



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 148 • NUMBER 437 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, June 19, 2019

—

Speaker: The Honourable Geoff Regan

CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, June 19, 2019

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayer

• (1405)

[*English*]

The Speaker: It being Wednesday, we will now have the singing of *O Canada* led by the hon. member for Chatham-Kent—Leamington.

[*Members sang the national anthem*]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

DRUG PRICES

Hon. Jane Philpott (Markham—Stouffville, Ind.): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to see the final report of the advisory council on pharmacare. I strongly support universal single-payer public pharmacare so Canadians have access to medicines. I hope the recommendations will be implemented.

However, I am concerned about the prices Canadians pay. There has not been progress to reform the Patented Medicine Prices Review Board. In 2017, I proposed regulatory changes to help the PMPRB protect consumers from high prices. This included changing the countries with which we compared prices. We said that value for money should factor into drug prices. We proposed that refunds should be reported to increase transparency and set fair prices. Those changes were to be in place by the end of 2018, but this has not happened.

National pharmacare is essential, but it must be accompanied by good stewardship of public funds. Canadians should not pay the third highest drug prices in the world. I encourage the Minister of Health to proceed with the PMPRB reform without further delay.

* * *

KITCHENER SOUTH—HESPELER

Mr. Marwan Tabbara (Kitchener South—Hespeler, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, over the past three and a half years, our government's policies have been very beneficial for my riding of Kitchener South—Hespeler.

The Canada child benefit has supported more than 20,000 children, who have received a total of \$246 million in tax-free benefits. Our middle-class tax cut saved 2,800 of my constituents an average of \$1,000. Our housing plan funded the building and repairing of 1,440 homes and subsidized 2,240 units. Our doubling of funding for the Canada summer jobs program provided jobs for 658 people. We lowered the small business tax from 11% to 9%, saving an average of \$7,500 for small business owners. When we doubled the gas tax transfer, Kitchener and Cambridge gained more than \$11 million. That was on top of the \$118 million for infrastructure funding that went into transit, water facilities and roads.

I am looking forward to returning here in November to continue the hard work for Canadians.

* * *

DOMINION DAY

Mr. Brad Trost (Saskatoon—University, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this July 1, millions of Canadians will wish each other a happy Canada Day. I will join them by wishing them a happy Dominion Day.

Drawing its inspiration from Psalm 72:8, “And he shall have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth”, the term “dominion” has a distinctly Canadian origin. It was proposed by Sir Samuel Leonard Tilley of New Brunswick, and it is a beautiful term to describe this vast land we call Canada. The loss of Dominion Day, to quote former Senator Hartland Molson, was “another very small step in the process of obscuring our heritage.”

Dominion is a term of dignity, beauty and poetry. It signified that Canadian origins were different from the republics and kingdoms of the world. It is a term and a day that needs to be brought back.

Therefore, let me wish my fellow Canadians, this July 1, happy Dominion Day.

Statements by Members

[Translation]

GATINEAU

Mr. Steven MacKinnon (Gatineau, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, so many great things have happened in Gatineau. Here are some numbers. Over the past four years, we increased support for seniors, restored the retirement age to 65, created 624 student summer jobs and supported 2,178 affordable housing units. Every month, 11,230 families receive \$550 tax-free per child thanks to the Canada child benefit. We are investing in our infrastructure and public transit. The Gatineau 2 project is the biggest building project in Canada.

We restored respect for the public service and are on track to fixing the pay problems the previous government left us. I am proud to have helped bring about the adoption of prompt payment for businesses working on federal projects and, most importantly, recognition in the budget that we need a sixth crossing.

The Government of Canada has higher hopes for Gatineau's future than ever before. The best is yet to come.

* * *

GILLES GERVAIS

Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau (Berthier—Maskinongé, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to say a few words about Gilles Gervais and to wish him a happy retirement.

Mr. Gervais has worked on the Hill for more than 30 years. He started out in the 1980s as a constable, then he was a sergeant in the galleries, and more recently an Assistant Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms. Throughout all that time he always carried out his duties with professionalism. He always treated his assignments with care and treated others with respect.

Soon he will be retired and will no longer have to take time off when the fishing is not so great. He will have plenty of time to work on his sculptures and take up new hobbies.

We will all remember his sunny disposition and we will certainly miss his special sense of humour. Right, Darryl?

I thank him for his commitment to the House of Commons and for his fine service to all parliamentarians and everyone who has worked here.

Gilles, on behalf of all my colleagues, I wish you a happy retirement. Thank you for your dedication.

* * *

2019 GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. René Arseneault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in 2015, Canadians placed their trust in us to put an end to 10 years of austerity.

[English]

Four years later, our numbers do not lie. Our policies have lifted over 825,000 people out of poverty, including 100,000 seniors and more than 278,000 children. We now have the lowest level of poverty in Canadian history.

We have cut taxes for families and small businesses, one million jobs have been created since we were elected and we have the lowest unemployment figures in 50 years.

● (1410)

[Translation]

For rural regions, we doubled the gas tax fund by investing an extra \$2.2 billion for municipal projects across Canada. We also announced over \$164 million for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency. Small communities in Canada need this infrastructure.

[English]

Our government has invested in Canadians and their communities. The results are plain to see, and now is not the time for a return to the harmful policies of the opposition.

* * *

RETIREMENT CONGRATULATIONS

Mr. Dean Allison (Niagara West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as we close out this session and go into another election, we often celebrate the contributions of MPs who have decided to retire from this place.

It is also important to take some time to acknowledge the incredible work done by people who serve around the parliamentary precinct. That is why I would like to recognize Marguerite Charlebois.

Marguerite has worked in the parliamentary restaurant since January 21, 1981, close to four decades. She will be retiring at the end of this week. Imagine trying to manage all of the different political parties, people and personalities and making sure they end up in the right place and at the right table so their conversations are kept private as much as possible.

Since my first days in Ottawa in 2004, Marguerite has been exceptionally pleasant, welcoming and friendly. I am not sure people realize how difficult it is for the parliamentary restaurant staff to manage their personal and professional lives around a challenging parliamentary calendar.

I think I can speak for all members in the House and our Wednesday crew, who have had the pleasure to get to know her, in wishing Marguerite all the best in everything she does in the next chapter of her life.

I thank Marguerite. I hope our paths will cross again. Marguerite is always welcome to my home town of Niagara, where I look forward to serving her.

* * *

FUNDY ROYAL

Mrs. Alaina Lockhart (Fundy Royal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I walked up the Hill last night, I took pause to look at the beauty of Parliament Hill and all that it represents. Serving the people of Fundy Royal in this 42nd Parliament has been a true honour and the most challenging work of my life.

Statements by Members

To understand local and national issues and to represent the interests of my constituents is a duty that I have not taken lightly. I am inspired by local community leaders, organizations and individuals, who are all as passionate as I am about the future of our area.

By working together, we have delivered supports for people at all stages in their lives, and we are making real progress. Over 14,000 children in Fundy Royal are better off today thanks to the Canada child benefit. As well, 825,000 Canadians have been lifted out of poverty. We have the lowest unemployment rate in 50 years and we finally have population growth in Atlantic Canada.

I thank the people of Fundy Royal for working with me and inspiring me. This is what working for Fundy Royal truly looks like. Together, I know we will continue to make a difference when I am sent back here as the member of Parliament for Fundy Royal.

* * *

PIERREFONDS—DOLLARD

Mr. Frank Baylis (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the citizens of Pierrefonds—Dollard and Île Bizard for giving me the honour of serving them as their member of Parliament.

[Translation]

Our community is rich in cultural, religious, linguistic and ethnic diversity, and I was proud to represent it. No one can do everything on their own, and I was lucky to have the support of many wonderful employees and volunteers.

[English]

I believe politics to be an honourable profession. I have been greatly impressed by my colleagues in this House, and when I say colleagues, I mean all members of Parliament. I believe that all of us come here in good faith to do what we believe is right for our country, Canada, and I salute them all.

Finally, I thank my wife, my children, my parents and my entire family. They are the world to me.

* * *

EVENTS ON JUNE 19

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a historic day. On June 19, the Hillcrest mine explosion in Alberta killed 189 miners. It was Canada's worst mining disaster.

It was also the day that Hungarians threw out Soviet troops, thus ending Soviet occupation, restoring their democracy and restoring their freedoms.

June 19 was also the day that the comic strip *Garfield* appeared in print for the first time.

Today Canadians are also learning that according to the PBO, the Liberal carbon tax will need to increase to a minimum of \$102 per tonne, adding 23 cents to a litre of gas, to meet the Paris targets. Canadians now see that the Liberal carbon tax is a revenue plan, not an environmental plan.

Another reason today is a historic day is that at 5:00 p.m., the leader of Canada's Conservatives will unveil the first credible environmental plan that has the best chance of achieving our Paris commitments, exposing the Liberal carbon tax plan as a fraud and that this Liberal Prime Minister is not as advertised.

* * *

●(1415)

[Translation]

UNIVERSITY OF QUEBEC IN MONTREAL

Mr. Emmanuel Dubourg (Bourassa, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this year, the Université du Québec à Montréal is celebrating its 50th anniversary. UQAM contributes to society's social, economic and cultural progress. Social issues have always been the primary focus of its actions. This public French-language university is proud of its international influence, research labs and the quality of education it provides at its downtown Montreal campus.

UQAM has trained 269,000 graduates through its 300 study programs and it employs 5,400 people. I commend its founders for their vision and congratulate the administrative and teaching staff, including those officials who are visiting Ottawa today.

Fifty years of UQAM is 50 years of daring, drive, innovation and pride. I, too, am a proud graduate of UQAM.

I wish UQAM a happy 50th anniversary.

* * *

[English]

RETIREMENT CONGRATULATIONS

Hon. Andrew Leslie (Orléans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this will be the last time I have the pleasure of rising in this place.

[Translation]

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the people of Orleans for trusting me to speak on their behalf on the Hill.

[English]

It has been an honour and a privilege to serve among all members.

However, that is not why I am rising today. I am here to recognize Luc St-Cyr, who is not only a constituent but a dedicated employee who has worked with all of us in this place for many years.

He served for 18 years as a constable with the House of Commons Security Services and an additional 16 years with the page program. He started when he was just 22 years old, and he has not changed a bit.

[Translation]

When Luc started here in 1985, there were only 285 MPs.

[English]

He has worked alongside six prime ministers and has seen seven Parliaments come and go. There have been 640 pages who have passed through his training hands.

He has witnessed state visits by Presidents Reagan, Clinton and Obama. He even witnessed Nelson Mandela's address.

*Statements by Members**[Translation]*

I thank Luc for his 34 years of exemplary service.

[English]

I wish him all the best in his retirement.

* * *

CARBON PRICING

Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after announcing a climate emergency, the Liberals have not been able to identify any specific or immediate actions they would take. They do not have a climate plan; they have a tax plan.

While our leader will roll out a real environment plan today that will help the planet, the Liberals are putting all their eggs in the carbon tax basket. The Parliamentary Budget Officer, as well as environmental experts, have said the carbon tax will not work. We see that already in B.C. and Quebec, where there has been a price on carbon for a decade and their emissions have gone up.

Experts say the carbon tax would have to increase by five times to do anything. That means a painful 23¢ a litre more for gasoline, as well as higher costs for home heating and groceries. However, the Liberals are not telling Canadians this before the election; they will wait until after the election, when they no longer need their votes but still need their money.

The carbon tax is not a climate plan. It is a tax plan, and it is definitely not as advertised.

* * *

RETIREMENT CONGRATULATIONS

Mr. Francis Drouin (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am rising today to recognize a constituent and long-time employee of the House of Commons. Mr. Gilles Gervais, the current assistant deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, is retiring after 35 years of service.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for not giving him the order to drag me out of this place once in four years.

[Translation]

Mr. Gervais joined the House of Commons security services in 1985. Over the years, Gilles rose through the ranks of the House of Commons security services, and some might remember the years he spent as a sergeant in the gallery before accepting his current position, Assistant Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms.

I would like to thank his wife, Susan, for sharing her husband with the House of Commons for 35 years.

Gilles, I hope you get to enjoy lots of time travelling and with family and plenty of sunshine at your Lac Gervais cottage. You deserve it. Thank you for 35 years of service.

● (1420)

*[English]***BETSY BURY**

Ms. Sheri Benson (Saskatoon West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the wonderful, passionate Betsy Bury and to honour her 97 years of a life well lived. Betsy died in April.

Betsy fought for a world that was safe from nuclear weapons and war, a world safe for all women and children. She did this both as part of social movements and in the realm of partisan politics.

In 1962, when Saskatchewan doctors went on strike to oppose universal health care, Betsy, along with a small group of women, started the Saskatoon Community Clinic to provide free care to anyone who needed it. Those women are a big reason that we have universal health care today. She helped start the first planned parenthood organization in Saskatchewan and the first public kindergarten in Saskatoon, and the list goes on.

From Tommy Douglas's campaign to my own personal campaign, from the CCF to the NDP, Betsy was there volunteering, leading, advising and supporting.

In 2017, Betsy received the Governor General's Award in Commemoration of the Persons Case for her lifetime dedication to bringing about gender equality.

Losing Betsy is devastating, but our broken hearts are comforted by the lives she touched and the young leaders who will follow in her inspiring footsteps.

* * *

*[Translation]***2019 GENERAL ELECTION**

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in 2015, the Prime Minister promised an open and transparent government, modest deficits and a balanced budget in 2019, electoral reform and real change.

What did the Prime Minister actually deliver? A government branded by his four ethics violations, astronomical deficits and attempts to influence the election. He did deliver one real change. Unlike the Conservatives, who want to make life more affordable, he raised taxes on all Canadians.

He promised an environmental plan, but he gave us a tax plan instead. The only thing he knows how to do is tax all Canadians without being able to deliver results. What is more, the government's true intentions have been revealed by the Parliamentary Budget Officer, who calculated that the carbon tax will have to be five times higher than announced in order to meet the Paris targets.

All Canadians, even Quebeckers, will have to pay more, since everything will get more expensive because of this Liberal government. We know now that it wants to raise taxes more and more. The environmental tax, or environmental plan on taxable paper is not what was promised.

Oral Questions

On October 21, Canadians will send the Liberals packing.

* * *

[English]

MARC GABRIEL

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, prime ministers do not normally get to give a member's statement, so I thank the other party leaders for allowing me to rise today to recognize the life and service of Marc Gabriel, a good man taken from us by cancer at just 47.

With 23 years in the RCMP, Marc served as an outstanding member of the PM's protection detail.

[Translation]

He had a big heart, an incredible inner strength, and a little smile always tugging at the corner of his mouth, despite being a consummate professional. His tenacity, his love of the outdoors and his adventurous spirit will be greatly missed.

[English]

A proud New Brunswicker, equally proud of his native heritage, Marc was a loving husband to Kelsey and a great dad. Dawson, Devon and Cadian know that his commitment to making our world a better and safer place was grounded in an immense love for them and a determination to bring about their best possible future.

Marc, my friend, you are deeply missed by us all.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[Translation]

NATURAL RESOURCES

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it has been a year since the Prime Minister promised that construction on Trans Mountain would begin.

Not one ounce of dirt has been moved so far. Canada's entire economy is suffering as a result. Every day of delay is costing Canadians \$40 million. The Prime Minister promised that Trans Mountain would be built and operational in 2019.

Why did he mislead Canadians by making a promise he could not keep?

• (1425)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for 10 years, Stephen Harper tried building pipelines to new markets and failed. He failed because he did not understand that major projects like this one can only move forward if we work with indigenous peoples and protect the environment. The Conservatives still do not grasp this.

That is exactly how we chose to move forward with the Trans Mountain pipeline. We followed the court's directions, and I am pleased to announce that construction will begin this summer.

[English]

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, again, he keeps saying things that are just not true. The

previous Conservative government saw the private sector build four major pipelines, including one to tidewater, increasing our capacity to foreign markets. It is under the Liberal government that major pipeline proponents have pulled out of Canada. In fact, the C.D. Howe Institute estimates that 100 billion dollars' worth of energy projects have been killed by the government.

The Prime Minister committed to Trans Mountain being completed and in operation this year, but it is over a year later, and there is still no start date. His failure is costing Canadians. Why did he not say so?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for 10 years, Mr. Harper and his Conservatives failed to get one pipeline built to new markets. The Conservatives talk about the Kinder Morgan Anchor Loop, but that pipeline goes nowhere near a port.

The reality is that the Conservatives did not understand, and still do not understand, that the only way to build energy projects today and into the future is to protect the environment at the same time and to work in partnership with indigenous peoples. That is exactly what we have done with the Trans Mountain pipeline, moved forward in the right way.

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, all the Prime Minister has done is buy a pipeline with taxpayers' money that he still does not have a plan to build. It is a terrible indictment of his record that in Canada, under his prime ministership, the government must nationalize a project to get it built. Under the Conservatives, the private sector did that.

We should not be surprised. After all, this is the Prime Minister who wants to phase out the energy sector and who has a senior minister who tweeted that they want to landlock Alberta's energy.

Why does the Prime Minister keep hurting our energy sector and the thousands of Canadians who work in it?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives just will not take yes for an answer. The reality is that we approved this pipeline, and it seems to cause tremendous consternation on the side of the Conservatives that we are actually succeeding in doing what the Alberta energy sector has long been asking for, which is access to new markets other than the United States.

We know that accessing new markets and having the money to pay for the transition to a cleaner, greener economy is important for building our future. They, quite frankly, do not know what to do or what to say, because they are wrong.

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we know what to do to get these projects built, starting with replacing the Prime Minister, scrapping the carbon tax, repealing Bill C-69 and giving our investors certainty that when they meet those standards, they can actually get it built.

The Prime Minister is great at saying yes. He just cannot get it done. Yesterday was another approval without a plan. Canadians did not want to see a photo op yesterday. They wanted a date on which this project would start.

Oral Questions

Why did he fail to do that?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what is very clear to everyone in this House, and indeed to all Canadians, is that the Conservatives still do not understand why they failed for 10 years to give the support to the Canadian economy that was needed. In the 21st century, the only way to move forward on big projects is to have a real plan for the environment and to bring in and work with indigenous communities. They refused to do that for 10 years, and they still do not see that the way to move forward is in partnership.

* * *

•(1430)

FINANCE

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister can take great comfort in knowing that a real plan for the environment is coming at five o'clock. What it will not include is special deals for Liberal insiders.

Under the Prime Minister, well-connected friends of the Prime Minister have done very well. He rewards his well-connected billionaire friends with taxpayer handouts, like \$12 million to Loblaws. He interfered in a criminal court case to help his corporate friends at SNC. He targeted entrepreneurs and small business owners while protecting his vast family fortune.

Why do the well-connected Liberals and the wealthy always get a better deal under Liberals?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Leader of the Opposition mentioned his climate plan.

We have been waiting 416 days to see this climate plan, but members will forgive Canadians for being a little skeptical about what is going to be in that climate plan, because the Leader of the Opposition thinks that pollution should be free. He thinks that plastic pollution is not a problem. He will not admit that climate change contributes to extreme weather events, and he continues to not understand that the only way to move forward on creating better energy projects is by protecting the environment at the same time.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): After a year of higher temperatures and more floods and forest fires, people across the country are feeling the effects of climate change. The decision to approve the Trans Mountain expansion is not going to help people deal with climate change.

The Liberals are spending more than \$10 billion to expand a pipeline. Why are the Liberals not investing this money in green initiatives to build a secure future for generations to come?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we are going to do.

Over the past four years, we have done more for the environment than any other government in Canada's history. We have put a price on pollution. We are safeguarding our oceans. We are investing in

public transit. We are reducing plastic pollution. We have also listened to Canadians about their desire for a cleaner future. Therefore, every dollar from this project will be invested in Canada's clean energy transition. With this project, we are creating jobs, opening new markets, accelerating the clean energy transition and generating—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Burnaby South.

[*English*]

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, that is a ludicrous proposition, given that no profits are going to be made in this project.

The race to the bottom with this pipeline, between the Liberals and Conservatives, is taking us in the wrong direction. Instead of ending fossil fuel subsidies, the Prime Minister is buying pipelines. Instead of legally binding emissions targets, the Prime Minister is continuing with Stephen Harper's targets. Instead of building a new relationship with indigenous communities, the Prime Minister has stuck with grand symbolism. New Democrats are proposing a better way.

Why is the Prime Minister refusing to protect coastal communities, indigenous communities and our environment?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, during the last four years, we have done more for the environment than any other government in Canada's history. We have put a price on pollution, we are safeguarding our oceans, we are investing in public transit and we are reducing plastic pollution. We have also listened very carefully to Canadians about their desire for a cleaner future. Every dollar from this project will be invested in Canada's clean energy transition.

We are creating jobs, opening new markets, accelerating our clean energy transition and generating new avenues for indigenous economic prosperity.

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I can summarize the Liberals' position on the environment. On one day, they pass a motion recognizing a climate emergency, and then on the very next day, they approve a pipeline. That is the government's track record.

The Liberals will dramatically increase our emissions, threaten coastlines and disrespect coastal and indigenous communities. The new hearings failed to look at the impact of climate, and they failed to meaningfully consult.

Why is the Prime Minister refusing to back up symbolic gestures with concrete actions to defend our environment?

Oral Questions

●(1435)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, over the past four years, we have taken more concrete actions to protect our environment than any government in Canada's history. We are going to continue to move forward on that in partnership with indigenous communities and in respect of environmental concerns.

We on this side of the House recognize that not all indigenous communities support the way we are moving forward, even though we have consulted with them extensively.

My question for the leader of the NDP is, why will he not recognize that there are indigenous communities that actually support this pipeline expansion?

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, that is a pretty low bar to set when we have the Harper Conservatives to compare with.

[Translation]

Indigenous and coastal communities vehemently oppose this project. Tanker traffic will increase nearly sevenfold. The risk of spills will increase considerably for those living on our coasts. The Prime Minister is ignoring those very valid concerns. We need to take decisive action to protect our environment.

How can the Prime Minister tell people that approving this pipeline will protect our environment, when that is not the case?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are disturbed by the dramatic increase in the transportation of oil by rail over the last few years.

We know that transporting oil by rail is more polluting and more dangerous. We will still need to use oil for several years. By building a pipeline in a responsible manner, in partnership with indigenous peoples, and by committing to invest all tax revenues from the pipeline in the clean energy transition, we know that we are building a better and more prosperous future for Canadians.

* * *

[English]

ETHICS

Hon. Candice Bergen (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, breaking ethics rules is par for the course for the Liberals. There have been so many ethics investigations of the Prime Minister and his caucus that there is probably a speed dial from the commissioner's office to the Prime Minister's. The Prime Minister himself has been found guilty of breaking four laws with his illegal vacation.

Could the Prime Minister tell us, with all of these scandals, exactly how many times he has been interviewed by the Ethics Commissioner. Is he proud of his legacy of scandal, corruption and entitlement?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, we see the Conservatives unable to actually challenge us on the economy, on the environment and on indigenous peoples, so they choose to sling mud.

We are confident that Canadians will look at how we listened to them, how we worked for them and how we saw the creation of a million jobs, the lowest unemployment in 40 years and the lifting of 825,000 Canadians out of poverty, including 300,000 kids.

Canadians know that this government is on the right track for growing the middle class and helping people working hard to join it.

* * *

JUSTICE

Hon. Candice Bergen (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister believes that there is one set of rules for him and his friends and one set for everyone else in this country. For example, there are his well-connected friends at SNC-Lavalin. They have given over \$100,000 in illegal donations to the Liberals, and they got unprecedented access to the Prime Minister and his office.

Will the Prime Minister admit that he inappropriately pressured the former attorney general just to help his buddies at SNC-Lavalin?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, obviously, the Conservatives are struggling for questions to ask, because they keep returning to this approach. It did not work for them before. It is really a sign of desperation as we head to meet with Canadians and talk about our plan for the next four years.

We have worked to create over a million new jobs in this country. We have delivered in lifting hundreds of thousands of Canadians out of poverty. We are continuing to demonstrate what leadership on the environment, leadership on the international file and reconciliation with indigenous peoples look like. That is something the Conservatives have a lot of difficulty with.

* * *

[Translation]

ETHICS

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this Prime Minister is the first in Canadian history to be found guilty of violating the Conflict of Interest Act not once, but four times. He took \$215,000 of taxpayer money to travel illegally with his family and friends to the Aga Khan's private island. These offences could constitute a violation of subsection 121(1) of the Criminal Code.

I have one simple question for the Prime Minister. How many times did he meet with the RCMP and the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner?

●(1440)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as everyone can see, the Conservatives are resorting to personal attacks.

Oral Questions

The Conservatives are focusing their attention on us, while we remain focused on Canadians. We have created one million new jobs over the past four years. Canada's unemployment rate is at a 40-year low. We have lifted 825,000 Canadians and 300,000 children out of poverty.

The reality is that our plan to invest in Canadians and to create growth for everyone, including the middle class, is working.

* * *

JUSTICE

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let's talk about the SNC-Lavalin affair and Vice-Admiral Norman.

The Prime Minister tried to cancel Davie's contract to help his Liberal Party friends. The Prime Minister did everything in his power to destroy the reputation of Vice-Admiral Norman, an honest and conscientious man of integrity, just as he did to the former justice minister and the former president of the Treasury Board.

Why did the Prime Minister try to ruin the careers of these honest people who simply wanted to stand up for the interests of Canadians?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this fall, Canadians will have a clear choice to make. They can vote for a party that protects the environment, creates economic growth and shows respect for Canadians by lifting hundreds of thousands of people out of poverty and putting Canada back on the international stage, or they can vote for the Conservative Party, which learned nothing from the Harper government's failures, continues to make divisive personal attacks, and continues to focus on me while we are focusing on Canadians.

[English]

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the work of the opposition on this side is to simply hold the Prime Minister to account for his own actions. He broke the Conflict of Interest Act, so did a number of his cabinet ministers. When two female cabinet ministers spoke truth to power, they were shoved out of caucus.

When the Minister of Finance, the former minister of fisheries and the Prime Minister himself broke conflict of interest laws, with a little wink and a nod, they were forgiven. I am wondering if the Prime Minister can tell us if the reason for this is simply, "Well, it's 2019".

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while the Conservatives remain focused on us, we will stay focused on Canadians. That is how we delivered creating over one million new jobs, lifting 825,000 Canadians out of poverty, the lowest unemployment in 40 years, 300,000 kids lifted out of poverty, with measures that the members opposite voted against.

We have a plan to continue to grow our economy in responsible ways, while Conservatives resort to personal attacks and petty issues.

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, sadly, the Prime Minister seems to want to run on the notion that the means, no matter how bad they are, justify the ends and I would caution that is an inappropriate way to continue with the Canadian public. However, I

am going to give him one chance to do something really appropriate on his last day today.

Admiral Mark Norman was put through hell for the last three years because of the concerted efforts of the government to ensure that he was put on the spot. We apologized to the House. Will the Prime Minister stand in his place today and apologize—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: The right hon. Prime Minister.

● (1445)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Once again, Mr. Speaker, on this last day of Prime Minister's question period, the members opposite are choosing to make personal attacks and not talk about the things that actually deeply matter to Canadians.

I will highlight that during these Prime Minister question periods, I have taken over 3,200 questions from the members opposite, including 237 different MPs. Mr. Harper, during his last term as prime minister, took only 1,400 from about 34 MPs. We know that greater accountability, greater opportunity to participate in debate—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order. There is far too much noise in the House when people are trying to answer questions. They may not like the questions or the answers, but it is important in a democracy to hear both and not to be speaking when someone else is speaking. The hon. member for Carleton will come to order.

[Translation]

The hon. member for Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have suddenly realized that green-lighting the expansion of Trans Mountain will not wash, especially after declaring a climate emergency the day before. Now they are trying to create a diversion by saying that any profits from the pipeline will go into a green fund.

They are spending \$15 billion to create more pollution. That is what I would call trading four quarters for a dollar, especially when that dollar is the equivalent of three million cars' worth of pollution.

Why not immediately invest that \$15 billion in renewable energy and the good jobs of tomorrow, as the NDP is proposing?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, during the last four years, we have done more for the environment than any other government in Canada's history. We have put a price on pollution. We are safeguarding our oceans. We are investing in public transit. We are reducing plastic pollution.

Oral Questions

We have also listened to Canadians about their desire for a cleaner future. Every dollar from this project will be invested in Canada's clean energy transition. We are creating jobs and opening new markets. We are accelerating our clean energy transition and generating new avenues for indigenous economic prosperity.

[*English*]

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, there are no profits. It is losing \$150 million a year. What an empty gesture. That is just our point. The Prime Minister asks Canadians to wait for pharmacare, affordable housing and so much else and then he splurges \$15 billion on Trans Mountain. He says he respects reconciliation and then runs roughshod over indigenous rights. He pushes a climate emergency motion and then, within hours, is trying to ram through a raw bitumen pipeline that trashes the Paris Agreement.

Why did the Prime Minister choose oil lobbyists over a future generation?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there was plenty wrong with the statements made by the member opposite, but I will focus on one.

There is a strong economic case for getting access to new markets and for investing in the clean energy transition, but we will all understand that New Democrats have always had challenges with economic plans and approaches. They think there is a choice to be made between protecting the environment and growing the economy. They do not understand that the only way to build a stronger future for all Canadians is to do them both together.

* * *

ETHICS

Hon. Peter Kent (Thornhill, CPC): The memory lane hits keep coming, Mr. Speaker. Who can forget the Prime Minister's disastrous India trip, the many days of answers from the PM, the public safety minister and others blaming the Liberal member for Surrey Centre for inviting a convicted terrorist on that bhangra-dancing, diplomatic train wreck. In the end, we will recall the National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians report revealed it was the Prime Minister's Office that put the convicted terrorist on the guest list.

Can the Prime Minister tell us when he last spoke with Jaspal Atwal?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, we see on this final day of the mandate, our final last days of this mandate, that the Conservatives continue to not understand what Canadians—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order, order. No singing. Members can sing outside. It is a bit more like the last day of school, it seems to me.

The right hon. Prime Minister has the floor.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, on these last days of this mandate, I will say the same thing that I will say in the first days of our next mandate. We are going to stay focused on Canadians, growing the economy, protecting the environment, reconciling with

indigenous peoples, and creating opportunities for the middle class and people who are working hard to join it.

The Speaker: The hon. member for Barrie—Innisfil has said quite a bit today, without having the floor. I would ask him not to do that and to show respect for other members.

The hon. member for Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis.

* * *

● (1450)

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Hon. Steven Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Corporal Nathan Cirillo and Warrant Officer Patrice Vincent were killed in terrorist attacks inspired by radical Islamism here in Canada. Global News reported that the Liberals want to bring 30 ISIS terrorists to Canada and give them poetry and podcasts instead of throwing them in prison.

Why is the Prime Minister rolling out the red carpet for terrorists who fought against our values, our soldiers and Canadian values?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives are once again playing extremely dangerous games with public opinion and with the truth itself. We know that one of the fundamental responsibilities of any government is to keep Canadians safe. That is exactly what we are doing. The safety of Canadians and the choices and actions of our border and police services are essential to the work we are doing. We will not engage in petty politics and fearmongering because of that.

* * *

[*English*]

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister made a convicted terrorist a multi-millionaire when he paid the murderer of U.S. army medic Christopher Speer ten and a half million dollars. The Supreme Court did not order any monetary compensation for Omar Khadr, but the Prime Minister said that because of the actions of the previous Martin Liberal government, he just had to write the cheque. Why has the Prime Minister spent over \$40 million to fight Canadian veterans in court, but decided to pay 10 and a half million dollars to a convicted terrorist without putting a fight?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, here is something the Conservative politicians just do not understand. When we violate the rights of anyone in Canada, all of us end up having to pay. The Conservatives refuse to recognize that the Charter of Rights and Freedoms applies to everyone. Quite frankly, I am glad that Canadians are angry about that payment to Omar Khadr because I am too. No government should ever have violated any Canadian's fundamental rights.

Oral Questions

Mr. Phil McColeman (Brantford—Brant, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister gave \$10 million to Omar Khadr because he did not want to fight him in court.

However, he spent over \$40 million fighting our veterans in court. He refused to revoke the veterans benefits going to convicted cop murderer, Christopher Garnier. When did the Prime Minister decide that veterans were asking for too much?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite well knows that he was part of a Conservative Party that nickel-and-dimed veterans and used them for photo ops, while shutting down their offices to balance the budget at all costs.

The reality is we invested \$10 billion in our veterans over the past four years to give them more support, more help for them and for their families, and to reopen the veterans offices. We have done more to support those men and women who have served our country so valiantly than the Conservatives ever had done when they were in government.

* * *

[Translation]

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau (Berthier—Maskinongé, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the dairy and cheese industries are losing \$450 million a year. In 2014, my motion to compensate producers following the signing of the Comprehensive and Economic Trade Agreement was adopted unanimously by the House of Commons. Five years later nothing has been done. There is still no money in the budget for the compensation, and we are still waiting for measures and a program to support our farmers. Successive Conservative and Liberal governments have failed our Quebec farmers.

When will the government take action and announce a compensation plan for our farmers?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, unlike the NDP, which continues to oppose every free trade agreement that is good for Canadians, our workers and our farmers, we know that increasing trade and supporting our farmers is the right way to create prosperity for all Canadians.

That is why we are working with farmers and dairy producers to ensure that they receive proper compensation for losses incurred under trade agreements while we create growth and wealth for all Canadians. Unfortunately, the NDP does not understand that.

* * *

• (1455)

[English]

HEALTH

Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, a man living in Ottawa Centre has been denied OAS because of his rare form of dementia. The family is now owed \$18,000, and the Liberal government is refusing it because he does not meet their criteria.

A one-size-fits-all approach to dementia patients is completely inappropriate.

Will the Liberal MP for Ottawa Centre stand up for her constituent or will the Liberals continue to make empty gestures, while abandoning Canadians in need of dementia care?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this government has moved forward with a national strategy on dementia that includes support for caregivers and more research into prevention. We recognize that there is always more to do.

I am not familiar with the case that the member opposite brings up, but I will ensure that we follow up on that one. We need to ensure that everyone is getting the support he or she needs. That is a commitment made by this government.

* * *

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Randy Boissonnault (Edmonton Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada's energy sector is a key driver of our economy and an important source of good, middle-class jobs in my community.

Edmontonians and all Albertans want to see good projects move forward in the right way. They know first-hand what happens when they do not.

For 10 years, the Conservatives cut corners and failed to get a single inch of new pipeline built to non-U.S. markets. We were elected on a plan to do things differently, and we have delivered.

Could the Prime Minister please update the House on our government's decision on the Trans Mountain expansion project?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this project will create thousands of good, middle-class jobs, and includes economic opportunities for indigenous peoples.

We have a plan to fight climate change and protect our oceans and respond to the concerns we heard in consultation. Every dollar earned through this project will be invested in clean energy.

We were elected to deliver real change. That is exactly what we are doing by moving forward on this project in the right way.

* * *

[Translation]

FINANCE

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I have some very bad news for our friend the Prime Minister of Canada.

Sadly, we all remember when he suggested that budgets balance themselves. I have bad news for him, but especially for Canadians: in the four years he has been Prime Minister, there have been four budgets and four consecutive deficits. That is the hallmark of this Prime Minister.

Oral Questions

Since he promised exactly the opposite four years ago, could he stand in his place, on this last day when we can ask him questions, look Canadians in the eye and tell them, “I was wrong”?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will take no lessons from the Conservatives, who ran eight consecutive deficits.

The reality is that the investments the Conservatives made did not create any growth because they made bad investments. The Conservatives still believe that the best way to create economic growth is to give advantages and benefits to the wealthy.

It is by investing in the middle class that we created one million jobs, reduced poverty, lowered the unemployment rate and helped middle-class Canadians.

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to refresh the memories of the Prime Minister and all his Liberal henchmen.

Four years ago, he promised that they would run three small deficits and then balance the budget in 2019. Four years later, we know what really happened: They ran three big deficits and then a \$20-billion deficit in their so-called zero-deficit year.

Again, I ask the Prime Minister: Will he stand in his place, look Canadians in the eye and tell them, “I lied to you”, since that is what he did?

The Speaker: The hon. member knows that he used an unparliamentary word. I would ask him to apologize.

Mr. Gérard Deltell: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives added \$150 billion to our national debt, all while posting the worst economic growth under any prime minister since R.B. Bennett during the Great Depression.

The reality is that not only did our decision to invest in the middle class, lift children out of poverty and invest in our communities and infrastructure create good economic growth, but it also set a record in terms of reducing poverty and making life better for Canadians. This is unheard of in the world—

• (1500)

The Speaker: The hon. member for Carleton.

[English]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, remember this great hit: “I’m looking Canadians straight in the eye and being honest, the way I always have. We are committed to balanced budgets, and we are. We will balance that budget in 2019.” The Prime Minister only missed that promise by \$20 billion.

When he looks Canadians in the eye in the next election and promises not to raise their taxes again, why should anyone believe what he says?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the promise we made in the last election was to invest in Canadians and create growth that for 10 years, Stephen Harper was unable to build.

That member opposite was part of a government that added \$150 billion to Canada’s national debt with nothing to show for it, the

worst growth rate since the Great Depression. Why? Because the Conservatives insisted, and continue to insist, that the way to create growth was to give advantages to the wealthiest. We know that does not work. That is why we invest in the middle class.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when the previous Conservative government was fighting the great global recession, that member said that we should spend more, spend now, spend faster. His only complaint was that the deficits were not big enough.

We left him with a balanced budget. He promised that in 2019 the budget would balance itself. He is off by just \$20 billion, on top of the taxes he raised on the middle class.

The Prime Minister broke that promise. Which other promises will he break if he is re-elected?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what Canadians wanted from that Conservative government was for it to invest in the kinds of things that would create growth. Instead, the Conservatives invested in signs, door-knobs and gazebos.

We instead chose to invest in the middle class, in lifting kids out of poverty, in ensuring everyone had a real and fair chance to succeed. It is working. A million new jobs have been created over the past four years. We have the lowest unemployment in 40 years, because we are investing in Canadians.

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Ms. Georgina Jolibois (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Denesuline of northern Saskatchewan and Manitoba were supposed to sign an agreement with the government after 18 years of negotiating for their land, harvesting and resource rights. A week ago, the minister backed away and now refuses to meet with them. She broke her promise and betrayed the Dene.

Meaningful reconciliation is about working with indigenous people and meeting in good faith. Will the minister meet with the Dene while they are in Ottawa and explain why she broke her promise, face to face?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, no relationship is more important to Canada than the one with indigenous people. Working to renew relationships on the basis of affirmation and implementation of rights, respect, co-operation and partnership is central to everything we do.

Concerns have been raised by indigenous groups in the Northwest Territories about the terms of the agreement and the impact on their communities and their rights.

Oral Questions

We have a responsibility to meaningful consultations with communities in order to understand and work through the issues that they have brought forward.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today a report on the state of Canada's birds is expected, with findings of dramatic declines in many species, most of this resulting from habitat loss. For instance, over the last 40 years, we have lost over half of our grassland bird populations, birds like meadowlarks and burrowing owls.

The Liberals promised to protect 17% of Canada's wildlands and water by 2020, but have only hit 11%. An NDP government would protect 30% by 2030.

Why are the Liberals making nothing but empty gestures and breaking their promise to protect our wildlife?

• (1505)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, speaking of empty gestures, the NDP have put forward targets with no plan to reach them. On the contrary, we are going to be reaching our targets to protect marine and terrestrial areas. We have worked very hard on that. We recognize that protecting our environment is not just about growing the economy; it is also about fighting climate change.

We recognize the importance of wetlands and a broad range of environmental ecosystems, which have a significant role to play in fighting climate change as well. This is why we are continuing to move forward with a real plan to protect our environment and fight climate change.

* * *

CARBON PRICING

Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC): Mr. Speaker, here are some sobering numbers: 48% of Canadians are \$200 away from insolvency and 24% cannot meet their monthly obligations. To make life harder, the Prime Minister has stepped on the throats of Canadians by imposing a carbon tax on the necessities of life in Canada. The carbon tax is not an environmental plan; it is a tax plan.

How could he raise taxes on those who can least afford it, like seniors, but give advantages to the wealthiest by giving \$12 million to his billionaire friends at Loblaw's for fridges?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the members opposite continue to mislead Canadians. The reality is that the climate action incentive and our plan to put a price on pollution actually get more money in the pockets of middle-class Canadians than without a price on pollution. This is in fact an environmental tax break for middle-class families. That is what we are moving forward with, a way to both protect the environment, fight climate change and make it affordable for Canadians.

The plan that the Leader of the Opposition is planning on putting forward tonight surely will not do that.

[Translation]

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, here is another one of the Prime Minister's shining moments.

Many will recall his infamous January 2017 tweet, which said "To those fleeing persecution, terror and war, Canadians will welcome you.... #WelcomeToCanada". Since that day, more than 45,000 people have come from New York, seeking asylum at Roxham Road. Meanwhile, genuine refugees continue to suffer in UN camps.

Will the Prime Minister admit that he made a huge mistake in January 2017?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the UN reported this week that 70 million people are currently displaced around the world.

I am sure the hon. member does not think this is because of something I tweeted a few years ago. The reality is that more and more people are immigrating all over the world. Canada has a robust system to ensure that everyone who arrives in this country, through regular or irregular migration, is processed properly.

All of our system's rules are carefully followed.

* * *

[English]

ETHICS

Hon. Michelle Rempel (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, a law firm that the member for Steveston—Richmond East owns had been implicated in a scheme that allegedly laundered money in the Vancouver area for a foreign drug lord. Today, the member is at the Prime Minister's right hand. He is front and centre. Compare that to another Vancouver area MP who got kicked out of his caucus simply for standing up to him and doing what was right.

This begs the question, if he is such a feminist, why the obvious, on display, double standard?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are committed to a robust regime to combat money laundering and terrorist financing.

With budget 2019, we created the action, coordination and enforcement team and the money laundering centre of expertise. These will help better identify and meet evolving threats. We have provided over \$160 million to the RCMP, FINTRAC and CRA. We support policing and real estate audit teams.

The Conservatives actually cut over \$500 million from the RCMP's budget, while we will ensure that law enforcement teams have the resources and tools they need.

The Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Edmonton Manning ought to remember that the time to speak is when he is called upon and has the floor and not otherwise.

The hon. member for Nepean.

Oral Questions

•(1510)

GOVERNMENT POLICIES**HOUSING**

Mr. Chandra Arya (Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this government has made unprecedented investments in giving more Canadians a place to call home.

This week, we unveiled details about the new first-time home-buyer incentive, which will help middle-class families by making their mortgage payments more affordable.

Could the Prime Minister tell the House how the first-time homebuyer incentive will help middle-class families in my riding of Nepean and across Canada achieve the dream of buying their first home?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Nepean for his question and his hard work.

With the first-time homebuyer incentive, we are helping middle-class families achieve the dream of home ownership by increasing the RRSP withdrawal limit and reducing their monthly mortgage payments without increasing the amount they need to save for a down payment.

We are putting home ownership within reach for more middle-class families. We are building on our historic commitments to giving more Canadians a safe and affordable place to call home.

* * *

GOVERNMENT PRIORITIES

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, right now in Cape Breton we are seeing a story as old as time. The Liberals are taking \$18 million from taxpayers to fund a private airport at the elite Cabot Links golf resort for their millionaire friends to park their private jets. This Liberal decision is decimating the Allan J. MacEachen Port Hawkesbury Airport and small businesses like Celtic Air Services.

Will the Prime Minister put small businesses ahead of his millionaire Liberal golf buddies and stop any funding for a competing private airport in Inverness?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is always interesting to hear the Conservatives pretend they stand up for the middle class. We know their approach has always been to give advantages and benefits to the wealthiest in the hope that it will trickle down to growth for everyone else.

The first thing we did as a government was lower taxes for the middle class and raise them on the wealthiest 1%, and the Conservatives voted against it.

Then we brought in a Canada child benefit that gives more help to nine families out of 10 by stopping the cheques being sent to the millionaire families the Conservatives kept helping.

The Speaker: Some members seem to feel that it is vital to have constant noise when someone is speaking. I think they are mistaken, and I don't think Canadians appreciate it. I kind of wish the media would actually report on who does it.

The hon. member for Burnaby South.

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's symbolic gestures do not match up with his actions. He promised change, but four years later medicine is still unaffordable, corporations are still avoiding billions in taxes, Canadians are still paying sky-high cellphone bills, and people still cannot afford to find a place to live.

The Liberals are buying pipelines and still using Stephen Harper's climate targets.

I believe better is possible. Why do the Liberals keep trying to convince Canadians that they have to settle for less?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while the NDP works hard to come up with catchy slogans, we actually moved forward on delivering for Canadians. We have lowered the prices of drugs by taking an approach that includes creating collaboration with provinces as we move forward toward pharmacare.

We are also moving forward on a \$40-billion national housing strategy, because we know that Canadians need to have affordable homes and the security that comes with it.

We have also been investing in new training, jobs and opportunities for Canadians, while lifting people out of poverty.

While the NDP has been working on slogans, we have been acting.

* * *

[Translation]

RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Michel Picard (Montarville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is no denying that rural communities have a significant impact on the national economy. They provide jobs to over four million Canadians and contribute nearly 30% of the GDP, which is considerable.

[English]

It is important for our government to have a "made in rural" plan to address the unique infrastructure needs and economic opportunities facing rural communities.

[Translation]

Can the Prime Minister tell us about our government's efforts to support Canada's rural communities?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Montarville for his tireless work.

Government Orders

We have always been partners with rural regions. We created an infrastructure fund especially for rural communities. We are currently crafting a strategy for rural Canada based on the ideas of the very people who live there. We have connected 380,000 households to high-speed Internet, and our investments will make it possible for every Canadian household to connect.

Our record is proof that rural Canadians are always a priority for us.

* * *

• (1515)
[English]

CANADA SUMMER JOBS PROGRAM

Ms. Rachael Harder (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister put a values test on the Canada summer jobs grants, targeting groups that do not agree with him. More than a week ago, it was brought to the attention of the Liberals that the member for Mississauga—Lakeshore awarded funding to a group with links to terrorism.

It has been more than a week since the minister said that she would do a so-called review of this matter. The CRA has already suspended this group's charitable status, and the government is well aware of its current links to terrorism.

My question is this. Since the minister cannot seem to get the job done, will the Prime Minister step in and do the job?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House we are unequivocal. We will always stand up for a woman's right to choose. The fact of the matter is that we have seen around the world women's rights eroded by conservative governments, by conservative leaders, by conservative politicians. The reality is that Canadians deserve to hear political parties and leaders stand up unequivocally to say that we will defend women's rights. We will defend women's rights to choose.

Why can the Conservatives not just say that?

* * *

[Translation]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has no credibility when it comes to the environment. Just 24 hours after declaring a climate emergency, he gave the green light to the Trans Mountain pipeline, which will produce more greenhouse gas emissions than all of Quebec's industries combined.

He is apologizing by saying that he is going to invest \$500 million in green energy, but he is investing \$14 billion in pollution.

How is the Prime Minister going to fight climate change by investing our money in a project that creates more pollution than all of Quebec?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, there are still politicians who believe that we have to choose between the environment and the economy.

The reality is that the only way to move forward as a society is to protect jobs and the environment at the same time. That is exactly

what we are doing by safely accessing new markets for our resources while investing historic amounts in the transition to green energy. All the profits from this pipeline will be put toward the transition to green energy because Canadians know that we need to show leadership in that regard.

* * *

[English]

SRI LANKA

Ms. Cheryl Hardcastle (Windsor—Tecumseh, NDP): Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among the parties, and I am hopeful that if you seek it, you will find unanimous consent for the following motion.

I move:

That the House, (a) extend its condolences to all the victims of violence and war in Sri Lanka; (b) call on the Government of Sri Lanka to promote justice for those affected by the Easter Sunday attacks, protect the rights of religious minorities and defend all places of worship; (c) reaffirm Canada's call for Sri Lanka to implement its obligations within a clearly specified time frame, as mandated under the UN Human Rights Council resolutions 30/1 and 40/1 as well as Canada's support in advancing accountability, peace and reconciliation among all people on the island; and (d) call upon the United Nations to establish an international independent investigation into allegations of genocide against Tamils committed in Sri Lanka, including during the last phase of the armed conflict in 2009.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1520)
[Translation]

WAYS AND MEANS

MOTION NO. 34

The House resumed from June 17 consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: It being 3:20 p.m., pursuant to order made on Tuesday, June 18, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on Motion No. 34.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The 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:

• (1525)

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

(Division No. 1375)

YEAS

Members

Aboultatif	Albas
Albrecht	Aldag
Alghabra	Alleslev
Allison	Amos
Anandasangaree	Anderson
Arnold	Arseneault
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Barlow	Barrett
Barsalou-Duval	Baylis
Beaulieu	Beech
Bennett	Benzen
Bergen	Berthold
Bezan	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Block
Boissonnault	Bossio
Boudrias	Brassard
Bratina	Breton
Caesar-Chavannes	Carr
Carrie	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Champagne	Chen
Chong	Clarke
Cormier	Cuzner
Dabrusin	Damoff
Davidson	DeCoursey
Deltell	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diotte
Doherty	Dreeshen
Drouin	Dubourg
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dzerowicz	Easter
Eglinski	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Ellis
Erskine-Smith	Eyking
Eyolfson	Falk (Provencher)
Fergus	Fillmore
Finley	Finnigan
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Freeland	Fuhr
Gallant	Genuis
Gerretsen	Gill
Gladu	Godin
Goldsmith-Jones	Goodale
Gould	Gourde
Graham	Hajdu
Harder	Hardie
Hébert	Hoback
Hogg	Holland
Housefather	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Jeneroux	Joly
Jones	Jordan
Jowhari	Kang
Kelly	Kent
Khalid	Khera
Kitchen	Kmiec
Lake	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lefebvre	Leslie
Levitt	Liepert
Lightbound	Lloyd

Government Orders

Lobb	Lockhart
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	Lukiwski
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacKenzie
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maguire
Manly	Martel
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
May (Cambridge)	
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McColeman	McCrimmon
McDonald	McGuinity
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendès	Mendicino
Mihychuk	Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Monsef	
Morrissey	Motz
Murray	Nassif
Nater	Ng
Nicholson	Nuttall
O'Connell	Oliphant
Oliver	O'Regan
Ouellette	Paradis
Paul-Hus	Paupé
Peschisolido	Peterson
Petitpas Taylor	Philpott
Picard	Plamondon
Poillievre	Poissant
Qualtrough	Raitt
Ratansi	Rayes
Reid	Rempel
Rioux	Robillard
Rogers	Romanado
Rota	Rudd
Ruimy	Rusnak
Sahota	Saini
Sajjan	Samson
Sangha	Sarai
Saroya	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Schmale
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Shields
Shipley	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Simms	Sorbara
Sorenson	Spengemann
Stanton	Ste-Marie
Strahl	Stubbs
Sweet	Tabbara
Tan	Tassi
Thériault	Tilson
Trost	Trudeau
Van Kesteren	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Viersen	Virani
Wagantall	Warkentin
Wagha	Webber
Weir	Whalen
Wilson-Raybould	Wong
Wrzesnewskyj	Yip
Young	Yurdiga
Zahid	Zimmer — 256

NAYS

Members

Angus	Ashton
Aubin	Benson
Blaikie	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boulerice	Boutin-Sweet
Brosseau	Cannings
Caron	Choquette
Christopherson	Cullen
Dubé	Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dusseau	Garrison
Hardcastle	Hughes
Johns	Jolibois
Julian	Laverdière
MacGregor	Masse (Windsor West)
Mathysen	Moore
Nantel	Quach

Private Members' Business

Ramsey
Sansoucy
Stetski

Rankin
Singh
Trudel— 36

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu

LeBlanc— 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

FEDERAL COURTS ACT

The House resumed from June 13 consideration of the motion that Bill C-331, An Act to amend the Federal Courts Act (international promotion and protection of human rights), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Tuesday, May 28, 2019, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-331.

• (1535)

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

(Division No. 1376)

YEAS

Members

Angus
Aubin
Beaulieu
Blaikie
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Cannings
Choquette
Cullen
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Garrison
Hardcastle
Johns
Julian
Laverdière
Manly
Mathysen
Moore
Pauzé
Plamondon
Ramsey
Sansoucy
Ste-Marie
Thériault
Weir— 49

Ashton
Barsalou-Duval
Benson
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boulerice
Brosseau
Caron
Christopherson
Dubé
Dusseau
Gill
Hughes
Jolibois
Kang
MacGregor
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Nantel
Philpott
Quach
Rankin
Singh
Stetski
Trudel

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Alghabra
Allison
Anandasangaree
Arnold
Arya
Badawey
Barlow
Baylis
Bennett

Albas
Aldag
Alleslev
Amos
Anderson
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Barrett
Beech
Benzen

Bergen
Bezan
Bittle
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boissonnault
Brassard
Breton
Carr
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Clarke
Cuzner
Damoff
DeCoursey
Dhaliwal
Diotte
Dreesen
Dubourg
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fergus
Finley
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fuhr
Genus
Gladu
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Graham
Harder
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Hutchings
Jeneroux
Jones
Jowhari
Kent
Khera
Kniec
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Leslie
Liepert
Lloyd
Lockhart
Longfield
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
Maguire
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Soeurs)
Monsef
Motz
Nassif
Ng
Nuttall
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Petipas Taylor
Poilievre
Qualtrough
Ratansi
Reid
Rioux
Rogers
Rota

Berthold
Bibeau
Blair
Block
Bossio
Bratina
Caesar-Chavannes
Carrie
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Chong
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davidson
Deltell
Dhillon
Doherty
Drouin
Duguid
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Falk (Provencher)
Fillmore
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Gallant
Gerretsen
Godin
Goodale
Gourde
Hajdu
Hardie
Hoback
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Joly
Jordan
Kelly
Khalid
Kitchen
Lake
Lametti
Lapointe
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lightbound
Lobb
Long
Ludwig
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martel
McColeman
McDonald
McKenna
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-
Morrissey
Murray
Nater
Nicholson
O'Connell
Oliver
Ouellette
Paul-Hus
Peterson
Picard
Poissant
Raitt
Rayes
Rempel
Robillard
Romanado
Rudd

Private Members' Business

Ruimy	Rusnak
Sahota	Saini
Sajjan	Samson
Sangha	Sarai
Saroya	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Schmale
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Shields
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand	Simms
Sorbara	Sorenson
Spengemann	Stanton
Strahl	Stubbs
Sweet	Tabbara
Tan	Tassi
Tilson	Trost
Van Kesteren	Vandal
Vaughan	Viersen
Virani	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Whalen
Wilson-Raybould	Wong
Wrzesnewskyj	Yip
Young	Yurdiga
Zahid	Zimmer — 238

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu

LeBlanc — 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

* * *

[Translation]

DIABETES AWARENESS MONTH

The House resumed from June 17 consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Tuesday, May 28, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on Motion No. 173 under Private Members' Business.

● (1545)

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

*(Division No. 1377)***YEAS**

Members

Abouttaif	Albas
Albrecht	Aldag
Alghabra	Alleslev
Allison	Anandasangaree
Anderson	Angus
Arnold	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Aubin	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Barlow	Barrett
Barsalou-Duval	Baylis
Beaulieu	Beech
Bennett	Benson
Benzen	Bergen
Berthold	Bezan
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Block	Boissonnault
Bossio	Boudrias
Boulerice	Boutin-Sweet
Brassard	Bratina
Breton	Brosseau
Caesar-Chavannes	Cannings
Caron	Carr

Carrie	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Champagne	Chen
Chong	Choquette
Christopherson	Clarke
Cormier	Cullen
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davidson
DeCoursey	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diotte
Doherty	Dreeschen
Drouin	Dubé
Dubourg	Duguid
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dusseault	Dzerowicz
Easter	Eglinski
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Eyking	Eyolfson
Falk (Provencher)	Fergus
Fillmore	Finley
Finnigan	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Fuhr
Gallant	Garrison
Genius	Gerretsen
Gill	Gladu
Goldsmith-Jones	Goodale
Gould	Gourde
Graham	Hajdu
Hardcastle	Harder
Hardie	Hébert
Hoback	Hogg
Holland	Housefather
Hughes	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Jeneroux	Johns
Jolibois	Joly
Jones	Jordan
Jowhari	Julian
Kang	Kelly
Kent	Khalid
Khera	Kitchen
Kniec	Kusie
Lake	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Laverdière	Lefebvre
Leslie	Levitt
Liepert	Lightbound
Lloyd	Lobb
Lockhart	Long
Longfield	Ludwig
Lukiwski	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor	MacKenzie
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maguire
Manly	Martel
Masse (Windsor West)	Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McColeman	McCrimmon
McDonald	McGuinty
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendès	Mendicino
Mihychuk	Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Monsef	
Moore	Morrissey
Motz	Murray
Nantel	Nassif
Nater	Ng
Nicholson	Nuttall
O'Connell	Oliphant
Oliver	O'Regan
Ouellette	Paradis
Paul-Hus	Paupé
Peschisolido	Peterson
Petipas Taylor	Philpott
Picard	Plamondon
Poilievre	Poissant
Quach	Qualtrough
Raitt	Ramsey

Routine Proceedings

Rankin	Ratansi
Reid	Rempel
Rioux	Robillard
Rogers	Romanado
Rota	Rudd
Ruimy	Rusnak
Sahota	Saini
Sajjan	Samson
Sangha	Sansoucy
Sarai	Saroya
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Schmale	Schulte
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Shields	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Simms	Sorbara
Sorenson	Spengemann
Stanton	Ste-Marie
Stetski	Strahl
Stubbs	Sweet
Tabbara	Tan
Tassi	Thériault
Tilson	Trost
Trudel	Van Kesteren
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Viersen
Virani	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Weir
Whalen	Wilson-Raybould
Wong	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young
Yurdiga	Zahid
Zimmer— 285	

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu

LeBlanc— 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS*[English]***CANADA ACCOUNT ANNUAL REPORT**

Mr. Omar Alhabra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I have the pleasure to table, in both official languages, the annual report of the 2017-18 Canada Account as prepared by Export Development Canada.

* * *

OTTAWA RIVER WATERSHED

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32 (2), and in accordance with Motion No. 104 put forth by my colleague, the hon. member for Ottawa South, and adopted by this House on May 3, 2017, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, a report on the long-term sustainability and management of the Ottawa River watershed, entitled “A study of governance, existing data, potential indicators and values in the Ottawa River Watershed”.

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 10 petitions.

* * *

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

Mr. Randy Boissonnault (Edmonton Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1), I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, a report of the Canadian Section of ParlAmericas representing its participation at the bilateral visit to Brazil, held in Brasilia and São Paulo, Brazil, from April 23 to 26, 2019.

[Translation]

Hon. Denis Paradis (Brome—Missisquoi, 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 respecting its participation in the 47th annual meeting of the Canada-France Interparliamentary Association, held in Gard and Alpes-Maritime, France, from April 8 to 12, 2019.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Hon. Denis Paradis (Brome—Missisquoi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 17th report of the Standing Committee on Official Languages, entitled “Modernization of the Official Languages Act”.

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

● (1550)

[English]

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. Neil Ellis (Bay of Quinte, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 14th report of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs, entitled “Effects of Mefloquine Use Among Canadian Veterans”.

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

Mr. Phil McColeman (Brantford—Brant, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to the issue that this report addresses, which is mefloquine, and point out that part of the report is a supplemental dissenting report requesting that the government take immediate action so that the veterans who are currently suing the government over this toxic medication they were forced to take while in service will not go any further forward and that the government will not fight these veterans in court.

Routine Proceedings

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Mr. Nick Whalen (St. John's East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 26th report of the the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration, entitled "Improving Settlement Services Across Canada".

I would like to take a moment to thank the clerk, Evelyn Lukyniuk, and analysts Julie Béchar, Isabelle Lafontaine-Émond and Madalina Chesoi for their excellent work at the end of the session to deliver our report on time.

I would also like to thank the retiring member of Parliament for Dufferin—Caledon, who was the previous chair of this committee and provided excellent advice and support during his entire tenure on the committee this session.

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

Hon. Michelle Rempel (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we will be tabling a dissenting opinion. We do not feel the report that was issued by the government members adequately addresses the strain on resettlement services that has been created by well over 40,000 people who have been allowed to illegally enter the country and claim asylum status in Canada.

We know that many of these people do not have valid claims and yet are able to access language training services. We also do not feel that the report dealt with some of the recommendations coming out of the resettlement services communities to make these services more effective for people who need them to integrate into the Canadian economic and social fabric.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Stephen Fuhr (Kelowna—Lake Country, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 17th report of the Standing Committee on National Defence, entitled "Improving Diversity and Inclusion in the Canadian Armed Forces".

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

It was a privilege and a pleasure to serve as the committee chair in the 42nd Parliament. I would like to thank the members, the clerk, and the analysts for their great work. This is another unanimous report.

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Hon. Larry Bagnell (Yukon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last time, I mentioned the great work of the committee clerk and the researcher. As this may be my last time up on these reports, I would like to congratulate all the committee members. I think we had a number of free spirits on our committee. I congratulate them for always making their decisions with integrity and based on what they believed. As can be seen, there has been a large volume of work.

[*Translation*]

I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 99th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, entitled "Advice for the Consideration of the Procedure and House Affairs Committee in the 43rd Parliament".

[*English*]

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Hon. Kevin Sorenson (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC): Mr. Speaker, these will be the last reports I ever table in Parliament, so I want to thank the public accounts committee for its good work in this Parliament. As well, I would like to thank our clerk, Angela, and our analysts, Dillan and Sara, for the work they have done.

I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the following two reports of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts: the 69th report, entitled "Processing of Asylum Claims, Report 2 of the 2019 Spring Reports of the Auditor General of Canada; and the 70th report, entitled "Call Centres, Report 1 of the 2019 Spring Reports of the Auditor General of Canada".

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to these two reports.

• (1555)

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Hon. Larry Bagnell (Yukon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, November 10, 1995, was the last time any committee reported 100 reports. Peter Milliken was the chair of PROC at the time.

I have the honour to present, in both official languages, at this historic moment, the 100th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, entitled "Advice for the Consideration of Committees of the House of Commons in the 43rd Parliament". This references procedures related to in-camera meetings and the Coast of Bays—Central—Notre Dame procedure.

The committee wanted to dedicate this report to a former member of Parliament, who we all had great fondness for. I will read the dedication:

The Committee dedicates its one hundredth report to the memory of the late Arnold Chan, who was the member for Scarborough—Agincourt, and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons. As a colleague and friend, he was widely respected for his sharp legal mind, willingness to listen and pursuit of fairness. Mr. Chan was a driving force behind the motion to establish rules on the use of in camera meetings for the Committee. The rules were established in close collaboration with his fellow Committee members.

To Arnold Chan.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Ms. Anita Vandenberg (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 29th report of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development, entitled "Raising Her Voice: Confronting the Unique Challenges Facing Women Human Rights Defenders".

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

I would also like to thank the witnesses who had the courage to come forward, many of them at great risk to themselves, to testify before the committee.

Routine Proceedings

As this is the last report I will be tabling, I also want to say that it has been a tremendous honour to be the chair of the subcommittee on international human rights. I want to thank all the committee members for working together collaboratively on some of the most difficult issues of our day.

I would also like to thank the support staff, our two clerks, the analysts, the interpreters and the technical staff, for the tremendous work they have done for the committee.

The Speaker: The next hon. member comes from the same place as former speaker Edgar Nelson Rhodes, who served as the speaker between 1917 and 1921. That is Amherst, Nova Scotia.

The hon. member for Cumberland—Colchester.

HEALTH

Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I note that you are the second speaker from Nova Scotia, and we are very pleased about that.

I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 29th report of the Standing Committee on Health, entitled “Violence Facing Health Care Workers in Canada”.

This was an amazing study we did on violence against health care workers, people who are there to help people. We made nine important recommendations, ranging from investing in best practices to prevent violence faced by health care workers to working with the provinces and territories to update the pan-Canadian health human resource strategy. Over five meetings, we heard 21 witnesses, who gave insightful and heartfelt testimony about their experience in the health care field.

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this report. We wish health care workers all the best.

I want to thank our committee. All members from all parties came to every committee meeting for three and a half years with their homework done, ready to do their jobs and speak on behalf of Canadians.

I also want to thank our clerk and our analysts, who have done a great job. I want to thank my vice-chairs as well.

All members of the Standing Committee on Health have done a great job.

* * *

PUTTING VICTIMS FIRST ACT

Mr. Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-463, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (orders of prohibition and orders restricting publication).

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to introduce Bill C-463, putting victims first. While the Criminal Code guides our justice system, sometimes it does not necessarily put victims at the heart of it.

With this bill, we would like to change section 161 to protect children up to age 17. Currently, it only protects them to age 15.

We would also like to establish a method to allow a victim to remove the publication ban on his or her own name. I am thinking in particular of the case of Rehtaeh Parsons, a young girl from the east coast who committed suicide and was subsequently the subject of an investigation. Later on, after it was cleared up, her family was unable to speak about the case because there was a publication ban. The bill would allow her family to lift the publication ban without having to go to court.

The last piece of the bill would put a reverse onus bail restriction on people who have trafficked other people.

I think all three proposals are common sense. I look forward to reintroducing the bill in the upcoming Parliament and to seeing it pass forthwith.

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

* * *

● (1600)

[*Translation*]

SUPPORTING SMALL BREWERIES, WINERIES AND DISTILLERIES ACT

Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau (Berthier—Maskinongé, NDP) moved to introduce Bill C-464, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act (small brewery, winery or distillery tax credit).

She said: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague and friend, the member for Jonquière.

This important bill seeks to introduce a tax credit that would help businesses increase their productivity, hire employees, and generate more revenue. That money would be entirely reinvested in the business and would help stimulate the local economy. I would like to see this bill passed soon. I know that people love their microbreweries, their vineyards and their distilleries, and this is a way to encourage them. I would like to list some of the companies in Berthier—Maskinongé.

In D'Autray, there is the Aux pieds des noyers vineyard, Vignoble Carone Wines, the Lano d'Or vineyard, the Saint-Gabriel vineyard, the Vent maudit vineyard and Domaine du Mont d'Or. In Maskinongé, there is the Prémont vineyard, Domaine & Vins Gélinas and Vignoble et Domaine Beauchemin.

We also have extraordinary microbreweries such as Microbrasserie Nouvelle-France, Brasserie Dépareillée and Microbrasserie L'Arsenal. There is also a distillery in Louiseville, the Distillerie Mariana.

This tax credit would help businesses across Canada and Quebec.

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

* * *

CANADA LABOUR CODE

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-465, An Act to amend the Canada Labour Code (automated external defibrillators).

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce this bill, which is the result of a collaboration with one of my constituents, Claude Leblanc, who was recently honoured. Sadly, he passed away a few weeks after I met him.

We worked together on the idea of this bill. Claude Leblanc was instrumental in getting automated defibrillators installed all over the riding of Sherbrooke and even all across Quebec. He wanted to push his idea even further and make it mandatory to install defibrillators in government buildings and buildings housing federally regulated businesses.

The bill would amend the Canada Labour Code to ensure that federally regulated businesses and federal government offices with a certain number of employees, which will be prescribed by regulation, install automated defibrillators in the workplace. We estimate that this would save hundreds of lives a year. It would ensure that this kind of assistance is available in all regions of Canada when needed.

I am grateful to Claude Leblanc for his years of hard work.

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

• (1605)

[English]

Mr. Michael Levitt: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would ask for leave to please return to committee reports to present the reports of the foreign affairs committee.

The Speaker: Is there agreement?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Michael Levitt (York Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, before I begin presenting these reports, I would like to thank the committee assistants, translation staff and, of course, our clerk, Erica Pereira, and our analysts, Brian Hermon and Scott McTaggart, for all their hard work over the last four years.

I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 30th report of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development, entitled “Democratic Strain and Popular Discontent in Europe: Responding to the Challenges Facing Liberal Democracies”. Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this report.

I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 31st report of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development, entitled “Human Rights Situation in Russia”. Following the testimony of Mr. Mustafa Dzhemilev, the committee supports recognizing the Crimean Tatar deportation of 1944 as a genocide and designating May 18 a day of remembrance for the Crimean Tatar deportation.

I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 32nd report of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development, entitled “Situation in Sri Lanka”. Pursuant to

Routine Proceedings

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

Finally, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 33rd report of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development, entitled “The Human Rights Situation in Iran”. Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this report.

The Speaker: In the current spirit of harmony, I wonder if there is unanimous consent to return to the introduction of private member's bills so that we could allow the hon. member for Milton to introduce her bill.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

CORRECTIONS AND CONDITIONAL RELEASE ACT

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-466, An Act to amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act (disclosure of information to victims).

She said: Mr. Speaker, this is the first time in 11 years I have had the honour of being able to table a private member's bill in this place. I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to do so.

Today I am introducing a private member's bill because very often, victims of crime, such as Lisa Freeman and her family in Oshawa, Ontario, are caught off guard when they are notified that an offender is eligible for forms of parole before the 25 years indicated on the certificate of conviction.

I believe that it is the responsibility of government to ensure that victims of crime are treated with the utmost respect and dignity. This legislation would require that information regarding review and eligibility for all forms of parole be communicated, in writing, to the offender's victims. The written documentation would also require an explanation of how those dates had been determined.

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

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions amongst the parties, and if you seek it, I think you will find unanimous consent for the following motion. I move:

That, notwithstanding any Standing or Special Order or usual practice of the House, on Thursday, June 20, 2019, after the taking of any recorded division deferred until the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions, the House shall proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business for two hours to consider, during the first hour, the motion for second reading of Bill C-431, An Act to amend the Canada Pension Plan Investment Board Act (investments), and, during the second hour, the motion for second reading of Bill C-429, An Act to amend the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999 (packaging), after which the House shall return to consideration of Government Orders until the ordinary hour of daily adjournment.

Routine Proceedings

●(1610)

The Speaker: Does the hon. parliamentary secretary have the unanimous consent of the House to propose the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in addition to that, there have also been discussions amongst the parties, and if you seek it, you will find unanimous consent for the following motion. I move:

That, in relation to the broadcasting of committee proceedings, after the opening of the 43rd Parliament, and once the necessary infrastructure has been installed, the House authorize:

- (a) televising or webcasting of up to six simultaneous meetings, provided that no more than two of the meetings are televised;
- (b) that the electronic media be permitted to video record meetings that are not televised, in accordance with the existing guidelines; and
- (c) that Standing Order 108(3)(a)(v) be amended to read “the review of and report on the broadcasting of the proceedings of the House and its committees;”.

The Speaker: Does the hon. parliamentary secretary have the unanimous consent of the House to propose the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

MILITARY FAMILY APPRECIATION DAY

Mr. Phil McColeman (Brantford—Brant, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there have been consultations among the parties, and if you seek it, you will find unanimous consent for the following motion. I move:

That, in the opinion of the House, the government should recognize the sacrifices Canadian military families make on a daily basis, the contributions of these families to the fabric of our society, and show appreciation for their ongoing commitment to the safety and security of Canada by designating the third Friday in September of each year “Military Family Appreciation Day”.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

PETITIONS

PHARMACARE

Mrs. Carol Hughes (Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusksasing, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure for me to rise in this House on behalf of the good people of Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusksasing.

I have two petitions to table. The first petition is from people from Hearst, Dubreuilville, White River, Echo Bay, Wawa, Richards Landing, Hawk Junction, Elliot Lake and Sault Ste. Marie.

The petition is in support of public, universal and comprehensive pharmacare for all. The petitioners note that right now, one in 10 Canadians cannot afford their prescription medication under the current system that prioritizes drug companies' bottom line. If we replace our current system with single-payer pharmacare that benefits everyone, the country will save \$4.2 billion each year. The petitioners add that Canada is behind the times, as we are the only OECD country with a universal health system that does not cover prescription drugs.

[*Translation*]

They point out that implementing a universal pharmacare program will give Canadians collective buying power that will lower the cost of drugs and health care. People could therefore feel more secure about their health in the future.

[*English*]

The petitioners are calling on the Government of Canada to eliminate this oversight in the health care system and bring in a public universal and public comprehensive pharmacare plan.

[*Translation*]

DEFENCE OF CANADA MEDAL

Mrs. Carol Hughes (Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusksasing, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is in support of the creation of the defence of Canada medal for the men and women who defended our country during the Cold War. The medal would officially honour those who served in the defence of Canada's borders from 1946 to 1989.

[*English*]

The petitioners note that this medal would recognize the support of the many men and women who gave countless hours of service to their country as they trained and prepared in case of an attack on Canadian soil, which fortunately never happened.

The petitioners call on the government to support Bill C-270, which would create a defence of Canada medal.

PALLIATIVE CARE

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am presenting three petitions to the House today from the constituents of the Yorkton—Melville area, as today is the very last day I will be in the House to do so before the summer break and ensuing federal election.

The first petition is signed by 85 petitioners who are calling on the government to establish a national strategy on palliative care.

Routine Proceedings

•(1615)

FIREARMS

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the second petition holds 550 signatures of petitioners who are calling on the House of Commons to scrap Bill C-71, the firearms legislation that would do nothing to provide the resources to front-line police forces to tackle the true source of firearms violence, gangs and organized criminal enterprises, and instead targets law-abiding gun owners.

SEX SELECTION

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the third petition I wish to present contains 75 signatures of petitioners who are calling on the government to condemn discrimination against girls occurring through sex-selected pregnancy termination and the use of ultrasound for this purpose.

CANNABIS

Ms. Yasmin Ratansi (Don Valley East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the pleasure of presenting a petition to the House today.

The petitioners call upon the House of Commons and the Government of Canada to amend the Cannabis Act to allow licensed and regulated pharmacies and pharmacists to sell and distribute cannabis for medical purposes.

ANIMAL WELFARE

Mr. Paul Manly (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, GP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to stand here on behalf of the people of Nanaimo—Ladysmith and present two petitions from my constituents.

The first comes from people who go to the Body Shop at Woodgrove mall. They draw the attention of the House to animal testing for cosmetic products. They want the House to know that the European Union has banned cosmetic testing since 2013 along with a number of other countries and yet their cosmetic industries continue to grow.

The petitioners call on the House of Commons to support Bill S-214, and ban the sale and/or manufacture of animal-tested cosmetics and their ingredients in Canada moving forward.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Paul Manly (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, GP): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is in regard to the DND rifle range in the Nanaimo area. This range was established in the 1920s and the city has grown substantially since then. This is an area that is surrounded on three sides by parks and it has residential areas nearby. The petition contains thousands of signatures.

The petitioners call on the House of Commons to clarify the safe operation of the DND rifle range, which has recently been closed for recreational purposes. They would like the government to establish a schedule for public access to the lands in the buffer zone of the range and order a feasibility study to look at relocating the range to a more suitable, less populated area. They would also like the government to engage in a community consultation with recreational users, the Regional District of Nanaimo, the City of Nanaimo and the Snuneymuxw First Nation about the future use of this land.

The Speaker: We have many members who wish to present petitions today. I would ask members therefore to try to be very brief in presenting their petitions, although at the end I will see if there is agreement to perhaps allow a little extra time.

PHYSICIAN-ASSISTED DYING

Hon. Kevin Sorenson (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this will be the last time I ever present a petition in the House. I want to thank you for your services as Chair.

I rise today to present a number of petitions on behalf of my colleague, my seatmate and my friend, the member for Langley—Aldergrove.

In the first, the petitioners call upon Parliament to enshrine in the Criminal Code the protection of conscience for physicians and health care institutions from coercion or intimidation to provide or refer for assisted suicide or euthanasia.

IMPAIRED DRIVING

Hon. Kevin Sorenson (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC): Madam Speaker, the second petition is signed by approximately 1,000 people, who are asking the Government of Canada to make a number of changes to the current drinking and driving laws in Canada.

PALLIATIVE CARE

Hon. Kevin Sorenson (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC): Madam Speaker, the third petition is signed by a group of petitioners who are calling on the House of Commons to specifically identify hospice palliative care as a defined medicinal service covered under the Canada Health Act.

In the speech given by the member for Langley—Aldergrove, he spoke a lot about palliative care.

SEX SELECTION

Hon. Kevin Sorenson (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC): Madam Speaker, lastly, I present a petition calling on all members of Parliament to condemn discrimination against girls occurring through sex-selective pregnancy termination.

I would like to take one minute to let our friend and colleague the member for Langley—Aldergrove know that our thoughts and prayers are with him and his family.

PHARMACARE

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am presenting a number of petitions from my riding of Courtenay—Alberni.

The first is a petition for pharmacare for all.

•(1620)

PENSIONS

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Madam Speaker, the second is a petition to withdraw Bill C-27 to protect defined benefit plans.

Routine Proceedings

The hon. member for North Island—Powell River.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am here today to present several petitions from my riding.

The first petition is with respect to cellular phone service in my riding. We have many areas that do not have access to cellular service.

The people who have signed these two petitions, with hundreds of signatures, are from Gold River, Alert Bay, Port McNeill, Port Alice, Courtenay, Hyde Creek, Quatsino, Victoria, Woss, Port Hardy and Sointula.

The petitioners ask the Minister of Rural Economic Development to acknowledge that this is an important public safety concern. It is very stressful for families and members who are driving to have to travel up to 30 minutes to reach a cellphone service area or landline to contact 911. Therefore, this is a major concern of public safety.

• (1625)

AGRICULTURE

Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP): Madam Speaker, I have two petitions with respect to saving our seeds, signed by people from from Powell River, Lund, Comox, Van Anda, Black Creek, Gillies Bay, Gibsons, Royston and Courtenay.

The petitioners ask for support in looking at the inherent rights of farmers to freely save, reuse, select, exchange, condition, store and sell seeds. This is very important to local farmers.

SENIORS

Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP): Madam Speaker, I have another two petitions, asking for an increase to the old age security and guaranteed income supplement benefits for seniors.

As we know, many seniors across the country are struggling. We have signatures from Campbell River, Comox, Merville, Courtenay, Cumberland, Victoria and Vancouver.

The petitioners ask the government to intervene and fully commit to a mandate of improving the lives of seniors across the country by increasing the benefit amounts to address the increased costs of living for senior citizens in Canada.

PHARMACARE

Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP): Madam Speaker, my last petition, which is from Campbell River and Quadra Island, is a national pharmacare petition.

The petitioners ask the government to recognize that the costs of prescription medications and necessary medical supplies in Canada is excessive and varies greatly from province to territory, that it needs to ensure the costs are affordable. They ask for a pan-Canadian single-payer universal pharmacare program that ensures all Canadians can access medically prescribed and necessary medications, regardless of their ability to pay.

Hon. Bardish Chagger: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Because many members want to make brief comments on their

petitions, I believe if you seek it, you will find unanimous consent to add up to 10 minutes to petitions today.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am presenting a petition that was launched in Quebec and signed by over 2,300 people. The petitioners are calling on us to immediately end all forms of discrimination in the Indian Act, to comply with the United Nations Human Rights Committee decision stipulating that all those whose equality and cultural rights were violated are entitled to reparations, and to take all necessary measures to abolish the Indian Act's racist and patriarchal regime as soon as possible.

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

Mrs. Alaina Lockhart (Fundy Royal, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I rise today to present a petition on behalf of the good people of Fundy Royal, as well as hundreds of other Atlantic Canadians.

I should note that a number of members of Parliament, across party lines and from all regions of the country, have been filing similar petitions with respect to the rights of farmers and the use, reuse, exchange and selling of seeds.

The petitioners call upon the Parliament of Canada to enshrine in legislation the inalienable rights of farmers and other Canadians to save, reuse, select, exchange and sell seeds.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Gary Anandasangaree (Scarborough—Rouge Park, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have the pleasure of presenting a petition from Canadians of Pakistani origin relating to the Pakistani nationals of Christian faith who are refugees in Thailand.

The petitioners are seeking Canada's intervention in assisting them to resettle in Canada.

ACCESS TO INFORMATION

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am tabling a petition on behalf of a constituent, who has collected over 800 signatures from Canadians in all provinces and territories.

The petitioners call on the government to review the records under the control of the Privy Council Office and to transfer all historical records to Library and Archives Canada. Researchers and historians rely on this information to write Canada's history. Historical records that do not threaten national security should be open and accessible by default.

Routine Proceedings

PALLIATIVE CARE

Hon. Alice Wong (Richmond Centre, CPC): Madam Speaker, I hereby present 103 petitions on two different subjects, and especially on behalf of the member for Langley—Aldergrove, who now needs a lot of care. I would take this opportunity to extend our best wishes, our prayers and thoughts.

The petitioners request that the House of Commons in Parliament specifically identify hospice palliative care as a defined medical service covered under the Canada Health Act.

The second petition notes that in the 41st Parliament, the House of Commons unanimously passed a motion calling on the government to create a national strategy on palliative care to ensure every Canadian would have access to high-quality palliative care at the end of life.

• (1630)

[*Translation*]

FORCED MIGRATION

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by many people from Sherbrooke.

Whereas every minute 31 people are forced to flee their homes, the petitioners are calling on the House to do more to address the underlying causes of forced migration around the world.

The petitioners are calling on us to ensure that humanitarian assistance is available to all refugees and their host communities; to support grassroots organizations that promote democracy, peace and human rights; and to invest more in diplomatic and peaceful solutions to armed conflicts.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau (Berthier—Maskinongé, NDP): Madam Speaker, the residents of Rang du Fleuve in Saint-Barthélemy wish to draw the attention of the House to a few points. Infrastructure in the area is crumbling as a result of the 2017 and 2019 floods, and emergency services and public safety officials have not had a single opportunity to visit and meet with the residents of Rang du Fleuve in Saint-Barthélemy. The petitioners are calling on the federal government to provide financial assistance to upgrade the infrastructure.

I want to thank and congratulate Marylene Gervais, who initiated this petition. I thank her for her work and involvement. I also want to thank public safety officials, firefighters and everyone who came out to help those struggling with the 2019 floods.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER BANK EROSION

Mr. Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Madam Speaker, today, I am tabling a petition calling on the government to protect the banks of the St. Lawrence River corridor.

This petition follows on an e-petition signed by about 700 people that has already been submitted. This time, the clerk certified 1,500 signatures on this paper petition. In the past, when Canadians came to Parliament Hill, the Minister of Transport refused to meet with them. We hope that, even if he does not meet with them, he will

still respond favourably to the petition. The erosion of the banks of the St. Lawrence River is a very important issue for the petitioners. It affects their daily lives. I think the minister should show a little humanity.

[*English*]

MARRIAGE FRAUD

Ms. Ruby Sahota (Brampton North, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is my honour to rise to table a petition signed by 502 citizens and residents of Canada

The petitioners call upon the government to take further measures to deter fraud marriages. Some of the measures include stopping renewal of work and residency permits of the accused in fraud marriages until criminal cases are brought to justice in India. Others include action by CBSA in cases where accused are criminally charged in India for fraud marriages, among various others.

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am honoured to rise to table a petition that was signed at the Guelph Farmers' Market. A lot of advocacy goes on there every Saturday between 6 a.m. and noon.

This petition is delivering community power to the post office in the post-carbon economy. There are a lot of ideas around greening the post office and providing more services for seniors.

The petition is signed by 48 Canadians.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, I rise to present a petition originated by a grade six student at the Royal Oak Middle School, Matthias Spalteholz, who has thought a lot about what we need to do to fight the climate crisis.

The petitioners call on the Government of Canada to put in an electrical vehicle fast charging network on all major highways to support the transition away from the internal combustion engine and to fight climate change.

The second petition is from residents throughout Saanich—Gulf Islands.

The petitioners call on the government to take the required action to avoid runaway global warming, to set ambitious targets to avoid going above 1.5°C global average temperature increase and a number of other measures that would achieve climate stability, including through arresting growth in oil sands expansion.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC): Madam Speaker, I have a petition to present signed by a number of residents from Cambridge, Ontario, pointing out the dangers of consumption and treatment services sites and safe injection sites.

The petitioners point to a notable escalation in overdose, drug trade, visible prostitution, damage to property and other activities. They state that these sites are also in conflict with children's charter of rights, particularly article 33, to protect children from the illicit use of narcotic drugs and so on. They also contribute to significant and dangerous conditions, causing environmental contamination and increasing public health hazards.

The petitioners call on the Government of Canada to decline any and all applications for exemptions to operate safe consumption sites or overdose prevention sites, permanent, temporary or mobile, under the section 56(1) of the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act, within the city of Cambridge, Ontario.

• (1635)

HUMAN ORGAN TRAFFICKING

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to be tabling seven petitions in the House.

The first petition is in support of Bill S-240, currently before the Senate, dealing with the heinous practice of organ harvesting and trafficking. It seeks to end Canadian complicity in that practice.

FALUN GONG

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, my second petition particularly highlights the persecution of Falun Gong practitioners in China.

The petitioners call for the Canadian Parliament to be actively engaged in defending the rights of Falun Gong practitioners and other minorities in China.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, the third petition highlights the fact that our concept of health care should include disease prevention and health promotion, not merely the management of disease. It highlights the importance of self-care options as part of health care.

The petitioners call on the Standing Committee on Health to undertake a comprehensive study of the impact of uninsured self-care products and wellness services and of the barriers that exist for those wishing to access them.

AFGHAN MINORITY COMMUNITIES

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, the fourth petition highlights the persecution of and the challenges faced by Sikh and Hindu minority in Afghanistan.

The petitioners call on the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship to use the powers granted to him to create a special program to help persecuted minorities in Afghanistan. They also call on the Minister of Foreign Affairs to be actively engaged with her Afghan counterparts on this issue.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, the sixth petition highlights challenges and violence faced by the Coptic minority in Egypt.

Routine Proceedings

The petitioners call on the Government of Canada to prioritize principles of universal human rights and religious freedom in their foreign policy and particularly to act in support of Copts.

The final petition I am going to present in this Parliament highlights the persecution and challenges faced by Pakistani Christians, and in particular Pakistani Christians asylum seekers who find themselves in Thailand.

The petitioners urge the Government of Canada to take up this matter urgently with the Government of Thailand and urge for the protection and humane treatment of Pakistani asylum seekers. They also say that these asylum seekers must be provided the opportunity to apply for refugee status with the UNHCR and for resettlement without being arrested, detained or deported.

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Madam Speaker, I rise to present an e-petition on Cameroon. Over 500 citizens have signed this.

The petitioners bring attention to the fact that there are increasing restrictions on human rights in Cameroon; the government's violent policy of having the army and police open fire on civilians; and several years of deadly repression of the English-speaking populations that are repeatedly condemned by organizations such as Amnesty International.

The petitioners call on the Government of Canada to condemn all human rights violations against civilian populations in Cameroon and to prevent any human catastrophe that may be perpetrated by the Cameroonian government.

STATUS OF WOMEN

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Madam Speaker, the second petition I am presenting today is about funding feminist women's organizations.

Again, the petitioners call attention to the fact that women's organizations are the most underfunded in Canada's non-profit sector, that the funding is insecure, competitive and is taking time away from women who are helping other women.

The petitioners call on the Government of Canada to dedicate the political and financial support, resources and funding to meet Canada's long-standing international and constitutional commitments on women's equality.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I see one more member is rising to present a petition. Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the House to present the petition?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

HOUSING

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, I thank all members for their courtesy. It has been an interesting time for presenting petitions.

I am tabling a petition signed by dozens of residents of the Lower Mainland of British Columbia, who add their names to hundreds of others who have already tabled their names in the House of Commons.

Routine Proceedings

The petitioners are concerned about the mini budget that was presented by the finance minister last November, giving \$14 billion in Christmas gifts to the corporate sector.

The petitioners call on the Government of Canada to allocate money now for affordable housing to address the housing crisis aggravated by the heat wave linked to climate change, instead of giving billions of dollars to the corporate sector through tax breaks; immediately accelerate funding for affordable housing; and announce an emergency housing plan right across the country to ensure all Canadians have a safe and affordable place to call home.

* * *

• (1640)

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Questions Nos. 2478, 2479, 2481, 2482 and 2484.

[Text]

Question No. 2478—**Mr. Brad Trost:**

With regard to the total number of registered guns and licensed gun owners for each year since 2001: (a) how many Possession and Acquisition Licence (PAL) holders have been charged with homicide; (b) how many registered firearms were used in a homicide; and (c) how many PAL holders have been charged with using a registered firearm to commit homicide?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, RCMP systems do not capture the requested information at the level of detail requested. As a result, the information requested cannot be obtained without an extensive manual review of files. This manual review could not be completed within the established time frame.

Question No. 2479—**Mr. Brad Trost:**

With regard to the total number of guns reported stolen for each year since 2001: (a) how many were registered; (b) how many were stolen from licensed gun owners; (c) how many were stolen from licensed gun dealers; and (d) of those guns stolen from licensed gun owners and dealers, how many were used in the commission of a violent offence?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, illegal or stolen handguns seized or found at crime scenes are deemed to be in the custody of the police force of jurisdiction, and kept for evidentiary purposes. Processes and/or policies may differ from one agency to another, as well as reporting requirements. Currently, there is no national repository for this type of information in Canada.

The Canadian firearms program, CFP, is a national program within the RCMP. It administers the Firearms Act and regulations, provides support to law enforcement and promotes firearms safety.

The CFP does not collect or track statistics with regard to the origin of illegal or stolen handguns.

Question No. 2481—**Mr. Ron Liepert:**

With regard to the impact of Bill C-69, An Act to enact the Impact Assessment Act and the Canadian Energy Regulator Act, to amend the Navigation Protection Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, on Alberta's economy: did the government conduct an economic analysis of the impact of Bill C-69 on Alberta's oil and gas sector and, if so, who conducted the analysis and what were the results?

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.):

Mr. Speaker, since coming to office, the government has made it clear that economic prosperity and environmental protection must go hand in hand. It has also been clear that it is a core responsibility of the federal government to help get Canada's natural resources to market. The decision in 2012 to gut environmental laws eroded public trust, put Canada's environment and economy at risk, and made it harder, not easier, for good projects to go ahead. These changes led to polarization and paralysis.

Bill C-69 was introduced to restore public confidence by better protecting the environment, fish and waterways, while also respecting indigenous rights. In addition, it would provide greater certainty to proponents, leading to the creation of good, middle-class jobs and enhancing economic opportunities.

Canada's investment climate remains robust. According to the most recent "Major Projects Planned or Under Construction" report, there are 418 projects, worth some \$585 billion, already under construction or planned over the next 10 years. This reflects Canada's position as a destination of choice for resource investors.

Significantly, new projects have continued to come forward in all sectors since Bill C-69 was tabled in 2017, reflecting the continued confidence of the investment community.

In developing this legislation, the government undertook extensive consultations with Canadians. The bill reflects the feedback and advice from a broad range of stakeholders, including investors and project proponents, who indicated that they wanted a clear, predictable and timely project review process.

In addition, Natural Resources Canada routinely monitors market, financial and economic indicators to gauge the competitiveness of Canada's oil and gas sector. These data inform all of the government's policy decisions.

Question No. 2482—**Mr. Ron Liepert:**

With regard to the Trans-Mountain Pipeline Expansion Project: (a) when is construction expected to resume on the pipeline; and (b) when will the expansion project be completed?

Mr. Joël Lightbound (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Trans Mountain Corporation is expected to update, publish and submit for regulatory consideration a revised construction schedule for the proposed Trans Mountain pipeline expansion project, if approved. The Department of Finance anticipates the government will be in a position to make a decision on the proposed project on or before June 18, 2019.

Question No. 2484—**Ms. Lisa Raitt:**

With regard to taxpayer-funded flights taken by David MacNaughton, Canadian Ambassador to the United States, since March 2, 2016: (a) what are the details of all flights, including (i) dates, (ii) city of origin, (iii) city of destination, (iv) cost; and (b) what is the total amount spent on flights by the Ambassador?

Routine Proceedings

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the following reflects a consolidated response approved on behalf of Global Affairs Canada ministers.

In response to parts (a) and (b), the information requested is publically disclosed at <https://open.canada.ca/en/proactive-disclosure>.

* * *

[English]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, if the government's responses to Questions Nos. 2477, 2480 and 2485 to 2504 could be made orders for returns, these returns would be tabled immediately.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Text]

Question No. 2477—Mr. Brad Trost:

With regard to the Investments to Combat the Criminal Use of Firearms (ICCUF): (a) what has been the total cumulative federal actual spending on ICCUF since its inception; (b) what are the total number of firearm prosecutions initiated; and (c) what are the total number of successful firearm prosecutions?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 2480—Mr. Brad Trost:

With regard to the total number of serving RCMP officers in each province for each year since 2001: (a) how many were charged with a criminal offence that were (i) violent, (ii) non-violent; (b) how many were convicted of these crimes that were (i) violent, (ii) non-violent; (c) of those charged with these crimes, how many remained on active duty, broken down by crimes that were (i) violent, (ii) non-violent; and (d) how many lost their jobs as a result of these criminal charges that were (i) violent, (ii) non-violent?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 2485—Mr. Ben Lobb:

With regard to corrections to government websites since January 1, 2016: (a) how many corrections have been made to erroneous, incorrect, or false information placed on government websites; and (b) what are the details of each correction, including the (i) website address, (ii) information which had to be corrected, (iii) corrected information?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 2486—Mr. Ben Lobb:

With regard to Access to Information Requests received since January 1, 2016, broken down by department, agency, Crown corporation, or other government entity: (a) how many requests required extensions in excess of (i) 180 days, (ii) one year, (iii) two years; (b) in how many cases was the information released in the time period noted in the original extension letter sent to the requestor; (c) in how many cases did the government fail to provide the documents in the time period set out in the original extension letter sent to the requestor; and (d) what is the longest extension for requests currently being processed, broken down by each department, agency, Crown corporation, or other government entity?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 2487—Mr. Bob Zimmer:

With regard to concerns raised by the Privacy Commissioner of Canada about information shared on Facebook: (a) what specific safeguards does each department and agency have in place to ensure that information individuals share with government entities on Facebook is not exploited; (b) does any government department or agency collect information obtained through Facebook, including on interactions individuals have with the government on Facebook and, if so, what are the details, including (i) type of information collected, (ii) number of individuals who have had information collected since January 1, 2016; and (c) what specific action, if any, has each department or agency taken to safeguard information since the concerns were raised by the Commissioner?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 2488—Mr. Scott Reid:

With regard to the establishment of the Canadian Drug Agency proposed in Budget 2019: (a) where is the Canadian Drug Agency, or the transition office set up to create the Agency, located; (b) will the Agency be a stand-alone Agency or a division of Health Canada; (c) how many employees or full-time equivalents are currently assigned to the Agency or the establishment of the Agency; (d) which government official is responsible for overseeing the creation of the Agency; and (e) what are the details of all consultations the government has conducted in relation to the Agency, including (i) name of organization, individual, or provincial government consulted, (ii) date, (iii) type of consultation, (iv) results of consultation?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 2489—Mr. Dave Van Kesteren:

With regard to materials prepared for Ministers between January 1, 2019, and May 1, 2019: for every briefing document or docket prepared, what is the (i) date, (ii) title or subject matter, (iii) department's internal tracking number?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 2490—Mr. Dave Van Kesteren:

With regard to materials prepared for Ministerial exempt staff members between January 1, 2019, and May 1, 2019: for every briefing document or docket prepared, what is the (i) date, (ii) title or subject matter, (iii) recipient, (iv) department's internal tracking number?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 2491—Mr. Arnold Viersen:

With regard to the government's sale of assets over \$1,000 since January 1, 2016: (a) what were the assets sold, specifying (i) the asset sale price, (ii) the name of the purchaser, (iii) whether multiple bids were received, (iv) for what amount the asset was purchased by the government, (v) the reason for the sale; (b) was a third party used for the sale and, if so, (i) what is the name of the third party, (ii) was this contract tendered or not; (c) in the case where a third party was used, how much was the third party paid for their services; (d) for the government's sale of stocks, (i) how much of the stock was sold, (ii) how much does the government still hold; (e) for sale of privately held companies in which the government held a position, (i) does the government still hold a position in the company, (ii) did the government have a market assessment done before the sale and, if so, by whom, (iii) what was the difference in the amount the government projected from the sale and the actual amount received; (f) how much income did the asset bring in during the year prior to its sale; and (g) how much was spent marketing the sale of each asset?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 2492—Mr. Deepak Ohrai:**

With regard to each expenditure contained in each budget or budget implementation bill since fiscal year 2016-17, inclusively: (a) has the Department of Finance done an economic impact analysis of the expenditure; (b) if the answer to (a) is affirmative, what is the date, name and file number of any record which constitutes part of that analysis; (c) has the Department of Finance relied on any economic impact analysis of any organization outside government on the expenditure or not; (d) if the answer to (c) is affirmative, (i) which organizations analysed the measure, (ii) what is the date, name and file number of any record obtained from that organization which constitutes part of that analysis; and (e) what were the findings of each analysis in (b) and (d), broken down by expenditure?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 2493—Mr. Deepak Ohrai:

With regard to government advertising since January 1, 2016: (a) how much has been spent on billboards, advertising and other information campaigns, broken down by (i) date released, (ii) cost, (iii) topic, (iv) whether any analysis of the effectiveness of the advertising campaign was carried out and, if so, the details of that analysis, (v) medium, including publication or media outlet and type of media used, (vi) purpose, (vii) duration of campaign (including those that are ongoing), (viii) targeted audience, (ix) estimated audience; and (b) what are the details of all records of related correspondence regarding the aforementioned billboards, advertising and other information campaigns broken down by (i) relevant file numbers, (ii) correspondence or file type, (iii) subject, (iv) date, (v) purpose, (vi) origin, (vii) intended destination, (viii) other officials copied or involved?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 2494—Mr. Scott Reid:

With regard to penitentiary farms, and agriculture and agri-food employment operations of CORCAN: (a) in what agriculture and agri-food employment operations are offenders at the Joyceville and Collins Bay Institutions presently engaged, and in what numbers, broken down by location; (b) in what agriculture and agri-food employment operations are offenders at the Joyceville and Collins Bay Institutions planned to engage in 2019 and 2020 respectively, and in what numbers, broken down by location; (c) are offenders at the Joyceville and Collins Bay Institutions engaged, or will they be engaged, in agriculture and agri-food employment operations, at any time, off of Correctional Service of Canada premises and, if so, to what extent, at what locations, by whom are those locations managed, in what numbers, and for what purposes, listed by location; (d) does Correctional Service of Canada or CORCAN have any contracts or relationships, with respect to labour provided through agriculture and agri-food employment operations at the Joyceville and Collins Bay Institutions, with Feihe International or Feihe Canada Royal Milk and, if so, when were they engaged, for what purpose, for what length of time, under what conditions, for what locations, and how will offenders at the Joyceville and Collins Bay Institutions be involved and to what extent, broken down by contract or relationship; (e) does the Correctional Service of Canada or CORCAN have any supply agreements, with respect to products generated by agriculture and agri-food employment operations at the Joyceville and Collins Bay Institutions, with Feihe International or Feihe Canada Royal Milk and, if so, when were they engaged, for what purpose, for what length of time, under what conditions, for what locations, and how will offenders at the Joyceville and Collins Bay Institutions be involved and to what extent, broken down by agreement; (f) of the \$4.3 million allocated over five years in Budget 2018 for agriculture and agri-food employment operations at penitentiary farms, how much has been spent, at what locations, and for what purposes, broken down by fiscal year; and (g) what funds have been spent from Correctional Service of Canada's capital budget on infrastructure, equipment, and improvements to penitentiary farm and agriculture and agri-food employment facilities at the Joyceville and Collins Bay Institutions, at what locations, and for what purposes, broken down by fiscal year since 2015?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 2495—Mr. Scott Reid:

With regard to Parks Canada water level management: (a) on the last occasion in June, July, or August 2018, for which data is available when a 12 inch stop log was removed from the Bobs Lake Dam, (i) what was the maximum water level increase (in centimetres) measured at Beveridge Dam, Lower Rideau Lake, and Poonamalie Locks, respectively, (ii) what was the period of time before the maximum water level increase was registered at Beveridge Dam, Lower Rideau Lake, and Poonamalie

Locks, respectively; (b) what are the water levels on Christie Lake, in 5 centimetre increments, from 154.5 metres to 156 metres above mean sea level (MAMSL) in relation to the rates of water flow, in cubic meters per second (CMPS), leaving Christie Lake at Jordan's Bridge (at the east end of Christie lake); (c) what are the water flow rates on Christie Lake, in Cubic Metres per Second, leaving the Bobs Lake dam, less the out flow rates at Jordan's Bridge, in 0.5 CMPS increments, in relation to the rate of water level rise, expressed in Millimetres per Hour; (d) how will the new Bobs Lake Dam be managed to mitigate upstream and downstream flooding and the potential resultant environmental and property damage; (e) what have been the daily water levels, from January 1, 2000 to the present date, for each of (i) Bobs Lake, (ii) Christie Lake, (iii) Beveridge Dam, (iv) Lower Rideau Lake; (f) what have been the daily maximum water flow rates, in cubic meters per second, for each of (i) Bobs Lake, (ii) Christie Lake, (iii) Beveridge Dam?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 2496—Mrs. Rosemarie Falk:

With regard to government contracts awarded to IBM since January 1, 2016: (a) how many sole-sourced contracts have been awarded to IBM; (b) what are the descriptions of these contracts; (c) what are the dollar amounts for these contracts; and (d) what are the dates and duration of each contract?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 2497—Mr. Michael Barrett:

With regard to the government's claim that it's Senator selection process is "non-partisan": how does it reconcile this claim with the Globe and Mail story which stated that "The Prime Minister's Office acknowledges that it uses a partisan database called Liberalist to conduct background checks on prospective senators before appointing them to sit as independents"?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 2498—Mr. Blake Richards:

With regard to partnerships signed between the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council and Huawei since January 1, 2016: (a) what are the details of each partnership including (i) date signed, (ii) duration of partnership, (iii) terms, (iv) amount of federal financial contribution; and (b) does the Prime Minister's National Security Advisor approve of these partnerships?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 2499—Mr. Blake Richards:

With regard to the approximately 103,000 non-citizens who were found to be on the National Register of Electors illegally: (a) how many voted in the 42nd General Election, held in 2015; (b) how many voted in each of the 338 electoral districts in the 42nd General Election; (c) how many voted in any federal by-election held since October 20, 2015; and (d) what is the breakdown of (c), by each riding where a by-election has been held?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 2500—Ms. Candice Bergen:

With regard to government commitments and the 271 commitments which, according to the Mandate Tracker, the current government has failed to complete as of May 3, 2019: (a) what is the government's excuse or rationale for not accomplishing each of the 271 commitments not listed as completed or met, broken down by individual commitment; and (b) of the 271 commitments which have not been completed, which ones does the government anticipate completing prior to October 2019?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 2501—Mr. Scott Reid:**

With respect to the West Block of Parliament: (a) is West Block subject to the Ontario Fire Code and the Fire Protection and Prevention Act, is the building subject to regular fire safety inspections, and on what dates have fire safety inspections taken place since January 2017; (b) is West Block subject to any other form of fire or safety codes or acts and, if so, what are those codes or acts, and what is the extent to which West Block is subject to each; (c) does West Block, as a whole, comply with the Ontario Fire Code and, if so, on what date was this certified; (d) is each space within West Block in compliance with the Ontario Fire Code and, if so, on what date was this certified, broken down by room or space, as applicable; (e) has each of West Block's stairwells and exits been inspected for compliance with the Ontario Fire Code or the Fire Protection and Prevention Act and, if so, what were the details of instances where concerns, instructions, or conditions were expressed or imposed for compliance purposes; (f) is West Block, or any space or part thereof, subject to or in receipt of any exemptions or waivers to the Ontario Fire Code or the Fire Protection and Prevention Act and, if so, what are the details for each instance the location, room, or space, the subject of the exemption or waiver, the authorizing section of the Fire Code or Fire Protection and Prevention Act, the reason for the exemption or waiver, the date of application for the exemption or waiver, the date the exemption or waiver was granted, by whom the exemption or waiver was granted, any instructions or conditions that accompanied the exemption or waiver and, if applicable, the date on which the exemption or waiver expired, will expire, or was revoked; (g) has West Block, or any space or part thereof, since January 2017, had a request for an exemption or waiver denied and, if so, identify for each instance the location, room, or space, the subject of the request for exemption or waiver, the applicable section of the Fire Code or Fire Protection and Prevention Act under which the request was denied, the reason for the denial, the date requested, the date the exemption or waiver was denied, by whom it was denied, and any instructions or conditions that accompanied it; (h) what spaces in West Block have been identified as being potentially hazardous due to a likelihood of congestion in the event of a fire, evacuation, or other emergency, identifying in each instance the space, the identified hazard, the reason, and any amelioration actions or procedures that have been adopted; (i) have any complaints or concerns been received respecting West Block's doorways, exits, stairwells, or exit, emergency, or traffic flow signage and, if so, identify in each instance the nature and details of the complaint or concern, the date on which it was received, the institutional or professional affiliation of the source of the complaint or concern, and any actions taken to ameliorate it; (j) respecting installed exit signage, which consists of overhead or high, wall-mounted rectangular signs featuring a white human figure on a green background, what requirements, guidelines, or standards governed and informed the selection, design, placement, and function of this exit signage; and (k) respecting installed exit signage, what are the reasons for using the white-on-green signage, versus red, text-based signage or other types of signage?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 2502—Mr. Don Davies:

With regard to federal government investments in housing, for each of the fiscal year since 2015-16: (a) what was the total amount of federal funding spent on housing in the city of Vancouver; (b) what was the total amount of federal funding spent on housing in the federal riding of Vancouver Kingsway; (c) how much funding was allocated to each of the following programs and initiatives in the city of Vancouver (i) the Rental Construction Financing initiative, (ii) Proposal Development Funding, (iii) Investment in Affordable Housing, (iv) Affordable Housing Innovation Fund, (v) Non-profit On-Reserve Funding, (vi) Prepayment, (vii) Reno & Retrofit CMHC, (viii) Renovation Programs On Reserve, (ix) Retrofit On-Reserve and Seed Funding; (d) how much funding was allocated to each of the following programs and initiatives in the federal riding of Vancouver Kingsway (i) the Rental Construction Financing initiative, (ii) Proposal Development Funding, (iii) Investment in Affordable Housing, (iv) Affordable Housing Innovation Fund, (v) Non-profit On-Reserve Funding, (vi) Prepayment, (vii) Reno & Retrofit CMHC, (viii) Renovation Programs On Reserve, (ix) Retrofit On-Reserve and Seed Funding; (e) how much federal funding was allocated to housing subsidies in the city of Vancouver for (i) Non-Profit On-Reserve Housing, (ii) Co-operative Housing, (iii) Urban Native Housing, (iv) Non-Profit Housing, (v) Index Linked, (vi) Mortgage Co-operatives, (vii) Rent Geared to Income, (viii) and Federal Community Housing Initiative; (f) how much federal funding was allocated to housing subsidies in the federal riding of Vancouver Kingsway for (i) Non-Profit On-Reserve Housing, (ii) Co-operative Housing, (iii) Urban Native Housing, (iv) Non-Profit Housing, (v) Index Linked, (vi) Mortgage Co-operatives, (vii) Rent Geared to Income, (viii) and Federal Community Housing Initiative; (g) what was the total amount of federal housing funding distributed as grants in the city of Vancouver; (h) what was the total

amount of federal housing funding distributed as grants in the federal riding of Vancouver Kingsway; (i) what was the total amount of federal housing funding distributed as loans in the city of Vancouver; (j) what was the total amount of federal housing funding distributed as loans in the federal riding of Vancouver Kingsway?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 2503—Mr. Don Davies:

What is the total amount of federal government funding for each fiscal year from 2015-16 to 2019-20 allocated within the constituency of Vancouver Kingsway, broken down by (i) department or agency, (ii) initiative, (iii) amount?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 2504—Mr. Dan Albas:

With regard to the Allowance for people aged 60 to 64 program: (a) how many people receive this allowance each year; (b) how many people apply; (c) how many request are approved; (d) for the request that are denied, what are the three most common reasons invoked; (e) how many people are deemed ineligible, and what are the three most common reasons; (f) what was the total budget to deliver the program, broken down for the last five years; (g) what was actually spent in the last five years, broken down by province and territory; (h) how many full-time equivalent and part-time equivalent work directly on the program; (i) how much does the program cost to administer; (j) how is the program marketed; (k) what were the advertising costs and how much was budgeted and spent in the last five years; (l) has the government reviewed this program and, if so, what was found; and (m) for the reviews in (l), are there reports of reviews available online and, if so, where?

(Return tabled)

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I ask that all remaining questions be allowed to stand.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

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

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

*Government Orders***GOVERNMENT ORDERS***[English]***CANADA-UNITED STATES-MEXICO AGREEMENT
IMPLEMENTATION ACT**

The House resumed from June 18 consideration of the motion that Bill C-100, An Act to implement the Agreement between Canada, the United States of America and the United Mexican States, be read the second time and referred to a committee, and of the amendment.

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Madam Speaker, let me say, as I probably rise for the last time in this Parliament, how honoured I am to represent the good people of Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, how much I have learned from my colleagues here, but also how invigorated I am by the greatness of this country and my commitment to work hard for the people I represent.

As I join this debate today, I feel compelled to make a few observations. To be clear, Canada did not ask to be put in this position. However, as we know, the U.S. election resulted in a new administration, with a mandate, among other things, to renegotiate NAFTA. That is where all of this started.

I think we can all agree that this particular renegotiated agreement resulted in an outcome that is less than ideal, but of course, it could have been much worse. Many concessions were made, and we still have unresolved issues, such as the lack of a deal for Canadian softwood lumber, something that is critically important to my riding.

Ultimately, it is not a secret that the official opposition will be supporting this deal. Unlike the third party, we do believe it is better than no deal. However, that does not mean that there are not some lessons to be learned here.

To me, it is deeply troubling that the Prime Minister went into these negotiations with his usual theme of demanding things that are all about building his brand and appealing to his base of supporters. In other words, the Prime Minister thought he saw an opportunity to score some political points and feed the brand. This is not unlike what he tried to do when he approached China.

In both cases, he failed miserably. Why would he not fail miserably? Would we as Canadians accept another leader trying to push his or her own values onto us? We simply would not accept that. What nation would? However, that is precisely what the Prime Minister attempted to do. Some may call this arrogance. Whatever we call it, it was easily foreseeable that it was a path to failure.

However, the Prime Minister did not care and went about his virtue-signalling anyway, so we ended up on the sidelines: Canada, a world leader, on the sidelines. There we were, on the sidelines with our biggest trading partner, while Mexico was in the driver's seat, getting the deal done.

Here is the thing. Mexico did get it done. Let us look at its approach. Mexico did not use the trade negotiations as some sort of domestic political opportunity to score points. Mexico did not use this as an opportunity for virtue-signalling. Mexico did not have a lead minister giving a speech within the United States of America that took veiled potshots at the U.S. administration. Mexico

discussed issues related to trade and did so professionally. It is easy to see why that approach worked so well for it.

Our approach, led by the Prime Minister, was a complete failure. It did not have to be that way. I can tell colleagues that, on this side of the House, we would have taken a much different approach. I am actually quite confident that there are members on the government side of the House, whom I have worked with at various committees, who I suspect would have also taken a much different approach. I believe it is important to reflect on these things so that we can learn from them.

Canada should never again be in a situation where we are sitting on the sidelines with our greatest trading partner, while Mexico is driving the bus. I hope that is one thing we can all agree on. Perhaps that is why we are now hearing the name of Mark Carney, because there are other Liberals who feel the same way.

Now we have a new deal. Whether it is called the new NAFTA, NAFTA 0.5, USMCA, CUSMA, or whatever, there is something we should all think about. Recently, Jack Mintz wrote a very good piece on investment fleeing Canada. Members who have read the article would know that it debunks some Liberal talking points that had been carefully cherry-picked.

As an example, yes, investment in Canada was up in 2018. However, that sounds good until we consider that it was up from 2017, and 2017 was an absolute disaster of a year. Even in 2018, it was still below where things were in 2015. Yes, I mean that 2015.

• (1645)

Yes, investment in the U.S.A. is down, but that is outside investment. There is a large increase in U.S. domestic capital now staying in the United States. This means it is not coming to Canada.

Why should we care about that? Let us look at our automotive sector. Yes, there is still some investment in Canada, but there is considerably more occurring in the United States and Mexico. Mexico, in particular, has been a hot spot for automotive investment. Let us think about that. Mexico has no carbon tax. It has no new and enhanced CPP causing premiums and payroll taxes to increase every month. Much of its industrial power is cheap, and I would even say it is dirty.

CUSMA does more to address some of those issues than the NAFTA deal it replaces, but we also have to recognize that foreign investment in Canada is not the rose garden the Liberals are trying to suggest it is. This is a deal among three countries. If we become the most expensive, most regulated and most inefficient country to do business in, we lose collectively as a country.

The Prime Minister can continue to be virtuous. He can continue to ask people to pay just a little bit more. He can continue to lecture others for not sharing his values. However, at the end of the day, none of those things are going to attract the investment we need to make the most of this deal.

Government Orders

While we are on the subject of trade, I note that last week, during question period in this place, the Prime Minister vilified former prime minister Harper close to a dozen times. As the Liberals' good friend Warren Kinsella recently pointed out, the Prime Minister is looking "for an enemy to demonize".

I mention that because the former Conservative government of Mr. Harper concluded more free trade agreements than any prime minister in the modern era. It is not as if the Liberals, or the Prime Minister, would be unaware of this, because they sat in this place during the last Parliament and voted in support of all those new trade agreements, yet the Prime Minister turns around and vilifies the former prime minister, who has a demonstrably more successful record on trade agreements.

However, perhaps that is preferable to talking about the lack of progress on Canadian softwood. I looked up on the Open Parliament website how many times the Prime Minister has even mentioned the word "softwood". The answer is 18 times since 2016. The vast majority of those times were only because he was answering questions on softwood lumber asked by the opposition.

How many times has he referenced Stephen Harper? It is 190 times, and it will probably be more than 200 after today's question period. With the Prime Minister's priorities so focused on vilifying Mr. Harper instead of focusing on softwood lumber, is it any wonder he has made zero progress on this file?

Why do I point this out? I point this out because lumber mills are closing all across British Columbia at an alarming rate. My riding has lost lumber mills. I know first-hand what that does to a small rural community. It is devastating. However, there is complete silence from the Prime Minister regarding softwood lumber unless he is asked about it by the opposition in this place. Why? Maybe it is because he is too busy vilifying Mr. Harper.

In my view, that is not acceptable. B.C. forest workers deserve better. They deserve to know that they have a prime minister in Ottawa working to reach a softwood lumber deal.

I sometimes wonder whether, if Mexico had a vibrant softwood lumber sector, we would now have a deal done by extension as well. It is clear that Mexico has a more effective track record in these negotiations than the brand-first approach of the Prime Minister.

To summarize, we did not ask to be in this situation, clearly. However, I believe the approach taken by the Prime Minister to try to use this as a political opportunity was deeply flawed and made a bad situation worse.

• (1650)

Again, as evidence of that, I say to look no further than the approach taken by Mexico and the success that it had while we sat on the sidelines.

I have raised this point with ministers of the Crown. They told us that the meetings between the United States and Mexico were simply on bilateral issues that had nothing to do with Canada. However, they came out with a trilateral agreement, and Canada had a take-it-or-leave-it moment.

Despite the many concessions that the Prime Minister has made on this file, we can still make the most of it, but only if we recognize that we need to be more competitive. We have a regulatory environment in which things can get done in Canada. Many people have raised alarm bells, particularly the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, and not just about the lack of investment but also the ability to get things done.

The Leader of the Opposition today clearly asked the Prime Minister several times for the date for the Trans Mountain pipeline. The Prime Minister promised the Trans Mountain pipeline, one of the most important projects on the deck and one of the only ones on the deck, would go forward to help build the national interest, but the Prime Minister cannot give a date.

Originally, the Liberals said that it would be operating this calendar year. Again, I would submit that one need to look no further than the Trans Mountain pipeline as evidence as to where the challenges are. It has been four years, and still there is not a shovel in the ground. The fact that the Liberal government had to buy the project to save Kinder Morgan from the embarrassment of not being able to build it in a timely manner is all part of the problem. The fact that today even the government has serious challenges in trying to navigate the process to get it done is telling. Does anyone seriously believe that Bill C-69 and Bill C-48 will make it easier to invest in Canada?

The Prime Minister says that tankers can operate totally safely in one part of British Columbia and in other parts of Canada, but are so dangerous in another part of British Columbia that they must be banned. Does anyone seriously think that makes sense? In fact, a number of the senators in the other place have commented on the lack of scientific evidence on Bill C-48. The committee that studied it in depth recommended that the bill not proceed.

The approaches of the current government do not reconcile. These are the types of mixed messages that are just not helpful. However, I remain hopeful that we can become more competitive and that as we move forward, we can ultimately try to fully capitalize on this agreement despite the many concessions.

I would like to close on a more positive note, and I will add a few positive observations.

As we have established many times and in many areas, Canada and Canadians can compete and succeed against the very best in the world. As legislators, it is our job to ensure that they have a level playing field and unrestricted market access to do so. Therefore, I will vote in favour of this agreement as, ultimately, it will provide these opportunities.

However, I must say one more time that until we have full, unfettered free trade within Canada's borders, we are, as a country, not owning up to the promise of Confederation, and that falls on us. It falls upon the provinces that have not allowed Canada to become not just a political union but an economic one.

This will be my last speech in the 42nd Parliament, and I would like to share a few words on a personal note.

Government Orders

We all share the collective honour of being elected members of this place, and our families all share the sacrifice for the many times that we cannot be there for them. It is my hope that our families, particularly our young ones, understand that in this place our collective desire to build a better country starts and ends with them. I would like to thank all families of parliamentarians for their understanding and support.

• (1655)

I would also like to share a word with other members of this place. It is so unfortunate that much of the work we do here is often summarized by many Canadians as what transpires in question period. Much of the most important work that we do collectively happens at committee.

On that note, I would like to sincerely thank the many members I have worked with on various committees. Everyone I have worked with shares the same commitment to help ensure that the federal government provides the best level of governance possible. We may disagree on programs, projects and approaches, but I have found that we share a commitment to making these programs work best for Canadians.

A final point I would like to make should not be lost by any of us. The former Conservative government introduced a program to provide supports for kids directly to their parents. At the time, the Liberal opposition mocked it, ridiculed it, and suggested that parents would simply blow the money they received on beer and popcorn, but when the Liberals formed their majority government in 2015, they did not kill that program. Liberals saw the merits of it and saw that it was working so they made improvements to it, and now it is working even more effectively. I wish to commend them yet again for that.

That is an example of two very different governments coming up with a program and finding ways to improve it to ensure that it helps support Canadian families.

Trade is similar. After all, we are a nation of traders. We need to have these things that make us collectively prosper, that allow us to build stronger ties and relationships and provide the security and the sense of certainty that it takes for someone to start a business or for a country to get behind a new program. These are great examples of the work that we do when we are here on behalf of Canadians.

Thank you, Madam Speaker, for the time you spend in the chair. I am sure there are many different ways you would rather spend your time than listening to me, but I do appreciate the work you do and I am sure my constituents do as well. I look forward to the challenges in the upcoming months and in the questions and comments I will hear from my fellow colleagues.

Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the member across the way is a fellow member on the INDU committee. We have had a lot of great discussions there, and a lot of them came as a result of our connections with the Canadian Chamber of Commerce.

I was the president of the Guelph Chamber of Commerce. I was on the board of the Ontario Chamber of Commerce and worked very closely with Perrin Beatty and his group at the Canadian chamber, who were supportive all the way through our negotiations on the

new NAFTA, in particular saying we had to hold our ground when it came to the section 232 provisions on steel and aluminum. When we were successful, the Canadian chamber put out a press release saying that it supported the federal government's efforts to have the unjustified U.S. tariffs on Canadian steel and aluminum products lifted. It took all of Canada standing together.

It sounds like the member was suggesting that we should be more like Mexico. Does he mean we should be reflective of the labour practices of Mexico, or the safety practices? How should we be more like Mexico?

• (1700)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): 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 Saanich—Gulf Islands, the environment; the hon. member for Kootenay—Columbia, child care; and the hon. member for Courtenay—Alberni, the environment.

The hon. member for Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola.

Mr. Dan Albas: Madam Speaker, in my speech I pointed out that this is obviously a three-way agreement and that trade is influenced by many different things: the ease of transport, the tax regime, and tariffs, obviously, because that is what a free trade deal is supposed to deal with.

As I mentioned in my speech, Mexico has seen a rise in the development of its automotive sector because Mexico is not subject to many of the costs that are associated with doing business in Canada, such as the enhanced CPP, for which employers have to pay higher premiums, and the carbon tax, which increases the price of everything, particularly for processes that require a tremendous amount of energy, such as those in the automotive sector.

We must remain competitive if Canada, a nation of traders, is to compete in trade. We cannot take our products and services to other countries if we are priced out of the market because of our input costs. That is an area where we cannot allow Canada to fall back. I hope that when the time comes, the member will advocate for a new government to deal with the red tape and excessive taxation that the government has put on this country.

[Translation]

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet (Hochelaga, NDP): Madam Speaker, I would first like to thank the member for his many years of service. I know this is not easy work, and he has been doing it for a long time now.

I would also like to say that my colleagues in the NDP and I are fully aware of how important our trade relationship with the United States is. We want to have the best possible agreement with the United States and Mexico, but we must recognize that that is not what we have. That is also why there are people in the United States who want to renegotiate the agreement to get a better deal.

Why rush the vote on this agreement, when we could very well improve on it by waiting a bit and continuing to negotiate?

Government Orders

[English]

Mr. Dan Albas: Madam Speaker, I want to reiterate my thanks to the member for her kind words, and to say the same. We all should respect members who work so very hard for our constituents. I thank her for her service.

One thing I have learned as an elected official, both at the city council level and now as a member of Parliament, is that business asks for just one thing from government: certainty. While the negotiations kept going on, I heard right across the country at business round tables that people felt they could not make those once-in-a-lifetime or once-in-a-generation investments in their businesses on the Canadian side. Often the reason people chose to go south with those investment choices was that we did not have trade certainty.

I am fully cognizant that this deal is a sub-par deal that the government's approach led us to this position. I will support this only because the business owners I speak to and the people they employ are asking for that basic certainty.

However, we need to make sure that our entrepreneurs, our producers and ultimately our employees have a level playing field. Right now, I am very concerned about the competitiveness aspects of our country. While we maintain trade ties with Mexico and the United States, competitiveness is going to become more and more important. It is something that we should never take our eyes off of.

• (1705)

Mr. Omar Alhabra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade Diversification, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his gracious final remarks.

We believe that in order for trade deals to be successful, they need to be inclusive. They need to bring onside the majority of the population so that all people benefit, not just the large multinational corporations.

Which of these provisions does the member find to be virtue-signalling? Is the labour chapter in the NAFTA deal virtue-signalling? Is the chapter that promotes gender equality virtue-signalling? Is the chapter that enforces environmental standards virtue-signalling? How about the committee that includes SMEs in the trade implementation? Is that virtue-signalling?

Mr. Dan Albas: Madam Speaker, I will just go back to my speech.

Again, it is about putting forward values that may be important to the Prime Minister, that may be important to Canadians. He tried the same approach with China. China rejected that.

I would just ask it the other way around. If the leader of China came to Canada and said, "We want a free trade agreement, but here is what we want to see" and put values in it that are contrary to Canadian values, Canadians would rightly say that we were not in support.

In the case of Mexico, Mexico was laser-focused on where it could win. When we asked the government where it got any wins, the Liberals said that we kept chapter 19. If they cannot say where their wins are and can only say that they kept one component, it is not much of a win.

There was concession after concession, not to mention the steel and aluminum tariffs that kneecapped many in our industry. That was the wrong approach.

In my speech, I gave an alternative view. We should not have allowed Mexico to isolate Canada in those bilateral talks that ended up being trilateral ones. That was a key error, regardless of what the government says. I know there are Liberals on that side who would agree with that assessment.

Mr. Paul Manly (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, GP): Madam Speaker, I have a question about how the member feels about investor state dispute settlements being removed from the agreement, and also about article 22, which limits state-owned corporations.

In light of that, how does he feel about the Canada-China FIPA? It was an investment treaty, not a trade agreement, that was pushed through by the Harper government without any debate in this House, whereby Chinese state-owned corporations can use investor state dispute settlements to seek compensation for the loss of potential profit when our laws and policies get in the way of their profitability.

I am just curious about how the member feels about investor state agreements in trade agreements, about state-owned corporations, and about the Canada-China FIPA in light of those things.

Mr. Dan Albas: Madam Speaker, the member seemed most offended by the Canada-China FIPA, so I will address that straight away.

First of all, the member should review the Constitution. It is the executive, in this case the Prime Minister and cabinet, that has the authority to enter into agreements with other countries. It was actually the Harper government that made changes that allowed those agreements to be tabled for 21 days here so that parliamentarians could review them.

If the member and his leader want to win enough seats to form an official party, they can make that the question on their opposition day.

When we push Canadian companies to sell their products and services abroad, and they choose to enter a place like China, they may not feel that they are going to be treated the same way they are in a rule-of-law country like Canada, like the United States and like many in the European Union, where there is due process and similar values in that due process. They would ask how they were going to protect themselves in case there was confiscation without compensation. Having that process in place in places like China allows some protection.

I would be happy to speak with the member further about his views.

Mr. Omar Alhabra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade Diversification, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak on the new NAFTA. Before I start, I would like to point out that I will be splitting my time with my colleague from Nanaimo—Ladysmith.

Government Orders

Let me take the time to highlight, first and foremost, our government's record on international trade. Consecutive governments have talked about trade diversification and trade expansion, but most governments have failed. I acknowledge that the previous government, under Mr. Harper, had started some negotiations, but unfortunately, it was not able to close the deals. When it came to the free trade agreement CETA, while the Conservatives started the negotiations, they could not close the deal. When it came to the CPTPP, the Conservatives negotiated the previous agreement known as TPP, but it failed. It took our government's leadership and our Prime Minister's leadership to renegotiate it to include progressive, inclusive elements and revive it, improve it and ratify it.

Canada is a trading nation. One out of six Canadian jobs is related to trade. Our government has recognized the value of trade. However, we also know that it is really important to make sure that when we sign trade agreements, they are inclusive. We keep in mind our middle class, we keep in mind small and medium-size enterprises and we keep in mind gender equality. Those issues are not virtue signalling. Those issues are economic issues. Those issues benefit all Canadians. They help lift many people out of poverty and invite them into our labour force to ensure that everyone is benefiting from those free trade agreements.

I want to talk about how we were able to close the deal on CETA, sign it and ratify it here in the House of Commons. We were able to renegotiate and improve the previous agreement known as the TPP, the CPTPP, sign it and ratify it here in the House of Commons. In fact, we were one of the first countries to ratify the CPTPP. We were also able to renegotiate NAFTA, and now we are in the midst of the ratification process.

If we add all that up, that is 1.5 billion new customers for Canadian businesses and Canadian workers. Today Canada is the only member of the G7 that has a free trade agreement with all other G7 nations. These are not just any free trade agreements. They are fair, inclusive trade agreements that keep in mind the interests of all Canadians, particularly our middle class.

I also want to highlight our investment in expanding trade. Our government has put the largest investment into trade infrastructure and trade support systems in Canada's history. We have invested over \$1.2 billion in expanding our trade corridors, including ports, roads and rail. We have invested in the Canadian Trade Commissioner Service, which is our best asset. It is our Canadian businesses' and Canadian workers' best asset. It is Canada's global sales force. It is present in 160 countries around the world, promoting Canadian businesses and promoting Canadian interests, and we are proud to invest in it and to expand its presence around the world.

We are creating programs that support small and medium-sized businesses that are looking to expand and trade, because we know that small and medium-sized enterprises that trade pay better, are more resilient and are more profitable. It is in our best interest, if we want to continue to create more jobs, that we support small and medium-sized enterprises that export. Today only 14% of our SMEs trade, and we want to increase that number.

We have created programs such as CanExport that help small and medium-sized enterprises that are thinking about trade but are worried about the upfront costs. We are providing support to those

SMEs all across our great country so that they are able to take advantage of those new markets that are available to them.

● (1710)

It does not end there. In 2018, foreign direct investment in Canada grew by 60%. Why? Canada is receiving an unprecedented level of foreign investment, because the rest of the world is noticing that Canada has access to an incredible array of markets. The U.S. market does not have the same access to foreign markets as Canada does.

International businesses are noticing. International investors are noticing. That is why we have seen a 60% increase in foreign trade investment. Direct investment from countries other than the U.S. has increased by 300%. Those investments bring jobs to our middle class. Those investments bring wealth to our businesses. This is good news for our country and good news for Canadians.

Let me take a moment to talk about NAFTA.

We had to renegotiate NAFTA when the current President of the United States campaigned on tearing up NAFTA. He told U.S. citizens that NAFTA needed to be torn up.

We started the negotiations with the new administration in good faith. We wanted to keep an open mind. NAFTA was over 20 years old, and it needed an overhaul. It was a tough negotiation process.

I want to take a moment to acknowledge how Canadians of all political stripes and Canadian businesses rallied around our government as we were in the midst of a tough negotiation with our partners.

However, many on the Conservative benches, and other Conservative voices, were asking us to capitulate. The Conservative Party loves to brag about Stephen Harper's record. Here is a direct quote from a memo written by Mr. Harper in 2017. He wrote, "it does not matter whether current American proposals are worse than what we have now." He wanted us to capitulate, and he was encouraging people to put pressure on the Canadian government to capitulate.

My colleagues on the Conservative benches were asking questions in question period, and this is on the record. They were demanding that our government capitulate to U.S. demands. I am glad, and I am proud, that our Prime Minister, our Minister of Foreign Affairs, and our team did not capitulate. We stood firm for Canadian values. We stood firm for what made sense for Canadian businesses. We ended up with a great deal.

We did face a challenge with steel and aluminum tariffs, unjust and illegal steel and aluminum tariffs, but we hung in. We pushed and we advocated. At the time, my colleagues on the Conservative benches again asked us to drop our tariffs. They called them "dumb". Our retaliatory tariffs worked, and we were able to negotiate the elimination of those tariffs with our partner, the United States.

Government Orders

My friends say that we were virtue-signalling. I would like to know from them what part of this new NAFTA is virtue-signalling. Is the new labour chapter virtue-signalling? Is the new chapter on the environment virtue-signalling? Is the new chapter on gender equity virtue-signalling? These inclusive chapters will benefit all Canadians and will raise their wages. They will make sure that we have more productive jobs for the middle class.

I am disappointed in the Conservatives. I am relieved that they will be voting for this agreement. It does not make sense to me, but still I am relieved that they will be voting for it. I ask them to join us and agree that those provisions and this deal are good for Canadians and good for middle-class Canadians.

• (1715)

Mr. Randy Hoback (Prince Albert, CPC): Madam Speaker, I need to straighten out the record. The parliamentary secretary said that his government saved the TPP. The reality is that it was signed, and if we had passed it, we would not have had to renegotiate NAFTA. What happened? The government stalled. The Liberals dragged their feet. They kept hesitating. They kept making it impossible for the U.S. to move forward. If the Liberal government had embraced it and ratified it, we would not be talking about NAFTA today. That is the reality.

The Liberals have upset many of our trade partners around the world: China, Saudi Arabia, the Philippines. Which country has the Prime Minister travelled to where he has not upset someone?

The reality is that this agreement is not perfect, but it would provide stability, and business communities want stability.

Our structural steel is going to face tariffs in August. Our softwood lumber has tariffs right now. What are the Liberals going to do to solve those problems once they ratify this deal?

• (1720)

Mr. Omar Alghabra: Madam Speaker, I have a lot of respect for my colleague, but I find it interesting that he is doubling down on the old TPP. I find it interesting that he has taken the side of the Saudi Arabian government over the Chinese government. I find it interesting that he is saying that we should not be upholding our own laws or values. I am really—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member for Prince Albert had an opportunity to ask the question. If he has other questions or comments, then he should wait for the opportunity to be recognized again.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Omar Alghabra: Madam Speaker, when we are defending Canadian interests and values around the world, my hon. colleague should support us in that effort. Yes, we have disagreements domestically, but I wish he would not take the side of the Saudis or the Chinese government's side.

Our government has proven that we will continue to defend Canadians' interests. We will continue to defend the interests of the middle class. All of our trade negotiation results have proven that. We have a million jobs to speak for that, we have the lowest poverty

rate in Canada's history to speak for those results and I am very proud of our government's record.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet (Hochelaga, NDP): Madam Speaker, for some time now, the NDP has been calling on the government to establish a national pharmacare program that would cover everything.

However, the agreement we are currently discussing, and that the government wants to get signed quickly, includes patent extensions that would make pharmacare even harder and more expensive to implement.

Does my colleague not think that this kind of clause in the agreement with the United States and Mexico will hinder the implementation of a pharmacare program?

[*English*]

Mr. Omar Alghabra: No, Madam Speaker, I disagree with my hon. colleague. We have seen this before. Twenty-five or 30 years ago, the New Democrats were dead set against the original NAFTA. They said the sky was going to fall and that we were going to lose so many jobs. It has been proven that free trade is good for Canadians. Today, once again, they are trying to scare Canadians, again claim that the sky is going to fall and that drugs are going to be so expensive. It is not true. The short answer to her question is no.

Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to ask the same question my colleague asked. He was quite right.

I am going to read from an article by Bill Curry on November 19, 2015. This was 13 or 14 months before Mr. Trump was even sworn in. Mr. Obama was in Manila and stated, "We are both soon to be signatories of the TPP agreement." In other words, as my colleague said, we would not have had these problems if the Liberals had actually moved ahead on it. Mr. Obama was the most progressive president around and now, by doing this, there seems to be no leverage for the outstanding issues, like my colleague said, on steel, softwood lumber and the Buy American clause.

Could the parliamentary secretary please let us know how he is going to resolve those issues now that he has given away this leverage?

Mr. Omar Alghabra: Once again, Madam Speaker, I find it strange. Regardless of what Conservatives think of the TPP, and I disagree with him, the U.S. pulled out of the TPP. The claim is that if we had ratified the TPP, it would have solved so many problems, but the U.S. pulled out the TPP.

To answer his question, I can point to our record. Our Prime Minister, the Minister of International Trade Diversification, the Minister of Intergovernmental and Northern Affairs and Internal Trade and the Minister of Foreign Affairs have proven that we will stand firm to defend Canadian interests and Canadian jobs.

• (1725)

Mr. Paul Manly (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, GP): Madam Speaker, it is an honour to stand here today and engage in the debate on NAFTA.

Private Members' Business

Many of my constituents in Nanaimo—Ladysmith will know that I am very passionate about trade issues and concerned about international trade and investment agreements.

First of all, I want to say that the Green Party of Canada supports trade. We think it is a vital part of our economy. However, what we want to see in trade agreements is respect for environmental regulations, labour standards, health and safety standards, and consumer protections. These things should be increased in trade agreements, the way that the European Union does. Countries that enter the European Union must increase their standards and regulations to meet the highest standards in the union. We think that those kinds of approaches to international trade are important.

About 15 years ago, I was focused on a lot of local issues and worked on films about local water. Somebody had asked me if I knew anything about the Security and Prosperity Partnership, the SPP, and I did not. Therefore, I went off to Ottawa to go to the people summit and learn about the SPP.

I went to Montebello to document the protests that were happening there, and I happened to videotape three police officers who were dressed as radicals with masks on who were attacking their own riot squad. They were unmasked in the process, and all of their boots matched with those of the riot squad. This raised questions for me about why the police would be involved in this kind of incitement, and I have footage of them banging rocks into shields, etc. I wondered why they would be involved in this kind of incitement at a peaceful protest, and they were later proven to be police officers.

I became interested in the Security and Prosperity Partnership and started to dig in. What I found was that in this process there was a deep integration of Canada, the United States and Mexico as part of a fortress North America after 9/11. It also included integration of our regulatory standards. I looked into who was negotiating on behalf of Canada for these regulatory standards. There were 20 corporations for each of three countries, Mexico, the United States and Canada. There were some great Canadian corporations representing Canada in this negotiation process, such as Home Depot Canada, Walmart Canada, Chevron Canada and Ford Canada.

I started to study trade agreements a little more and found that there really was no involvement of civil society in these agreements. These were corporate agreements. Therefore, I really appreciate in this new version of NAFTA that the government has involved labour organizations and environmental organizations as part of the negotiating process, and I see that as progress. This is what we need to be doing in our negotiations on international trade and investment. They cannot just be secretive processes where only the corporations and the bureaucrats are involved. We need people who represent consumers, workers and environmentalists so that we have a fair process that can look at all aspects of trade and make sure that our regulations and standards are protected.

One of the others things I learned working on this film was about investor-state dispute settlements. Chapter 11 in NAFTA was the first time that a developed country had signed on to this process. It was something that the Europeans had used with their former colonial states to kind of keep corporate control over mineral extraction, etc. However, when I looked into Chapter 11, there were cases such as

Ethyl Corporation, which got \$5 million when Canada blocked the use of MMT, an additive that was a neurotoxin in gasoline. Ethyl Corporation said that it was an unfair trade practice to ban it. There are also things in these investment chapters such as indirect expropriation, and we all know what expropriation is; national treatment; as well as most favoured nation status. These are all things that are used by corporations to challenge our laws and policies. Therefore, I was really happy to see that the investor-state dispute settlement was taken out of the new NAFTA.

● (1730)

Let us look at cases like Bilcon, where a foreign corporation is challenging our environmental assessment process and getting \$7 million for doing nothing. It is not a process that makes sense. We see this used as a big stick by mining companies to get developed countries to accept mining and extraction projects.

We need to do something about softwood lumber. That is an important issue in my community.

I am also concerned about the extension of patents for pharmaceuticals from eight years to 10 years for biologics and how that will affect the cost of drugs. We see many people, seniors in particular, who are having to make decisions about what they spend their money on: rent, food or pharmaceuticals.

Article 22, the state-owned chapter, has a carve-out for the Trans Mountain expansion project. That is a concern for me as well.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The hon. member for Nanaimo—Ladysmith will have four minutes coming to him when we come back to the debate later on this evening. He will have five minutes for questions and comments as well.

It being 5:30, the House will now proceed to consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

PAROLE SYSTEM

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC) moved:

That, in the opinion of the House: (a) rights of victims deserve proper consideration in our criminal justice system; (b) the parole system must avoid unnecessary revictimization; and (c) the government should amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act prior to the next election, so as to provide victims with an explanation of how dates are determined for offenders' eligibility for temporary absences, releases and parole.

Private Members' Business

She said: Mr. Speaker, in the interest of how important it is to advance the rights of victims in a timely manner, I will be very brief in my intervention today, given the fact that we are in the last hours of this House sitting in this session.

Earlier today, I introduced a bill that would make it a requirement that victims be provided with an explanation of how dates are determined for their offender's eligibility for temporary absences, for release or for parole. This is a simple change that would ensure victims are given information up front, rather than finding out through some other channel that their offender was returned to society.

Mr. Speaker, I should be clear that I introduced a bill, and that today we are debating a motion.

This simple change could save a lot of heartache and unnecessary revictimization for the victims of crime. As such, I would suggest that if the government wants to demonstrate that it cares about victims, it can adopt the bill as its own. The official opposition is prepared to support it, at all stages, before this House rises, to ensure that victims are provided with the information that they need.

I have waited 11 years to be able to stand here and introduce my very first private member's bill and my first motion on the floor of the House of Commons. This is an issue of victims rights that is very near and dear to my heart. I am grateful for the opportunity and for the support of my colleague, the member of Parliament for Oshawa, in bringing this moment to today's floor.

Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Lisa Freeman is a constituent of mine who has worked years to advance this motion about the parole system.

To provide a bit of background, Lisa's father was brutally murdered. At the age of 21, she had to identify her father's body. His murderer was sentenced to 25 years without parole. Lisa, like many victims, found out that he was going to be let go early. This happened out of the blue. There was no transparency.

Passing this motion is a very simple thing the government could do to give more transparency to the system. It would treat victims with dignity and give them timely and accurate information.

I cannot overemphasize that the system is rigged toward the rights of criminals versus the rights of victims. To give an example of how bad this is, Lisa's father's murderer was transferred to a correctional facility within 10 miles of where Lisa's sister lived. She only found out about it 24 hours after he was transferred.

The motion proposes a very simple change and it would give more transparency. The government has run on transparency. Does the member see any reason that an initiative like this could not get unanimous consent of the House?

• (1735)

Hon. Lisa Raitt: Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate all the work the hon. member for Oshawa has done on this file and for bringing Lisa Freeman's story to our attention and to my attention in the House.

Fundamentally, the government and the rest of the House could pass this motion very quickly, as we stand here today. It is a very simple amendment. It would add one single line, asking for an explanation as to why parole would be given parole in a certain way.

Transparency for victims in these matters is incredibly important. It helps them to understand how the system works.

In the case of Lisa Freeman, they were part of the system for at least 20 years. They should have the ability to understand, at the very end of their journey through the system, exactly what happened. It is an ask for the government from this family, and many other families in Canada, that makes sense and can easily be done.

I would ask that the government consider this so we can give some comfort to families like Lisa Freeman's and other families experiencing the same confusion and lack of transparency with respect to dealing with the corrections system as it currently stands.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the issue of victims. Over the last number of years, we have tried to come up with thoughts and ideas on how to prevent people becoming victims in the future.

I realize this may not necessarily be on topic, but could my friend provide some thoughts on tangible actions that could be taken to prevent people from becoming victims in the first place, actions to which individuals could relate?

Hon. Lisa Raitt: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's question relates to a broader and larger discussion that we will probably have in the next Parliament, should we be so lucky to be returned to this place by our constituents.

That being said, one concrete thing we can do to prevent re-victimization is to have the government adopt the motion and ensure it passes here and makes it to the other place. People become victims in the moment and the instant that horrendous crimes happen to them. However, they are re-victimized and they continue to be victims for the rest of their lives, as the process unfolds through incarceration, corrections and then further into parole.

This one tiny aspect of at least understanding the reason parole is being granted at early stages would be extremely helpful for the Freeman family in particular, and I am convinced for the rest of Canadians as well. I hope the government continues to consider it.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.):

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in this debate, and I would like to thank the hon. member for Milton for moving this motion.

• (1740)

[*English*]

The motion comes just short weeks after Victims and Survivors of Crime Week. Members may know the objectives of that week.

Private Members' Business

The first objective is to raise awareness across Canada about the issues facing victims and survivors. They and their families must be treated with courtesy, compassion and respect at all stages of the criminal justice process. Victims, survivors and their families also have an important role in helping to ensure that justice is done, that during the parole process, for example, reliable and relevant facts about parole can be made.

The second goal of this special week is to let victims and their families know about the services, programs and laws in place to help and support them.

The motion before us states that:

the government should amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act prior to the next election, so as to provide victims with an explanation of how dates are determined for offenders' eligibility for temporary absences, releases and parole.

I will point out that information about offender eligibility dates is provided to victims already, but it is always worth examining whether there is room for improvement.

[*Translation*]

That said, the government already provides victims with useful and timely information in a number of ways.

[*English*]

In fact, last week, the government announced an important new step, a new victim outreach strategy to ensure that more victims would be aware of the information available to them and the role they could play in the corrections and conditional release process.

There was a great deal of collaboration in creating this strategy. Correctional Services Canada worked with federal partners, including the Parole Board of Canada, Public Safety Canada's National Office for Victims and the Department of Justice Canada, in consultation with victims and survivors. The result is a suite of communication tools to inform the public and victims of the resources and services available to them. The tools include infographics, videos and a social media campaign.

Another way that victims can receive information is through the victims portal. The portal is a secure online service, available to registered victims to receive information about the offender who harmed them. They can submit information electronically, including their victims' statements. These communication tools help victims stay informed, engaged and empowered to make informed decisions.

[*Translation*]

The Public Safety Canada portfolio is also working to ensure that victims of federal offenders have a voice in the federal criminal justice system.

[*English*]

For example, there are now 8,000 victims registered with Correctional Services Canada and the Parole Board of Canada. They are entitled to receive over 50 types of notifications. Last year, they received 160,000 pieces of information.

Along with more avenues to obtain information and give their input, victims have access to resources such as dedicated victim service officers, who provide victims with information about correctional services and the offender who harmed them.

Victim service officers explain to victims how correctional planning works and how decisions are made. They provide victims with information on the offender's progress toward meeting their correctional plan. They advise when parole hearings are scheduled.

It is fair to say that the rest of the motion aims to ensure that victims are treated even more fairly and respectfully by our criminal justice system. For decades, Canada's criminal justice system has been getting better at attending to the needs of victims and survivors, whether it is a matter of providing information, delivering support, or simply showing empathy and respect.

When Correctional Service of Canada prepares an offender's case for a parole hearing, for example, it takes into account the concerns that victims have raised in their victims' statements. Last year, victims presented over 300 statements at parole hearings. We are also taking steps to make the parole hearing process less traumatic for victims and survivors.

Members may recall that as part of the implementation plan for the Canadian Victims Bill of Rights, the National Office for Victims hosted consultations on the victims right to information, participation and protection in the corrections and conditional release system.

One of the early issues discussed at the round tables was the parole hearing process as legislated in the Corrections and Conditional Release Act.

Under its terms, victims unable to attend the parole hearing can have access to an audio recording of the hearing. At round tables held by the National Office for Victims, we heard that attending a parole hearing could be traumatic, such that afterwards many victims did not have a clear sense of what exactly was discussed.

Why not make the audio recordings available to those who have attended the parole hearing as well as those who could not attend? Why not enable them to listen again at a time and a place of their choosing?

That is one of the proposed amendments we have included in Bill C-83, an act to amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act, to strengthen victims roles in the criminal justice system.

This is just one way we can increase the number of avenues through which victims can obtain information and participate in the processes of the criminal justice system. There is always more that can be done, but we continue to take steps in the right direction.

● (1745)

[Translation]

One of the most important things we can do is prevent people from becoming victims in the first place.

[English]

The national crime prevention strategy provides leadership on ways to prevent and reduce crime among at-risk populations and vulnerable communities. The strategy's goal is to mitigate the underlying factors that might put individuals at risk of offending in the first place.

The Government of Canada is making up to \$94 million available over five years to develop inclusive, diverse and culturally adapted crime prevention projects right across Canada.

The national crime prevention strategy is another example of this government's efforts to reduce crime and by the same token, reduce the number of victims.

[Translation]

The government will continue to work with all our partners to support victims in every way possible.

[English]

Once again, I would like to thank the hon. member for introducing this motion and I look forward to continued debate on this very important topic.

[Translation]

Mr. Matthew Dubé (Beloil—Chambly, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking the sponsor of the motion, the member for Milton. Since I have been working on the public safety file, I have seen the consequences these cases can have on people's lives. If I may, I have more I would like to say on the subject.

I should point out that I support the member's motion. During the previous Parliament, we supported the legislation that was introduced. We had many disagreements with the previous government on matters of law and order and on how to achieve our public safety objectives. We did not agree on how to protect our communities or how to promote rehabilitation. That is also important to achieving our public safety objectives.

In that context, we supported the Victims Bill of Rights. It is also important to understand the impact these crimes have on the victims. In some cases, repercussions can last an entire lifetime, depending on the seriousness of the crime. There are gaps with respect to the enforcement of the act and the resources available to the Parole Board of Canada.

One example comes to mind, and that is the legal obligation to inform victims when there has been a change in the status of an offender who could cause them harm, particularly in the case of the most horrific and violent crimes. In recent years, some high-profile cases have brought to light how badly the law is being enforced. Some victims were not informed or were not informed in a timely manner, which does not respect the spirit of the law that was passed.

The government surely does not intend to change the law, but it must ensure that these organizations have the resources they need to

Private Members' Business

keep victims informed in accordance with existing legal obligations. That is one of the reasons why I support the motion.

It is not easy. In this digital age, there is a 24-hour news cycle and the news is available on television and on our phones. We know that, unfortunately, horrific crimes are being committed in every part of our society.

We need to look at this in several stages. I am sorry that I missed part of the parliamentary secretary's speech. At the end, I heard her talk about crime prevention. That too is important. From what I see and hear, victims often do not want other individuals or families to go through the same grief or trauma as they did.

Another way to show respect for victims is to prevent similar crimes from being committed against other individuals or other groups in our society. Unfortunately, as hon. members know, we have a lot of work to do in that regard. We know there are aggravating factors that can lead to a crime being committed. We need to address the housing crisis, deal with mental health issues and reduce poverty. Sometimes, through no fault of their own, people are in situations where their own illness or their difficult circumstances take them down a very dark path that has significant repercussions on the lives of other innocent Canadians. It is a scourge on our society. I think we can all agree that we need to address all this.

Something else that needs to be considered is the objectives of rehabilitation. Rehabilitation is key to achieving public safety objectives. I have said that several times since the beginning of my speech, but it is important. Unfortunately, that is rarely a popular aspect to address.

● (1750)

There are significant, palpable tensions within our criminal justice system. They reflect the need to understand that these crimes involve victims, who need respect and adequate resources so they can get on with their lives and feel like justice has been done.

At the same time, we also have rehabilitation objectives that, sadly, do not always align with the popular will. Since becoming the NDP critic, I have seen several cases. Listening to the parents of victims, I can only imagine the grief and rage they must be feeling. Those feelings are completely normal. No one here would blame them.

That being said, we need to gear the system towards rehabilitation, not to diminish the impact of crimes on victims or the importance of victims, but to ensure that our society is safe. The issue of record suspensions is a good example, even though the offence in that case is not a particularly heinous crime. In the case we are talking about now, these are people who will be in jail for the rest of their lives and who will never get to seek that kind of relief. However, I still want to cite some statistics, because they are relevant, even though the crimes in this case are very different from the crimes that are eligible for a record suspension.

Private Members' Business

First, 95% of people who were granted a record suspension did not reoffend. Second, three-quarters of Canadians believe that record suspensions, which allow individuals to reintegrate into society, are a positive thing. As I said, these statistics are about a program that does not necessarily apply to the crimes addressed by my colleague's motion, but I did want to mention them, because we need to acknowledge the importance of rehabilitation.

No matter how serious a crime may be, if the system allows an individual to reintegrate into society, we, as legislators, want this to be done with zero, or almost zero, chance of reoffending. This is also important for other inmates. Prison is often referred to as a crime school, and we obviously want to avoid that.

Since my time is running out, I will get back to the main point and reiterate that we support the motion. We do, however, have many concerns.

First, as I mentioned, we need adequate resources and ministerial direction to ensure that the current law is applied so that victims remain informed.

Second, there are some gaps with respect to the type of information provided, and we believe that the law should be updated in that regard. As the motion states, the government must address this issue to reconcile privacy and victims' needs. For example, the motion speaks about individuals' absences when on conditional release, but they are usually granted for medical reasons. It would be appropriate to inform victims when such absences are granted and to explain the process to them so they are better informed. A victim who is better informed is better able to achieve the desired goals, which is to get their life back on track and to grieve. We want to avoid revictimizing them.

We must consider all these factors, determine whether the law passed in the previous legislature was properly enforced, then think about how we can update it. That would be quite appropriate.

Earlier this week, in another debate on another bill, my colleague from Elmwood—Transcona spoke about an important element that I feel is very pertinent to the motion we are debating. He stated that the laws passed by Parliament often include a review period. Laws are reviewed after three or five years. However, this is often not done, or we seem to think that it is not important. It is our duty, as parliamentarians, especially in the case of a law on victims' rights.

• (1755)

I thank the member for Milton. I support her motion and I urge the government to take this opportunity to ensure that we do all we can so that there is also room for victims in this process.

[*English*]

Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to start this evening by thanking Lisa Freeman of Oshawa for the creation of this bill. I have known Lisa now for many years, and her public advocacy, which has led to this bill being introduced today, cannot be overstated.

Before I delve into Lisa's story and her contributions to this bill, I want to make it clear that I will not be mentioning the name of the man who took the life of her father in 1991. It is our job not to give notoriety to people willing to take the innocent life of another.

Lisa's father, Roland Slingerland, was brutally attacked and murdered in 1991. Lisa was but a mere 21-year-old at the time, and she was tasked with identifying her father after the attack. As a result, the murderer was convicted and sentenced to life imprisonment without the possibility of parole for 25 years, the standard practice for violent crimes such as this one.

However, 20 years into that sentence, the man responsible for tearing Lisa's life apart became eligible for early parole, for reasons that were never made clear to Lisa or her family. She was not told what her father's murderer had done to earn the possibility of early parole. She was not told why the Parole Board was considering releasing the murderer who had taken away the life of an innocent man, her innocent man. She was not told why her government would provide leniency to a criminal more than deserving of his punishment.

The fact is that Lisa Freeman was never even given a single piece of justification for why her country's justice system was willing to turn its back on the people it is designed to protect.

In the Criminal Code's current state, there is no legislation that requires the Parole Board to provide any reasoning to victims and victims' families for why the criminal who committed a crime against them is eligible for early parole. Many pieces of legislation protect the rights of victims. As this House knows, there is quite literally a Canadian Victims Bill of Rights, for the sole purpose of ensuring that the protection of victims' rights remains a top priority for the justice system.

However, the laws that we currently have on the books simply do not provide the right of victims to know: the right to know why those who have harmed them are eligible to be released. When a court of law convicts an individual, the justice system is not just punishing or rehabilitating a person; it is providing justice on behalf of the victim, too.

However, when a convicted felon not meant to be even eligible for parole for another five years is provided with the opportunity to walk freely in public, it is not fair to the victim's family to be kept in the dark as to why or how.

Another example of victims in Canada not having the right to be informed is the fact that Mr. Slingerland's killer was transferred to a prison in British Columbia that was only 10 kilometres from the home of Lisa's sister. Lisa was not made aware of this transfer until 24 hours after it occurred.

This is just another example of Lisa being in the same situation that many others find themselves in every day: uninformed. Since then, the killer has been transferred to a minimum-security prison on Vancouver Island. This facility has even been nicknamed "Club Fed" because of its lax restrictions on inmates.

Private Members' Business

This sheer institutional injustice influenced Lisa to become an outspoken advocate for victims' rights, specifically regarding the rights of victims to know why those who have inflicted pain upon them and the public as a whole are eligible to be released. She has not only been an outspoken advocate in my community on victims' rights, but has even gone so far as penning her own book to speak about her experiences throughout the entire Parole Board process, titled *She Won't Be Silenced*.

It is people like Lisa Freeman who make Canada the greatest country in the world. In the face of utter shock at the early parole announcement, she took a stand to ensure that other people just like her would never have to face the same treatment, the same neglect and the darkness that she was forced to endure as a result of the Parole Board's sudden and mysterious announcement.

I would like to take the time to read aloud a statement made by Lisa regarding this private member's bill: "Families such as mine are plunged unasked into unfathomable situations, and then further demoralized and re-traumatized by the actions of a government: i.e. the Parole Board of Canada, Correctional Services Canada, institutions that say they are supportive of victims of crime, which is, at best, an illusion.

• (1800)

"After dealing with Corrections since 2011, when I questioned why my father's killer was granted multiple day passes a full four years before his parole eligibility date, I quickly tired of the scripted lip service and virtue signalling of the Correctional Service of Canada, which purportedly assists victims but in reality does the opposite.

"Under the guise of rehabilitation, victims of crime often have to stand back and watch while violent offenders exercise their rights, which, as most victims of crime find, is nothing more than a mockery of justice and basic common sense. It was a quick realization on my part that any access to rights by the offender was in fact taking away from my rights, which has been proven time and time again.

"It is the responsibility of the government to ensure that victims of crime are treated with dignity and respect and to provide timely and accurate information in a transparent manner. With this legislation, it will avoid providing a sense of false comfort. Families like mine and indeed families coast to coast who find themselves trying to navigate the system at what is already a very trying time deserve more—and for the very least they deserve accurate information."

It is because of Lisa Freeman that I stand here in the House today to speak to this private member's bill that is proposing amendments to the Criminal Code that would ensure that all victims and their families are aware of how parole dates and eligibility are determined, because the current laws on the books fall short in doing so.

While getting tough on crime, in my opinion, is key to creating a safer Canada, victims of crime—especially of violent ones, such as the murder of Lisa's father—must not be forgotten. In every criminal case, the two opposing sides are the Crown and the defence. However, it is right and just that the victims not be forgotten. They are the ones who truly suffer at the hands of criminals. In cases such

as Lisa's, victims suffer not only at the hands of criminals but also at the hands of the government when they are kept in the dark.

The Parole Board grants 79% of day parole requests it comes across. For victims of crimes committed by people eligible for early parole, it is only logical and compassionate that they be made aware as to how those who have harmed them have a very high probability of being released into the public before the end of their sentence.

This is truly a non-partisan issue. Providing a reasonable explanation is not only logical but feasible as well. At this time, when the Parole Board determines a convicted criminal's date for parole eligibility, it sends a document to the victim who was harmed by the criminal's crime. All that is required under this bill is that the Parole Board clarify why the specified date for parole eligibility was chosen. The potential financial and procedural considerations are very limited, verging on non-existent.

This legislation would require that information regarding review and eligibility for all forms of parole be communicated in writing to the offender's victims. As such, victims and families would not have to feel uninformed about those who have harmed them. An explanation of how the dates for parole eligibility are determined would also be required in the written documentation. It is a simple matter of transparency. Victims deserve accurate and timely information regarding the parole process.

For every day we do not pass legislation on transparency for parole decisions, another victim and another family have to come to the realization that their government has neglected them.

This bill would avoid providing the sense of false comfort that comes to victims when they are misled about parole eligibility. Its purpose is to make Parole Board procedures more transparent and more accommodating to the rights of victims and their families.

This legislation has been applauded by advocates as giving a stronger voice to victims of crime. They will no longer be drowned out by the focus on the convicted. This legislation offers victims the ability to fully understand how and why the justice system is making decisions on their cases.

It is the responsibility of the government to ensure that victims of crime are treated with the utmost respect and dignity. To this point, the government has failed to protect the most vulnerable. It is about time this House takes a step forward to fix that situation.

In closing, above all, Canadians who have suffered as a result of an offender's action do not deserve to be re-victimized by the parole system. The current parole system is guilty of failing to be transparent. It is the duty of lawmakers in this House to repair the broken system. That is why I stand today. I call on my colleagues in this House to support this bill.

Private Members' Business

I would also like to thank my colleague, the member for Milton, for spearheading this initiative to provide transparency for the most vulnerable in our judicial system. It has been an honour to work with her, and this private member's bill is evidence of her hard work for her constituents and all Canadians.

● (1805)

Mr. Chris Bittle (St. Catharines, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to rise today and add my voice to the debate on Motion No. 229.

Before I do that, this may be my last opportunity to give a speech during this Parliament, so I want to thank my wife, Charlene, and my son and daughter, Ethan and Hannah. Hannah will be turning one next week, and Ethan will be turning three next month. They came after my election and do not know any different, but they make a great deal of sacrifices, like so many other kids of parents who work here on a daily basis. It is important to say thanks to remember them and those whom we leave back in our ridings to do this important work.

I also want to thank my constituents for this incredible honour of representing the people of St. Catharines here in this place almost four years.

Let me begin by first thanking the hon. member for Milton for bringing this motion forward. If there is one thing in this House that all of us can agree on, it is the importance of supporting victims and survivors of crime.

I would like to take a moment to recognize the dedication and tireless efforts of all those who work so hard to provide that support. We are all fortunate in this country to have a system in place that is there for people in their greatest time of need. That system spans different orders of government across different sectors. It offers programs and services that support victims of crime so that they can play an important role in the criminal justice system. It works to meet their needs and ensure that they do not suffer in silence. It encompasses professionals and volunteers who work with victims and survivors, helping them to get their lives back on track and making sure they are not re-victimized along the way.

I would like to take a moment to recognize the important work of Victim Services Niagara for the incredible work the people there in my home region do on a daily basis, and to recognize also the Kristen French Child Advocacy Centre. So many organizations across the country are working so hard and so passionately for victims of crime.

As part of that system, the federal government has an important role that includes support for victims of federal offenders, meaning those serving a sentence of two years or more. The Correctional Service of Canada, or CSC, strives to ensure that victims of federal offenders have an effective voice in the federal correctional and justice systems. Part of that involves providing them with information. Last year, in fact, victims received 160,000 pieces of information from CSC and the Parole Board of Canada.

That information is not automatically provided. Victims must register with CSC and the Parole Board in order to obtain that information about the offender who harmed them. However, the government has launched a victims portal to make that process

easier. The portal provides a simple and secure way for victims to register and access information. It also allows them to submit information electronically for consideration in case management decisions. That includes victim statements, which can be submitted at any time during the offender's sentence.

In addition to the portal, victims are able to reach victim services officers by email or by phone. These officers can provide victims with information about CSC and the offender who harmed them. That includes information about correctional planning, decision-making processes and the progress the offender is making toward meeting the objectives of his or her correctional plan.

Victims are entitled to receive more than 50 types of notification. For example, victims can be notified of the start date and length of the sentence that the offender is serving. With respect to the motion before us, I would also point out that victims are already notified of the offender's eligibility and review dates for temporary absences or parole. That said, there could be room for improvement. Debates like this one certainly help us to shed some light on the issue of ways to support victims.

This debate is also taking place not long after the government took important steps forward in terms of how it communicates and engages with victims of federal offenders. On May 27, in conjunction with the 14th annual Victims and Survivors of Crime Week, the government announced a new victims outreach strategy.

The strategy has two main goals: The first is to improve public awareness about the information and notifications that the CSC provides to registered victims, and the second is to bring greater clarity to certain aspects of the corrections and conditional release system, including victims' understanding of sentence management and the offender reintegration process.

● (1810)

Specifically, the strategy will see the Correctional Service of Canada promoting the benefits of registration. CSC would also promote the information available to victims through the victims portal and the benefit of submitting a victim statement outlining the impact of the offence on them. CSC is working with federal partners in consultation with victims and survivors to develop new tools to let people know about the resources that are available. These tools include infographics videos and a social media campaign. That is just one recent step that the government has taken to support victims.

It has also proposed a new measure under Bill C-83, which is being considered by Parliament, to increase the participation of victims in the criminal justice system. If that bill passes and receives royal assent, victims who attend a Parole Board of Canada hearing will be allowed to listen to an audio recording of the parole hearing.

Right now, that opportunity is only available to victims who do not attend the parole hearing. It makes perfect sense to extend audio recordings to all registered victims because it would allow victims who did attend a hearing and found the experience difficult and traumatic to have a clear sense of how things transpired.

Private Members' Business

All of these measures are complemented by the government's National Office for Victims. The office provides a central national resource for information and support to victims of federal offenders. It can answer questions about the criminal justice, corrections and conditional release systems, giving victims a more effective voice. Last year, the office distributed more than 6,000 publications to victims of crime, victim service providers and the general public. The office also helped to point victims in the right direction by receiving calls, responding to email queries and referring Canadians for direct services.

Finally, I would like to note the support the government is providing to victims and survivors of the despicable crime of human trafficking.

Budget 2018 included federal funding of \$14.5 million over five years and \$2.9 million per year after that to establish a national human trafficking hotline. Being from Niagara, I find this initiative to be incredibly important, because ours is a border community where so much of that crime occurs. Because so much trafficking occurs through that border crossing, it is important for my community to have those types of resources to combat this horrible crime.

I am pleased to report that the hotline was launched on May 29. It offers help and hope to victims and survivors 24 hours a day, seven days a week, 365 days a year, and it is confidential.

Victims and survivors will be able to use it both to seek information and to receive the help they need to find safety and protection. This includes connecting them to local law enforcement, emergency shelters, trauma counsellors, transportation and other services and supports. The hotline will also forward information to law enforcement agencies so they can take action against the perpetrators.

This is only a sampling of the federal measures that are in place or on track to support victims of crime. There is always more we can do to make things work even better for them.

I am proud to stand behind a government that takes this issue seriously, that has already taken steps to improve the support system for victims and is committed to working with partners on further improvements to better serve the needs of victims and survivors of crime.

Again, I would like to take this opportunity to thank all of those involved in victim services. It is an incredibly difficult job to help people through the trauma they experience. We talk a lot about first responders and the important work that they do, but victim support workers provide a significant component of that, the next step that is too often forgotten about. The work is important to help get people on the right track, to help them move forward, and I would like to take this opportunity to thank them.

Again, I would like to thank the member for Milton for introducing the motion and spearheading this important debate.

•(1815)

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

Mr. Speaker, it is important to recognize that victims of crimes play a very important and crucial role in the whole process.

We had a very sad story not that long ago in Winnipeg North. When I say Winnipeg North, I am referring to the inner city, north end of Winnipeg. A very young man was at home with his grandmother. Someone broke into the home and the young man was stabbed and killed. This touched on a lot of emotions in the city of Winnipeg. It had a fairly profound impact with the amount of attention it gathered. People rallied around the family. The deceased young man was supposed to graduate this month from Technical Vocational High School.

A series of public meetings followed. The victim was of Filipino heritage. The community, particularly the Filipino community, really came out to support the mother and father, both of whom I have known for many years.

I have relayed this message to the House, because throughout the process, time after time, we meet with individuals who have followed the story. People really want answers to a series of different questions, everything from why it happened to what the circumstances were. They want to know about the perpetrator who caused the harm. It is really difficult for us to provide answers to everything they are looking for.

I think of the family members. It was difficult for me. I attended the meetings. I think of Imelda in particular, a dear family friend, and the emotions involved in that. It really heightens the importance. Sadly, a lot of crimes take place in our communities. It affects not only the victims of the crime, but family members and friends as well. They need to have some form of understanding of what has taken place and a sense of justice.

I sat on a justice committee for youth for many years. In fact, I was the chair of the Keewatin youth justice committee for a number of years. We talked a great deal about the importance of ensuring there was a consequence for young people breaking the law or for inappropriate behaviour.

One of the things I felt pretty good about was the committee looked at ways to put in place restorative justice. Restorative justice is where victims meet with offenders with the goal of a disposition to provide some sense of justice to the victim. Obviously, there is a huge difference when someone steals something, or a relatively minor offence, compared to an incident where the victim dies.

•(1820)

Through the years, going back to the to the days of the Keewatin justice committee, to the days in which I was the critic for justice in the province of Manitoba, I have always believed there needs to be a consequence for individuals who break our laws. However, at the same time, the victims need to be taken into consideration.

We reformed our military laws through legislation in the last couple of years. When I spoke on that, I highlighted that the fact that we were incorporating rights for victims within it. I cannot remember all the details offhand, but the principle of recognizing and appreciating the need to have victims as a part of the process is something the government, particularly the minister, have taken very seriously.

S. O. 57

There are a couple of points I want to highlight. First, the government launched a communication and outreach strategy to provide victims with greater awareness of the services available and how they could access them, which is of great importance. We are in consultation with victims and the federal ombudsman for victims of crime, recognizing we can and should do better.

I will cite another piece of legislation we have passed. Imagine a victim of sexual assault decides to listen to the perpetrator's parole hearing for possible release. We can only imagine the state of mind of that victim having to listen to the parole hearing. Therefore, under the legislation we passed in the last year, victims can receive an audio recording of proceedings, which they can listen to on their own time.

Whether it is the enshrinement of victims rights in legislation, as we did with the military reform, or the example I just cited, the government has moved on these issues. I think we all recognize that there is always room for improvement. We can always do better. I think we all appreciate the importance of ensuring victims are recognized through this process.

I have had the opportunity to address an issue such as this. I mentioned this the earlier in a question for the member putting forward the motion. The best way to continue to move forward is to also look at ways to prevent people from being victims in the first place. As a government, we have been very successful, through a multitude of grants, budgetary measures and legislative measures, on things that will make a difference.

For example, Winnipeg North has some of the more challenging areas along Selkirk Avenue. There is a 24-hour, seven-days-a-week drop-in centre. As individuals become engaged and involved at that drop-in centre or they become involved with the Bear Clan, we have seen less crime.

• (1825)

I look forward to continuing the dialogue with respect to what the government can do to ensure victims are taken into consideration in all legislative and budgetary measures that the government presents to the House. It is important and it really does matter.

I always appreciate the opportunity to share a few thoughts on the important issues Canadians have to face.

Mr. Vance Badawey (Niagara Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to stand in the House today to speak on this very important issue. I have my Métis jacket on today in celebration of indigenous month. Aboriginal day is this Friday.

As was very well articulated by the member for Winnipeg North, victims have an important role in the criminal justice system and we need listen to their concerns on a regular basis to ensure they have a further role in the criminal justice system.

This government is committed to ensuring that victims of a crime are supported, informed and respected, especially taking into consideration what they go through. Of course, it does not end there. It sometimes continues. Victims need well-informed support as well as a government that takes into consideration the respect they fully deserve. It is very important.

Correctional Service Canada as well as the Parole Board of Canada and the National Office for Victims work together to provide victims the information to which they are entitled. We have launched communication and outreach strategies to provide victims with greater awareness of the services available to them, how to access them and how important that is.

As a government, we often find ourselves with our constituents, informing them and ensuring they are well advised on the many services available to them under the federal government, a menu of services. This is no different.

We will continue engaging with victims and the federal ombudsman for victims of crime and continuing to strengthen victims services and supports they well deserve and expect.

• (1830)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The hon. member for Niagara Centre will have seven minutes and 58 seconds coming to him should this bill come back.

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

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CRIMINAL CODE

MOTION THAT DEBATE BE NOT FURTHER ADJOURNED

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in relation to the consideration of the Senate amendments to Bill C-75, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Youth Criminal Justice Act and other Acts and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, I move:

That debate be not further adjourned.

[Translation]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Pursuant to Standing Order 67.1, there will now be a 30-minute question period.

[English]

I invite hon. members who wish to ask questions to rise in their place so their places so the Chair has some idea of the number of members who wish to participate in this question period.

The hon. member for Yellowhead.

Mr. Jim Eglinski (Yellowhead, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am very alarmed that here we go again with the Liberal government, through an omnibus bill, Bill C-75, watering down criminal penalties for serious crimes. What really irks me terribly is that impaired driving causes bodily harm.

Statistics in Canada today state that impaired driving offences are going up. Impaired driving is a leading cause of death in Canada, whether from consuming alcohol or drugs, and here is that government trying to include a softening of the sentences for it through Bill C-75.

S. O. 57

I wonder if the government could answer this. What is it really trying to do here? Statistics are going up and penalties are going to be reduced. How is that going to help make Canada safer for people driving on the roads?

Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that I am going to miss the hon. member. He is now my neighbour. I have always enjoyed working with him, particularly during our time on the industry committee.

That is not our intention at all in this piece of legislation. While there is a hybridization of certain offences in this legislation, serious crimes where the facts are serious will always be taken seriously, both in terms of the sentence sought and in terms of the procedure used if it goes by way of indictable offence.

Sometimes, under the same alleged offence, there are facts that point to a less serious situation, and here we give the prosecution service across Canada the option to proceed by way of summary offence, which is quick and efficient, making more resources available within the judicial system for the treatment of serious crimes, and they will always be treated seriously.

• (1835)

Mr. Randall Garrison (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke, NDP): Mr. Speaker, here we are on one of the last sitting days of this Parliament, and it is passing strange that the Liberals appear to be going for a very strange record.

In the last Parliament, I took a photo of myself standing next to a pile of bills on which the Conservative government had introduced time allocation. It was nearly half a metre tall. If we stacked up the bills that the Liberal government has used time allocation on, the pile would be of similar size. Even though the Liberals have not quite reached the 100 record for time allocation that the Conservatives established, they have used some kind of time allocation or closure on a greater percentage of their bills than the Harper government ever did.

Lately, we have had closure motions like this one. One of those motions restricted debate to a government speaker only, with no questions allowed. One of them occurred after four minutes of debate. This one occurs after less than two hours of debate.

Could the Minister of Justice tell us if the Liberals are going for a new record? I always like it when Conservatives and Liberals compete to be the worst.

Hon. David Lametti: Mr. Speaker, I believe that in the current Parliament, closure has been used 10 times. I coached soccer for a number of years, and the number 10 was always a lucky number. Many of the best players in the world wear the number 10. For a soccer fan, that is a good thing.

In all seriousness, this bill was introduced in March 2018. It has been debated in the House for a total of 22 hours and 10 minutes. It has been with the Senate since December. The Senate has proposed 14 amendments and we have accepted 13. There has been a lot of back and forth, a lot of study by both committees. I can go through the number of speeches and the time spent on those speeches, as well as the witnesses in front of either the justice committee in the House or the justice committee in the other place.

It is simply time. It is an important bill. We have had time to look at it. A lot of House time has been dedicated to it. It is time to move on.

Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the minister's being in the House and the opportunity to question him.

I tabled a bill recently in regard to human trafficking. I know we all think this is a very serious offence. I would like the minister's honest opinion here.

He mentioned the hybridization of offences: in other words, taking things that were indictable offences and turning them into summary convictions. For example, in some cases of human trafficking, it would be taking it from a high level down to two years less a day or a \$5,000 fine.

The reason I want him to answer is that, in Oshawa and Durham Region, human trafficking has actually doubled. I know the minister's intention, but there is a reality here. Two years less a day or a \$5,000 fine is very lenient when a person who traffics one individual can make \$300,000 a year. That is only for one person, but many of these guys are trafficking 10 to 20 young girls in our communities. The challenge is that Canada is becoming a country where this crime is being perpetrated because the system here is so lenient. Two years minus a day or a \$5,000 fine is just the price of doing business for these guys.

Does the minister think that two years minus a day or a \$5,000 fine for a serious crime like human trafficking is going to stop somebody from victimizing our young people, especially young women for sex trafficking and things like that? Could he please comment? I do not think it is realistic, and advocates think this is ridiculous.

• (1840)

Hon. David Lametti: Mr. Speaker, the first thing I would point out is that we rolled what used to be Bill C-38 into this bill, which deals with human trafficking and presents improvements to prosecuting human trafficking in the justice system.

The answer to his question is the same as the previous, which is that in the serious kinds of facts that he describes, it would be quite unfathomable for a prosecutor to proceed by way of summary offence. It would proceed by way of indictable offence and that is the way it would go. I would point out that across Canada, provinces are widely in favour of this bill. We worked closely with our provincial and territorial counterparts in putting this legislation together, and they are widely supportive of this bill, particularly on the side of the Crown. This is evidence that this is the way it is going.

S. O. 57

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am slightly disappointed that the Minister of Justice moved a closure motion today. Yet another minister rises today to limit the number of hours of debate in the House by using a procedure that is supposed to be extraordinary but that has become commonplace under the Liberal government. When the Liberals were on this side of this House, they spoke out every time this procedure was used. Now, they are joking around about this being their 10th closure motion. They are making jokes as if this were all a game. They are laughing at Canadians who are watching today and who are seeing a government invoking closure for the 10th time. They seem to be taking this lightly, as if it were no big deal, just another regular procedure, but it is supposed to be an extraordinary procedure.

How can my colleague defend this today? How can the Minister of Justice, who is supposed to defend our rights and justice in Canada, rise in this democratic chamber to defend the use of a procedure that is supposed to be extraordinary? The situation is rather ordinary and does not call for the use of a procedure to shut down debate and rush this bill into law.

Hon. David Lametti: Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed by my colleague's question because I just said that we spent over 22 hours debating this bill in the House. There were 78 speeches in the House. The Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights heard from 107 witnesses over the course of 10 meetings, and 50 submissions were received.

This bill was introduced in the House in March 2018 and in the Senate on December 3, 2018. It is now June 19. We worked with the Senate to improve the bill. All in all, it is entirely appropriate to use this measure to conclude debate today.

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan (Châteauguay—Lacolle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, although I am anything but a lawyer, my constituents and I are very concerned about long delays in the legal system. I see some major reforms in Bill C-75.

I would like to know if the minister thinks we held enough consultations. I believe this is a very important bill, and I want to be sure everything has been done properly.

Hon. David Lametti: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her question. The short answer is yes. We held consultations. We did a lot of work on different aspects of the bill.

This should be part of our response to the issue of delays in the judicial system. The reform of hybrid offences will give more discretion to our prosecution services. This will differentiate less serious cases from more serious cases, which will be allocated more resources.

This will also help indigenous people across the country, who are often overrepresented in the justice system. There are reforms of administrative procedures and also of administrative offences. This should help prevent revolving door justice for indigenous people. There is also a reform of preliminary inquiries.

• (1845)

[*English*]

Hon. Kevin Sorenson (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are in the last few days of Parliament, and it seems like

every day the government is saying it is going to invoke closure and bring forward time allocation to shut down debate.

Contrary to what the minister has just said, the process we go through here is this: Our committees look at these justice bills, and then we debate them here and send them to the Senate. Sometimes the Senate will send a bill back to us with amendments. Indeed, the Senate has sent this bill back with a number of amendments, at least 13 or 14, from what we hear tonight. However, we are not given the ability to debate those amendments. Our constituents expect us to do our due diligence.

We debated the bill prior to this, but the Senate has sent it back, and now the Liberal government is going to invoke closure. This is not just about closure and time allocation; it is about another promise of an omnibus bill. Bill C-75 is a 300-page bill that is an omnibus bill. The government has thrown everything in here, and now we are asked to shut down debate and get ready to vote on it.

The question that came from the Liberal side hit the nail on the head. That member said that one of the things we are concerned about is long delays in the courts. This bill is not just hybridizing many offences, but showing the failure of the Liberals to appoint judges throughout this country so these cases can be heard in the court system. Therefore, the Liberals bring this forward to basically push things through quickly, like a revolving door.

This is how the Liberals drew this up. Originally, offences like leaving Canada to join a terrorist group were part of this bill. It is basically allowing them to water down serious offences, such as advocating genocide, using a date rape drug and human trafficking. Yes, some of those may not be in there now, but that is the Liberal philosophy of criminal justice reforms.

I am sorry, but we are skeptical of the kinds of measures the current government brings forward, and we are very skeptical of the closure the minister is invoking.

Hon. David Lametti: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I disagree not only with the facts as the hon. member has presented them, but also with his starting assumptions.

With respect to appointing judges, we have set up a rigorous and transparent system to appoint judges. At last count, I believe there were over 350 superior court judges appointed across Canada. There are not many vacancies left. I have appointed 50 to 60 since I was appointed Minister of Justice.

With respect to the examples the hon. member cited, those are precisely examples of how the justice committee worked and worked well. Changes to the bill were brought by the committee and accepted by the government.

This bill has been in front of us for over a year. It is not a question of anything being rushed through. We have been quite deliberate. We have accepted amendments at the justice committee level. We have heard and accepted amendments from the Senate. There has been a good to-and-fro in a number of different situations. Frankly, I have no problem whatsoever invoking closure on this bill, given where we are in this session and given the amount of input that all sides have had on this bill.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House as a father from Longueuil—Saint-Hubert. We are grappling with a real crisis. Young women are getting dragged into a process that will destroy them. As a father, I am deeply troubled by that.

I know nothing about this subject, seeing as I am not a lawyer, but the point raised by my Conservative colleague caught my attention. It is true that \$5,000 sounds like a paltry fine. I do not know much about this.

The government says that we have been talking about this for however many days and hours, but when it decides to cut our debate time short, it is not respecting the standard regarding the number of hours that should be allocated to debate on a given issue. The Liberals say it is fine, but this is an issue I really care about.

Do they think all bills should be debated for less time? Is the Minister of Justice trying to tell us that the parliamentary process in general is too long?

The debate on this issue does not seem like an appropriate place to save time. This is such a serious issue that we should have enough time to discuss it fully, but the Liberals are saying we have talked enough.

Does my colleague think the parliamentary process is too long? It seems to me that it is shorter in China.

● (1850)

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

What I am saying applies specifically to this bill. I am talking about this bill only.

As parliamentarians, we have a lot of opportunities to reflect on legislation and take part in debates. As I said, there were 22 hours and 10 minutes of debate. At second reading, there were seven hours and 15 minutes of debate. We heard 24 speeches at second reading, including nine from the NDP. Everyone had plenty of opportunity to contribute to this bill. I can quite comfortably say that we had enough time. We have been studying this bill for more than a year. At some point we have to decide.

As I just explained, as far as human trafficking is concerned, which my colleague brought up, we incorporated Bill C-38 into Bill C-75 because human trafficking is a very serious offence.

Moreover, the system gives the prosecutor the flexibility to determine how to proceed. Also, there is always the option to proceed by way of indictment. The penalties are very serious.

S. O. 57

I want to assure my hon. colleague that we are not treating serious offences any less seriously.

[*English*]

Mr. Chris Bittle (St. Catharines, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is clear to me that the Conservatives are misleading Canadians in saying that this is going to reduce sentences. I have heard this time after time. What it really means is that they do not trust the independent police or independent prosecutors who bring cases forward to the justice system.

The bill would ensure that they would have discretion and would ensure that they could put people behind bars. Do Conservatives honestly believe that people who have dedicated their lives to criminal justice and fighting for victims would use the bill to reduce sentences?

What this would do is clean up the mess left by the Harper government. The Jordan decision was argued before we were elected and released after. After 10 years of making a mess of the justice system and clogging it up, the only thing we hear from the Conservatives is Doug Ford's plan to cut and make things even worse. They have nothing.

Could the hon. minister please tell the House why it is important to get the bill through?

Hon. David Lametti: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his work on the justice committee, to which he has brought his experience as a practising lawyer.

The bill is critically important as part of our response to the Jordan decision and to making the criminal justice system much more effective and efficient, while maintaining fairness for victims and making sure that the rights of the accused are also protected.

It is critically important that we pass this legislation. It contains a number of reforms that attempt to reduce delays in the system and attempt, as the hon. member has said, to give discretion to our prosecution service in general, which we think very highly of. As we know, at the federal level, it was, in part, created by the justice minister in the previous government, the member for Niagara Falls.

It is important that we move ahead with these kinds of reforms. Along with the number of judges we have named and the process we have created to name them, we are pushing the system ahead.

We have consulted widely. We have consulted practitioners and experts. Most importantly, we have consulted parliamentarians. That is why we are moving to do what we are doing this evening.

S. O. 57

•(1855)

Mr. Kevin Waugh (Saskatoon—Grasswood, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what the minister did not say is that they never consulted the victims of crime in this country. On the second to last day of Parliament, Bill C-75 comes to us. It does not show that they are taking the safety and security of Canadians seriously. We have seen this. They are attempting to water down serious offences in this bill, such as impaired driving causing bodily harm. The province of Saskatchewan has the worst record in the Dominion of drunk driving charges. I have talked to many victims, and they are upset with this bill, because they have not had chance to address it. Many of them have lost loved ones. When they look at this flawed bill, it is all about criminal rights and nothing about the victims in this country.

I would like the minister to answer that. What is the government doing for the victims in this bill, because they are upset with this?

Hon. David Lametti: Mr. Speaker, I reject his premise on this bill. I believe it is an attempt to mislead.

With respect to drunk driving, in addition to the measures contained in this bill, we have also passed Bill C-46, which strengthens our ability to react to driving while impaired. Again, it is the result of consultation with police forces across the country.

I categorically reject the idea that we do not take victims into account. This legislation takes victims into account. We met with victims groups seriously throughout the process, and I have since I have become minister.

Let me say that years ago, when I clerked at the Supreme Court of Canada and helped Mr. Justice Peter Cory prepare for the *Ascov* decision at the time, which was the *Jordan* of that generation, one of the things that were abundantly clear was that delays in the system did no good for victims. By improving delays in the system, we are also helping victims. We are helping families adapt to the tragedies that have befallen them, and we are helping them to have closure and move on.

I reject categorically any hint from the other side, any insinuation from the other side, that we do not take victims seriously. That is simply false.

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am thankful that the minister is here today to answer questions, because New Democrats have a lot of concerns. The government is again breaking another promise. The Liberals said that they would not use closure if they were in government and condemned it when they were sitting on this side of the House. Here we go again with another omnibus bill. They said they would not put forward omnibus bills. The broken promises continue, whether it be electoral reform or environmental protection. They are ramming through legislation without proper debate.

In terms of this piece of legislation, we have not heard from enough witnesses, and the Liberals have not produced this legislation in an evidence-based way. We are concerned that this legislation might even lead to more backlogs. We have concerns that we would like to debate here in the House, and we have not had the opportunity to do so.

Here we go again with another broken promise by the government. I would like to hear the minister speak about some of

the concerns New Democrats have and about why the Liberals are breaking another promise.

•(1900)

Hon. David Lametti: Mr. Speaker, my colleague is one of the first members I met when I came here four years ago, and this may be one of the last exchanges we have, so it is quite fitting.

There were over 107 witnesses at the justice committee over the course of 10 meetings, in 43 hours of committee time. There were 58 briefs submitted. There were also more than eight meetings of the justice committee in the other place and 40 witnesses during the Senate study. In addition to the usual letters and that sort of thing that come up through this kind of process, which has been going on for more than a year, we have dedicated a lot of House time and a lot of committee time to the bill. The other chamber dedicated a lot of time to the study of this bill. Amendments were proposed at the committee stage by all sides, some of which were accepted, some of which were not. The same was true at the Senate stage. There has been a lot of back and forth and a lot of participation.

I can assure the hon. member that I am quite comfortable with the amount of parliamentary input into this bill, and I am comfortable in saying that it is simply time to adopt it and allow these changes to be implemented in the system, because they will do people good, be they victims or the accused.

Mr. Colin Carrie: Mr. Speaker, I introduced a private member's bill that would change the Criminal Code on human trafficking. Right now it is extremely difficult to get a conviction in Canada, because we have to prove fear. The bill would align our definition with the Palermo protocol. In other words, it would allow easier convictions of human traffickers and also allow for training judges on human trafficking. Right now, it is extremely difficult to get a conviction.

I was wondering if the Minister of Justice could let all Canadians know if he would be supporting my private member's bill, or at least the initiatives the bill intends to provide for Canadians, especially victims of human trafficking.

Hon. David Lametti: Mr. Speaker, the bill addresses human trafficking and tries to make it easier to prosecute human trafficking offences. It is my understanding that our government will also take measures toward a better approach on human trafficking in upcoming weeks. I am pretty confident that we have addressed a part of that question in this bill.

[*Translation*]

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

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: *Yea*.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Call in the members.

• (1940)

[English]

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

(Division No. 1378)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Baylis	Beech
Bennett	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Boissonnault	Bossio
Bratina	Carr
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Casey (Charlottetown)
Chagger	Champagne
Chen	Cormier
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeCoursey	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Drouin
Dubourg	Duguid
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz
Easter	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Ellis
Erskine-Smith	Eyking
Eyolfson	Fergus
Fillmore	Finnigan
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr	Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones	Goodale
Gould	Graham
Hardie	Hébert
Hogg	Holland
Housefather	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Joly	Jones
Jordan	Jowhari
Khalid	Khera
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Lefebvre
Leslie	Levitt
Lighbound	Lockhart
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)	McDonald
McGuinty	McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendès	Mendicino
Mihychuk	Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)
Monsef	Morrissey
Murray	Nassif
Ng	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
O'Regan	Ouellette
Peschisolido	Peterson

Petipas Taylor
Poissant
Ratansi
Rogers
Rota
Ruimy
Saini
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tan
Vandal
Vaughan
Whalen
Yip
Zahid — 149

Government Orders

Picard
Qualtrough
Robillard
Romanado
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Tabbara
Tassi
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wrzesnewskyj
Young

NAYS

Members

Albas	Aubin
Beaulieu	Bergen
Blaikie	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boudrias	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Brosseau
Cannings	Caron
Carrie	Chong
Choquette	Clarke
Cullen	Davidson
Doherty	Dreeshen
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	Dusseault
Eglinski	Fast
Finley	Gallant
Garrison	Genius
Hardcastle	Harder
Hughes	Johns
Jolibois	Julian
Kent	Kmiec
Lake	Lobb
Lukiwski	Manly
Masse (Windsor West)	Mathysen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Nantel
Nater	Pauzé
Plamondon	Poilievre
Quach	Ramsey
Rankin	Reid
Saroya	Schmale
Sopuck	Sorenson
Stanton	Ste-Marie
Stetski	Thériault
Trudel	Viersen
Wagantall	Waugh
Webber — 67	

PAIRED

Members

LeBlanc — 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

MOTION IN RELATION TO SENATE AMENDMENTS

The House resumed from June 17 consideration of the motion in relation to the amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-75, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Youth Criminal Justice Act and other Acts and to make consequential amendments to other Acts.

Government Orders

Ms. Rachael Harder (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today in the House we are discussing Bill C-75. The bill is supposed to strengthen the justice system. It is meant to better protect Canadians. It is meant to reduce delays and it is meant to modernize the criminal justice system.

In part, it does this by facilitating the administration of justice down to the provinces. However, the reality is the bill is yet another example of the current government's dirty habit of saying one thing but doing another. It is known as Liberal hypocrisy, or sometimes people refer to it as Liberal logic.

At the end of the day, this will in fact severely damage Canadian society and our justice system as a whole. Despite the rhetoric from across the way and despite the current heckles, the Liberals decided that they would not properly consult with stakeholders. They rammed the bill through without giving it careful consideration, without paying attention to the call for further discussion and certainly without adequate debate in this place.

As a result, Canadians are stuck with a piece of legislation that has a number of flaws that are very significant in nature. One of the flaws has to do with hybridization. Putting aside the issue of reducing the penalty of very serious crimes for just a moment, which I will come back to, hybridization also results in many crimes being moved from Federal Court into provincial court.

The Canadian Bar Association had this to say with regard to hybridization. It said this "would likely mean more cases would be heard in provincial court. This could result in further delays in those courts". In other words, we already have a backlog within our justice system and the Canadian Bar Association is saying that Bill C-75 would result in an even further backlog, which is problematic because these individuals do need to go to trial. These cases do need to proceed, so holding them up even further is actually an injustice to the victim.

Furthermore, it should be noted that it is the government's chief responsibility to care for the safety and well-being of its citizens, to defend the vulnerable, to create laws that put the rights of victims first, which is why it is extremely alarming to see that the Prime Minister is actually pandering more to criminals than standing up for victims.

Bill C-75 reduces penalties for some very heinous crimes including participating in a terrorist group, trafficking women and girls, committing violence against a clergy member, murdering a child within one year of birth, abducting a child, forced marriage, advocating for genocide or participating in organized crime.

The members opposite do not like it when I say those things, it is an inconvenient truth for them, so their heckling gets louder and louder, but the truth cannot be concealed. These heinous, unthinkable acts would have a reduced sentence under Bill C-75.

Conservatives believe in the safety of Canadians being put first. They believe that it should be the number one priority of any government. We will continue to speak up on behalf of victims and we will continue to advocate for them to come first in our justice system. It is very important for me to stand here today and to speak to this piece of legislation because the rights of victims and the rights of communities must come first.

We have a Prime Minister who is much more concerned about pursuing his own agenda than he is about acting in the best interests of Canadians. It is not just with Bill C-75, it is with other pieces of legislation and other decisions being made by the government as well.

Bill C-71, which is the firearms legislation, was rammed through by the government earlier this spring. This was an attack on law-abiding firearms owners. Bill C-71 was rammed through without the government taking concern for the advice of law enforcement agents. It was rammed through without them actually consulting with legislative experts. It was rammed through without the Liberals taking the time to consult with and listen to Canadians.

When those in power turn a deaf ear to the people that they represent, arrogance incapacitates any ability for them to exercise logical thought or common sense. That is exactly what has happened under the current government.

● (1945)

The irony in all of this is that while the Liberals are letting criminals off the hook for committing atrocious crimes such as forced marriage, trafficking, terrorist activity and genocide, they insist on demonizing those who hunt or use their rifles for sport shooting. It is absolutely ludicrous. In what world does this make sense?

From the start, the Liberals did not want to debate Bill C-71. They did not want to consult, because that would mean they would need to listen and then would be held accountable to act on the things that they heard. Instead, the Liberals decided to push Bill C-71, the firearms legislation, through the House. They told Canadians that the bill is for their safety and protection, but it does nothing of the sort. It fails to address gang violence, it fails to address illegal firearm acquisition and use and it fails to address rural crime and violence. Bill C-71 simply goes after those who are already following the law, while rewarding criminals with shorter sentences or allowing them to walk away altogether.

It is very clear that what the current government likes to do more than anything is deceive Canadians. It is less about the safety, well-being and security of our country and more about appearing to be doing something good. If the government took Canadians seriously and really took the position of honour that has been bestowed upon it seriously, then it would genuinely want to strengthen our justice system and our borders. It would genuinely want to invest in front-line responders and make sure that illegal firearms are taken off the street and that people are kept safe in this country, but the current government is not interested in actually governing well. The current government under the current Prime Minister is more interested in its appearance, its image.

The Prime Minister told veterans that they cost too much. Meanwhile, he handed \$10 million over to a convicted terrorist, Omar Khadr.

An hon. member: Shame.

Ms. Rachael Harder: It is shameful. I'm glad you recognize it.

Government Orders

The Prime Minister insists consistently on putting criminals before victims. This is wrong, because Canadians elect a government to look after their safety, security and well-being, to ensure that this country is running on all cylinders, that Canadians have a vibrant future that they can dream for, work toward and step into and be excited about for their children and grandchildren. The bill we are discussing today, Bill C-75, which makes changes to the criminal justice system, actually puts this country at risk and victims in serious danger. It rewards criminals.

The role of every government is to keep citizens safe. It is to facilitate an environment of economic prosperity in which people are free to use their time, their talent and their energy to build wealth and achieve the financial outcomes they desire. This means protecting our borders, investing in necessary infrastructure, decreasing taxes, exercising fiscal restraint and scrapping unnecessary regulations. It means respecting the rights and freedoms of Canadians and celebrating the contributions of those who work hard, rather than turning them into criminals. I am talking about the retired widow who lives next door to me, the local business owner who serves coffee when I go there, the medical practitioners who look after our health, the students who dream for a vibrant future and the veterans who have faithfully served this country. These are the faces that government should be looking into when it makes decisions to rule this country.

During his time as prime minister, John Diefenbaker told party members, “I was criticized for being too much concerned with the average Canadians. I can’t help that; I am one”, and so it is today. Just as the Right Hon. John Diefenbaker did all those years ago, my colleagues and I on this side of the House are committed to standing up for everyday Canadians, those who work hard and want a vibrant future not just for themselves but for their children and grandchildren.

• (1950)

When we mess around with the justice system with a bill like Bill C-75 and when we reward criminals who commit some of the most heinous crimes imaginable and allow them to go free or we diminish their sentence to a mere fine, we depreciate the value of our country and we fail to look after the well-being of Canadian citizens.

In this place, there are 338 of us who were elected to do far better than that. I would expect much more from the current Prime Minister and much more from the members who govern with him. There is no greater honour than to serve in this place, to be elected by the people of Canada and to have the opportunity to function as a voice on their behalf. I would call upon this House to steward that honour and to vote this bill down.

Ms. Kim Rudd (Northumberland—Peterborough South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am a mother and a grandmother and I truly am honoured to be in this place. I feel I have a duty and a responsibility to represent my constituents and all Canadians. I come here with honesty and integrity. I listened to the member across the way talk about people heckling in a place where we could hear a pin drop.

It is dishonest and it is misleading. I ask if the member opposite is proud of the remarks she just made.

Ms. Rachael Harder: Mr. Speaker, I would invite that member to have her hearing checked, because there was clear heckling in this place.

• (1955)

Mr. Arif Virani (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and to the Minister of Democratic Institutions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I respect the member opposite’s commentary here tonight, but in terms of clarifications, there are significant inaccuracies that she put forth in her comments.

The member represented to this House that crimes and offences related to terrorism or advocating genocide are being hybridized in this bill. That is clearly not the case. I urge the member to actually look at the bill as it was structured and as it was amended at the standing committee.

I take issue with many things that she raised here in terms of our government’s commitment to addressing crime and our government’s commitment to addressing victims. I know of the member’s role on the committee for the status women and I would put this to her: This bill addresses intimate partner violence. This bill includes enacting reverse onus at bail for repeat offenders. It broadens the definition of intimate partner violence to include dating partners and former partners and it increases the maximum sentence in cases involving intimate partner violence.

In light of her own advocacy for women in this Parliament, would the member agree that those amendments serve the victims for whom she seems to speak?

Ms. Rachael Harder: Mr. Speaker, I respect the hon. member’s question. Certainly any act that advocates on behalf of victims is noble. Any act that would put the well-being of women and children first and foremost is absolutely to be commended.

However, there are allowances made within this bill that would in fact allow people off with very small fines or penalties after committing extremely heinous crimes. I would also like to add that if the member opposite and his colleagues are interested in the well-being of victims, it probably would have been a good idea to consult with them in the creation of this bill. That was not adequately done.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I too was surprised to hear my colleague talk about heckling, because she is part of the Conservative caucus, which does most of the heckling in the House. Every day, during question period, that is the caucus that makes the most noise. I am surprised to hear her say that there is too much noise in the House. I would like to know whether the Conservative Party has a new, no-heckling policy for debates in the House, including question period.

My question is actually very specific. I know it is not directly related to the bill, but since the member raised the issue of heckling in the House, I would like to know whether the Conservative Party intends to introduce a no-heckling policy during question period.

Government Orders

[English]

Ms. Rachael Harder: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives have always had a policy of standing up for victims and placing them as our first priority. We have always had a policy of advocating for Canadians who live everyday lives. We have always had a policy of making sure that our justice system is strengthened and that the most vulnerable among us are advocated for. We will continue that legacy when we form government in October.

Mr. Anthony Housefather (Mount Royal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we looked at this bill for dozens of hours at the justice committee, and I think I was looking at a different bill than the one the member was referring to. I would like to point out two inaccuracies in her comments.

First, terrorism and genocide offences were not hybridized under this bill.

Second, and more important, offences are not given lesser penalties under this bill. There are many offences that were already hybridized in Canada before this bill. All that hybridization does is allow the Crown to choose between an indictable and a summary type of offence. Under indictable offences, which they were before, the maximum sentence was five, seven or 10 years, but the minimum sentence could have been a fine. Therefore, there is no difference in minimum sentences and there is also the possibility of looking at the facts of the case and prosecuting it as a summary offence.

I would like to ask if the member was aware, before she gave her remarks, that terrorism and genocide offences were not hybridized under this bill?

Ms. Rachael Harder: Mr. Speaker, certainly when this bill was first brought forward, terrorism and genocide were included within hybridization. However, due to pressure that was applied by the Conservative members in this House as well as by members of the Canadian public, the Liberals did walk those two back, so I will give them credit for that.

• (2000)

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Cody Legebokoff is Canada's youngest serial killer. He heinously killed four young women in my riding. He just started serving his time, but recently he was transferred to medium security. I want to ask our hon. colleague what she feels about the current government's lack of priority for victims' rights. Cody Legebokoff should be behind bars—

The Speaker: I am sorry; I have to allow the hon. member for Lethbridge 30 seconds to respond.

Order. I ask the hon. member for Cariboo—Prince George and others, and the member for St. Catharines—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order. Order. That is enough. I am looking at who is talking right now. The member for Cariboo—Prince George has to stop.

Order. We do not need those gestures by the member for St. Catharines.

I am going to ask the hon. member for Lethbridge to respond in 30 seconds.

Ms. Rachael Harder: Mr. Speaker, I think the bottom line is this: Those who find themselves elected in this place find themselves in a very honoured position and have every responsibility to stand up for the rights of victims first and foremost. Bill C-75 fails to do that.

[Translation]

The Speaker: Order. It being 8 p.m., pursuant to order made earlier today, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the amendments tabled by the Senate to Bill C-75 now before the House.

[English]

Order. What I am hearing is over here. Order. I have spoken to both members, and I expect them both to be silent and keep their hands down for a while.

The question is as follows—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Okay, I am going to ask the hon. member for Cariboo—Prince George to go outside for a while and take a little break until he can calm down, until he can be in here without reacting to what he is hearing.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The 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:

The Speaker: Call in the members.

• (2040)

[Translation]

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

(Division No. 1379)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Amos
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Beaulieu
Bennett
Bittle
Boissonnault

Alghabra
Anandasangaree
Arya
Badawey
Baylis
Beech
Bibeau
Blair
Bossio

Government Orders

Boudrias
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Cormier
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (Central Nova)
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hébert
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Jones
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
Manly
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Soeurs)
Monsef
Murray
Ng
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Petipas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Ratansi
Rogers
Rota
Ruimy
Saini
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tabbara
Tassi
Vandal
Vaughan
Weir
Wilson-Raybould
Yip
Zahid — 161

Bratina
Carr
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Dabrusin
DeCoursey
Dhillon
Duguid
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fraser (West Nova)
Fuhr
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hardie
Hogg
Housefather
Hutchings
Joly
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Saanch—Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-
Morrissey
Nassif
O'Connell
Oliver
Ouellette
Pauzé
Peterson
Philpott
Plamondon
Qualtrough
Robillard
Romanado
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sarai
Schieffe
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Tan
Thériault
Vandenbeld
Virani
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Young

Carrie
Clarke
Cullen
Doherty
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Eglinski
Finley
Genuis
Harder
Johns
Julian
Lake
Lukiwski
Mathysen
Nantel
Poilievre
Ramsey
Rayes
Saroya
Sorenson
Stetski
Viersen
Waugh
Choquette
Clement
Davidson
Dubé
Dusseault
Fast
Garrison
Hardcastle
Hughes
Jolibois
Kmiec
Lobb
Masse (Windsor West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Nater
Quach
Rankin
Reid
Schmale
Stanton
Trudel
Wagantall
Webber— 58

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu LeBlanc — 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

● (2045)

[English]

**CANADA-UNITED STATES-MEXICO AGREEMENT
IMPLEMENTATION ACT**

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-100, An Act to implement the Agreement between Canada, the United States of America and the United Mexican States, be read the second time and referred to a committee, and of the amendment.

The Speaker: The hon. member for Nanaimo—Ladysmith has four minutes remaining in his speech.

Mr. Paul Manly (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, GP): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to stand again to speak to the new NAFTA. I appreciate the Liberal Party giving me some time to speak about this.

When I left off, I was talking about investor-state dispute settlement and my appreciation that this part of NAFTA was removed. I know it will take three years for it to be completely removed and that some corporations will still be able to use that provision against Canadian laws and policies that get in the way of their profits.

I think it is time to get rid of investor-state provisions in all our trade agreements. It is undemocratic, and it undermines our sovereignty. As we have seen in many cases, such as in *Bilcon v. Canada*, three arbitration lawyers, whose only interest is keeping the system going, sit in a room and make decisions on our environmental assessment process.

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Aubin
Bezan
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boutin-Sweet
Cannings

Albas
Bergen
Blaikie
Boulterice
Brosseau
Caron

Government Orders

In *Bilcon v. Canada*, there was a proposed quarry at Digby Neck. The community came out and experts came out and talked about the problems with the quarry. It was an area where the endangered North Atlantic right whales had their calving grounds. There was tourism for whale watching. There was lobster fishing. The community did not want the quarry. When the environmental assessment review panel ruled against Bilcon, after years of environmental assessments, Bilcon was able to take the dispute to a NAFTA panel. Bilcon wanted \$470 million. It walked away with \$7 million. That is outrageous. Using these kinds of processes to challenge our laws and policies is antithetical to democracy.

Investor-state provisions are being used in developing countries to force through extraction projects or to make developing countries pay through the nose.

A good example of this is Crystallex, a Canadian mining development company. It challenged Venezuela using investor-state provisions after Venezuela decided, on behalf of its indigenous population, that the Crystallex mine would not be in the interest of the indigenous population. It was a threat to the environment. Tenor Capital paid for the arbitration lawyers and invested \$30 million. Crystallex ended up getting \$1.2 billion in a settlement in this investor-state dispute, and Tenor Capital walked away with a 1,000% return, or \$300 million. It is obscene.

I could give members example after example of these kinds of situations. I am glad this is out of NAFTA.

I am also glad to see that the proportionality clause is gone. Under this clause, we had to continue to export the same amount of energy to the United States, on average, as we had in the previous three years.

However, as I was saying earlier, there are a few things that disappoint me about the new NAFTA.

First is the extension of biological patents for pharmaceutical drugs. This is important for products like insulin and for people who have Crohn's disease. People are already struggling with the cost of pharmaceutical drugs. We need drug costs to come down. We must have a national pharmacare program rather than more money for big pharma.

Second is article 22, the carve-out for the Trans Mountain expansion. It looks to me as though it will continue to be a state-owned corporation, which is concerning.

Third is having bovine growth hormone in the American milk and dairy products we will import.

I am thankful for the opportunity to speak to the bill.

● (2050)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the fact that we have had a government in the last three and a half years that has recognized the true value of trade. The trade agreement between Canada and Mexico further supports the fact that Canada is a trading nation. Having these trade agreements helps facilitate and secure markets. That helps Canada's middle class and those aspiring to become a part

of it. It helps drive our economy. We are looking for new trade with new nations and with our best friends to the south.

Would the Green Party be in a position at some point in time where it would support a trade agreement or would it be more inclined to take the same approach to trade as the New Democrats?

Mr. Paul Manly: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned at the top of the speech, we support trade. What we look for in trade agreements is fair trade. We want to ensure labour rights are respected and that standards are improved for labour, health and safety and for consumer standards and environmental standards.

We like the European Union model. When a country joins the European Union, its standards need to be raised to the level of the highest standards of countries in the European Union. We should be looking to that model.

I appreciate that in this round of NAFTA there have been labour organizations and other civil society organizations involved in the actual negotiations, and that is important.

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my colleague and friend from Nanaimo—Ladysmith has outlined a lot of concerns with the legislation and this trade agreement, including that it sides more with big corporations and pharmaceutical companies than it does with people and workers' rights.

What we have not heard from the Green Party is whether it will support the legislation. We would like to know that. Therefore, is the Green Party supporting this legislation? Will the members be voting in favour of Bill C-100, yes or no?

Mr. Paul Manly: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that I will support the bill. The hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands thinks that this might be as good as it gets.

I understand the New Democrats think the Democrats in the United States might be able to improve the deal. I know there is some progressive movement within that party, but it has been very neo-liberal in the past and I am not sure the leadership in the Democratic Party in the United States has changed enough that we will see progress from them on this issue.

The member for Saanich—Gulf Islands has less trust of the Democrats. I am not sure she thinks we will get a better deal than what we have. I think we could be getting a better deal. I am not whipped in my vote. We will see how it all comes down when we vote.

Mr. Mike Bossio (Hastings—Lennox and Addington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member said earlier that there could be trade deals that he might be in favour of, and he referred to the European Union. Of course Canada has a free trade agreement with the European Union. We also established a free trade agreement and approved the TPP by making it the comprehensive, progressive agreement. We brought labour and environmental issues into that trade deal. In the most recent new NAFTA deal, environmental and progressive trade practices are in there to protect the environment and labour.

Therefore, maybe the member could give us some specifics in areas, for example with CETA, where he did not see something that could have been it. What would make it a trade deal that he would support?

Government Orders

Mr. Paul Manly: Mr. Speaker, the problem with CETA is that there is some change in the way investor-state dispute settlement is done, with the tribunal process, but it is still not good enough. I have listened to trade experts, like Gus Van Harten from Osgoode Hall. He says that it is basically the same kind of thing, the same sort of investor-state dispute settlement. It has just done it with a more permanent court.

We need to improve the judicial system. We need to deal with these issues within domestic boundaries. When we talk about domestic law, let us deal with disputes within domestic boundaries. If we are dealing with countries that do not have good judicial systems, let us make that part of the trade conditions.

● (2055)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marwan Tabbara (Kitchener South—Hespeler, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House today.

I support Bill C-100.

[*English*]

Not that long ago, our workers and our businesses were in a state of economic insecurity. The U.S. president had demanded a renegotiation of NAFTA, which has guided our shared North American economy for 25 years. In response to that challenge, our government rose to the task. We met it head on, and it brings me great pleasure to say that we have been successful.

We are now in a place where we have secured our access to the U.S. market and have secured stability for Canadians. We have projected the economic relationship that Canada, Mexico and the United States have built together. It is hard to overestimate the importance of this economic relationship to Canadians.

In 2017, trade between our countries exceeded \$1 trillion, more than a threefold increase since 1994, when NAFTA was born. The North American free trade zone is the biggest economic region in the world, encompassing a \$22-trillion regional market of more than 480 million consumers. Additionally, with CETA and the CPTPP, we have now secured markets of a combined total of 1.5 billion consumers. Not only have our renegotiations secured our access to this market, but the new NAFTA will reinforce the strong economic ties and support economic opportunities.

Our achievements have brought back predictability and stability to the economic relationships between Canada, the U.S. and Mexico. This modern trilateral agreement turns the page and focuses on what makes our economic relationship so successful: stability, economic integration and rules that work for our businesses and our workers.

From the start of the negotiations, Canada had three primary objectives. The first was to preserve important NAFTA provisions and market access to the U.S. and Mexico. The second was to modernize and improve the agreement where possible. The third was to reinforce the security and stability of our market access into the U.S. and Mexico for Canadian businesses.

We have achieved those objectives.

First and foremost, the new agreement would preserve Canada's market access into the United States and Mexico, securing our most

important trading partnership. Canada's preferential access to these markets is vital to the continuing prosperity of Canadian workers whose livelihoods rely on trade.

As two of Canada's largest trading partners, it was a priority for our government to ensure that modernizing NAFTA would not allow for any disruption of North American integrated supply chain. We understand how vital this is to Canadian companies and to exporters.

As an annual average, from 2015 to 2017, Canada exported more than 355 billion dollars' worth of goods to the United States, Canada's top export market. For the same time period, Canada exported an annual average of 12.4 billion dollars' worth of goods to Mexico, Canada's fifth-largest export market.

The CUSMA ensures continued preferential access to these key export destinations. The new NAFTA preserves our market access. This means that duty free access for all non-agricultural goods from NAFTA will be maintained. For agricultural goods, Canadian exports will also continue to benefit from duty-free access for nearly 89% of U.S. agriculture tariff lines and 91% of Mexican tariff lines.

This is a big deal for Canadian exporters and a big deal for Canadian farmers.

Maintaining these tariff outcomes provide Canadians with an advantage over those countries without a preferential trade agreement with the United States and Mexico. It also ensures predictability and continued secure market access for Canadian exporters to our largest trading partner.

Other key elements of NAFTA are also preserved, including chapter 19 and state-to-state dispute settlement, the cultural exception and temporary entry for business persons. The new agreement also creates new opportunities for Canadians. It opens new market access opportunities in the U.S. market and improves existing market access.

● (2100)

It has new customs and trade facilitation measures that will reduce red tape and make it easier for companies to move goods across our border, including by eliminating paper process and providing a single portal for trade to submit most important documents electronically. This will make it fast and efficient, while keeping up with a fast-paced industry in the 21st century.

The agreement includes a new stand-alone chapter on rules of origin and origin procedures for textiles and apparel goods that will support Canada's textile and apparel sector.

The new NAFTA enhances regulatory transparency and predictability, which will provide added assurance for exporters that their goods will make it to market and not be delayed by unjustified or unclear measures at the border.

Government Orders

The new NAFTA also ensures Canada's agricultural and processed food exports can rely on sanitary measures that are risk-based and that increase predictability of market access, so products make it to market in a reasonable amount of time.

In addition, the section 232 side letter on autos and auto parts provides added security and stability for Canadian automotive and parts companies that export to the U.S. market and will reaffirm Canada's attractiveness as an investment destination for automotive and parts manufacturers.

I want to speak a little about the auto sector now.

In the new NAFTA agreement, we made key changes. One was that the parts for automakers used to be at 62.5% of North American parts. The new NAFTA agreement will raise it to 75% by 2023. This will increase North American parts made and will ensure that we increase and stabilize the auto sector.

Another addition to this new NAFTA deal on auto is that wages are at least \$16 an hour, which will help keep jobs in Canada, instead of what we have seen with jobs going to Mexico. This increase in wages and stability in wages will ensure we keep jobs here.

I want to talk about Toyota in my riding. Canada will now produce the Lexus NX crossover and it will be selling the RX sport utility in 2022. Up until now, these two vehicles have only been made in Japan. This will be the first time these two lines will be made in Canada. We are securing jobs, particularly in and around my region of Kitchener South—Hespeler.

I also want to mention that the federal government last year invested \$110 million to support 8,000 jobs in southwestern Ontario. That will help create an additional 450 new jobs in the auto sector.

This is a progressive agreement that meets the needs of the 21st century, including bringing obligations on labour and environment directly into the agreement and subjecting them to dispute settlement.

The new NAFTA preserves key elements of the North American trading relationship, allowing for our continued regional prosperity and stability. It reinforces the strong economic ties among Canada, Mexico and the United States, while also recognizing the importance of progressive and inclusive trade, including key outcomes in areas such as labour and environment. This modernized agreement is good for Canadian workers and Canadian businesses.

We have faced up to the largest challenge in U.S.-Canada relations in decades and we have achievements and outcomes that benefit us all. This is a great achievement for Canada. This is a great trade agreement. It modernizes it in the 21st century. I am happy to support it.

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we have some concerns around this trade agreement, especially when it comes to biologic medicines that are the most expensive and profitable class of medicines out there. For example, popular biologics to treat rheumatic arthritis and Crohn's disease can cost between \$20,000 and \$30,000 annually. The cost for certain biologics designed to treat rare diseases can be substantially higher. Biosimilars can significantly lower these costs, increasing access and stretching health dollars further. Even insulin costs are going up.

Why does the government want Canadians suffering from these types of illnesses to have to pay more for their medications? That is what is going to happen if this trade agreement is ratified as it is.

• (2105)

Mr. Marwan Tabbara: Mr. Speaker, there have been many negotiations and we had a strong team of negotiators. They have illustrated that the price of prescription drugs would not be increased. This would actually have a positive benefit, because we would have more access to markets.

The statement that the hon. member just made is inaccurate. The cost of prescription drugs would not increase under this new NAFTA.

Hon. Tony Clement (Parry Sound—Muskoka, Ind.): Mr. Speaker, this is a very important trade deal, one I generally support, but I do have concerns about particular items, as do other members of the House.

As someone who was responsible for a time for changes to better protect copyright laws while balancing that with access for consumers, I am always concerned when the Americans bring up copyright. They are always trying to pursue with Canada and with Canadian law watering down some of our protections for consumers: for instance, the notice and take down provisions that the United States tries to push on Canada when it comes to posting on the Internet, and the fair dealing provisions that we have in Canada versus the fair use provisions that are found in the United States.

I am wondering whether the hon. member has a point of view on those issues as well.

Mr. Marwan Tabbara: Mr. Speaker, when we were negotiating, we wanted to ensure that we protected jobs and Canadian culture, and we did that with this agreement. We fought really hard and it took many months to ensure that we got a great deal for Canadians, and Canadians should be proud.

Perrin Beatty, president and CEO of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, said this:

The Chamber congratulates Minister Freeland and Canada's negotiating team for delivering an agreement that remains trilateral and that will continue to deliver prosperity for Canada, and for doing so under extraordinarily challenging conditions.

Mr. Raj Saini (Kitchener Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague and my neighbour, the hon. member for Kitchener South—Hespeler, for his very comprehensive review of the advantages of this deal.

We are both proud of representing a region that is very advanced in many things, whether it be education or insurance. Another thing we are very advanced in is advanced manufacturing. The pride and joy of our community is all the sub-suppliers and subcontractors that supply the Toyota plant in the hon. member's riding.

Government Orders

The member mentioned the side letters. He mentioned the impact of auto and the tremendous advantages this deal would provide to the auto industry in Canada. It would provide a lot of advantages to our region for people who live, work and play there.

Could my hon. friend highlight some of the advantages this deal would provide, not only for our region but also for the country?

Mr. Marwan Tabbara: Mr. Speaker, our region is known for its high-tech sector, as well as for education, insurance and advanced manufacturing. We use a lot of high-tech technologies to advance some of the technology in our vehicles. That is why Toyota is investing in technology.

The federal government invested \$110 million in Toyota. This will build more RAV4 vehicles. Toyota cannot sell enough of these cars. They have been selling like crazy. Every time I meet with Toyota officials, they tell me they cannot keep pace with the demand. It is a very popular model, not only across the country but exported to markets in the United States. That is why this deal is great for the auto industry. It is great for Canada, and I am supporting this deal.

• (2110)

Mr. Ali Ehsassi (Willowdale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to rise in the House today in support of Bill C-100, the implementing legislation for the Canada-United States-Mexico agreement.

Last fall, we concluded negotiations on the new NAFTA with the U.S. and Mexico. Throughout the intense negotiations, we remained steadfast and focused on what really matters to Canadians: jobs, growth and, of course, expanding the middle class.

[*Translation*]

We refused to capitulate, and we secured a good deal for Canadians. Since negotiations began in August 2017, Canada has engaged constructively and pragmatically with our NAFTA partners to reach a good deal for Canadians.

The agreement provides key outcomes for Canadian businesses, workers and communities in areas such as labour, the environment, automotive trade, dispute resolution, culture and energy.

[*English*]

We guaranteed continued access for Canadian workers and Canadian businesses to our largest export market, and we succeeded in preserving key elements of NAFTA, including chapter 19, which is really the heart and soul of the agreement, the all-important dispute settlement mechanism and the cultural exception, something we had fought very hard for in the negotiations in the 1980s.

We addressed important bread-and-butter issues like cutting red tape to make it easier for Canadian businesses to export to the U.S. market.

[*Translation*]

The new NAFTA will safeguard more than \$2 billion a day in cross-border trade and tariff-free access.

[*English*]

I will provide just one example to the House. In 2017, trilateral trade exceeded \$1 trillion, more than a threefold increase since 1994,

when NAFTA was first born. The North American free trade zone is the biggest economic region in the world, encompassing a regional market of \$22 trillion U.S. and over 480 million consumers. With only 7% of the world's population, the U.S., Canada and Mexico together now account for more than a quarter of the world's GDP.

The new NAFTA represents an opportunity for Canada to build upon the highly integrated economies in North America. Implementing and ratifying the new NAFTA will help maintain Canada's global competitive position. Our three countries are among one another's largest trading partners and sources of foreign investment.

It is important at this juncture to acknowledge all the work that went into these negotiations. I am referring to the Prime Minister, who was highly engaged on this, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and other ministers who were very much embedded in the process and, of course, the many members of Parliament who consistently went to the United States to explain the significance of this agreement to Canadians.

Preferential access also means a level playing field for Canadian products and will provide Canadian companies with a leg-up on others that do not yet have the same level of access to the U.S. and Mexican markets. This will translate into increased profits and market opportunities for Canadian businesses of all sizes, in all sectors and in every part of our beautiful country.

Our relationship with the U.S. and Mexico is about more than simply trade. Our relationship is also about friendship, shared values, prosperity and security. We do not just trade with each other; we make things together and we co-operate to ensure the mutual safety and security of the continent.

It is important to emphasize that throughout the negotiations, this government worked hard to advocate for the interests of Canadian families. Our efforts extended to all levels of government and society, from continuing constructive dialogues between Prime Minister Trudeau and the U.S. and Mexican presidents to conversations—

• (2115)

The Deputy Speaker: Order. It is the second instance, not for this particular member, but we have had a couple of occasions just in recent minutes. I am sure members are not doing it on purpose, but they should just watch that they do not cite actual given names or family names of other hon. members. Just switch it to their title, or their riding name works as well.

The hon. member for Willowdale.

Mr. Ali Ehsassi: Mr. Speaker, I apologize for that oversight.

Government Orders

Of course, what I meant to highlight and emphasize was that numerous people were highly engaged in this process. As I mentioned earlier, there were many members of this House who took their responsibilities very seriously. Of course, we also reached out to business leaders, labour leaders and everyone who could assist along the way.

I think it would be fair to say that, in all these interactions, we have been unwavering in sharing our message in the U.S., and our message was very simple. We were informing Americans that it was in their self-interest to keep strong relations with Canada. Good, middle-class jobs in every U.S. state depend directly on trade with and investment in Canada. Apart from being a friend and a neighbour, Canada is also the most like-minded ally the United States can find in the world.

Similarly, Canada and Mexico continue to weave ties for the future through our shared values and commitment to a secure, prosperous, inclusive and democratic world. I should highlight that this year marks the 75th anniversary of diplomatic relations between Canada and Mexico, and we very much look forward to building on this milestone to create an even stronger partnership.

In negotiating the modernized agreement, we underscored that a good deal is one that reflects the Canadian national interests and in which Canadian values are defended. That was at the core of our negotiating priorities and approach, and we were consistent throughout.

[*Translation*]

The new NAFTA is a win-win-win agreement for Canada, the United States and Mexico.

Ms. Karine Trudel (Jonquière, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I listened to my colleague's speech and was shocked when I heard the end part.

Back home in my riding of Jonquière we have a lot of dairy farmers. In the last budget the government announced a compensation plan, but there is no date and no money going directly to our dairy farmers. Now the government is boasting that the agreement is a win-win-win.

I have some news for the government. These farmers are the hands that feed us. They work every day to provide us with fresh food. The government promised them all kinds of things they are entitled to, but they have been shortchanged again. This is a third breach of supply management. The House will soon be adjourning and we still have nothing.

How does this government plan to compensate dairy farmers and comply with the agreement it signed with them?

[*English*]

Mr. Ali Ehsassi: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for raising an issue that is obviously of concern to our government as well.

As I indicated throughout my remarks, we were keen on maintaining a dialogue with various sectors of our economy, and that communication has been ongoing. I can tell the member that we have received every assurance that dialogue will be ongoing with dairy producers, and they have been very pleased with the progress we are making to ensure that we stand up for their interests and make the necessary changes.

Mr. Paul Manly (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, GP): Mr. Speaker, my question for the hon. member is about article 22 and annex IV, which gives a carve-out to the Trans Mountain expansion project.

When we are dealing with climate change, do we not think that perhaps it would be a good idea for other state-owned enterprises to be available to us in dealing with a climate emergency?

Also, I would like to know about this carve-out for the Trans Mountain expansion project. What is the plan? We have seen that it is not really economically feasible. I have read reports by Robyn Allan and others who say that this pipeline is not economically feasible.

What is the plan if the government cannot sell it to the private sector within the 10-year period, as outlined in article 22?

● (2120)

Mr. Ali Ehsassi: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for raising a very good concern.

Of course, as with any other trade agreement, it is important to make sure that we are focused on the details as negotiations go on. The member will recall, for example, that when the original NAFTA was negotiated, Canadian negotiators made sure that there were all sorts of reservations for various things. In that particular instance, the big issue Canadians expected us to stand up for and preserve was culture.

In this particular case, it was quite obvious to our American friends and to the Mexicans that the environment is something we take very seriously as a country. However, as with all negotiations, there were some carve-outs, which is something that epitomizes the process of negotiations.

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and colleague for his speech. We have done some work on some tough files together. On behalf of my constituents, I appreciate his efforts.

We keep hearing the Liberal government is committed to the creation of a national pharmacare program. Maybe this member can explain why it would sign this trade deal, which includes patent extensions that would make it harder and more expensive to create a pharmacare plan.

Mr. Ali Ehsassi: Mr. Speaker, allow me to reciprocate and say I have very much enjoyed working with my hon. colleague.

As the member is well aware, these issues are serious issues. They are legal matters. They are issues that require that each of the negotiating parties be familiar with various provisions. I think it would be fair to say that lawyers in the department are very much aware of some of the limitations that might exist, but that will certainly not get in the way of this government's commitment to pharmacare in the future.

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak tonight. In the final days of Parliament, I would be remiss if I did not thank my colleagues in the NDP for our tireless fight for fair trade for Canadians, who represent farmers and workers, to keep the cost of pharmaceuticals low and to address the issues Canadians care about and matter to them in terms of trade.

Government Orders

I would like to thank my family for the time that I have been able to devote here, my husband Germaine, my sons Maxwell and Maliq. I thank them for their support and love and for the wild ride we have been on this last four years and I look forward to going further. I would like to say a quick thanks to my team. They are just so incredible. I thank Nadine, Lindsay, Katrina, Joseline and Megan and the many volunteers throughout the years.

We are back on Bill C-100 and I am pleased to rise to speak on this stage of the bill. I thank my colleague, the member for Windsor—Tecumseh, who brought forward a reasoned amendment, something the government should consider, which is to decline to give second reading to Bill C-100. Before I get into the reasons, which my colleague laid out quite well in her reasoned amendment last night, there has been a lot of discussion about what is happening in the U.S., the moves the Democrats are making. We know they have written four letters from the subcommittee on trade to Ambassador Lighthizer.

They are in the middle of negotiations right now and it is quite shocking to know that the Prime Minister and the Minister of Foreign Affairs will be going to Washington, for Donald Trump, to pressure the Democrats to drop these progressive elements that they are trying to achieve. I do not think that is something that Canadians widely support. It is certainly not something that Speaker Pelosi has said she is willing to do. She said that the Democrat-controlled House will not take up legislation to ratify the deal until it is tweaked to address her concerns, which include issues with enforcement tools, labour reforms in Mexico, environmental protections and provisions on pharmaceuticals.

Are these not things that we in Canada should all be pursuing? Is this not something that the Liberal government should be getting behind and supporting instead of ramming this through, closing down debate in the dying days of Parliament with an uncertain future throughout the summer on Bill C-100? I understand that we are heading into an election and that it is in the best interests of Liberals to try to get this done, to put something on the shelf to show Canadians that they have achieved something on the trade file. I just say “something”. I reserve my comment as to the value of it or how this deal is being viewed.

I want to go back to the member for Windsor—Tecumseh and the reasoned amendment she put forward. The first reason she states is that this new deal, the NAFTA, the CUSMA, the USMCA, whichever one chooses to call it, fails to improve labour provisions necessary to protect jobs. This is entirely true. Yesterday, there were 12 witnesses at the trade committee. There was a witness from Unifor who expressed concerns about the labour provisions. Unfortunately, what was initially attempted was not fully achieved. We know the Democrats are working hard to improve it.

I want to talk about more specifics and the uncertainty that still exists. The first thing I want to talk about is working women. In the agreement that was signed last fall, there was a negotiation that included provisions for improving the conditions of working women, including workplace harassment, pay equity and equality issues, but in the scrub phase of this new deal, those things disappeared. They are completely gone from the agreement now. The Liberals have yet to answer why. They have yet to acknowledge that these important gender gains have completely disappeared and

they have yet to ask what happened to them and say they need to be put back in Bill C-100. I would be curious to hear why the Liberals are not pushing for these gender changes that have now somehow disappeared.

There is a lot of discussion about the \$16 U.S. per hour wage that has been talked about. The unfortunate part of this provision, and I hope that Canadians understand this, is that it is not a minimum \$16 per hour; it is an average \$16 per hour, and the determination of that has yet to be defined. If we use the example of an auto assembly plant or a manufacturing plant, we would have to include everyone, the CEO, all of the shareholders, all of the stakeholders, all the way down.

● (2125)

If we take the average wage of everyone working there, \$16 an hour is not going to be what people are being paid in right-to-work states in the U.S. or in Mexico. It is simply what the average wage has to be among workers in that whole company. Again, while this appears to be something progressive on the surface, I want Canadians to understand there is no guarantee here that people will actually be paid that amount of money. That is definitely a concern to us.

We know that in the Mexican government, the people have moved toward some labour reforms. The problem is that we are taking a gamble on the backs of working people in hoping that this thing will correct the imbalance and have the jobs continue to drain down to Mexico. There are many Canadian companies that have footprints in Mexico that are not paying a fair wage to people in plants. These are North American multinational companies. Of course, when executives are looking where to put a new manufacturing facility, they know that in Mexico people are being paid a very low wage, there are no labour standards, no legitimate unions and no environmental provisions, and then they look at the Canadian standard.

This is the reason we have not had a new greenfield site in Canada over the life of NAFTA. We will continue to have this problem. It is a great gamble that is being taken, once again, on the backs of working people. We have lost 400,000 manufacturing jobs over the life of NAFTA. We lost our entire textile industry. We lost 50% of our vintners, our wineries that are in a lot of our ridings here in the House. There are a great many questions, to find out whether the provisions in this deal would actually work and would actually help the Mexican working people, the U.S. working people and the Canadians. It is a great gamble and risk that we are taking here. I do not believe that I have heard a strong argument from the other side, other than to say that this is the best that we could do. Canadian workers deserve better than that.

Most people, when they think of the U.S. and Canada and labour standards, certainly do not think of the U.S. as being more progressive than we are, but that is exactly what is happening there now. The Americans are actually trying to stand up for working people in the U.S. It is a shame that we do not see the same thing happening here in Canada.

Government Orders

The other thing I want to talk about, which my colleagues have touched upon and I have in my previous speech, is that this deal allows for the extension of drug patents, which would significantly increase the cost of medication for Canadians. We know that Dr. Hoskins came out with his report saying that we should move toward a single-payer universal pharmacare plan in Canada, something New Democrats have been saying and putting forward as a plan to Canadians for quite some time. It is disappointing to see the Liberals dangle that carrot once again in front of voters, saying, “Do not worry, we are going to do it”. We have been hearing that for 20 years.

Here is a deal that would make drugs like insulin, drugs that are used for Crohn's disease and drugs that are used for rheumatoid arthritis more expensive. That is so counterintuitive to where we need to be going because we know that Canadians already cannot afford the medication that they are taking. The fact is that Big Pharma is getting its way once again in a trade agreement. This is a complete TPP hangover. This was part of the original TPP that, thankfully, disappeared when the U.S. left, but it is right back on the table again.

My colleagues have rightly pointed out the impact on supply management. We heard from the egg farmers at committee yesterday. I just have to pause to point out that it is shameful that we had only 12 witnesses before the committee on a study on the new NAFTA, or the CUSMA, when we had over 400 on the TPP. We did a whole cross-country tour on the TPP, where we not only included everyone in the local communities but we also had open-mike periods. Now we have the complete opposite. While the Liberals keep saying this is our most important relationship and this is why we have to do this, I believe that is the reason it deserves proper attention and proper oversight. Certainly that is not what is happening here.

I am very pleased to rise to say that New Democrats will always fight for fair trade that is in the best interest of people, communities and workers, and we will put the poorest and most marginalized Canadians in the best position when we do so. When we continue to sign trade agreements that will have negative impacts and violate people's human rights, do not address gender inequality and do not work to make the wealth inequality in our country shrink, we are doing a disservice. We need to do better. New Democrats are committed to fair trade at every turn.

● (2130)

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, sometimes I wonder if the NDP would like no trade agreements, without regard for the consequences.

The hon. member, who gave a very eloquent speech, described the USMCA as “something on trade”, forgetting that it was an arduous negotiation that was carried out wonderfully by the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the government.

However, I would like to go back to the extension of pharmaceutical patents. I would accept the hon. member's point if we were talking about traditional drugs. In the case of traditional drugs, generics are ready to pounce the moment a patent is lifted, but we are talking about biologics and biosimilars, which are the generic versions of biologics.

All experts agree that the barriers to entry into the biosimilars market are extremely high, because we are dealing with extremely complex drugs. The notion that patent extensions may be having an impact really is moot, because the barriers to entry will prevent biosimilars from quickly entering the market when there are no patent protections.

It is not really a proper parallel to make. It is alarming Canadians for no reason. Could the member comment on that?

Ms. Tracey Ramsey: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the member does not have an issue with what I am saying, but I think he should talk to the PBO.

The member for Vancouver Kingsway initiated a study on the new CUSMA with the PBO, and when the report came back, the PBO estimated that the increased drug costs would be \$169 million in the first year alone.

I would encourage the member to look at that report from the PBO. I thank the PBO for the work that they have done throughout this Parliament. Certainly they have shone a light on things that the Liberal government does not want Canadians to know or understand. I would encourage the member to go and read that study. I would encourage Canadians to do the same.

I would say that the pharmaceutical manufacturing capacity in Canada is operated by the generic pharmaceutical industry, and there are about 11,000 Canadians who work in the industry. However, the true question is, if we could remove that regressive provision—because the member is saying, “Do not worry; it is not going to impact us”—as they are attempting to do in the U.S., would the Liberals not support that? That is the true question.

● (2135)

Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when I hear the member speak, I think of her riding and the amount of time I have spent in the automotive industry, working on automation applications on tier 2s and tier 3s and also going on to tier 1s.

I want to correct one thing for the record. In terms of the labour value content, it states that 40% of a passenger vehicle and 45% of a pickup or cargo vehicle must be made by hourly workers who earn a wage of \$16 U.S. an hour or more. There are other provisions in terms of R and D credits and credits for high labour value areas.

I have seen the automotive industry go up and down over the years. Usually it was the exchange rate that put us out of work, or it was changes in technology. Right now, we have really good conditions for the automotive industry, with the lowest marginal effective tax rate in the G7, 13.8%, and 100% writedown of investments on buildings when we are trying to green buildings. As well, our exchange rate is very stable where it is, so things should look pretty good for Windsor.

Could the member comment on any positive things that she sees developing in the automotive industry in Windsor?

Government Orders

Ms. Tracey Ramsey: Mr. Speaker, I would have to say that the concern that auto workers have and the concern that the auto industry has is that the 2.5% tariff rate on auto and auto parts is not prohibitive enough for companies to actually want to reach this level.

We have watched 400,000 manufacturing jobs bleed out of our country. We cannot attract investment into auto because we are competing on such an unfair playing field. The things that have been established here are easy enough for companies to get over and to pay the 2.5%.

What the member is really asking is for southwestern Ontario auto workers and manufacturing workers across our country to take a chance that what has been established here will work in practice. It is a best guess whether or not the provisions here will actually end up being meaningful, and I have to say that these provisions are not even fully fleshed out yet. We do not even have the details of exactly what they will look at.

That is also a piece that is very concerning, because there are ministerial powers that have been written into the new CUSMA. The Liberals would like to say, “Do not worry; if something happens, the minister of the day will be able to override it, or cabinet will be able to override it.” Why should we trust that they are going to go and put these provisions in after the fact? If the deal is so good—

The Deputy Speaker: Order. I will let the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs know that there are about five to six minutes remaining in the time for Government Orders on this particular bill. I will give him the signal at the usual time.

Resuming debate, the hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Robert Oliphant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to take the opportunity to say this as we close out the debate at second reading on this very important bill, Bill C-100. This bill will enable us to take the next steps toward ratification of one of the most important and progressive trade agreements that has ever been negotiated anywhere in the world.

We went into this discussion with three primary objectives: first, to preserve important NAFTA provisions and market access to \$2 billion worth of trade into the U.S. and Mexico every day; second, to modernize and improve the agreement to make it a better agreement than NAFTA; and third, to reinforce the security and stability of market access into the U.S. and Mexico for Canadian businesses. Those were the objectives, and that is what we accomplished.

I want to take a moment to commend our Prime Minister, who has a spine of steel when it comes to these sorts of issues, and our formidable Minister of Foreign Affairs, because no one can negotiate anything in the world like she can. I want to thank her parliamentary secretary, the member for Orléans, who was engaged in this process, as well as the trade negotiators, the officials, and the members of opposition parties who were engaged in the council that did this work, which is really groundbreaking work to make a difference for Canadian labour, indigenous Canadians and workers in every sector to make sure our businesses remain competitive while we continue to grow them and have access to markets in the United States and around the world with the most diverse trading program that any country has ever developed.

One issue I want to spend a bit of time on, because there has been so much misinformation tonight, is with respect to biologics and patent protection, which was negotiated as part of this whole deal.

I want to be clear about this. There are pharmaceutical drugs that are compounds created from atoms being compounded to each other to create the drugs we know so well. Of the drugs that people in this room take, 95% are those kinds of drugs, while 5% of the medications we take are biologics. These are created from living organisms in a living organism and are extremely complex and expensive to make.

My career for four years as president of the Asthma Society of Canada led me to understand the very complex way that biologics are created. On the one hand, drugs made from compounds are generic drugs that are relatively easy to create and are exactly the same as the original drug. However, a biologic will never be replicated exactly. They are biosimilars. At times, I jokingly call them “bio-differents”, because they are different. They are extremely expensive to replicate, and most companies do not want to do it.

I am really glad some people are listening to this. The reality is that a biologic drug, if we have 10 years of protection for it, most likely will be replaced by another biologic. That is the way that the industry works.

I am not simply saying we do not need to worry about this because I am, on this side of the House, arguing for this trade agreement; I am arguing this because we have a very high stake in targeted medicine and in ensuring that Canadians have access to the biologics that are part of our medical care system.

I have heard various numbers quoted, which are mathematical calculations without any nuance whatsoever. When Amir Attaran, a professor at the University of Ottawa, a biomedical scientist and a lawyer, looked at everything we are doing, he recognized it is going to be a wash. We are changing regulations on the PMPRB, the Patented Medicine Prices Review Board. We are obviously committed to a pharmacare system that we can see is being developed through the early steps taken in this budget. We are moving on these issues.

I would ask every member of this House to commit themselves to the science, the creativity and the imagination that goes into our pharmaceutical industry. Quit beating up on big pharma.

I have taken on big pharma as part of a patient organization to ensure that Canadians have access to medication. I am not afraid of big pharma; I am respectful of pharmaceutical scientists and the companies that bring us the medications that, frankly, keep me alive. I need those medications and I am glad they are there. NAFTA will ensure that there is moderate protection, either under the 20 years as a drug or the 10 years as a biologic.

Government Orders

• (2140)

This is not something that is scientific. It is an embarrassment that some people in the House are misusing this idea to scare Canadians. The reality is that we have a progressive trade deal. It is the most progressive and inclusive trade deal to involve indigenous people. It has labour standards that are progressive and will become a worldwide model. We have a deal that will make sure that as Canadians move into the rest of the century, we will be effective and competitive.

• (2145)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: It being 9:43 p.m., pursuant to an order made on Thursday, June 13, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the second reading stage of the bill now before the House.

[*English*]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to an order made on Tuesday, May 28, the division stands deferred until Thursday, June 20, at the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CORRECTIONS AND CONDITIONAL RELEASE ACT

The House resumed from June 14 consideration of the motion in relation to the amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-83, An Act to amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act and another Act.

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-83 has two main objectives.

First of all, it would allow federal inmates to be separated from the general prison population when necessary for security reasons. Second, it will ensure that inmates have access to the interventions, programs and mental health care they need to safely return to the general prison population and make progress toward successful rehabilitation and reintegration.

[*English*]

The bill would achieve these objectives by replacing the current system of administrative segregation with structured intervention units. In SIUs, inmates would be entitled to twice as much time out of their cells, four hours daily instead of two, and two hours of meaningful human contact every day.

We have allocated \$448 million over six years to ensure that the Correctional Service has the resources to provide programs and interventions to inmates in SIUs and to implement this new system safely and effectively. That funding includes \$150 million for mental health care, both in SIUs and throughout the federal correction system.

Bill C-83 was introduced last October. It was studied by the public safety committee in November and reported back to the House in December with a number of amendments. There were further amendments at report stage, in February, including one from the member for Oakville North—Burlington that added a system for binding external review.

In recent months, hon. senators have been studying the bill, and they have now sent it back to us with proposed amendments of their own. The high level of interest in Bill C-83 is indicative of the importance of the federal corrections system and of the laws and policies that govern it. Effective and humane corrections are essential to public safety, and they are a statement of who we are as a country. In the words of Dostoyevsky, “the degree of civilization in a society is revealed by entering its prisons.”

I extend my sincere thanks to all the intervenors who provided testimony and written briefs over the course of the last nine months and to parliamentarians in both chambers who examined this legislation and made thoughtful and constructive suggestions.

Since the Senate social affairs committee completed clause-by-clause consideration of the bill a couple of weeks ago, the government has been carefully studying the committee's recommendations, all of which seek to achieve laudable objectives. We are proposing to accept several of the Senate's amendments as is or with small technical modifications.

First, with respect to minor adjustments, we agree with amendments that would require a mental health assessment of all inmates within 30 days of admission into federal custody and within 24 hours of being transferred to an SIU. This fits with the focus on early diagnosis and treatment that will be facilitated by the major investments we are making in mental health care.

We agree with the proposal to rearrange section 29 of the act, which deals with inmate transfers, to emphasize the possibility of transfers to external hospitals. The Correctional Service runs five certified psychiatric hospitals of its own and will now have significant new resources for mental health care. Even so, there may be cases when a transfer to an external facility is appropriate. If the transfer can be done safely, if the hospital has the capacity and if it is in the best interest of the patient, then it should be done. In fact, that is why we allocated funds in budget 2018 for more external mental health beds.

Government Orders

● (2150)

We also agree with an amendment regarding the initial review of SIU transfers. The bill would require a review by the warden in the first five days. This amendment clarifies that the clock on those five days would start ticking as soon as the transfer decision was made, as opposed to the moment the inmate physically arrived in the SIU.

With minor changes, we agree with two amendments to the section of the bill that would require consideration of systemic and background factors in decisions involving indigenous offenders. One of them would provide greater precision by specifying that a person's family and adoption history should be included in the analysis. The other would clarify that these factors may be used to lower the assessment of an inmate's risk level, but not to raise it.

These provisions in themselves would obviously not be enough to solve the problem of indigenous overrepresentation in the corrections system. The upstream socio-economic factors that result in higher rates of indigenous people involved with the criminal justice system must generally be addressed in concert with other departments and agencies, and efforts to that effect are indeed under way. The Correctional Service is charged with ensuring that indigenous people in its custody get a genuine opportunity to turn their lives around, and these amendments should help advance that objective.

There are two other amendments on which we agree with the intent, and we are essentially proposing to meet the Senate halfway.

The first is an amendment that seeks to add certain elements to section 4 of the act, which establishes guiding principles for the Correctional Service. In particular, it puts a focus on alternatives to incarceration, and we agree that those alternatives should be consistently considered and used wherever appropriate.

We are, however, suggesting a few changes to the language drafted in the Senate. For example, the amendment lists sections 29, 81 and 84 of the act as alternatives to incarceration. Section 29 refers to hospital transfers, and section 81 refers to healing lodges, so their inclusion here makes sense. However, section 84 is about community-supported release following incarceration. It is not an alternative; it is the next step, so we are proposing to remove it from this list.

The amendment would also require that preference be given to alternatives to incarceration. Frankly, that is very problematic. Alternatives to incarceration should be used where appropriate, but there are situations when putting someone in prison is a valid and necessary approach. Alternatives should be considered, but not necessarily preferred.

Also, for clarity sake, we are proposing to remove or replace certain terms that do not have established legal meanings, such as “carceral isolations” or “incarcerated persons” or “a broad interpretation informed by human rights”. Certainly, everything government agencies do should be informed by human rights principles, but to be enforceable and actionable, legal terms need to have clear and precise definitions. If we asked everyone in this House to explain what it means to interpret legislation broadly and in a manner informed by human rights, we would probably get 338 different responses.

● (2155)

The Deputy Speaker: Order. The government House leader is rising on a point of order.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among the parties, and I think if you seek it, you will find unanimous consent for the following motion.

I move:

That, notwithstanding any Standing or Special Order or usual practice of the House:

(a) the motion respecting the Senate Amendments to Bill C-91, An Act respecting Indigenous Languages, be deemed adopted;

(b) the motion respecting the Senate Amendments to Bill C-92, An Act respecting First Nations, Inuit and Métis children, youth and families, be deemed adopted;

(c) Bill C-98, An Act to amend the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act and the Canada Border Services Agency Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, be deemed to have been concurred in at the report stage, and deemed read a third time and passed;

(d) Bill C-101, An Act to amend the Customs Tariff and the Canadian International Trade Tribunal Act, be deemed to have been concurred in at the report stage, and deemed read a third time and passed on division; and

(e) when the House adjourns on Thursday, June 20, 2019, it shall stand adjourned until Monday, September 16, 2019, provided that, for the purposes of any Standing Order, it shall be deemed to have been adjourned pursuant to Standing Order 28 and be deemed to have sat on Friday, June 21, 2019.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

INDIGENOUS LANGUAGES ACT

(Bill C-91. On the Order: Government Orders:)

June 14, 2019—The Minister of Canadian Heritage and Multiculturalism—Consideration of the amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-91, An Act respecting Indigenous languages.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

FIRST NATIONS, INUIT AND MÉTIS CHILDREN, YOUTH AND FAMILIES ACT

(Bill C-92. On the Order: Government Orders:)

June 14, 2019—The Minister of Indigenous Services—Consideration of the amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-92, An Act respecting First Nations, Inuit and Métis children, youth and families.

Government Orders

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE ACT

(Bill C-98. On the Order: Government Orders:)

June 18, 2019—The Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness—Consideration at report stage of Bill C-98, An Act to amend the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act and the Canada Border Services Agency Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, as reported by the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security without amendment.

(Bill concurred in at report stage, read the third time and passed)

* * *

CUSTOMS TARIFF

(Bill C-101. On the Order: Government Orders:)

June 14, 2019—The Minister of Finance—Consideration at report stage of Bill C-101, An Act to amend the Customs Tariff and the Canadian International Trade Tribunal Act, as reported by the Standing Committee on Finance without amendment.

(Bill concurred in at report stage, read the third time and passed on division)

* * *

CORRECTIONS AND CONDITIONAL RELEASE ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion in relation to the amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-83, An Act to amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act and another Act.

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is why we are proposing to remove these terms. Even so, of course, the Charter of Rights and Freedoms will continue to apply to everything the Correctional Service does.

The other amendment that we are proposing to partially retain has to do with strip searches. The Senate is proposing to prohibit any strip searches conducted as a matter of routine and we wholeheartedly endorse that objective. It would not be pleasant for any of us to be strip-searched.

People in prison have often experienced trauma, including sexual abuse. Strip searches can cause them to relive that trauma and can even deter people from participating in programs like work release if they know they will be strip-searched on their way out or on their way back in. The Correctional Service should do everything possible to minimize strip searches.

That is why Bill C-83 would allow for the use of body scanners similar to what exists in airports as recommended by the United Nations. Rather than a blanket prohibition though, the government is proposing that the law require that Correctional Service use a body scanner instead of a strip search whenever one is available. That accounts for the fact that it will take some time for body scanners to be installed in every institution and it recognizes that sometimes machines break down. In those situations, correctional staff still need to be confident that inmates are not smuggling drugs, weapons or other contraband. That is important not only for staff safety but for the safety of other inmates as well. As body scanners become more available in federal institutions, strip searches should become increasingly rare.

I will now turn to the proposals from the Senate with which we respectfully disagree.

To begin with, there are two relatively similar ones that would take existing concepts used for indigenous corrections and expand them to other unspecified groups. This would apply to section 81 of the act, which allows for community-run healing lodges and section 84, which allows for community-supported release. Both of these concepts have proven valuable and successful in an indigenous context and the idea of expanding them is indeed worthy of serious consideration.

Certainly, there are other overrepresented groups in federal custody, particularly Canadians of African descent. Our government is wholly in favour of examining whether strategies that have worked for indigenous corrections can be successfully applied in other contexts and with other communities. We are opposing this amendment not because we disagree with the principle but because the serious consideration and examination I mentioned has not happened yet.

Before moving forward with something like this, there should be extensive consultations to determine which groups would be interested. Where does the capacity exist? And how the experience of the relatively few indigenous communities and organizations that run section 81 facilities is or is not applicable more broadly.

● (2200)

It would be a major policy change and potentially a positive one, but the study and analysis should come before we change the law, not after.

We also respectfully disagree with an amendment that would require the Correctional Service to approve the transfer to a provincial hospital of any inmate with a disabling mental health issue. As I mentioned earlier, in the 2018 budget, our government increased funding for external mental health beds. The use of provincial hospitals may be appropriate in some circumstances. The fact is, though, that it can be very difficult to find provincial hospitals willing and able to house and treat federal inmates. If we want to change the law without the aim of bringing about the transfer of a significant number of people from federal correctional institutions to provincial hospitals, it is imperative that we consult the provinces first.

Government Orders

It is also important for the sake of preserving the clinical independence of the health care providers who work in corrections that the law not pre-empt their professional judgment. The law already allows for these kinds of transfers where possible and appropriate and where recommended by medical professionals. At the same time, we are dramatically bolstering mental health resources within the federal correctional service so that inmates receive high-quality mental health care wherever they serve their sentence. We are also proposing not to accept an amendment that would allow sentences to be shortened on application to a court, due to acts or omissions by correctional personnel deemed to constitute unfairness in the administration of a sentence.

Once again, the goal of deterring improper conduct by correctional staff is commendable. There are a great many people working in federal corrections who are committed professionals doing excellent work. Anything less should be deterred, denounced and the persons potentially disciplined or dismissed. Inmates who are negatively impacted by inappropriate conduct on the part of correctional staff already have recourse, in the form of grievances or lawsuits, for example. The idea of retroactively shortening court-imposed sentences in these circumstances would be a major policy change. Before enacting this kind of provision, there should be consultations with stakeholders, including victims groups as well as provincial partners and other actors in the justice system. Parliamentarians in both chambers should have the opportunity to study it at length. It is not something that should be tacked on at the end of a legislative process that did not contemplate this kind of approach.

We also respectfully disagree with the recommendation to have the new system reviewed by parliamentary committees after two years rather than five. This House added a five-year review to the bill, and that is a reasonable time frame. It gives the new system time to get off the ground and be fully implemented and that will actually make Parliament's review more meaningful and impactful when it happens. In the interim, the minister will soon be appointing an advisory panel to monitor implementation of the SIUs as they roll out. That panel will be able to visit sites, meet with inmates and staff, provide feedback to the commissioner and sound the alarm if something is really not working out as it should. Of course, parliamentary committees do not need legislation to tell them what to study. Even without a legal requirement, if committees of this House or of the other place want to review the SIU system two years from now, they are perfectly free to do so.

● (2205)

Finally, the government respectfully disagrees with the proposal to institute judicial review of all SIU placements after 48 hours. Bill C-83 already has a strong system of binding external oversight.

Independent external decision-makers appointed by the minister will review any case where someone in an SIU has not received the minimum hours out of cell or minimum hours of meaningful human contact for five days in a row, or 15 days out of 30. They will also review cases where the Correctional Service is not following the advice of a health care professional to remove an inmate from an SIU or change their conditions. They will review all SIU placements at 90 days and every 60 days thereafter for any inmate still in the SIU

at that point. That is in addition to regular and robust internal review at five, 30 and 60 days.

Simply put, judicial review of SIU placements is unnecessary. Colleagues do not have to take my word for it. At the public safety committee, the correctional investigator supported using the independent chairperson model to oversee SIUs. That is a model that uses ministerial appointees, not judges.

Plus, while no court has considered the new SIU system proposed by this bill, courts in Ontario and B.C. have rendered decisions about the kind of oversight they deem necessary for the current system of administrative segregation. In B.C., the court found that oversight of administrative segregation must be external to the Correctional Service but did not say that judicial review was required. In Ontario, the court actually found that internal review was preferable, saying, "The reviewing tribunal can have adequate independence without having all the attributes of a judge."

Beyond being unnecessary, requiring judicial review of all SIU placements longer than 48 hours would have considerable impacts on provincial superior courts. There would need to be new judges appointed to handle the caseload. Those judges would be paid for out of federal funds and they would require support staff paid for by the provinces. There would also be changes required to the Judges Act, as well as to corresponding provincial legislation. In other words, accepting this amendment would mean imposing legislative and financial requirements on the provinces without so much as a phone call to check and see if they are on board.

If judicial review were the only way to ensure that this new system works properly and to provide the procedural safeguards required, then one could make an argument that all of these complications, making legislative amendments across the country, finding the money in federal and provincial coffers, and fast-tracking the appointment of a bunch of new judges would just have to somehow get done. However, judicial review is far from the only option. There must absolutely be robust oversight of the new system proposed by Bill C-83 and review by independent external decision-makers meets that need.

● (2210)

[*Translation*]

I thank all hon. senators for their efforts and their contributions. At this point, the bill truly is the product of the Parliament of Canada as a whole.

If the version we are sending back to the Senate receives royal assent, it will be a piece of legislation drafted by the government, amended by Liberal, Conservative, NDP and Green Party members, and amended by our colleagues in the Senate, as well.

Government Orders

[English]

For all of our frequent disagreements, this bill is a good example of the strength of the legislative process in our parliamentary democracy. Most importantly, it will significantly improve Canada's correctional system, enhancing the safety of the people who work and live in federal institutions and improving the system's effectiveness when it comes to rehabilitation and safe, successful reintegration.

I look forward to the passage and the implementation of Bill C-83.

Mr. Matthew Dubé (Beloeil—Chambly, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is interesting. This bill is being offered as a product of all of Parliament, while we reject any of the substantive amendments that the Senate is bringing forward.

Certainly, I do not want to be an apologist for the Senate, with some of the legislation it is holding up. In particular, Senator Pate, who worked on this, is someone who comes from the community of civil society, of folks who have worked on these issues for a long time. The reason I say that is because the bill was panned by every witness who came to committee. In fact, the Ontario Superior Court, when it offered the extension to the government, which has allowed this unconstitutional practice to fester for four years now, said that there was nothing in its mind that seemed to indicate there would be any remedial effort brought forward.

What I find really frustrating and baffling about the bill is that ultimately it is just a rebrand, and I am not the only one saying that. Many others have said it as well, including Senator Pate.

I want to ask the member a question. Judicial review has been offered. It was offered years ago, even decades ago, by Justice Arbour when she was looking at some of these issues. The reason why was because we were essentially changing someone's sentence, we were extending someone's sentence by adding additional punishment through the system.

Does the member not recognize that? If the government truly believes there will be an undue burden on provincial courts, is that not because the practice has been used in such an abusive way that it would require that additional judicial oversight?

• (2215)

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is always someone who contributes in committee work, and I personally appreciate the contributions he has made to this bill.

As always, on the question of judicial review versus independent oversight, there are limited resources that could actually do the work. The government has to decide where those limited resources will be used and whether anybody else can do this work.

It has been the determination that these independent decision-makers can be in the position to do this work without imposing an additional workload at the provincial and federal court levels.

Hon. Kevin Sorenson (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I chair the public accounts committee. There are some significant changes in this bill.

When we look at the supplementary estimates, \$448 million were given to CSC. However, when we have tried to find out what the

financial implications are, the cost of all the measures in the bill, we can not get an answer from the government.

The parliamentary secretary is privy to those briefings with the department. I know that typically those answers are given by the department.

If we have scanners, and the parliamentary secretary talked about limited, I wonder, and I think Canadians wonder as well, what the costs of the bill would be.

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: Mr. Speaker, this is really a considerable move forward when it comes to the use of administrative segregation into a structured intervention unit. There will be need for infrastructure changes. There will be need for personnel changes. There will be need for programming changes and mental health care.

That number is that \$448 million have been put into the latest budget to ensure we actually have the money to do this well. However, it is going to be shared over a series of requirements, everything we need to implement a structured intervention unit. We are going to do it right. Involving all the stakeholders in these decisions as we move forward will be very important.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, for my hon. friend, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, I recognize that the bill before us would make improvements in the situation of solitary confinement. I am particularly grateful to her colleague, the hon. member for Oakville North—Burlington, for working so collaboratively on the committee and helping some of my amendments get through.

However, I am very troubled by the rejection of some of the Senate amendments. I am sure the parliamentary secretary is aware of the letter from Senator Pate to the Minister of Public Safety and the Minister of Justice, which was shared with many members. It spoke to something that is quite compelling, which is unusual when legislation goes through this place. We already have a foreshadowing from the Ontario Court of Appeal that the legislation will not be found to be constitutional.

The citation is from the Canadian Civil Liberties Association case, where the Ontario Court of Appeal comments in relation to the five-day review. The key sentence reads, "Nothing more has been done to remedy the breach", and this is a breach of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in the interim, "and it remains unclear how Bill C-83 will remedy it if enacted."

The Senate amendments and the ones that the hon. parliamentary secretary referenced must go through. We can get the bill faster by accepting these amendments from the Senate. The administrative objections that I heard from the parliamentary secretary do not measure up to the imperative of ensuring the bill is constitutional.

• (2220)

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for her caring about this, for her compassion, and also the hon. member to my right.

Government Orders

This matters. This is not an easy thing to do. We are making significant change to the administrative segregation regime in Canada. We need to do it. The court has told us that we need to do it. There has been a letter explaining why this new way of doing administrative segregation is going to meet the court requirements.

We need to move forward with this to make it happen. Then we will be in a position of having a better chance to help people have a successful rehabilitation and reintegration into society.

Hon. Larry Bagnell (Yukon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, because we are near the end of the session, I want to thank my staff, Brad, Erica, Susan, Ellen, Alisha and formerly Denis Sabourin for their great work.

Also, anyone in the House who has questioned the existence of the Senate, which we call the other place here, this is a great example of where it has provided a number of suggested amendments and the government is accepting a number of them. This has happened since Confederation, where laws in Canada have been approved like this.

With the structured intervention, there would be significantly more time away from the cell and more time for programming, etc. Does the bill direct Correctional Service Canada to record these times to ensure they are followed. If it does not, are there penalties in the bill for CSC?

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question is yes. There is a requirement to record meaningful human contact and time out of the cell, and it needs to be during reasonable day hours. It cannot be during the night. It cannot be at other inopportune times. It must be at normal operating times.

On whether there is a penalty for CSC if it does not provide that, I think there will be recourse. CSC needs to record that time and will be encouraged to meet those standards.

Mr. Matthew Dubé: Mr. Speaker, to go back to the last answer, I would like to quote for the parliamentary secretary Dr. Adelina Iftene who is a law professor at Dalhousie University. Following these amendments and the response to the work that Senate Pate was doing, she said:

The government claims that these units don't fall under the definition of solitary confinement because the amount of time prisoners would be alone in their cells is 20 hours versus 22 hours. While that falls within UN standards...The UN standards state that meaningful contact of two hours or less per day is also considered solitary confinement.

Do the Liberals not believe that living up to the UN standard is the very least they could do, but they have not?

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: Mr. Speaker, the UN standard is very important, but there is also a requirement to actually be able to fulfill that. When we talk about meaningful human contact, we are also talking about the kind of programming the offenders would need. That was the problem with the old system.

If inmates were in administrative segregation, they lost so much access to the kind of programs that would help them succeed, that were would help them move past the position where they were. That kind of mental health programming, that kind of literacy programming, that kind of addiction counselling program will now be available to inmates.

Hon. Kevin Sorenson (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC): Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I would like to seek unanimous consent for this speaking slot to be a regular 20-and-10 speaking slot, rather than unlimited time, and to split the time with the member for Yellowhead. We have unlimited time slots and would ask for unanimous consent to split the time so my friend from Yellowhead can share some of his stories of the Correctional Service.

• (2225)

The Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. member for Battle River—Crowfoot have the unanimous consent of the House to regard this time slot as a 20 and 10 for the purpose of splitting his time?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Hon. Kevin Sorenson: Mr. Speaker, I thank the chamber for doing that.

This undoubtedly will be the last time I ever speak in this place. As I rise on this night, I want to thank the throng of people that have come out to hear this speech.

I rise this evening to speak to Bill C-83, an act to amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act and another act.

This legislation seeks to eliminate administrative segregation in correctional facilities; replace these facilities with new structured intervention units, or SIUs; introduce body scanners for inmates; set parameters for access to health care; and formalize exceptions for indigenous offenders, female offenders and offenders with diagnosed mental health issues.

Just as we fundamentally opposed the bill in its original form, we oppose the government's motion respecting the Senate amendments.

We on this side of the House believe that this legislation has the potential of making prisons more dangerous both for offenders and for correctional officers. I will get into that in a bit.

Drumheller Institution, a medium security facility, is located within my riding of Battle River—Crowfoot. Over the many years I have represented this riding, I have developed a very good rapport with many of the good people who work there.

Correctional officers contact my constituency office on a regular basis, asking for assistance in resolving cases and issues they have within and with their institution. I would never support a bill that could potentially endanger their lives any more than they already are, given that they are employed in an inherently hazardous occupation. Currently, my office has 20 active files and 50 inactive files, but also unresolved files from Drumheller correctional workers with respect to pay issues due to the Phoenix pay system, as well as other issues. They are not alone. Nearly two-thirds of public servants have unresolved pay issues more than three years after the Phoenix system was launched.

Government Orders

Now the national union president representing correctional officers is raising serious concerns about the very real possibility of some new measures taking place within the institution. One of them is the first supervised drug injection site for prisoners. The Correctional Service of Canada has neither confirmed nor denied this is about to happen by the end of the month.

As National President Jeff Wilkins told the National Post in an article that appeared on June 9, “The correctional officers are dead set against the prison needle-exchange and the current way it's being rolled out.” It is a program that he says is unsafe for guards, as they are responsible for distributing needles to prisoners in their cells, a scheme that has done nothing to stop needle sharing and defies reason in that people in prison should not have access to those drugs.

One of my constituents wrote me, “As a Correctional Officer, I am opposed to the proposed Needle Exchange program, which is definitely defeating the purpose of the whole anti-drug thing that we were shooting for in jail. Is there any way that I and other co-workers can express our concerns with our MP?”

I told him that I was definitely open to hearing and discussing these concerns with him and his colleagues. I could not assure him, however, that the Liberal government would listen. I did in fact tell him that I would bring his concerns to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness but was not at all confident that he would be receptive to those concerns.

After 19 years in this place and a number of years as our party's public safety critic for the official opposition in 2001 until about 2005, I have learned that when it comes to justice, under Liberal governments inmates and their rights take precedence over victims and correctional officers' rights.

For the 19 years that I have been in this place, I have repeatedly stood in the House fighting for victims' rights, fighting for changes to the Corrections and Conditional Release Act to end such things as statutory release and promoting the idea of protection of society as a guiding principle in our justice system.

• (2230)

I oppose conditional sentences as originally prescribed by the Liberals, which saw rapists and other violent offenders serve their sentences at home. My constituents back me up on that.

I am equally opposed to needle exchange programs in our correctional institutions, and I am opposed to injection sites. I wholeheartedly agree with the union president that rather than providing needle exchanges and designated sites within prisons for inmates to shoot up, we should perhaps have medical facilities closer to these prisons to deal with the drug overdoses that may result.

So much more should and can be done to stop the drug trade within the correctional facilities, which is leading to overdose, to death and to the continued gang wars that take place within our prisons. Canadians would agree that it defies reason that drugs make their way into the prisons, not to mention the huge amount of drugs and number of needles that circulate.

This is certainly not a new phenomenon. This has been going on for years. The Liberals' only solution is to give the inmates what they want. I disagree.

I fully understand that many inmates are drug addicts and that many of them are in prison as a result of criminal behaviour related to their addiction. They need help. They do not need more drugs, especially drugs that are bought or bartered for within prison. The fact that drugs cannot be stopped from entering our prisons certainly is a blight on the reputation of the Correctional Service of Canada.

As I pointed out this year when I last spoke to this bill, the Correctional Service of Canada certainly has been the subject of much criticism over the last number of years. In that speech, I mentioned one of the fall reports of the Auditor General of Canada, in 2017. It was entitled “Preparing Women Offenders for Release”. The objective of the Auditor General's report was this:

[to determine] whether Correctional Service Canada assigned and delivered correctional programs, interventions, and mental health services to women offenders in federal custody—including Indigenous women offenders—that responded appropriately to their unique needs and helped them successfully reintegrate into the community.

We heard our parliamentary secretary talk about correctional programs tonight, and this bill also deals with indigenous women offenders.

As noted by the Auditor General:

Under the Corrections and Conditional Release Act, Correctional Service Canada is required to provide programs and services that respond to the needs of women offenders.

The report states:

Overall, we found that Correctional Service Canada had not implemented an initial security classification process designed specifically for women offenders.... As a result, some women offenders risked being held at inappropriate security levels...

Furthermore, and most relevant to our debate here this evening, the Auditor General concluded:

We found that Correctional Service Canada had not confirmed whether its tools correctly identified women offenders with mental health issues or assigned them the appropriate level of care.

I also spoke about report 6 of the fall 2018 Auditor General report on community supervision of offenders, in which the Auditor General found that while the number of offenders released into community supervision had grown and was expected to keep growing, the Correctional Service of Canada had reached the limit of how many offenders it could house in the community. Despite the growing backlog and despite research that showed that a gradual supervised release gave offenders a better chance of successful reintegration, the Correctional Service of Canada did not have a long-term plan to respond to its housing pressures.

The Auditor General also found that the Correctional Service of Canada did not properly manage offenders under community supervision. Parole officers did not always meet with offenders as often as they should have, nor did parole officers always monitor offenders' compliance with special conditions imposed by the Parole Board of Canada.

Government Orders

I continue today to implore the Liberal government to focus on ensuring that the Correctional Service of Canada fully meets its mandate. The safety and security of Canadians depends on the successful rehabilitation and reintegration of offenders into society upon their release. Given the findings of the Office of the Auditor General, I believe that uneasiness with respect to safety and security of Canadians extends well beyond Bill C-83.

• (2235)

I implore the current government to start thinking about those who find themselves in danger's way daily by implementing measures and policies to protect them. If it only took the time to consult them, I am confident their ideas, based on years of experience, would ensure Correctional Services Canada would be able to fulfill its mandate.

I am thankful for the opportunity to speak tonight. I look forward to any questions.

Ms. Pam Damoff (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while we are debating Bill C-83 tonight, the hon. member spent a great deal of time talking about corrections officers and the needle exchange program, which has absolutely nothing to do with this bill.

He mentioned that there has been no consultation with corrections officers. I would like to correct the record on that. I have met with them numerous times and the minister just recently spoke at their meeting in Calgary. Quite frankly, if we had not had the draconian cuts to corrections that were made over the last 10 years, our corrections officers would be much better prepared in their daily efforts at work. I have the utmost respect for corrections officers.

My question to the hon. member has to do with the Senate amendments, which is what the debate is about tonight. Will his party be supporting them?

Hon. Kevin Sorenson: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the consultations, let me quote what Jason Godin, president of the Union of Canadian Correctional Officers, said. This is partly involving the costing of the bill. He stated, "Unfortunately, due to cabinet confidentiality, as our commissioner often tells us, we weren't really consulted." That is what the union said.

When I speak to my officers, they are not consulted about a whole host of issues.

A member of the committee said she spoke to a number of people. However, it should not just be a chat with someone on the sideline of a committee meeting, but deep consultations with not just the union but correctional officers.

Godin continues, "The bill was as much a surprise to us as it was to anybody. I don't see the bill before it comes onto the table, so we weren't officially consulted on Bill C-83."

Here is our problem. I asked the parliamentary secretary tonight about the costing of the bill. She gave us a line item, but she did not specify what the costs would be for the scanners or the change to the integration system and no longer having the administrative segregation. We do not have those answers.

This is another one of these bills where we moved into tonight's last few hours of debate after the government invoked closure and time allocation.

I will go into some of what Senator Pate said. She stated, "If there have been no meaningful consultations to this point on this process, then I would not have faith that those mechanisms would be put in place within the prison setting". Although the Senate has brought forth amendments, the senator is saying she recognizes there is a lack of consultation.

Ms. Rachael Harder (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, talking about consultation, interestingly, two weeks ago there were several hundred correctional officers who gathered on the lawn here on Parliament Hill to protest the current government and its decision to introduce a needle exchange program within the federal prisons. Officers would say they were not consulted on this decision and that they very much feel they have been put in harm's way by the installation of this program.

I am wondering if the hon. member could comment on this further and highlight the importance of consulting with those who are on the front lines, day in and day out.

Hon. Kevin Sorenson: Mr. Speaker, I served in government. I know consultations. For me, it was budget consultations across the country, meeting with as many as we could, meeting with people in every community and every chamber. There were consultations online, as well as in person.

The hon. member is correct. When I spoke to my correctional officers, they said they were not consulted. When we speak to the union, it said there was inadequate consultation.

In the case the member is referring to, which is a little different than what the scope of the bill is, on the needle exchanges the officers are very concerned about their safety. We know that the needle that was maybe used to shoot up a drug could also be used as a weapon in the hands of that offender against other offenders and against correctional officers. It is one thing to say they are employed in an inherently dangerous surrounding, and another for governments to say they had better consult and make sure that what they are doing is the right thing. Unfortunately, the current government fails on consultation every time.

• (2240)

Mr. Jim Eglinski (Yellowhead, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my partner from Battle River—Crowfoot in speaking to Bill C-83. I have stood in the House a number of times to speak to it, and I was on the committee that studied Bill C-83, an act to amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act and another act.

This has been a bad bill right from the beginning. The Liberals did not listen to very many people. They wrote the bill, brought it before committee and forced it upon it, as they are doing today, forcing us in the second-to-last day Parliament is sitting to speak to the amendments that have been brought in by the Senate. The Liberals do not like the amendments, but they want to push this through.

Government Orders

From the beginning, when we started studying Bill C-83 at committee, a number of witnesses came forward. The John Howard Society said it was bad. The Elizabeth Fry Society said it was bad. We had a 19-year prisoner who admitted to being a pretty bad guy, and he said parts of the bill were bad. He was the type of person who needed to be put into a segregation unit to protect the guards and other prisoners, and even himself. The British Columbia Civil Liberties Association said it was a bad bill. The Native Women's Association said it was a bad bill. There were a number of organizations.

Now we have it brought before us, as I said, on the second-to-last day before the House rises for the summer.

My friend from Battle River—Crowfoot just mentioned the corrections union and that his union was not spoken to. Very much like the institution in his riding at Drumheller, which is medium-security, I have a medium-security facility in the town of Grande Cache, in the great riding of Yellowhead. It is probably one of the most beautiful jail settings in North America. It is on top of a mountain overlooking the Rocky Mountains. There are a large number of aboriginal prisoners there.

I know some of the guards there very well; some of them went to school with my daughter years ago. They are very concerned that they were not consulted properly and that Bill C-83, if enacted the way it is, will make it dangerous for the guards. That is totally unacceptable.

The change would make prisoners more dangerous for the guards, as they will have to deal with the worst of the worst and the most volatile being out and about from their cells for four hours a day.

I totally agree that things need to change and we need to be civil and human in how we treat prisoners. Many years ago, I had the privilege to be on what the RCMP called provost duty. I escorted prisoners throughout British Columbia and western Canada back and forth from remand centres and detachments to prisons, etc. I came to know many of these individuals on a personal basis and many times I travelled 200 or 300 miles with three prisoners by myself.

One could be a real dick and those guys would hate it by the time they got to the destination, or one could be a decent individual, have a conversation with them, treat them decently, with respect and dignity, and have a 200- or 300-mile drive with three prisoners.

• (2245)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I am curious to see what the translation for that word was. I do not think it was very parliamentary. I realize this is probably the member's last speech, so I will not call him on it. I will let him continue.

Mr. Jim Eglinski: Mr. Speaker, it is my last speech, and I do apologize. It was just the terminology that slipped out.

Years ago we learned that we had to give respect to the prisoners. They had to be treated properly. That is no different today. I realize that Bill C-83 is trying to do that in a number of areas. As our colleagues in the Senate have said, there are some things that need to be corrected. I hate to say it, but the Liberals are not listening again.

My primary purpose in getting up today is to say that the women and men who work in our institutions do a great job for our country.

They are a fantastic group of people. In many cases, maybe even more than police officers who are out on the street or our military who might be defending some country somewhere, these guys are right on the front lines.

A lot of our prisoners are everyday common people. We do not need to worry too much about them. They are civil. We can have great conversations with them. We can joke around with them. However, we do have some real bad apples there. Some have mental health problems. Some are just downright mean. Some can be rehabilitated. Some, and I am going back to 50 years of experience, cannot be rehabilitated or do not want to be rehabilitated, and that is where the problem comes with segregation.

I know that the Supreme Court has ruled that we need to change our policies. We need to give prisoners more rights, but that will come at a cost to the country. I guess we will have to accept that, because that is what it has ruled.

However, the primary thing is that I want my friends and my constituents who work at Grande Cache Institution to be safe. I want the average prisoner who is there, who maybe was picked up for impaired driving or maybe something minor, who is not really a bad person, to be very safe in our institutions. That is my primary concern.

My colleagues across have been given a number of recommendations from the Senate that I think need to be addressed and cannot be ignored. I did not pick up on all of them, and I am not going to deal with all of them. However there is one I thought I would spend a little time talking about.

The Senate said that the authority should be left with the institutions as to the movement of a prisoner to a provincial institution. That is only rational, good, common sense. I am not knocking professional health people. They do a great job for us, but we have some great con artists in our jails who could sweet talk the Speaker into letting them sit up there while the Speaker took their place. That is how good they are. I know that the Speaker would never be conned. However, that is where my fear comes in. The institution staff know these people. They are dealing with them 24 hours a day, seven days a week. They know how slick the prisoners can be.

A medical professional coming in, maybe for an hour or two or maybe three hours a week, could be baffled. That is why I think it was a very wise decision that came back from the Senate. It was a common-sense correction, yet it is being ignored.

I appreciate being given the time to stand up here to defend the institutional guards at Grande Cache and others across the country. They are doing a great job for us.

• (2250)

Get rid of the needles. I am not going any further with that. It is the biggest mistake we ever made.

Government Orders

Ms. Pam Damoff (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by thanking the hon. member for his service to this country and everything that he has done in this place. From the bottom of my heart, I want to give him my thanks. It was truly an honour and a pleasure to work with him on the public safety committee. I have so much respect for his opinions.

I am asking this question from a very sincere place. As the member knows, we are under a timeline from the Supreme Court of Canada. We have passed this bill. It has gone to the Senate. The Senate has come back with some fairly significant amendments, some of them requiring judicial oversight, which we do not agree with. Some of them we have agreed with, such as the one for mental health assessment when a prisoner first arrives in the institution.

I am just wondering if the member feels it is important to get this legislation done, because the alternative would be that the courts would impose a solution. I just recently spoke with the past president of UCCO and I have spoken to corrections officers, and they were concerned that if we do not get this legislation done, the courts could put something else through. They are concerned that they would have zero input into that.

I am wondering what the member's thoughts are on that, and I give my thanks again for his service.

Mr. Jim Eglinski: Mr. Speaker, I hate to rush anything unless it is correct. The Senate has studied this bill, as has the committee, and we have heard from many witnesses. If we just bring it forward because we are threatened by the possibility that the courts might take action, we should have thought of that right off the bat and got at it a little more quickly than we did. We are here on the last day.

Again, the issue goes back to the safety of the people. Yes, I agree with a psychiatric review when a person comes in, but if we bring these measures forward, is that going to make it very difficult to correct them afterward, and is it going to put a guard's safety in jeopardy in the next month or two before we come back to help correct it in the fall?

Mr. Matthew Dubé (Beloeil—Chambly, NDP): Mr. Speaker, like my colleague from Oakville North—Burlington, I do want to thank the member for his service and say what a pleasure it was to work together on the public safety committee. He is certainly a straight shooter, and it led to probably some of the best witness testimony we could get. At the risk of mixing metaphors, it was also a bit disarming. I think we tend to like to be verbose at committee, but getting to the point is something we could do more of. My thanks to him for that.

I do want to ask the member this question. We have talked a lot about consultations. He mentioned it in the context of correctional officers. We both know from being at the committee that most of the major stakeholders on this file, if not all of them, told us at committee that they were not consulted.

There was a first go that the government had at this, Bill C-56, which never got to be debated at second reading when it was tabled in 2017. This bill was tabled late last year, and we are now finalizing debate. I just wonder what my colleague thinks about this. While there is a tight timeline and he is talking about rushing it, the reality

is that with the Ashley Smith inquest and some other things, this has been on the agenda even before the government took power.

I am wondering what the member thinks of the fact that there was the opportunity to consult and there was the opportunity to get it right, but now there have been some court decisions, a rushed timeline and a bit of legislative dropping the ball, if I am allowed that turn of phrase. What does the member think about that situation?

• (2255)

Mr. Jim Eglinski: Mr. Speaker, the member is absolutely correct. None of the witnesses really agreed with this bill. We were given this bill as written by the senior management of Canada's institutional system, but with no consultation with the unions or stakeholders. The committee was to get it through as fast as possible and get it passed. The Senate saw the mistakes. We could see the mistakes. The witnesses could see the mistakes.

We are going to make a bigger mistake if we go and vote for it with the errors or with the Senate submissions being omitted.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Matthew Dubé (Beloeil—Chambly, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I will be proposing an amendment at the end of my speech. Please let me know when I have one minute remaining.

I would like to share with the House a few important quotes.

First, I will go over the topic I just raised in my question to the hon. member for Yellowhead. In Canada, administrative segregation is a scourge. It has been overused for many years and was an issue well before the current government came to power.

During the previous Parliament, two of our colleagues, the member for Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke, who was the critic, and the former member for Alfred-Pellan, Rosane Doré Lefebvre, who was the deputy critic, asked many questions about the inquest into the tragic circumstances surrounding Ashley Smith's death. I invite all parliamentarians who wish to speak about that case to read that file.

It is horrifying to see that this teenager, this child, was killed. The findings of the inquest attest to the negligence and abuse in the prison system. The Correctional Service of Canada has to take responsibility for its role in this tragedy.

It is all the more troubling when we consider that members of her family, namely her mother and her sister, if I remember correctly, came to testify before the Senate committee. Senator Pate, who was doing amazing work on this file long before being appointed to the Senate, had invited them to testify. In their testimony, the family members said they were disappointed and furious with the Prime Minister and the Minister of Public Safety, who were supposed to make improvements to ensure that the circumstances surrounding Ashley's death never happened again. They invoked her name and her memory to justify their approach, but in the end this approach will not help resolve the situation at all.

Government Orders

Since the Liberals took office, two courts and the Supreme Court have granted extensions and the government has requested a stay because the legislation before us has not yet passed. The courts found what we have known for a long time, namely that excessive use of administrative segregation is unconstitutional.

That pronouncement is deeply disturbing. We know of numerous cases of abuse. Incidentally, those cases of abuse are not exclusive to federal institutions. However, given our jurisdiction and the limited time we have left, we cannot delve into the many troubling cases that worry us, including the one that happened recently in Ontario.

• (2300)

[*English*]

It is important to bear in mind that the remedy the government is proposing is no remedy at all. In fact, it is quite the contrary. The reason so many stakeholders, and in certain cases, the loved ones of victims of the abusive use of solitary confinement, have deplored this is that all we have is a rebrand. It is solitary confinement under a different name.

As is unfortunately too often the case with the government, we have to propose amendments and make changes to bills, pointing out there are a few things that might be better. Experts agree that the courts will continue to find this practice, even if under a different name like structured intervention units, to be unconstitutional. I will come back to this with some quotes I pulled up earlier, which I want to share with the House.

Bill C-83 was one of the first bills that came before our committee and was opposed by all the witnesses. Rarely had I seen this until quite recently, although there have been a few since then. I am sure Liberal members could pull out a couple of quotes to say that corrections officers think this would be an okay approach. However, the witnesses were opposed to this approach, because a variety of things were not in place that needed to be.

[*Translation*]

One of the Senate's proposed amendments is to require judicial approval for an inmate to be held in solitary confinement. This is nothing new. Justice Louise Arbour conducted an inquiry into riots at an institution in Saskatchewan. She noted that the overuse of segregation has an impact on inmates.

Judges sometimes impose sentences of imprisonment as part of their duties and authority. However, when segregation is overused, this means that institutions, their managers and, ultimately, the Correctional Service of Canada are altering the judge's decision. They are modifying the sentence handed down by the judge. This was Justice Arbour's argument, which is why she advocated for the use of judicial supervision.

• (2305)

[*English*]

What is particularly troubling to me is that I proposed an amendment, now Senator Pate has proposed an amendment and these amendments are being rejected by the government. My understanding, after hearing the parliamentary secretary's speech earlier tonight, is that it would cause an increased workload on provincial courts. Ultimately, the sad and tragic thing about that

argument is that the only reason it would cause an increased workload is because of the abusive use of solitary confinement as so many individuals are being subjected to the practice when they should not necessarily be.

Focusing on women offenders in particular, I presented an amendment at committee to end the practice completely in women's institutions. Why? The figures demonstrate two things. One is that the number of women in solitary confinement is infinitesimal. The practice is not necessary for maintaining security in our institutions, which is obviously the primary reason it is used most of the time. The second is quite simply that pregnant women, women with mental health problems and indigenous women are the women most often negatively affected by the abusive use of solitary confinement. There is certainly an argument to be made about that, but at the very least, it should be with judicial oversight.

In fact, the argument might also be made that Senator Pate's amendment goes too far. I do not think so, which, as I said, leads us to support the amendment, but there are other routes as well. I proposed an amendment that sought a longer period of 15 days before judicial oversight would be required. It is certainly a much longer and wider threshold than what Senator Pate is proposing. That was also rejected.

The fact of the matter is that the issue we are facing here is quite contradictory. I want to go back to another issue that was raised by the parliamentary secretary about the burden we would be putting on provinces. The parliamentary secretary mentioned the burden on provincial mental health hospitals and institutions. That is one of reasons I wanted the Senate amendments. Members will forgive me for not recalling the exact amendment, but this was being proposed.

We look at the same Public Safety department, through the work of my provincial colleague in Queen's Park, Jennifer French. It has fought the Ontario government for years over the fact that it has contracts with Public Safety Canada to detain, in some cases with dubious human rights parameters, immigrants who have sometimes not even committed crimes and have uncertain legal status in our country. When that is the purview of the federal government, these individuals are treated very poorly.

I do not have the title with me, but I would be happy to share with them a great report in the Toronto Star two years ago, if I am not mistaken, on some of these individuals. One individual, for example, in the U.S. was apparently accused of stealing a DVD, but was never found guilty in court. He came to Canada, was working through the process for permanent residency and due to a variety of issues, he is now being detained in a provincial prison under poor circumstances, without the proper accountability that a normal detention process would have. Even though that is the responsibility of the federal government, there are issues like overcrowding and such, and that is through subcontracting that the federal government does with the provinces.

[*Translation*]

Why am I talking about a completely different case? I am simply trying to demonstrate the government's hypocrisy.

Government Orders

The government has no qualms about working with the provinces. In some cases, it even forces them to implement legislation and various mechanisms related to our legal and correctional systems. Now, the government wants to use the provinces as an argument to continue violating inmates' rights.

As promised, I will share some quotes. I want to share two of them with the House.

[English]

First of all, I want to go to the Ontario Court of Appeal ruling granting the second extension, in April. Certainly my colleagues who are lawyers will not appreciate me selectively quoting. It is always a dubious and dangerous game, but I will do so for the sake of expediency. The court said this:

Extensive evidence is put forward outlining the legislative process, the steps necessary to implement the Bill [Bill C-83] including cost, staff training, infrastructure, public consultations.... But this court remains where we were when the first extension was argued: we have virtually nothing to indicate that the constitutional breach identified by the application judge is being or will be addressed in the future.

It is pretty clear from that quote and that extension, and not even the initial judgment ruling that the practice was unconstitutional, that this is an issue the bill will not resolve.

I sort of opened the door to this at the beginning, and I did not quite finish that thought, but I did want to come back to it, because I just mentioned the second extension.

Bill C-56 was tabled in 2017, the first attempt by the government to deal with this, because it was, after all, part of not one minister's but two ministers' mandate letters, the minister of justice and the Minister of Public Safety. As I said, it was a debate that began in the previous Parliament and even before through a variety of public inquiries and the like.

Finally, we get to Bill C-83, which was tabled late last year. Here we are now, at the eleventh hour, having it rammed through, because the government, quite frankly, did not do its proper homework. It is problematic, because here we have the Liberals asking for extensions and having to go now, in the last few weeks, to the Supreme Court, of all places, to get an additional extension. The thing is that the witnesses at committee were not consulted. No one was consulted except the officials in the minister's office, and they all came to committee to tell us that.

[Translation]

I would like someone to explain to me how this could be an issue when the Prime Minister included it in his 2015 mandate letters for the ministers responsible. A bill was introduced in 2017, and two decisions by two different courts, the B.C. Supreme Court and the Ontario Superior Court of Justice, were handed down in late 2017 and early 2018. Then Bill C-83 was introduced in late 2018. Then not one, not two, but three applications were filed for an extension to implement what the courts had requested.

That is interesting. I have a great deal of respect for my colleague from Oakville North—Burlington. Earlier, when she asked the member for Yellowhead a question, she stated that it might be more beneficial for correctional officers if we were to pass the bill so as not to have to impose the will of the courts upon them.

Personally, to defend human rights and prevent people from dying in our prisons due to excessive use of administrative segregation, I would like the courts' restrictions and terms to be imposed. Of course, that is what we wanted to see in the legislation.

On a similar note, I would like to come back to the UN rules concerning segregation, which are known as the Nelson Mandela rules.

They cover a number of factors: the number of consecutive days in administrative segregation, the number of consecutive hours in administrative segregation and the number of hours spent outside the cell. Viewers might see that last point as problematic, but when inmates are outside their cells, they are not frolicking in wildflower meadows. I hope my colleagues will forgive my humorous tone when talking about such a serious issue. All that means is outside the cell used for administrative segregation. The rules also mention the importance of meaningful human contact.

Now I would like to read the quote I read a small part of when I asked the parliamentary secretary a question.

● (2310)

[English]

Dr. Adelina Iftene is a law professor at Dalhousie University. I will read the full quote and I ask for colleagues' indulgence. She said:

The government claims that these units don't fall under the definition of solitary confinement because the amount of time prisoners would be alone in their cells is 20 hours versus 22 hours. While that falls within UN standards, the amount of time prisoners would have meaningful contact with other human beings—two hours per day—does not. The UN standards state that meaningful contact of two hours or less per day is also considered solitary confinement. The government simply cannot argue that its proposed regime is not segregation. Passing a bill that does not include a cap on segregation time and judicial oversight will lead to another unconstitutional challenge.... Refusal to pass the bill with amendments would be a sign of bad faith, disregard for taxpayers' money and for the rule of law. It is disheartening to see such resistance to upholding human rights at home by a country that champions human rights abroad.

[Translation]

That drives home the point that the window dressing may have changed, but the store still carries the same goods. Please forgive my use of such a light-hearted expression. The system is the same, and it still has harsh and sometimes fatal consequences for people.

Some people argue that there are public safety reasons for this and that some of these inmates have committed horrible crimes and deserve to be punished. However, by far most of the people subjected to excessive use of administrative segregation struggle with mental health problems. That is a problem because these people are not getting the care they need for either their own rehabilitation or to ensure public safety objectives are achieved and they stop posing a threat to communities and society. Excessive use is at odds with our mental health and rehabilitation goals, and that is bad for public safety. I would encourage anyone who says this measure will improve public safety to think again because there is a situation here we really need to address.

Government Orders

I have a lot more that I would like to say, but my time is running out. As members can see, this problem has been around for years. Many stakeholders gave inspiring testimony, despite the sombre issue and our discouragement with regard to the government's proposals and inaction. What is more, what the Senate has been doing when it comes to some of the bills that were democratically passed by the House is deplorable. I am thinking of the bill introduced by my colleague from James Bay and the one introduced by our former colleague from Edmonton, Rona Ambrose, on sexual assault. That being said, Senator Pate has done extraordinary work. She has experience in the field. She used to work at the Elizabeth Fry Society. She knows what she is talking about, much more than anyone in the House. I tip my hat to her for the amendments that she managed to get adopted in the Senate. I support them.

Accordingly, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Jonquière:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "That" and substituting the following: "the amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-83, An Act to amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act and the Abolition of Early Parole Act, be now read a second time and concurred in."

• (2315)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The amendment is in order.

Questions and comments. The hon. member for Yukon.

[*English*]

Hon. Larry Bagnell (Yukon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions. I think the member answered one at the end of his speech.

I think the Conservatives will vote against this bill, this concept, because they think it makes the prisons and people more dangerous. The member is making the case that because of the effect of solitary confinement on a person's mental and social situation, it makes it more dangerous not to deal with it.

The member wants improvements to the bill, which could come with a new Parliament in the fall, or at the five-year review or through the court challenge that he mentioned. However, if the votes of the New Democrats cause the bill to be defeated so nothing happens, does the member not think some inmates could have poorer treatment this summer? There are some improvements in the bill, obviously not enough, but there is more time out of cell, more rehabilitation services, etc.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I just want to remind the hon. members when they are asking a question or giving a speech, if they have their earpiece, to keep it away from the microphones. The translators are doing a wonderful job, and we do not want to damage their ears this late in the game.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Matthew Dubé: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

[*English*]

I have a couple of things. First, as I said, the bill, despite some extremely minor improvements, will perpetuate the status quo. In fact, I would not be concerned about the bill being scrapped, because the consequence of that would be the court's conditions would be imposed on Correctional Service Canada, which are much more restrictive in the use of solitary confinement.

I will go back to the other part of the member's question; I was getting to it at the end of my speech. The concerns raised by corrections officers are certainly valid. At the end of the day, the member from Oakville was correct in pointing out that the cuts they had been subject to was something they continued to have to deal with. Interestingly enough, they are also part of the reason why this practice has perpetuated.

For corrections officers, a decision has to be made about an offender who is causing an issue within the institution. If there is a mental health issue and there are no mental health resources available, or the officers do not have the resources, the only option then is to put the offender in solitary for safety reasons.

I am open to a debate on this. I proposed amendments to eliminate it at women's institutions. There is an argument from the John Howard Society and others that it still has its place in men's institutions. Ultimately, that is the role of judicial oversight. We do recognize there might be an urgency within 24 or 48 hours, maybe even over the span of a couple of days, depending on who is asked or what expert we speak to.

At the end of the day, without the proper oversight, and this bill just does not have it in my estimation, the concerns will still remain. Corrections officers are stuck. They are flying by the seat of their pants, and improvising a little. It is not something they want to do. I do not think this legislation provides them with either the resources or the clarity they seek to do the work they would like to do. Their goal is not to prejudice anyone's rights; it is the contrary. They need our help to do it and they are just not getting it.

• (2320)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Karine Trudel (Jonquière, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Beloeil—Chambly for his excellent work.

I have had the opportunity to work with him over the past four years. I find he has a way with words and that his speeches help us better understand what is really going on.

In his speech, my colleague said that he had a lot more to say but that he was running out of time. I would therefore like him to take this opportunity to elaborate further.

Mr. Matthew Dubé: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her kind words, which are very much appreciated.

Indeed, this is a complex file. As I said earlier today during the debate on another motion, when dealing with public safety and correctional institutions, people often talk about individuals who do not deserve any sympathy, and with good reason. However, we have a duty to make sure they are rehabilitated. That is one of the objectives of the Correctional Service of Canada. It is also an objective that we all should share, for reasons I mentioned, namely public safety. After all, any effort we can make to lower recidivism rates will contribute to public safety.

Government Orders

We also need to uphold human rights. To repeat some of the quotation I read, we champion human rights abroad and denounce how prisoners are treated in other countries. I will not name any, but we can all think of some examples. It is important that we be consistent here at home.

We must acknowledge that human rights abuses can adversely affect the mental health of Canadian citizens, whether criminal or not, and then those individuals continue their journey as inmates in a correctional institution. In some cases, it can even cause the deaths of certain individuals, in all kinds of tragic circumstances. We need to recognize that there is still a great deal of work to be done.

In closing, I am very disappointed that the government has done nothing even though it clearly said it would fix the problem. Civil society is progressing, but the government is satisfied with what it has done. Unfortunately, regardless of what the parliamentary secretary said earlier, the Liberals agreed to amendments that are, at best, cosmetic and, at worst, watered down and much weaker than what was put forward initially.

I believe this measure comes to us from the minister's office and does not take into account the goals Canadians want us to achieve. It certainly does not reflect what we heard from people who are involved in this issue and have spent decades working to improve our communities, in part through the correctional system.

I thank my colleague for giving me the opportunity to recap.

[*English*]

Ms. Pam Damoff (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for his work on the bill. Along with this legislation is an investment of \$450 million, of which \$150 million will be for mental health. I know we disagree on the legislation, but I am wondering whether the hon. member feels that this investment is important for corrections.

• (2325)

Mr. Matthew Dubé: Mr. Speaker, since this may be the last time to speak on this issue, which we have had the chance to work on, I want to thank the member for her advocacy and the opportunity we had to work together.

As I mentioned in a previous response, the public safety file is a challenging one because we are sometimes swimming upstream when it comes to dealing with complicated issues that are not always the issues that garner the most sympathy from the public, but they do have important outcomes for our communities and for many individuals in Canada.

We were able to accomplish many important things, and I thank the member for that and for her continued advocacy. As she mentioned, while we might disagree, I certainly know that, at the very least, she is a persistent voice in the minister's ear on some of these issues.

I am never going to speak against any further investment on issues that I believe are important, and certainly the investments she talked about are important. It does leave me to raise a final concern with the remaining few seconds that I probably have left. There were some specifics I raised at committee, concerns that I had with some of the wording of the bill.

Often, as I mentioned earlier, corrections officers do not have the resources, or even if there are mental health resources in an institution, they might not always be readily available at the time of an incident. Therefore, it sometimes makes it challenging for them to make the decision that leads to the best mental health outcomes.

My concern is that some aspects of the bill are phrased in such a way that there could be a potential loophole. Some of those concerns were alleviated, but others still remain. I am pleased to see them continue to go in that direction, but unfortunately we will have to agree to disagree on the substance of the bill.

I do not believe that this is the right approach. I want to see strong parameters around the use of solitary confinement in the country, in line with the court decisions we have seen, with UN standards and certainly with judicial oversight. That is the direction I believe we need to go in.

Again, I want to say that it has been a pleasure to work with the member and hopefully we can push these issues forward in the years to come, even if it is not in these roles or any other roles that we might play in this place.

Ms. Pam Damoff (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Parliament has been studying Bill C-83 for the last nine months. Its essence and objective are the same now as they were when the bill was introduced: to provide a way to separate inmates from the general population in an institution when doing so is necessary for safety reasons, without cutting off those inmates from rehabilitative interventions, programs, mental health care and meaningful human contact.

The main feature of the bill is the replacement of administrative segregation with structured intervention units, or SIUs. In SIUs, inmates would get a minimum of four hours out of the cell every day, twice as much as they currently get in administrative segregation, and for the first time, there would be a legal entitlement to meaningful human contact of at least two hours every day.

In addition to these legislative changes, the government is investing \$450 million so that the Correctional Service will be able to hire the staff necessary to provide programs, interventions and mental health care in SIUs and to do it all safely. This investment is critical to the success of the SIUs.

During my conversations with both the Union of Safety and Justice Employees and the Union of Canadian Correctional Officers, as well as during visits I made to corrections facilities in Edmonton and Saskatoon last year, something I heard loud and clear was that there was a need for meaningful investments in corrections to atone for 10 years of cuts by the previous Conservative government so that we can ensure the best rehabilitative outcomes for inmates, and just as importantly, ensure the safety of those who work in corrections.

My friend Stan Stapleton, the national president of the Union of Safety and Justice Employees, wrote an article in May 2019, and I would like to read from it now:

Correctional Service Canada's use of solitary confinement must change. The long-standing practice of managing difficult offenders by [the use of]...solitary confinement is totally unworkable. As Canada's courts have said, it is also profoundly inhumane. Men and women serving federal time are broken and desperate human beings in need of meaningful contact, not further isolation.

Government Orders

At the same time, federal prisons are fraught with danger. The pressure cooker environment and threats of violence lead some prisoners to seek time away from the general population for their own sanity and safety.

Other offenders with a strong propensity for violence and few coping skills simply cannot manage long periods with others without posing a real threat. In a system with few safety valves, administrative segregation (or solitary confinement) has tragically become one of the few.

The new legislation proposes significant changes to solitary. Bill C-83 definitely won't solve everything, but it's a worthy next step. It will mandate that Correctional Service Canada dedicate the appropriate human resources for sustained rehabilitative efforts. Until now, the opportunity for parole officers, program officers, and teachers to spend quality time with the highest needs offenders has been minimal, if existent.

It will render offenders separated from the general population a priority, instead of an after-thought, within Corrections. It will enforce better reporting and accountability mechanisms.

I believe the proposed segregation units will benefit from independent oversight outside of Corrections, as is proposed by the Bill. This is crucial. But to ensure that the Bill does what is intended, the Correctional Service needs to glean the ongoing wisdom of those on the front lines of rehabilitating offenders every day....

A commitment to keep all Canadians safe means serious investments in rehabilitating all offenders in federal prisons, 90 percent of whom will be released back into the community, ready or not. I am hopeful that Bill C-83 passes so that the real work can begin.

That is the end of the article.

I want to thank Stan for his years of service to corrections, for his assistance with my understanding of our corrections system and for providing all of us with the critical perspective of those working in corrections.

Let me return to Bill C-83. The amendments made at the public safety committee last fall addressed practical concerns raised by certain witnesses to help ensure that the new system would function as intended.

The committee heard from indigenous groups, including Dr. Allen Benson and the Native Women's Association of Canada, who called for changes to the definition of indigenous organizations to ensure that it properly captured the diverse range of indigenous groups and organizations working on these issues across Canada.

● (2330)

Following the discussion, the committee was able to unanimously approve an amendment that called for indigenous organizations to predominantly have indigenous leadership. We also heard about the need for CSC to seek advice, particularly in matters of mental health and behaviours, from indigenous spiritual leaders or elders. I was pleased that my amendment to that effect was adopted at committee.

The bill has changed in significant ways since it was first introduced. I am proud to work for a government that is amenable to feedback and was receptive to amendments, informed by witness testimony that we heard at the public safety committee, that make the bill even stronger.

At report stage, we made a major additional amendment, one that I am incredibly proud to have introduced, that creates a mechanism to provide binding, independent, external oversight of SIUs.

The Senate has sent the bill back to us with some additional proposals. I appreciate the intent of all of the Senate's proposals and I am glad the government is accepting several of them, in whole or in part.

Those that we are accepting include the following: mandatory mental health assessments for all inmates within 30 days of admission and within 24 hours of transfer to an SIU; adding precision to the section of the bill that requires the Correctional Service to consider systemic and background factors in decisions affecting indigenous inmates; establishing the consideration of alternatives to incarceration, where appropriate, as a guiding principle of the Correctional Service; and minimizing the use of strip searches.

Other proposals from the Senate are interesting ideas, but they really should be studied as stand-alone items rather than included as amendments to this bill. For example, the idea of expanding the use of measures developed for indigenous corrections to non-indigenous inmates might be valid. When I visited the Pê Sâkâstêw and Buffalo Sage healing lodges in Edmonton last year, I saw first-hand the incredible impact that the programming in these institutions was having on outcomes for inmates who are serving their sentences there.

At Buffalo Sage, I was honoured to take part in a circle with Elder Vicky and hearing from strong female offenders, women who have survived what life has thrown at them and are now on a healing journey, immersed in their culture and on the road to rehabilitation and reintegration. These were women who had escaped violent abusers and themselves ended up in prison, women whose lack of housing and poverty led them to the criminal justice system, and women who lost their children to the foster system. One individual at Buffalo Sage shared with me that for the first time since entering the correction system, at Buffalo Sage she felt that she was able to heal.

I also had the privilege of visiting Pê Sâkâstêw, a men's healing lodge, where I had a memorable meeting with a 39-year-old indigenous man who first came into the justice system at 12 as a young offender. After a life in and out of jail, a life that included abuse and addictions, he was serving a sentence for robbery and now was on a successful healing journey. He lives as a man in prison and a woman outside, and prefers the "he" pronoun. He had reconnected with his community for the first time in 20 years.

I have a lot more that I could say in support of healing lodges and their impact on correctional outcomes for indigenous offenders, but a lot of work would have to go into determining how the Senate's vision would be executed, including what aspects could be borrowed from indigenous programming, what elements would have to be redesigned, what kind of community support exists and where the funding would come from without diminishing from the services provided to the indigenous prison population, which we know is the fastest-growing prison population in Canada.

Government Orders

Another example from the Senate is a proposal designed to deter misconduct by correctional employees and to support inmates affected by it.

It is important to point out that the vast majority of correctional staff are trained professionals doing a very hard job with skill and dedication. They are individuals for whom I have the utmost respect, who work in a job that gets little in the way of accolades from Canadians. Whenever there is an issue with someone working in corrections, we must absolutely address those situations. However, in my opinion, the Senate's proposal of shortening inmates' sentences because of the conduct of correctional personnel is not the right approach.

The Senate has also proposed an amendment that would require the authorization of a provincial superior court for any SIU placement longer than 48 hours.

Once more, I understand and share the objective of ensuring that SIUs are properly used. Robust oversight will help see to it that SIUs will be a last resort, that placements in SIUs will be as short as possible, and that inmates in SIUs are receiving all the time out of cell and meaningful human contact to which the bill entitles them.

• (2335)

It is important to note that in the context of administrative segregation, the Ontario Superior Court of Justice has found that placements must be examined by the fifth working day by a reviewer who is "completely outside the circle of influence of the person whose decision is being reviewed" and "able to substitute its decision for that of the person whose decision is being reviewed." The court was explicit that the reviewer need not be external to the Correctional Service Canada and, in fact, recommending "an administrative review provided by the Correctional Service of Canada." While this finding was specifically in relation to administrative segregation and not SIUs, Bill C-83 would create a review process for SIUs consistent with what the court required for administrative segregation.

Under Bill C-83, SIU placements will be reviewed by the fifth working day by the institutional head who does not report to the initial decision-maker and who has the authority to overturn the initial decision. Importantly, whether in the context of administrative segregation or SIUs, no court has required judicial oversight and no court has set 48 hours as a timeline for review of any kind.

I would remind the House that robust oversight was discussed at length at the public safety committee, and has already been added to the bill in my report stage amendment.

Independent external decision-makers would be appointed by the minister to review any case where an inmate in an SIU does not get the minimum hours out of cell or minimum hours of meaningful human contact for five days in a row or 15 days out of 30. They will also review situations where Correctional Service Canada does not accept the advice of a health care professional to remove an inmate from an SIU or change their conditions. In addition, they will review all SIU placements at 90 days and every 60 days thereafter for inmates still there at that point.

The determinations of independent external decision-makers will be binding and reviewable by the Federal Court. All of that external

oversight is on top of regular reviews within the Correctional Service, beginning on the fifth day of placement in an SIU.

There are several advantages to using independent adjudicators rather than judges to provide oversight in this context. For one thing, our courts already have a heavy case load. Giving them additional responsibilities would mean giving them additional resources, namely increasing the number of Superior Court judges, which involves changes to legislation and making budgetary allocations both at federal and provincial levels.

That raises another problem. There are provincial Superior Courts. We should not be adding to their workload to this extent without engaging in thorough consultations with the provinces.

Also, the flexibility of a system of independent adjudicators is a big advantage in this context. A few of them could be stationed in different parts of the country and could be reactive to needs in different provinces. With judges, they are appointed permanently to a specific court and only deal with cases in their jurisdiction. Even for the current system of administrative segregation, the courts have not said that a judicial review is required. The Ontario Superior Court actually expressed a preference for non-judicial review, so decisions could be made faster.

Ultimately, while I appreciate the intent of the Senate's proposal about judicial review, an independent adjudication system already in Bill C-83 can meet the need for oversight without the drawbacks of using the courts.

I appreciate all the Senate's contributions and hard work. This bill has gotten a lot of attention from parliamentarians over the last nine months, and rightly so.

We entrust Correctional Services with the task of carrying out sentences that are supposed to be a deterrent to and punishment for criminal activity and we entrust it with the physical separation of potentially dangerous people from the rest of Canadian society. At the same time, we charge the Correctional Service with the rehabilitation through measures including behaviour counselling, anger management programs, mental health care, substance abuse treatment, education and vocational training.

In a country like Canada, we demand that these tasks all be carried out humanely and with respect, even for the rights of people who have done terrible things, and in accordance with the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Bill C-83 would help ensure that all these goals can be achieved.

When I spoke to this bill at report stage, I said that I felt strongly that the legislation, combined with the additional investments from our government, would transform our correctional system. That is why I support the legislation and the motion before us today. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Government Orders

• (2340)

This is the last time I will be speaking in the House before we rise. I would like to acknowledge my staff who are present today: Hilary Lawson and Conor Lewis. This legislation benefited from the input of Hilary, and it would not be the legislation that it is right now without her hard work. Conor has worked with me on the status of women committee. I can quite confidently say that I have the best staff on the Hill. I thank them both for all of their efforts.

I would also like to extend my thanks to the members of the public safety committee who are here tonight. I am sorry I do not know their ridings, but they have both spoken tonight. They have both been incredible members to work with. It is rare that we see members work across the aisle as well as we did on the public safety committee on issues that were by nature very controversial. We always found a way to work together, and even when we did not agree we always did it in a very agreeable way. I would like to commend them for their work, as well as my Liberal colleagues on the committee. We got a lot of good work done, and this bill is one that I am very proud of. I will be going back to my riding knowing that we have passed legislation that will truly be transformative for our corrections system.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her speech, and for her work on this file.

The obvious question in this debate was raised by my colleague, our critic on this file, who delivered a very eloquent speech. There is no need for me to repeat it. It is very likely that the constitutionality of this legislation will be challenged in court once it is passed and receives royal assent.

I would like to know what my colleague thinks about the constitutionality of this legislation. Does she think it will stand up in court in the event of a challenge?

Later on, when we review previous debates of the House, we will know whether my colleague was on the right side of history or whether she was mistaken on this.

• (2345)

[*English*]

Ms. Pam Damoff: Mr. Speaker, I know that the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness and the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada have both reviewed this legislation. They did send a letter to the Senate today with regard to some of the amendments that the senators felt they needed to make, in order to, in their opinion, bring the bill to be constitutional. However, Bill C-83 does meet the requirements that the courts were looking for. The courts did not require judicial oversight. No court set 48 hours as a timeline for review.

Yes, we do believe that this bill is constitutional. I will rely on the judgment of my colleagues, in particular the Minister of Justice, who has far more experience than I do on this, that the bill is what we need to do to move forward and to meet the demands from the court.

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her service in this place. I know we have disagreed from time to time on certain issues, but I do know she has the pleasure of representing my in-laws. I do

not know that I can say they are Liberal supporters, but I am sure they appreciate her efforts in this place.

I want to pick up on something the member said at the end of her speech. She said that we need to recognize the rights of people, even those who have committed heinous crimes. I agree with that. I fundamentally agree that we need to affirm the rights and dignity of all people, regardless of what they have done in their life, at a fundamental level.

We often talk in this place about rights. We use the word “rights” very often. I do not think we are going to disagree on this. I wonder if the member could talk a bit more about how we explain the origins of those rights at a core level. In other words, how would the member explain this to somebody who disagrees? On what basis should we say definitively that all people have rights regardless of their circumstances?

Ms. Pam Damoff: Mr. Speaker, I have met the hon. member's in-laws. They are wonderful people, and I am very proud to represent them. He is probably right that they are not Liberal supporters, but that is okay, because I represent all the residents of Oakville North—Burlington in this place.

I think the member is talking about this in the context of people who have gone to prison. They are in prison and their freedom has been taken away. They are serving time that has been determined by the courts. They are receiving a punishment, but that does not mean they are not entitled to human rights.

Most importantly, as I said in my speech, 90% of people who go to prison will be released, so it is important for us to recognize what kind of people we want to release from prison. They will be our neighbours. They will be in our neighbourhoods and in our communities. We want to ensure the public safety of all Canadians, and in order to do that, we need to provide things like programming to help them deal with mental health issues, provide rehabilitative programming and provide them with the human rights that we expect not only for Canadians but for people all around the world.

I know the hon. member feels quite strongly about human rights around the world. While we may disagree on some issues, I think on this one we are in complete agreement.

Hon. Larry Bagnell (Yukon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I too would like to thank the member for all her hard work on this file at committee and her very good amendments, which make this bill much better. I am sure she has more to say, so I will leave her time to do that, instead of asking a question.

However, I want to make one comment for the next Parliament. A number of people in solitary have FASD, and those people are not treated appropriately in the correctional system because of their affliction. I presented a bill earlier this year, which almost passed. Hopefully, some parliamentarians here will pick that up in the next Parliament.

I will let the member continue on the topic she was doing so well on.

Ms. Pam Damoff: Mr. Speaker, I heard something yelled across the way. I actually supported the member's bill.

Government Orders

When I visited Edmonton Max, someone said in a meeting that if there was one thing that could be done in corrections, it would be to deal with individuals who have FASD. The Regional Psychiatric Centre in Saskatoon is running a pilot program. As the hon. member knows, and I do commend him for his efforts on that, individuals with FASD can be difficult to diagnose. They can have behavioural issues and, as a result, often end up in administrative segregation.

I do believe that with this bill, because of the additional mental health supports that will be provided in prisons, individuals with FASD who have been ending up in solitary confinement will now be going into an SIU, where they will get the supports they need and we can start to deal with that.

In addition, I have to say that the Senate's amendment that would require an assessment within 30 days of arriving at an institution would go a long way toward ensuring that individuals with FASD are diagnosed upon admittance. That way, staff will have the knowledge they need to deal with those offenders.

● (2350)

Ms. Rachael Harder (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, currently, correctional officers do not even have enough resources to allow prisoners out of their cells for two hours a day. How is the government going to ensure that the monetary resources are in place to ensure that these inmates can come out of their cells for four hours a day?

Some of these individuals are what we might call the worst of the worst. They have committed some very atrocious crimes. These individuals, then, need to be monitored during their time out of their cells, and correctional officers need to be kept safe during this time. Their security is put at risk in the process of them doing their job. What is the government going to do to ensure their safety and well-being, and where is the monetary investment?

Ms. Pam Damoff: Mr. Speaker, I just want to be clear that we would never put the safety of anyone working in corrections at risk. That is why we are investing \$448 million, in addition to this bill, that was in the fall economic statement.

When we talk to corrections officers, when we talk to parole officers, they have said that the only way this can work is with an additional investment, and that is what we have done. This will allow for more staff, for the infrastructure that is needed to implement these SIUs. It will allow for hiring additional mental health care professionals.

The government is putting money behind the legislation to ensure that it will be successful, to ensure that people who work in corrections always have the support they need, unlike the previous government that cut corrections because it was the easy thing to do. Conservatives cut prison farms, they cut programming, and they actually put the public at risk because they were not allowing individuals in prison to get the programming they needed to be rehabilitated and released into the community.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Resuming debate. The hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan will have approximately eight minutes, and then when this bill is taken up again, he will have another 12 minutes coming to him.

The hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan.

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I suspect that this will be my last speech in the 42nd Parliament. I hope to be able to continue after the next election, but, as Forrest Gump says, "Life is like a box of chocolates. You never know what you are going to get."

I will take advantage of this opportunity before I launch into my specific remarks on this bill to do a couple of things. One is to thank my colleagues, my constituents, my staff and especially my family for their support and the opportunity to serve.

I did want to make a point of paying particular tribute to my friend, the member for Cypress Hills—Grasslands, who is retiring. He is a champion of justice and human rights and someone who has been a great mentor to me as I have sought to engage on many of the same issues that he has been championing for years. I look forward to seeing the ways in which he will continue with these important issues in whatever role he takes on afterwards.

It has been a pleasure to work with members on all sides. I certainly wish my friends on the Liberal side well as they prepare to transition to the private sector. I do plan to campaign in their ridings and I hope they do not take it personally. Perhaps we will have an opportunity to go for a drink afterwards, and I will even bring the Solo cups.

This is the one other point that I wanted to make to honour a promise I made to a particular community. It is that I want to briefly highlight the Zoroastrian community in Canada.

The ancient Zoroastrian religion is one of the oldest religions in the world. Members of this community have been migrating to Canada for many decades, yet they still remain relatively unknown to Canadians, so I thought it would be important to acknowledge their community and their contributions.

The Zoroastrian religion is based on three key principles: good thoughts, good words and good deeds. These are principles that align with Canadian values and represent traits that all Canadians should aspire to have. These teachings were passed on by their prophet, Lord Zoroaster, and through the Zoroastrian religious text, the Avesta.

Zoroastrians believe there is one creator god. The primary symbol of Zoroastrianism is fire, which is seen as a conduit for wisdom and spiritual knowledge.

Zoroastrianism originated in what is now modern-day Iran, but because of persecution, the community had to emigrate to other parts of the world. Zoroastrians, like so many communities, have often come to Canada to escape persecution.

There are 100,000 Zoroastrians around the world and 7,000 of them reside in Canada. Zoroastrians are a peaceful and well-educated community, and we celebrate their work and their contributions.

I am speaking today on Bill C-83, which proposes to replace administrative segregation with so-called structured intervention units.

Government Orders

During its tenure in office, the government has put a big emphasis on the naming of things. “Foreign Affairs” became “Global Affairs”. The universal child care benefit became the Canadian child care benefit, and administrative segregation becomes structured intervention units.

When it comes to the name changes, to this bill, and to the record of the government in general, by this point in the mandate, people are asking that all-important question whenever they hear of a name change, “Where’s the beef?”

As Shakespeare wrote in *Romeo and Juliet*, “What’s in a name? That which we call a rose by any other name would smell as sweet.” In other words, would administrative segregation by any other name be of the same nature?

Parenthetically, Confucius speaks in *The Analects* about the importance of naming things correctly. He said the beginning of wisdom is to call things by their proper name. He also said:

If names be not correct, language is not in accordance with the truth of things. If language be not in accordance with the truth of things, affairs cannot be carried on to success.

When affairs cannot be carried on to success, proprieties and music do not flourish. When proprieties and music do not flourish, punishments will not be properly awarded. When punishments are not properly awarded, the people do not know how to move hand or foot.

So much of politics, so much of what we have seen here in the last four years, involves effort by government to change the names of things and to re-engineer language. It becomes increasingly difficult to have dialogue and to know the difference between justice and injustice if things are not called by their proper names.

We often bemoan political polarization and the decline of meaningful dialogue. Perhaps we should consider how this is born out of the breakdown of meaning in language, how leaders and elites so often try to name things based on political objectives exogenous to the substance of the thing, rather than simply calling a thing what it is.

● (2355)

The vast majority of stakeholders oppose this legislation because they see it principally as a renaming exercise as opposed to a substantive one. In practical terms, the legislation requires a person

in this new form of administrative segregation to have a minimum of four hours out per day, as well as legislated meaningful human contact. This raises questions about the capacity of the government to respond in terms of providing the resources necessary to operationalize this new framework.

In our judgment, the resources are not there to do this safely and effectively, and the distinctions made are not meaningful. This raises further questions in terms of the strength of the drafting of this legislation and the planning that went into it. We also have residual questions of what constitutes meaningful contact and how that can be defined.

On that basis, and recognizing that my time is running short, I will conclude.

I have greatly appreciated the opportunity to spend so much time with members in the House. I encourage members of the government caucus to get away, enjoy the summer, go on vacation, travel and spend time in the Caribbean islands.

I will of course be working hard in my riding. In particular, I hope to spend a lot of time in the beautiful riding of Spadina—Fort York. Maybe the member and I can start an Alasdair MacIntyre discussion group. The member can share with me from his reading of Ayn Rand and I can share more with him about Alasdair MacIntyre and Aristotle.

It has been a pleasure. I wish all members the best, including yourself, Mr. Speaker. I hope to be able to come back in the next Parliament.

● (2400)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): When debate resumes on Bill C-83, should it come back, the hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan will have 13 minutes and 14 seconds coming to him.

It being 12 a.m., pursuant to order made on Tuesday, May 28, the House stands adjourned until later this day at 10 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 12 a.m.)

CONTENTS

Wednesday, June 19, 2019

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Drug Prices	
Mrs. Philpott	29381
Kitchener South—Hespeler	
Mr. Tabbara	29381
Dominion Day	
Mr. Trost	29381
Gatineau	
Mr. MacKinnon	29382
Gilles Gervais	
Ms. Brosseau	29382
2019 General Election	
Mr. Arseneault	29382
Retirement Congratulations	
Mr. Allison	29382
Fundy Royal	
Mrs. Lockhart	29382
Pierrefonds—Dollard	
Mr. Baylis	29383
Events on June 19	
Mr. Kmiec	29383
University of Quebec in Montreal	
Mr. Dubourg	29383
Retirement Congratulations	
Mr. Leslie	29383
Carbon Pricing	
Ms. Gladu	29384
Retirement Congratulations	
Mr. Drouin	29384
Betsy Bury	
Ms. Benson	29384
2019 General Election	
Mr. Berthold	29384
Marc Gabriel	
Mr. Trudeau	29385

ORAL QUESTIONS

Natural Resources	
Mr. Scheer	29385
Mr. Trudeau	29385
Mr. Scheer	29385
Mr. Trudeau	29385
Mr. Scheer	29385
Mr. Trudeau	29385
Mr. Scheer	29385
Mr. Trudeau	29386

Finance	
Mr. Scheer	29386
Mr. Trudeau	29386
The Environment	
Mr. Singh	29386
Mr. Trudeau	29386
Mr. Singh	29386
Mr. Trudeau	29386
Mr. Singh	29386
Mr. Trudeau	29387
Mr. Singh	29387
Mr. Trudeau	29387
Ethics	
Ms. Bergen	29387
Mr. Trudeau	29387
Justice	
Ms. Bergen	29387
Mr. Trudeau	29387
Ethics	
Mr. Rayes	29387
Mr. Trudeau	29387
Justice	
Mr. Rayes	29388
Mr. Trudeau	29388
Ms. Raitt	29388
Mr. Trudeau	29388
Ms. Raitt	29388
Mr. Trudeau	29388
The Environment	
Mr. Boulerice	29388
Mr. Trudeau	29388
Mr. Julian	29389
Mr. Trudeau	29389
Ethics	
Mr. Kent	29389
Mr. Trudeau	29389
Public Safety	
Mr. Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	29389
Mr. Trudeau	29389
Veterans Affairs	
Mr. Strahl	29389
Mr. Trudeau	29389
Mr. McColeman	29390
Mr. Trudeau	29390
Agriculture and Agri-Food	
Ms. Brosseau	29390
Mr. Trudeau	29390
Health	
Ms. Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	29390

Mr. Trudeau	29390
Natural Resources	
Mr. Boissonnault	29390
Mr. Trudeau	29390
Finance	
Mr. Deltell	29390
Mr. Trudeau	29391
Mr. Deltell	29391
Mr. Trudeau	29391
Mr. Poilievre	29391
Mr. Trudeau	29391
Mr. Poilievre	29391
Mr. Trudeau	29391
Indigenous Affairs	
Ms. Jolibois	29391
Mr. Trudeau	29391
The Environment	
Mr. Cannings	29392
Mr. Trudeau	29392
Carbon Pricing	
Mr. Brassard	29392
Mr. Trudeau	29392
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship	
Mr. Paul-Hus	29392
Mr. Trudeau	29392
Ethics	
Ms. Rempel	29392
Mr. Trudeau	29392
Housing	
Mr. Arya	29393
Mr. Trudeau	29393
Government Priorities	
Mr. Barlow	29393
Mr. Trudeau	29393
Government Policies	
Mr. Singh	29393
Mr. Trudeau	29393
Rural Economic Development	
Mr. Picard	29393
Mr. Trudeau	29393
Canada Summer Jobs Program	
Ms. Harder	29394
Mr. Trudeau	29394
The Environment	
Ms. Paupé	29394
Mr. Trudeau	29394
Sri Lanka	
Ms. Hardcastle	29394
Motion	29394
(Motion agreed to)	29394

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Ways and Means

Motion No. 34

Motion	29394
Motion agreed to	29396

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Federal Courts Act

Bill C-331. Second reading	29396
Motion negatived	29397

Diabetes Awareness Month

Motion	29397
Motion agreed to	29398

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Canada Account Annual Report

Mr. Alghabra	29398
--------------------	-------

Ottawa River Watershed

Ms. McKenna	29398
-------------------	-------

Government Response to Petitions

Mr. Lamoureux	29398
---------------------	-------

Interparliamentary Delegations

Mr. Boissonnault	29398
Mr. Paradis	29398

Committees of the House

Official Languages

Mr. Paradis	29398
-------------------	-------

Veterans Affairs

Mr. Ellis	29398
Mr. McColeman	29398

Citizenship and Immigration

Mr. Whalen	29399
Ms. Rempel	29399

National Defence

Mr. Fuhr	29399
----------------	-------

Procedure and House Affairs

Mr. Bagnell	29399
-------------------	-------

Public Accounts

Mr. Sorenson	29399
--------------------	-------

Procedure and House Affairs

Mr. Bagnell	29399
-------------------	-------

Foreign Affairs and International Development

Ms. Vandenbeld	29399
----------------------	-------

Health

Mr. Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	29400
---	-------

Putting Victims First Act

Mr. Viersen	29400
Bill C-463. Introduction and first reading	29400
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	29400

Supporting Small Breweries, Wineries and Distilleries Act

Ms. Brosseau	29400
Bill C-464. Introduction and first reading	29400

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	29400	Pensions	
Canada Labour Code		Mr. Johns	29403
Mr. Dusseault	29400	Seniors	
Bill C-465. Introduction and first reading	29400	Mr. Johns	29404
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	29401	Cycling	
Committees of the House		Mr. Johns	29404
Foreign Affairs and International Development		Plastic Pollution	
Mr. Levitt	29401	Mr. Johns	29404
Corrections and Conditional Release Act		Zero Waste	
Ms. Raitt	29401	Mr. Johns	29404
Bill C-466. Introduction and first reading	29401	International Development	
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	29401	Mr. Johns	29404
Business of the House		Vision Care	
Mr. Lamoureux	29401	Mr. Johns	29404
Motion	29401	Plastic Pollution	
(Motion agreed to)	29402	Ms. Moore	29404
Broadcasting of Committee Proceedings		Boil Water Advisories	
Mr. Lamoureux	29402	Mr. Ouellette	29404
Motion	29402	Libya	
(Motion agreed to)	29402	Mrs. Zahid	29404
Military Family Appreciation Day		Physician-Assisted Dying	
Mr. McColeman	29402	Mr. Anderson	29404
Motion	29402	Justice	
(Motion agreed to)	29402	Mr. Anderson	29404
Petitions		Trans Mountain Pipeline	
Pharmacare		Ms. Rempel	29404
Mrs. Hughes	29402	Telecommunications	
Defence of Canada Medal		Ms. Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	29405
Mrs. Hughes	29402	Agriculture	
Palliative Care		Ms. Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	29405
Mrs. Wagantall	29402	Seniors	
Firearms		Ms. Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	29405
Mrs. Wagantall	29403	Pharmacare	
Sex Selection		Ms. Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	29405
Mrs. Wagantall	29403	Indigenous Affairs	
Cannabis		Mr. Boulerice	29405
Ms. Ratansi	29403	Agriculture	
Animal Welfare		Mrs. Lockhart	29405
Mr. Manly	29403	Human Rights	
National Defence		Mr. Anandasangaree	29405
Mr. Manly	29403	Access to Information	
Physician-Assisted Dying		Mr. Poilievre	29405
Mr. Sorenson	29403	Palliative Care	
Impaired Driving		Mrs. Wong	29406
Mr. Sorenson	29403	Forced Migration	
Palliative Care		Mr. Dusseault	29406
Mr. Sorenson	29403	Infrastructure	
Sex Selection		Ms. Brosseau	29406
Mr. Sorenson	29403	St. Lawrence River Bank Erosion	
Pharmacare		Mr. Barsalou-Duval	29406
Mr. Johns	29403	Marriage Fraud	
		Ms. Sahota	29406
		The Environment	
		Mr. Longfield	29406
		Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	29406
		Public Safety	
		Mr. Albrecht	29406

Human Organ Trafficking	
Mr. Genuis	29407
Falun Gong	
Mr. Genuis	29407
Health Care	
Mr. Genuis	29407
Afghan Minority Communities	
Mr. Genuis	29407
Human Rights	
Mr. Genuis	29407
Ms. Ramsey	29407
Status of Women	
Ms. Ramsey	29407
Housing	
Mr. Julian	29407
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Lamoureux	29408
Questions Passed as Orders for Returns	
Mr. Lamoureux	29409
Motions for Papers	
Mr. Lamoureux	29411

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Canada-United States-Mexico Agreement Implementation Act	
Bill C-100. Second reading	29412
Mr. Albas	29412
Mr. Longfield	29414
Ms. Boutin-Sweet	29414
Mr. Alghabra	29415
Mr. Manly	29415
Mr. Alghabra	29415
Mr. Hoback	29417
Ms. Boutin-Sweet	29417
Mr. Carrie	29417
Mr. Manly	29417

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Parole System	
Ms. Raitt	29418
Motion	29418
Mr. Carrie	29419
Mr. Lamoureux	29419
Mrs. McCrimmon	29419
Mr. Dubé	29421
Mr. Carrie	29422
Mr. Bittle	29424
Mr. Lamoureux	29425
Mr. Badawey	29426

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Criminal Code	
Motion that debate be not further adjourned	
Ms. Chagger	29426
Motion	29426

Mr. Eglinski	29426
Mr. Lametti	29427
Mr. Garrison	29427
Mr. Carrie	29427
Mr. Dusseault	29428
Mrs. Shanahan	29428
Mr. Sorenson	29428
Mr. Nantel	29429
Mr. Bittle	29429
Mr. Waugh	29430
Mr. Johns	29430
Motion agreed to	29431
Motion in relation to Senate amendments	
Motion	29431
Ms. Harder	29432
Ms. Rudd	29433
Mr. Virani	29433
Mr. Dusseault	29433
Mr. Housefather	29434
Mr. Doherty	29434
Motion agreed to	29435

Canada-United States-Mexico Agreement Implementation Act

Bill C-100. Second reading	29435
Mr. Manly	29435
Mr. Lamoureux	29436
Mr. Johns	29436
Mr. Bossio	29436
Mr. Tabbara	29437
Mr. Johns	29438
Mr. Clement	29438
Mr. Saini	29438
Mr. Ehsassi	29439
Ms. Trudel	29440
Mr. Manly	29440
Mr. Johns	29440
Ms. Ramsey	29440
Mr. Scarpaleggia	29442
Mr. Longfield	29442
Mr. Oliphant	29443
Division on amendment deferred	29444

Corrections and Conditional Release Act

Motion	29444
Mrs. McCrimmon	29444

Business of the House

Ms. Chagger	29445
Motion	29445
(Motion agreed to)	29445

Indigenous Languages Act

(Bill C-91. On the Order: Government Orders)	29445
(Motion agreed to)	29445

First Nations, Inuit and Métis Children, Youth and Families Act

(Bill C-92. On the Order: Government Orders)	29445
(Motion agreed to)	29446

Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act	
(Bill C-98. On the Order: Government Orders:)	29446
(Bill concurred in at report stage, read the third time and passed)	29446
Customs Tariff	
(Bill C-101. On the Order: Government Orders:)	29446
(Bill concurred in at report stage, read the third time and passed on division)	29446
Corrections and Conditional Release Act	
Motion	29446
Mrs. McCrimmon	29446
Mr. Dubé	29448
Mr. Sorenson	29448
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	29448
Mr. Bagnell	29449
Mr. Sorenson	29449

Ms. Damoff	29451
Ms. Harder	29451
Mr. Eglinski	29451
Ms. Damoff	29453
Mr. Dubé	29453
Mr. Dubé	29453
Amendment	29456
Mr. Bagnell	29456
Ms. Trudel	29456
Ms. Damoff	29457
Ms. Damoff	29457
Mr. Dusseault	29460
Mr. Genuis	29460
Mr. Bagnell	29460
Ms. Harder	29461
Mr. Genuis	29461

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>