people at the end of their lives suffering from the effects of thalidomide.

Then there was the debate on medical assistance in dying. I had the good fortune of having a law partner and a dear friend, Joe Arvay, who went to the Supreme Court of Canada on a case called Carter, reversed a decision of the Supreme Court of Canada on a case called Rodriguez and established a constitutional right for Canadians who were suffering interminable pain to avail themselves of medical assistance in dying.

To me, that was the finest moment in this place, with people working across parties. I want to pay particular tribute to the then minister of health and the then attorney general, the member for Markham—Stouffville and the member for Vancouver Granville. However, I would be remiss if I did not pay tribute to the member for Don Valley West who ably chaired one of the committees. There was a Senate committee, a justice committee, and we worked with senators like Senator Cowan and Senator Joyal, and my colleague from Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot who was very wise on that committee.

We ended up, despite our differences, despite profound philosophical ethical differences, coming up with something that I think serves Canadians well. I am very proud of the way Parliament worked. To me, that was its finest hour since I came here.

More recently, my work as vice-chair on the justice committee allowed Canadians to understand the revelations of the former attorney general in the SNC-Lavalin matter and remind Canadians of the crucial importance in our democracy of the rule of law.

I am also very proud of something that I cannot even talk about, which is the work I have been doing under the able leadership of the member for Ottawa South with the National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians, which looked at a special report on the Prime Minister's trip to India. However, much more importantly, it did the first in-depth review of our security and intelligence community, which is the work that Canadians do to counter espionage, terrorism and foreign interference, and of course, to safeguard our freedoms. We spent endless hours on that work, and I am very proud of that.

I am proud of the fact that I was given the honour of being elected by my peers as one of the hardest working MPs. I am proud of the public service of Canada with which I have had the opportunity to work over the years.

On the more frustrating side, I am frustrated by question period; I do not mind saying that. I think a lot of us are. We can do much better for Canadians. The tired lines and the bad theatre is wearing a little thin. I know that I do not look forward to it, and I know people on the other side feel the same way. Surely we can do better.

Government Orders

I am frustrated, as all of us are, when our private member's bills are not passed. On one I did, I worked with the late federal tax lawyer, Robert McMechan, on tax reform, which did not go through, nor did the one I worked on to expunge cannabis convictions, which I still think is the right way to go. However, the government has brought in a half measure and we will see if that works.

I am deeply disappointed with the progress Canadians have made toward reconciliation with indigenous peoples.

I am particularly disappointed in our collective failure to address the climate crisis. We have to do better. Today is World Environment Day. It has to be that we give our future generations a better planet to live on. It is going to take hard work on all sides of this House for Canada to do its job.

By way of conclusion, I am a proud social democrat. I have Tommy Douglas's picture on my wall. I think he was justly elected the greatest Canadian for his work in giving us something we now take for granted: medicare. I am hoping that the next Parliament will complete his work and bring in a comprehensive public pharmacare program for all of Canada.

Let us all recommit to a fairer Canada. Let us reduce the enormous and growing inequality between the rich and poor in our society. What J.S. Woodsworth said is still true today: "What we desire for ourselves, we wish for all". However, Jack Layton still said it best: "My friends, love is better than anger.... So let us be loving, hopeful and optimistic."

● (2045)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I want to take this opportunity to thank all the members who spoke this evening, sharing their successes and their frustrations, their histories and everything they have gone through since they made it here.

I am going to have to check the rule book to find out what the penalty is for bringing tears to the Speaker's eyes because many times I was listening and could not help but get emotionally involved in the story.

[*Translation*]

I thank everyone for their stories and their service. I wish them the best of luck in all their endeavours for the rest of their days.

* * *

[*English*]

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2019, NO. 1

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-97, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 19, 2019 and other measures, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): Mr. Speaker, maybe to the chagrin of my Liberal colleagues across the way, this is not my farewell statement. They will have to put up with me a little longer. I listened to a lot of the statements made by retiring members and, again, I offer a heartfelt thanks for their service to Canada.

There are some members like the member for Victoria, whom I appreciated working with on several committees. I know that many of us will miss him. Even though he was a New Democrat, he was one we could have a decent argument with and come away still friends at the end of the day.

There is a Yiddish proverb that says, "If you want to know what God thinks of money, look at the people he gives it to." That is what I want to start with. I know I have a 20-minute statement on the budget with questions and answers. I am not splitting my time. I do not want to do that, but I want to talk about this Yiddish proverb because the government has spent a prodigious amount of money over the last four years. We know that today's debt is tomorrow's taxes.

The government now has a total debt of \$705 billion. If one includes Crown corporation debt, it is over \$1 trillion. I know there will be Liberal MPs who will say to look at the previous government, which increased the national debt as well. The counter-argument is that they had the Great Recession in 2008-09. As I remember it, the Liberal Party members clamoured for more spending. They actually wrote a coalition document with the New Democrats and the separatist Bloc Québécois, demanding even more spending. The government of the day decided that it would find a middle ground and not spend us off a cliff, but that it would do what the House of Commons was indicating, which was to spend cyclically into the economy.

Budget 2019, which this bill tends to introduce and make real in the lives of people, I call it a distraction budget. Last year, I called it the refrigerator budget. There is an extra \$41.3 billion of new spending over five years. The campaign promise of the Liberal Party was that there was supposed to be a surplus of \$1 billion this year. It is a \$19.8-billion deficit instead, \$19.7 billion the year that follows, \$14.8 billion in the year after, and \$14.1 billion the year after that. It is successive years of deficits.

If we look at the financial statements on the—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I would ask the hon. member for Calgary Shepard to pause for a second.

I will ask the Sergeant-at-Arms to maybe just check on the outside. There is some clamouring going on. I am sure they are not doing it on purpose. It sounds like a very good conversation, but I am really not interested in hearing what they have to say.

We will concentrate on what the hon. member for Calgary Shepard has to say.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Mr. Speaker, I am usually the one rising on points of order about too much noise in this new interim chamber, which is beautiful but not very functional, as I like to remind members. I have been quoted in the Hill Times as having said that.

Government Orders

To return to budget 2019, as I mentioned, successive budgets have increased spending. I went back to previous years' budget documents. I went all the way back to budget 2016. I looked at budget 2015. There is actually a gap in this year's spending. What budget 2015 expected to spend this year was \$302.6 billion. Instead, what the government is intent on spending is \$329.4 billion, which is a gap of \$27 billion between what the government expected to do in 2015 and what it is now expecting to do in 2019.

One of the great problems of the current government is its inability and maybe disinterest in controlling spending. Every solution requires gobs of new spending. Every problem requires gobs of new spending. Every single year, Canada's GDP growth keeps being revised downward. In the economy, there is a cycle of 10 to 12 years and we reach a recession. Sometimes they are short recessions; sometimes they are prolonged recessions.

Again to my Yiddish proverb, if we want to know what God thinks of money, we look at the people he has given it to and look at what they have done with it. The Liberals have achieved far too little for the money that they have spent.

I want to talk about the housing proposals inside the budget and some of the housing policies and ideas the government has put forward. The Liberals are far lacking in both what they should be trying to achieve for first-time homebuyers and the damage they have done by introducing the B-20 stress test and the Minister of Finance's stress test on insured mortgages. It is an issue I have raised in the House repeatedly. I have raised it at the finance committee repeatedly. I had Liberal MPs vote me down twice on a request to do a study of the B-20 stress test. The first time it was without saying a single word. They did not rebuff my argument on why it should be done. The second time, they did have an argument but it was not very strong.

In budget 2019, the first chapter of the budget that the BIA would implement is on housing. I am glad the Liberals have a chapter on housing because young first-time homebuyers across my riding deeply care about being able to achieve the dream of home ownership.

When I lived in Edmonton and purchased my first condo, for my wife and me it was one of the great achievements in our lives that we had put aside enough money and were able to qualify for a mortgage. We got a longer amortization of 35 years. Some people say that there are now 25-year amortization periods for insured mortgages, but there are still 30 years for the uninsured market, and there is a difference between the two.

Taxes have gone up. It is harder for people to accumulate savings over time in order to have a down payment. Now we have a successive series of government decisions, with policy direction being given to the CMHC, policy direction being given to chartered banks and lenders on insured mortgages, and the B-20 stress test, an OSFI rule that is given the blessing of the government, that are hurting opportunities to get into housing, especially for young people.

What I want to avoid is a situation where we eliminate an entire generation, a cohort of people, from being able to get into the type of home that suits their needs. That is different for different people at

different times in their lives. When people are younger and starting a family they need a bit more space. When they are getting toward retirement, they want to downsize so they need to sell their house and move into something smaller that suits their needs.

When the government begins to introduce different policies and legislation, that starts to gum up the workings of the real estate markets. I say "markets", plural, because there is no such thing as a single real estate market in Canada. We do not compare a home in Vancouver to a home in Calgary, to a home in Halifax, to a home in Ottawa. Those real estate choices are very local. They are things such as schools, access to public transit or perhaps there is a baseball diamond near a home as there is near mine so my kids can go and play there. Those are the choices that really matter to people.

• (2050)

The decision the government made with the B-20 stress test has heavily impacted the market. I am going to be referencing a TD Canada report and a CIBC economics report to make my point. There are defects inside the BIA. There are defects inside the budget and how the Liberals are trying to address the housing problem for young people, especially for first-time homebuyers.

Approximately 20% to 30% of first-time home buyers have been pushed out of the market by the B-20 stress test. The statistics have shown this, whether we use Statistics Canada, CREA, the Canadian Real Estate Association, or Build Canada. Build Toronto has shown there is a 100,000 unit gap in the last 10 years of built dwellings in the Toronto area.

When the B-20 was introduced, two reasons were given for it. OSFI said that the reason for introducing these much harsher stress tests, 2% to qualify for a mortgage, was to ensure the stability of the banks. What happened, according to TD, was that by introducing this rule, over the past year, 2018 and now into 2019, it had pushed lending to the B market, the B lending. That is not to say monoline lenders are bad, they just typically have higher interest rates, they offer different terms, and it is actually a 2% increase. In Toronto, in the GTA area, it is far higher.

What the government has done is it has moved into the unregulated market by introducing the B-20 stress test.

The second reason was given by the Minister of Finance in January. He said publicly that the reason was to reduce prices. That is not the reason this Parliament allows OSFI to regulate insurance, securitization and lending. The reason for that is the stability of chartered banks and large lenders.

Government Orders

OSFI regulations are not supposed to be used to manipulate prices in different real estate markets. That is mission creep. That is policy creep. It is far beyond the scope of what Parliament intended when it gave the government the ability to set regulations through this independent, autonomous regulator.

I always remind people that regulators are arm's length but within arm's reach. That is something I learned when I worked for the finance department in Alberta. They still have to abide by the wishes of the government and the general direction. The decision-making, the individual regulatory tools they have are truly up to the regulator to decide. However, this one in particular, the B-20, we know from TD Economics that the side effect was that a lot of people were pushed into mono lenders, B lenders, the unregulated market, which defeats the purpose of OSFI having introduced it.

Ahead of B-20, we know that mortgage origination started to soften well before. If we look back, and this is a CIBC economic report, going all the way back to the third quarter of 2013, we saw an increase in mortgage origination to about the first quarter of 2015, and then it started to slide downwards. It is proof apparent that this rule did not have to be introduced, because mortgage origination, people taking out new mortgages, was on its way down for well over a year before the Minister of Finance introduced his stress test on insured mortgages.

I have no idea why he would introduce a 2% stress test on insured mortgages, when it is on a fixed term. There was always a stress test on variable mortgages, because, reasonably put, if the government is offering insurance through the CMHC, or through Canada Guaranty or Genworth, two private providers, taxpayers are on the hook, because they are backing up that policy.

On variable rates, it makes sense to ensure that the lendee can actually pay it back in case something happens in the market, such as the interest rates go up. On a fixed rate, five-year mortgage, there is absolutely no reason to do that. Over a five-year period, on average, and Statistics Canada will bear this out, people's incomes go up, their ability to pay goes up, their circumstances change, but typically it is for the better.

We can look at CIBC Economics, and it is called "Mortgage stress test: the operation was a success, but" and then it goes into all the side effects of having introduced this rule. It is by Benjamin Tal.

I have another graphic about which I want to talk. One of the things I heard, and it is in the chapter in the budget, where it talks about housing, is the a worry about affordability. It is also a worry about Canadians taking on too much debt.

• (2055)

I sit on the Standing Committee on Finance, and I heard this repeatedly at committee from officials, Liberal members of Parliament and the CEO of CMHC, whom I will speak more of later. They worried that Canadians were taking out mortgages that were too big and were taking on too much debt. Chart 5 of the CIBC report notes that in 2012, in the third quarter, just under 50% of people had an average credit score of 751, which is an excellent credit rating. If a person's credit report says 751 or above, that is excellent.

The number has been creeping up as well. Well before B-20, it started to creep up to 50%, 51% and then to 52%. It is not that people were being irresponsible. In fact, the average credit score of those seeking a mortgage loan is going up. Nevertheless, the government has done nothing for unsecured loans. It is still just as easy to get a credit card.

Bank of Canada officials came to my office to explain the Bank of Canada's financial statements. I told them that if I got unsecured loan and spent \$30,000 on a boat, the government would pat me on the back for consumer spending. If I then crashed the boat and claimed it on my insurance, the government would be extremely happy again because I might replace it with a new boat. That is \$60,000 spent. However, the government is worried about mortgage debt.

In Canada, because of our culture, people are pretty conservative when it comes to borrowing, especially on their homes, delinquency rates are at historic lows. I think it is 0.15% in British Columbia and 0.23% in Ontario. Every statistic I can find from the major chartered banks and every trend line I see from economic shops show that although there was a lending problem, the lending problem was not directly related to the mortgages people were taking out; it was related to unsecured debt, such as credit cards, personal lines of credit and home equity lines of credit.

In fact, when the government introduced B-20, which is also in a report, there was a sudden spike in reverse mortgages, as people were taking more equity out of their homes. Interestingly, this number has been going up for about 10 to 15 years. It is a tool people use. Their homes are their savings so they take money out of them. There was a spike in January 2018. As soon as everybody knew the new stress test was coming, the number went up.

An interesting report came out of Toronto asking about housing. It asked what young people and their parents were doing. A third of parents admitted that they had given their kids an early inheritance gift of, on average, \$50,000. This speaks to the problem of pricing in the greater Toronto area and the greater Vancouver area.

What the government and the Minister of Finance did was impose a one-size-fits-all policy, the B-20 stress test, across the board and across the country, as though every real estate market in the country has the exact same problems. Instead of introducing variants and designing a policy tool for specific problems, they went around whack-a-mole and hit everybody.

I know I have to be careful. I hear the parliamentary secretary got in trouble with Premier Doug Ford when he called for him to be whacked, although I did say "whack-a-mole".

Government Orders

This is a policy tool. I am not saying people in housing should not be worried about what the government is doing in budget 2019, because the government has now given an answer to the problem. Its answer to the problem was to introduce shared equity mortgages. In the BIA, it is introducing a mechanism by which the CMHC will be a Crown agent acting on behalf of the government.

For those listening at home this late in the evening, who perhaps have insomnia, the Crown borrowing program will allow the government to borrow \$1.25 billion to buy shared equity stakes between 5% and 10%, depending on whether a house is new. A new home gets 10% and one that already exists gets 5%. The government says this will help 100,000 first-time homebuyers.

When I asked Department of Finance officials where they got this number, they said from CMHC. When I asked CMHC officials where they got this number, they said from the Department of Finance. Nobody could explain to me where this 100,000 number came from. The CEO of CMHC gave it his best shot. The only way this number makes sense is if we look at insurance mortgages and assume that over the next three years, we will only be able to help about 30,000 to 40,000 people. Actually, the Minister of Finance said the same thing in Toronto.

• (2100)

Then I went to MLS listings online to find what kinds of properties were out there. In the greater Toronto area, I found about 500 properties out of 20,000 listings that these shared equity mortgages could potentially apply to, and I specifically excluded those with parking spots, which are very expensive in the greater Toronto area, especially downtown. They are quite expensive to get, but that is not the goal of this. We do not want anybody living in a parking spot in a tower in downtown Toronto. That is not our goal.

• (2105)

Mr. Adam Vaughan: They are. They're called homeless people.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I hear the parliamentary secretary saying they are.

This tool is not the answer to it.

When I questioned people at Mortgage Professionals Canada how long it would take the brokerages to get their IT systems ready to go, because they need IT systems to do their underwriting, securitization, double-check loans and all the details that need to be figured out, the said eight to 10 months. That is eight to 10 months on a program the government wants to be effective in September.

When I asked the Department of Finance officials about the details of the program, the terms and conditions, the fees, if there would be a premium on these shared equity mortgages, they told me they did not know those details because they had not been decided yet.

When I asked the CEO of CMHC, I was told it had not decided yet what those details would be. When I asked when the board of CMHC was informed that it would be handling the shared equity mortgages on behalf of the Government of Canada, he told me the night of the budget. That means the board of CMHC had no idea it would be administering this large-scale program.

If we want to know what God thinks of money, we should look at the people he has given it to, what they have done with it and how

badly they have mismanaged it. With a problem like housing, the policy tools chosen to address it are completely inadequate.

I will not be supporting this bill and I encourage all members not to support it.

Mr. Anthony Housefather (Mount Royal, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is always a great pleasure to hear from my friend from Calgary Shepard. He is definitely the champion in the House on Yiddish proverbs. However, I also go to the same Yiddish proverb Twitter page that he does in order to get Yiddish proverbs. The one right before the one he gave was, a nation's treasure is its scholars.

I am so proud that in this budget we are investing in science, research, innovation, education and scholars across Canada. We are investing in space, the lunar exploration accelerator program, the strategic science fund, the strategic innovation fund and the research science and innovation fund. We have brought back science, brought back academics and brought back university.

There is another Yiddish proverb that says investing in people is more important than anything. Does my hon. colleague not think that many of the investments in this budget have brought Canada back into the realm of science and space exploration?

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Madam Speaker, I do not want to start a Yiddish proverb battle on the floor of the House of Commons. I do appreciate the member because he is thoughtful and an adept chair of committees. He stickhandled the last committee he was assigned quite nicely.

However, this is an issue of debt and deficits. While the member is telling us to look at the wonderful investments the Liberals have made, it is all with borrowed money. Part of a responsible government is ensuring that it has the means to provide these investments. It cannot just be looking at borrowing on the markets, passing the bill to future generations and hoping the investments actually work out.

I met with the Coalition for Canadian Astronomy. It is deeply disappointed by these so-called investments the government is putting through. The people there want to see more put toward basic research. A lot of what the government is putting the investments toward is engineering work instead of basic scientific research. It is a disappointment.

If we want to know what God thinks of money, we should look at the people he has given it to.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP): Madam Speaker, I have a question for my colleague about his favourite topic, mortgages and home ownership.

Government Orders

He already raised some points that came up in committee about the new first-time home buyer incentive, which will allow the CMHC to take on 5% to 10% of the mortgages of Canadians participating in the program. I was surprised to hear experts say that this program would not help anyone get a mortgage from a financial institution, since the program will only apply if the person has already qualified for a mortgage with their financial institution.

Could my colleague talk about this point, which has been ignored? The government is implying that this program will help more Canadians buy homes, but witnesses in committee said the complete opposite. Only Canadians who have already qualified for a mortgage will be able to participate in this program.

• (2110)

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Madam Speaker, the member for Sherbrooke is correct.

Witnesses at the Standing Committee on Finance said that the government will be playing the stock market with part of people's homes. We have no details on how this will work or how much it will cost. The president and CEO of the CMHC said that this measure would have a marginal impact, while some Liberal members in committee described it as transformative. They said that this would change everything.

Even reports from the CIBC and TD Bank say that the impact on the market would be 0.2% to 0.4%, at most. This is a marginal impact. Furthermore, the government wants to spend \$1.25 billion on this project, when it could be doing something else with the money. This is a big failure for the government in this budget.

[*English*]

Mr. Garnett Genus (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, my colleague does excellent work in this place and in the finance committee. I appreciate his drawing attention to the issues with home ownership. This is something that I hear about often in my constituency.

It is an interesting perception that, in some cases, government policy is aimed at making home ownership harder to access, with things like the stress test that was piled on. The perception, certainly in my constituency, was that these policies were not taking into consideration the reality of the real estate market in most of the country, but they were responding only to specific situations in specific regions. At the same time, there was another policy brought in that, as the member has pointed out, does not deal with the reality in those same places.

It is striking that we have, on the one hand, policies that are aimed at making home ownership harder, and in other cases, policies that purportedly make accessing home ownership easier. There is a contradiction in the objectives, never mind the policy.

I wonder if the member can comment on what we should make of this incongruity between policies like the stress test, which are making home ownership more inaccessible, and claims that other policies are going to make home ownership more accessible.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Madam Speaker, one of the things we heard from stakeholders who presented at committee was that 200,000 Canadians will not see a job created because of these changes by 2021.

We know that the residential construction market is one of the areas where a lot of people work. We can imagine all the trades that go into building a home, whether it is a condo, a row house, a duplex or whatever it is. We heard that 147,000 first-time homebuyers were unable to get into the type of home they wanted. The Canadian Home Builders' Association said that. According to the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, the number of new mortgages coming out dropped by 11.9%. Then there is the government overreaching with the B-20 stress test, the Minister of Finance's stress test, and then panicking, I think, and being unwilling to admit it made a mistake.

Even at committee, the Liberals would not admit they had made a mistake, so now they are trying shared equity mortgages, throwing it up there to see if it will work. That is not the right way to be doing policy-making in this country. It is okay to admit a mistake and then dial it back. That is what all the big banks have been asking for.

I will mention one last thing. I asked every single stakeholder whether shared equity mortgages would offset the impact of B-20, and not a single one said they would.

• (2115)

Mr. Adam Vaughan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development (Housing and Urban Affairs), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am most interested in the comments that the hon. member made regarding breaking up the mortgage structure of the country to regionalize it, instead of having a one-size-fits-all set of policies, which has been the policy of every federal government since CMHC was founded.

Does he see those regional delineations along provincial lines or along urban-rural lines? How would the member opposite configure a regionalization of mortgage rules, a regionalization of mortgage stress tests and also assessment of risks in the market?

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Madam Speaker, that is one of the matters I would have liked the finance committee to consider.

If it were not for the member's Liberal colleagues on the committee voting it down twice and then being unwilling to negotiate a reasonable study of the issue, we could have looked into what type of regionalization is reasonable and whether it is even reasonable or not. We already do it for employment insurance and for several other government programs. CMHC actually tracks the cost of mortgage premiums by province. Would that be a better way of doing it?

We could not get to any of that expert testimony, expert information, because the Liberal MPs on the committee were so unwilling to even entertain the idea of looking at a B-20 stress test study. That would have given us the ability to call in people from CMHC and outside stakeholders to give us the answers on what is reasonable, what is not reasonable, what is doable, what is not doable.

Government Orders

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise today on behalf of my caucus. I am sure that other members will have a chance to do the same, but I am deeply honoured to be taking part in the third reading debate on Bill C-97.

This bill has already been heavily scrutinized here in the House and at the Standing Committee on Finance, and its sheer size has provoked much debate. The bill is more than 400 pages long. It is yet another omnibus bill. Its content has also sparked debate. I would be remiss not to mention the content of the bill, as well as everything that the government left out. I am going to focus on the aspects of the bill that we consider most problematic, as well as the things that were completely left out of this last-chance budget.

It is 2019, and this is the government's last opportunity to deliver on its mandate and vision for the country. It is already June 2019. The latest budget was tabled in March, and this bill seeks to realize the vision outlined in budget 2019. This is the Liberal government's last bill, its last chance to turn its ideas and its vision for the nation into reality. It goes without saying that everything that was left out, everything that still has to be done and everything the Government of Canada is leaving unfinished will have to wait until later.

We will have to take the word of the Prime Minister, who, during the next election campaign, will try to convince Canadians that he will have time in the next four years to do what he did not have time to do in the past four years. We know full well that many promises have been broken over the past few years. Some were much bigger than others. Take electoral reform. Many Canadians remember quite clearly that this was a solemn promise. The Prime Minister repeated it almost daily during the election campaign. Nearly a year and a half later, he did not hesitate to break that promise, brushing it aside by saying that he changed his mind, that it was not a good idea after all, and that he would not be moving forward with electoral reform. This is a government that broke some of its signature promises, such as returning to a balanced budget. I know that my Conservative colleagues like to bring that up quite a bit.

Clearly, this government, which is nearing the end of its term, is suffering from a lack of credibility in terms of its campaign promises, and it will soon try to convince Canadians that it needs another term to complete what it did not have time to do in this last budget. Canadians are not stupid. They know what this Prime Minister's word is worth, because they have had four years to see him at work, to listen to him and to see what he had to offer Canadians. The people of Sherbrooke, Quebec and Canada will realize that his word is unfortunately not worth very much. This is the kind of thing that fuels cynicism among Canadians, and among my constituents back home in Sherbrooke. I often hear people say they are disappointed by politics and politicians. I am trying to get them interested in politics again, but when a government like this one, formed by the Liberal Party of Canada, breaks so many promises so shamelessly, it fuels cynicism about politics. That is why people will be so wary of any of the campaign promises made by the Prime Minister of Canada, and with good reason. We have to give them some credit. They will be right to doubt him, because the Prime Minister has broken so many of his promises during this last term.

This is a last-chance budget. Today we are debating the government's budgetary policy, its execution and its implementation. That is why, on our side of the House, we will ultimately have to vote against it. We will be forced to vote against Bill C-97 at third reading because it does not meet Canadians' needs. Clearly, on many issues, the government has not responded to the concrete problems Canadians are facing, and it is not about to do so over the next few months.

● (2120)

We will be voting against this budget, and we hope that many members will do so as well. We need to send the government a clear message. Its fiscal policy has not worked so far, and the rich are getting richer. We saw this recently. I will give just one example, that of KPMG. The accounting firm and its clients once again reached an out-of-court settlement after they were caught avoiding taxes using a scheme that was dubious and questionable, to say the least. It was certainly questioned by the Canada Revenue Agency.

The Canada Revenue Agency recently made a proposal to these clients. They were told to pay their taxes and the matter would be closed. They could move on once they paid their debt to society.

These people had a minimum of \$300,000. For every file that KPMG opened, the client had to pay the firm at least \$300,000 to put the scheme in place. In addition, the firm would take a cut of the tax savings that their clients realized with the Isle of Man scheme.

The scheme was revealed to the general public, so I will not repeat all the details. We know that the clients moved money abroad to a place with low taxes. They managed to avoid paying taxes by using all kinds of strategies, such as shell companies and fake directors. In its agreements with clients, this accounting firm demanded a cut of the tax savings. That is not something to be taken lightly. The firm promised tax savings and took a percentage off the top. This week, these clients signed a settlement with officials of the Canada Revenue Agency. With this settlement, they can put the matter behind them, close the books, pay the taxes, say goodbye and carry on as if nothing happened.

That is the message the Government of Canada decided to send all Canadians today. It conflicts with the standard messaging that the government and the Minister of National Revenue has been delivering up to now, about how the net is tightening, how tax cheats will pay, and how there never has been and never will be an amnesty. The Canada Revenue Agency and the minister even sent out photos showing people in handcuffs back when the KPMG scandal broke. She said that tax cheats would pay for their actions and that criminals would be put behind bars.

Government Orders

Today she is sending a different message. People who could afford to spend \$300,000 on a scheme, plus a percentage of the money they saved on taxes, can afford to pay lawyers to get them off the hook with just a slap on the wrist.

Understandably, most Canadians, including most of the people of Sherbrooke, find that frustrating. They see rich people who can afford to pay the accounting firm and who have the means to defend themselves in court against charges relating to these borderline schemes getting off with a slap on the wrist, and my constituents find that frustrating in the extreme. I know my colleagues are frustrated too, but, unfortunately, the government decided to do nothing. Rather than do something, the government decided to follow in the Conservatives' footsteps and give preferential treatment to people who can afford to pay accounting firms, tax experts and lawyers to defend them against these charges and emerge virtually unscathed. Sure, they will pay the taxes they owe. It is the least they can do, but the government is signalling that they can keep doing this. The worst-case scenario is that they will end up in the Tax Court of Canada like the family from Vancouver and end up signing a settlement to close the books.

• (2125)

This sends the message that, under the current government, it is acceptable to engage in tax evasion and shady schemes. The government is turning a blind eye to all of that. That is the sort of behaviour that is perpetuated by the implementation of this budget and the government's budgetary fiscal policy.

We heard some powerful, compelling testimony in committee. The witnesses spoke to many parts of the bill, which is 400 pages long. This bill affects many laws and makes significant changes to many sectors of our economy. However, some provisions have nothing to do with the economy, but the government threw them all into the budget implementation bill anyway. It is therefore difficult for parliamentarians to speak to the bill as a whole.

We will soon have to vote on this 400-page bill. It will be a single vote, even though the bill makes many changes to many different laws. Earlier today, we voted on the amendments to this bill at report stage. We therefore had the opportunity to speak to many parts of the bill. At third reading, there will be just a single vote either for or against the bill as a whole. When the Liberal Party was on this side of the House, it spoke out against this practice. The Liberals criticized omnibus bills at every opportunity, because omnibus bills do not allow parliamentarians to vote on each measure or group of measures.

Since we have to cast a single vote on the bill as a whole, we need to consider the pros and cons of the bill. Today, it is clear that the cons outweigh the pros. Although we recognize that the bill contains some good measures, we have no choice but to vote against this budgetary policy.

The government has tried to make up for its blunders on several issues by presenting amendments in committee or at report stage. Earlier today, we debated the amendments that the government had proposed, with a royal recommendation, to change the bill. The government had to backpedal to fix things, particularly as regards the housing act.

The section on the housing act fell well short of what Canadians and housing experts had expected. The experts said that the right to housing is a fundamental human right, something the government refused to acknowledge in the first draft of the bill. It had to fix that, just like it had to fix other parts of the bill.

In committee, we tried to get the government to see reason on certain issues. We wanted it to provide a list pertaining to student loans as quickly as possible. In the bill, the government proposes starting to charge interest on student loans after six months. We tried to persuade it to just make student loans interest-free. It is not right to ask former students to pay interest on loans they took out to train for a career.

In committee we learned that this interest brought \$700 million annually into the coffers of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada. That money funds the government's priorities when it could stay in the pockets of young people who just completed their studies and are entering the workforce. Those young people have to save money to get into the real estate market and invest in our economy in various ways. The government is currently taking \$700 million out of the pockets of young workers who are fresh out of school, and putting that money in the consolidated revenue fund.

The government is giving former students a six-month relief period when it could have gone further by permanently eliminating interest on student loans and stopping government funding by students. The government rejected this proposal.

• (2130)

As far as worker health and safety is concerned, representatives from the Canadian Labour Congress told us in committee that the flexibilities of the Hazardous Products Act benefited industry to the detriment of the health of the workers who are exposed to these products in the short or long term. They could have accidents with these hazardous products. The government is easing the rules to give the chemical products industry a free pass, which jeopardizes the health and safety of Canadian workers. In committee, the government once again sided with industry and the major lobbies in this country to ensure that their profits keep going up every year.

Furthermore, a large number of witnesses spoke out against the changes to the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act. Bill C-97 is, quite simply, anti-refugee. It creates two classes of refugees: those who enter Canada regularly and those who enter irregularly. The government is creating two parallel systems that it claims complement each other or are nearly identical.

The government could have simply turned to the Immigration and Refugee Board, which does a very good job and which needs more resources. Unfortunately, it decided to create two classes of refugees. One refugee even testified in committee that if the government's heartless bill had been in force, he might not be in Canada right now because he would have been sent back to his country, where he is in danger. Numerous experts called this a bad idea. That is why we are compelled to oppose the bill.

Now let's talk about pensions, which were not protected and which continue to be at the bottom of the order of creditor priority in the event of bankruptcy or insolvency. They could have had the courage to respond to the concerns heard at consultations. Most people said that the order of creditor priority had to be changed. The government decided to ignore all the experts' recommendations.

That was also the case for stock options. The economic update indicated that the government would address this situation, which is clearly problematic because it benefits the wealthy. It even says so in the budget document, but they decided to ignore the issue. In this budget, which is its last chance, the government decided to do nothing and wait until after the election to solve the problem, even though we know this government will be gone in October 2019.

The Liberals gave in to the pharmaceutical lobby on pharmacare. They gave them more time to rake in the biggest profits of the corporate world at the expense of taxpayers. They were given a free pass. The government is asking Canadians to trust it even though it broke many promises. It says that it will keep this one and that we must trust it, even if it has been saying so for 25 years.

As for oil companies, the Liberals continue to subsidize the fossil fuel industry to the tune of billions of dollars every year. This budget would have been a good opportunity to put an end to that.

Also, household debt continues to rise. Canadians are within \$200 of insolvency each and every month, and the government is doing nothing to fix that.

Furthermore, the media bailout has been the talk of Parliament Hill and elsewhere. The media just want tax fairness. Of course, they also need some assistance to meet certain challenges, but above all, they need tax fairness. The government needs to put an end to the double standard that is giving web giants a free ride when it comes to taxes. They are exempted from paying income tax and sales tax, and are raking in billions of dollars in ad revenues, while our local and national media can barely make ends meet and take in sufficient ad revenues.

This is a bad budget bill. The government missed out on its last opportunity to show some courage and make the right choices.

• (2135)

I can assure the House that Canadians will not give the Liberals another term, since they merely spew empty rhetoric and make lofty promises, and have not honoured their commitments over the past four years. Canadians will turn to an alternate serious and credible solution, like the NDP, so we can finally fix the problems facing our society in 2019.

Ms. Rachel Bendayan (Outremont, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech.

Government Orders

Bill C-97 will enact Canada's first national poverty reduction strategy. I would like to know whether my colleague would agree that that strategy is not only important but vital to helping the most vulnerable Canadians in our society.

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague.

She heard the many witnesses in committee who spoke about poverty reduction and the national housing strategy, which are two major parts of Bill C-97.

I may repeat myself here. The member should already know my position on poverty, since she serves on the committee with me. Frankly, I think that the government set its sights too low. The United Nations' first sustainable development goal is the elimination of poverty, not the reduction of poverty, which is what the Liberal government is proposing. The government set its sights too low by simply planning to reduce poverty by 50%. It could have gone even further and created a plan to eradicate poverty, which should be the goal of every member in this House.

The government simply decided to set a target for reducing poverty. Once this target is met, the advisory council will be dissolved and we will move on. The same goes for housing. The Liberals had to backtrack and adjust their bill along the way because experts were unanimous in saying that the bill was seriously flawed. The government does not even recognize housing as a fundamental right. They fortunately rectified the situation, but they missed their first chance and had to fix things.

[*English*]

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Sherbrooke for the work he does on the finance committee, a task I know very well. We spend quite a bit of time on it.

I would like to ask a more practical question about Bill C-97. In the bill, the government has offered a shared equity program through the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. We had a similar program in British Columbia, and there was not very much pickup on it.

I raise that for two reasons. The government has not given very much information, but what we do know is that it intends to make it operational by September 20. With our fixed election dates, it seems scandalous to offer a new program just before an election.

Government Orders

However, more important to the people who will be relying on it, one of the reasons why the shared equity program in British Columbia was not picked up was that mortgage brokers said they were not able to get answers as to who could apply and under what criteria one could get the proper approvals to be able to purchase a house. As we know, it can be very difficult for someone who is not able to make a proper offer to buy a home in a timely manner. If they do not know within days, chances are the deal will go to someone else.

Does the member feel that this is a proper program? Does he feel that the practical realities of implementing such a program on such a short time basis may end up not achieving its intended purposes?

• (2140)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault: Madam Speaker, from what we heard in committee, one thing was clear. Although the government's intention was to make housing and home ownership more accessible, this first-time homebuyer incentive, also known as a shared equity mortgage, will not achieve its goal. Aspiring homebuyers must qualify for a mortgage from a financial institution before they can apply to the much-touted incentive program for 5% to 10% of the down payment.

The officials from the CMHC and the Department of Finance were not even able to provide any details on this program. They did not know what the 5% to 10% share of equity meant in practical terms. Would there be active involvement? If the homeowner did renovations that increased the property value, how would the added value be shared out?

All of the questions on this aspect were very important. The government is saying it will have a share in property owned by Canadians, but it is being stingy with details. Ultimately, this measure will not even make housing more accessible, because Canadians can only access the program if, and only if, they qualify for a mortgage. This measure is being misrepresented by the government.

Mr. Robert Aubin (Trois-Rivières, NDP): Madam Speaker, I listened carefully to the speech of my colleague from Sherbrooke. He mentioned a few of the measures in the budget that made some sense, but I mostly heard him provide a rather long list of things that did not make sense at all. Since he had only 20 minutes, I am sure he did not get to everything.

During the 2015 election campaign, many analysts told us that the Liberals were not unlike the NDP, in that they campaigned to the left and were in touch with the grassroots. However, when I look at the way they govern and how they deliver their budgets and the measures therein, I have a hard time seeing the difference between a Liberal government and a Conservative government.

Would it then be correct to say that the Liberals campaign to the left but govern to the right?

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault: Madam Speaker, that is a good way to describe what happened during the last election campaign. This is not the first time we have heard it said that the Liberals signal left and then turn right. That is a very old expression. It is a rather dangerous thing to do on the road. However, that is exactly what this

government did with the many budgetary measures it introduced over the past few years. It signalled one way during the election campaign and then turned the other, hoping that people would not remember when it came time for the next election. We are here to remind Canadians that they were hoodwinked during the last election campaign and that this time they do not have to go back to the Conservatives' austerity.

The Conservatives make dangerous decisions for the safety of workers. Canadians also do not have to go back to a party that says one thing and then does the opposite, a party that makes promises and then shamelessly breaks them. They have a credible and reliable option. The NDP has always been on the right side of the debates in the House, and we will live up to Canadians' expectations if they give us a chance. That is what I sincerely hope for the next election campaign.

Mr. Anthony Housefather (Mount Royal, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Sherbrooke, whose speeches are always thoughtful and intelligent.

He talked about our government's economic record, which I am very proud of. Unemployment is at its lowest since the 1970s; we have lifted hundreds of thousands of Canadians, especially children and seniors, out of poverty; and no G7 country other than the United States has a higher growth rate. Furthermore, we have created over a million new jobs in Canada since 2015.

One way to create jobs is through the private sector. The \$40-billion LNG Canada project will create more than 10,000 jobs in British Columbia by 2021.

Are the member and his party in favour of the LNG Canada project?

• (2145)

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault: Madam Speaker, I cannot respond to every point my colleague raised, so I will focus on the specific question at the end of his remarks.

That is a perfect example of the government saying one thing and doing another. Here is another one. The government decided to spend \$15 billion in public money to buy an existing pipeline and expand it, which will cost at least another \$10 billion, for a total of \$15 billion invested in fossil fuels.

The government says it is taking care of the environment, but it is also investing in a liquefied natural gas project when what we need to do is transition to renewables. That is what we have been saying for years, and we are saying it again today. We need to stop investing in fossil fuels such as oil and natural gas. We need to invest in the energy sources of the future. That is where the government should be investing Canadians' money. We have no problem with the private sector financing projects. What we have a problem with is the government spending massive amounts of public money on fossil fuel projects rather than investing in renewable energy and the green economy of the future.

The Liberals and Conservatives are like two peas in pod on all these issues. They do everything for the economy and nothing for the environment.

Government Orders

Ms. Rachel Bendayan (Outremont, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with my colleague from Mississauga—Erin Mills.

I am very proud to rise in the House today to speak to this fundamental bill. Our 2019 budget will enshrine some important goals in law, like the first Canadian poverty reduction strategy.

[*English*]

It is a privilege to rise in the House and speak to this legislation, which would enact the poverty reduction act.

As many already know, reducing poverty, and in particular childhood poverty, is something I care about very deeply. As a new mother of a 22-month-old girl, I cannot accept and will not accept that there are children in Canada who do not have a roof over their heads, who do not have a warm bed to sleep in, who do not have enough food to eat. That is why it is so important to me that we enact Canada's first national poverty reduction strategy.

My riding includes the community of Côte-des-Neiges, the municipality of Outremont, as well as the community of Mile End, all adjacent to downtown Montreal. While it is often believed that poverty is not an issue in my riding, I can say from experience that there is poverty hiding below the surface. There are families barely able to make their rent payments. There are lineups outside food banks and clothing drives. There are children who go to school hungry in the morning.

Poverty often hides, and I can tell the House that it is hiding in every single community right across the country.

[*Translation*]

That is why budget 2019 reaffirmed our commitment to reducing poverty. It will introduce an official poverty line for Canada, set poverty reduction targets, including a goal of reducing poverty by 50% by 2030, and create an independent national advisory council to monitor and publicly report on our progress toward poverty reduction. This strategy makes Canada a world leader in eradicating poverty. That is definitely something to be proud of.

● (2150)

[*English*]

When we talk about holding ourselves to account, we are talking about statistics. We are talking about hard facts and real numbers.

Just a few months ago, Statistics Canada published results from the 2017 Canadian income survey. This was the first release of such data since we launched Canada's first poverty reduction strategy, a strategy that targets a 20% reduction in poverty by 2020 and a 50% reduction by 2030.

I am very pleased to report to the House that the statistics show that we have met our first poverty reduction target a full three years ahead of schedule.

Between 2015 and 2017, the poverty rate fell by more than 20%. What does that mean? It means that there are 825,000 fewer Canadians living in poverty. It means that Canada has reached its lowest poverty rate in history. It means that Canadians have more

money in their pockets: The median after-tax income for 2017 is the highest in Canadian history.

The poverty rate of 9.5% in 2017 is the lowest poverty rate ever, based on Canada's official poverty line. This represents an important step toward our government's goal to cut poverty in half by 2030.

[*Translation*]

In addition to the targets, the Canadian poverty reduction strategy also introduces Canada's first official poverty line, which will be based on the cost of a basket of goods and services that individuals and families need.

The strategy also provides for the creation of a national advisory council on poverty. This group will advise the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development on poverty reduction and publicly report, in each year, on the progress that has been made.

[*English*]

I would like to highlight for the House some of the federal programs that are working to reduce poverty in Canada, and we know that they are working because the statistics bear it out.

For example, the old age security program and the guaranteed income supplement both play a significant role in providing income security to Canadians in their senior years. When our government increased the guaranteed income supplement, we improved the financial security of close to 900,000 seniors across Canada.

Our government also introduced the Canada child benefit. The Canada child benefit provides families with up to \$6,400 per child under the age of six, and up to \$5,400 per child aged six through 17. This is what has helped raise 300,000 children out of poverty in this country.

Instead of making cuts like the Conservative government of Doug Ford in Ontario, our government is investing. We have invested billions of dollars in the national housing strategy and the renewal of labour market development agreements in infrastructure projects and in health care, all of which will help reduce poverty in this country.

[*Translation*]

Our government's investments improve the lives of children, seniors and vulnerable Canadians. For example, the Canada child benefit increased support for families and continues to help lift almost 300,000 children out of poverty. Our new and enhanced Canada workers benefit will help lift 75,000 low-income workers out of poverty by 2020. By reducing the eligibility age for old age security to 65 and increasing the guaranteed income supplement, we prevented tens of thousands of seniors from living in poverty.

Several other policies also helped reduce poverty, such as the creation of the first national housing strategy. The Liberal government innovated once again. This is the very first national housing strategy in Canada and it comes with \$40 billion in funding over 10 years, which will result in the construction of 100,000 new affordable housing units and renovation of more than 300,000 existing units across the country. Our government is meeting the urgent housing needs of more than 500,000 Canadians. We are ensuring that they will have safe and affordable housing.

Government Orders

The initiatives I have just outlined represent significant investments for Canadians. There are already 825,000 fewer Canadians living in poverty and we expect that a greater number of Canadians will be lifted out of poverty as the benefits of our investments materialize in the coming years. It is clear that our government is working hard to give Canadians a real and fair chance to succeed.

Thanks to budget 2019 and Canada's first poverty reduction strategy, we are on our way to a poverty-free Canada. I am therefore asking members of the House to vote in favour of this bill and help thousands of Canadians and thousands of children escape poverty.

• (2155)

[English]

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, I have a simple question for my colleague.

Her party ran in 2015 on a commitment to balance the budget by 2019. The budget is obviously not balanced. That was a choice. People voted for a balanced budget by 2019. Does the member think the budget should be balanced at any point? If so, by when?

Ms. Rachel Bendayan: Madam Speaker, we ran on a strong economy. We ran on ensuring that Canadians could find good-paying jobs and on ensuring that the middle class and those working hard to join it would be able to succeed in this country. I am proud to say that we have delivered on that commitment.

We created over one million jobs in this country. There are more people working than ever before. The unemployment rate is at a historic low. Since we have been tracking unemployment, we have never had such a low unemployment rate. I believe that we delivered on the economy in ways that Canadians can feel, not only in their pocketbooks but in their everyday lives.

Mr. Terry Duguid (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Women and Gender Equality, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for her remarks, as well as for her terrific work on the status of women standing committee, particularly her work in advancing the cause of senior women.

Manitoba is home to 63 first nations. It is the homeland of the Métis Nation. I wonder if the hon. member would comment on the historic investments we have been making in our indigenous communities in Manitoba and beyond, and how we are helping to reduce poverty in those communities.

Ms. Rachel Bendayan: Madam Speaker, the consultations that were conducted and the conversations had with Canadians really informed the first strategy on the reduction of poverty. We had many discussions, as my colleague will know, with indigenous communities and aboriginal peoples right across the country. It has indeed informed many of the different programs that fall under the strategy. For example, the national housing strategy commits to the successful implementation of specific measures for first nations, Inuit and Métis.

Similarly, the new indigenous skills and employment training program recognizes the unique needs of first nations, Inuit and Métis through the creation of a distinct program and funding stream. The “Opportunity for All” strategy to reduce poverty will also take actions to help better understand poverty among first nations, Inuit and Métis. As well, the government plans on working with

indigenous leaders, communities and organizations throughout the country to identify and co-develop indicators that reflect poverty in those communities.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, I just have a brief follow-up to my previous question, which I do not think was answered. The member may have many other things she wishes to say about the economy, the government's record and so forth, but those watching can understand a simple question and whether the question is answered.

Does the member believe that the budget should be balanced at any point, and if so, at what point does she think the budget should be balanced?

Ms. Rachel Bendayan: Madam Speaker, I believe that at the moment the current economic conditions call for greater investment in our country, which is what we have been doing. Investing in Canadians is what is propelling the economy forward. As I mentioned previously, it is because of our investments in infrastructure, health care and programs that service Canadians that we are experiencing one of the greatest economic periods in our history. The unemployment rate is at its lowest, since we have been collecting data. Creating over one million jobs in this country has been felt from coast to coast to coast.

• (2200)

Ms. Iqra Khalid (Mississauga—Erin Mills, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have had the privilege of learning from the thousands of residents of Mississauga—Erin Mills over these past four years. From knocking on doors to hosting 45 town halls, to helping over 4,000 families with their individual cases, to advocating for support for organizations, to promoting small business, I have had the opportunity to be the voice for my riding here in this place.

I start my remarks today on budget 2019 by thanking the residents of Mississauga—Erin Mills for trusting me to be their voice and to advocate on their behalf.

Today, I would like to focus my remarks on the impact that our Liberal government has had on the everyday lives of my constituents and how budget 2019 enhances that positive impact.

Mississauga—Erin Mills is home to the University of Toronto's Mississauga campus. It is a beautiful campus with lush green spaces, amazing architecture and incredibly engaged students. On occasion, one can spot a deer wandering from the Credit River nearby. However, what brings me back to the campus time and time again are the students. I have had the pleasure of meeting them on numerous occasions during campus events, coffee meetings and classroom visits.

When we speak of students, I find that we often speak of youth, but in my experience, the student body is far more varied. In my visits, I have met single mothers working for their degrees to better provide for their children, and women in their thirties and forties pursuing the means to a better career or pursuing their passions for the first time. I have met seniors who, in their retirement, are studying, learning and engaging with questions that they have had all of their lives. When I meet these students and listen to their stories, I better understand the issues that matter most to them.

Government Orders

These conversations with Canadians, knowing their struggles, hopes and ideas, are what inspires our government to make real investments to create a better quality of life for all. This commitment has informed budget 2019, as it has informed our budgets each and every year of our mandate.

As we continue forward on our path, the path that Canadians chose in 2015, a path of hope and hard work and the pursuit of a more positive future, I find it is also important to look back on where we started and how far we have come.

I saw employment ads back in 2014 and 2015 that were looking to hire for an entry-level position but required five years of experience, or for internships of six months, unpaid, for 40 hours a week. That was the reality facing youth in Canada. It is difficult for young Canadians already facing massive debt from their education to find work, let alone work in their field, and harder still to find work that is paid. I met one new graduate who had taken on an unpaid internship and just to afford the commute to downtown Toronto was forced to work a second job on evenings and weekends.

Young Canadians struggle to find the means to move out on their own to start their adult lives, and despite their hard work, many live in poverty.

Since 2015, our government has worked to create a better quality of life for young Canadians and we are continuing that commitment in 2019. In 2016 and 2018, we invested over \$80 million to create the student work placement program, supporting 8,400 student placements to better prepare students to pursue a career in STEM and business. We are continuing this commitment through investments that will create 84,000 new work experience placements. We invested in the youth employment strategy and have committed \$49.5 million over five years to modernize it and ensure all youth have an equal opportunity to succeed.

Through our investments, we more than doubled the number of opportunities created through the Canada summer jobs program, totalling more than 70,000 jobs for students last year and even more this year. In my riding, that meant over 1,500 jobs for youth. We also eliminated unpaid internships in federal sectors to ensure Canadians receive fair payment as they pursue meaningful work experiences.

• (2205)

To further tackle student debt, we are investing \$1.7 billion to not only lower the interest rates on student loans, but to eliminate them entirely for the six-month grace period.

We are implementing a first-time homebuyers incentive to support young Canadians looking to move out and purchase their first home.

For those who are struggling and facing mental health challenges, we are investing \$25 million to implement the pan-Canadian suicide prevention service.

One of our commitments to Canadians is that we are a feminist government, one that works to ensure equality of opportunity for everyone across the country. The struggle for equal rights for women has a long history and we are doing our part to promote gender equality in Canada and around the world.

This challenge to overcome systemic gender discrimination and violence requires hard work, and that is our commitment. Not only did our Prime Minister appoint a gender-balanced cabinet and a full department for women and gender equality, we also invested \$2 billion in Canada's first women entrepreneurship strategy, with a goal to double the number of female-led businesses by 2025, as well as increasing the participation of women-owned enterprises in federal procurement by 50%.

We have introduced proactive regulations to guarantee equal pay for equal work for women in federally regulated industries and taken steps to boost women's participation in the workforce.

Every month, the Canada child benefit puts more money, tax-free, into the pockets of nine out of 10 families, including those led by single mothers, and is lifting 300,000 children out of poverty.

In 2015, we heard stories of seniors in my riding who were struggling to make ends meet. Their pension benefits had been clawed back or lost entirely as their providers went out of business. Their retirement had been pushed back due to legislation that unfairly increased the age of eligibility. I met seniors who were forced to choose between paying for food and heat or their medications. The seniors of Canada worked all their lives to shape this beautiful country and they deserve to retire in peace and dignity.

Since 2015, we have been investing in their quality of life. We consult with seniors and we are continuing to implement supports to help them thrive through budget 2019. We have boosted benefits for nearly 900,000 seniors in Canada. Through our top-up payments to the guaranteed income supplement, we have lifted over 57,000 out of poverty.

Building on this, we have committed \$1.76 billion over four years to enhance and extend the earnings exemption to include self-owned businesses. We have already restored the age of eligibility for retirement back down to 65, the way it should be, and we will be proactively enrolling CPP contributors over the age of 17.

We are implementing legislation to protect pension benefits even in the case of corporate insolvency.

We have empowered seniors through increases to the new horizons for seniors program, which continues in budget 2019, with the addition of \$100 million over the next five years to create even more programs supporting seniors across Canada.

Last year, our government appointed a minister for seniors to advocate for the support that our seniors deserve. I was proud to sponsor the e-petition that called for this appointment.

As members can see, we have come so far in what feels like such a short time. There is still a lot to do and we are just getting started.

Government Orders

Our plan to invest in Canadians is working. Over one million jobs have been created. More than 800,000 Canadians have been lifted out of poverty. Our unemployment rate is the lowest it has ever been in over 40 years.

Budget 2019 is a framework for the next steps in our plan to improve everyday life for Canadians living in Mississauga—Erin Mills and across the country, from coast to coast to coast.

The fact is that I have barely scratched the surface in my speech. As we move ahead with our plan to fight the effects of climate change, our strategy to bring Canadian businesses to new markets and our efforts to make Canada a shiny example of equality of opportunity for all, we will always remember and renew our commitment to Canadians. That commitment is of hope, hard work and the path toward positive change.

In 2015, Canadians chose this path because they believed in a better quality for life and they believed in a better future. That is what we are delivering.

● (2210)

Mr. Ziad Aboultaif (Edmonton Manning, CPC): Madam Speaker, we have heard the list of achievements from the member opposite. Since the member is aware of all these achievements and government activities, is she aware of the high unemployment rate in Alberta? If yes, what does she think the percentage of unemployment is in Alberta?

Ms. Iqra Khalid: Madam Speaker, as I stated in my speech and as the Parliamentary Budget Officer and many Canadians have seen, Canadians have created over a million jobs from coast to coast to coast over the past four years.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Tens of thousands of jobs in Alberta.

Ms. Iqra Khalid: There have been tens of thousands of jobs in Alberta—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I can assure the parliamentary secretary to the government House leader that his colleague is well able to answer the question. I would ask members in the official opposition not to be heckling or inciting more debate while somebody has the floor.

The hon. member for Mississauga—Erin Mills.

Ms. Iqra Khalid: Thank you, Madam Speaker, for your intervention. I thank the parliamentary secretary as well for his assistance in making the House a more lively place.

As I was saying, Canadians have created over a million jobs over the past four years and that is because of a different way of doing politics, a different way of governing. Investing in Canadians has created these jobs. As we continue to reinforce those investments and embellish them through budget 2019, we will see more and more impact on the lives of Canadians, including those who live in Alberta.

I encourage the member opposite to continue his advocacy and ensure we work together for the people of Alberta.

Mr. Scott Duvall (Hamilton Mountain, NDP): Madam Speaker, I heard nothing but great things from the other side about the bill. We will have to agree to disagree. A lot of things in it are not at all good for Canadians.

The member talked about pensions and bankruptcy. The legislation the Liberals are talking about has nothing to do with protecting pensions. It is absolutely garbage, foolish and nonsense. It is lip service on what they said they would do in 2015. I will say more on that on Friday.

In the bill, the Liberals want to remove the labels on dangerous products in the workplace. I cannot believe this is even in a budget bill. This is health and safety in workplaces. We are not only putting the workers at risk by cowing down to the owners of the companies, but putting front-line paramedics and firefighters, who deal with disasters and spills, in danger. They do not know whether they are dealing with dangerous products or not. I do not know why anybody in the world would put that in here. It is unbelievable. It is a shame and it should be taken out. I would ask the member to comment on that.

● (2215)

Ms. Iqra Khalid: Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the member opposite for raising these concerns and for agreeing to disagree.

I would like to thank the first responders across Canada who do the hard work and protect our lives. We really must commend them for the work they do and provide them as much support as we can. I was not able to address this in my speech today, but in budget 2019, there is legislation and policy, not only in the budget but across the government over the past four years, to tackle workplace harassment issues, for example, and ensure safer workplaces.

The member opposite also talked about pensions. In my riding of Mississauga—Erin Mills, I held numerous consultations with senior and labour organizations to talk about about pensions and what the government could to ensure future pensions were protected. It is because of those consultations, not only in my riding of Mississauga—Erin Mills but across the country, that we have put forward legislation. It is in that culture that we are building better lives for Canadians every day.

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Madam Speaker, it certainly is a pleasure to rise in this august chamber to talk about the things that are important to the good constituents of Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola. It is always a pleasure to speak on their behalf.

Before I begin my speech tonight, I would like to share my time with the hon. member for Brandon—Souris, who will give a much more comprehensive speech on the finer details of the budget.

I will share a few thoughts and observations on the budget implementation act, Bill C-97.

Who said that omnibus bills were used to prevent debate in the House and limit the ability of MPs to examine what was in the budget by putting all kinds of different things in a single budget? I will spare colleagues the suspense. It was the Prime Minister.

Government Orders

It was also the Prime Minister who said, “I hope that future prime ministers will not make excessive use of omnibus bills and will not resort to prorogation to avoid problematic situations.” The same Prime Minister said, “the abuse of omnibus legislation under the previous government was egregious and something on which we committed to take action.” In fact, we know he promised not to use omnibus legislation in the last election, yet here we are.

I only mention this because it points to the usual pattern from the Prime Minister. He is happy to demonize others, to make promises that he will never do that which he says is wrong. Even if he promises not to, he breaks his promise. Of course, in his mind it is always okay when he does it, just not okay when someone else does it: do as I say, not as I do.

From my perspective, I am actually prepared to give some leeway to the use of omnibus legislation. Why? Because I have sat on the government's side of the House. When we are in government, our goal is to bring forward as many initiatives as we can and hope it will keep the economy strong.

As I used to say when I sat on that side of the House, I would much rather be criticized for attempting to do too much for the economy in a budget bill than not enough.

As an example, in one of the omnibus budget implementation acts of the last Conservative government, I was honoured that an amendment I used in my private member's bill to end the prohibition or ban on the shipping of wine was adopted by the previous Harper government and expanded to also include beer and spirits in the 2014 budget. I would even make light of the fact that it was one page in the former Conservative implementation act that received absolutely no complaints.

Indeed, in this current Liberal BIA, there is language that seeks to further amend the Importation of Intoxicating Liquors Act with the intent to remove federal barriers to directly ship to, in this case, the end-user, shipping of wine, beer and spirits. Of course, that is all subject to provincial regulations.

While the intention, I am sure, is fine, the deletion of any reference to domestic or interprovincial rules in the Importation of Intoxicating Liquors Act seems to me to be more of an abdication of any federal role. This is important. It is contrary not just to our Constitution and the framework that was set up in Confederation, but also it really says that the Liberal Party has lost any sense of imagination or creativity to apply leadership. In fact, it feels that abdicating the field is better than no leadership at all. I would take issue with that.

There is also language in the budget implementation act that also proposes to protect RDSPs. As some may know, I submitted a private member's bill proposing to protect registered disabled savings plans and registered education savings plans. I was pleased to see the government take my suggestion of protecting RDSPs, which are a crucial savings option for many Canadians, particularly for those with children who have challenges.

In last year's budget implementation act, the government also adopted another idea I submitted from one of my private member's bills to amend the Bank Act so that credit unions could continue to

use consumer-friendly terms, such as “bank”, “banker” and “banking”.

I mention these things to demonstrate that I do believe there is some merit in tabling comprehensive budget implementation acts and, at the same time, to also point out there are measures in a BIA that I would support.

One other thing in this bill is about reducing the regulatory burden on credit unions. There is one measure in the bill that does exactly that. It was one of the four items proposed last December by the Canadian Credit Union Association. Therefore, I give big points for listening.

• (2220)

However, of the two items listed in this year's budget, introduced by this Minister of Finance, we see in this bill only one. Again, the Liberals get points for listening but zero points for delivery, other than that one.

This also leads to the challenge of budget implementation bills and why many critics oppose them. The downside of a budget implementation bill is that there are things one may strongly support, but there are also things that one may strongly oppose. As an example, this budget implementation act would not lead Canada back to any semblance of a balanced budget in 2019. This Prime Minister looked Canadians square in the eye and promised them that he would do precisely that. Again, what we have here is a broken promise.

If we are being candid, let us simply admit the obvious. He is not even trying to balance the budget. The finance minister will not even say the words “balanced budget”.

There is another challenge with omnibus legislation, and that is when a government tries to hide something in a budget implementation bill that has no business being there. In last year's budget implementation act, one example was the deferred prosecution agreement language. Not even Liberal MPs on the finance committee had any clue that the proposal was hidden in there or why. Several said it did not belong there. Now we know, sadly, why the Liberals hid it in there, or at least some of the reasons. I suspect that the full story will never be known.

In this year's budget implementation bill, there are proposed changes to Canada's refugee system that, frankly, do not belong in the bill. Those changes need to be debated independently.

Let me get back to the budget itself, and I will point out some other concerns that I will continue to raise.

Government Orders

This budget is silent on household debt. Let us recap why this is a problem. After the Liberals' first year in government, household debt, as a percentage of gross income in 2016, was 166%. In January of this year, that had increased to 176%. Let us pause to think about that for a moment. Canadian household debt is now 176% of gross household income. That has occurred in spite of the Liberal government spending over \$60 billion since being elected, and still Canadians are falling further and further behind. This does not include government debt that is being added onto the backs of Canadians every single day.

Why do I raise household debt? Let us look at the Canada training benefit. On the surface, it sounds like a good thing. What can be wrong with encouraging skills, jobs and retraining? However, when we read the fine print, only \$250 per year is available, up to a career maximum of \$5,000. The challenge I am already hearing is that the majority of training programs cost well in excess of \$5,000. Many skills training programs are literally thousands of dollars or more. For many workers, to benefit from this \$250 training credit will mean borrowing thousands of dollars and increasing household debt.

Similarly, to access a credit of \$5,000 toward the purchase of a new electric vehicle, for most people, would mean borrowing up to the maximum program amount of \$45,000. This again would result in more household debt for anyone borrowing money for a new vehicle purchase.

A similar situation would be created with the new homebuyers' program. This budget offers many programs that sound great until we read the fine print and realize that people will end up borrowing, and becoming deeper in debt, to access them. How about the proposal to borrow up to \$10,000 more from an RRSP, up to a maximum of \$35,000? How many new homebuyers have they run across with a spare \$35,000 kicking around in an RRSP? Still, homebuyers are only being allowed to borrow that money. They have to pay it back. Once again, more debt would be added.

Ultimately, a budget implementation act should try to do as much as it can for the economy. There are so many different things in here that it makes it difficult for us to say what is good and what is bad. There are so many aspects I have not been able to touch on. What should be number one on any government's mind is whether it is in the national interest to pursue this legislation. My vote will be no.

• (2225)

Mr. Nick Whalen (St. John's East, Lib.): Madam Speaker, earlier in the night, I had some interesting questions for the member for Sherbrooke on the issue of different mechanisms in the budget to help homeowners with affordability.

The debt issue is obviously important, not just to people in his riding but across the country. While home values are rising and the amount of debt and leverage associated with home ownership is up, my understanding is that non-mortgage-backed debt is actually in a slight decline. As long as we are trying to support housing prices, make homes affordable for people and protect them from defaults on mortgages, if we see a decline in non-mortgage-backed loans and credit card debt, is that not a sign that the economy is doing well, and should the member not support these initiatives?

Mr. Dan Albas: Madam Speaker, when we had the Governor of the Bank of Canada at the finance committee, my province at the

time had put forward a program similar to the shared equity program the government is offering. I asked the Governor of the Bank of Canada what he thought of it. At the time, the Bank of Canada was not in favour of it, simply because it can cause home prices to rise. We would have home prices rising at the same time we have people going into the market and taking on more debt, in addition to having a government that is borrowing money to pay for the program CMHC would be offering.

Debt is an important part of an overall plan, but the government does not have a plan for its own debt. It does not have a plan to help Canadians get into homes without encouraging them to take on more and more debt. At some point, we have to find reasonable limitations and work with people. We should start in our own backyard with the Government of Canada starting to tame its own debt.

Mr. Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for his hard work in his constituency.

I want to talk about this supposed benefit for homebuyers, the equity portion. The member comes from British Columbia, as I do. I would like him to talk about the average home price in his riding. In my riding of Chilliwack, the idea that people can get into a new home for anywhere near the \$480,000 cap is just not possible. The prices in the Lower Mainland are much higher than that. Who would this be benefiting? Would it benefit people in his riding, or is this just a marketing gimmick to make it look like something is being done for first-time homebuyers?

Mr. Dan Albas: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for Chilliwack—Hope for the work he does. Obviously, his community has been impacted, because people are now having to go out further from metro Vancouver to be able to raise a family on a single detached lot. His community is fortunate to have many of those families, but again, it means longer drives, and it can be very tough.

When it comes to that program, the government has not been very transparent with people. Liberals say that they will lend on property up to \$480,000, but what they do not say is that people can only borrow a maximum of four times their income. For example, people would need to have \$120,000 worth of income to get \$480,000. Again, in many communities in the Okanagan, the average income is between \$60,000 and \$80,000. Four times that is not going to even be able to buy someone a condo.

This is where the government is trying to play games. Rather than dealing with some of up-front challenges, the government is trying to say that three lefts make a right and offers a program so that people somehow feel that it is doing something. It is more of a gimmick than an actual program that will help people.

Government Orders

● (2230)

Mr. Larry Maguire (Brandon—Souris, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the member for Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, for sharing the block of time we have here this evening. It will allow me to zero in on one issue. He said that there are many that I might speak about, but I am going to zero in on one this evening.

In the Liberal's budget implementation bill, the government snuck in a major change to Canada's refugee laws. In fact, the Liberals did not even want to send division 16 to our immigration committee for review. Luckily, our former Liberal chair, who I believe is very much opposed to his own government's changes, was able to get it referred to our committee.

I want to set the stage for why the proposed changes are too little and too late. There is a good chance that they will be deemed not compliant with the Singh Supreme Court decision from the 1980s.

Since the between-ports border crossers started to enter in the numbers we have seen in these past couple of years, the Liberals have literally done nothing to close the loophole in the safe third country agreement with the United States. While there are MPs in this House who want to scrap the agreement in its entirety, our public servants, who are in constant contact with their American counterparts, still firmly believe that the United States is upholding the spirit of the agreement.

What we do not know is if the Liberal government has tried to renegotiate the agreement. Trying to get a straight answer out of the immigration minister is harder than getting the finance minister to tell us when the budget will be balanced.

I also understand that division 16 caused great consternation in the Liberal caucus. This was a major pivot from their previous stance that we could not do anything because of obligations and international law. Somehow this change, which came out of nowhere, seems to have been given the green light by the justice department.

The proposed Liberal changes have been panned by virtually every immigration professional in Canada and are not likely to withstand any sort of court challenge. We have asked for the government's charter review of the legislation, and it has yet to provide it. What the government did provide was a very high-level response that said it was compliant.

Multiple witnesses testified at our immigration committee and said that these changes might even add to the administrative backlog and the burden on the refugee system by directing people through the pre-risk removal assessment process. This change also raised concerns that the pre-risk removal assessment process would be conducted by departmental officials rather than by the independent and quasi-judicial Immigration and Refugee Board.

After ignoring concerns about how the Liberals reacted to the influx of people walking across the border to claim asylum, they took almost two and a half years to introduce legislation. In fact, they stuck it into the budget implementation bill, and our immigration, refugee and citizenship committee was not even permitted to amend it. The Liberals pushed it through and tried to limit any political

fallout. It sounds just like how the Liberals presented the deferred prosecution agreements issue in the SNC-Lavalin affair.

To add to the confusion, there are conflicting media reports as to whether the Liberals have reached out to the Americans to amend the safe third country agreement. According to the CBSA, they have had fruitful discussions with their American counterparts, but neither the Minister of Border Security nor the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship have told us if they want to amend the safe third country agreement.

Moreover, the Auditor General just gave the Liberals a failing grade on how they have handled Canada's refugee system. The Auditor General was clear that the government “did not process asylum claims in an efficient and timely manner.”

The audit revealed that the Liberals did not adequately respond to the influx of border crossers from the United States, and the Auditor General uncovered serious inefficiencies, which are contributing to significant delays.

Due to these delays in processing claims, there has been an increase in total costs for all levels of government for such things as housing, social assistance and health care. This report confirmed that the Liberals were incredibly slow to react. They should have responded immediately, rather than delay for two years.

● (2235)

The Auditor General conducted this review because of “the rising number of asylum claims that is testing the ability of Canada's refugee determination system to process claims in a timely manner.”

According to the report, if the Liberals do not improve the system, the backlog and wait times will continue to grow. They are projecting that if the number of new asylum claimants remains steady at around 50,000 per year, the wait time for a decision will increase to five years by 2024, which is more than double the current wait time. It goes without saying that these delays are costing taxpayers millions of dollars and putting tremendous strain on the resources of our provinces and municipalities.

In the report, it was determined that roughly 65% of all asylum hearings are being postponed at least once before a decision is made. This means that individuals seeking a decision from the Immigration and Refugee Board are facing increasing wait times to determine if their claim is valid or they will be issued a deportation order.

The Liberals have only themselves to blame. The Auditor General was clear when he stated the postponements “were due to administrative issues within the government's control.”

The Auditor General also brought to light that while the government records the identity documents of those seeking asylum claims, some were indecipherable and could not be read.

Government Orders

Furthermore, the Auditor General took a sample of the asylum claims and reported the government failed to check for criminality or to determine the identity of 400 individuals. He concluded that neither CBSA nor the immigration department tracked whether criminal record checks were always completed.

There is a vacuum of leadership at the very top that is now permeating throughout the entire government. If the Liberals cannot properly manage our immigration and refugee system, it is time for a new government. They should stop blaming others and take responsibility. They have had years to make the necessary changes to improve efficiencies, and now the entire system is backlogged for years to come.

If the Liberals think their proposed changes in the budget implementation act are a step in the right direction, they should listen to the litany of people who are speaking out and saying it will only create more confusion. What we would have liked to have seen is a clear commitment to fix this situation once and for all.

It was just last year that I wrote to the Parliamentary Budget Officer to request a full financial analysis of border crossers into Canada. The request stemmed from the lack of financial information provided by the Liberal government.

Since January 2017, over 40,000 border crossers have been intercepted by the RCMP in Manitoba, Quebec, Ontario and British Columbia. The PBO revealed that the border crossers cost taxpayers \$340 million in 2017-18, \$368 million this year, and if similar numbers come across next year, it will cost another \$396 million. It is projected to cost at least \$1.1 billion in just these three fiscal years, while costs will only continue to go up as the wait times for processing through the Immigration and Refugee Board have ballooned.

These numbers are just the federal government's expenses, and they exclude the hundreds of millions of dollars in costs being borne by provincial and municipal governments for housing and for welfare payments.

The numbers in the report are quite staggering. If the Liberals do nothing to either close the loophole in the safe third country agreement or deter border crossers, we can expect that the overall price tag will only continue to grow.

The PBO outlined in his report that the average cost per asylum claim will grow from \$14,321 to \$16,666 by 2019-20 as the backlog continues to grow.

The reason for this increased cost is that while asylum claimants are in the country waiting for their refugee hearing, they are eligible for various government services. Moreover, as asylum claimants are denied by the Immigration and Refugee Board, the individual can appeal that decision, which could end up costing \$33,738 by the time the appeal is done.

The PBO also revealed that only 18% of border crossers have had their refugee board hearing, and out of the failed claimants, only a fraction have been removed from the country.

Because of this influx, there has been significant pressure on resources for all organizations involved in this process, which has led to delays in the processing of these claims.

● (2240)

To wrap up, not only do I oppose division 16, but I also want the Liberals to immediately get to work to renegotiate the safe third country agreement. Then and only then will we be able to restore confidence in our refugee system and stop ill-thought-out changes of the kind we find in this budget implementation act.

Mr. Nick Whalen (St. John's East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do have the fortunate opportunity to work with the member on the citizenship and immigration committee, where we had the opportunity to study not only divisions 15 and 16 of part 4, which he spoke about, but other aspects in the estimates as they relate to budget 2019 and, of course, budget 2018.

In budget 2018, we brought in measures for biometrics to better engage with our partners, including the United States, in identifying people who come across the border. As the member knows, this will allow us to have some type of a path for the repatriation of people back to the United States who come across the border irregularly. Hopefully, it will be a mechanism that the minister will be able to negotiate with his foreign counterparts, a mechanism to have people who cross irregularly to be sent back at a regular crossing, because with thousands of kilometres of borders, it is not possible to render people back without someone to receive them on the other side. If they come irregularly at one point, there needs to be a mechanism to send them back, and I look forward to hearing what is able to be negotiated.

However, with respect to budget 2019, \$1.18 billion over five years is committed for things like border security and improving the asylum process. The member has identified some problems with the asylum process, but I wonder if he is favourable to our approach on strengthening border security itself, and whether he feels that these reinvestments in border security, after previous years of cuts, are worthwhile.

Mr. Larry Maguire: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for the question he has put forward and congratulate him on his new position as the chair of the immigration committee.

However, to answer his question, no, I am not in favour of division 16. If he was listening to my speech, he would have learned that we think still stronger measures are needed to be more clear in how these border issues are being handled.

On the issue of people who have come across between the border crossings, the government has come up with an idea right out of the blue, which I think half of its own caucus was surprised to see come forward. I think there needs to be consistency in dealing with this issue.

As my colleague for Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola said a while ago, that consistency is lacking in this budget, and the situation facing the border crossers right now is another point of inconsistency with the way the government has handled it. One of the things the Liberals took two years to do was to even talk to the Americans about whether or not they could begin the process.

Government Orders

The Speaker: I will pause the time for a second.

The other day we had a question from the hon. member for Wellington—Halton Hills on a point of order which helped me to remind members that one member should be standing at a time. I do not mean when it is time for questions and comments, which is the time to stand, but when a member is speaking, everyone should wait until the member is finished before getting up.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Winnipeg South.

Mr. Terry Duguid (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Women and Gender Equality, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are two things that I think the hon. member and I agree on. One is that Manitoba is the friendliest province in the entire confederation and the second is that we are friendly to immigration.

I would ask the hon. member to reflect on the immigration and refugee policy of the previous government. He will recall the snitch line to report barbaric practices. He will recall health cuts to refugees. He will recall the parents and grandparents program being called a “burden” by the previous government. It took two years to reunite spouses. We have that down to one year.

If the hon. member reflects on the record of the previous government, which he was part of, does he support the measures that were introduced by the previous government, and does he agree that what we have done on this side of the House is an improvement?

• (2245)

Mr. Larry Maguire: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Terry Duguid (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Women and Gender Equality, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I just remembered the second attribute of Manitoba. It is the curling capital of the world, not just Canada.

I am going to share my time with my good friend, the hon. member for Winnipeg North, whom I have known for 33 years. He had a lot more hair back then, but he is wiser. He is my counsel. I am so proud to have him sitting next to me.

I am pleased to rise today as the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Women and Gender Equality, as well as the member for Winnipeg South, to speak about budget 2019, a budget that focuses on building an economy that works for everyone, a budget that gives all Canadians, regardless of gender, a fair and equal chance at success.

Our government truly believes that our country and our economy benefit when women, girls and people of all genders are safe and free to live their lives to the fullest.

The facts speak for themselves. Over the last 40 years, greater participation of women in the workforce has accounted for about one-third of Canada's economic growth. According to the McKinsey Global Institute, advancing gender equality could contribute as much as \$150 billion to our economy by 2026. More and more, we can see there is a very close correlation between gender equality, the level of competitiveness and human development in our country. It is clear to us that gender equality is the foundation for a prosperous Canada. For decades, women's organizations and other equality-seeking organizations have been working hard to tackle the systemic barriers impeding gender equality, and they have made a huge difference.

We need to support further community action to create the right conditions so that everyone can achieve their potential. Our government has stepped up with historic investments to advance gender equality, but women's organizations know first-hand how vital it is to safeguard the hard-won rights and progress they fought for.

Budget 2019 made an important investment of \$160 million to support projects that work to tackle systemic barriers impeding women's progress while also recognizing and addressing the diverse experiences of gender and inequality across this country. These new funds allow the government to set in motion new innovative partnerships to fundamentally change the way we fund women's organizations so it is more stable and sustainable, and our Minister for Women and Gender Equality has made some really terrific announcements at Women Deliver in Vancouver this week.

Canadian women are among the world's most educated, yet women and girls still face barriers in achieving their potential. We cannot move forward if half of us are held back. Budget 2019 recognizes that and encourages women's participation in high-demand fields of the economy through investments and skills development and financial support for training in order to promote science, technology, engineering and mathematics, the STEM sector, to girls. These are wise investments indeed.

Investing in the middle class includes investments in gender equality, and gender equality is a core consideration in this government's policies and programs. Our government is working to develop policies and programs that will deliver a society where a person's gender identity or expression does not deter the likelihood of developing one's potential. In this vein, budget 2019 helps address the unique needs and persisting disparities among LGBTQ2+ Canadians by investing in capacity-building and community-level work of service organizations. I want to thank the member for Edmonton Centre for his great work in this regard.

Ending gender-based violence is crucial if we are serious about giving everyone the same opportunities to join and grow Canada's middle class. Our government has invested over \$200 million in a strategy to prevent and address gender-based violence. We have heard from survivors and the organizations that support them, and we are responding to the need for funding to prevent and address gender-based violence. We have heard from underserved groups, groups that are often impacted disproportionately by gender-based violence and that need more resources to address the gaps in services. We have listened and are investing more than \$50 million for more than 60 projects in communities across the country to support survivors of gender-based violence and their families.

Government Orders

● (2250)

One of the harsh realities of gender-based violence is human trafficking, which I know is an issue everyone in the House feels strongly about and one that needs to be addressed aggressively. Budget 2019 announced a whole-of-government human trafficking strategy, recognizing that individuals at greatest risk of victimization include persons who are socially or economically disadvantaged, women and girls, youth and children, indigenous peoples, refugees and migrants, LGBTQ2+ individuals and persons with disabilities. We need to address their needs.

Budget 2019 also supports combatting child sexual exploitation online, preventing hate crimes and providing increased access to family justice in the official language of one's choice.

Our government was elected on a promise to support the middle class and to work hard to help those who want to join the middle class. From day one, we have understood that one of the most important things we can do to achieve this is to ensure that everyone has access to safe and affordable housing. The budget implementation act before us today recognizes that the right to adequate housing is a fundamental human right affirmed in international law. It ensures that Canada's first-ever national housing strategy is not also the last. The national housing strategy and the commitments to build and repair shelter spaces for women fleeing violent situations mean that more women and their children have a safe place to turn to.

The decisions governments make impact different people differently. That is why gender budgeting is at the heart of our government's strategy to improve equality in Canada. In December, we passed the Canadian Gender Budgeting Act, which requires by law that all future budgets take gender equality into account when we make decisions. As we have said, what gets measured gets done. The gender results framework, launched in budget 2018, has guided our decisions on policies and programs that are responsive to the needs of the diversity of individuals in our society.

The most important determinant of our country's competitiveness is its human talent and the skills and productivity of its workforce. No one should be left behind. We all deserve equal access to the workforce and to political decision-making power. We should all have access to resources and opportunities.

To have a country where all citizens are equal and have a fair chance of success is a goal worthy of our best efforts. I believe the people of Canada deserve nothing less than our very best.

Mr. Garnett Genus (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the parliamentary secretary a little more about the issues related to gender-based budgeting.

There are, I suppose, two approaches one could take in this regard. One is to try to maximize choice and flexibility for women to ensure they do not face the barriers they have historically faced in accessing certain kinds of opportunities. The alternative is to try to create incentives to propel women into the workforce even when they might want to make a different choice.

In that context, I want to ask the member about the issue of the “use it or lose it” parental leave program. The government's approach to parental leave is to try to constrict and reduce the space for choice, requiring that in order for families to get the full allotment

of parental leave, both parents have to take it at some point. That is just not realistic for certain families, as it may be that one parent is not able to access parental leave. There is also a question of equality in this type of program with regard to single parents.

What I hear from women and young parents in my riding is that they are looking for greater flexibility. They would prefer a system that allows, for instance, a greater opportunity for moms or dads on parental leave to work a bit from home. Could the parliamentary secretary tell me why the government believes the path to advancing equality involves limiting choices? Would he not agree that a better path might be to expand choices and flexibility for parents?

● (2255)

Mr. Terry Duguid: Mr. Speaker, I would argue that the current system is very flexible. Men and women can share parental leave. What we have done is added an extra five weeks for a second parent. Often that time would be taken by fathers.

This is a well-trodden path in Scandinavian countries and in Quebec. In previous eras, very few men would take parental leave. We found that in Scandinavian countries and in Quebec, somewhere upwards of 87% of people, particularly fathers, will take parental leave because of the kinds of provisions we put in budget 2019.

Mr. Scott Duvall (Hamilton Mountain, NDP): Mr. Speaker, there was a chance to help people who are off sick from work. I have been getting a lot of complaints from my constituents, and I know we have been lobbied here in Ottawa about 15 weeks not being long enough, especially nowadays because of the long hospital waits. People might have hip injuries or need a new knee, but it takes a long time to get that surgery done, and until that is done, they cannot work because they are having a hard time performing their jobs.

Fifteen weeks does not cut it. Why did we miss the opportunity to increase those weeks when we have been pressured by society for many years to have this looked after?

Mr. Terry Duguid: Mr. Speaker, we have made a number of improvements to the EI system since we were elected in 2015. I participated in some of those when I was the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Families. We have increased flexibility, and maternity and parental leave benefits have been improved. I know that the EI system is constantly being looked at and that the question has been raised in the House many times. The minister certainly is aware of these questions and is always looking to improve the EI system in this country.

Government Orders

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to address the chamber on a wide variety of issues. This evening is special in the sense that we are talking about the budget. When we talk about the budget, we talk about priorities and I am happy to share my thoughts on the government's priorities.

As the member for Winnipeg South pointed out, he and I go back 30 years, both on the provincial and national scene. I have learned to respect many of the things he does, especially on issues surrounding the environment, women's issues and Churchill, Manitoba. These are the types of issues he really digs his teeth into and produces tangible results. I respect the effort he puts in, day in and day out, in serving the constituents of Winnipeg South. Combined, we bring the south end of Winnipeg to the north and the north to the south. As he pointed out, it is friendly Manitoba and it has always been a pleasure to work with him in many capacities.

Having said all of that, I would like to pick up on a couple of points. The overriding issue for me has always been to demonstrate that, as a government, we have been very effective in a relatively short period of time. The budget is all about priorities and ensuring the economy and the social fabric continue to move forward. When I say the social fabric, I am talking about diversity. One of the most compelling facts is the number of jobs that have been created since we have been in government: one million jobs. That is a significant achievement.

When we talk about those one million jobs, we ask ourselves how that happened. It is because we have a government that is committed to working with Canadians in all regions of our country. We have a government that is committed to working with many different stakeholders, provinces, territories, indigenous people and municipalities, and by working with Canadians, we were able to deliver in a very tangible way.

I referenced something the other day and I want to repeat it. From day one, we have been focused on Canada's middle class and those aspiring to be a part of it, and that has been demonstrated from the very first piece of legislation we introduced, which my colleagues will recall was Bill C-2. It is what gave the middle class of Canada a substantial tax cut, putting hundreds of millions of dollars into the pockets of Canadians.

If we carry that piece of legislation over to the budget of 2016, the very first Liberal budget under this administration, we saw substantial increases to the guaranteed income supplement, which lifted tens of thousands of seniors out of poverty. There were also substantial increases to the Canada child benefit that completely reformed it, which again lifted tens of thousands of children out of poverty. Through those things alone, we invested in Canadians in very real and tangible ways. We put hundreds of millions of dollars into the pockets of Canadians in all regions of our country. In Winnipeg North alone, there is \$9 million a month for children, every month, in the form of the Canada child benefit.

This is how to support the middle class and those aspiring to be part of it and how to give a helping hand to those who really need it. By doing that, we increased the disposable incomes of Canadians. It

meant more money was being spent in our communities in all regions of our country, and by doing that, we created jobs.

• (2300)

Take that into consideration along with the historic investment in Canada's infrastructure. In the most recent budget we have seen an additional allocation for municipal infrastructure investment. That investment in infrastructure means hundreds of millions of dollars being invested in every region of our country, creating more jobs.

Why have we been able to create one million jobs by working with Canadians? Compare what we did in the last three and a half years to the 10 years of misery with the Harper regime. For Canadians who follow the debate on the budget they will see there really is no change in the opposition today. The only change is the incredible amount of influence that Doug Ford has with the Conservative Party. The Premier of Ontario now sits on that small circular table with Stephen Harper and the current Conservative leader.

An hon. member: Who is in charge?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: That is a very good question that is being posed. Many would suggest that nothing has changed, it is still Stephen Harper. Many would argue it is Stephen Harper behind the curtains. He is still the driving force with the Conservative Party. There is no change.

Every so often Conservatives give a special invite to that circular table. One of the individuals recently there was Jason Kenney from Alberta. There are some interesting individuals at the top of the leadership.

Imagine the discussion. Doug Ford says, "Just wait a minute, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, I need more time to figure out this environment thing". As Canadians from coast to coast to coast wait for the Conservative Party to tell us what the plan is, we have to wait for Doug Ford to give instructions to the current opposition leader. Sadly, I do not think that is the limit. I believe that Canadians would be surprised at the degree to which the Conservative Party really takes its direction from individuals like Stephen Ford.

That was a Freudian slip: Stephen Harper and Mr. Ford.

The point is that we would like to see more transparency coming from the Conservative Party. At some point its members have to start telling Canadians what they are proposing. It was not that long ago that the current leader of the official opposition said the deficit would be four or five years. Before long the Conservatives are going to adopt the same policy in regard to what we are talking about on the deficit.

It is important for Canadians to realize whenever we talk about deficits that the Conservatives like to give advice, but when Stephen Harper became the Prime Minister of Canada, he inherited a multi-billion dollar surplus. Before the recession, he had already squandered it and turned it into a multi-billion deficit.

Government Orders

Year after year of Stephen Harper Conservative rule in Canada, the deficit was accumulated in excess of \$150 billion. Is it any wonder we do not take advice from Conservatives when it comes to managing the deficit, let alone the economy? We have been able to do in three and a half years what took the Conservative Party on the employment file almost 10 years to do. We know we have to invest in Canadians. We have to invest in infrastructure. We believe in Canadians, not just serving the rich.

Conservatives say they support tax cuts. That is balderdash. When they had a chance to vote for tax cuts, what did they do? They voted no. When they had the opportunity to say the rich in Canada, that one per cent, should pay a little more, they voted no. It is a Conservative Party that caters to its friends. The middle class of Canada is no friend of the Conservative Party. I believe that we have a government that will continue to work—

• (2305)

The Speaker: Questions and comments, the hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan.

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that was the most ridiculous speech I have ever heard in this place.

Frankly, what it shows is that Edward Blake is still pulling the strings over there. We wonder how much influence he really has. Maybe Stéphane Dion is really behind all the things this government is doing. We do not know for sure. They are sitting around a table somewhere, and who knows.

In all seriousness, I do wish the member well with his post-parliamentary career after the election. It sounds like he is interested in pursuing a future in Ontario provincial politics. We have had cases before of people elected in Manitoba who have moved to Ontario to run. Maybe he is positioning for that.

In the midst of all the bluster, all of the exaggeration and outright fabrication, I have one simple question for the member. When will the bloody budget be balanced?

• (2310)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what it is that I said.

Virtually everything I said was factual and could be supported. I did make one Freudian slip when I said “Stephen Ford”. That was not factual. It is actually “Stephen Harper and Doug Ford.” I apologize for that. However, everything else is a true reflection of reality.

It is interesting that when it came right down to the member's question, he asked about balanced budgets. Really? Is that the best question he could come up with? When we take a look at our deficit-to-GDP ratio, we are actually doing quite well. As I pointed out, the last people we should turn to for advice are those in the Conservative Party of Canada.

In the last 150 years of our Confederation, Conservatives have actually governed for a minority of those years, yet they have accrued the largest portion of the deficit. We do not need to take any advice at all from the Conservatives on how to manage an economy or balance the books.

Mr. Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to get back to the question about balancing the budget. I must say that this imaginary table that Stephen Ford sits at, along with Stephen Harper, Iron Man and Superman, where they all gather and conspire against our Canadian government, is more than just a fabrication; it is certainly imaginary.

However, I want to get back to the question from my hon. colleague about balancing the budget. In 2015, we were originally promised that the budget would be balanced by 2019. Simply put, we are asking, if it is not going to happen in 2019, when will it be balanced?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, every year Stephen Harper said that he would balance the budget, and that never happened.

Let me give the stats, for those who are following the debate: in 38% of the 151 years, which is a minority, the Conservatives actually accumulated 74% of the debt. Then we can take a look at Stephen Harper. As I said, he actually inherited a multi-billion dollar surplus and said that he would have balanced budgets, but he turned that multi-billion dollar surplus into a multi-billion dollar deficit even before the recession, in his first year.

At the end of the day, we would not be well advised to listen to what the Conservatives really and truly have to say about balancing budgets. They are so far out on the issue.

Mr. Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I can assure members that my presentation will not be as loud or as exuberant as the previous one. That may be a very welcome reprieve for the members and many others watching TV this evening. I also want to say that I am going to be splitting my time with the NDP member for Beloeil—Chambly. I am going to do that for them.

It is my pleasure to speak to the budget implementation act today. I can best describe this budget implementation act and the budget as a distraction from Liberal scandals and failures. I want to set the stage a bit before we talk more about that.

Back in 1975, when I began my work career, I was a 15-year-old boy. I got a job working at Steinbach Toyota, and my job was to wash cars. I worked for a gentleman by the name of Henry Kliever. He taught me how to wash cars. He developed in me an appreciation for clean vehicles and he taught me all about detailing. He was a fussy guy and he was absolutely careful and particular about everything he did.

We were walking through his shop one day in the back of the dealership. We were coming up to the showroom part of the building when I noticed a penny on the ground. I was going to give it a bit of a kick with my foot. He saw what I was going to do and he picked it up and said, “This is one penny I am never going to have to work for.” He said, “I want to tell you something. I look after the nickels and the dimes, and the dollars look after themselves.” I have never forgotten that. That was in 1975 when I was making \$1.95 an hour and he was concerned about nickels and dimes.

Government Orders

I can extrapolate that to today. What a privilege it is to stand in this House and talk about the finances of the country of Canada. It is an extreme privilege, and it is humbling, but today requires us to look at the millions of dollars because what we are talking about is the billions. If we are good stewards of the millions of dollars that we are entrusted with as members of Parliament, then the billions will probably look after themselves.

Let us talk about some of these millions of dollars that we have not been looking after very carefully.

The current Liberal government under this Prime Minister has given Canadian taxpayer dollars to the Clinton Foundation. It has given money to Hamas. It has gotten India to invest \$250 million here in Canada, but only after we have turned around and invested \$750 million in India. If we do the math, that does not quite add up.

We have had a crisis with illegal migrants at our southern border with the United States. That crisis cost us roughly \$200 million in 2017 and \$400 million in 2018. In 2019, it was another \$600 million. It has cost us \$1.1 billion already because we have mismanaged our borders and allowed illegal migrants to come into this country, and we have been footing the bill. In addition to that, municipalities and provinces have also had to pick up additional expenses. That number is again projected to grow to another almost \$2 billion this coming year.

Let us then look at the Trans Mountain expansion pipeline. Kinder Morgan owned the Trans Mountain pipeline. It had it on the books for \$600 million. It invested another \$1.2 billion on working toward constructing a second pipeline, known as the Trans Mountain expansion. The current government turned around and bought the existing pipeline plus the investment that had been made in the proposed pipeline for \$4.5 billion, using Canadian taxpayer dollars.

• (2315)

Kinder Morgan had \$1.8 billion invested in that project. The Liberal government turned around and gave it \$4.5 billion for its \$1.8 billion. Kinder Morgan had to realize a capital gain of \$2.7 billion. That was Canadian taxpayer dollars that left this country, left our resource sector here in Canada and were sent down to wealthy Texas investors in Kinder Morgan, which owned the Trans Mountain pipeline.

We have not been managing our millions of dollars very well. We have given \$2.7 billion of Canadian taxpayer money to American investors. In addition to that, Canada could have received a further investment from Kinder Morgan of close to \$10 billion in the actual construction of the Trans Mountain expansion. That money will also now have to come from Canadian taxpayers.

We have not been managing our millions of dollars very well under the Liberal government and under the current Prime Minister. It has been a failure, and Canadian taxpayers are going to be the ones left on the hook.

We have paid convicted terrorists \$10.5 million. We have paid millions of dollars to Bombardier in Quebec. We have bought rusted-out CF-18s from Australia to bolster up our defence forces and our defence fleet of aircraft. That is money we will not recover.

Now we are looking at a budget implementation act that would implement the budget that the government has presented to the House, which is not balanced. The Liberals are projecting a \$20-billion shortfall again.

I worked in the credit union system for 30 years. For 17 of those years, I was the president and chairman of Manitoba's largest credit union. One thing I know is that when times are good, money is set aside because rainy days are coming.

We were promised sunny days. The sunny days are gone. I think they left on the first day after the election. We have some rainy days on the horizon. The time to invest money and to set money aside was when the sun was shining. I saw that over and over again in my experience and involvement in the credit union system. People who wisely put money aside when times were good were the people who were successful with their finances at the end of the day.

Members of the Liberal caucus stand up in this place and tout the good results they are having from a financial perspective in the Canadian economy. They tell us about all the jobs they have created and how the economy is booming. It is actually not booming as much as they say it is. They tell us it is booming, and yet they have not been salting away money and reducing our debt to build up our inventory of cash so that we can weather the storms that may someday come.

The time to do that is when times are good, and the Liberals would like Canadians to believe that times are good. If times are good, why do we still have a deficit budget? We need to have a balanced budget. The Prime Minister promised in 2015 that by 2019 we would have a balanced budget. We do not have a balanced budget.

The budget that has been presented this year was supposed to be an election-type budget, with lots of good news. There is \$41 billion of new spending in this budget over the next five years. It was meant to be a bit of a hit budget, a budget that people could get excited about. With all the scandals and failures of the current government, it hardly got any airplay when it was announced. The \$41 billion of additional spending in the next five years is not enough to distract the Canadian taxpayer from the failures and scandals of the current government.

• (2320)

Mr. Terry Duguid (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Women and Gender Equality, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleague is the member for the riding adjacent to mine, and I am often in his riding, because I travel Highway 75 south to places like Morris, which has great curling facilities. He knows that I am a big curling fan.

I am a little puzzled when the member talks about the border and security. The Stephen Harper government, which he and the member for Brandon—Souris were part of, as they were both elected in by-elections, cut millions from the budget for border security and the RCMP. In getting to their fake budget surplus, some of the other things they cut were the Cereal Research Centre, the Institute for Biodiagnostics and the Experimental Lakes Area. There was a war on science in Manitoba. Why did the hon. member not stand up for Manitoba?

Government Orders

● (2325)

Mr. Ted Falk: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member from Winnipeg South for his complimentary remarks about my riding. When he is looking for good employees to staff his constituency office, he comes into my riding and snatches the good folks out of Provencher to provide him with the staffing he needs in his riding. It was probably the only Liberal in my riding, but he did get him, so good on him.

Approximately 40,000 illegal migrants came into Canada in the last three years, and not all of them through Emerson. Most of them came through Roxham Road, in Quebec. That was the result of one careless little tweet that said, “Welcome to Canada”. It does not matter who people are or where they are from, they are welcome here in Canada, and by the way, we will fork out \$1.4 billion and go further into debt to do it. That was the case.

That member is a member of the government. Right now, the Prime Minister is standing in the way of allowing his province to export the cleanest, renewable hydroelectricity energy from Manitoba into Minnesota. He is standing in the way of allowing the transmission line to proceed.

Why does the member not encourage the Prime Minister to sign off on a deal that the NEB and the province have already approved?

Mr. David de Burgh Graham (Laurentides—Labelle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if my friend from Provencher is so convinced that we can cut our way to growth, how is it that his government left the country completely penniless?

Mr. Ted Falk: Mr. Speaker, as the member knows, we left, in 2015, with a balanced budget. We had just come through the greatest economic recession since the Great Depression. We successfully navigated that. We came out less scathed than any of the other G7 countries in the world. It was because we had Stephen Harper, who the member for Winnipeg North has been so infatuated with all evening that he cannot stop talking about the great work he did. Stephen Harper will go down in Canada's history books as the greatest prime minister Canada has seen to date. The member for Winnipeg North acknowledged this evening what a wonderful job he did, and I am so pleased that he is so infatuated with him.

Mr. Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have growing debt and deficits like never before, but we have huge opportunities, with the TMX pipeline, to transport oil and natural gas in my riding and get that to market. There is a way to make money as a country by developing our natural resources. Does the member not think we should develop more of those resources?

Mr. Ted Falk: Mr. Speaker, we are so blessed here in this country with natural resources. Our biggest challenge is finding a way to get them to market. I am passionate about natural resources.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Matthew Dubé (Beloeil—Chambly, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Provencher for sharing his time with me. The NDP and the Conservative Party often disagree, but we have been able to work well together in true parliamentary spirit.

I have five key points to make. Obviously, there could be more, since we are talking about an omnibus bill, but I will focus on five points that I believe should be raised in today's budget debate.

The first is that the oil industry subsidies are being maintained, despite the government's promise to get rid of them. These subsidies are still in place. Budget 2019 is a missed opportunity to do something to fight climate change and provide additional revenue in order to truly invest in green energy, the energy of the future.

The second aspect I would like to address is another missed opportunity, and that is the fact that the government is not requiring web giants like Netflix to collect sales tax. That is important, and it shows a major lack of political will. Just look at Quebec. With the stroke of a pen, Quebec managed to do what the current government has not done in four years. We are seeing the consequences today, with massive layoffs at TVA. We know that our cultural industry is suffering the effects of this unfair situation, which would be so easy to fix. Contrary to popular belief, it is not a new tax. It is just a matter of applying existing taxes and the law consistently, as they apply to businesses here.

Third, I would like to talk about the fact that this is an omnibus bill. The issue of immigration and refugees comes up in this bill. A budget bill is creating a situation that is unfair and discriminatory towards refugees. Omnibus bills were criticized under the previous Conservative government, which is precisely why the Liberals promised not to use this kind of problematic tactic. As the member for Sherbrooke pointed out earlier in his speech, this matter was raised several times at the Standing Committee on Finance. Stakeholders and civil society representatives had to appear before the finance committee to share their concerns regarding legislative changes that will affect refugees. It is completely absurd that this issue appears in an omnibus budget bill. It is completely unacceptable.

Speaking of missed opportunities, my fourth point is about employment insurance, the 50 weeks, and people with serious illnesses who cannot get their fair share of EI and so are unable to return to work, despite having gone through a terrible ordeal while dealing with a very serious illness. We have been fighting for this for quite some time. Just think of people like Marie-Hélène Dubé and everyone fighting for the same cause. We in the NDP will continue to support them. This is another one of this government's missed opportunities.

I addressed my last point when I talked about the amendments to the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act. Despite the government's repeated promises, it introduced a number of omnibus bills. Some of them were even longer than the ones introduced by the previous government. That is a broken promise that violates our rights as parliamentarians.

In closing, I would like to present an amendment:

● (2330)

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word “That” and substituting the following:

“the House decline to give third reading to C-97, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 19, 2019 and other measures, because it:

(a) gives more to big business than to Canadians;

Government Orders

- (b) does not establish a universal pharmacare plan;
- (c) does not solve the current housing crisis;
- (d) maintains subsidies to oil companies;
- (e) makes major changes to the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act that are unfair and fail to meet the standards of the process established by the Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada;
- (f) is an omnibus bill that is contrary to this government's promises; and
- (g) limits the Members' ability to vote separately on the various divisions of the Bill."

• (2335)

[*English*]

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for the proposed NDP amendment.

I want to ask for his further reflections with respect to the immigration sections of the budget. We have heard concerns from many Canadians on the issue of shady consultants and the impact that has on Canadians when bad advice is given and this budget. Although it purports to make some changes, it falls short of the changes that many people have asked for and there continue to be many concerns about those changes.

Could the member share a bit of his thoughts and what he has heard from people in his riding?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Matthew Dubé: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

Some shady individuals try to profit off of vulnerable people by offering services at an astronomical cost. In some cases, these services could have been provided by an MP's office or by people much more honest and reputable, for example, a lawyer, for a much more reasonable fee. This is an extremely important issue. I remember an article in *Le Journal de Montréal* about this. It talked about consultants that were misleading people about what they could or could not do when coming to Canada.

What we mainly object to in the proposed changes is the inequity that the changes will create. The Liberals spoke about having a compassionate system that would respect human rights. They mismanaged the situation at the border because they did not know how to deal with President Trump's racist policies and the irregular arrival of people at our borders, they made a de facto change to fix the situation. At the end of the day, this change will violate the rights of people who are seeking a better life here in Canada and who are simply trying to start a process legitimately.

[*English*]

The Speaker: Before going on to the next question, members who do not already know, although I gather some do, will want to know that the Toronto Raptors just defeated the Golden State Warriors 123 to 109.

The hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

• (2340)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I suspect 30 million-plus Canadians are quite happy to see the Raptors prevail. As they were watching the Raptors, we have

been having a very challenging debate in the House of Commons on a budget that will impact many of those millions of people. I congratulate to the Raptors and the fans.

I think it is fair to say that sadly the NDP has been consistent over the last few years with respect to budgets. We have seen a government that has brought in many different progressive measures. It shocks and surprises me the degree to which the NDP continues to vote against what I would have thought it would vote for. A good example of that is the housing issue.

On the housing issue, the NDP made a commitment for a very small allocation in the last election. We, on the other hand, made a commitment of billions of dollars in the national housing strategy.

Why does the NDP continuously not support good progressive social policies?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Matthew Dubé: Mr. Speaker, it is extremely dishonest for a member to say that a party voted against a given measure when that member knows full well that budgets contain many measures and that one can only vote against the budget as a whole. If we could vote on individual measures, things would be different.

That gives me an opportunity to remind everyone that we are talking about an omnibus bill that deprives MPs of the right to vote on individual measures. Once again, they are preventing us from voting on individual elements.

Just to prove how willing we are to do that when we are able to vote on separate elements, I would point out that, earlier today, we voted in favour of an amendment that would have done exactly what the NDP wants to do with the housing file. The amendment was proposed in committee by my colleague from Sherbrooke, but because it lacked a royal recommendation, the government had to come back with this one.

When a government maintains oil industry subsidies, refuses to tax web giants and refuses to protect workers' pensions, its progressive measures are really just half-measures that are not nearly good enough.

[*English*]

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this speech is well timed, because I know now that the Raptors game is over. Canadians will now be able to switch their dials back to CPAC and watch this, so I appreciate that. I am very pleased about the Raptors' success this evening. I have been a long-term fan. For two weeks, I have been following the games and I am sure that devotion is going to mean a lot for my continuing visits to the ridings of the members across the way in the greater Toronto area.

Government Orders

We are talking today about the budget implementation act and I want to frame this by talking about what I think is on a lot of Canadians' minds when they look at the budget. They are asking themselves how they can get ahead. Frankly, a lot of Canadians are struggling to get ahead. They might be getting by, but not getting ahead. When I think about getting ahead, I think about my paternal grandfather. He just passed away a couple of weeks ago and it was great to hear some of the stories shared at his funeral. My grandfather came here as an immigrant from Malta with not very much money. If there was someone who could get ahead, who could make a looney go a little further, it was my grandfather.

I remember one story he told us. He came from Malta right after the Second World War. Malta was heavily bombed by the German Air Force during the Second World War. When he bought his first car, he saw the ad in the paper, the guy came over and they negotiated a price of \$300 for the car. The guy thought he recognized my grandfather's accent and asked where he was from. My grandfather answered that he was from the island of Malta. It turned out the guy he was talking to had served in the German Air Force and the guy said he had dropped so many bombs on that country. They talked back and forth a little and at the end of the day, my grandfather gave him \$200. When the guy said he thought they had agreed to \$300, my grandfather said that was a discount for all the bombs he had dropped on his country, and the guy took the money and left. That was the immigrant experience for so many people who came then and come now and need to use every advantage they can get just to get ahead.

I look at the economic reality that the government is presiding over and it is one in which it is harder and harder for Canadians to get ahead, so I want to contrast the economic vision we see from the government and the alternative vision of the Conservatives.

The government's approach, which we have heard in the speeches that were given tonight, is that if someone has a problem, the government has a program for that. If people are struggling with accessing the Internet, the government will have an access-the-Internet program. If people want new tires, the government will have a new tires program. There is a program for every problem. Of course, every time there is a new program, there are people to administer the evaluation and delivery of those funds. Thus, in the name of providing help to the specific issues people face, and I do not doubt that many members of the government are sincere in their intentions, the effect of it is the piling on of expenditure and bureaucracy and on the other end of it, it is taxes. Taxing people more and more is like trying to lift people up in the bucket they are standing in.

The government purports to want to be more generous, but generous with whose money? The effect of its constant growth in program spending, with more bureaucracy and more administration, is that people have to pay more taxes. Not only do they have to pay more taxes today, but they feel a great deal of uncertainty about the taxes they will have to pay in the future. We know, and we have seen it before, that when governments run unplanned, uncontrolled deficits, that leads to higher taxes, as surely as night follows day. The government is already imposing higher taxes on Canadians as a result of its inability to control spending and people are worried that

if that spending does not get under control, we are going to see higher taxes in the future.

My friend from Winnipeg North spoke a lot tonight about his favourite politician: Doug Ford. I would like to take us back to how Ontario got the challenges that it faces. I will share a little about my own province as well. In Ontario, there were successive Liberal governments under Dalton McGuinty and Kathleen Wynne. They did not believe that the budget ever had to be balanced, so it seemed, although at least they had a theoretical target for balancing the budget, which the federal government does not even have. They wanted to convince people that the party could just go on forever. Now Liberals are looking at the situation and asking why spending could not just increase forever right now.

● (2345)

We have to understand how we got here. The fiscal challenges that Ontario experienced were created by multiple terms of reckless spending. I believe that we can avoid that at the federal level. I believe that we can prevent this Prime Minister from doing to Canada what Dalton McGuinty and Kathleen Wynne did to Ontario. I believe we can avoid that kind of a situation.

I think we can effectively manage spending and reduce taxes at the same time, while continuing to invest. However, I think it is important that we act now by replacing the Liberal government with a government that actually understands the importance of balance and prudence in our spending.

I heard the member for Mississauga—Erin Mills talk about the U of T Mississauga in her riding. I have been to that university. Actually, I spoke at a number of events at that beautiful university in her riding. One of the big issues on the minds of students at that university, and other universities, is how they will have to pay back, over the long term, the deficits, the debts that are being accumulated today.

Young people are aware of this. I have young children. I have three young children and one more on the way. My children should not have to pay, in their future, for the things that I got to enjoy today.

The government talks about all these areas in which it is spending more. However, it is going to cost the future. It is going to cost our children and our grandchildren. I asked the new member for Outremont if the budget should ever be balanced, if there is a point at which she thinks the budget would be balanced. She told us that in the current conditions, it makes sense to be “investing”, which for the Liberals is a code word for “spending more than we have”. If the conditions are always, in their view, such that we should be spending more than we have, then eventually the Liberals are going to run out of other people's money. Eventually the rubber is going to hit the road.

Government Orders

Where does this thinking come from? How do they come to the place of just not understanding this basic reality of the rubber hitting the road, not understanding the reality that my grandfather understood? My grandfather understood, intuitively, when he negotiated a reduction in the price of his car that every dollar matters, every dollar counts. However, we have a government led by a Prime Minister who has never had to make those tough choices in his own life. Therefore, he does not recognize or appreciate the importance of being prudent in his spending decisions.

We see these concerns that everyday people are facing in terms of the uncertainty that comes from high deficits and high taxes. They are looking at their futures and they are saying, "Okay, the government might be promising to spend more in this area, this area and that area, but in the long run, how can be confident that those investments will continue into the future if they are not made from a balanced budget position?"

The great advantage of a balanced budget situation is that when spending decisions are made in the context of a balanced budget, people can have confidence that those investments will stay in place. However, we have seen, consistently, how when one does not spend within their means, eventually the rubber is going to have to hit the road.

In addition to this, while the situation we have is creating economic uncertainty for individuals, it is also creating some level of economic uncertainty in our business environment. We want to aspire to be the sort of country where entrepreneurs succeed by having their own ideas, not by their ingenuity at filling out grant applications, not by their ability to hire well-connected lobbyists and to justify their desire for more money in terms of whatever the government's priorities of the day are. I think we want to be the kind of country where people succeed on the basis of their ingenuity, acting independently from government, where government establishes the framework, the infrastructure that allows them to succeed, but then they are making those investments on their own.

• (2350)

In the past, the Conservative government was able to facilitate entrepreneurs' success by lowering business taxes. We saw that when we lowered business taxes, there was an increase in business tax revenue. The government was taking in more money from business taxes because the government was creating the conditions in which businesses were making greater investments.

Some politicians in this place want to raise business taxes. The government would like us to forget that when the Liberals first came into office, they tried to raise small business taxes. In fact, they did, but then they unraised them in response to subsequent criticism, and trumpeted that as some kind of great success.

It seems like yesterday when the Liberals told us that the fact that they had appointed a minister for seniors showed how committed they were to seniors. The member for Edmonton Mill Woods, whose riding I look forward to visiting this Saturday, is applauding that. He may have forgotten that there was a minister of seniors throughout the tenure of the previous Conservative government. The minister of seniors position was then removed at the beginning of the Liberal mandate, but then in the final year they had this great idea of

appointing a minister of seniors, and that demonstrated their commitment to seniors.

The member for Edmonton Mill Woods is applauding. I have to say that I am looking forward to having the great Tim Uppal back in the House of Commons. I know he is going to do a great job for the constituents of Edmonton Mill Woods. He is probably out door-knocking right now. It is not too late in Alberta to be doing that. Probably while he is doing that, he is talking about things like Bill C-69 and Bill C-48, which the member for Edmonton Mill Woods voted in favour of.

This is maybe a good point in which to transition to talk a little about the Alberta economy, because in Alberta we see continual attacks on our economy coming from the current government. We see legislation put forward that even the Alberta NDP saw problems with. We see bills that essentially would make it impossible for new pipeline infrastructure to ever proceed in the future. We see so many efforts from the government to block the development of the natural resource economy in Alberta, and that is a particular source of concern and anxiety in the greater Sherwood Park area in which I live.

What is the alternative to this vision that the government has put forward? It is an alternative Conservative government that lives within its means, that understands the importance of balancing budgets over the medium term and believes in cutting taxes.

I will respond to some of the comments that the member for Winnipeg North made about the Doug Harper or the Stephen Ford government that he was talking about. What he said was that deficits were run during the period of the previous government, which is true. We had a Liberal opposition that was calling for us to spend so much more, but we made the decision to have timely, targeted and temporary deficits in a time of economic recession that were focused on significant infrastructure investments, such as building up our university campuses and building up our roads. They were actual infrastructure investments, and we had a clearer, tighter, well-defined definition of infrastructure. These were investments that genuinely stimulated our economy, and we returned Canada to a balanced budget before the next election. Members across the way will say an "alleged" balanced budget, which was told to us by the alleged Parliamentary Budget Officer.

I know that the members across the way are worried that they will not get their questions and comments in. They do not have to worry. I will be back here tomorrow morning, and I look forward to the questions that the members are going to ask.

However, all of the spending commitments that were made by the Conservatives were within the framework of a balanced budget plan, which means that Canadians could have confidence in them. When we raised the guaranteed income supplement, when we introduced the universal child care benefit, which the Liberals have since renamed, when we supported families, when we brought in income splitting for parents with children, which the current government took away, and when we offered these forms of vital support, Canadians could have confidence that those investments were going to stay in place.

Adjournment Proceedings

• (2355)

Where did this way of thinking come from? Our leader understands what it means to live within a budget. That is his experience and the experience of his family. He understands what everyday families are going through in struggling to get ahead.

I also want to comment on the government's immigration policy, because there is discussion of immigration in the budget. The government's immigration policy is very clearly not as advertised.

With respect to the issue of illegal immigration into Canada, we have had an epidemic of illegal immigration under the current government. For a long time, it tried to demonize the opposition for even raising this concern. Then, the government's bright idea was to appoint a minister responsible for the border who is not actually responsible for the Canada Border Services Agency. Finally, with this budget, it brought forward measures that attempted to respond to the issue. However, the government has not taken any action on the need to renegotiate the safe third country agreement, for instance, or on the need to change the tone.

Where do I hear most about these problems in our immigration system? I hear about them in my riding, to be sure, but I hear a lot about them in ridings like Edmonton Mill Woods, Winnipeg North, York Centre and Etobicoke—Lakeshore. People there are very concerned about these issues, because they know the costs and the challenges of coming to Canada the right way. They do not believe it is right when people can take advantage of the fact that they are in the United States and can walk into Canada. It is not fair to those in China, India, the Philippines or other parts of the world who are trying to come to Canada the right way and cannot just walk across the border. That is why we need to renegotiate the safe third country agreement.

I look forward to continuing the debate.

• (2400)

The Speaker: The hon. member will have two and a half minutes remaining in his speech when the House next resumes this topic.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

• (2405)

[*English*]

HOUSING

Mr. Paul Manly (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, GP): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to discuss an important issue for Nanaimo—Ladysmith.

We have an affordable housing crisis in my constituency. Our region has had a rapid rise in home prices and rental costs. It is the inevitable consequence of skyrocketing house prices in Vancouver and people moving to the island. It is also related to speculation and money laundering in B.C. real estate. As houses are sold, renovated and flipped, the price of rental stock has gone up along with the cost of buying homes. The most vulnerable people in our community,

low-income renters, people with disabilities, low-income seniors and single-parent families, are forced to move and are finding it increasingly difficult to find affordable places to rent.

For the last three years, I ran employment skills training programs for young people with barriers to employment. Of the 60 people I had in my 15-week program, six experienced homelessness while they were in the program. The homes they were living in were sold or renovated and they could not find affordable places to live. I have heard similar stories from seniors.

During the Nanaimo—Ladysmith by-election, I heard over and over again that people were struggling with the cost of housing. I met a young single mother with two children who lived in a campground last summer. She found a place to live in the fall and had that home sold out from under her six months later. She has been dealing with a housing cycle like that for several years. There is no stability for her children.

This is simply not acceptable in a country as wealthy as Canada. We have homeless people living in our parks and bushes around the community. There are people who are couch surfing and homeless. On any given evening, we can see people sleeping in cars in parking lots and on the street.

Last summer, we had a major homeless camp in downtown Nanaimo with hundreds of people living there. Many of the people living in this camp were indigenous, and there were a number of people with mental health and addiction issues. A few of the homeless people who were desperate and in survival mode engaged in criminality. There was a growing community backlash to the camp. Homeless people were threatened and bottles thrown at them in the camp at night. Some were physically attacked in the streets. We had the Soldiers of Odin marching in our streets and threatening vigilante action against the people in the camp. The businesses in the downtown core suffered from a loss of revenue as people avoided our downtown.

B.C. Housing set up emergency temporary housing for people in the camp, but the homeless people who were not in the camp did not get the same access to this emergency housing. This emergency housing is only a band-aid, but it does not cover the whole wound. The homeless situation in my constituency is exacerbated by a lack of mental health and addictions services.

We need help in Nanaimo—Ladysmith. We need more purpose-built, affordable, energy-efficient housing. Developers and builders are not going to create low-income housing without incentives from the government. They are in business. Affordable rental units cannot compete with the margins available for market housing.

Adjournment Proceedings

We could really use some co-operative housing in our community. Co-op housing is an excellent model for affordable housing. Co-ops are owned by the community they are in and they are not susceptible to real estate speculation, changing ownership or rent evictions. People pay rent based on their incomes. If they start to earn more, they pay more. If people lose their jobs they do not lose their homes. Seniors can age in place. The federal government needs to support co-op housing the way it did decades ago.

The City of Nanaimo is struggling with this affordable housing crisis. I would like to know what the government can do now to help our community with this crisis. What emergency measures is the government prepared to take to help with this crisis right now, not next year, not in two years or four years, but now?

Mr. Adam Vaughan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development (Housing and Urban Affairs), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I often say that it is always a good day, or a good night, when we can discuss housing in this House, because there is no issue more important to me and more important to the residents I represent, and in fact more important to this government, than making sure we get the housing system we need for this country.

That is why today we passed historic legislation on the right to housing, the progressive realization in a systemic way of making sure that every Canadian has a place to call home that is safe, secure and affordable.

However, building housing alone does not work. As the member opposite has accurately identified, housing with supports is as critical a part of the process as repairing housing, as delivering emergency responses to housing needs, and as building long-term, sustainable solutions.

Our government has invested close to \$7 billion already, above and beyond what was forecast from the previous government, into new housing starts right across the country. It has put together what is now a \$55-billion 10-year program to turn this country's housing situation around and make sure that Canadians from coast to coast to coast, most importantly indigenous Canadians and certainly Canadians of indigenous heritage in urban settings, get the housing they require.

British Columbia is much like the province I come from, in that the major city has had an explosion of housing starts, but at the same time the market just has not provided for people with disabilities, the elderly, people on fixed incomes, as well as new Canadians who have not quite gotten their feet underneath them as they make their way in this country. There are significant challenges all the way around. People with disabilities, of course, are also on that list, as are people being discharged from hospital or from prison who get discharged into homelessness, which is part of the institutional gapping that happens in this country, and part of what this country has to address systematically to make sure it puts an end to the flow into homelessness as we try to deplete what is a horrible cohort of people, in terms of the circumstances they live in, that has to be addressed by ending homelessness.

I have been to British Columbia. In fact, in its first three and a half years, our government has invested in 99 specific projects that run the full range of housing needs that need to be met in British

Columbia. In Campbell River, we broke ground on a housing project to deal with people with developmental disabilities.

The project in Nanaimo, which I have discussed with my colleague opposite, is one of the most beautiful and most energy-efficient passive housing programs in the country, run by a friendship centre, which has shown us and the rest of the country not only how to deliver good, strong, affordable community housing for youth coming out of care, for elders in the community as well as for families, but how to do it in such a way that it would actually come in under budget and produce remarkable results in terms of greenhouse gas reductions.

Our investments in Victoria are going to bring Victoria to functional zero in terms of homelessness within two years. In Vancouver, the modular housing we have invested in is dealing with people from tent cities and getting them into good, strong, supportive housing programs that put an end to their homelessness.

This government is committed with its program. The money is being spent now, as we speak. It is a 10-year program, so the math tells us that some of it comes after the next election. A lot of it comes after the next election, because not only are we building new housing and repairing new housing, but we are also subsidizing the housing to make it affordable. Adding 1,000 units in Nanaimo this year and 1,000 next year and the year after that means that the subsidy has to grow from 1,000 units to 2,000 to 3,000. Any party that says, and the NDP does it quite often, that we should not back-end load housing programs has never run a housing system.

We are proud of the national housing strategy. We are proud of the rights-based framework that we put into legislation to make sure that no future government can ever back out of the housing program, and we are very proud of our results in British Columbia, working with a good, strong provincial government that also understands how critical this is. We hope the parties in this House can support our investments, because they are good, they are strong and they are making a difference.

Mr. Paul Manly: Mr. Speaker, this is a crisis that did not develop overnight. This is the result of years of budget cuts and neglect. This is not something that is going to be fixed overnight. I appreciate what the hon. member has said about the actions that the government is taking, but what we need now is emergency measures.

We need help with housing in Nanaimo and Ladysmith right now. We have people who are living on the streets. We have people who are vulnerable in our communities and it is a shame. It is a national shame to have people who are vulnerable and living homeless in this country, a country with so much wealth.

I would like to know what we can do to deal with this issue now, to get some modular housing into Nanaimo to help these people who are in need and to ensure that people have a good, secure place to live.

Adjournment Proceedings

● (2410)

Mr. Adam Vaughan: Mr. Speaker, British Columbia has led the way in evolving modular housing. We have supported the programs proposed by cities there, particularly the City of Vancouver and the City of Burnaby as well. Those investments have shown us a way to build modular housing. I would be happy to walk the member opposite through the program that gets us there.

The other thing our government did upon taking office, beyond tripling transfers to provinces, which is a large part of where British Columbia gets its dollars to build its housing, was double the money for homelessness. To put this into context, the Conservatives were prepared to see that program lapse, the Green Party had no policy on it and the NDP was only going to spend an extra \$10 million on what is properly described as an emergency.

We have put more than \$2.2 billion into this program over the next 10 years. We have extended the number of designated communities. We created a separate, distinct indigenous-based program for communities right across the country, a different rural strategy and a strategy for the territories. We have also changed the rules of housing first so it can be used to prevent homelessness rather than just solve it after it has been on the streets in the communities for six months. We have also stepped up to ensure that women—

The Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Windsor—Tecumseh.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Ms. Cheryl Hardcastle (Windsor—Tecumseh, NDP): Mr. Speaker, during the 2015 election, the Liberals repeatedly promised voters they would act to improve the record of Canadian companies operating abroad.

In 2016, after the election, the Prime Minister went to the UN and declared “Canada’s back”. He said that Canada would pursue a seat on the security council.

Then he received an open letter, signed by 183 countries and NGOs, urging him to do something to address the many instances in which Canadian mining companies were associated with human rights and environmental abuses.

Four United Nations bodies have called on Canada to hold Canadian companies accountable for their operations overseas. The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights has had three hearings on the subject.

In January 2018, the Minister of International Trade held a flashy press conference, replete with labour leaders and important stakeholders, to announce the government’s intention of establishing an office of the Canadian ombudsperson for responsible enterprise or CORE. It was an impressive photo op, one that presented an air of expectation of action.

The minister confidently declaimed, “The progressive trade agenda...includes Canada’s strong commitment to responsible business conduct and the respect for human rights of workers and local stakeholders in Canada and around the world.” He continued, “The ombudsperson will be mandated to independently investigate allegations of human rights abuses arising from a Canadian company’s activity abroad.”

Flash forward 15 months, in the fourth year of the government’s mandate, and what do we have? After this long wait and much inaction, the international trade minister announced that a former petroleum industry lobbyist had been appointed as the ombudsperson, but that the proposed investigatory powers the government clearly stated CORE would have were under legal review for a month. Seriously?

For years we have been asking the government what would happen when it enacted such an office without using a legislative process. It is cutting the powers. It befuddles me that it does not understand the difference in what was done and the concerns that have been raised around the world about this shortcoming.

The ombudsperson’s power is limited to recommending the government withdraw economic and political support for companies that refuse to participate in the process in good faith. The New Democrats and stakeholders, as well as the UN, have repeatedly told Canada that this approach simply does not work.

It is quite obvious the government has a serious problem when it comes to corporate accountability. The SNC-Lavalin saga offered a glimpse into the extraordinary influence that one powerful company could have on Canadian politicians at the highest level.

The people of my constituency champion social justice around the world and they expect the corporations that they patronize and work for to be transparent and accountable when it comes to corporate ethics.

Therefore, I ask the government to inform the Canadian public how and when it intends to honour its commitments fully.

● (2415)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not support the overall characterization the member is trying to put on the record in terms of what this government has been able to accomplish over the last four years. We have many strong advocates within our caucus. Almost every member of the Liberal caucus feels that corporations have a responsibility not only within Canada but internationally.

We do not need to be lectured by New Democrats on this issue. In the last four years, we have seen more movement by this Liberal government than we saw with Stephen Harper in the previous 10 years.

The member referenced a couple of the actions and then started mocking them, saying that they are not going to make a difference. I beg to differ. Our government has taken action. It has fulfilled its commitment.

Building on Canada's existing expertise in leadership, the government announced two initiatives to strengthen Canada's approach to responsible business conduct abroad. We created the Canadian ombudsperson for responsible enterprise, and we created a multi-stakeholder advisory body on responsible business conduct, made up of experts from industry and civil society, to advise the government.

On April 8 of this year, our government appointed Sheri Meyerhoffer the Canadian ombudsperson for responsible enterprise, the first position of its kind in the world. Ms. Meyerhoffer took office on May 1 and is actively engaged with stakeholders across Canada.

I would like to emphasize that this is something unique in the world. Canada, even though it has a population base of 36 million people, is often looked at by other countries in terms of having leadership. Corporate responsibility is an area in which we have demonstrated leadership. Think about it. In only three and a half years, with many different priorities, our government was able to identify this, because we told Canadians in the last election campaign that we would act on it, and we have done just that. Our government has acted on the important issue of corporate responsibility.

Private member's bills have been introduced by current and past members of the Liberal caucus that deal with corporate responsibility abroad. It pleases me to indicate to the House and to those who might be following this debate that our government is committed to many different social causes. This is but one of those issues.

There are many horrific stories around the world involving corporate abuse or misconduct. We are very much aware of it. We want to come up with ideas and find solutions that will minimize the negative impact. This is where I believe Canada can demonstrate leadership, and we have done that in terms of the ombudsperson.

Ms. Cheryl Hardcastle: Mr. Speaker, we are no further ahead after all that. The Conservative government had an arrangement in place that gave us exactly what we have right now. That is a shame. There is an immediacy when it comes to the human rights aspects of this issue.

Adjournment Proceedings

Besides the cases the Canadian courts have agreed to hear, there is a legal argument mounting globally that governments and corporations have a duty of care to protect citizens, consumers and investors from risk.

This is the international community. This is several countries that already have legislation in place on corporate accountability. These are countries that already have modern slavery and supply chain transparency and due diligence reporting mechanisms in place. Canada has none of these—

• (2420)

The Speaker: Order, please. The time has expired for the hon. member.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, the member stands in her place and says that Canada is no further ahead. I will for repeat that on April 8 of this year we appointed Sheri Meyerhoffer as the first Canadian ombudsperson for responsible enterprise, the first position of its kind in the world.

That member says that we have done nothing. That is something and it is significant. It is one of the examples I am citing to demonstrate very clearly that Canada at times has done exceptionally well at showing strong leadership on important social issues. This is a tangible example where Canada is making a difference and contributing to a healthier world corporate sector.

I appreciate the question this evening even though I disagree with the—

The Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Bow River is not present to raise that matter for which adjournment notice has been given. Accordingly, the notice is deemed withdrawn.

[*Translation*]

The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly the House stands adjourned until later this day at 10 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 12:22 a.m.)

CONTENTS

Wednesday, June 5, 2019

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Members Not Seeking Re-Election to the 43rd Parliament

Ms. Goldsmith-Jones	28651
Mr. Oliver	28652
Ms. Leitch	28654
Mr. Eglinski	28656
Mr. Trost	28657
Ms. Quach	28658
Mr. Cullen	28660
Ms. Boutin-Sweet	28661
Mr. Sorenson	28662
Mr. Van Kesteren	28664
Mr. Sopuck	28665
Ms. Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	28667
Mr. Rankin	28668

Budget Implementation Act, 2019, No. 1

Bill C-97. Third reading	28670
Mr. Kmiec	28670
Mr. Housefather	28673
Mr. Dusseault	28673
Mr. Genuis	28674
Mr. Vaughan	28674
Mr. Dusseault	28675
Ms. Bendayan	28677
Mr. Albas	28677
Mr. Aubin	28678
Mr. Housefather	28678
Ms. Bendayan	28679
Mr. Genuis	28680
Mr. Duguid	28680
Ms. Khalid	28680

Mr. Aboultaif	28682
Mr. Duvall	28682
Mr. Albas	28682
Mr. Whalen	28684
Mr. Strahl	28684
Mr. Maguire	28685
Mr. Whalen	28686
Mr. Duguid	28687
Mr. Duguid	28687
Mr. Genuis	28688
Mr. Duvall	28688
Mr. Lamoureux	28689
Mr. Genuis	28690
Mr. Zimmer	28690
Mr. Falk (Provencher)	28690
Mr. Duguid	28691
Mr. Graham	28692
Mr. Zimmer	28692
Mr. Dubé	28692
Amendment	28692
Mr. Genuis	28693
Mr. Lamoureux	28693
Mr. Genuis	28693

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Housing

Mr. Manly	28696
Mr. Vaughan	28697

International Trade

Ms. Hardcastle	28698
Mr. Lamoureux	28698

Published under the authority of the Speaker of
the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: <http://www.ourcommons.ca>

Publié en conformité de l'autorité
du Président de la Chambre des communes

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante : <http://www.noscommunes.ca>