

FOURTH SESSION - TWENTY-SEVENTH LEGISLATURE

of the

Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

(HANSARD) Published under the authority of The Honourable Dan D'Autremont Speaker

N.S. VOL. 57 NO. 45A THURSDAY, APRIL 2, 2015, 10:00

Federal Government Bill C-51 and Provincial Budget

Mr. Forbes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's an honour and a pleasure to rise in the debate today, an important one as we've come to realize that we are, as Canadians, in a very challenging world that now tragically includes terrorism. And this is a significant shift and has been over a few years. But of course, no one in Canada can deny the tragic events of last October with the deaths of Warrant Officer Patrice Vincent and Corporal Nathan Cirillo.

It is clear though that there are many different paths forward as we tackle this issue and we look at how we can serve our communities, our country, and of course serve as role models in the world. Now the challenge for all Canadians and for our governments, and I include the Saskatchewan legislature and the Government of Saskatchewan, is how do we preserve the Saskatchewan and the Canada that we know and cherish and, at the same time, rise to the challenge of preserving safety for our communities. And this is no small thing because we know, we look to our past and we think about how Canada was perceived in the world as a leader when it came to human rights and a place that valued human rights and was the place that many people would seek to come to.

Now the federal Conservative Bill C-51 does not meet this test. This is why I and my colleagues on this side of the House — and I actually hope both sides of this House — will support my motion that we express grave concerns about the federal government's Bill C-51 because its terms unreasonably infringe upon the freedoms of Saskatchewan people and all Canadians, it lacks appropriate parliamentary oversight, and it undermines the integrity of our democracy. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will at the end of my remarks again read the full motion into the record and hand the motion in to the Clerks.

I, along with many Canadians, have been watching the recent activities in Ottawa regarding Bill C-51 with much apprehension. And you know, at first, Mr. Speaker, many Canadians, and it was shown by the polls, supported the bill because it's something that really many people are thinking a lot about these days, and so the polls were that people

felt that we needed to do something.

But when the details in this omnibus bill — and I understand that there are some five different bills really bundled together — really became apparent, it was clear that it was not from the kind of Canada that we've come to love and cherish. And this is truly unfortunate that again the Harper government would tend to bundle these bills together as an omnibus bill. But we are left to wonder, is this bill fearmongering or worse? Is it about politicking for the next federal election? Clearly there are better paths forward to meet the public demand for security in our communities, our province, our country, and in fact the world.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about two stories that are really meaningful, and they speak to me about how wonderful Canada truly can be and how wonderful our province is when we are at our best. And the first is about a meeting that my colleague from Nutana and I attended on Remembrance Day long weekend at Station 20 West in 2012. It was a teach-in about another Harper omnibus bill. This one was Bill C-45, the navigational waters Act, but really it was much more than that and what was happening there.

But four amazing women from Saskatoon in this province organized this group, and then something, something very special happened. A special energy amongst the Aboriginal community and its allies morphed into Idle No More. And that winter was a very special winter as groups across Canada, in fact around the world, they danced, they met and protested and engaged in civil disobedience and continue to do so, Mr. Speaker. But I wonder if that could happen today with Bill 51. I don't think so. The chill that this bill creates throughout the country is something that we should be, we should be challenging.

And the second story is one of Zarqa Nawaz, no stranger to this city or this building. In fact we know that Zarqa was here in December 4th, meeting with the government side. But I listened to her testimony on Bill 51 on March 26th, just last week. And she was talking about it, and she's an amazing storyteller. It was a very personal narrative about why she feels so strongly about being identified as a Canadian. She was in Paris and apparently a friend of hers asked her and found it really odd that she identified more as a Canadian than as a Muslim. And then she thought that was a strange question because it was just natural to her.

She was born and lived until five in the city of Liverpool in England, but the family came over here. Her dad actually helped build the CN Tower as an engineer, and then they moved out here. And talked about what really concerns her about Bill 51. She says it will tear at the fabric of what it means to be Canadian. And her story from being a child in Liverpool and coming to Canada is one that we all lived with because, except for the people here in this House who are indigenous, First Nations, the rest of us have come as immigrants. And she makes that point. She makes that point. It's a very important point, that we are all, except for the indigenous folks, really immigrants.

But she's deeply concerned about Islamic-phobic potential in the sentiments that are behind Bill C-51. Those are powerful unique experience about how our world can

change, but could they under Bill 51? This is really, really the concern.

And you know, and as I said, in fact Zarqa was here, and many members of the Islam community came here on December 4th and, I understand, met with the government side. In fact we introduced them in the House. They were introduced in the House on December 4th. And then the news story in the *Leader-Post* talked about Muslims being proactive in crisis intervention and how they really feel strongly. The Muslims feel very strongly about this issue as well, as we all do. But there are, as I said, many paths to restoring security and safety in our communities. But Bill 51 really oversteps this, and I may go back and talk a little bit about this further on. But there are solutions, there are solutions, but Bill C-51 is not the one.

So we talk about the serious work in our communities regarding de-radicalization and strengthening mental health services for youth and young adults because what we've seen, especially in the situation in October, whether it's radicalization and the fact that the lone wolf attacks really speak to the need for mental health services. While there are many deficiencies in Bill C-51, and we know that there were last-minute amendments, but clearly it was too little, too late, and how they really didn't address the issue of oversight, didn't address the issue of privacy rights, and the general language around terrorism really is a cause for concern.

Mr. Speaker, we know that 45 out of 49 witnesses called for significant changes to this legislation, criticizing the lack of parliamentary oversight for CSIS [Canadian Security Intelligence Service], lack of resources for addressing radicalization, the wide-ranging and dangerous provisions that criminalize the promotion of terrorism, when they've used the word generally.

And the people that have opposed Bill C-51 — and I know my colleagues on this side of the House will speak more specifically about this — but we know National Chief Perry Bellegarde of the Assembly of First Nations called for this bill to be thrown out. Former prime ministers Chrétien, Martin, Clark, and Turner also called for the bill to be turned out. The Canadian Bar Association, Roy Romanow, Ed Broadbent, Zarqa Nawaz, Amnesty International, the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, the Canadian Muslim Lawyers Association, and the National Council of Canadian Muslims have all called for the end of Bill C-51.

And this is because they see real problems. They see real problems with this. And one includes the fact that, one, is that C-51 includes a clause that makes it an offence to promote terrorism in general. And such vague language has the potential to chill freedom of expression, and that really is a serious concern for Aboriginal activists, environmentalists, civil libertarians, and others that the government disagrees with, who may actually be labelled by the federal government as terrorists.

And so this is a real issue. And again, I've been reading the *Hansard* from Ottawa, and the whole discussion around oversight for CSIS versus review. The government will say that it actually has oversight, but actually it doesn't have oversight. It has review. And we know that the process now is actually flawed. In fact we know that former Premier

Romanow's . . . [inaudible] . . . identified significant deficiencies in the current review process.

But there is a difference between oversight, ongoing oversight like there is in the UK [United Kingdom] or the US [United States]. We know they have a much rigorous process for oversight that involves the parliamentary offices. And this is not the case now, that the current review process is appointees from the Prime Minister and actually reviews issues after the fact. And this is a real, real problem.

So we have some real concerns, and we ask that the Sask Party really should stand up to the Conservatives and Liberals and oppose this bill because this does not make Canadians safer or does it reduce the threat of terrorism.

Now we know that we really want to do what we can to make our communities safer, and we really want to make sure that really what we want is legislation that is not designed to create fear and pit Canadians against each other. Instead of uniting all of Saskatchewan people, Muslims and non-Muslims, the Conservatives really in many ways have chosen to stoke fear and stereotypes about Muslims that divide people.

And we see this again, how this government is ramming through another piece of legislation. The federal government is ramming through Bill C-51 through parliament and then committee this week — I understand it may be in the Senate today — without really proper debate. And you know, and as I've said, as Canadians become more and more aware of what C-51 actually does, we know the support for it is actually declining. We've seen that in recent polls and the letters and calls that we know that we've been getting.

I want to read a bit about what Romanow and Broadbent had said in their submission, and they say:

Terrorism is a threat throughout the world, including Canada. We cannot adopt a passive attitude toward it. We must invest in discovering terrorist threats and in stopping them. But national security also means defending our democracy, and that depends on holding the loyalty of citizens and maintaining their confidence in a just and stable government. This requires tolerance for diverse opinions, respect for personal integrity and timely and effective accountability for governmental conduct, including security operations. Shortchanging these will only weaken our strength as a nation — and our security.

Mr. Speaker, I think this quote says it all, really. We have to do something, and we are saying and nobody at the federal level is saying, stop; don't do anything. But people are putting forward reasonable solutions to this challenge that we have in Canada. We're all part of this global community and we must do something about terrorism, but this Bill C-51 actually goes too far and it changes the Canada that we have come to really appreciate.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little bit about some of the things that have given us hope. You know, it's interesting. I just want to say that as we look around the world, clearly we are not an island to ourselves. And I just think about the Nigerian election that just happened this past weekend and what happened there where we saw . . . And

everybody was wondering how that would happen in terms of they knew the election was going to be very close, the election in Nigeria was going to be very close.

And this is a quote from *The Globe and Mail*: “It was a historic moment, heralding a new era here. Mr. Jonathan became the first Nigerian leader . . . to accept democratic defeat . . .” This is very significant, Mr. Speaker. There are ways to respect the democratic processes and our rights that we hold near and dear.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read into the record the motion:

That this Assembly expresses grave concerns about the federal government’s Bill C-51 because its terms unreasonably infringe upon the freedoms of Saskatchewan people and all Canadians, it lacks appropriate parliamentary oversight, and it undermines the integrity of our democracy.

I do so move. Thank you.

The Speaker: It has been moved by the member for Saskatoon Centre:

That this Assembly expresses grave concerns about the federal government’s Bill C-51 because its terms unreasonably infringe upon the freedoms of Saskatchewan people and all Canadians, it lacks appropriate parliamentary oversight, and it undermines the integrity of our democracy.

Is the Assembly ready for the question? I recognize the member for Melfort.

Mr. Phillips: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I’m pleased and more than a little surprised in this debate this morning. I’m surprised that after two weeks, just after two weeks after the most important document that the province of Saskatchewan and the Government of Saskatchewan puts out, the provincial budget, here we are standing this morning, talking to a NDP motion about a federal piece of legislation. I suppose I’m to assume that there’s nothing in the budget or estimates that the NDP could find fault with, so they had to go hunting like an Easter hunt all across the country to find something. Clearly our provincial NDP still do not have a plan and are now looking to their federal counterparts for a little inspiration. You know, in my mind that’s a real injustice to their constituency but, Mr. Speaker, because it is the motion, as confusing as it is, I will speak to it.

Personally, and I want to emphasize personally, I want the laws governing terrorism in our country strengthened so that the security of our beloved Canada is increased. I want to watch the news in the evening and see that a terrorist is jailed before innocents are killed. I’ve had the opportunity in the last 24 hours to talk to some who work in security, some who sit on police commissions. They want either the amended C-51 that was changed yesterday or a bill that’s very, very similar to it.

At one point, I was Chair of the police commission in Melfort. And I remember asking the constable, the fact that a lot of people in Melfort knew where the drug houses were, why didn’t the police raid them? And the constable told me that there is so much

background work that has to be done in order to make, get a search warrant, that by the time they get it, the people are gone. Another person that I talked to that I would call a security expert told me that often it would take up to 80 pages of information to get a search warrant of people they suspect to be drug dealers. There comes a point where we are protecting the wrong people.

Mr. Speaker, last October 22nd when terrorism struck in the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier on Parliament Hill, our security was shaken from sea to sea to sea. And that day I looked at the Saskatchewan legislature, and in the legislature it was very unique that day. It was the Throne Speech. We had 51 representatives from various countries around the world in the gallery that day. We had leaders of the municipal governments from right across the province. We had judges from our judicial system, ceremonial guard, business and labour leaders, and the Saskatchewan members of the Legislative Assembly and our families. And I wondered what a target that would be.

In talking to people involved in security, both within these walls and outside, they feel that more has to be done. What we as Canadians face today is different than we have ever faced in the past, so I think that our tactics and our techniques have to change and be better.

Terrorism does exist in Canada even if the leaders of some parties have trouble getting that word out of their mouth. But just six weeks ago, there was a threat made for the West Edmonton Mall and I was, like all Canadians, a little horrified that a threat would be made. But I was maybe a little concerned, more than most, because the Melfort cheerleading team was going to the West Edmonton Mall to compete. And I'm very, very proud that they showed leadership in going to the West Edmonton Mall even after that threat was made. Yes, there was a concern, but as Canadians we can't hide from it. We must stay strong and that leadership was shown by that cheer team. And for interest's sake and to put it on the record, out of 150 teams there, Melfort placed fourth. So . . . yes.

So on the topic of security, I think about airport security. And I think that, oh two months ago I was in a busy airport and I had to stand in line for an hour and a half to go through security, and I hated it. However, that shouldn't be taken as a complaint, just a fact. I believe when I get on an airplane, I know myself, I know April, that we're not going to do any damage. It's the other 137 people beside me that I want checked out. And I'm okay in having to wait for an hour and a half just to know that I'm safe when I get there.

But, Mr. Speaker, we can't talk about terrorism without talking about ISIL [Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant]. I wonder if the members opposite agree with their federal counterparts in opposing a military intervention. Seems to me when there's an organization that burns people alive while they're locked in cages, an organization that kills thousands, an organization that beheads hundreds, that rapes innocent women and children, and kills the children, do we have to do more than buy them lunch and a blanket if they survive? I think we do. Some would say that because we are there militarily, we started the war. That's just plain ridiculous, to suggest that ISIL would form a country or caliphate, kill everybody within that country that doesn't agree with their particular brand of religion, collect wealth and military strength, and then sit back and leave the Western

world alone, because hating us and our culture is what they're made of.

I believe the federal NDP has some remnants, because it's election year, has some remnants of a policy on something, on anything, unlike the NDP in this province. But honestly, is their plan to feed the refugees and everything else will work out in the end? Is that their plan? Because yesterday ISIL attacked a refugee camp, took over 50 per cent of it. I wonder if they're worried today about the sandwich or if they would like some defence.

In trying to figure out why a motion from the Parliament of Canada would be so important to the Saskatchewan NDP, let alone the member from Saskatoon Centre, a constituent asked me if maybe the provincial NDP was campaigning for Thomas Mulcair, as the federal NDP was not allowed to open a constituency office paid for by taxpayers in the province of Saskatchewan where they have no members. Huh. Is the official opposition in the province of Saskatchewan going to be the Saskatchewan mouthpiece for the federal NDP? Are the members from across the aisle going to run the federal NDP campaign from within these walls? Can we look forward to such intelligent motions in the days and months ahead?

You know, and then I got thinking, what else could they be talking about? Our Finance minister introduced a budget just two weeks ago. Not a single . . . There were two questions — stand corrected — two questions today on the budget for the first time. Could they not talk about their plans for a better Saskatchewan? After eight years of sitting in opposition, they must have plans for a better Saskatchewan. We haven't seen them — not a plan, not a program, not a platform, nothing. The last platform they had was four years ago, the tree book written by the Official Opposition Leader. Since then, nothing, so maybe our plans are the right plans.

So in this legislature let's talk about Saskatchewan. Let's talk about how we continue to make this province better, Mr. Speaker. And let's not follow the members opposite down the rabbit hole and forget about the people that put us in these seats. Mr. Speaker, I will not be voting in favour of this motion. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: I recognize the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. McCall: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And I am glad to join debate today on this important resolution and glad to follow the lead of our member from Saskatoon Centre who has brought this motion forward. And I guess what I'd like to say is, off the top, Mr. Speaker, certainly I'm a legislator in the Saskatchewan Legislative Assembly but I'm also a Canadian. And in terms of being from Saskatchewan and being a Canadian, we have a long, proud history in this province of Saskatchewan: citizens that recognize the contribution that they could make in terms of human rights and freedoms, and from both sides of the political aisle throughout the history of this province, Mr. Speaker.

I think of the 1947 Saskatchewan Bill of Rights that was brought in by the CCF [Co-operative Commonwealth Federation] government then headed by Tommy Douglas. I think about the role that Frank Scott, the long-time dean of law at McGill law school, the

role that that individual played in that particular document. I think about the 1960 Canadian Bill of Rights being brought into effect by John G. Diefenbaker, Mr. Speaker, a Progressive Conservative politician of some renown in this province and then prime minister of the country.

I think about the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in 1982 in which then premier, Allan Blakeney, and then attorney general, Roy Romanow, played a definite role in the patriation of the Canadian constitution but also in the establishment of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

And you know, those are just the highlights, Mr. Speaker, but there have been many passes where Saskatchewan people have stood up and spoke about what it means to be a Canadian and how that should be reflected in our Charter of Rights and Freedoms, how that should be enshrined in law not just at the provincial level, Mr. Speaker, but on the federal level as well.

And given that background, it's no surprise that we've seen Saskatchewan people again coming to the fore in terms of the commentary that's been provided around the shortcomings of Bill C-51. And again, Mr. Speaker, I always . . . For governments that would come forward with the proposition that they're there to defend your rights and your freedoms by taking them away or by curtailing them, Mr. Speaker, that bears examination. That bears commentary.

And when we see the federal Conservatives, Stephen Harper government coming forward with Bill C-51, what do the people that know constitutional law, what do people that know security matters, what do they have to say about this piece of legislation? And again in that context, Mr. Speaker, what do Saskatchewan people have to say about that legislation?

And in recent days we've seen — which I'd like to quote at length because it certainly deserves it — we've seen a letter that, a public letter that was brought forward over the names of Ed Broadbent and Roy Romanow, again two individuals that have given much of their lives to the welfare of Saskatchewan and Canada. But two individuals that know what they're talking about when it comes, not just to matters of constitution or to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, but as well as regards the Canadian security intelligence system, Mr. Speaker, or what happens with CSIS.

So I'd like to quote at length from the letter entitled, Parliament must reject the anti-terror bill, Ed Broadbent and Roy Romanow:

We are writing to add our voices to the rising chorus of opposition to Bill C-51, Prime Minister Stephen Harper's draft legislation extending the powers of Canada's intelligence agency.

This bill should be withdrawn, or defeated in Parliament.

Terrorism is designed to provoke governments into making damaging mistakes. It is conducted through brutality and rooted in the belief that killing ordinary

citizens will cause nations to abandon their most basic commitments.

Terrorism demands a sustained and effective response. Resources must be allocated to enable police and intelligence agencies to find its perpetrators and to discover potential terrorists. Those who are guilty of offences must then be brought to justice.

Canada already has the mechanisms, practices and laws necessary for dealing with terrorism. These include surveillance, immigration controls, preventative detention and incarceration for criminal activity.

As we have recently seen, our system of national security is not perfect. But this is not due to the inadequacies in our security legislation. It is the result of overworked and underfunded police and security services.

The Harper government has been effective in piling up our security anxieties. But actual material and strategic support for pursuing security needs have not been this government's priority.

Instead of a considered statement in Parliament and a new and better plan, the Prime Minister spoke at what can only be described as a political rally to announce new threats to the rights and liberties of Canadians.

The government subsequently presented us with Bill C-51, an intemperate terrorism bill that will remove reasonable restraints on Canadian security authorities but give them no new resources or strategies to more effectively do their real work.

The bill attacks the civil rights of all Canadians, and places the protections guaranteed by the Charter of Rights and Freedoms under the shadow of wider powers to interfere with lawful and legitimate conduct.

The general tenor of the bill is to expand the definition of threats to national security and add to the powers of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service.

Any interference with financial or economic stability could now be considered to violate national security. Such activities are a daily occurrence and in truth could include just about anything.

Other new national security offences include influencing any government in Canada by unlawful means or "interfering with infrastructure." Neither of these is a rare practice. Neither is necessarily connected to terrorism.

And now persons can be held in custody as a preventative matter if officers believe that a terrorist activity "may" occur. This makes detention a matter for the purely subjective views of security officials.

CSIS has now been given powers to engage in the active disruption of activities

that it believes threaten the security of Canada, a power that was once illegally exercised by the RCMP and which led to the creation of CSIS with the mandate to focus exclusively on intelligence gathering — not to engage in activities that would otherwise be illegal. As the recent unfortunate history of intelligence agencies in the United States and Britain shows, we should be wary of this expanded mandate for our country's intelligence arm.

The exercise of security powers must be made subject to review by an open, publicly observed review process. The work of the current oversight agency, the Security Intelligence Review Committee, while valuable when properly staffed, takes place below the radar of public knowledge. The new bill is defective in not establishing a public process for assessing whether the exercise of these powers respects the entrenched rights of Canadians and is safe for Canadians.

Terrorism is a threat throughout the world, including Canada. We cannot adopt a passive attitude towards. We must invest in discovering terrorist threats and in stopping them. But national security also means defending our democracy, and that depends on holding the loyalty of citizens and maintaining their confidence in a just and stable government. This requires tolerance for its diverse opinions, respect for personal integrity and timely and effective accountability for governmental conduct, including security operations. Shortchanging these will only weaken our strength as a nation — and our security.

The Prime Minister should withdraw this bill. If it is not withdrawn, Parliament should vote it down. Possibly, then, a more limited and focused statute would be worth debating.

Security agencies may feel that their present powers constrain their ability to protect Canada. But let us have an open discussion of this claim within Parliament and its committees before rushing to impose politically motivated “solutions.” Our rights as citizens are at stake.

And that concludes the letter, Mr. Speaker. Again it's words that are worth heeding and words that come forward from two individuals that have literally lifetimes of work in terms of the constitutional and legal framework that we enjoy so well here in Canada, the rights and freedoms that are so hard won.

You know, certainly my colleague had referenced the great words of Zarqa Nawaz. I think of the work being done by Assembly of First Nations Chief Perry Bellegarde saying that the whole bill should be gone. I think these are Canadians that are from Saskatchewan that we would do well to listen to in this debate, Mr. Speaker, and that the federal government should listen up as well. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: I recognize the member for Regina Qu'Appelle Valley.

Ms. Ross: Well thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It gives me great pleasure to stand up and speak against this motion. I think the timing . . . it's ill-timed in that respect. This Bill

C-51 has been sent back for revision, so for us to be even standing here and debating what hasn't been released doesn't make any sense. So because of that I think what we should be focusing in on is, let's talk about things that are real, things that are happening today here in our province.

You know, this is the first private members' day after the budget, and this would have been the perfect, the perfect opportunity for the members opposite to stand and talk about maybe some of the issues they didn't disagree. Somehow that doesn't happen. In fact they bring forward a motion that is probably ill-founded, in that it's gone back for revision, and we would like to be able to see it before we debate it.

So I would like to talk about some of the positive things that are happening in this province. We had a budget that was brought down. It is a balanced budget. It's a budget that has no tax increases, but it also has incentives within it that in fact the members, especially the members from Regina, should be interested in. I know that they're, you know, standing up and speaking to this budget today. Now if they want to speak about the federal bills, maybe they should seek a federal nomination and then run and become an MP [Member of Parliament]. But right here in this House, people have elected us to bring forward and talk about legislation that is relevant and pertinent to them today. So in fact, that's why I think it's really important we should be talking about the economy. That's what each and every person is talking to me about. They're talking to me about jobs.

You know, this past week I had the opportunity, along with the Premier and members from Regina Dewdney and Regina Walsh Acres and the Minister of the Economy, to be at Evraz. And Evraz made an announcement that makes it the largest single investment, of around \$200 million here in their facility in Regina. Now what does that mean? That means jobs, but it also means that there's a secure aspect to this for that steel mill because Evraz was at a point where they had to make a decision whether they were going to continue the way they were or whether they were going to . . . They had to make a decision on what options they had for them. So they have now decided to increase and ramp up what they're doing at Evraz place.

So in fact there's going to be 40 new jobs that are going to be the result of this kind of investment. And during the construction, there's going to be 1,100 more new jobs that are going to be undertaken during construction. So, Mr. Speaker, this is what the people in my constituency want to talk about. Yes, they're very concerned about security but, Mr. Speaker, they want job security. That's what they want to talk about.

They want to know that in fact their children are going to be able to continue going to a good school. And guess what? Mr. Speaker, in my constituency, we're going to be building a new school. We're going to be building one of the new joint schools, and in that school there's also going to be 90 new child care spaces. Now I know this past week, the members of the opposition, boy, during question period, they were just about setting their hair on fire. But were they asking real good questions? No. They were ramping it up, torquing it up, but in fact asking questions of the government that in fact each and every one of us would like to have been able to share about the budget. But that didn't happen, in fact. So I think it's really important that as members it's incumbent on us to

now talk about what people in Saskatchewan want to hear.

They want to hear that there are no new tax increases because, Mr. Speaker, each and every person in Saskatchewan wants to be able to know that they have elected a government that is fiscally responsible, that we're prudent so that the money they do pay in taxes is being spent to the best way possible.

So we know that this was a tough budget, and we had to control spending. But we made sure that in fact the decisions that were being made were going to ensure that we were going to keep Saskatchewan strong. So the decisions to ensure that continued spending in infrastructure, well that is what people expect from this government. They want to make sure that we are looking at job creation.

This announcement at Evraz, that's job creation. That's ensuring that one of the largest employers in this province is going to stay here, is going to produce product. I mean the members opposite had a buy Saskatchewan day. Well this is a good Saskatchewan story because what are they producing? They're producing steel here in Saskatchewan. And then we have the member, the critic opposite who talks about the environment. Well guess what? The steel that is being produced here is from recycled products, so this is hitting it on every high point.

Why are they not talking about things like this? They should be talking about what is happening in this province, the good things that are happening in this province. But no, they want to talk about a bill that in fact isn't even being discussed until it comes back from being revised . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . They are. A member on this side said, "I think they're a little out of touch."

They are out of touch because one of the things we had was a balanced budget with no new taxes. And you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I go and talk to the constituents in Regina Qu'Appelle Valley, they say to me, keep up the good work. Keep making sure that Saskatchewan keeps moving forward. We want a strong economy. Yes, we want to feel safe in our communities, and we're ensuring that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a time when we should be talking about the economy. This is a time when the members opposite should be asking relevant questions. This is a time when they should be bringing forward a motion for debate that is happening here right now, talking about the budget, talking about the economy. But you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because they have no plan it's pretty difficult for them to come up with their own motion. They're just kind of parroting what . . . Well they're kind of joined at the hip with the federal NDP under Mulcair, you know. And talk about a sinking ship over there — both sides, be it provincially or federally.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have a strong economy here. We have a province that continues to move forward. We are investing in our people. We are investing in our infrastructure. We're investing in good jobs right here in the province, unlike the opposition. They have no plan. They bring forward a bill that in fact is under revision so why they even brought it forward . . . They had every ample opportunity to make a change, bring forward

something that's relevant today. Did they? Absolutely not.

They ended up bringing . . . You know, do they even know what this bill is about? I'm not sure. Because you know what it really is about? It's coordinating information between departments. That's what it's about. Meanwhile they're kind of setting their hair on fire, getting everybody all ramped up, thinking there's going to be guns in the streets and police on the streets and things like that. That's absolutely not what this bill is about. This bill is about ensuring that people in Canada are going to be safe and secure.

But you know what? It's ill timed for them to be bringing forward this motion. I cannot support this motion because it's gone back for revision. They don't even know what they're bringing forward in that case, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because this is a motion that is ill founded at this point in time. We do not have all the relevant information. They should go back to the drawing board, put together a plan for people in Saskatchewan, and then bring forward questions and debates based on that, not on some scare tactics that their federal leader has kind of handed down to them and expect us to all turn around and say, this is a good motion. Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I could never support something like this.

The Deputy Speaker: I recognize the member from Athabasca.

Mr. Belanger: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I stand in proud support of the motion being presented by my colleague from Saskatoon Centre. And, Mr. Speaker, for the record I wanted to read the motion once again so the Saskatchewan Party government can finally find their courage to stand up to the federal Conservatives and say that these are Saskatchewan people's rights that are being trampled upon. This is the security for all of the nation. Nobody is arguing those points, Mr. Speaker, but these are Saskatchewan people's interest that we must maintain as a provincial government and which the Sask Party is not prepared to do, Mr. Speaker. And the motion today simply reads this, Mr. Speaker. I think it speaks volumes of what we're trying to do here. And the motion reads:

That this Assembly express grave concerns about the federal government's Bill C-51 because its terms unreasonably infringe upon the freedoms of Saskatchewan people and all Canadians, it lacks appropriate parliamentary oversight, and it undermines the integrity of our democracy.

It's really important for people to know that yes, overall the people of Saskatchewan and people and the Canadians generally want to see freedom and not feardom when we talk about making sure that the country as a whole is viewed throughout the world as a country that are consisting of peaceful people, assertive people, productive people, Mr. Speaker.

And what you see happening here is the federal government simply politicizing the process. And this is why I go back in my earlier statement where we're seeing evidence that these guys are simply pushing the whole notion of feardom versus freedom. That's one of the quotes, Mr. Speaker, from parliament, in the sense that many people have grave concerns about why Bill C-51 simply is not going to do what it's intended to do.

I stand here today, Mr. Speaker, as I've mentioned time and time again, I'm very proud of the military service of many of my family members. And I shared stories of how my father who was a World War II vet would sit around with us as young boys and explain to them, explain to us exactly what was involved with some of his travels and some of his experiences as a member of the Canadian Armed Forces.

And he spoke about the many people that died on many of the beaches, and spoke fondly about his sergeant, of how he really respected and admired his sergeant. And when he went back, Mr. Speaker, on a tour of Normandy, I think he went to find the grave of the sergeant who perished during those battles.

And he was a very proud man, my father was, and he was very, very strong, but this guy had his hero. And you know how as you grow up and you're a young man, your father is your hero; well he was my hero. And then when I found out who his hero was, and the fact that he searched for this individual's grave and paid a lot of respect to his sergeant, and prayed for him, Mr. Speaker, it really, really, it really shows the amount of incredible sacrifice and commitment that these men and women had for each other in defending Canada overall when it came to World War II.

Now many of my family members, as a result of some of the pride we see and the courage that my father had and certainly the admiration that many people in the community had towards him and all the other veterans, it was something that would really instill the sense of confidence in us but also made us realize that we in Ile-a-la-Crosse, in Canada, in Saskatchewan owe a great debt to the many veterans and people that serve today and the veterans of many world wars that have happened time and time again.

And, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that my father spoke about — and as a result of that, many of my family members joined the military — he spoke about the whole notion of democracy and making sure that we enjoyed and appreciated the freedom that many of his colleagues, including his sergeant, paid for for us so we can enjoy the freedoms and the opportunities to have a good country, to live in a good country, and to appreciate the good country like Canada and like the province of Saskatchewan.

And that's why this Bill C-51, Mr. Speaker . . . It really irked me one day when I was watching, when I was looking through some national newspapers when I saw a picture, somebody drew a picture of Prime Minister Harper holding his hands up in the air with a masked terrorist, and the caption underneath that picture — as both of them are rising, holding hands and rising, or holding each other's hands up in the air, the Prime Minister and this masked terrorist — and the caption underneath read "running mates." That's what the caption read.

And I think the national paper that ran that cartoon really depicted exactly what this is about. It is not about defending the freedom, and it's not about appreciating veterans and people that served in the military, Mr. Speaker. It is all crass politics. And that's the shameful act on behalf of Canadians that the Prime Minister has undertaken as well as the Conservative government.

And it really irks me, Mr. Speaker, when I see the Saskatchewan Party government sitting in their chairs, not speaking up for what I think many families and many veterans and many people that paid a sacrifice that was intended to do, is to respect the democracy that was handed to us and to enjoy the freedom that came on the backs and the lives of so many men and women over time, Mr. Speaker . . . That's not why my father served the country, to have somebody politicize the process that we see under Bill C-51, Mr. Speaker. Not in the least bit did any of them ever talk to me about saying, this is important that we politicize the process, Mr. Speaker.

And that's why, when Saskatchewan people's interest, when Saskatchewan people's liberties and freedoms are being threatened by a federal government that is simply politicizing the process, politicizing the process, Mr. Speaker, and pushing fear and opposition to freedom, this is fundamentally the wrong thing to do, Mr. Speaker. It is fundamentally the wrong thing to do, Mr. Speaker.

And when you look at some of the evidence that we see, some of the evidence in how the federal government has not afforded many of the veterans that need critical help, I think it's over \$1 billion a year that the Department of Defence sent back that was earmarked to support many of our veterans and many people that served in the military, Mr. Speaker. The federal government didn't afford them those supports and instead saved on the backs of many of our veterans and people that served in the military that had many challenges after their service, Mr. Speaker. So when you see that kind of process unfolding, when you see this kind of the visual that many Canadians see of this federal government really not doing a service to the people that served the country, Mr. Speaker, I begin to really get angry and it really offends me when you see some of these processes undertaken.

And all we see the Sask Party do, Mr. Speaker, when the rights and privileges and freedoms afforded to the Saskatchewan people are infringed upon, we see the Saskatchewan Party government talking nonsense, Mr. Speaker. They should be standing up for the people of Saskatchewan and they should be defending the notion of democracy and ensuring that the federal government does what they're supposed to do, Mr. Speaker, and that is to promote a peaceful yet functioning Canada, which I don't think will occur under this particular bill.

Now many people have indicated time and time again, many scholars and many legal people and many Aboriginal people where they've spoken about the intent of the bill, nobody is arguing that we shouldn't defend Canada. Nobody's arguing that at all. But the most important thing is they're saying we should trust the process but give the opportunity to be verified. Trust but verify are some of the phrases that I've picked up from some of the discussions and some of the comments made by many people involved with this bill. Trust but verify, and we don't see any evidence that this is going to be verified by a good, solid process.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the First Nations also spoke. I think Chief Perry Bellegarde spoke about the effort that they're going to undertake as First Nations people to go through the courts because the courts are separate from the politics and parliament, Mr. Speaker. And we urge the integrity of the courts to strike down this law because it's unconstitutional, it

is unnecessary, Mr. Speaker, and it is undeserving of the many sacrifices made by men and women throughout the years that have served their military and served our country with distinction. And all we're getting from the Saskatchewan Party government is their effort to try and change the channel and not deal with the issue at hand, Mr. Speaker.

Terrorism is something that we do not support. Terrorism is something that we should not tolerate, Mr. Speaker. Terrorism is not something that we should accept as a people. Nobody is saying anything of that sort on this side of the Assembly. But what we should not accept is to use the Canadian military service as a political pawn in this larger game, Mr. Speaker. It is shameful for the federal government to do this, Mr. Speaker, and it is especially shameful that they're not giving any opportunity for people to participate in a very well-thought-out plan on how we respond to the threat of terrorism without breaking Canada's freedom.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, the message from the NDP, it is about freedom; it is not about fear. And it really shames me today to see our federal government playing on the politics of terrorism on the backs of many people that serve our country.

The Deputy Speaker: I recognize the member from Arm River-Watrous.

Mr. Brkich: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure to join in this debate, a debate that I believe is more of a federal issue, and I can understand possibly why they're bringing it forward. Let's face it. Tom Mulcair is starting to run their party. They've been in trouble federally in this province; they haven't elected a member. And when they come up with motions like this and what they're doing in Ottawa, they're probably not going to. And I can tell the members opposite that if they keep following what Thomas Mulcair is telling them, they're not going to elect any members over on that side.

At least a previous leader, Dwain Lingenfelter, I think at least he stood up a little bit against the federal — I'll call them what they call each other — brothers and sisters. He used to stand up a little bit. Their leader right now and the members there, don't. They take their marching orders from Thomas Mulcair because, you know, why we're discussing a strictly federal bill . . . We just passed a budget, you know, and it's a good budget and apparently they don't . . . They must think so, because they don't want to even discuss it on private members' day.

You know, and I'll touch on some of the highlights of this budget as we move forward, you know. It's a balanced budget. It's something that the constituents have always asked for. It's no tax increases. That's one of the biggest things. They say, always look internally. Every constituent says, you know, look to yourselves first, which this government has. You know, where the NDP, it was the first thing when they ran a little bit of trouble, always increase taxes.

Infrastructure. We're doing \$8 billion in infrastructure since we formed government, more than double the investment of the NDP over the same period; \$1.3 billion for core infrastructure in 2015 and '16, largest infrastructure investment in Saskatchewan history and a 50 per cent increase over last year; 248.5 million for K to 12 schools, up 150

million; 157 million investment for initial construction costs for nine joint-use schools in Warman, Martensville, Saskatoon, and Regina.

The members opposite constantly get up and say the education system is crumbling. Well we're trying to fix what they left us. This is how we're dealing with it, and I don't hear them ever saying one good thing about the nine schools that we're building. You'd think one of them would say, you know what? That's a step in the right direction. You know, we do need schools. And I'll admit maybe they ran some tough budgets. They had some tough years, but near the end they could have looked at it or they could have said, okay, now at least you're trying to do something out there. Not one word on that. Not one word on that.

And I'll tell you what, when you go door to door — and I've gone in this city; I've gone in rural Saskatchewan door knocking — you know, they'll mention that. They'll say, you know what? I have yet to hear a plan from the NDP, not one . . . what they would do, just always complaining.

Well I'll tell you what, if you're going to run in the next election, I'll give you some advice. I'll give some advice to the members opposite. You better come up with a plan. You better not just go to Thomas Mulcair and let him write your plan because you will end up in more trouble than you did when Lingenfelter ran, wrote your plan. The Leader of the Opposition helped Lingenfelter write his plan. He signed off on that. Now either — you've got two options — either you're either waiting for Lingenfelter to come back and help you, or you're letting Tom Mulcair write that plan. I'm not sure which, but I'm telling you something right now, Mr. Speaker. You better, the members opposite better start coming up with a plan.

You know, as we go: 211 million to start construction on the Regina bypass, 19 million to start construction on twinning Highway 7 from Saskatoon to Delisle, 14.7 million continued construction investment on the Estevan truck route, 23 million to continue twinning Highway 16 from Saskatoon to Clavet, 74.5 million for municipal infrastructure. The plan's to invest more than 400 million over the next four years.

Two billion for Crown infrastructure; 5.5 billion in total spending for health care; 157 million for the Saskatchewan Cancer Agency, up almost 100 per cent, almost up 100 per cent since 2008 — those are the issues that the people of Saskatchewan are worried about. Those are what they feel we should be debating in this House, not some federal issues.

I'll tell you what, when you go door to door, I never got a lot of . . . on this bill. You know, I got what we're doing and what needs to be done in the future, and to keep working. And that's what we've been doing as we move forward, coming up with a plan. Education, 3.7 billion in total spending for education including 53 million extra for child care spaces . . . or 53 million total, an increase of 2.2 million.

You know, if the members opposite want to talk about fighting terrorism, we're happy to do that. You know, we fully support the mission to fight ISIS, one of the most brutal

regimes. If they ever got to be in power . . . to think what would happen if they ever got control of a country. And you know what? The dealing with that mission is just . . . The Middle East and the partners are just asking help from Canada just to be part of that coalition to try to stop that, to try to stop what's been happening in the Middle East and in Nigeria where they're kidnapping, raping, killing.

These are terrorists that aren't in it for the religious reasons. They're not in it for political reasons. They're just wanting to take over a country and run one of the most brutal regimes we would've ever seen. It would be more brutal than any regime we've ever had in history if they ever got control of a country.

And all they're asking us is to be part of a coalition to extend air strikes to try to destabilize them as they're moving forward into Syria, into Iraq, and also now into Nigeria and places. If we don't stop them, if we don't try to help them countries, I don't know how you can look them in the face, people down in the face years from now when there's possibly millions killed there if we don't try to stop it.

Their federal counterpart voted against that, and I can't understand that. I'll tell you what, when I take that door to door, I've had NDP members ashamed, literally ashamed of that, and that's going come back to haunt you. And it'll also come back to haunt the provincial party at that end, you know, as we move forward.

You know, even this bill, the one we're debating, one of the most important things in it is the transfer of information between federal agencies, and that needs to be done. Agencies can't operate in silos, whether it's the police, whether it's CSIS, or whether it's the border security. Sharing of information of known terrorists, that's what the main concern of this bill is. That's the main concern of it.

How can we stop the events that have happened in the past? You look at what happened in Ottawa. I'm not saying that this bill would've stopped it, but we have to address that.

This is the reality that we're living in in this country right now. There is going to be homegrown terrorism. There is going to be terrorists from other countries that are going to target us. You can mention about the malls, the Edmonton west was actually mentioned. They are looking at attacking Canada. They've mentioned it. They are talking about that, of doing raids here. And there is, whether we like it or not, and it shames me to know that there is homegrown terrorists wanting to, you know, kill people in this country.

The sharing of information, if that helps, about known terrorists back and forth, I think we need to do whatever we can to try to control that. I think we need to work towards that.

And I'm not sure. I'm pretty sure that federally, you know, they're just trying to grandstand on this. The security of this great country should be what we're worried about.

There's amendments to the bill. There's been issues raised, and I think the federal are

going to adjust them. You know, they have been to certain amendments. But the main thrust of this bill, the main thrust of it is to save people's lives, and I think that's the most important thing that we should be looking at and dealing with here on this.

And I wish, I just hope that the provincial NDP will tell Mulcair, you know what? We're not going to play your political games. We're going to maybe deal with Saskatchewan issues and represent Saskatchewan people. Because I'll tell you what. When it comes to terrorism and fighting terrorism across the world and in Canada, they're for it. The constituents and the people of this great province want to do what they can. Because I'll tell you what. It sickens a lot of people when they see what's happening in the world and that Canada . . . that there's certain members of the NDP that won't try to help to stop that.

The Deputy Speaker: Time for debate has expired. Questions. I recognize the member from Cut Knife-Turtleford.

Mr. Doke: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately terrorism is a reality not just across the world but here in Canada. We saw this reality last fall with the deaths of Corporal Nathan Cirillo and Warrant Officer Vincent. It is imperative that our country stands against the ideology of actions of ISIL. We commend the federal government for recently voting to extend the mission against ISIL. Both the Liberals and the NDP voted against protecting our country.

To the member from Athabasca: are you going to stand against terrorism and support our troops fighting against ISIL, or are you just going blindly and follow the party line?

The Deputy Speaker: I recognize the member from Athabasca.

Mr. Belanger: Mr. Speaker, I will stand again to fight against terrorism and protect our country.

The Deputy Speaker: I recognize the member from Saskatoon Centre.

Mr. Forbes: Thank you much, very much, Mr. Speaker. You know, we know that five former Supreme Court justices, seven former federal ministers, and four former prime ministers including one Conservative are all worried about the harmful effects of Bill C-51. This bill undermines public safety and human rights right here in Saskatchewan, right here in Saskatchewan. The government members seem not to want to talk about that, but I want to know. Does this concern, does this have any concern for the member for Regina Qu'Appelle Valley?

The Deputy Speaker: I recognize the member from Regina Qu'Appelle Valley.

Ms. Ross: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. You know, I'm going to reject the premise of his question because, as I said in my comments, that for them to bring forward this bill, a motion on this bill, is unfounded. This bill has gone back for revisions, so they don't even know what's in it. To bring forward a motion that in fact . . . How could we have a logical discussion about something that we don't have all the relevant

information? So because of that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm going to reject the question.

The Deputy Speaker: I recognize the member from Regina Walsh Acres.

Mr. Steinley: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's very clear that the members opposite have no vision or leadership within their provincial party. This is why they're taking their marching orders from the federal party. On the first private members' day after a provincial budget, they have no provincial policies that they want to discuss on a private members' day to put forward a motion based on provincial policy ideas.

So my question to the member from Regina Elphinstone: seeing there's no leadership within their provincial party right now, at the next convention will he be supporting the member from Massey Place or the member from Rosemont as the next leader?

The Deputy Speaker: I recognize the member from Regina Elphinstone-Centre.

Mr. McCall: This brings to mind the old adage: ask a silly question, Mr. Speaker, get a silly answer. So I'll try to refrain from providing a silly answer, but I guess this is part of the point of the exercise.

We know that this government has a very close relationship with the Harper Conservative government. That member in particular has drawn a salary working for the Harper Conservative government. So how is it that when you've got a bill before the federal parliament that poses a number of dangers to Saskatchewan people's rights and freedoms . . . What is the position of that government when it comes to reining their pals in the federal Harper Conservative government in? Has that government stood up for the people of Saskatchewan, or have they just rode along in the hip pocket of the Harper Conservative government as per usual?

The Deputy Speaker: I recognize the member from Athabasca.

Mr. Belanger: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Five former Supreme Court justices, seven former federal ministers, and four former prime ministers including one Conservative are all worried about the harm that Bill C-51 will cause. This bill undermines public safety and human rights right here in Saskatchewan. It lacks an effective oversight mechanism for CSIS. Does any of this concern the member from Melfort?

The Deputy Speaker: I recognize the member from Melfort.

Mr. Phillips: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. You know, we sit in this House and we're talking about a federal motion, and they're saying that it affects us. Well of course every federal motion affects us. But I believe the Parliament of Canada has a sober Chamber of sober second thought — maybe they have one too many — and we are not it. We are the provincial Legislative Assembly.

And I wonder in my mind when we go back to some laws that we have, like the RCMP [Royal Canadian Mounted Police] and the Armed Forces being able to carry weapons

within Canada. If we have laws that say, no they can't, just take us outside and shoot us. Because we know our democracy. We know the way things work. And they would love to change it and think of the world's worst ideas — but not going to happen.

The Deputy Speaker: I recognize the member from Regina Douglas Park.

Mr. Marchuk: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the world is being held hostage by terrorists. I've been behind the Berlin Wall. I've been through armed Checkpoint Charlie. I've been to the memorial at Dachau where it professes, "never again." I've seen first-hand the result of terrorist oppression and, make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, Hitler was a terrorist. And we have all seen, first-hand, terrorism in Canada. Yet the members opposite would oppose an Act aimed at ensuring the safety of our citizens and our democracy.

To the member from Saskatoon Centre: do you support protecting our way of life and our people, or do you support terrorism?

The Deputy Speaker: I recognize the member from Saskatoon Centre.

Mr. Forbes: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. A very important question, and of course I think what we have to do is make sure we fight terrorism in sustained, effective means. I want to quote from Ed Broadbent and Roy Romanow, who happens to be from Saskatchewan, but this is what they say:

Terrorism is designed to provoke governments into making damaging mistakes. It is conducted through brutality and rooted in the belief that killing ordinary citizens will cause nations to abandon their most basic commitments.

And that's what's happening, Mr. Deputy Speaker, through Bill C-51. That's why it's not a good bill. We need to do a better job.

The Deputy Speaker: I recognize the member from Saskatoon Nutana.

Ms. Sproule: Mr. Speaker, Zarqa Nawaz, the creator of *Little Mosque on the Prairie* appeared at the committee meeting for C-51, and she said she's concerned that the government is stoking fear and driving wedges between people instead of focusing on working with the community leaders and local mosques on deradicalization. Doesn't the member for Regina Qu'Appelle Valley think that that would make more sense? Shouldn't we focus more on deradicalizing youth here at home?

The Deputy Speaker: I recognize the member from Regina Qu'Appelle Valley.

Ms. Ross: Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I'd like to thank the member opposite for the question. In fact Zarqa is a very good friend of mine. I do spend a lot of time within the Muslim community talking to different members, and yes I do understand it very fully.

But you know what really concerns me is the members opposite blindly buying in to their

federal counterparts. They then turn around and state in a question here, do you just follow with your federal . . . We're not adjoined federally. The Saskatchewan Party is a stand-alone party. Many of us happen to be federal Liberals or federal Conservatives but, Mr. Speaker, we have our own mind. And one of the things we are concerned about is the economy, is ensuring that Saskatchewan has a strong economy and is moving forward, Mr. Speaker, so that good jobs are provided for people, especially newcomers here in this province.

The Deputy Speaker: I recognize the member from Saskatoon Sutherland.

Mr. Merriman: Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm very disappointed in this debate. I really wish we could hear some plans as to what the New Democratic Party would do or what they are getting their instructions from their federal party on what to do because they don't seem to have any vision on their own.

What I would like to know again is from the member of Athabasca. Does he stand up for Canada and for the people of Canada, all the people of Canada, or does he stand up for terrorism?

The Deputy Speaker: I recognize the member from Athabasca.

Mr. Belanger: Mr. Speaker, that's an absolutely pathetic question, Mr. Speaker. Of course nobody in any part of Canada supports terrorism, Mr. Speaker. Nobody within the New Democratic Party support terrorism in any way, Mr. Speaker.

I support the men and women that have served this great country over history. I will continue supporting the Armed Forces, Mr. Speaker, because they've got an incredible job ahead of them, Mr. Speaker. The Armed Forces of Canada throughout history, especially the World War II, were considered one of the best fighting forces throughout the world, Mr. Speaker. We should not do a disservice to them by politicizing the process, as I've indicated. We should honour them for the rest of their lives by giving them proper support, respect, and cherish the one thing that they gave their life for — freedom. That's what they gave their life for, freedom that we enjoy today, Mr. Speaker, not politics, not crass politics, especially silly questions like that that was just posed by that member, Mr. Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: I recognize the member from Regina Elphinstone-Centre.

Mr. McCall: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In terms of the member from Regina Qu'Appelle Valley saying that she's a friend of Zarqa Nawaz, would she do her the respect . . .

The Deputy Speaker: Time for the 75-minute debate has expired.