



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 148 • NUMBER 304 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, May 30, 2018

—

Speaker: The Honourable Geoff Regan

CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, May 30, 2018

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayer

• (1400)

[*English*]

The Speaker: It being Wednesday, we will now have the singing of the national anthem, led by the hon. member for South Okanagan—West Kootenay.

[*Members sang the national anthem*]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*Translation*]

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

Mr. Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, last week, Quebec's National Assembly forwarded a unanimous resolution to the Prime Minister's Office to open talks on a single tax return administered by Quebec.

How did the Prime Minister respond? We are used to our requests being ignored or flat out rejected, but we are not used to the kind of response we got this time. Not only did he say no, but he also ridiculed the National Assembly's request. He ridiculed the National Assembly, its 125 members, and the eight million Quebecers they represent. That is outrageous.

The Prime Minister is not even trying to hide his disdain. He clearly could not care less about the Quebec consensus. He is supremely arrogant.

In case he has forgotten, his seat is in Quebec. If he has no respect for the people he represents, he should not represent them. He should run in another province or not run at all.

* * *

• (1405)

[*English*]

PARAMJIT KAUR DEOL

Mr. Raj Grewal (Brampton East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I rise in the House with a heavy heart. After a long and tough battle with cancer, my dearest aunt, Paramjit Kaur Deol passed away this week. She leaves behind a loving husband, four children, and eight

grandchildren, who will always remember her as the rock of their family.

Like many Canadians, she came to Canada in search of a better life for herself and her family, in 1974. Grateful for what she had, she always made sure to give back. In the 1970s, one immigrant with a similar name, the Deal family name, found her in the phone book and called her to ask for help. She invited that person, a complete stranger, to stay with her family until the new immigrant could get settled in Canada. This is just one story of many. Thanks to Paramjit Kaur's efforts, several new immigrants got to achieve their very own Canadian dream.

To my mama-ji, Tina, Karen, Kushwant and Moni—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Calgary Heritage.

* * *

HERITAGE PARK HISTORICAL VILLAGE

Mr. Bob Benzen (Calgary Heritage, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my riding, Calgary Heritage, shares its name with one of western Canada's great attractions, the Calgary Heritage Park Historical Village. The park brings the history of Canada's west to life through recreations that chronicle the frontier, from the 1800s to the middle of the last century.

From forts and trading posts, first nations encampments, and rail lines, to a replicated 19th-century prairie village and the popular Gasoline Alley Museum, life in the west as it was once lived unfolds with the help of 1,800-plus volunteers.

The park just recently announced a new project to honour the pioneers of Alberta's oil patch while exploring the past, present, and future of our energy sector. Heritage Park is truly a grassroots operation, and one that enhances our sense of community.

I urge all Canadians to visit it when they travel to Calgary, and see first-hand why this remarkable place is rightly called Canada's largest living history experience.

* * *

[*Translation*]

MÉLANIE PAUL

Mr. Richard Hébert (Lac-Saint-Jean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Mélanie Paul is a well-known businesswoman in my riding.

Statements by Members

Originally from the community of Mashteuiatsh, Ms. Paul used her background in both social service and entrepreneurship to establish many business partnerships that make use of indigenous knowledge and address social problems by providing high-quality jobs.

For her outstanding work and proactive leadership, Ms. Paul was awarded the young entrepreneurs award on April 27 by the Conseil du patronat du Québec.

As a humanitarian and a businesswoman, Ms. Paul is a role model for our entire community. I congratulate her on this well-deserved award. It is a testament to her accomplishments and her invaluable contributions to our region.

* * *

CHAMBLY HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. Matthew Dubé (Beloeil—Chambly, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the students of École secondaire de Chambly, which came first in Canada in the Zone01 Robotics challenge for the fourth time in four years.

I salute the work of Noémie and Stéphanie Dussault-Balency, Tristan Amesse-Laparé, Alexandre Cayer, Simon Blanchet, Loïc Sabourin, Francis Bonin, Dylan Sylvestre, Jérémie Zaragoza, Justin Boucher, Justine Blanchet, Jacob Gagnon, Mathieu Ouellet, and Jean-François Leblanc. They all took home numerous awards in the various challenge categories.

I offer my warmest congratulations to Emmanuel Nadeau-Éthier, the school's robotics teacher, who is seeing his efforts bear fruit and help the program grow.

Having visited the school several times, I have seen the importance of offering young people an education in robotics, as it is an essential asset in an era of rapidly evolving technology. I am extremely proud of the success of this program, and I am especially proud of these students and their teacher.

Congratulations to you all.

* * *

[English]

LIFETIME ACHIEVEMENT AWARD

Hon. John McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have seldom met a politician more skilled in the art of politics and policy than Bob Rae.

On May 16, the Canadian Association of Former Parliamentarians recognized Mr. Rae with a lifetime achievement award. It is a recognition well deserved.

Many more eloquent than I have highlighted Bob's many political accomplishments. From my perspective, keeping the Liberal Party in the game from 2011 to 2013 was easily one of Bob's most significant political accomplishments. Political leadership is required when times are darkest, and indeed times were dark until October 2015.

In caucus, Bob was pure joy. Not only does he have a wicked sense of humour, but he can and did quickly summarize complex

political and policy positions with insight, perspective, and clear direction.

I am glad to know that Bob is not retiring. I will miss his wit and wisdom. This is a well-deserved recognition.

* * *

● (1410)

[Translation]

BEAUCE ART

Hon. Maxime Bernier (Beauce, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the House about a cultural organization in my riding called Beauce Art. Its mission includes contributing to the development and promotion of arts and culture. Every year Beauce Art presents a major international event. From May 27 to June 17, my region will host a symposium with the theme “sculpting history in the great outdoors”. Artists from eight countries and diverse cultural backgrounds will come together in Saint-Georges, in Beauce, to give residents a taste of a live creative experience. This will be an opportunity for each artist to share how he or she views history and interprets the facts. This international sculpture symposium is a major tourist attraction for Beauce.

I invite my colleagues to attend this event and I encourage everyone to come and see what Beauce has to offer.

* * *

[English]

TEACHING EXCELLENCE

Mr. Dan Vandal (Saint Boniface—Saint Vital, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, the Prime Minister presented awards for teaching excellence in early childhood education. There were four recipients from Manitoba, and I am extremely proud to say that three of them work in my riding of Saint Boniface—Saint Vital.

[Translation]

Yvette Sorin was awarded a certificate of excellence in early childhood education. She stood out for her inclusive, family-centric approach and her innovative ways of encouraging young people to be independent.

[English]

Stephen Jones received the certificate of achievement for teaching excellence in STEM education. Stephen organizes the Youth BIOLab Jeunesse, a unique science program for school-aged kids at the St-Boniface Hospital Albrechtsen Research Centre.

[Translation]

Meagan Chopek, a teacher and librarian at the brand new École Sage Creek School, was awarded the certificate of achievement in teaching.

[English]

Her commitment to bringing the world to the school is having a positive effect on her new school.

To them, I extend congratulations and thanks.

*Statements by Members***BON ECHO PROVINCIAL PARK**

Mr. Mike Bossio (Hastings—Lennox and Addington, Lib.):
Mr. Speaker,

It is Tourism Week in my riding, so let us all embark to see true rural living at Bon Echo Park, and head south to Stone Mills when the day turns to night, because the dark sky viewing is a true delight. If we go to Newburgh, we will all be shoe-ins if we poke our head in at Art Among the Ruins. And thanks to the volunteers who always pitch in on Amherst Island, at the Back Kitchen. We take the ferry from there to steer a path to the Canada Day parade in historic Bath. If we need to quench our thirst, we are already near to stop at Napanee, Bancroft, Signal, and MacKinnon Brothers for craft beer. Mr. Speaker, pay close attention now, Because I am sure you would love the Mohawk powwow. But if it is rodeos we need, then we take heed and saddle up our steed for the stampede in Tweed. And so, Mr. Speaker, all this to say, Summer in Hastings—Lennox and Addington is all sunny ways.

* * *

MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS

Mr. Kerry Diotte (Edmonton Griesbach, CPC): Mr. Speaker, one in 340 Canadians lives with multiple sclerosis. I have a personal connection with this disease. My dear Edmonton friend Ted Marianix died from MS three years ago. However, there is hope. Another friend, Julie Kelndorfer, has lived with MS for 14 years. She has seen the difference research makes.

She tells me that 20 years ago there were only one or two drug therapies for people with relapsing-remitting MS. Today, there are 14 drug treatments. People with MS today are getting a better quality of life by research done into stem cell treatments.

Since 1948, the MS Society of Canada has provided about \$175 million in funding for research. We are now a shining light.

May is MS Awareness Month and today is World MS Day. I ask all my MP colleagues to join me to support the MS Society's quest to accelerate MS research. Together, we can find a cure.

* * *

• (1415)

[*Translation*]

HENRI-BOURASSA HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. Emmanuel Dubourg (Bourassa, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it has been 50 years. As member of Parliament for Bourassa, I have the honour of marking the 50th anniversary of my alma mater, École secondaire Henri-Bourassa. When I walked through those doors back in 1975, it was a comprehensive school.

I want to recognize the current principal, Mr. Tremblay, the Pointe-de-l'Île school board, the entire teaching staff, and the school's cohorts over the past 50 years. HB, as it is affectionately known to students, has played and continues to play a big role in helping thousands of teenagers from all backgrounds gain expertise and knowledge.

Happy 50th anniversary to École secondaire Henri-Bourassa.

[*English*]

MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS

Hon. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today is World MS Awareness Day. I remember our colleague and friend Rick Wackid, who was taken suddenly by this disease at a very young age.

Canadians have one of the highest rates of multiple sclerosis in the world. It is a progressive illness, and the ability to perform basic activities that many of us take for granted is lost over time. Medication, equipment, treatment services, and transportation pose significant economic challenges and burdens. However, despite these obstacles, persons with MS and their families live lives of quiet and courageous dignity.

Let us raise awareness of MS as parliamentarians, and pledge for more funding for stem cell research and support services.

I urge us all to renew our commitment to end multiple sclerosis.

* * *

RED DEER & DISTRICT CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. Earl Dreeshen (Red Deer—Mountain View, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last weekend in Grande Prairie, the Red Deer & District Chamber of Commerce was honoured as the Alberta Chambers of Commerce 2017 Large Chamber of the Year. The Red Deer & District Chamber and its members all work tirelessly to help build a vibrant community in my riding.

Recently, the chamber, in partnership with Westerner Park, hosted the most successful agri-trade to date, attracting thousands of attendees and adding over \$250 million to our local economy. That partnership also resulted in a successful bid to host the Canadian Finals Rodeo in Red Deer for the next 10 years. This event will bring an additional \$25 million every year.

The chamber's advocacy campaigns also helped local farmers and businesses as it lobbied the government to end the Canadian Wheat Board monopoly back in 2011. This year, the chamber's advocacy for Red Deer College resulted in a successful bid to pursue its degree granting status.

Today, I am proud to congratulate our Red Deer & District Chamber and CEO Robin Bobocel on this well-deserved recognition.

Statements by Members

[Translation]

VICTIMS AND SURVIVORS OF CRIME WEEK

Ms. Emmanuella Lambropoulos (Saint-Laurent, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this week is Victims and Survivors of Crime Week, which is an opportunity to reflect on the progress we have made and the work that is yet to be done to achieve our shared goal of transforming the culture of the criminal justice system to support victims and survivors of crime.

[English]

As a member of the status of women committee, I have been trusted with stories from many brave victims and survivors. These stories are the heart of our report “Taking Action To End Violence Against Young Women and Girls in Canada”, which shapes the first federal strategy to prevent and address gender-based violence, with an investment of nearly \$200 million. This work could not have been done without the heroism of our witnesses. We would like to thank them for that.

[Translation]

I also want to thank the community organizations, like the Centre des femmes de Saint-Laurent, the Centre d'encadrement pour jeunes femmes immigrantes, and the Amal Center for Women in Saint-Laurent, which dedicate their time to ensuring that victims and survivors of crime are treated with compassion, dignity, and respect.

* * *

[English]

WALK A MILE IN HER SHOES

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today is the ninth annual Walk a Mile in Her Shoes: International Men's March to Stop Rape, Sexual Assault & Gender Violence, hosted by White Ribbon in Toronto. I stand here today in high heels to support these walkers.

Our former NDP Leader, Jack Layton, was one of the co-founders behind the White Ribbon campaign. Now in 70 countries, men and boys are working in the prevention of violence against women and girls, with more than 4,700 Canadians who were involved in workshops and speaking engagements.

Sadly, women and girls continue to face crisis levels of violence in Canada, with rates of violence against women remaining largely unchanged over the past two decades. Canada has fallen behind many countries when it comes to prevention and protection of women and girls against gender violence, and successive governments have failed to do enough to make this a priority. This needs to change

We urge the Canadian government to demonstrate leadership by walking the talk and dedicating resources to meet Canada's long-standing domestic, international, and constitutional commitments to make a safer world where women and girls live free of violence.

● (1420)

UKRAINE

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Vladimir Putin and his Kremlin kleptocrats continue their illegal occupation of Crimea and waging war on Ukraine's Donbas. The Russian Federation has been intensifying its war in Eastern Ukraine this spring, killing more Ukrainian soldiers, civilians, and dissidents who speak out against Putin's invasion of Ukraine. This must stop.

Canada must do more to help our ally Ukraine. That is why a Conservative government in 2019 will provide lethal defensive weapons to Ukraine. That is why Conservatives brought forward Magnitsky legislation to hold Russian kleptocrats and human rights abusers accountable.

While our Conservative caucus has been a world leader in its support for Ukraine, it is shameful that the Liberal government has failed to follow suit. Putin is provoked by weakness. That is why Canada must stand fast by our friend and ally Ukraine. Only through action and strength of resolve can we help Ukraine protect its sovereignty, regain its territorial integrity, and stop the illegal occupation of Putin's proxies in Ukraine.

* * *

TELUS DAYS OF GIVING

Mr. Randy Boissonnault (Edmonton Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, earlier today, members of the House and TELUS volunteers packed Kits for Kids backpacks, filling them with school supplies as part of TELUS Days of Giving.

Participating members will have the opportunity to select a school in their community for children who may not have access to the tools they need, providing them with necessary school supplies. This year I have chosen Inglewood School, a wonderful school in Edmonton Centre, to receive these school supplies.

TELUS Days of Giving inspires us to give back and make a positive difference in our local communities. This year celebrates the 13th annual event, with thousands of volunteer activities taking place from May 1 to June 30.

[Translation]

TELUS and its teams, which are all dedicated to improving Canada's social vitality, have raised over \$1 billion since 2000 through philanthropy and volunteer work.

I sincerely thank all those who took part in the TELUS Days of Giving campaign across Canada.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[English]

NATURAL RESOURCES

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's legacy, when it comes to the energy sector and the hundreds of thousands of Canadians who work in it, has already been established. Not only has he driven out tens of billions of dollars of investment, but he has killed several important energy pipeline projects.

Energy east would have brought western Canadian energy to eastern markets, displacing foreign oil and creating jobs in New Brunswick. However, the Prime Minister killed that project by imposing a double standard on Canadian energy from which foreign oil was exempt.

Why is the Prime Minister opposed to energy east?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have been consistent in demonstrating that we understand that growing the economy and protecting the environment must go together. As we move forward on a national plan to reduce climate change, at the same time, we also defend Canadian jobs right across the country, particularly in Alberta.

We are happy to move forward on demonstrating that we understand what the Conservatives and the NDP simply do not: there is no choice to be made between the environment and the economy when it comes to creating good jobs for Canadians and into the future.

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has made the choice to kill thousands of jobs in Canada and give preferential treatment to foreign oil over domestic Canadian production.

Energy east was not the only pipeline that he killed. He killed the northern gateway project, which would have taken Canadian products to deepwater ports accessing Asian markets. He ignored the dozens of first nations communities that supported it all along the way.

Will the Prime Minister just admit that killing these projects is just part of his plan to phase out the energy sector?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, across the country, people are talking about the pipeline investment we made yesterday, but the Conservative Party is actually talking about old news. The Conservatives cannot talk about the news that we had, which moves forward on protecting jobs for Albertans, standing up for Albertan workers and, indeed, workers from across the country who get benefits when we get our resources to markets other than the U.S. They tried, and failed, for 10 years to get our resources to markets other than the U.S. They failed, and we got it done. No wonder they cannot talk about it.

• (1425)

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, under our Conservative government, taxpayers never had to pay for pipelines to be built. Four major pipelines were approved and constructed without a cent of taxpayers' dollars. When we approved the northern gateway pipeline, which would have brought Canadian

Oral Questions

energy to deepwater ports accessing Asian markets, the Prime Minister killed it. He has created the scenario where taxpayers have to pay for his mistakes.

Why has he waited so long and created this problem—

The Speaker: The right hon. Prime Minister.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what we have seen here is the Conservatives trapped by their rigid ideology and therefore unable to protect jobs and create jobs for Albertans. For 10 years, they tried, and failed, to get a new pipeline built to markets other than the United States. They were unable to do that. What they seem not to understand is that public investment has always been part of developing the resource sector.

We are proud to make sure we are supporting the growth in the economy, the good jobs for Albertans and all Canadians, while we protect the environment.

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, to date, the only thing standing in the way of getting Canadian energy to foreign markets is that Liberal government. Now the Prime Minister is trying to characterize the belief that when a private sector company wants to use shareholder money to build a pipeline, that is somehow rigid ideology. Well, when a Texas-based company wants to bring \$4.5 billion of investment into Canada, the Conservatives will support that investment and not ask taxpayers to pay for his mistakes.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the rigid ideology that the Conservative Party is showing is costing jobs for Albertans. The Conservatives failed for 10 years. Perhaps a little history lesson is in order.

Progressive Conservative leaders like Peter Lougheed understood that public investment in our resource sector was important to get our resources built and to markets. For 10 years, the Conservatives tried, and failed, to get our resources to markets other than the U.S. We are standing up for Alberta and Canadian jobs.

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, tens of billions of dollars of investment in the energy sector have already left this country, and now the Prime Minister is telling Canadian taxpayers that they are going to have to pay for his mistakes. He is writing a cheque for \$4.5 billion for an existing pipeline. Not a single centimetre of new pipeline will be built with this bill to the taxpayer. It is going to a Texas-based company that is taking that money out of Canada.

Why is it that when the Liberals are in power, taxpayers have to pay \$4.5 billion for something they could have gotten for free?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives tried for 10 years to get our resources to markets other than the United States, and they failed, and now that we are actually securing access to new markets, securing Canadian jobs, and securing Alberta jobs, their ideology is getting in the way.

Oral Questions

I remind them that the great Peter Lougheed knew that public investment in resource development is essential to move forward as a country. That is exactly what we are doing for Alberta and for Canadians.

The Speaker: I would ask for the assistance of the hon. members for Chilliwack—Hope and St. Albert—Edmonton in not calling out, yelling, or speaking out when someone else has the floor and in waiting until they have the floor before speaking, as the Standing Orders provide.

The hon. member for Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques.

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it would be good if the Prime Minister would put as much passion into talking about the environment as he has talking about buying a pipeline.

• (1430)

[*Translation*]

Let's not kid ourselves. By deciding to invest \$4.5 billion of taxpayers' money in the Kinder Morgan pipeline, the government is nationalizing it. Champions of the environment do not buy pipelines. Champions of the environment do not choose to make taxpayers assume the financial and environmental risks associated with a pipeline. Champions of the environment invest in clean energy.

What risk assessments did the government conduct before getting out its chequebook for Kinder Morgan?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when Rachel Notley announced her plan for the environment, NDP members here in Ottawa applauded her approach and commended her for her vision. However, today, they are forgetting that Rachel Notley's plan to combat climate change was a three-pronged approach, which included limiting greenhouse gas emissions from the oil sands, putting a price on carbon in Alberta, and building a pipeline to get Alberta's resources to new markets.

That is the plan they applauded. What they are forgetting today is that the environment and the economy go hand in hand.

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we are the ones talking about energy and the environment and they are the ones abandoning the environment for the economy. That is clear. The other thing that is clear is that the Premier of Alberta keeps her promises. We really take issue with the government breaking the promises it made to Canadians.

The Liberals do not seem to realize that they have decided to take on a risk that Kinder Morgan clearly no longer wanted to bear. Let us be clear: what the government bought for \$4.5 billion is a pipeline that was built in the 1950s. Expanding the pipeline will take an additional \$7-billion to \$15-billion investment.

Can the government tell us what fiscal impact this nationalization will have on Canadian taxpayers?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the NDP still does not understand that we cannot choose between what is good for the economy and what is good for the environment. They have not understood a thing.

Our historic plan to achieve our Paris targets includes a pipeline to get our resources to new markets. We know that getting our resources to new markets, securing a better price, and securing jobs across Canada will translate into pricing pollution across the country, protecting our oceans, and limiting greenhouse gas emissions—

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

[*English*]

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, only the Liberals would dump \$4.5 billion on a 65-year-old pipeline and call that an energy strategy. Only the Liberals would try to force through a pipeline, and tankers, through traditional first nations territory and call that reconciliation. Only this Prime Minister would call himself a climate change leader and then be willing to spend \$15 billion on a diluted-bitumen pipeline to China.

He is about to say, “The environment and the economy must go together.” Does he know what else must go together? It is making a promise to the Canadian people and then actually keeping it.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think it would be worthwhile to remind the House and remind Canadians, and indeed remind the NDP, that they celebrated Rachel Notley's approach to protecting the environment and growing the economy just a few years ago, yet they forgot that part of that plan involved three elements: one, an absolute cap on oil sands emissions; two, a price on carbon that would apply to the Alberta economy; and three, getting our oil resources to new markets.

That was integral to Rachel Notley's approach. That is what they have done. That is indeed what we have done to demonstrate that the economy and the environment go together.

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I must have missed the part where she said that we should nationalize a 65-year-old pipeline with four and a half billion dollars of Canadians' money. The Liberals do know it is not legal to smoke weed until August, right? This idea makes no sense at all.

When he was asked about why he bailed out a Texas oil company, this is what the Prime Minister said: it was “too risky for a commercial entity” to take on. What? If it is too risky for an oil pipeline company to build an oil pipeline, why is it okay for the Canadian public to pick up all that risk? Liberals have to learn one thing and one thing finally, that bailing out Texas oil companies is no way—

The Speaker: The right hon. Prime Minister.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since the member brought it up, let us remind the House what Rachel Notley, the NDP Premier of Alberta, actually said about this pipeline:

This is a major step forward for all Canadians.

We have met the deadline.

This project has more certainty than ever...

Oral Questions

We have demonstrated that despite the actions of one province trying to block this pipeline, the project, which is in the national interest, and the jobs that will be assured and defended through this project are an integral part of our plan to fight climate change and grow the economy for future generations. That is what Canadians expect.

• (1435)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, these are the facts. Canadian taxpayers are going to pay \$4.5 billion because of our Prime Minister's lack of leadership. He is going to use \$4.5 billion to buy an existing pipeline. The \$4.5-billion price tag does not include the pipeline expansion or the creation of new jobs. The \$4.5 billion is going to go straight into the pockets of a U.S. corporation that will invest our money in other countries.

I have a question for the Prime Minister. How much will his failure end up costing?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party tried to build a pipeline to new markets for 10 years and it failed. For the past two and a half years the Conservatives have been telling us to move forward and make sure that a pipeline takes our oil to new markets.

Yesterday, we succeeded. We ensured that we will develop our resources so they can be exported to new markets, and we have a plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and meet our Paris targets.

I understand why the Conservatives having nothing to say. We were able to accomplish what they could not.

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, here are some more facts. Let's see what the Prime Minister has to say about this.

What happened on January 26, 2016, February 13, 2018, May 24, May 25, and May 28? The Prime Minister and all the Liberal members opposed motions in favour of Trans Mountain. Those are the facts.

Because of this failure, Canadians will have to fork over \$4.5 billion. That money could have been used to reduce taxes or provide better services.

How much will this failure end up costing?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, every year, Canada loses \$15 billion because we are prisoners of a single market. We need to develop our resources and export them to new markets that are not the United States. That is exactly what we are doing.

For 10 years, the Conservatives failed to do that. For two and a half years, they have been shouting at us to do it, and now that we are doing it, they are angry and they have no idea what to do because we are standing up for jobs for Albertans in the oil fields. This will strengthen the Canadian economy for years to come while protecting the environment.

[*English*]

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals gave \$4.5 billion in Canadian tax dollars to Kinder Morgan to build pipelines in the United States, Canada's biggest energy

competitor. The Prime Minister killed northern gateway, energy east, and Pacific NorthWest LNG and imposed an offshore drilling ban, a tanker ban, and a carbon tax. No other major oil producer in the world is hampering itself with these damaging policies, but the Prime Minister is ramming through even more red tape. Oil and gas investors warn that it is suffocating the sector, but we all know that he wants to phase them out.

When will the Prime Minister stop attacking the livelihoods of hundreds of thousands of Canadian energy workers?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully propose that it is the Conservatives who are now attacking the livelihoods of hundreds of thousands of energy workers across this country by standing in the way of this pipeline. We are actually moving forward on this pipeline to get our resources to new markets in a way that also will allow us to reach our climate agreements under the Paris accord.

This is what for 10 years they were unable to do. This is what for two and a half years they have been shouting at us to do, and now that we are actually doing it, no wonder they are completely lost. This is a sad day for the Conservatives but a good day for Canada.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the reality is that the Liberals jeopardize investment in Canada at every turn, and the U.S. is poised to supply 80% of the world's growing oil and gas demand. Banks, economists, and investment firms have been warning for months that investment is leaving Canada. The Canadian Energy Pipeline Association said that "uncertainty and potential implications of further...seismic regulatory changes" are driving energy investments out of Canada.

Canada does not need nationalization. Canada needs certainty and to be able to compete. When will the Liberals stop undermining Canadian energy investments?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the rigid ideology of this particular band of Conservatives forgets the long and storied history of public investment in our national resource sector. The great Progressive Conservative leader Peter Lougheed understood that well and made significant public investments in our natural resources to get to where we are today.

The Conservatives are now letting their ideology get in the way of securing and creating good jobs for Albertans, and indeed for all Canadians. That is what we are focused on. That is what we will continue to do.

Oral Questions

•(1440)

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in an interview, the Prime Minister indicated that the reason the government intervened and decided to nationalize a pipeline was because the Liberals recognized that there was too much uncertainty for Kinder Morgan and it was in the national interest.

There is another pipeline that was in the national interest, and that was the energy east pipeline. It would have provided jobs, competitiveness for New Brunswick, and more certainty, for sure, with respect to supply.

What I would like to know is, will the Prime Minister promise to enter into negotiations to provide the same level of certainty for energy east?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting that the day after we are actually getting this important pipeline for new markets built, the Conservatives are pivoting to try to talk about old news and other issues.

We are securing investments in Alberta and good jobs for Albertans, and indeed all the Canadians who work in the oil sands industry, for years to come. It is no wonder the Conservatives are flailing about.

We are going to continue to stand up for Albertan jobs, for Canadian jobs, while we protect the environment for future generations. That is the commitment we made, and we are keeping it.

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is very distressing, as a former Cape Bretoner, that the government takes for granted the 32 seats it was delivered in the last election. I will tell members why.

As the Prime Minister stands up here and says that I am talking about old news, it is not old news. Yesterday the mayor of St. John indicated that he wanted to have the energy east pipeline opened up again. A pre-eminent business leader in New Brunswick said exactly the same thing. Indeed, the member for Saint John—Rothesay told his local newspaper this morning that he is going to tell the Prime Minister that we have to get this going again.

Is the Prime Minister going to listen to his own member and get this going again?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we all know that it is essential for us to get our resources to markets other than the United States. The Conservatives know that, but they were unable to do it for the 10 years they were in power. They were shouting at us to get it done for the past two and a half years, and when we finally ensure and secure access to new markets for our oil resources, they do not know what to say. The fact is that their ideological approach and their playing of politics is getting in the way of Canadian jobs.

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Ms. Georgina Jolibois (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Cindy Blackstock said that Canada could have funded the underfunding of first nations' education, water infrastructure on reserves, and early childhood programs; ensured

that no sick child was air transported alone in the north; and more. Instead, the Liberals bought a pipeline.

Yesterday the Auditor General confirmed that the Liberals have ignored crucial data on the well-being of first nations across Canada. Now that we know the Liberals have billions of dollars to spend, when can first nations, Métis, and Inuit expect the same investment?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what the NDP fails to understand is that every year we were losing \$15 billion, because we were prisoners of a single market for our oil resources. Accessing new markets will allow us to grow our economy and create good jobs while we invest in the things that matter.

In regard to indigenous leadership, let me point out this quote: "I am happy the Prime Minister, the Finance Minister...are delivering on their promise that the [Kinder Morgan] Expansion Project will be built, and that construction will get under way this summer. This is good news for First Nations & all Canadians." That is Ernie Crey, Chief of Cheam First Nation.

[Translation]

Mr. Romeo Saganash (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon there will be a vote on my bill to ensure that Canadian laws respect the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, a principle that the Prime Minister supported.

This government has a fundamental constitutional obligation to uphold the honour of the crown in its relations with the indigenous peoples.

How does imposing the pipeline expansion despite strong and growing opposition from indigenous peoples uphold the honour of the crown?

•(1445)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, respecting indigenous communities includes listening to all indigenous communities. I know that there are indigenous communities that are opposed to this pipeline, but there are also indigenous communities that are in favour of it and the opportunities for development that come with it.

We are working with all the indigenous communities to respond to their concerns and to allay their fears. We will continue to work toward reconciliation in partnership with the indigenous communities while building an economy that works for everyone and protecting the environment.

* * *

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, never in the history of Canada have we had a prime minister with such contempt for the oil sector and for Canadian workers as our current Prime Minister.

Oral Questions

Remember when he was in Calgary and said we need to phase out Alberta oil? Then, in Paris, he said it was not happening fast enough. Later he even said that higher gas prices were exactly what he wanted. Perhaps that is what he wants, but that is not what Canadians want. What is his latest bright idea? It is to send \$4.5 billion of taxpayers' money to Texas. My question for the Prime Minister is very simple.

How much is the Kinder Morgan project going to cost taxpayers in the long run because of the Liberal Prime Minister's ineptitude?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives are completely lost in their arguments.

By purchasing a pipeline that will take our oil to new markets outside the U.S., we are actually standing up for jobs and workers in the natural resource sector in Alberta and across the country. It is what the Conservatives tried to do for 10 years, but they failed because they did not understand that the environment and the economy must go hand in hand.

We are proud of the work we are doing to protect the environment and access new markets to grow our economy, and we will continue to do so.

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): That is quite the track record, Mr. Speaker. The northern gateway project was not approved and energy east did not go ahead because of Liberal measures.

Now, the Liberals are proposing to impose a Liberal tax on carbon and to send \$4.5 billion of taxpayers' money to Texas. Again, I have a very simple question for the Prime Minister.

How much will the Kinder Morgan project end up costing taxpayers because of the Liberal government's ineptitude?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us look at the Conservative government's track record. For 10 years, the Conservatives tried to do everything they could for Alberta's economy, but they failed because they did not understand that environmental protection and economic growth must go hand in hand.

By putting a national price on carbon and by demonstrating that we understand that we can defend the economy while creating growth, we were able to approve and begin construction of a pipeline that is vital to our economy.

[*English*]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, welcome to the bailout economy.

When Porter Airlines wanted to extend the runway at the Toronto downtown airport the Liberal government said no, which led to the cancellation of \$2 billion of Bombardier planes. The government said, "We have to bail out Bombardier." The government wrapped this western pipeline in so much red tape and taxes that it became uneconomical, and it says, "We have to bail out the pipeline." Why does the government not just stay out of the way in the first place?

Will the Prime Minister admit that his economic policy is that if it moves, tax it. If it keeps moving, regulate it. If it stops moving—

The Speaker: The Right Hon. Prime Minister.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the desire of the Conservatives right now to play politics with an issue that they have been trying and failing to get done for 10 years is really disappointing.

We have always recognized in Canada that public investment is part of our natural resource sector. The great Peter Lougheed demonstrated that to great advantage for Alberta for many years.

We are going to continue to invest in ways that support and stand up for Albertan workers and workers right across the country as we grow the economy.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the great Peter Lougheed probably had to do that because Pierre Elliott Trudeau was in the process of destroying the entire energy sector. I was living in Alberta during the national energy program. The Prime Minister was living in a publicly funded mansion at the time. It is time that he got in touch.

We had private sector money to build this project. Now we have a \$4.5 billion expense and no pipeline to show for it.

When will the Prime Minister finally get the job done?

• (1450)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I look forward to hearing from an Albertan who actually knows Peter Lougheed's history and understands the timelines involved.

Let me get back to the fact that we are going to continue to stand up for Canadian resources, we are going to continue to stand up for Canadian workers, and we are going to continue to stand up to protect the environment. This is what the Conservatives have tried to do for years but were unable to do. This is what they have been shouting at us to do for two and a half years. Now they are playing politics, but we are actually delivering on what Alberta needs. They do not know what to do and so they make things up.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order. Let me remind members of the way it works. This side says something that the other side does not like, and then the opposite happens, and it goes back and forth. However, we should only have one side at a time speaking to whatever the other side does not like, and we should listen to the answers and the questions.

The hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Fin Donnelly (Port Moody—Coquitlam, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the *Marathassa* leaked 2,700 litres of bunker fuel into Vancouver's English Bay, costing the city more than half a million dollars to clean it up. Three years later, Vancouver is still fighting for reimbursement, but the government is only offering 30¢ on the dollar, leaving taxpayers on the hook. No wonder British Columbians are so concerned about a Kinder Morgan oil tanker spill.

Oral Questions

Now imagine a toxic dilbit spill with no technology in place to clean it up. Who will the minister leave on the hook to clean up that disaster?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I grew up spending my summers on the B.C. coast and I have deep connections with British Columbia, so I too am concerned about the nature of our coast. That is why we have invested \$1.5 billion in a world-class oceans protection plan to ensure that we are keeping our pristine and effective environment, and our strong ecosystem, safe from accidents and disasters. This is something that we take very seriously, and we have made the investments to demonstrate that.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister himself said that the Kinder Morgan pipeline is too risky of a project for the private sector, so what did he do? He took \$4.5 billion out of taxpayers' pockets to buy a 65-year-old pipeline. If this project was too risky for a private company, why would he decide to make Canadians assume that risk? Talk about a moronic decision.

How can the Prime Minister justify throwing our money away on such a risky project instead of investing in the energy transition?

The Speaker: I would ask the hon. member to be more careful about what he says and to avoid using any words or phrases that will cause a disruption in the House.

The right hon. Prime Minister.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have often said, we can disagree and still be respectful of one another, especially when we discuss issues that are important to Canadians.

We understand just how important it is to defend the economy while protecting the environment. We will continue to do so. We will defend jobs across the country. We will cut our greenhouse gases. Canadians expect as much from us. We will always do so.

* * *

[*English*]

LABOUR

Mr. Dan Vandal (Saint Boniface—Saint Vital, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government committed to doing things differently when it came to building a strong economy, supporting the middle class through good quality jobs, and supporting a strong labour movement. The rail sector is integral to our economy, and many Canadians rely on this industry for their livelihoods. While previous governments intervened in the collective bargaining process, we have taken a different, more fair, and balanced approach.

Could the Prime Minister update the House on the status of the negotiations between CP Rail, TCRC, and the IBEW?

• (1455)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the MP for Saint Boniface—Saint Vital for standing up for the interests of westerners across the country. I am very happy to see that CP has come to an agreement with its union partners. Our government respects the collective bargaining and important role

played by organized labour. In our two and a half years in government, not once have we had to introduce back-to-work legislation. Today's agreement shows that when companies treat their workers as partners not opponents, a fair deal for all is possible. This agreement is good news for CP, it is good news for workers, but most of all, it is good news for Canadians.

* * *

DEMOCRATIC REFORM

Mr. Blake Richards (Banff—Airdrie, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, we know that the Prime Minister does not care too much for any opposition, but we are here to hold the government to account and to stand up for the interests of Canadians whether he likes it or not. It is evident that he is trying to ram through his new electoral legislation using closure, time allocation, or whatever other trick he has up his sleeve. Will the Prime Minister commit today to allowing Bill C-76 the proper due diligence and study that Canadians know it deserves?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again Canadians across the country find it humorous that the Conservatives are suddenly standing up for fair elections after what they did in their time in government to make our elections less fair and to try to lean them in their favour. Fortunately, Canadians saw through that and relegated them to where they are right now. We are happy to be moving the Elections Act proposals to committee, where all parliamentarians will be able to make proposals and debate them. We are open to amendments. We are looking forward to strengthening our Elections Act in a way that serves Canadians, not the Conservative Party of—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Banff—Airdrie.

Mr. Blake Richards (Banff—Airdrie, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what Canadians do not find amusing are the games and tricks being played by this Prime Minister while trying to ram through this legislation. He talks about being open to amendments in committee and wanting to have debate while they are in the middle of trying to shut it down and make sure there can be no amendments and no opportunity for debate. That is just plain wrong. It is time this Prime Minister understood that Canada is not a dictatorship and that Canadians will not stand for his garbage. Will he stand up today and let us know that he is going to respect the rights of Canadians and allow a—

Some hon members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: The right hon. Prime Minister.

Oral Questions

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, we know that the Conservatives revert to type whatever chance they get. They try to sling mud, especially when there is good news for Canada, good news for our democracy, and good news for our economy on the table. The approach the Conservatives have of trying to scare and divide Canadians and to hurl insults at each other simply does not work. We are looking forward to working at committee with all members of this House to ensure that the fair elections reform actually moves in the right direction. Canadians said very clearly under the Conservatives that they did not appreciate it when the Conservatives tried to tilt things in their favour.

[Translation]

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have just seen this government's arrogance.

The Prime Minister wants to impose electoral reform on Canadians and he could not care less about the House. He asked Elections Canada to implement the changes contained in a bill which has not yet been passed.

Why does the Prime Minister have so little respect for parliamentarians on both sides of the House?

When will he finally act like a prime minister, and not just like the leader of the Liberal Party of Canada, a partisan leader, and withdraw the unacceptable request he made to Elections Canada?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I realize that the Conservatives are concerned about the fact that we are reversing the unfair changes they made to our election legislation. They tried to rig the election in order to win. Fortunately, it did not work.

We are currently working with all parties and Elections Canada to ensure that the next election will unfold with better rules that will benefit Canadians and not the parties—least of all the Conservative Party.

[English]

Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the democratic reform bill has not even become law. In fact, it has just started to be reviewed at committee, and all Canadians deserve to be heard, yet the Prime Minister has already instructed Elections Canada to implement this bill. I remind the Prime Minister that our democracy does not belong to him or his rigid dictator ideology. It belongs to Canadians. Without blaming Stephen Harper again, how can the Prime Minister justify telling Elections Canada to implement this bill before we have had a chance to hear from Canadians and before it becomes law?

• (1500)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is almost as if the Conservatives want the next election to be fought under the same rules by which they had tilted the electoral system in their own favour in the last Parliament. Canadians rejected that. They wanted a real fair Elections Act, which is not what they got. That is why we are moving forward to improve our electoral system so that it is fairer for all Canadians, and to make sure that our system is reformed in a way that Canadians, parliamentarians, and Elections Canada recommend.

[Translation]

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, after long consultations and the Netflix fiasco, the Minister of Canadian Heritage has now admitted that her half-baked cultural policy was simply an interim policy awaiting further consultations by the CRTC on the future of our culture.

The CRTC will release its report tomorrow, and rumour has it that the minister is going to engage in consultation instead of taking action. That would be the third in three years.

Will the Liberals finish their term with the exact same cultural policy as the Conservative Party: nothing except a tax break for web giants?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are proud that this government has made historic investments in culture, such as supporting the CBC and investing in the Canada Council for the Arts.

We are investing in our creators. We support them and we are helping them flourish around the world. As for the NDP's desire to increase taxes on Canadians, as I said, this is not something we will do. The NDP can keep insisting on it, but we will not increase taxes on Canadians.

* * *

[English]

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, imagine receiving a letter from the government saying a husband and his wife are “not well matched”. Imagine the reason cited is because the wife is three years older than the husband. Imagine the marriage being in question because the wedding was not big enough.

Mr. Baig's wife received that letter.

The government routinely sends these letters out to spousal sponsorship applicants from Pakistan to “tease out a response”. “Offensive” and “insulting” do not even begin to describe this.

What action will the Prime Minister take to rectify this systemic issue?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have moved forward on strengthening our immigration system, investing in more capacity to analyze and look at files.

We know the backlogs that the Conservative government created in family reunification, in spousal sponsorship. We are pleased that we have dropped spousal sponsorship down from the over two years it took under the previous government to 12 months. We also know there is more to do.

We are going to continue to keep Canadians safe. We are going to continue to make sure that we are applying the rules properly. We are going to continue to be compassionate and efficient.

Oral Questions

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, according to a recent CBC/Radio-Canada story, the Minister of Immigration is beginning to wake up. The article indicates that the minister is in talks with his American counterparts to modernize the safe third country agreement. However, the change he is proposing would do nothing to stop the influx of illegal migrants crossing Canada's border at various unofficial entry points like Saint-Bernard-de-Lacolle.

Will the Prime Minister impress upon the U.S. government the need to close the loophole in the the safe third country agreement?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can assure Canadians that our immigration system continues to be applied in its entirety.

All newcomers, whether regular or irregular, continue to be subjected to all the usual security processes and analyses. We know that Canadians expect our system to be comprehensive, and I can assure them that it is. We continue to apply all the usual rules, principles, and laws.

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I really want to believe the Prime Minister, but his minister says otherwise.

The minister was not candid with the parliamentary committee on the subject of illegal migrants. He said they would be arrested and deported, yet he knows full well that the appeal process can take as long as 10 years. He insists that these people are not welcome, yet he rushes to give them expedited work permits and helps them to settle in communities all over Canada. He also refuses to reveal the true number of illegal migrants who have already been deported from Canada.

The minister obviously knows the figures. He needs to stop dodging and tell Canadians.

Would the Prime Minister agree?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yet again, the Conservatives are peddling fear and division, fear of immigrants and newcomers, for political gain. That is utterly irresponsible.

I can assure all Canadians that we are applying all of our immigration laws and claim review procedures, that we are keeping Canadians safe, and that we have the capacity to address the challenge of irregular arrivals.

I can assure Canadians that we have the situation under control.

• (1505)

[*English*]

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's irresponsible tweet started a flood of illegal border crossings. Over 25,000 people have responded to his open invitation.

The Liberals have broken our immigration system. Downloading this problem onto our municipalities and backlogging legal immigrants is not fair and it is not compassionate.

The immigration minister now claims that he is open to modernizing the safe third country agreement. Will the Prime Minister now act responsibly and commit to closing the loophole that is allowing these illegal crossings?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not have enough time in 30 seconds to respond to all the misinformation in the question from the member opposite. The fact is that the opposition are continuing to try to stoke fear and foment division between new Canadians and the newest Canadians and Canadians who have been here for many generations. That is completely irresponsible. Quite frankly, it was the kind of politics of division that were rejected by Canadians in the last election.

We are going to continue to be compassionate and open. However, we will also apply our immigration system in its entirety, and all the rules and laws that apply to it.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Ken Hardie (Fleetwood—Port Kells, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, employment opportunities for all Canadians are critical for growing the economy. Canada's success depends on our ability to leverage our diverse talent pool. Canadians living with disabilities have the same ambitions as all other Canadians. They want opportunities to find good, well-paying jobs, make a contribution to their communities and the economy, and build a better life for themselves and their family.

Can the Prime Minister please explain what the government is doing to ensure Canadians living with disabilities have the tools and skills needed for success in the new digital economy?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the world becomes increasingly digital, we want to ensure all Canadians are set up for success. In Vancouver, we announced \$3 million for the Neil Squire Society to develop an open-source assistive technology model across Canada that will greatly reduce costs for persons with disabilities. This is part of our \$22.3 million accessible technology program, which will help overcome barriers and give all Canadians an equal opportunity to obtain good jobs for today and tomorrow.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher (Beauport—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île d'Orléans—Charlevoix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the G7 is just around the corner and despite the crowds in La Malbaie and the Prime Minister's smiles, people are worried.

Local residents did not choose to be within the perimeter of the facilities and they already know that they will be denied any compensation from the government if they are victims of vandalism during the summit.

Since the government has no qualms about spending more than \$10 million to compensate the terrorist Omar Khadr, how can it refuse to compensate honest Canadians?

Oral Questions

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was very touched by the welcome I received from the people of Charlevoix when I went there a few weeks ago to thank them for their openness and commitment, as well as the welcome they are preparing for the people who will be visiting us from around the world.

I know that there are concerns, but the people were enthusiastic and positive about the fact that we are inviting the entire world to come see the extraordinary region of Charlevoix with its magnificent landscape and even more magnificent people.

I look forward to sharing this beautiful region that I love so much with the entire world 10 days from now.

* * *

[English]

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Ms. Niki Ashton (Churchill—Keewatinook Aski, NDP): Mr. Speaker, last week the people of Little Grand Rapids, Manitoba, were terrified. It is an isolated community where 630 people crowded into a smoke-filled school gym that was being hosed down from the outside because the forest fire was already in their community. They asked for help, and it was not until the last minute that government stepped up.

Why did it take government so long to listen to those calls for help? Will the government recognize that instead of investing \$4.5 billion in a pipeline, we should be investing in all-weather roads to first nations and improving the lives of first nations people?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a bit irresponsible for the member to set up false dichotomies like that. Of course we continue to be extremely proud of the investments we are making in partnership with indigenous communities across this country to build houses, roads, community infrastructure, and hospitals. We know we have lots more to do, and we will continue to do it. It would help if we were not losing \$15 billion every year because we cannot get our oil resources to markets other than the United States. That is why we are moving forward on growing the economy while protecting the environment, which will enable us to do even more for all our partners across the country.

* * *

• (1510)

[Translation]

DEMOCRATIC REFORM

Mr. Fayçal El-Khoury (Laval—Les Îles, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-76 is a generational overhaul of the Canada Elections Act for the 21st century.

In 2014, Elections Canada struck its Advisory Group for Disability Issues to provide advice about accessibility. All Canadians have the right to participate fully in the electoral process.

Can the Prime Minister update the House on the measures introduced to ensure that more Canadians can vote?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Laval—Les Îles for his question.

We are determined to ensure the full participation of all Canadians in our democratic processes. Elections Canada's Advisory Group for Disability Issues made recommendations to improve the democratic participation of Canadians with different types of capabilities. More than 90% of these recommendations are in our elections bill. As we know, Canada is at its best when everyone is included.

* * *

[English]

JUSTICE

Hon. Rob Nicholson (Niagara Falls, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last night the Liberals gave us notice that they are attempting to ram through a 300-page omnibus criminal justice bill. I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he thinks it is a good idea that committing crimes as a gang member, kidnapping a 12-year-old, or forcing marriage for children under the age of 16 are crimes that could be punishable by a mere fine. When does the Prime Minister think that a fine could be appropriate for such serious crimes?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, obviously criminal justice reform is an issue that was avoided and actually went in the wrong direction under 10 years of Stephen Harper. We were pleased to move forward in a way that focuses on protecting Canadians, supporting victims of crime, and ensuring adequate punishment consequences for those who commit those crimes. We continue to take very seriously our responsibility to ensure that our Criminal Code is up to the standards that Canadians expect of it. I am very much looking forward to seeing this bill debated at committee.

* * *

[Translation]

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, GPQ): Mr. Speaker, am I dreaming, or did the government just shove a pipeline down our throats? That is a most bitter Kinder Surprise, indeed.

Who did the Minister of Finance consult before deciding to use \$4.5 billion of our money to buy himself a pipeline? That is utterly ridiculous.

Where in its platform did the Liberal government say it would nationalize a dirty oil pipeline? What is next? Nationalize Enbridge? Nationalize energy east?

The government needs to do the right thing and backtrack on this.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, like all Canadians, Quebecers know that we need to leverage our natural resources and that all levels of government regularly invest in natural resource projects to do just that.

With respect to what we are doing, we consulted Canadians and we strengthened the approval and assessment process for this pipeline project. We are proud that what we are building will open up new markets for us and help us achieve our greenhouse gas reduction targets.

Private Members' Business

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Transport on a point of order.
[English]

Hon. Marc Garneau: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. During question period on Monday, the hon. member for Milton cited a statistic that 600 individuals had crossed the border irregularly last weekend. That would be May 26 and 27. This number is definitely much higher than what is understood to be the case, and I am—

The Speaker: I am sorry, but that does sound like debate to me.

* * *

OFFICIAL REPORT

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am prompted by the previous point of order. I wanted to rise in the House today, Mr. Speaker, to indicate that on Monday—

Some hon. members: Debate.

Hon. Lisa Raitt: It is not debate, my friends. Maybe I could finish first.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

● (1515)

The Speaker: Order, please. The Chair needs an opportunity to assess whether it is a point of order. Sometimes, yes, there are points of order that sound like debate, but I need a few more seconds, at least. I would ask members to be patient.

The hon. member for Milton.

Hon. Lisa Raitt: Mr. Speaker, I reviewed *Hansard* from the same date, Monday, May 28, and I also reviewed the original article that was being quoted. Unfortunately, I indicated that 600 migrants came across “this past weekend alone”. I would like to ask to change the record to indicate that it was not 600 this past weekend; it was 600 one weekend in April.

The Speaker: Order, please. If the member wishes to correct the record, that seems like a reasonable point of order to me.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[Translation]

RURAL CRIME

The House resumed from May 24 consideration of the motion, and of the amendment.

The Speaker: It being 3:17 p.m., pursuant to order made on Tuesday, May 29, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the amendment by the hon. member for Abitibi—Témiscamingue to Motion No. 167 under private members' business.

[English]

The Speaker: The question is as follows. Shall I dispense?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[Chair read text of amendment to House]

● (1525)

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

(Division No. 681)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Aldag
Alghabra	Alleslev
Allison	Amos
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arnold	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Bains
Barlow	Barsalou-Duval
Baylis	Beaulieu
Beech	Bennett
Benson	Benzen
Bergen	Bernier
Berthold	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Block	Boissomault
Bossio	Boucher
Boudrias	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Brassard
Breton	Brosseau
Caesar-Chavannes	Calkins
Cannings	Caron
Carrie	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Chen	Chong
Choquette	Clarke
Cooper	Cornier
Cullen	Cuzner
Dabrusin	Damoff
Davies	DeCoursey
Deltell	Dhalival
Dhillon	Di Iorio
Diotte	Donnelly
Dreeschen	Drouin
Dubé	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	Dusseault
Dzerowicz	Easter
Eglinski	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Eyking	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Fergus	Fillmore
Finley	Finnigan
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser (Central Nova)
Fry	Fuhr
Gallant	Garneau
Garrison	Généreux
Gerretsen	Gladu
Godin	Gould
Gourde	Graham
Grewal	Hajdu
Hardcastle	Hardie
Harvey	Hébert
Hehr	Hoback
Housefather	Hughes
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Jeneroux
Jolibois	Joly
Jones	Jordan
Jowhari	Kelly
Kent	Khalid
Khera	Kniec
Kwan	Lake
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe

Private Members' Business

Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Laverdière	Lebouthillier
Lefebvre	Leslie
Levitt	Liepert
Lightbound	Lloyd
Lobb	Long
Longfield	Ludwig
Lukiwski	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor	MacKenzie
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maguire
Malcolmson	Maloney
Marcil	Masse (Windsor West)
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Mathysen	
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McCrimmon
McDonald	McGuinty
McKay	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	Nault
Ng	Nicholson
Nuttall	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
O'Toole	Ouellette
Paradis	Paul-Hus
Pauzé	Peschisolido
Peterson	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Picard
Plamondon	Poilievre
Poissant	Quach
Qualtrough	Raït
Ramsey	Rankin
Ratansi	Rayes
Reid	Richards
Rioux	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Rota
Rudd	Ruimy
Rusnak	Saganash
Sahota	Saini
Sangha	Sansoucy
Sarai	Saroya
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Shields
Shipley	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Simms	Sopuck
Sorbara	Sorenson
Spengemann	Stanton
Ste-Marie	Stetski
Strahl	Stubbs
Sweet	Tabbara
Tan	Tassi
Tilson	Tootoo
Trost	Trudeau
Trudel	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Vecchio	Viersen
Virani	Warawa
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Weir
Whalen	Wilkinson
Wilson-Raybould	Wong
Wrzesnewskyj	Yip
Young	Yurdiga
Zimmer — 287	

The Speaker: I declare the amendment carried.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on the main motion, as amended.

Shall I dispense?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[*Chair read text of motion to House*]

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

Hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion, as amended, agreed to)

* * *

[*English*]

CONTROLLED DRUGS AND SUBSTANCES ACT

The House resumed from May 25 consideration of the motion that Bill C-330, An Act to amend the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act (landlord consent), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Tuesday, May 29, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-330 under private members' business.

● (1535)

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

(*Division No. 682*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultouf	Albas
Albrecht	Allison
Arnold	Barlow
Benzen	Bergen
Bernier	Berthold
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Block
Boucher	Brassard
Calkins	Carrie
Chong	Clarke
Cooper	Deltell
Diotte	Dreeschen
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Finley	Gallant
Généreux	Gladu
Godin	Gourde
Hoback	Jeneroux
Kelly	Kent
Kniec	Lake
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Lukiwski	MacKenzie
Maguire	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Motz	Nater
Nicholson	Nuttall
O'Toole	Paul-Hus
Poilievre	Rayes
Reid	Richards
Saroya	Shields
Shipley	Sopuck
Sorenson	Stanton

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Nil

Private Members' Business

Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Van Loan
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga

Stubbs
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Warawa
Wauh
Wong
Zimmer— 80

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Badawey
Bains
Baylis
Beech
Benson
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boulerice
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Caron
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cormier
Cuzner
Damoff
DeCoursey
Dhillon
Donnelly
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fergus
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Gould
Grewal
Hardcastle
Harvey
Hehr
Hughes
Hutchings
Jolibois
Jones
Jowhari
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lighbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)
Mathysen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKay
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mencicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Monsef
Moore
Murray
Nassif

Alghabra
Amos
Angus
Arya
Ayoub
Bagnell
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bennett
Bittle
Blair
Boissonnault
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Brosseau
Cannings
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Choquette
Cullen
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhaliwal
Di Iorio
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Dusseault
Easter
El-Khoury
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fry
Gameau
Gerretsen
Graham
Hajdu
Hardie
Hébert
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Joly
Jordan
Khalid
Kwan
Lametti
Lapointe
Laverdière
Lefebvre
Levitt
Long
Ludwig
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Marcil
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Morrissey
Nantel
Nault

Ng
Oliphant
Ouellette
Pauzé
Peterson
Philpott
Plamondon
Quach
Ramsey
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Ruimy
Saganash
Saini
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Stetski
Tan
Tootoo
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Virani
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

O'Connell
Oliver
Paradis
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Qualtrough
Rankin
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Rusnak
Sabota
Sangha
Sarai
Schieffe
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Tabbara
Tassi
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Weir
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young— 206

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

* * *

[*Translation*]**NATIONAL LOCAL FOOD DAY ACT**

The House resumed from May 28 consideration of the motion that Bill C-281, an act to establish a National Local Food Day, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Tuesday, May 29, 2018, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-281 under private members' business.

● (1545)

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

*(Division No. 683)***YEAS**

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Alghabra
Allison
Anandasangaree
Arnold
Arya
Ayoub
Bagnell
Barlow
Baylis
Beech
Benson
Bergen
Berthold

Albas
Aldag
Alleslev
Amos
Angus
Arseneault
Ashton
Badawey
Bains
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bennett
Benzen
Bernier
Bittle

Private Members' Business

Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Block
Bossio
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Cannings
Carrie
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Choquette
Cooper
Cullen
Dabrusin
Davies
Deltell
Dhillon
Diotte
Dreeschen
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
Egliniski
El-Khoury
Eyking
Falk (Provencher)
Fergus
Finley
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fry
Gallant
Garrison
Gerretsen
Godin
Gourde
Grewal
Hardcastle
Harvey
Hehr
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Jolibois
Jones
Jowhari
Kent
Khera
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengary)
Laverdière
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lightbound
Lobb
Longfield
Lukivski
MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malcolmson
Marcil
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Mathyszen
May (Cambridge)
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McDonald
McKay
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Monsef
Moore
Motz
Nantel
Nater
Ng
Nuttall

Blair
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boissonnault
Boucher
Boulerice
Brassard
Brosseau
Calkins
Caron
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chong
Clarke
Cormier
Cuzner
Damoff
DeCoursey
Dhaliwal
Di Iorio
Donnelly
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Dusseault
Easter
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Fillmore
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garneau
Généreux
Gladu
Gould
Graham
Hajdu
Hardie
Hébert
Hoback
Hughes
Hutchings
Jeneroux
Joly
Jordan
Kelly
Khalid
Kniec
Lake
Lametti
Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Liepert
Lloyd
Long
Ludwig
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKenzie
Maguire
Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)
Morrissey
Murray
Nassif
Nault
Nicholson
O'Connell

Oliphant
O'Toole
Paradis
Pauzé
Peterson
Philpott
Plamondon
Poissant
Qualtrough
Rankin
Rayes
Richards
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Ruimy
Saganash
Saini
Sansoucy
Saroya
Schieffe
Serré
Shanahan
Shields
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sopuck
Sorenson
Stanton
Stetski
Stubbs
Tabbara
Tassi
Tootoo
Trudeau
Van Kesteren
Vandal
Vaughan
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Weir
Wilkinson
Wong
Yip
Yurdiga

Oliver
Ouellette
Paul-Hus
Peschisolido
Petipas Taylor
Picard
Poilievre
Quach
Ramsey
Ratansi
Reid
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Rusnak
Sahota
Sangha
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Shipley
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Spengemann
Ste-Marie
Strahl
Sweet
Tan
Tilson
Trost
Trudel
Van Loan
Vandenbeld
Vecchio
Virani
Warkentin
Webber
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewskyj
Young
Zimmer— 286

NAYS

PAIRED

Nil

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

[English]

UNITED NATIONS DECLARATION ON THE RIGHTS OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES ACT

The House resumed from May 29 consideration of the motion that Bill C-262, An Act to ensure that the laws of Canada are in harmony with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, be read the third time and passed.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Tuesday, May 29, 2018, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at third reading stage of Bill C-262 under private members' business.

• (1555)

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

*Private Members' Business**(Division No. 684)*

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Amos
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Barsalou-Duval
Baylis	Beaulieu
Beech	Bennett
Benson	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Boissonnault
Bossio	Boudrias
Boulerice	Boutin-Sweet
Breton	Brosseau
Caesar-Chavannes	Cannings
Caron	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Chen	Choquette
Cormier	Cullen
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
DeCoursey	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Di Iorio
Donnelly	Drouin
Dubé	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	Dusseault
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Eyking
Fergus	Fillmore
Finnigan	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)	Fry
Fuhr	Gameau
Garrison	Gerretsen
Gould	Graham
Grewal	Hajdu
Hardcastle	Hardie
Harvey	Hébert
Hehr	Housefather
Hughes	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Jolibois	Joly
Jones	Jordan
Jowhari	Khalid
Khera	Kwan
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Laverdière
Lebouthillier	Lefebvre
Leslie	Levitt
Lightbound	Long
Longfield	Ludwig
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Malcolmson
Maloney	Marcil
Masse (Windsor West)	Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	McCrimmon
McDonald	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Monsef	
Moore	Morrissey
Murray	Nantel
Nassif	Nault
Ng	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
Ouellette	Paradis
Paupé	Peschisolido
Peterson	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Picard
Plamondon	Poissant

Quach	Qualtrough
Ramsey	Rankin
Ratansi	Rioux
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Rota	Rudd
Ruimy	Rusnak
Saganash	Sahota
Saini	Sangha
Sansoucy	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Simms	Sorbara
Spengemann	Ste-Marie
Stetski	Tabbara
Tan	Tassi
Tootoo	Trudeau
Trudel	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Virani	Weir
Whalen	Wilkinson
Wilson-Raybould	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young— 206

NAYS

Members

Abouttaif	Albas
Albrecht	Allison
Arnold	Barlow
Benzen	Bergen
Bernier	Berthold
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Block
Brassard	Calkins
Carrie	Chong
Clarke	Cooper
Deltell	Diotte
Dreeshen	Eglinski
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Fast	Finley
Gallant	Généreux
Gladu	Godin
Gourde	Hoback
Jeneroux	Kelly
Kent	Kmiec
Lake	Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	Lukiwski
MacKenzie	Maguire
McCaughey (Edmonton West)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)	Motz
Nater	Nicholson
Nuttall	O'Toole
Paul-Hus	Poilievre
Rayes	Reid
Richards	Saroya
Shields	Shiple
Sopuck	Sorenson
Stanton	Strahl
Stubbs	Sweet
Tilson	Trost
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Vecchio	Viersen
Warawa	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Wong	Yurdiga
Zimmer— 79	

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

CRIMINAL CODE

Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table, in both official languages, a legislative background for 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 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 response to five petitions.

* * *

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

Mr. James Maloney (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, 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 mission to Ireland, Northern Ireland, and the United Kingdom from March 5 to March 9, 2018.

I would like to say a special thanks to all the participants on the trip, who made it a very worthwhile venture. Members from both sides of the House worked tremendously well together, which made the trip a success. I would also like to say a special thanks to our clerk, who put together a great itinerary and made for a very special trip. Last but not least, I would like to say thanks to the hon. member for Coast of Bays—Central—Notre Dame, without whom this trip would not have happened. He is the chair of the Canada-Europe group, and without his pushing this agenda, it would not have happened. For that, I thank him.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Mrs. Bernadette Jordan (South Shore—St. Margarets, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 13th report of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans in relation to Bill C-68, An Act to amend the Fisheries Act and other Acts in consequence.

The committee has studied the bill and has decided to report the bill back to the House with amendments.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Stephen Fuhr (Kelowna—Lake Country, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the

Routine Proceedings

ninth report of the Standing Committee on Defence in relation to the main estimates 2018-19.

[Translation]

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Mr. Pat Finnigan (Miramichi—Grand Lake, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am tabling two reports.

I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 11th report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food entitled "Toward a Resilient Canadian Agriculture and Agri-food System: Adapting to Climate Change". Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests the government table a comprehensive response to this report.

I also have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 12th report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food concerning the votes in the main estimates 2018-19 that were referred to the committee.

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am tabling, in both official languages, the dissenting opinion of the Conservative Party of Canada to the report on climate change and soil and water conservation.

We agree with most of the report and most of the committee's recommendations. However, we wish to draw attention to some aspects of the report and believe that more information should be made available to Canadians with regard to the Liberal government's climate change policies.

It became clear in committee that the Liberal members were deliberately avoiding discussion, particularly with regard to some politically troubling facts related to the economic aspects of the carbon tax, the key element of the government's pan-Canadian framework.

We believe that it is important that the government tell Canadians what impact the carbon tax will have on lowering greenhouse gas emissions and what that tax will cost Canadian farm families.

We believe that it is irresponsible of the government not to assess all of the impacts the federal carbon tax will have on the environment, the economy, the budget, and employment and not to share that information with Canadian farmers and agricultural businesses.

The dissenting opinion contains only one recommendation, and that is that the government scrap the federal carbon tax, which is causing disproportionate harm to the agricultural industry and rural communities.

● (1600)

[English]

INDIGENOUS AND NORTHERN AFFAIRS

Hon. MaryAnn Mihychuk (Kildonan—St. Paul, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 14th report of the Standing Committee on Indigenous and Northern Affairs entitled "Main Estimates 2018-19: Vote 1 under Canadian High Arctic Research Station, Votes 1, 5, 10, L15 and L20 under Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Votes 1, 5, and 10 under Department of Indigenous Services Canada".

Routine Proceedings

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Hon. Kevin Sorenson (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 47th report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts entitled “Report 5, Preparing Women Offenders for Release—Correctional Service Canada, of the 2017 Fall Reports of the Auditor General of Canada”.

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

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I move that the second report of the Standing Committee on Natural Resources, presented on Wednesday, September 21, 2016, be concurred in.

I look forward to splitting my time with the hon. member for Carleton.

It is timely today that we talk about the study submitted by the natural resources committee entitled “The Future of Canada’s Oil and Gas Sector: Innovation, Sustainable Solutions and Economic Opportunities”.

Before we talk about the future, we need to discuss the importance of responsible resource development to Canada with respect to its impact on the standard of living of Canadians and on our country’s ability to provide jobs and funding for social services and social programs that are valued across the country, but also in terms of Canada’s position in the world as a global leader. There is no doubt about the importance of responsible resource development, and energy development in particular, to all of Canada.

A professor of economics from the UBC Vancouver School of Economics recently submitted an editorial to *The Globe and Mail* and eloquently outlined the importance of responsible resource jobs for sustaining Canada’s middle class. He said:

Opinions on pipelines [and there sure are more today than ever before] are flowing around Canada more quickly than the oil. The ultimate decisions on natural resource projects, however, ought to derive from facts. As an economist studying income inequality over the last 15 years, I can offer a key fact to the debate. In my view, nothing has contributed more than natural resources to buttressing the Canadian middle class against the rapidly changing global economy of the 21st century.

The importance of resources to middle-class incomes is most clearly seen by looking at a simple measure: the earnings of the middle worker in the economy (the median). Between 2000 and 2015, Canadian median earnings rose by just 6 per cent after inflation.... However, underneath this national number lie vast differences across provinces. While Alberta saw earnings growth of 27 per cent and Saskatchewan topped 44 per cent, Quebec only saw growth of 6 per cent and Ontario suffered a loss of 4 per cent. When researchers have pushed beyond these basic comparisons, the same essential fact holds up: Without income derived from the resource boom, Canadian inequality and the well-being of the Canadian middle class would be much worse than we’ve experienced.

He points out that it is important for social services, nursing, education, and transit. Those benefits help the provinces by providing plentiful resources, but importantly, he notes that, “since our equalization formula uses the federal purse to top up provinces without comparable resource-revenue streams”, even when that revenue is derived in certain provinces in the energy sector, it is shared across the country and benefits all Canadians.

He notes the benefits of resource development to indigenous communities living near natural resources. He also talks about the sharing of economic benefits that indigenous communities deserve for their future, and about the opportunities for them to be partners and beneficiaries of responsible resource development.

As an Albertan, that is something I have seen in my backyard and in northern Alberta for a long time. I often find myself questioning whether I am in a twilight zone when I hear members from other parties spinning the myth and narrative that indigenous people and indigenous communities are of one mind and are opposed to oil and gas and pipelines. It is not at all the truth. In fact, holding back Canadian oil and gas development disproportionately harms people in rural communities and remote areas, and in particular indigenous communities, which deserve to pursue prosperity, a legacy, and opportunities for future generations and for all their young people, just as all other communities deserve to do that through responsible resource development in Canada.

The professor says:

The stakes we face are high. To maintain public support for pro-growth initiatives such as trade agreements and for doing Canada’s part in limiting climate change, we need to ensure that economic growth is felt by everybody in society. Economic growth that brings everyone along gives all families a stake in Canadian economic success. This increased economic security energizes social forces that pull us together.

He also points out:

Around the world, the relentless pressures of technology are hollowing out middle-class employment, leading to stagnating middle-class incomes and exacerbating social tensions. These same pressures appear in Canada too, but resource development has allowed the Canadian middle class to push back on these pressures better than almost any other advanced economy on earth.

● (1605)

It is a reality today that more energy investment has left Canada under the current Prime Minister and the Liberals than in any other multiple-year period in seventy years, over half a century. The Liberals have suggested at times that this is a function of prices. Of course, there are many more factors impacting oil and gas and resource development in Canada other than prices. It has to do with certainty, predictability, stability, and clear, concrete measures, outcomes, roles and responsibilities. Oil and gas proponents talk about the devastating impacts of the cumulative costs of layers of regulations, additional red tape, duplication with other jurisdictions, and tax increases. Therefore, we have to review what has caused investment to leave Canada at historic rates and hundreds of thousands of Canadians to lose their jobs in the energy sector under the Liberals.

Routine Proceedings

Last year, the Prime Minister told the world that he wanted to phase out the oil sands. In case Canadians thought that this was a slip of the tongue, unfortunately he reinforced it again just a couple of weeks ago in Paris, when he said he regretted that Canada cannot get off oil tomorrow. Therefore, at the outset, is it any wonder that oil and gas proponents and investors around the world might be wondering whether or not the Prime Minister and the Liberals actually welcome oil and gas development in Canada? The Liberals campaigned in co-operation with anti-energy activists, denigrating Canada's world-leading track record as the most responsible oil producer in the world, and denigrating our track record for the highest standards, second to none, for science-, evidence-, and expert-based decision-making, and for consultation with impacted communities and first nations, including the incorporation of traditional knowledge.

The Liberals froze the regulatory system in February 2016, causing massive uncertainty for energy development in Canada. They announced interim measures, most of which had been hallmarks of the Canadian regulatory system for decades. However, one was not, and that was the consideration of upstream emissions for pipeline approvals. Not only was that an overreach into provincial jurisdiction, because that is where upstream emissions are regulated, but it was later magnified by the Liberals instructing that downstream emissions coming from tailpipes should also be attached to a pipeline for consideration of its approval. Ultimately, that is what caused the abandonment of the potential nation-building opportunity in energy east. However, before that, the Liberals had vetoed the northern gateway pipeline, previously approved by the Conservatives, which was the only new stand-alone opportunity to reach tidewater to get Canada's energy into the Asia-Pacific, which will continue to demand oil and gas for years to come. Then, the regulatory delays caused the abandonment of two LNG projects, holding Canada back by missing Asian contracts.

On top of all that, the Liberals decided, at the very worst time for energy workers, to remove the tax credit for new oil and gas drilling and exploration wells, and then imposed a carbon tax on all provinces, increasing costs right across the board. They imposed an offshore drilling ban, which the Premier of the Northwest Territories said destroyed hope for the future of people in his communities. The ban was imposed without adequate consultation, and it does not apply to any other Canadian coast. It stops exports, and it clearly targets the oil sands and the pipelines, because it does not address foreign tankers or American tankers in the region.

• (1610)

Here is the reality. The world is going to continue to demand oil and gas. Developing countries need oil and gas. Canada should be the choice as a world-leading, responsible provider of oil to the world. The Liberals need to stop implementing policies, legislation, and costs that shut down Canadian energy.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yet again, I would say that I am surprised, but I am not. The Conservatives have chosen to bring in a concurrence on a report. There are many concurrences on the Order Paper. We can deal with all sorts of reports between now and the next election. Obviously, they want to continue to play games, and that is really and truly what

this is all about. I wish I had the time to expand on that particular point.

Having said that, yesterday was a historic day. Canadians from every region of our country would benefit from that legislation. It is good for our environment, and it is good for our economy. It is good for so many reasons, yet the Conservatives will continue to find something to criticize. If they were not playing this game today, right now we would be debating the budget.

Given that the member across the way appears not to want to debate the budget today, does she believe we should just allow the budget to pass? Given that the Conservatives want to debate something else, as opposed to the budget, what sort of time does she believe would have been appropriate to have on the budget, which delivers so much to Canada's middle class, and so much more?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I would like to hear what the hon. member for Lakeland has to say, so if the hon. members do not mind letting her speak, I am looking forward to hearing from her.

The hon. member for Lakeland.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Mr. Speaker, the question by the hon. member confirms just how completely and totally out of touch the Liberals are.

The economic, constitutional, and fiscal crisis facing Canada today centres around one thing, the path forward for responsible energy development, because energy is the number one private sector investor in the Canadian economy. It is Canada's second biggest export. Canada has competitiveness challenges and a productivity challenge, and it is on the verge of losing both to our neighbours in the United States and to oil-producing countries around the world, which do not have anywhere near the environmental and social standards Canada does, nor the innovation and technology to be responsible providers in the future.

All of that is because of the Liberals' policies, regulations, red tape, and mixed messages, talking down Canada, bashing the regulator, and defending spending tax dollars on activists to stop pipelines. Then they are standing around wondering why capital is leaving this country, faster than under any government in my lifetime.

That is the key pressing issue. What is the future for Canadian energy development? The Conservatives will champion Canadian energy, and I hope that one day we will have the opportunity to say that Canada is open for business.

• (1615)

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for her speech about our committee's report, which we tabled a couple of years ago.

Routine Proceedings

Just moments ago in the House, we passed a private member's bill, Bill C-262, from the member for Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou. Everybody in the House voted for it except the Conservatives, who voted against it. It is unfortunate. That bill talked about making sure that the laws of Canada match up with the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

In our committee, we have heard a lot about indigenous peoples, first nations, and their ability to take part in the natural resource extraction sector. We have heard that the mining sector has been very good at involving those communities, and the oil industry less so. Here we have a pipeline, Kinder Morgan. Some communities have signed agreements with Kinder Morgan, but the majority of first nations communities have come out against it. We have a government here that says it will listen to those people.

Could the member comment on that initiative, the reconciliation we are facing as a country, and how we have to include that in our extraction of resources for the future?

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Mr. Speaker, I have so much respect for my colleague from the NDP, but I could not disagree with him more profoundly. That narrative from the left is a myth, because in fact the majority of indigenous communities in Canada are open to oil and gas and to pipelines. It is that narrative that puts at risk the most the ability of indigenous people to secure their own futures, which is what true reconciliation with Canada looks like.

That narrative completely ignores the fact that the Trans Mountain expansion is supported by every single indigenous community touched by it and within the 10-kilometre buffer zone. It ignores the fact that, for the northern gateway pipeline, there were 31 equity partners worth \$2 billion. It ignores the indigenous people who opposed the tanker ban and the indigenous people in northern Alberta who would be in utter poverty. Oil and gas can provide futures for their young generations and services for their elders. What is damaging to the indigenous people of Canada is exactly that kind of narrative.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise today to discuss the matter before the House, and we know what that matter is. It could not be a more appropriately timed subject to bring before the House than the one before us, because there are two raging controversies at this time.

One deals with the government's decision to allow a \$7-billion private sector pipeline expansion to be wrapped so thoroughly in red tape and so burdened by taxes that the investors decided to take their money and run. The government gave that company \$4 billion of Canadian tax dollars to take with it. The government spent that \$4 billion, and we do not have a single centimetre of new pipeline to show for it. All we have is a promise that a company and a project owned by politicians will be more successful in building a pipeline than a project that was previously owned by one of the biggest pipeline companies on planet earth, a company that literally has tens of thousands of kilometres of pipeline around the world and that makes a living and pays its shareholders by profiting from those pipelines, believing, in the Prime Minister's words, that this project had become "too risky". Now those risks belong exclusively to Mr. and Mrs. Taxpayer.

This project is really an economic and environmental no-brainer. Economically it is a no-brainer, because the company had already been willing to put forward its own resources to pay for the construction of that pipeline.

There is a gap between Western Canadian Select prices received in Alberta and Saskatchewan for oil and the world price this pipeline would enable Canadian producers to receive. That gap could have been arbitrated out of existence by allowing an extra 600,000 barrels of oil to go from where oil is cheap, in Alberta and Saskatchewan, to where it is more expensive, on the world market. The world Brent price has been consistently higher, sometimes \$20 a barrel higher, than the Western Canadian Select price with which our producers have been stuck because they are landlocked. Of course, those producers would have been willing to pay a handsome sum for access to those higher prices, making this investment an economic no-brainer.

It is an environmental no-brainer as well. We know that, because it is actually not really a new pipeline. It is just the twinning of an existing pipeline, one that has operated since 1953, 65 years, and that delivers 300,000 barrels of oil per day without incident and without any environmental problems. The right-of-way is already there. Bulldozing a new direction or charting a new course do not need to be done. I do not even think any land has to be confiscated, which most large projects require. Therefore, it is an environmental no-brainer just as much as it is an economic no-brainer.

However, because the government, along with left-of-centre allies at provincial and municipal levels, have so wrapped our natural resource projects in red tape and taxes, the company believed that it could no longer get a reasonable, risk-adjusted rate of return and headed for the hills. That \$4 billion will go not to a pipeline in Canada but to a pipeline company in Texas, which will likely use it to build new pipelines that compete with the Canadian industry.

How did we get here? Before now, a Texas company wanted to invest \$7 billion in Canada, and now we are giving \$4 billion of Canadian tax dollars to that company to take out of Canada. That is where we have arrived, and the Prime Minister today trumpets it as a grand success.

● (1620)

We still do not know what it will cost to actually carry out the construction of the new expansion. The government will not tell us. Presumably, it would know. One would think that people spending \$4.5 billion would know what additional costs they would be forced to bear if they went ahead with such an investment. One would think, but again, the Liberals are using other people's money, so such calculations perhaps are not as important to them as if it were their own.

Speaking of other people's money, the government is planning to impose a carbon tax, which will collect billions of dollars of other people's money. It would not be the first time a government raised taxes. Governments do that, although typically, they tell us what they are collecting and how much we will pay.

Routine Proceedings

Many taxes are so visible and transparent that we can look at our bills when we pay them. When people purchase something for their kids at a sports sport, they can look at the HST or GST right on the receipt and they will know exactly what it cost them. At tax time, they can calculate what they will pay in income tax. Those taxes are visible, and calculable, to the folks who are paying them.

A carbon tax, however, is far more insidious. The price effect of it is buried in the consumer products themselves and is not broken down item by item. If we buy some fresh fruit at our local grocery store, that fruit will be even more expensive, because it was transported by truck to that store, but we will not know how much more expensive, so we might be inclined to blame the local grocer. However, do not blame the grocer. Do not get angry at the grocer, because part of that pricing is actually the carbon tax the Liberal government is imposing on the grocer and on the farmers and the transportation company that brought that fruit to the storefront.

To my knowledge, it is unprecedented for a government to impose a tax without revealing what that tax will cost people. As a result, we in the opposition are of the view that the government is engaged in what many Canadians are now calling a carbon tax cover-up. We believe that the government should end the carbon tax cover-up by telling people what this thing will cost them. We know the government knows, because it has the documents. There is a 2015 memo that calculates how much families will pay based on the income they earn. Unfortunately, all the numbers are blacked out.

I am standing right next to the hon. member for Lakeland, Alberta. She is the pride and joy of Lakeland, Alberta, who is here fighting for jobs in her community, and it is indeed lucky to have her.

I move:

That this House do now adjourn.

● (1625)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): 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 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 nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Call in the members.

● (1705)

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

(Division No. 685)

YEAS

Members

- | | |
|--|--|
| Aboultaif | Albas |
| Albrecht | Arnold |
| Barlow | Benzen |
| Bergen | Bernier |
| Berthold | Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis) |
| Block | Boucher |
| Boudrias | Brassard |
| Calkins | Carrie |
| Chong | Clarke |
| Cooper | Deltell |
| Diotte | Dreeshen |
| Egliniski | Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster) |
| Falk (Provencher) | Fast |
| Finley | Fortin |
| Gallant | Généreux |
| Gladu | Godin |
| Gourde | Hoback |
| Kelly | Kent |
| Kmiec | Lake |
| Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry) | Liepert |
| Lloyd | Lobb |
| Lukiwski | MacKenzie |
| Maguire | McCauley (Edmonton West) |
| McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo) | Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound) |
| Motz | Nater |
| Nicholson | Nuttall |
| O'Toole | Paul-Hus |
| Poillievre | Rayes |
| Reid | Richards |
| Saroya | Schmale |
| Shields | Shipley |
| Sorenson | Stanton |
| Ste-Marie | Strahl |
| Stubbs | Sweet |
| Tilson | Trost |
| Van Kesteren | Van Loan |
| Vecchio | Viersen |
| Warawa | Warkentin |
| Waugh | Webber |
| Wong | Yurdiga |
| Zimmer — 81 | |

NAYS

Members

- | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Aldag | Alghabra |
| Alleslev | Amos |
| Anandasangaree | Arseneault |
| Arya | Ayoub |
| Badawey | Bagnell |
| Bains | Barsalou-Duval |
| Baylis | Beaulieu |
| Beech | Bennett |
| Benson | Bittle |
| Blaikie | Blair |
| Blaney (North Island—Powell River) | Boissonnault |
| Bossio | Boulerice |
| Boutin-Sweet | Breton |
| Brosseau | Caesar-Chavannes |
| Cannings | Casey (Cumberland—Colchester) |
| Casey (Charlottetown) | Chagger |
| Chen | Choquette |
| Cormier | Cullen |
| Cuzner | Dabrusin |
| Damoff | DeCoursey |
| Dhaliwal | Dhillon |
| Di Iorio | Donnelly |
| Drouin | Dubé |
| Dubourg | Duclos |
| Duguid | Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona) |
| Dusseault | Dzerowicz |

Points of Order

Easter	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Eyking	Fergus
Fillmore	Finnigan
Fisher	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser (Central Nova)
Fry	Fuhr
Garneau	Garrison
Gerretsen	Gould
Graham	Grewal
Hajdu	Hardcastle
Hardie	Harvey
Hébert	Housefather
Hughes	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Jolibois	Joly
Jones	Jordan
Jowhari	Khalid
Khera	Kwan
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamouroux	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Lebouthillier
Lefebvre	Leslie
Levitt	Lightbound
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Malcolmson
Maloney	Masse (Windsor West)
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	McCrimmon
McDonald	McGuinty
McKay	McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Medicino	Mihychuk
Monsef	Moore
Morrissey	Murray
Nantel	Nassif
Nault	Ng
O'Connell	Oliphant
Oliver	Ouellette
Paradis	Pauzé
Peschisolido	Peterson
Petipas Taylor	Philpott
Picard	Poissant
Quach	Qualtrough
Ramsey	Rankin
Ratansi	Rioux
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Rota	Rudd
Ruimy	Rusnak
Sahota	Saini
Sangha	Sansoucy
Sarai	Schiefke
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Simms	Sorbara
Spengemann	Stetski
Tabbara	Tan
Tassi	Tootoo
Trudeau	Trudel
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Virani
Weir	Wilkinson
Wilson-Raybould	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young — 188

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

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 Foothills, International Trade; the hon. member for Kootenay—Columbia, Canadian Heritage.

POINTS OF ORDER

MAIN ESTIMATES 2018-19

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise in keeping with our agreement to address once more some of the procedural points with respect to vote 40 and again, as per our discussions, I will try to do that in the briefest possible period without compromising the integrity of the arguments.

Part of the reason for having these points of order and the number of them is that vote 40 is a significant departure from the usual practice. The estimates document itself, in part I, page 3, reads under the heading, “Significant changes in voted spending from 2017-18 include: the Budget Implementation vote to provide new funding for Budget 2018 Initiatives”, so the estimates themselves tell us that this is a very different and very significant change in the way the government approves funding.

My point has to do with the statutory authority for a number of the votes in the estimates. I would refer you to *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, which tells us on page 873 that:

The Chair has maintained that estimates with a direct and specific legislative intent—

Mr. Speaker, this speaks to your ruling from Monday.

(those clearly intended to amend existing legislation) should come to the House by way of an amending bill.

Speaker Sauvé nicely traced the development of this principle in her June 12, 1981, ruling on certain items in the estimates, and I believe it is worth quoting that ruling at length. She said:

...members have objected that in one way or another the estimates that have been submitted from time to time by the government have attempted to do more than set out the spending requirements of the government for the next fiscal year. This is of course supposed to be the acknowledged purpose of estimates and appropriation acts.

In 1971 the Chair ruled that items in the estimates that attempt to amend existing statutes are out of order. This was confirmed by most subsequent rulings.

In 1974 and 1976 the Chair went further and dealt with the question of matters of substance being put in the estimates. The Speaker, in effect, ruled that the Appropriation Act is not the place to seek authority to do something such as to establish a program. Rather, the Appropriation Act should only seek authority to spend the money for a program that has been previously authorized by a statute.

In 1977 the Chair continued to lay down these principles that should be followed in the use of the estimates and added that it makes no difference whether the item attempted to spend a large sum or simply one dollar. The distinction is unimportant. The test is whether or not the government is putting forward a spending estimate under authority it already possesses, or whether it is really seeking new legislative authority to do something.

In March of that year the Speaker said:

The government receives from Parliament the authority to act through the passage of legislation and receives the money to finance such authorized action through the passage by Parliament of an appropriation act. A supply item in my opinion ought not, therefore, to be used to obtain authority which is the proper subject of legislation—

I continue to quote from Speaker Sauvé's ruling:

In other words, the government may not by the use of an Appropriation Act obtain authority that it does not have under existing legislation.

The then Speaker summed it up in this way in December 1977:

Points of Order

Supply ought to be confined strictly to the process for which it was intended; that is to say, for the purpose of putting forward by the government the estimate of money it needs, and then in turn voting by the House of that money to the government, and not to be extended in any way into the legislative area, because legislation and legislated changes in substance are not intended to be part of supply, but rather ought to be part of the legislative process in the regular way which requires three readings, committee stage, and, in other words, ample opportunity for Members to participate in debate and amendment.

In that ruling, Speaker Sauvé emphasized the sequence of events required to obtain authority in a manner that is in order: First, the government must establish the appropriate legal or statutory authority for an expenditure item, and then it may seek funding for that item through an appropriation act.

Thus, she ruled three votes under Energy, Mines and Resources out of order and ordered them deleted from the main estimates. In so doing, she cited evidence that the government intended to introduce legislation with respect to the program it was seeking spending authority for under those votes. Given the need confessed by the government to enact legislation to support the programs in question, the Speaker ruled that “By asking for money now, the [President of the Treasury Board] would be putting the cart before the horse.”

She further said that:

While the significance of such a ruling is not lost, as was said on March 22, 1977, the function of the Chair is to ensure that what Parliament attempts to do is procedurally correct. Furthermore, the Chair is comforted by the fact that the President of the Treasury Board said on June 1 last, in reply to the point of order at issue here, that legislation will be introduced with respect to these programs.

● (1710)

While it would be a stretch to say that vote 40 alters any statutes in and of itself, it is not at all a stretch to say that it puts the cart before the horse in the way ruled out of order very clearly by Speaker Sauvé. These main estimates clearly seek funds for initiatives that require legislative changes in order to move ahead. For the benefit of the House, I will provide two examples, although I do not pretend that this is an exhaustive list, and I just want to mention again that my objections and these examples are about the procedure and not about the substance of the initiatives at hand.

My first example pertains to the item “Making Employment Insurance More Responsive and Effective”, which appears in table A2.11 of the budget as well as in the annex of the main estimates that itemizes initiatives in the budget implementation vote. On page 57 of the budget, we read:

This pilot project is scheduled to expire in August 2018. The Government proposes to introduce amendments to the Employment Insurance Act to make the current EI Working While on Claim pilot rules permanent, providing \$351.9 million over five years, starting in 2018-19, and \$80.1 million per year ongoing. The legislation will also include a provision to grandfather claimants who have chosen, under the current pilot project, to revert to more flexible rules....

Again, I will dispense with the rest of that quote for the sake of time.

Along with the announcement of new funding, the budget clearly signalled the government's intent to modify existing legislation. Indeed, it is quite clear that the money announced is for the program after its legal infrastructure is altered. Announcing this intention in the budget is perfectly in order and presents no problem in and of itself.

The problem comes once this item is included in the estimates prior to the government's instituting the required legislative changes. Unfortunately, this is exactly what the government has done.

How do we know this is what the government has done? We know because on the one hand, the item “Making Employment Insurance More Responsive and Effective” appears in the main estimates annex for Treasury Board—

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

The Speaker: The hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands is trying to rise on a point of order. Of course, she cannot interrupt another point of order. However, I can see why she is rising: members are making too much noise. I would ask them to cease and to maintain some order in this place.

The hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona has the floor.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, thank you, and I thank my colleagues who have called for order in the chamber.

How do we know this is what the government has done? We know because on the one hand, the item “Making Employment Insurance more Responsive and Effective” appears in the main estimates annex for the budget implementation vote, seeking a little over \$130 million in spending authority to implement the changes the budget tells us require legislative changes to implement.

However, we do not just glean this from the budget document. More important, the legislative changes contemplated in the budget document are currently in Bill C-74, the budget implementation act, 2018, No. 1, and that bill is currently before the House.

In the Department of Finance's briefing binder for the clause by clause review of that bill, we read, “Amendments are proposed to the Employment Insurance Act (EI Act) to make permanent the default rules of the current Working While on Claim pilot project.” This is essentially exactly what we are told the money is for in the proposed appropriation act. It then goes on to say, “Transitional provisions are proposed to allow claimants to revert to the rules of a previous pilot project on an optional basis.” Again this is the same language for which we are being told the money is being appropriated. Again, for the sake of time, Mr. Speaker, you can check out those documents on your own, but I think I have quoted enough to give you an idea.

These changes in the budget implementation act are clearly meant to authorize the program changes for which the government is seeking appropriations under the item “Making Employment Insurance more Responsive and Effective”. The budget implementation act is still before the House and has yet to go to the Senate. In other words, it is some ways away from being passed, even if the government acts on its propensity for time allocation in order to pass the budget implementation act through the House once it returns from committee, which it now has. Forgive me for the notes, having prepared them a little in advance. It will nevertheless have to pass through the other place.

Points of Order

We cannot prejudge how quickly the bill will pass in the other place. Nor do I think the possible use of time allocation would be a basis on which to say that the proposed allocation for this item would be in order. The cart is clearly before the horse in this case, and the vote ought therefore be ruled out of order.

It is likewise with the item “Ensuring Security and Prosperity in the Digital Age”. Under the rubric of Treasury Board vote 40, the government is seeking to appropriate a little over \$100 million across eight different departments, including \$43 million for the Communications Security Establishment. From the budget document, on page 203, we learn:

Canada's plan for security in the digital age starts with a strong federal cyber governance system to protect Canadians and their sensitive personal information. To that end, the Government proposes to commit \$155.2 million over five years, and \$44.5 million per year ongoing, to the Communications Security Establishment to create a new Canadian Centre for Cyber Security.

In order to establish the Canadian Centre for Cyber Security, the Government will introduce legislation to allow various Government cyber security functions to consolidate into the new Centre. Federal responsibility to investigate potential criminal activities will remain with the RCMP.

It is clear legislative changes to establish the new Canadian centre for cybersecurity are integral to the purpose for which the government is seeking to appropriate funds under the Treasury Board vote 40 item, “Ensuring Security and Prosperity in the Digital Age”.

It is also clear that the government has chosen to seek spending authority for this initiative without first obtaining the requisite legislative authority. The evidence that it has is undisputable, as the legislative measures required to establish the Canadian centre for cybersecurity are also in the budget implementation act, 2018 No. 1 currently before the House.

The Department of Finance's briefing binder for the clause by clause review of the bill reiterates verbatim the passages from the budget I just quoted, so I will spare you, Mr. Speaker, quoting from that document because the two are in fact exactly the same.

Once again, the budget implementation bill is currently before the House. It has not passed. It may not even be close to passing, though the timeline here is irrelevant.

To quote Speaker Jerome from March 21, 1977, the matters touch:

... very fundamentally upon the right of parliament to function, the right to examine the spending program and to control the spending program through parliamentary votes, which is perhaps the most fundamental aspect of the work of parliament.

In conjunction with that is the legislative role. It is clear that some statement ought to be attempted to separate those powers which the House possesses by way of supply and those powers which the House possesses by way of legislation. That is not a task that I look forward to with particular relish. It is an important task..

Clearly, the government is seeking to appropriate funds without first having established the legislative authority for the appropriation. It cannot assign funds to an entity that does not yet exist. This is a principle that at least some government departments seem to understand.

• (1715)

The government's pension for life initiative for veterans is announced in the budget, including an estimate of the cost. However, no request to appropriate funds was made in the estimates, and the

departmental plan clearly states that legislative changes must be made before the department can include the expenditure in its financial plan. Presumably, the request for funding will come through a supplementary estimates after Parliament has passed the appropriate legislation.

There are other examples that are more vague. I was prepared to offer some detail, but I will try to go through it in a more rapid fashion. I will simply mention these examples.

The first one is the new intellectual property strategy. That is an item under vote 40. The language in the budget document very clearly contemplates the possibility of legislation as part of the program. The item “Modernizing Canada's Regulatory Frameworks” also contemplates the possibility of legislation in order to realize the program for which it is requesting an appropriation of funds. The item “A New Process for Federal Election Leaders' Debate” also very clearly contemplates the possibility of legislation in order to achieve the program purposes for which the government is seeking an appropriation of funds. The item “Stabilizing and Future Transformation of the Federal Government's Pay Administration (Phoenix)” also contemplates legislative changes for the purpose for which it is requesting those funds.

What do all of these examples have in common? In all of these cases, the government is seeking an appropriation of funds under the main estimates. In all of these cases, the information we have, which is not always presented in the estimates but in the budget document instead, the government explicitly contemplates changes to legislation as an integral part of fulfilling the purpose for which it is seeking spending authority. In some cases, it seems more likely than in others that legislation would, strictly speaking, be required in order to spend the money toward accomplishing the program goal.

However, I humbly submit that while this level of uncertainty with respect to required legislative authority is perfectly acceptable in the budget, it is not acceptable in the estimates. Had these programs gone through the Treasury Board process, as items usually do before their inclusion in the estimates, we would have the necessary level of detail with respect to the programs contemplated in order to assess their legislative requirements. It is because of the novel mechanism of vote 40 that Parliament cannot make this assessment, a situation that undermines its ability to provide proper oversight of government spending and subverts the established supply processes of this place.

Some members may want to interject at this point and say, “But wait, vote 40 is structured in such a way as to prevent expenditures for which an appropriate legal mandate does not exist.” The problem with that defence is the question of who decides whether the appropriate legal mandate for certain expenditures exist.

Under the normal process, parliamentarians would be able to review appropriations and match them up with existing authorities prior to approving the estimates. If there were a dispute about proper authorities, Parliament would simply be able to withhold the funding until the problem was rectified.

Points of Order

Under vote 40, the funding would already be approved. Therefore, if the government goes ahead and spends money on a new program and reports on that in a supplementary estimates, and note I say “report” and not “request approval”, and a member suspects that the program requires new statutory authority, what is the member to do? The spending has been pre-approved and the money has been spent. Parliament cannot simply take it back.

The point here is that Parliament should be the arbiter of whether expenditures are within the legal mandate of the departments or organizations doing the spending. That is what our oversight role for government spending requires, and it is our right as the ultimate guardian of the public purse.

There you have it, Mr. Speaker. There are at least two items under vote 40 that are clearly out of order because they put the cart before the horse by requesting appropriations for measures that do not currently have the appropriate legal mandate. We know that because the legislative changes are currently before the House. The point is perhaps most succinctly put in Beauchesne's fifth edition, citation 486, where it says:

If a Vote in the Estimates relates to a bill not yet passed by Parliament, then the authorizing bill must become law before the authorization of the relevant Vote in the Estimates by an Appropriation Act.

The point was also clearly stated by Speaker Sauvé on June 21, 1982, when she said:

As I said in my ruling of June 12, 1981, an item that seeks to establish a new program in the absence of other legislative authority and the funds to put it into operation runs counter to the rulings of the Chair since 1974, which hold that legislation is required to authorize new programs, particularly matters of major substance.

This point was made again by Speaker Fraser on March 20, 1991, when he said:

It appears common ground in the arguments that have been made, first, that statutes ought not to be amended by means of items in the estimates; second, that authority to act in cases where statutory provisions already exist should be sought by the passage of amending legislation and only then the money to finance that action should be sought through appropriation acts...In both instances authority is sought, first, to implement the Senate committee report which recommended the allowances and, second, to pay the allowances. The very wording of the votes confirms that there is no existing statutory authority under which the allowances could be paid. If the statutory authority existed there would be no need to seek approval for implementation in this fashion. The type of authority sought here is akin to approval in principle and, as was made clear in the ruling of both Speakers Lamoureux and Jerome, should be sought through legislation other than appropriation bills.

● (1720)

That vote 40 does permit the establishment of new programs is clear in its wording. It does authorize the creation of new grants, and it said so. I do not have that wording because I have been trying to be brief, but I have referred to that wording in the past in other arguments. The caveat that they must conform to existing legal mandates is cold comfort to a Parliament that will have already authorized the disbursement of funds and finds out only after the fact how it was actually spent. Effectively, Parliament will have lost the power to decide for itself whether the government has acted within its legal mandate or whether legislative changes are required to authorize the new initiatives.

Beyond those two items, there are a number of others where it is unclear whether legislative changes would be required to legitimize expenditures that vote 40 seeks to authorize. Once again, in these

cases, Parliament should get to judge once the program is adequately developed. This is ordinarily the case through the supply process as we know it, but the mechanism of vote 40 subverts that process and Parliament's power of oversight along with it.

Canada's constitutional monarchy is largely based on the British model, which developed largely through Parliament's efforts to limit or appropriate royal prerogative power. The most significant way in which it achieved that goal was by gaining control over public expenditures and the power to raise revenue. The creep of power does not always come by way of conniving maniacs. Sometimes it comes a little more gently with the sense of entitlement typical of those accustomed to power. Parliament is—

● (1725)

The Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member said that he would be 20 minutes or so. I have been trying to get a sense of how many pages he has left, which is hard to do from this distance. Perhaps he can give me an idea.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Yes, Mr. Speaker. On this particular point of order, I think I can wrap up in about a minute or so, and with any time I have remaining, I will begin to address the second point of order.

Whatever its intentions, the government of the day has presented a very new way of approving funds in the estimates, which I think violates some of the long-standing principles of the process of supply. I believe it is incumbent upon you, Mr. Speaker, to strike vote 40 from the main estimates in order that the parliamentary process be upheld.

By way of explanation, I know that some members may, therefore, feel that the new budget initiatives are not going to get funded. That is simply not the case. Only \$221 million of those programs have been allocated by Treasury Board. Those could appear in supplementary estimates.

Moreover, under Standing Order 82, if there are other initiatives that have since been approved by Treasury Board, the government does have an extraordinary way of seeking the approval of Parliament for those initiatives. There are many ways that the government can obtain funding quickly for an initiative that is actually approved and ready to go. The striking of vote 40 need not mean that those initiatives not get funded.

My second point of order today with respect to vote 40 has to do with the implications of vote 40 for study at committee. I know that the vote and the estimates are currently before committee, but the problem is that the structure of the vote actually undermines the committee study process. *House of Commons Procedure and Practice* is very clear that the appropriate standing committee, the subject expert committee, is the committee that ought to be studying the initiatives presented within the estimates for a particular department.

Private Members' Business

For instance, on page 1013, *House of Commons Procedure and Practice* tells us, "When the estimates are tabled in the House, each standing committee receives an order of reference for those departmental and agency votes which relate to its mandate." However, by including all of the government's new budget initiatives under one Treasury Board vote, the government has disrupted the normal process by which votes are referred to the appropriate subject expert committee. Instead, the 247 new spending initiatives contemplated in the budget and proposed in the estimates by way of vote 40 are referred to only one committee, the Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates, which is then expected to study and evaluate the new initiatives for every department, initiatives as disparate as strengthening the Canada Border Services Agency, indigenous sport, Canada's co-chairmanship of the G20 Working Group, and hundreds more.

Asking a single committee with no subject area expertise to examine all of those items would be an unrealistic expectation in the best of circumstances, but I would remind members that this House and its committees have even less time to study the estimates this year than they did last year or any other year before it. Last year, the Standing Orders were changed to allow for the tabling of the main estimates to occur as late as April 16, and in fact that was the date they were tabled. The putative reason for reducing the time for studying the estimates was that we would have more information to better scrutinize the demands in those estimates.

However, we are now in a position where, as I pointed out at previous sitting, the estimates contain less information about proposed new government spending, and have instead substituted promises of post facto reporting for offering information up front. Whereas that information would once have come through the supplementary estimates process concurrently with the request for spending authority, the government, this year, is asking for the authority up front. It is important that the study of the estimates at committee not be undermined by an unprecedented eccentric vote structure that excludes new initiatives from the scope of study of the appropriate committee. As you rightly pointed out on Monday, Mr. Speaker, the study of the estimates does not happen in this place; it happens at those committees. Therefore, it is very important that not be undermined by having—

I appreciate the demands of time. I hope I can resume this point once this important business is concluded.

• (1730)

The Speaker: I think I have been extremely lenient with the rule about being concise with points of order. I have heard the member a number of times and I think I understand the point the member is making.

It being 5:30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

ABORIGINAL CULTURAL PROPERTY REPATRIATION ACT

The House resumed from April 26 consideration of the motion that Bill C-391, An Act respecting a national strategy for the repatriation of Aboriginal cultural property, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Mr. Martin Shields (Bow River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today on Bill C-391, the Aboriginal Cultural Property Repatriation Act.

I have a keen interest in the subject matter of this bill. I have great respect for history and greatly enjoy learning more about it. I will try to keep my remarks brief and to the point. I liked it when Diefenbaker said, "don't get me started on history, because then you shall know the meaning of eternity." I will continue in that spirit.

This bill is well-intentioned, and I will be supporting it. However, I do believe it has a couple of flaws that should be amended at committee.

I have great respect for the important role artifacts play in fostering an appreciation for history. They are a tangible and irreplaceable link to our past. It is one thing to read about history in a book. It is another to actually see a historical object created by another person living in a different era, like in the time of the Greek Acropolis, or the terracotta warriors in China, or the Machu Picchu of the Incas. To see those things in person, to see the artifacts, to see the real things that people created centuries and centuries ago makes such a difference.

Historical objects help bring history to life. They provide a window into how others really lived. They remind us that the historical figures we read about really existed in the flesh and blood. If we want future generations to truly understand how their present is linked to our country's past, we need to make sure these objects are not lost.

They are not just an invaluable means through which to remember the past. They are also a key to understanding the present. I strongly believe that their protection and preservation should be a priority of the government.

This bill seeks to establish a framework through which aboriginal peoples of Canada can reacquire these invaluable links to their proud histories. It would implement a mechanism through which any first nation, Inuit, or Métis community or organization may acquire or reacquire aboriginal cultural property to which it has a strong attachment. It would encourage owners, custodians or trustees of aboriginal cultural property to return such property to aboriginal peoples and support them in the process. This is a laudable goal.

Private Members' Business

In my riding of Bow River, we have Blackfoot Crossing Historical Park. They maintain a collection of many incredible historical objects and provide a great educational service to their community there. They also provide an economic benefit by attracting visitors and promoting tourism in the region. I was fortunate enough to visit and receive a guided tour of it last year. I was greatly impressed by the wealth of history and knowledge on display. I believe they are an example of a success story that deserves to be emulated more broadly.

Despite being well-intentioned, I do think that several parts of this legislation could be clarified, and possibly improved. First, we need to ensure that the public interest is considered so that artifacts are available to Canadians in a way that enhances knowledge and appreciation of aboriginal culture. Access to history is always in the public interest. As I noted, we cannot comprehend the present without understanding the past.

I again point to the Blackfoot Crossing Historical Park in my riding as a great success in this regard. It is located on a historic site of great significance to the Blackfoot Confederacy, where thousands gathered on September 22, 1877, for the signing of Treaty No. 7. This historical site is visited by thousands of people annually. I can assure anyone who is interested in visiting that it offers a fantastic educational experience in aboriginal history.

I also believe that this bill should ensure that consideration is given to how best to adequately preserve and protect the quality and integrity of aboriginal property. At the heritage committee, we have heard about the challenges the museum industry faces in attracting qualified staff. For a variety of reasons there are not enough professional curatorial staff in Canada. Many artifacts are fragile and require a good deal of expertise to be handled and preserved.

• (1735)

Operating costs related to the preservation of historical objects can also be a real challenge for smaller historical museums. The Haida Museum, which I was fortunate enough to visit, has some difficulties due to its remote location. It has a fantastic collection, but very few people get to see it.

This legislation should be amended to reflect this reality. We need some sort of safeguard in place to ensure that these tangible links to history are not lost to future generations.

We also need to make sure that the legislation does not have unintended consequences for aboriginal artists and creators. I own several pieces of tremendous artwork produced by Siksika artists in my riding. This industry yields great economic benefits in many indigenous communities, and helps to foster appreciation for their cultures. It should not be jeopardized in any way. The bill must not dampen enthusiasm for the incredible work produced by aboriginal artists by suggesting that what one has purchased might some day be repatriated. That would be a very unfortunate unintended consequence.

Finally, I note that in his previous remarks on this legislation, the member for Cumberland—Colchester said that the bill's intent is not to force people to give up their artifacts. I do not believe this is made explicit in the bill's language, which should be amended to clarify this point.

I was also disappointed to learn that the Canadian Museum Association was not consulted during the drafting of the bill. This is a great organization in our country with tremendous knowledge. Perhaps some of these issues could have been highlighted at an earlier stage in the process had that consultation taken place. The Canadian Museum Association has a great working relationship with first nations. Its input could be very valuable going forward.

I would also echo the comments of my colleague from York—Simcoe that this legislation must strive to develop a framework that builds on common interests to achieve mutually beneficial outcomes.

We want to continue to ensure that Canadians understand and appreciate the first peoples of Canada. With their artifacts in appropriate locations, handled scientifically and correctly, this could happen. We would then be respecting property and the great significance of these historical objects to the aboriginal people themselves.

As I noted, I will be supporting this legislation, but I hope to see it amended significantly at committee to ensure that it does not result in unintended consequences.

Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am divided right now talking about this important bill. I want to thank the member for Cumberland—Colchester for bringing it forward. This bill would create a national strategy on aboriginal cultural property repatriation.

I appreciate the intent of the bill, and I will be supporting it. However, I am also very concerned about the weakness of the language in the bill. It says things such as “to promote and support the return” and “encourage owners”, which would leave this bill as an option for people.

There is an important conversation that needs to happen in this country about what it means to be looking at reconciliation and the history of Canada. We know that the protection of cultural property touches many aspects of policy development, and this raises the risk that inconsistencies may happen and even that contradictory actions may potentially be taken if there is no coordinating mechanism. That is one of the biggest concerns I have. There is nothing here that is actually going to deal with this very important issue.

I had a wise person in my riding once tell me that for him, one of the best things about being indigenous was that the history of the culture was that they did not leave much behind. There were things like totem poles, but the actual impact on the environment was very balanced and limited.

I know that in indigenous communities across the country, their cultures are alive and active, and some communities are working very hard to bring back culture in their communities.

Private Members' Business

The history of this country is such that the human rights of indigenous people have been violated and often continue to be violated. Cultural heritage has been disturbed, stolen, excavated, exchanged, and taken under duress, and this is important when we talk about this bill. It is important to recognize that indigenous people were studied and bodies were exhumed and moved out of their territories and Canada without free, prior, and informed consent. That is the important thing we are speaking of today, as we saw with the passing of Bill C-262. In this day and age of reconciliation, it must be a key part of the conversation. How are we looking at what it means for indigenous communities to have free, prior, and informed consent? How are we looking at the history of Canada and what has happened, and how are we making things change?

The University of Winnipeg, for example, currently has the remains of 145 indigenous people stored on its campus. It is concerning that the remnants of the first people of this country are left in places where they are not taken care of in a proper way.

In the riding I represent, North Island—Powell River, whenever remains are found, there is a working process with the indigenous community to make sure that those remains are treated respectfully. When we look at this bill, we have to be looking at that as well.

It makes me think of a community in my riding, the Klahoose First Nation, which is currently undertaking to find ancestors across the world. Recently, an ancestor was located in a Lower Mainland institution. The community came together and worked very hard. They wrote:

When it came time to transfer the ancestor from a cardboard box to the cedar box prepared by the Klahoose Nation we were guided into a private room. This is an incredibly spiritual and honourable undertaking: a precious moment as we handle the remains, bless them, brush and cradle them with cedar and tobacco, and then pray for peace to surround them on the journey to their final resting place.

However, when they walked into the room, what they saw was a cardboard box, which was home to their ancestor for more than 50 years. It had a single word written on it: “skull”.

One of the things this bill does not really look at is how to move forward in a respectful way to make sure that the remains of loved ones are returned home to their communities and that when that process happens, it is in the most thoughtful way possible.

The sad reality is that the history of Canada is steeped in colonialism. In the region I represent, many communities participate in the potlatch system to this day. The potlatch system was a way of redistributing wealth. It was a way of making sure that people were looked after. It was a very sacred process, and it was one of governance. That is really important. It was not a celebration. It was a way of governing. It was a way of making sure that there was fairness and that no one was left behind. People were respected for their generosity.

● (1740)

We know that in 1885, when the ceremony was made illegal, authorities took items away, including totem poles, regalia, and sacred family items. It is hard to explain the impact on the communities. These were the ways they governed themselves. These were the ways they dealt with conflict. These were the ways they acknowledged when people were moving from one phase of life to

another. Therefore, it had a huge impact having all of those things gone.

I want to talk about the Nuyumbalees Cultural Centre in my riding, which has done a lot of work repatriating artifacts to their community. One of its main objectives is “to recover from other institutions and individuals, artifacts and records of cultural, artistic and historical value to the Kwakwaka’wakw people.” This cultural centre has activities for schools to educate young people about the history of the area. It has a carving and education centre where they continue to train people in methods that have been passed down from generation to generation. It works hard on language preservation. There is also archival footage in the lower gallery theatre, where people can see some of the recordings that were taken so long ago.

In 1975, the hereditary and elected chiefs founded the Nuyumbalees Cultural Centre so they could begin negotiating the return of their potlatch artifacts and regalia. In 1979, the society had things finally returned home and several months later, opened the doors and allowed the community to come in and engage with those things. It also encouraged the public to come and learn more about their history. It is important that they continue to do that work and find things all over the world that are from their cultural territory.

There are challenges trying to get those things back. The capacity of many indigenous communities to store and care for objects is extremely limited. Some museums work very hard with communities to make sure that they have access to these items.

Recently, a community in my riding, Homalco, took elders and young people to the Royal BC Museum in Victoria, where they saw masks from the late 1800s that are now stored there. They also saw baskets and other pieces of regalia. It was a really meaningful moment for those young people to see how long their history was, to see what the masks looked like, and to interact with the elders to learn the stories of the things that have been passed down. It is good to see those relationships happening, but there is so much more that can be done.

Professor Jack Lohman, chief executive officer of the Royal British Columbia Museum, said the following:

My last issue concerns the slow progress being made toward reconciliation. Our museum displays are still riddled with stereotypical display information, displays of indigenous life emphasizing and privileging white history over indigenous history. Repatriation is inadequately funded. Our museum culture is still predominantly white.

I understand the intention of this bill, and I appreciate it. It is important work. I think it is time in this country of Canada that we start to focus more on the impact than the intention, that we talk with indigenous communities and make sure we recognize the vibrancy in those communities, the history, and what it means when a person has things from their ancestors, their parents' parents' parents, and loved ones sitting in a box somewhere far away and there is no pressure to have those things returned. What does it mean to communities when they get those things back home? This is something we have to look at.

Private Members' Business

I look forward to supporting this bill. I wish I saw a little more emphasis on money. I understand that in a private member's bill, we cannot talk about money, but I want to make sure that this plan actually has a discussion about that. I saw nothing in there that said there would be a plan that comes forward from this national strategy that would include some of the heavy financial commitments that would have to be made to do this and do this right.

• (1745)

Mr. Arif Virani (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage (Multiculturalism), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, I am very proud to rise today to speak in support of Bill C-391. I want to begin by sincerely thanking the hon. member for Cumberland—Colchester for bringing this very important issue before Parliament. I would also like to thank him for being so open about the prospect of amendments to this bill. That and the comments so far by other hon. members of this House from different parties show that we are all here to work together.

We believe that the government has an important leadership role to play in support of the repatriation of indigenous cultural property, which is critical to our work overall to promote reconciliation. We are supporting this bill, because it is a critical step in the right direction, in the direction of empowering indigenous persons; in the direction of ensuring a renewed relationship with all indigenous persons—first nations, Inuit, and Métis people; in the direction of respect; and, most important, in the direction of autonomy.

A new national strategy on the repatriation of indigenous cultural property is something I have heard about locally from advocates for reconciliation in my riding of Parkdale—High Park, but it is also something we have heard about nationally when consulting with indigenous leaders, literally from coast to coast to coast.

This is an idea whose time has clearly arrived, but we also believe that there are a number of ways in which this bill can and should be strengthened. I would pause to reflect on the comments made by members of the two opposition parties who just spoke to this bill. The government will indeed be seeking some amendments to this bill.

First, we have heard others refer to the importance of the repatriation of indigenous human remains, including in the comments by the member opposite. Indigenous communities themselves have shown that this is often the highest priority for them. It seems that some consider human remains to be part of what the bill calls “Aboriginal cultural property”, but that aspect is not clear. We feel that the bill should be explicit in stating that the proposed national strategy will focus on both cultural property and human remains.

Second, we have heard other hon. members voice concerns about the definition of aboriginal cultural property in the bill. Definitions are always tricky. We know that as parliamentarians. We do not believe this term should actually be defined in the legislation itself. It does not appear to be defined elsewhere in law, and it is not even defined in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. It would be much more appropriate, in our view, if the scope of the strategy and any necessary definitions were developed as part of the strategy itself, in co-operation with indigenous communities and the

holders of collections. We should not define the term in legislation itself, because we may end up with something either too vague or too narrow, and we may inadvertently exclude something we may regret after the fact.

Third, and to the same point, the bill refers to cultural property where there is “a strong attachment”. By whom or how should this strong attachment be judged? In our view, this concept and the scope of the proposed mechanism are best left to be determined in consultation with all stakeholders during the development of the strategy Bill C-391 contemplates. The point is that we need to be very careful that the bill does not go too far in determining the details of the strategy in advance. To do so would restrict the ability of the government and all those who work with it, most importantly indigenous persons themselves, to come up with the best possible result.

Fourth, speaking of the development of the national strategy in co-operation with stakeholders, Bill C-391 makes reference to the role to be played by the provinces, but there is no mention of the territories, and that certainly is something that should be added.

One of the really innovative aspects of the bill is that it proposes the creation of a forum for the resolution of conflicting claims. We are assuming that this is meant to be a forum where, if more than one indigenous community or organization is claiming the same item, indigenous people would get together and decide whose claim should go forward. That is very important and should be highlighted. Sorting out something of this nature should not be the role of a museum facing competing claims, and it should not be the role of the government. It should be up to indigenous people themselves. That is the point of reconciliation. It is about ending the patterns and habits of colonialism, where too often, governments have told indigenous persons about policies that affect them, rather than working with indigenous persons to co-develop those policies in a respectful nation-to-nation or Inuit-crown or government-to-government relationship, in the context of the Métis.

Co-development is the method we are pursuing in tabling Canada's first-ever indigenous languages act, a project I have been privileged to work on as the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage. That spirit of moving away from the old colonial ways of thinking to ensuring that decisions on competing claims to the same indigenous item rest with indigenous people is something that needs to be emphasized more clearly in this bill.

• (1750)

It also should not be a forum where the government adjudicates the claims between indigenous communities and holders of collections. I cannot stress enough that success in repatriation depends on direct dialogue between indigenous peoples and institutions. The government should not be trying to insert itself into the middle of that dialogue, but clearly has a role to play in facilitating that dialogue. It is also important to acknowledge that a single forum may not be appropriate. Separate forums may be needed for first nations, Inuit, and Métis peoples. We need to take what we call a “distinctions-based approach” and acknowledge the unique circumstances of each of these three groups.

Private Members' Business

There are two more amendments I would like to raise.

[*Translation*]

Fifth, given everything we have heard and everything that has been said here, it is clear that developing a national strategy will be neither simple nor easy. Two years is not enough time to do all this work, hold all the consultations, and make all the decisions that need to be made. If the minister has to come back before Parliament with a strategy within just two years, we worry that it will not be the best possible strategy.

The government will be seeking an amendment to extend the period for developing the strategy to three years. We agree with the hon. member for Cumberland—Colchester that a deadline is important to ensure that this repatriation work, which will support the reconciliation process, goes quickly.

• (1755)

[*English*]

Before I close, my sixth point relates to the report that the minister would provide after the first two years of the strategy's implementation. As the bill is drafted, that section of the report seems to suggest that success can only be measured by the number of objects returned. As parliamentarians, we know that is not the only form of positive outcomes of negotiations. We also know there would be some information, particularly on negotiations still under way, that would simply be too sensitive to be included in a report that becomes public. Therefore, some adjustment to how the report is described is needed, in our view. We fully support the need for a report and the accountability and transparency it would bring with respect to delivering on the national strategy.

None of the potential amendments I have mentioned would weaken Bill C-391, or change its fundamental objective of enabling more progress on repatriation, the honourable goal of the member for Cumberland—Colchester. We support what he is working to do. We want that progress to take place, and that is why our party and our government is supporting the bill.

We look forward to working on amendments that would increase the chance of successfully implementing a national strategy for the repatriation of indigenous cultural property.

Mr. Kevin Waugh (Saskatoon—Grasswood, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak to Bill C-391, an act respecting a national strategy for the repatriation of aboriginal cultural property. While this bill has very good intentions, aspects of it could lead to unforeseen consequences and it is consequently in need of much amendment.

As we all know, first nation communities play a critical role throughout this great country, contributing to our great cultural diversity and history. The cultural artifacts of first nation peoples provide all Canadians with opportunities to learn lessons from the past, understand the present, and view the future with greater awareness and clarity. To ensure that the cultural artifacts of first nations continue to educate, inform, and inspire Canadians across this country, significant dialogue took place way back in 1994 between the Canadian Museums Association and the Assembly of First Nations with the goal of ensuring that the common interest of Canadians would be met by these important cultural artifacts. They

developed a joint recommendation through many consultations, which advocated that there be moral and ethical frameworks for the display and interpretation of first nation cultural artifacts and for resolving disputes. The report of the Canadian Museum Association and the Assembly of First Nations found that museum collections do recognize the importance of cultural objects. These objects represent cultural history and values, and are therefore sources of learning, pride, and self-esteem.

The primary concern of first peoples is the importance of the cultural collections within their own communities. Nonetheless, there is a general recognition of these collections and that the institutions that care for them serve a wider function and can contribute to greater public education and awareness of the significant cultural contributions made by first peoples in this country. Clearly, we all want to ensure that as many Canadians as possible are able to learn about first nation cultures and to discover from these artifacts the rich cultural heritage of first nation peoples. It is in the common interest of all Canadians that we continue to educate and inform them about the amazing contributions that have been made by first nation people throughout history, right up to the present day.

Disconcertingly, the Canadian Museums Association was not consulted prior to the introduction of this bill. That is troubling. It is unfortunate, considering the vast body of work that has been done by this marvellous organization, along with numerous first nations, in the field of first nations' cultural artifacts, and how best to promote mutual interest.

One of the principles brought forward by the joint recommendation of the Canadian Museums Association and the Assembly of First Nations is that museums and first peoples should work together to correct the inequities that characterized their relationship in the past. In particular, the desire and authority of first peoples to speak for themselves should definitely be recognized and affirmed by museums. However, given that the Canadian Museums Association was not consulted prior to the introduction of this bill, the partnership highlighted by this principle from the joint recommendations seems to have been forgotten during the drafting of the bill. That is unfortunate, because the relationship between the AFN and the Canadian Museums Association goes back to 1984 with respect to the artifacts we are discussing today.

In recognition that the presentation and interpretation of first nations' cultural artifacts represents a significant public good for this country in terms of the wealth of knowledge, perspective, and understanding that they provide Canadians across this country, and in keeping with the recommendations resulting from the excellent work by the Canadian Museums Association and the AFN, we will propose an amendment that would ensure that consideration be given to the public interest in artifacts being available to Canadians in a way that enhances knowledge and appreciation of aboriginal culture.

• (1800)

Furthermore, we will propose that steps be taken to ensure that first nations cultural artifacts are preserved in a way that they will be available to instruct and inspire all future generations of Canadians, who will only benefit from this cultural property and heritage.

Private Members' Business

Our amendment will seek to ensure that consideration is given to how best to adequately preserve and protect the quality and integrity of aboriginal cultural property. No common interest is served when cultural artifacts are damaged or even destroyed, and we should be taking every precaution possible to ensure that these cultural artifacts survive for the benefit of all Canadians. Such a consideration is currently absent within Bill C-391 in its present state, and we believe that this amendment would better serve the intentions of the bill by removing unforeseen consequences.

Additionally, we note with some trepidation that the bill includes a very broad definition of aboriginal cultural property. This is defined in the bill as “objects of historical, social, ceremonial, or cultural importance to the Aboriginal peoples of Canada.”

One outcome that we want to avoid in the bill is a chilling effect on the thriving first nation arts sector, in which our first nation artisans and craftspeople produce many stunning works that are then bought by people around the world. The income these artists generate through this sector is very important for many families. I saw that first-hand when I had an opportunity to go to Nunavut in January. When the plane lands in a community, the artists come out and are really thrilled to show off their work to those new to the community.

We definitely want to protect their work. We want to make sure that people are not discouraged from purchasing the works of art produced by these talented first nation artisans for fear that this work may be repatriated in the future. That is why we will propose an amendment that would ensure that such a strategy does not have the effect of harming or discouraging the importance of commercial trade by aboriginal artists in the creation and sale of art, design, and fashion.

Finally, as my colleague from York—Simcoe noted, we will propose an amendment that would ensure that the proposed repatriation policy would only affect artifacts that individuals or museums are no longer interested in possessing. This is in the spirit of the remarks made by the hon. member for Cumberland—Colchester across the aisle, who said that the intent is not to force anyone to give up any artifacts. It also opens the door or encourages owners to display artifacts that are in storage or currently not on display, either at their own facility or at other facilities across this great nation by lending them out.

First nations culture is incredibly important for Canada. It serves to broaden the perspectives, knowledge, and understanding of all Canadians. We need to make sure that we are doing everything to ensure that first nations cultural artifacts continue to teach and inspire all of us both now and in the generations to come.

• (1805)

Mr. Robert-Falcon Ouellette (Winnipeg Centre, Lib.):

[Member spoke in Cree]

[English]

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to be here to speak to this private member's bill.

It is important that we consider what story is told, who tells that story, and how it is told. We often hear the phrase that history is the

story of the victorious, those who have won the battle, but Canada, we know, is perhaps a different country that is unusual and special in the history of man, for we have created a very pluralistic society for many Canadians. As Steve Heinrichs, a friend of mine, said, “It's all about relationships. It's all about how we relate to each other.”

I am very proud of the work of the member for Cumberland—Colchester, who put forward Bill C-391, an act respecting a national strategy for the repatriation of aboriginal cultural property. The bill seeks to provide for the development and implementation of a national strategy to enable the return of aboriginal cultural property to the aboriginal peoples of Canada.

I believe the government must work to ensure the protection of important aspects of Canada's heritage. The Government of Canada must facilitate the repatriation of indigenous cultural property through financial support, and it must do so in a timely way. The government must continue to examine the bill and find ways to ensure that it is implemented with indigenous peoples.

This bill, in my estimation, is consistent with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. It is consistent with articles 11 and 12 of UNDRIP, which we have just approved today in the House at third reading.

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission recommended the implementation of UNDRIP and a national review of museum policies and practices to determine their compliance with UNDRIP.

I would like to quote article 11:

Indigenous peoples have the right to practice and revive their cultures and tradition.

Governments will work with indigenous peoples to ensure indigenous property rights to their cultures, knowledge, spiritual and religious traditions are respected, and to address cases where these have been used without free, prior and informed consent.

Article 12, on the right to spiritual and religious traditions and customs, says:

Indigenous peoples have the right to practice their spiritual and religious traditions. Governments will, with indigenous peoples, ensure that indigenous peoples are free to practice, protect and revive and keep alive their cultures, spiritual, religious and knowledge traditions.

These are very noble objectives.

I have a friend whom I have not had a chance to talk to in a number of years, but when I was at the University of Manitoba, we had excellent and very profound conversations over the role of museums and how museums shape our history. We know there was a great debate in this Parliament when the Museum of Civilization's title was changed to the Museum of Canadian History. We know that how we tell these stories is very important.

Ruth B. Phillips, who wrote *Museum Pieces: Toward the Indigenous of Canadian Museums*, writes, “Critical writing on museums during the past two decades has produced a widely accepted understanding of the ways in which nation-states have historically used these institutions”—museums—“to educate their public to desired forms of social behaviour and citizenship.”

This is a long history, and we have been talking about indigenization of cultural artifacts for a very long period of time.

Private Members' Business

In 1988, during the Calgary Winter Olympics, the Glenbow Museum had a wonderful display on indigenous peoples, but it was not without controversy.

Most writers on this topic know that *The Spirit Sings: Artistic Traditions of Canada's First Peoples* was a point of departure and change within the Canadian state about how museums work with indigenous peoples. For instance, Bernard Ominayak, chief of the Lubicon First Nation said in 1986, “The irony of using a display of North American Indian artifacts to attract people to the Winter Olympics being organized by interests who are still actively seeking to destroy the Indian people seems painfully obvious.”

In response, Duncan Cameron, director of the Glenbow Museum, wrote, “I believe that it is this Olympic connection which will draw attention to the real concerns of Canadian Native peoples, as it is in the context of the exhibition that the richness and depth of Canada's Native culture will be emphasized.”

• (1810)

Stuart Hall later wrote—in 2005, because sometimes these debates go on for very many decades in academia—“The exhibiting of “other cultures”—often performed with the best of Liberal intentions—has proved controversial. The questions ‘Who should control the power to represent?’ and ‘Who has the authority to re-present the culture of others?’ have resounded through the museum corridors of the world, provoking a crisis of authority.”

It is important that this crisis of authority continue. It is not simply about indigenous people taking back and never sharing; it is about how we build relationships together and how we work together. I do not believe there is any indigenous nation or people who would say, ‘We don't want to work with museums around Canada and around the world’, but “nothing without us” is an important phrase.

This work has been going on even in Winnipeg. I was at the University of Winnipeg for a funding announcement on indigenous knowledge on a research project for Dr. Reimer. It was called the Six Seasons of the Asiniskow Ithiniwak.

In 1993, the remains of a 25-year-old Cree woman were found. She had lived 350 years ago near the South Indian Lake. The community-led archaeological research resulted in Elder William Dumas writing an award-winning book, *Pisim Finds Her Miskanow*. This also led to working with Dr. Reimer from the University of Winnipeg to create a research project with the goal of reclaiming the Rocky Cree language, history, and culture. We eventually did an interview in which we talked about it, and it can be found on Facebook if people are interested.

This was about a community taking charge of its own knowledge, its own story, to ensure that what the community needed was put first and foremost. It was not about the Museum of History in Ottawa and Gatineau taking charge or, in the case the member for Cumberland—Colchester talked about, a museum in Victoria in Australia taking charge, but about truly indigenous communities saying, “This is how we believe the story should be told.” Who better to tell a story than the person who has lived it?

Ruth Phillips, who wrote that book, said:

Since the late nineteenth century, one of the most important collections of Mi'kmaq and Huron-Wendat art from what are now New Brunswick and Quebec has

lain largely unregarded in a large urban museum on the opposite side of the globe from its communities of origin. Consummate examples of Native North American textile and sculptural art, the clothing, textiles, wampums, and carved pipes in the collection accompanied the aspiring young writer and amateur ethnologist Samuel Douglass Smith Huyghue in 1852 when he emigrated to Australia to take up work as a government clerk in the Ballarat gold mines.

He had gone to New Brunswick and bought a number of artifacts and objects and essentially gave them to a museum in Australia. This Mi'kmaq community would like some of these artifacts repatriated so that they can be displayed and bring pride to the indigenous Mi'kmaq community in New Brunswick.

This is important, because this bill would enable us to develop a strategy. Australia, incredibly enough, actually already has a strategy on this, and they should have been repatriated many years ago.

I talked about the work that was going on at the University of Winnipeg. These remains were eventually re-buried, but if we had continued to follow old practice from the 19th century, the bones of this 25-year-old indigenous woman would have remained in storage, disturbing her spirit and the peace of the community.

I support this bill, I believe many Canadians support this bill, and I hope other members support the bill. I understand there is a bit of controversy, but as with *The Spirit Sings* exhibit at the Calgary Olympics in 1988, controversy sometimes can help move us forward, because it increases the amount of debate. It makes sure that everyone understands that people hear about this issue and we come to some form of conclusion and consensus about the way forward.

I wish to express my thanks.

[Member spoke in Cree]

[English]

• (1815)

The Deputy Speaker: Before resuming debate, I will let the hon. member for Saint Boniface—Saint Vital know that there are about eight minutes remaining in order to reserve some time for the sponsor of the bill and his right of reply.

The hon. member for Saint Boniface—Saint Vital.

Mr. Dan Vandal (Saint Boniface—Saint Vital, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I rise today in support of Bill C-391, which concerns the development of a national strategy on the repatriation of indigenous cultural property.

I want to begin by thanking the hon. member for Cumberland—Colchester for bringing this very important issue before Parliament. I am happy to have seconded the bill that supports ongoing efforts for reconciliation. I was happy to second this bill because of its relevance to my home province and community.

Private Members' Business

In Manitoba last year, the federal government and the RCMP agreed to transfer Métis artifacts that belonged to Louis Riel to the Manitoba Metis Federation. These items were of deep cultural importance to the community, and the symbolism of the RCMP displaying items belonging to Riel, whom they imprisoned, was very striking. In transferring these items, the government made it very clear that it understood the artifacts belonged to the Métis community, and therefore it was only appropriate for them to be returned.

One cannot speak to this bill without referencing the importance this bill has for the path of reconciliation our government has embarked upon. It is the spirit of reconciliation that inspired this bill, and again I commend the member for using his opportunity to present legislation in the House to present such a bill.

The member for Cumberland—Colchester recalled, in his first speech concerning this bill, the events that inspired its creation. The situation he described is one that is repeated in many communities throughout Canada. Many communities have lost artifacts through various circumstances, and thus have had to resort to showing a picture of their own heritage in place of the actual item.

Bill C-391 would require the government to develop and implement a national strategy on repatriation of indigenous cultural property and to report to Parliament on this strategy within a set number of years. What is of note to me is that the development and implementation of this national strategy would be done in consultation with indigenous peoples. It is the communities that will tell us what a relevant cultural property is, and how best to engage on a strategy to return the items can only come from them.

[*Translation*]

I have discussed this bill with the member on many occasions, and I was pleased to see that he realized the importance of a distinctions-based approach. What works for one community may not suit another, and the national strategy must meet the needs of a wide variety of communities. That is why the strategy should not be developed from the top down. The strategy needs to be developed organically, with an emphasis on collaboration with the affected communities. A one-size-fits-all solution does not work in a country like Canada, whose indigenous communities are very diverse.

[*English*]

With the remaining time I have, let me speak briefly to the importance of this bill to my own community.

As I indicated earlier, the Manitoba Metis Federation was told last year that artifacts that belonged to Louis Riel would be returned. They are currently housed in the RCMP Heritage Centre. This transfer is an example of reconciliation in action.

● (1820)

[*Translation*]

By facilitating the return of these artifacts to the Métis nation, we are supporting the vitality of Métis culture and heritage. I am thrilled about the Métis National Heritage Centre that will be opening soon in Upper Fort Garry. This centre will give all Canadians a chance to learn about Métis heritage. It will also give the Manitoba Metis

Federation the space and resources it needs to properly store and display cultural heritage artifacts.

[*English*]

While this example of repatriation was facilitated by our own government, there are many situations in which repatriation is not quite as simple. Often indigenous artifacts were sent across the world, and they are now displayed in museums as far away as Australia. It is not easy for indigenous communities to engage in discussions with museums in foreign countries, and this strategy should try to make this process easier on communities. Continuing and facilitating international conversations will take time, but having a concrete strategy will make conversations easier and less adversarial for all parties involved.

We must also respect the existing relationships that have developed between cultural institutions and indigenous communities. Sometimes the appropriate solution will not be repatriation. However, this can be explored through the development of a strategy, and ultimately be the decision of the individual community involved. For example, broadly, a community may seek ownership but allow the museum to maintain its display. In this situation all Canadians benefit as they will be able to see and learn about the communities culture.

It is important that these relationships evolve. We cannot allow colonialism and colonialist-thought to continue to shape our conversations and policies surrounding indigenous culture. We must recognize the power imbalance that led to many of these items being displayed. When a museum displays a cultural property, it should respect the terminology, knowledge, and understanding of the community when describing and promoting indigenous heritage.

I am happy to have heard from the parliamentary secretary for heritage, who outlined the amendments our government intended to propose. I truly feel that these amendments will strengthen the bill, rendering it ultimately more effective. I look forward to the work of my colleagues on the heritage committee, from all parties, to collaborate to make the bill possible.

It is clear that our government is committed to ensuring the preservation and promotion of indigenous heritage and culture. This bill is an extension of this commitment. I am proud to support the bill and our government has indicated its support as well.

Meegwetch.

Hon. Bardish Chagger: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to table the government's response to Order Paper Questions Nos. 1629 to 1646.

Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all members who have spoken to the bill. I underestimated its impact when we drafted it. It was a very basic, simple bill for us, but we had no idea of the impact it would have on so many indigenous peoples who have contacted us. Just to hear the stories from the members and experiences they have had in their museums, heritage, and cultural sites is very gratifying.

Government Orders

I was sitting here thinking that I am almost an artifact myself. I will celebrate my 30th anniversary of my first election in November. However, I have been thrown out, recycled, and changed cars a few times. I was sent home for health reasons. Fortunately, I came back in the last election and was able to do this. It is just as exciting and interesting to me today as it was 30 years ago, and it is because of things like this where we can help change the lives of people and do things that will help and be meaningful to them. We are very fortunate we can do this and help people recognize their history and culture. It is an honour for me.

Somebody referred to me as the sponsor of the bill. I am the sponsor, but the bill belongs to the indigenous peoples. Everything about it is for them. I welcome every amendment that anybody wants to make. Any ideas that anybody has to add to the bill to make it more meaningful for indigenous people, I will welcome and support. Everybody has been very supportive. They may have their own little twists and turns on it, but they are supportive, and I appreciate that.

When I wrote the bill, the point was to help small communities. For instance, Millbrook First Nation in my riding had a case where it had discovered an artifact that might be available, but it needed a hand. My idea was to add another voice to small communities like Millbrook First Nation in Nova Scotia so it would not be alone in its effort to try to repatriate this article.

The second part came up after we tabled the bill. People who had artifacts were contacting us but they did not know where to take them. They wanted to repatriate them, but they did not know what to do with them. Therefore, another part of my vision of this strategy is that we have a place for people to go, if they have artifacts, to ensure they go back to the original community that had the artifacts and have a close relationship to them.

I am grateful to all the people we consulted on this. My executive assistant, Joel Henderson, was so helpful. As well, some of the people we dealt with were the Millbrook First Nation, the Confederacy of Mainland Mi'kmaq, indigenous members of Parliament, and indigenous members of the Senate, who were very interested and had many meaningful stories. We were approached by foreign governments. The Commonwealth Association of Museums, which represents museums in 53 countries, looked at the bill as perhaps a model for something it might do. The Canadian Archeological Association, the Canadian Museum of History, academics and authors have offered us help and ideas. We have been in touch with the Assembly of First Nations, the Cree Cultural Institute, the Royal British Columbia Museum, and the Victoria Museum in Melbourne, Australia.

I want to thank Mr. Mark O'Neill, the president and CEO of the Canadian Museum of History, and John McAvity of the Canadian Museum Association, who we met in our office to discuss the direction we should go in and the it could play to help. Dr. Sarah Pash from the Cree Cultural Institute was so interesting.

I had a visit from Her Excellency Natasha Smith from the Embassy of Australia. She offered to help open up a dialogue between Millbrook First Nation and a museum in Australia. To my amazement, I now have a young first nation Canadian woman dealing with a young first nation Canadian woman in Australia, and

they are negotiating about artifacts. That is symbolic of the intent of this bill, first nation to first nation. It is so gratifying.

I have a lot of things I would like to say, but this bill has been a journey of enlightenment for me. I started to very much appreciate the culture and meaning of the artifacts of indigenous people, which I did not appreciate when we first started this. However, it has been very meaningful to me and I have met so many wonderful people. The one thing I learned is that we have a lot to learn.

I want to thank all members of Parliament who spoke on this, and those members who have amendments and proposals to add to the bill to make it more meaningful for the indigenous peoples who I hope it serves.

• (1825)

The Deputy Speaker: 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 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 yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to an order made on Tuesday, May 29 the division stands deferred until Wednesday, June 6, at the expiry of the time provided for oral questions.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1830)

[*English*]

EXPORT AND IMPORT PERMITS ACT

BILL C-47—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister of Small Business and Tourism, Lib.) moved:

That in relation to Bill C-47, An Act to amend the Export and Import Permits Act and the Criminal Code (amendments permitting the accession to the Arms Trade Treaty and other amendments), not more than five further hours shall be allotted to the consideration of the report stage and one sitting day shall be allotted to the consideration at third reading stage of the said bill; and

That, at the expiry of the five hours provided for the consideration at report stage and fifteen minutes before the expiry of the time provided for government orders on the day allotted to the third reading stage of the said bill, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required for the purpose of this order, and in turn every question necessary for the disposal of the stage of the bill then under consideration shall be put forthwith and successively without further debate or amendment.

Government Orders

[Translation]

The Deputy Speaker: 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 places so the Chair will have some idea of the number of members who wish to participate in the question period. Based on what I see, I will ask hon. members to keep their interventions to around one minute. That will be in regard to those who have put the questions and also to the minister who responds.

I will also remind hon. members that during the course of the 30 minutes, most of the questions are reserved for opposition members, although some will be permitted from members of the government party.

The hon. member for Durham.

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, here we go again with time allocation for yet another bill. I think we are now up to 36 or 37 uses of time allocation by a party that suggested in the last Parliament that such procedural motions were an “assault on democracy”. That is the quote of the parliamentary secretary, who is now one of the minions in charge of executing this policy. The hubris involved in that is unbelievable.

My question on Bill C-47 comes down to the reasonableness of the request of anglers, hunters, and first nation hunters who lawfully use firearms. All they wanted to see from the government was a basic recognition in the bill that lawful uses, such cultural use and sport hunting, would be exempt from the UN treaty. They were led to believe that would come, yet here we are. There is no such direct provision in the legislation, and the government is rushing through debate on Bill C-47, alongside its companion piece of legislation, Bill C-71.

My question is simple. Why not have a reasonable exemption for lawful use?

• (1835)

The Deputy Speaker: Before we go to the response, I would just caution hon. members to avoid characterizations of other hon. members that are not particularly honourable.

The hon. Minister of Families, Children and Social Development.

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have this opportunity to say how proud we are of the hard work done by the parliamentary committee. It had five different meetings with 16 different witnesses. We had 40 different speeches on this very important issue, 20 of them by the official opposition, which had the opportunity to demonstrate that it was also interested in the value and opportunity of bringing this bill to completion. We are very appreciative, and we would like to congratulate the parliamentary committee on its work. We are delighted that we can now move to the next step, which is to demonstrate to all Canadians, and indeed to all the world, that Canada is back on the international stage for peace, security, and development.

[Translation]

Ms. Hélène Laverdière (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting that the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development is the one answering questions this evening, seeing as the arms we sell to other countries often destroy families and kill children. That is why this is such an important topic.

The committee did indeed study this issue, and the experts told the committee that the government's bill conflicts with both the letter and the spirit of the treaty. A few minor adjustments were made, but this is like me going to a restaurant, ordering a tomato, lettuce, and mayo sandwich, and being served just a little dish of mayonnaise because I said I wanted mayonnaise. What happened to the tomato, the lettuce, and the bread? I am not alone in wanting the rest of the sandwich. The experts and many Canadians want it too. Specifically, we want the loophole with the United States closed. I have a petition about that here. This petition was launched on Friday, and it has almost 30,000 signatures already. We did not initiate this petition.

Will the government listen to Canadians and the experts once and for all?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to hear my colleague make the important link between the well-being of our families, our children, the well-being of Canadians, and Canada's role on the international stage. I have a quotation that I would like to read because it is important, and I think it will reassure my colleague regarding the importance of this bill. I will quote Alex Neve, Secretary General of Amnesty International Canada:

[English]

The news that the key criteria with respect to human rights, peace and security and gender-based violence will be brought into Canada's Arms Trade Treaty legislation, and not left to regulation, is a welcome development; particularly the specific attention to gender-based violence. Equally, the adoption of a clear legal obligation that would require the Minister to turn down—with no discretion to the contrary—arms deals that contravene those criteria is a significant advance.

[Translation]

What we are seeing here, with concurrence in the committee report, is that not only are we about to prove that Canada cares about the role of children, families, peace, and security around the globe, but also that Canada is back on the international stage and is demonstrating its commitment to supporting so many other countries around the world.

[English]

Mr. John Nater (Perth—Wellington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, before I came to this place, I had the great honour of teaching some university courses at King's University College. One of the courses I taught was POLI 1020: Introduction to Political Science. I had some great students who worked hard all semester, but there was the odd student who partied a little too hard and waited until the last minute to do the assignments and hand them in. There was usually a 3 a.m. email asking for an extension. Those students really did not do the work throughout the semester.

Government Orders

That is exactly what we see right now with the Liberals. They have had a little too much fun all year. They first tabled this bill on April 13, 2017, and now, at the last minute, after only one day of debate at report stage, they brought in time allocation. After bringing in time allocation and closure three times yesterday, here we have a fourth one within 48 hours.

I want to ask the Minister of Families, who for some reason is answering on Bill C-47, why the government has squandered more than a year of parliamentary time when it could have been debating this issue, and then all of a sudden, when time is limited right before the summer recess, it decides to ram all these bills down Parliament's throat at the last minute.

● (1840)

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Mr. Speaker, the key word here is “leadership”. We announced and promised this during the campaign, as was clearly understood by many Canadians.

Anna Macdonald, director of the Control Arms Secretariat, said:

Canada's absence from the ATT [the Arms Trade Treaty] was a strange exception over the last few years, and we are greatly encouraged by the current government's commitment to accede to the treaty in the near future. This presents a tremendous opportunity for a return to the leadership in disarmament and peace issues for which Canada was once renowned, for example, through the leadership which led to the Ottawa convention and subsequent mine ban treaty signed in Ottawa in 1997.

It is exactly that: leadership at home, and leadership in the world.

Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau (Berthier—Maskinongé, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is very frustrating to see that we are here again debating time allocation on a bill. This is the fourth time we have had time allocation or closure in the last two days. In the last little bit, I think we were up to 36 or 37 time allocation motions proposed by the government.

I remember that back in the day, when the Liberals were in opposition, they bemoaned and complained about time allocation used by the Conservative government. During the election campaign, the Prime Minister promised to do things differently. Now we see that the Liberals are not doing that. They are eliminating debate. They are making it difficult for a lot of MPs in this place to be a strong voice for their constituents. When we come to the House, we are a voice to represent the concerns of our constituents.

What has changed? Why are the Liberals doing time allocation again and again? They promised not to do as the Conservatives did, but here we are, with a fourth time allocation or closure in two days.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary committee members worked very hard over the past few weeks to complete their report and propose a number of constructive amendments. Out of respect for their work, those members would like us to have an opportunity to speak with a collective voice on the value of their work, so that the Canadian government's renewed leadership on the international stage could produce real results.

We are very grateful for and proud of the important work done by the parliamentary committee. Now we look forward to speaking with a collective voice on the value of that work so that it may lead to meaningful changes in how Canada can be useful and active on the international stage.

[*English*]

Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I remember that, when we were first elected, there was some consternation over an agreement we had for arms going to Saudi Arabia. The Prime Minister stood in the House and said that we would honour previous agreements, as a change of government should not change the legal requirements that we have signed onto as a government.

Now that we are looking at Bill C-47 in a new light, how can we make sure that Canadian defence equipment is being used for humanitarian purposes?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my colleague for his hard work and his interest in this very important issue. I know how committed he is to the agenda, which makes a lot of sense for Canadians and for Canada in the world.

I want to take this opportunity to quote a very important view, the view of Christyn Cianfarani, president and CEO of the Canadian Association of Defence and Security Industries, or CADSI. She said:

Canada's accession to the UN ATT will further enhance our very strong defence export regime and raise the bar globally for other countries whose defence export control processes are not up to Canada's very high standards. The treaty places additional burdens on countries that export small arms and military equipment, to ensure the weapons are not diverted to third parties or misused by the actual recipients.... This is in part why CADSI called on the government last year to accede to the UN ATT.

● (1845)

Mr. Blaine Calkins (Red Deer—Lacombe, CPC): Mr. Speaker, here we go. This is the fourth time allocation we have had in the last two days. I think it is now at 38, with the government at its current pace, but the night is still young. I am sure we will have a couple more.

I could not be happier to see time allocation moved on Bill C-47. This bill would actually do nothing to reduce the trafficking of firearms. I know that it is well-intentioned. I know that it is the United Nations' intention to do this. However, for the same reason that criminals in Canada do not register their guns or buy their guns legally, international gunrunners are not going to be complying with the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty. They are not going to be complying with all the entry and exit requirements that are now going to be foisted upon manufacturers and those in the shipping business of legal firearms, which are hopefully going to make their way into the hands of law-abiding citizens. The reality is that this is another bill that is a make-work project by the United Nations, which, of course, any Liberal government in the past has been all too happy to follow.

Government Orders

I am going to ask the minister a direct question. Syria has used chemical weapons extensively. It has been ostensibly proven that the Syrian government has used chemical weapons on its own people, but it is now chairing the conference on disarmament. Given that this is just one of the instances in the track record of the United Nations, why is the minister rushing headlong into another United Nations agreement?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Mr. Speaker, Canada has the privilege of being a country that has demonstrated to the rest of the world that peace and security lead to development. We want to show the rest of the world that this is a vision and an agenda that can be useful for other countries as well. I am sure the hon. member is also aware that the current government's actions in Syria, the Middle East, and around the world are focused exactly on that.

Peace and security equals development. That is why acceding to the Arms Trade Treaty matters so much. It must be done, now that we have had the opportunity to listen to the important advice of many witnesses and the important work of parliamentary committee members. We should all be delighted that not only have we worked very hard over the last few weeks, but now we are going to build on that work and lead Canada and the rest of the world to higher standards when it comes to peace and security, which equals development.

Hon. Kevin Sorenson (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC): Mr. Speaker, again I stand in this place tonight disappointed. I guess the government realizes how little it has done throughout the year and now wants to rush through some of this legislation.

My constituents who are law-abiding gun owners in Battle River—Crowfoot know that Bill C-68, the long-gun registry, was originally one of the reasons I got into politics. I want them to know that the government's priority tonight, before we break for summer, is to give the United Nations, not Ottawa, which would have been bad enough, the ability to make gun laws for my law-abiding farmers and ranchers, and also to take certain measures that, as we heard from the minister, the Liberals hope would show the world that we are leaders in the world if we just buy into this UN piece of legislation.

We are seeing two bills this year. We are seeing this one, Bill C-47, which the Liberals have moved closure on, but we are also seeing Bill C-71, which is basically a companion-type legislation. The Liberals bring both bills together, because they want to have power over law-abiding firearm owners.

I notice that the minister who is to shepherd this bill through the House tonight is not even here for the debate, or maybe I am not supposed to say that. However, it is unfortunate that another minister is doing standby duty for someone else tonight.

I would ask him to comment on the two pieces of legislation dealing with firearms, and why it is so vitally important that we move on this so quickly.

• (1850)

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to see my colleague here in the House tonight. Earlier, I had the impression that our Conservative colleagues wanted to adjourn the House. It is, therefore, very comforting and promising to see them sitting late

tonight with us. We enjoy their company. We value their hard work. It would be very unfortunate if we had to adjourn the House.

I commend the member for staying and sitting late tonight. We indicated earlier today that we value the Conservatives' presence and enjoy their work. We do not want to adjourn the House. We want to continue the hard work of members in this place, as well as build on the hard work of parliamentary committee members in the last few weeks and months.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Families about Canadian arms exports to foreign countries.

Since the time of Joe Clark as Canada's foreign affairs minister, there has been a departmental regulation that clearly states that Canada must not sell arms to a country if there is a risk that this country will use the arms against a civilian population.

Since this departmental regulation has been around for years, why did the government sign the permit to export arms to Saudi Arabia?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Mr. Speaker, I want to commend and thank the member opposite for his work. He asked a highly relevant question. This is exactly why we are now working even harder on the parliamentary committee's recommendations.

This bill will make it easier for the Canadian government to ensure that its efforts on the international stage focus as much as possible on tying peace and security to development. This is why we are counting on the support of the NDP, which indicated its support during the election campaign, for Canada's accession to this UN treaty. I look forward to seeing the NDP's support for the Canadian government's efforts in the coming minutes or hours.

[*English*]

Mr. Robert-Falcon Ouellette (Winnipeg Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to dispel a myth that has been put forward in the House. The ATT does not affect domestic gun control regulations. It does not create a registry of conventional weapons. Nothing in the ATT prevents lawful use of sporting firearms for legitimate purposes, such as sport shooting or hunting, and neither does it hinder the legitimate trade in conventional arms.

The Arms Trade Treaty's preamble recognizes very clearly legitimate trade and lawful ownership and the use of certain conventional arms for recreational, cultural, historical, and sporting activities where such trade, ownership, and use are permitted or protected by law. The ATT does not apply to domestic trade in arms.

I would also like to note that Canada is the only G7 or NATO not to have signed the ATT. Note that the U.S. and Turkey have signed, but not ratified it. I wonder if the minister could speak to how some of these myths are being perpetrated in the House.

Government Orders

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Mr. Speaker, it is always a delight and an honour to sit next to an MP such as the one from Winnipeg Centre. He demonstrates a tremendous ability to indicate to Canadians and to members of the House the value, the depth, and the intensity of this type of work. I congratulate him.

He mentioned something I forgot to mention, which I would hope members of the opposition, in particular members of the Conservative Party, would know. Canada is the only country not to have signed or ratified the Arms Trade Treaty among all of the G7, NATO and OECD countries. This is an anomaly, according to many experts, that we need to correct.

Let me make that even clearer with a short quote from an expert. Anna Macdonald, director of the Control Arms Secretariat, said:

The Arms Trade Treaty is about the international transfer of arms and ammunition between countries and territories that import, export, transit, and transship. It's not about domestic gun ownership.

● (1855)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alupa Clarke (Beauport—Limoilou, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to address the member for Québec, whose riding borders mine. They are both very beautiful ridings.

The minister said something that deeply troubled me. It is one of the Liberals' recurring themes. He said that Canada was back on the world stage; however, we never left it. We simply have a different public policy, a different understanding, and a different approach.

I do not see how they can claim that we left the world stage when we signed 47 international treaties and we sent the Canadian Armed Forces to Kandahar on one of the most dangerous missions. It was a great success. My brother went there in 2006 to fight the Taliban and then al Qaeda.

I do not understand how they can say that given that we established the free trade agreement with the European Union. If that is not an international commitment, I do not know what it is. As I often say in the House, according to the Liberals' rhetoric, they have a monopoly on virtue.

I would like to know if the Liberals are going to move another time allocation motion this evening or if we are going to start a serious debate of their proposed legislation.

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Mr. Speaker, I too want to say how lucky I am to be neighbours with my colleague from Beauport—Limoilou. We share a border, but we also share the same aspirations and make the same considerable efforts for our beautiful and great Quebec City region. I would also like to commend him on his previous service to his community through the contribution he made in the Canadian Armed Forces.

That being said, I have a suggestion for him. If he wants proof that the Canadian government and Canada are back on the world stage, all he has to do is take a little tour outside Canada to see how happy and grateful countries, citizens, and governments around the world are that Canada has most definitely returned to the world stage.

Barely two weeks ago, for the first time in its history, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, the OECD, one of the most credible organizations in the world when it

comes to matters of social policy and economic development, held its meeting on social policy in Montreal. Before leaving, the OECD said it was proud of Canada because it has demonstrated how fiscal, social, and economic policies can serve everyone.

[*English*]

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I was listening earlier to my friend and colleague, the member for Perth—Wellington, describe students handing in their homework late, something that I can very much identify with, because I used to be one of those students. I look at the actions of the Liberal government and see that kind of behaviour replicated, because it takes one to know one. I get a sense that the House leader's office has looked at the calendar and said, "My goodness, the due date is coming, we have to rush and make up for all of the inaction over the rest of the parliamentary year."

That aside, we are debating time allocation on Bill C-47 and I want the minister to tell me why he is rushing through such a flawed bill, and why the bill does not have any provisions within it to track the exports of Canadian arms to the United States. That is of great concern, because as a result of what President Trump is doing in the United States, there is a very real concern that components of arms manufactured in Canada could be funnelled to countries that have gross human rights violations. Why is that aspect left out of the bill and why are the Liberals ramming it down Parliament's throat when it is so flawed?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to observe and witness, as many of our colleagues are doing, the interest of the NDP in this very important file. We look forward to the NDP's visible demonstration of support for this important bill.

We also know on this side of the House the importance of working collaboratively with our great neighbour, the United States. We know how important that economic, social, and military relationship is in the context of our close physical connection and our long history. To support the needs and ambitions of our middle-class families, to provide jobs for our families and growth for our communities, we need to work respectfully and efficiently with our great neighbour. That is exactly what the bill is about.

● (1900)

Mr. Larry Maguire (Brandon—Souris, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to ask a question of the government tonight, but it is ironic to have to deal with a bill that is less accomplished than what we already have in place in Canada with regard to tracking and a number of other things. As my colleague from Durham noted in his speech to the House when the bill was first brought forward, the government is now all of a sudden in a big hurry to get the bill through the House after the bill sat on the shelf for 13 months.

Even in that time, the world knows that the rules we have in place in our Canadian system for tracking are far superior to what the UN has in its Arms Trade Treaty, yet the Liberal government members seem very satisfied to just put a bill through dealing with the same things. I do not know if they really looked at it. Why in the world are they passing a bill that is not even up to the standards that we already have in Canada?

Government Orders

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Mr. Speaker, we are grateful for the hard work of members of this House, including the one who just spoke and all of the members of the parliamentary committee. They have been very active and strongly supportive of the importance of this bill. We have come to a time when we need, first, to recognize that work and, second, decide on what to do with that important work. That is why we look forward to all members of the House having a say in the way forward.

Given the question, let me position Canada's role on the international stage. I will quote Madam Christyn Cianfarani, president and CEO of the Canadian Association of Defence and Security Industries. Those industries are very important when it comes to providing good jobs for middle-class families. She said, "Canada's accession to the UN ATT will further enhance our very strong defence export regime and raise the bar globally for other countries whose defence export control processes are not up to Canada's very high standards." That says two things: first, that this is important for Canada and, second, that it is very important for the rest of the world.

Again, we are very proud of what we do for Canadians and equally proud of the significant benefits this brings to the rest of the world.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: It is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith the question necessary to dispose of the motion now before the House.

[*English*]

Shall I dispense?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[*Chair read text of motion to House*]

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: 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 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 yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

● (1940)

[*English*]

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

(*Division No. 686*)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baylis
Beech	Bennett
Bittle	Blair
Boissonnault	Bossio
Breton	Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen	Cornier
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	DeCoursey
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Di Iorio	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Dzerowicz
Easter	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Eyking
Fergus	Fillmore
Finnigan	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser (Central Nova)
Fry	Fuhr
Geretsen	Gould
Graham	Hajdu
Hardie	Harvey
Hébert	Housefather
Hutchings	Iacono
Joly	Jones
Jordan	Jowhari
Khalid	Khera
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Lebouthillier
Lefebvre	Leslie
Levitt	Lightbound
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)	McCrimmon
McDonald	McGuinty
McKay	McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendès	Mendicino
Mihychuk	Monsef
Morrissey	Murray
Nassif	Nault
Ng	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
Ouellette	Paradis
Peschisolido	Peterson
Petitpas Taylor	Philpott
Picard	Poissant
Qualtrough	Ratansi
Rioux	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Rota
Rudd	Ruimy
Rusnak	Sahota
Saini	Sangha
Sarai	Schiefke
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Simms	Sorbara
Spengemann	Tabbara
Tan	Tassi

Government Orders

Tootoo
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

Vandal
Vaughan
Whalen
Wrzesniewski
Young— 150

NAYS

Members

Albas
Beaulieu
Bergen
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boutin-Sweet
Brosseau
Cannings
Clarke
Davies
Donnelly
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Eglinski
Fast
Gallant
Généreux
Jolibois
Kmiec
Lake
Lobb
Maguire
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Saarnich—Gulf Islands)
Moore
Nantel
Nuttall
Pauzé
Quach
Rankin
Saganash
Schmale
Shiple
Sorenson
Ste-Marie
Sweet
Trudel
Vecchio
Warawa
Webber
Yurdiga

Arnold
Benson
Blaikie
Boulerice
Brassard
Calkins
Choquette
Cullen
Diotte
Dreeshen
Dusseau
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fortin
Garrison
Hughes
Kelly
Kwan
Laverdière
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Mathysen
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Motz
Nater
O'Toole
Poilievre
Ramsey
Richards
Sansoucy
Shields
Sopuck
Stanton
Stetski
Trost
Van Loan
Viersen
Waugh
Weir
Zimmer— 78

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

FEDERAL SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT ACT

The House resumed from May 29 consideration of Bill C-57, An Act to amend the Federal Sustainable Development Act, as reported (with amendment) from the committee, and of the motion in Group No. 1.

Mr. John Nater (Perth—Wellington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour and privilege it is to rise in the House today to debate Bill C-57. I might begin by saying that—

The Speaker: I want to help out the hon. member by asking members to take their conversations out into the lobbies. I am sure the hon. member for Perth—Wellington will appreciate it.

The hon. member for Perth—Wellington.

Mr. John Nater: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know all members are excited and intrigued to hear my commentary on Bill C-57. Why should we not be excited about debating in the House of Commons?

However, what is disappointing is that we are debating Bill C-57 once again under the guillotine of time allocation. In the last 48

hours, the Liberal government has used time allocation or closure on four separate bills or motions. Indeed one parliamentary expert on Twitter has referred to this fiasco as the closure supercluster of 2018. How many more closure or time allocation motions will it take before the Liberal government has a super-duper closure cluster of 2018? It is certainly well on its way to doing so.

We are into night sittings. We are here debating until midnight. We just had a time allocation vote at about 7:45 at night.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I was trying to hear the hon. member and I was having a hard time. I am sure everybody else wants to hear him.

The hon. member for Perth—Wellington.

• (1945)

Mr. John Nater: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the encouragement. I know hon. members may want to hear what I have to say on this matter.

We are into the last week of May and the final four weeks of our sitting. However, the Liberal government has wasted and squandered its parliamentary session. Now, as the deadline of the summer recess approaches, the Liberals are trying to ram through bills on the threat and guillotine of time allocation and closure, and that is wrong. Canadians expect us to come to this place and have a thorough debate on things that matter to them, yet we have time allocation and closure time and after time.

We are sitting until midnight, and I am happy to do so. I think all members here are willing to put in their time and do that work. However, I have to question how the Liberal government, which claims to be a family-friendly government and wants to see Parliament be a little more family friendly, thinks that having a vote at 7:45 at night is family friendly. Granted, as the father of an 11 day old, I am certainly used to being awake at all hours of the night, so it is not so bad. I would be happy to debate anyone at three o'clock in the morning if anyone is awake at that time.

Here we are in an evening sitting debating bills that clearly the government could have called and worked on. The bill before us has had relatively limited debate here at report stage. However, we, as the opposition, will be supporting Bill C-57, both at report stage and as it goes forward. I do want to commend our shadow minister, the member for Abbotsford, for his hard work on the bill. He was exceptionally eloquent when he spoke to the bill earlier in the session.

As Conservatives, we certainly believe in increased accountability. We are supporting the bill because it would provide a measure of increased accountability and increased reporting to Parliament. At the end of the day, Parliament is the ultimate arbiter. Therefore, providing that additional information and analysis to Parliament is important. The bill, with the amendment, would have a mandatory reporting requirement on a variety of matters, including environmental, economic, and social decision-making, and have that reported to Parliament.

Government Orders

As well, there are new enforcements. As Conservatives, we have always supported sustainable development. Many of our colleagues have been passionate about this matter and have spoken in and out of the House on it. Many of our colleagues have worked on this issue in the private sector and in their private lives for a number of years.

However, we do have some concerns with the bill. We have challenges with the increased number of paid advisory positions. These positions could be done on a voluntary basis. Unfortunately the bill would put paid advisory positions in the act. It is unfortunate, but at the same time it is something we will manage to deal with in supporting the bill.

It is a great opportunity as well to highlight that the amendment to the bill would be amending a bill that was first introduced in this place in 2008. At that time, it was introduced by our former colleague, the Hon. John Baird. This is an opportunity to highlight the good work that was done by Mr. Baird in his time as minister of the environment and the good work done by other Conservative environment ministers, including the member for Thornhill, who did an exceptional job during his time as minister of the environment.

As I said, we will be supporting Bill C-57. We are willing to see it move forward through report stage and third reading. If we look at our Conservative record on this bill, we supported the recommendations of the committee report that looked at the amendments to the legislation. We supported the committee report entitled "Federal Sustainability for Future Generations – A Report Following an Assessment of the Federal Sustainable development Act". Sometimes we have reports with exciting titles, and this one rolls off the tip of the tongue and provides an exceptional basis from which to work.

● (1950)

I want to say a little about this committee report, and committee reports in general. Committees work best when they do so on a consensus basis. This was one of those reports that was achieved with a degree of consensus and reported back to the House with multi-partisan support. It is important that we, as the opposition, are able to do that. The challenge, however, is that so many committees are not working that way. We see that right now in the procedure and House affairs committee. We see the Liberal government trying to ram through changes to Canada's Elections Act without debate, without analysis, and without the time to fully hear from witnesses and to introduce amendments based on deliberations on the information from those witnesses. We should be hearing from Canadians on that matter. We should be hearing what they think is important when it comes to Canada's elections. We should be hearing how this issue will affect them on the ground, in their communities, at polling booths.

There will be an election in Ontario next Thursday. We should at least, as parliamentarians, be able to hear some of the stories and some of the options that have come out of that provincial election and the impact they may have on our federal legislation. We should be able to hear lessons learned and how they could benefit and improve that piece of legislation. Unfortunately, that is not the case. The Liberals are intent on ramming through legislation, ramming it through committee, and enforcing it with limited debate on this important matter.

That was not the case with Bill C-57. There was a previous committee report that analyzed this issue. However, now, when we have the opportunity to debate this at report stage, we have the guillotine. We have forced time allocation. Indeed, tonight we can only debate this issue for another 40 minutes. I have already used up eight or nine minutes of that time. There are only about 32 minutes left for members of the House to debate this piece of legislation. That is unfortunate, because I know that many of my colleagues could speak on this issue at great length, for the full 10 minutes of their time, or perhaps longer if they were given that time. However, unfortunately, we are being constrained to about 31 minutes to debate this issue. That is wrong.

I see I am down to one minute now to finish my comments. I am reminded of a famous writer who said that he did not have time to write a short letter, so he wrote a long letter instead. I feel like I am in the middle of a long speech, and I am being cut off early. I am so disappointed that the Liberals are cutting off debate on Bill C-57.

To conclude, the Conservative opposition will be supporting the bill at report stage, but under great duress, because we have been forced to debate this within the confines of time allocation, which is truly unfortunate. I look forward to questions from hon. members on this important matter.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my friend across the way said he is prepared to continue the debate until 3 o'clock in the morning. It is interesting that he would make that kind of comment, when just a couple of hours ago, the Conservative Party voted that we stop working for the day. I suspect that he might be a minority of the caucus and that he lost that vote in the back room.

Having said that, I would really appreciate a better understanding of something. The member for Abbotsford, the person he gave credit to, moved a Conservative amendment at committee. He got the committee membership to support the amendment, and it passed. Now the bill is before us at report stage, and what did the member for Abbotsford do? He moved another amendment to delete the amendment he moved in committee. It does not make any sense whatsoever. I wonder if my colleague and friend can explain why the member for Abbotsford moved the amendment in the first place, if they do not want it in at report stage.

● (1955)

Mr. John Nater: Mr. Speaker, we actually call that move a Lamoureux. It is not the member's name. It is just a general term we use.

I just want to clarify the record. The member for Abbotsford did not move such a motion at committee, and that should be on the record. However, it does give me an opportunity to talk about the member for Abbotsford, who is one of the hardest-working members of our caucus. It is he who is holding these Liberals to account on important issues, like the Liberals ramming a carbon tax down the throats of Canadians. It is the member for Abbotsford who brought home the trans-Pacific partnership agreement, one of the things the Liberals tried to mess up, and nearly did. It is thanks to that member, who brought home that important trade deal, expanding our markets. It is that hon. member who deserves a lot of credit for all the good work we did on the trade file.

Government Orders

Mr. Pat Kelly (Calgary Rocky Ridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member raised the matter of committees in general and the experience of committees.

This committee worked on a consensus basis. Other committees sometimes do not. The previous intervention talked about other votes that have taken place. I wonder if this member could maybe explain to the member for Winnipeg North, or anyone else here, that these events do not happen in isolation.

What is going on at PROC right now is a disgrace. It is shameful. There are repercussions. We only have limited tools as an opposition, limited tools to deal with a government that is determined to unilaterally act against the best interests of Canadian voters by changing the system without the consent of other parties.

Mr. John Nater: Mr. Speaker, the member is absolutely right. These events do not happen in isolation. The vote to adjourn earlier today was a matter of protest against the heavy hand of the Liberal government.

Let us see what the Liberal government has done. It introduced Motion No. 6 in June 2016 to basically take away all the tools of the opposition. Last spring, it introduced, and tried to ram through, changes to the Standing Orders unilaterally, forcing a three-week filibuster in the procedure and House affairs committee, not to disrupt but to preserve the rights and privileges of parliamentarians. That is what we are here to do. It is our right and duty to defend those rights.

Now we see it happening once again in the procedure and House affairs committee. The Liberals have tried to introduce a motion with a guillotine, forcing limited debate, next to no debate, in fact, and forcing amendments to be tabled before we have even finished hearing from witnesses. We have not even heard from any witnesses outside of departmental officials. We heard a limited response from the minister. We are still waiting for responses from the minister on how she bungled the appointment of the Chief Electoral Officer. The government made one appointment, and then it appointed someone else, with virtually no consultation other than a letter saying that this was who they were nominating. That is wrong.

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is an interesting debate in that there are rare occasions when I agree with the government. There are elements of Bill C-57 I am in agreement with, but I am going to talk about some concerns about the ideological creep of the Liberal Party into the legislation of Canada. By "ideological creep", I do not refer to any hon. members. I refer to a creeping barrage of ideology that is actually not rooted in science. The Minister of Environment and Climate Change is seemingly unaware of global concerns with respect to some of the things being put in legislation.

Why I agree with elements of Bill C-57 is that they are rooted in the work of the last Conservative government. In 2008, as my colleague from Perth—Wellington mentioned, the Conservative government passed it. There was a lot of good work done by John Baird at that time, and it has been continued. That is the basis of the Federal Sustainable Development Act. It is based on the sustainable development goals the United Nations started with the Rio declaration, right through to the UN agenda 2030. We certainly

see a benefit to many social and economic considerations going into the sustainable development goals of a country.

When looking at an environmental plan, considering economic aspects of that plan, the impact on communities, and social development is prudent as one is planning. There are many departments within the federal government planning to meet the sustainable development goals articulated by the UN, and they are coming up with plans to do that.

I would note that the government has appointed a commissioner, who I wish well in her role, Ms. Julie Gelfand. We all wish her well in terms of working with federal government departments, particularly the Department of National Defence, which has large tracts of green space and lands in Canada, to make sure that we minimize the impact on the environment, make our operations sustainable, and operate with the future in mind of handing over the country we inherited to our children. There is a lot of agreement on that, and I will agree with those goals in this legislation.

I have three areas of concern I am going to keep my remarks to, because I do not like spending too much time on agreement with Liberals in this place. My friends will start questioning my loyalty.

The first area is the typical Liberal approach. There has been concern expressed by my colleague, the member for Abbotsford, and others that it seems the minister is going to continue to expand the paid advisory councils the government will rely upon. We know, going back to the days explored by Justice Gomery, that when there are gatherings of advisers, on a range of issues, being paid and being dependent on contracts and the goodwill of the government, it actually breeds a lack of accountability. We have already seen that, with the Prime Minister being the first sitting prime minister in Canada to have been found to have violated ethics legislation that governs this case. The finance minister has two pending investigations.

We do not think there should be that approach, with these friends of the Liberals being paid advisers. That should be arm's length, and we should rely upon Ms. Gelfand and her department to provide that advice. We have exceptional civil servants, so I do not like the approach we see the Liberals resorting to too often.

I commented that there are elements I said I agree with in Bill C-57. They are certainly rooted in the work done by the Conservative government, such as instilling the polluters pay principle and a number of tangible things that will have benefits. They will show that everyone in our country, including corporations, will need to be good and responsible stewards, and those principles enshrine that.

However, there has been a lot of window dressing from the government when it comes to the environment. We almost groan when we hear the minister say that the environment and the economy go together. It has just become rote language. However, I want to show how it is now also window dressing.

Government Orders

The minister herself said, in debate on Bill C-57, that the bill “would shift focus in the Federal Sustainable Development Act from planning” to reporting results. If we are looking at reporting results when it comes to our environmental goals and sustainable development, what were the comments of Julie Gelfand in her first appearance at committee on Bill C-57, and later, her comments with respect to the government's environmental plan?

● (2000)

If we are trying to say reporting results is what the government wants through this legislation, what did the Commissioner for Sustainable Development report on the government's progress on the environment? Here is her report on results:

We concluded that Environment and Climate Change Canada...measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions contained in this plan had yet to be implemented.

She went on to confirm that the government “did not make progress” with respect to any of its greenhouse gas emission targets. This is another case of the Liberals talking a very good game—whether in legislation, whether in debate outside of the chamber—but if we look at results, which is what the minister wants the bill to do for all departments of the federal government, we see they are failing. The commissioner actually reported a failing grade to the government.

If we combine that with the Auditor General's most recent report, which says that under this government there is basically no ability to implement projects, it should concern all Canadians. I know it concerns many of the civil servants who have had trouble getting paid and families having to help out their children, but it is a fundamental thing when the Auditor General in such strong language calls out the Liberals' inability to actually implement projects.

I hope the minister moves beyond the rhetoric of “the environment and the economy go together”, because we want to see results. Rhetoric we get enough of. We want to actually see some tangible results, and if Bill C-57 can do that, I am very happy that it will be part of our sustainable development discussion for the next number of years.

My final concern is the ideological creep that I see with the government, because in a similar fashion to Bill C-55 on the oceans act, this bill also creeps the precautionary principle into federal legislation. The old approach of the Conservative government enshrined the polluter pay model, and it is very obvious what that is: if there is an impact on our environment that is negative and it is clear who the polluter is, the polluter will pay to remediate that impact on our environment. The polluter pay principle is in this legislation, but Liberals are inserting the precautionary principle, and that is troubling because it is pseudoscience. The precautionary principle actually says, “Let us not wait until we have final scientific evidence to make public policy; let us just make it if we feel good.”

I will illustrate this with a quote. I know the front bench of the Liberal Party enjoyed their trip to see President Obama. They were downright giddy. What did Obama's chief scientific adviser say about the precautionary principle? He said that the precautionary principle, for all its rhetorical appeal, is deeply incoherent.

If we are talking about sustainable development and goals, we should be talking about science-based evidence. That was something

the Liberals used to say in opposition a lot, but now in several pieces of federal legislation they are enshrining a policy principle that is not rooted in science. It is rooted in rhetorical appeal. It is rooted in feeling good. It is virtue-signalling, something we see every day from the government.

We should see a science-based approach. Whether it comes to sustainable development, our oceans, or marijuana, we should not be legislating and regulating because of an ideological view. While I support the goals of Bill C-57, it is this creeping barrage of Liberal ideology that they are secretly inserting into things. They have a condescension of the left that is troubling to people who have worked in the private sector, people who rely on science and evidence, as I do. Their attitude is that if we do not agree with them, we are somehow un-Canadian, or wrong, or as the Prime Minister says, we are being partisan. Is it partisan to ask for science before making decisions?

● (2005)

I would say in overall support that I am happy that there are elements to work together on, but I would like to alert Canadians to this ideological creep of the Liberal Party, which will set Canada back in the long term.

Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is always enlightening to hear the hon. member for Durham speak in this place, particularly when it comes to sustainability. I am very interested in his reading of sustainability.

The member mentioned an ideological creep. I am thinking about the global 2030 agenda, which Canada signed on to under our government but which really was ignored under the previous government, and the United Nations 17 sustainable development goals that we are also following. Personally, I have triple bottom-line goals as I manage my constituency work, my work on the Hill, and having a net-zero office and things like that around social, environmental, and economic sustainability.

In this bill, we are looking at moving from 26 government organizations, departments, and agencies to over 90 federal development agencies that will have to act together in working on common interests toward sustainable solutions. I wonder whether the hon. member thinks that working with the United Nations standard is good, or whether it is better just to fudge it through, the way the previous government was doing.

Government Orders

● (2010)

Hon. Erin O'Toole: Mr. Speaker, certainly I think Canada should govern on its own, and where we can work collectively with multilateral organizations, including the UN, we should, and we should take some guidance and some education from them and share in a number of goals.

However, I have seen, including in the debate on Bill C-47 today, that the Liberals, in their pursuit of the Security Council seat, almost seem willing to outsource our legislative agenda to another body. I would remind the member that this month the UN committee on disarmament is going to be chaired by Syria. The only country to actually use chemical weapons is now chairing the body to prevent the use of chemical weapons.

What we should do is work on the sustainable development goals, but also take ownership of our own house. The polluter pay principle does that.

When it comes to the 90 agencies the member mentioned, I do have some concerns. When the Auditor General says that the government cannot manage a project in a fashion that would be acceptable to the levels set by the Auditor General, we should be worried when we are foisting more challenges on more departments. Therefore, while I share the sustainable development goals we have, my concern is we have to be able to deliver. We own our own responsibility, and we should not think that signing on to something globally negates our ability to legislate here in Canada.

Mr. David Sweet (Flamborough—Glanbrook, CPC): Mr. Speaker, with my colleague's comments on not only this bill but some of the rhetoric, I wonder if he has some concerns that the only thing we are hearing with regard to the environment is the reduction of greenhouse gases and climate change.

While those aspects are very important, we are not hearing anything about clean air, clean land, or clean water. There seems to be a total absence in that regard.

Let me just give one example of why that is important. We focused on noxious gases and particulate in the air because 6,000 to 8,000 Canadians die every year because of bad air. We had a significant reduction in particulate and in noxious and SO_x gases, to the degree that when the member for Don Valley West was the president of the Asthma Society of Canada, he confided in me and said that our government was doing a very good job at reducing particulate.

I wonder if my colleague could comment on the one-sided aspect of the environment that the current government focuses on. We had to come in after 20 years and finally clean up the Sydney tar ponds and finally deal with the number one hotspot in the Great Lakes in Hamilton. We finally got the job done. I am just wondering if the member has a concern about a holistic approach to environment.

Hon. Erin O'Toole: Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Flamborough—Glanbrook is passionate and knowledgeable, and he is absolutely right. The environment is more than just GHG target goals, which can be met in two ways. They can do it the wrong way, which is taxing seniors and people who have to commute, or they can work on stepping down the emissions of large emitters, a much

more practical way that is not a carbon tax. However, the Liberals seem focused entirely on a tax.

That ignores entirely particulate matter, hazardous chemicals, and cleanup of sites such as Sydney and in our Arctic. It ignores sustainable practices in wildlife and in forestry. We should be proud of an entire and total environmental package. That should be part of our sustainable development goals, not just as a nation but as a society.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to be joining the debate on Bill C-57, although I must agree with my Conservative colleagues that it is unfortunate to be doing it under the yoke of time allocation.

It is a strategy that the federal government seems to be employing quite a bit this week. I was having an exchange with the member for Perth—Wellington earlier today about this resembling a student who has missed the due date for his homework and has suddenly realized it is coming up and he had better rush things. We have been wasting time over February, March, April, and May, and now we are almost into June. If we look at the parliamentary calendar, we see that time is suddenly short, so the Liberals are feeling the need to engage in these draconian tactics to limit the ability of members to be here on behalf of their constituents. Every single one of these seats represents a unique geographic area of Canada, and the people of Canada deserve to have their voices and concerns raised in this House by the members who represent them.

That said, let us now turn to the bill before us, Bill C-57.

I want to compliment my friend and colleague, the member for the riding of Edmonton Strathcona. She has decades of experience in the field of environmental sustainability. When she speaks to our caucus or delivers speeches in this House or at committee, people listen, because they realize this member has the experience and the knowledge. Very rarely have I seen people contradict her, because they know that she is usually right. She has the experience to back it up.

I want to walk the House through a bit of the history of how we got to Bill C-57. We would have to go back to the spring of 2016, when the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development reviewed the current act. There is a mandate in the act that it has to be reviewed every certain number of years. I believe it is every three years. That is just to make sure that it is staying up to date with the changing nature of Canada, to see if we are meeting our goals or if anything needs to be tweaked, and to see if the government has been doing a good job in following the existing act. That is why it is important.

Government Orders

As a part of this review, the committee, as committees usually do, brought forth witnesses to testify with respect to the current act and present some recommendations for ideas for reform. Witnesses at the committee found the current act lacking in two important ways. First, unlike the definition of “sustainable development”, it focuses on environmental decision-making and ignores the social and economic pillars of sustainable development; second, the purpose is about transparency and accountability for environmental decision-making, rather than about advancing sustainable development. The committee agreed with those significant shortcomings and recommended that the act be amended to require the development of an effective federal strategy that will inspire, in equal measure, environmental, social, and economic advancement toward a better future, something I think that all members in this House can very much agree to.

The unfortunate thing with the bill before us, Bill C-57, is that it only partially addresses these deficiencies and recommendations. It is important to note that the updated law should reflect the broader UN sustainable development goals, which have been endorsed by Canada.

I want to list some key things that came about after that study, because when Bill C-57 made it to the committee, the Liberal government did not even listen to its own members of Parliament on that committee. It did not even listen to the recommendations that had come from the environment committee. That is a real shame, because suddenly we have Liberals recommending something, only to see their government completely ignore it. That action shows that the government is not committed to delivering on its commitments under the broad UN sustainable development goal to ensure the whole of government ensures that its laws and policies reflect environmental, social, and economic needs.

I want to drill down on that, because the member for Edmonton Strathcona really was faced with a Herculean task. Many of my colleagues who sit on committees know this. Since the NDP has just one spot on a 10-member committee, that one member does not have the luxury of teamwork with other MPs. The work often falls upon us, so when it comes to the amending stage of a bill, the clause-by-clause part of a bill, it is a pretty big task.

● (2015)

I can remember doing that last year at the justice committee when I was the justice critic for our party, especially when it came to Bill C-46. That was a gargantuan justice bill, and my staff and I were pretty busy on that.

Going back to the matter at hand, Bill C-57, almost all of the amendments by the member for Edmonton Strathcona at committee were based on three things: recommendations from the Commissioner of the Environment, recommendations from expert witness testimony at the committee, and recommendations from the committee itself.

She had three very good arguments behind her recommendations. What did the Liberal-dominated committee do? It voted down those amendments, flying in the face of the evidence. The government likes to pride itself on evidence-based decision-making. I have yet to hear a coherent answer from the government side as to why the Liberals did that to the amendments of the hon. member for Edmonton Strathcona, when they knew she has years of experience

and that her amendments were based on solid evidence. We have still not received any good reasons on that.

The House voted today, historically I might add, for Bill C-262, which was moved by my hon. colleague, the member for Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou. It was a historic moment for the House of Commons, because that private member's bill passed third reading and commits the federal government to ensuring that all laws are in compliance with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

One of the amendments by the hon. member for Edmonton Strathcona was to ensure that Bill C-57 actually included a reference to UNDRIP. However, that was voted down. Then the Liberals decided they would vote in favour of the bill that is now going to mandate adherence to UNDRIP. Canadians should try to work their way through the reasoning behind that. I am still having some problems doing it.

That said, UNDRIP has passed this House. It is going to the other place now. I wish senators well. I certainly hope they will look at the hard work we did here in the House of Commons that recognize that in 2018, we are at a place in this great country where we can no longer afford to play the role of a colonizer. We have to make sure that first nations in Canada are the full and equal partners they very much deserve to be. It is only when we make sure that all of our federal laws recognize that implicitly that we will be able to move beyond our past—never forgetting it, but moving beyond it—to a place where most people would like us to be.

I know that my time on this bill is short, so I just want to end with this. The day that the Minister of Environment moved time allocation on this bill was Tuesday, the very day the Liberal government announced it was purchasing the Kinder Morgan pipeline for \$4.5 billion. That is just the price tag for the existing infrastructure. There is no word on the cost of expanding the pipeline. I just think that when the environment minister is moving to shut down debate on a bill that seeks to bring federal departments in compliance with sustainable development goals and yet buys a pipeline, which is infrastructure that rightly belongs in the 20th century, it makes a mockery of the government's real commitment to addressing climate change.

I would dearly like to know what federal department is going to be in control of the Kinder Morgan pipeline, and how it can possibly justify its sustainable development when it is going to be operating something that makes a mockery of our climate change commitments.

This being 2018, with all of the evidence of climate change all around us, we certainly need this country to be taking a firm and strong direction in addressing climate change. I think everyone who looks to future generations knows that we owe them that at this moment in time.

I will conclude there. I have appreciated this opportunity to speak to Bill C-57. I welcome questions and comments from my colleagues and friends.

Government Orders

• (2020)

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will start by congratulating the member, along with all members of the House, for gaining a share of the Trans Mountain pipeline. We are all owners together now of a project that would have been profitable had the government just stayed out of the way and provided certainty to the company who owned it before.

Members often disagree in the House. We on this side of the House are Conservatives who believe in a free market and think there is a way to manage the balance between the economy and the environment. We are talking tonight about the Federal Sustainable Development Act. New Democrats have a different point of view on reaching that fine balance. Does the member feel that this legislation finds that balance?

What does the member think of the government now being in the potential business of exporting oil sands energy to the west coast, all the while talking a good game about promoting environmental stewardship, which I think is quite possible? Obviously the member has a different point of view as a New Democrat. Could he comment further on this dichotomy that has been created by the Liberals?

• (2025)

Mr. Alistair MacGregor: Mr. Speaker, it is true that we in the NDP do have different views on why this is a bad idea.

What I will say to workers in Alberta, my brother being one of them involved in the industry, is that stopping the Kinder Morgan expansion will not stop the oil sands from working right now, and no one in the House wants that.

Furthermore, Kinder Morgan was devised at a time when oil prices were around \$100 a barrel. It is exporting diluted bitumen, which is the rawest form of the product, and we are not getting any value for this. If we want our oil industry to be sustainable, then we should sell it for the most value possible, not bargain basement prices.

If we are going to talk about Canada's energy security as a country, it does not involve building a pipeline that will direct exports to China. This will not in any way lead to Canada's energy security. That makes a mockery of the government's sustainable development goals, especially in light of Bill C-57.

Mrs. Karen Vecchio (Elgin—Middlesex—London, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have talked a lot in the House about the carbon tax. Some people have said it is going to create sustainability, that it is going to do this or that. I would like the member's personal view on that.

From what we have seen in the last couple of days with \$4.5 billion going to Kinder Morgan and things like that, does the member think that the government is going to take the money from the carbon tax and put it into technologies that will make development more sustainable? Many Canadians are hoping that is what the government will do with their hard-earned dollars. Does the member think the government will put that money aside, or does he believe the money will just go into the coffers and be ill-spent?

Mr. Alistair MacGregor: Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of discussion about the carbon tax at the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food. We heard from a lot of witnesses,

farmers in particular, who are quite concerned about the impact the carbon tax will have on their operations. I very much empathize with those farmers.

For those who are in industries and businesses that are still very reliant on fossil fuels for their operations, I think there is a way to design the carbon tax to mitigate the worst effects on them while also respecting the need to put a price on pollution. Putting higher prices on this starts to change the conversation. I am from Vancouver Island and gas is selling at \$1.50 a litre there. That certainly has led to my constituents thinking about how fast they can get an electric car, because they say these prices are killing them.

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the debate in this late hour on Bill C-57, An Act to amend the Federal Sustainable Development Act. Of course, as other members have said, including the member for Abbotsford, we will be supporting this piece of legislation.

In preparing for the debate, I went through past commentary by other members, including the member for Abbotsford, and really, what else is there to add? He went over every single point and report that rebutted many of the talking points the Liberal government has put forward in defending its environmental record and so-called achievements. They are achievements in name, mostly. He went through it very well, so there is really nothing more I can contribute in illuminating the debate in that sense.

However, there is one part of it that I do want to delve into and spend more time on. It is the part where the member for Abbotsford referenced a report, which, in his words, "is supposed to marry the environment and the economy". He questioned why the government had completely forgotten about the economic component. He said it was unbelievable, and I agree with him.

We have heard time and time again in the House this metaphor alluding to the economy and the environment going hand in hand. All I have seen so far is posturing by the Liberals when it comes to the environment, and very little focus on the economy. We have seen over the past two and a half years one thing happen, and one thing only, which is this two-handed concept. Why are both of those hands in my pockets? Both hands are in the pockets of taxpayers.

On one side are carbon taxes. On one side is a higher cost of living, so-called, to pay for environmental reasons and environmental targets, so-called. At the end of the day, it is always about more revenue. On the other side are higher small business taxes, higher payroll taxes, or higher taxes period, across the board, with a higher cost of living for most Canadians today. Think tanks have said this. Independent reports have said this, and I am sure every single member of the House could attest to the fact that they have received emails, letters, and phone calls from constituents who are saying that the cost of living has gone up significantly.

Government Orders

Why are both of those hands, supposedly the economy and the environment, when managed by the federal government, the Ottawa Liberals, in the pockets of taxpayers? They are in our pockets. Everyone in Canada is paying more because of the government's decision-making. There are job losses in the energy sector.

I know that members hear all the time that Statistics Canada is saying that the job numbers are better. However, the comparison is being made between the loss of an engineering job paying maybe \$150,000 to \$200,000 in Calgary and then maybe a job working in retail for \$50,000.

What about underemployment? It is something that Statistics Canada and stats in general have a very difficult time catching. I can give example after example in my own riding in Calgary, and even wider than the Calgary area, of individuals who have been impacted by the drastic slowdown in the energy sector, which was initially caused by lower prices, and then prolonged by bad government policy, both provincially and federally, making things far worse for far longer than they needed to be.

I have heard the debate in the House thus far on Bill C-57, including an exchange earlier today. Members know that I like Yiddish proverbs. One of them is "What you don't see with your eyes, don't invent with your tongue." I see this happening on that side of the House all the time. They make it up as they go along.

This brings me to the next point, which I will spend some more time on. The Trans Mountain pipeline is the perfect example of this. Supposedly, in the name of getting it right and finding the right balance between the economy and the environment, the only way the Liberals can do this is by expropriating Kinder Morgan and forcing the company. It would have been one of the most profitable portions of the energy sector to transport the goods to the market. The Liberals made it unprofitable by getting in the way at every single junction, and by undermining the legitimate process by which a company, shareholders, and members of the public can arrive at a reasonable decision. They can disagree without being disagreeable through a regulator, define approval, and move the project forward.

• (2030)

Instead, with the encouragement of the federal government, the Liberals on that side, protesters, third-party groups, many foreign-funded, then went out and undermined the rule of law and the legal process by which the pipeline was approved. Now we have a situation.

The economy and the environment supposedly go hand in hand. However, both of the government's federal hands are now taking Kinder Morgan's pipeline. The Liberals are saying that in the name of getting it built, the only thing they can do, the only way we can get it done is by taking on 100% of the risk for \$4.5 billion, and that is just to buy the old pipeline. Now we are talking about building the actual pipeline expansion itself.

However, the court proceedings will still go ahead. The obstruction of a provincial government will still continue. The obstruction of a legally approved pipeline will continue to go ahead, because nothing has changed. We have seen it in the media, with quote after quote from protester leaders, from certain but not all indigenous groups, and from civic leaders who say they will

continue to oppose it, that it makes no difference. However, now every one of us is on the hook for cost overruns, for cost failures, for potential strikes, for workers' health and safety, and for the extra spending to ensure they can work in a safe environment while they build this pipeline, even if it goes ahead.

This \$4.5 billion that the Canadian taxpayer is giving to the shareholders of Kinder Morgan Canada is going to do what? It is going to go and finance competitor pipelines. The state of Texas will become the largest producer of oil in the world. I always joke about the state of Texas. I call it "Alberta Junior". That is what it is to me in my heart. Texas calls us in the reverse. So many Canadians who worked in the energy sector in Calgary, Edmonton, and Fort McMurray are working there today.

Where was that focus on getting the environment and the economy right? Did that involve the brain drain, the escape, the exile, of tens of thousands of Canadian energy workers to Dallas and Houston? Was that the purpose? Is that how we get the balance right? The Liberals failed miserably, despite this legislation, which we will support.

As I mentioned, what our eyes do not see, do not invent with our tongues, but they are inventing. The Liberals are inventing a narrative that simply does not exist, because they do not have the balance right. They did not get it right with the economy and the environment. If they did, they would not be getting into the business of owning and operating a pipeline.

Seven thousand kilometres of pipeline has been cancelled under the Liberals' watch, not our watch. They are the ones who failed to achieve it. They are the ones who did not get it to move forward. However, now they will be able to build their own pipeline. The future health of the Alberta government's finances now rest in the hands of the federal government, which is a position I guarantee 90% of Albertans will be against.

We are adamantly against it, because we have seen this type of behaviour before, 40 years ago with the national energy plan. This is the second version of it, getting it wrong again. The Liberals do not know where to find the balance between the two. They will continue to back their allies in the environmental movement, the activists, and those who they continuously back in illegal activities because they need their help to win elections.

We will support this proposed legislation. However, on the continuous use of the environment and the economy go hand in hand, the Liberals actually have to live it and they have to do it. Buying pipelines, expropriating pipelines, is not the way to achieve it. We should never have been in the position where the taxpayer of Canada would have to be on the hook for up to \$12 billion of new spending.

Government Orders

• (2035)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alupa Clarke (Beauport—Limoilou, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I really appreciated the speech by my colleague from Calgary Shepard, who adroitly set out to deconstruct that worn-out Liberal platitude about the environment and the economy going hand in hand. It is patently obvious that they do, because we human beings come from the environment, our resources come from the environment, and the economy comes from the environment.

The economy is both a process and a product of the environment we live in. The resources we export, such as oil, are natural resources that come from the environment. The Liberals' platitude is purely political PR.

As I recall, under the Conservative government, we did not sweet-talk anyone. We took concrete action that produced excellent results. For example, we reduced Canada's greenhouse gas emissions by 2% while we grew the GDP by 16%.

I would like the member for Calgary Shepard to tell us more about the strides our government made on both the environmental and economic fronts.

[*English*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Before going to the hon. member for Calgary—Shepard, I want to remind hon. members that there are no rules preventing people from one side to go to the other side to speak. There are rules that prevent members from shouting or talking loudly across. It makes it difficult to hear the hon. member.

Let us hear what the hon. member for Calgary—Shepard has to say.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for Beauport—Limoilou for his question.

Indeed, the previous government was very successful at balancing the environment and the economy. Even though the members across the aisle, the Liberals, keep denying it, the member is correct in saying that greenhouse gases decreased by 2% and the economy kept growing.

Four pipelines were approved and supported by the previous government, which knew how to balance environmental objectives and the economy. Our growth was quite good, even in the midst of a massive recession that significantly affected Canadian businesses and workers. The previous government was able to balance the budget and create 1.4 million jobs in Canada after the recession, giving Canada's middle class a major boost.

• (2040)

[*English*]

Hon. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my colleague certainly highlighted the fact that the legislation would ensure that government decisions would not only be reviewed through the lens of the environment, but also through a social lens as well as the lens of the economy. There is a certain irony that we are in the House debating this legislation. The Liberal government of course has it brought forward, which is strongly supported, but the Liberals do not

even take their own advice. They generally do not understand how important it is to view decisions the government makes through the lens of the economy.

We have seen that with the incredible flight of capital in Canada. Canada used to be the most desired destination in the world for foreign investors. Today, we are among the least desired investment destinations among the developed countries. I would be interested to hear my colleague's comments on what could have contributed to that dramatic decline in confidence in Canada's economy.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Mr. Speaker, there are a series of policy decisions the government has taken, some legislative, some regulatory. We could talk about the tanker ban off the west coast. It was totally a political decision, not based on very much of any science. It hurt the prospective investment decisions that companies were going to make in Canada. We could talk about the carbon tax, which seriously hurt the cost of living for all Canadians, because we are all paying higher taxes now.

We could also talk about decisions, such as Bill C-69, which did immense damage to the regulatory process. In fact, if I remember correctly, a very senior official at Suncor, I believe it was the CEO, said that no new project would be built under that model because it gave the Minister of Environment and Climate Change so much power to cancel projects.

What company could be blamed for not wanting to take on an immense amount of risk? At the end of the day, the board of directors and executive teams are responsible to the shareholders who invested in it. I would not invest in Canada either if I were being told by the members opposite that I would have to jump through as many hoops and they would decide afterward if I did it well enough.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alupa Clarke (Beauport—Limoilou, CPC): Mr. Speaker, here we are in the House, on Wednesday, May 30, at 8:45. I should mention that it is 8:45 p.m., for the many residents of Beauport—Limoilou who I am sure are tuning in. To all my constituents, good evening.

We are debating this evening because the Liberal government tabled very few significant government bills over the winter. Instead, they tabled an astounding number of private members' bills on things like swallows' day and beauty month. Sometimes my colleagues and I can hardly help laughing at this pile of utterly trivial bills. I also think that this process of randomly selecting the members who get to table bills is a bit past its prime. Maybe it should be reviewed. At the same time, I understand that it is up to each member to decide what kind of bill is important to him or her.

The reason we have had to sit until midnight for two days now is that, as my colleague from Perth—Wellington said, the government has been acting like a typical university student over the past three months. That comparison is a bit ridiculous, but it is true. The government is behaving like those students who wait until the last minute to do their assignments and are still working on them at 3 a. m. the day before they are due because they were too busy partying all semester. Members know what I mean, even though that paints a rather stereotypical picture of students; most of them do not do things like that.

Government Orders

In short, we have a government that, at the end of the session, has realized that time is running out and that it only has three weeks left to pass some of its legislative measures, some of which are rather lengthy bills that are key to the government's legislative agenda. One has to wonder about that.

The Liberals believe these bills to be important. However, because of their lack of responsibility over the past three months, we were unable to debate these major bills that will make significant changes to our society. Take for example, Bill C-76, which has to do with the electoral reforms that the Liberals want to make to the voting system, the way we vote, protection of the vote, and identification. There is also Bill C-49 on transportation in Canada, a very lengthy bill that we have not had time to examine properly.

Today we are debating Bill C-57 on sustainable development. This is an important topic, but for the past three years I have been getting sick and tired of seeing the Liberal government act as though it has a monopoly on environmental righteousness. I searched online to get an accurate picture of the record of Mr. Harper's Conservative government from 2006 to 2015, and I came across some fascinating results. I want to share this information very honestly with the House and my Liberal colleagues so that they understand that even though we did not talk incessantly about the environment, we achieved some excellent concrete results.

I want to read a quote from www.mediaterre.org, a perfectly legitimate site:

Stephen Harper's Canadian government released its 2007 budget on March 19. The budget allocated \$4.5 billion in new investments to some 20 environmental projects. These measures include a \$2,000 rebate for all electronic-vehicle or alternative-fuel purchases, and the creation of a \$1.5-billion EcoTrust program to help provinces reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

The Liberals often criticize us for talking about the environment, but we did take action. For example, we set targets. We proposed reducing emissions to 30% below 2005 levels by 2030. The Liberals even retained these same targets as part of the Paris agreement.

• (2045)

They said we had targets, but no plan. That is not true. Not only did we have the \$1.5-billion ecotrust program, but we also had a plan that involved federal co-operation.

Allow me to quote the premier of Quebec at the time, Jean Charest, who was praising the plan that was going to help Quebec—his province, my province—meet its greenhouse gas emissions targets. Jean Charest and Mr. Harper issued a joint press release.

Mr. Harper said, "Canada's New Government is investing to protect Canadians from the consequences of climate change, air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions." He was already recognizing it in 2007.

Mr. Charest said, "In June 2006, our government adopted its plan to combat climate change. This plan has been hailed as one of the finest in North America. With Ottawa contributing financially to this Quebec initiative, we will be able to achieve our objectives."

It was Mr. Charest who said that in 2007, at a press conference with the prime minister.

I will continue to read the joint press release from the two governments, "As a result of this federal funding, the Government of Quebec has indicated that it will be able to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 13.8 million tonnes of carbon dioxide or equivalent below its anticipated 2012 level."

What is more, the \$1.5-billion ecotrust that was supposed to be allocated and was allocated to every province provided \$339 million to Quebec alone. That was going to allow Quebec to engage in the following: investments to improve access to new technologies for the trucking sector; a program to develop renewable energy sources in rural regions; a pilot plant for production of cellulosic ethanol; promotion of geothermal heat pumps in the residential sector; support for technological research and innovation for the reduction and sequestration of greenhouse gases. This is probably one of those programs that is helping us make our oil sands increasingly environmentally friendly by allowing us to capture the carbon that comes from converting the sands to oil. There are also measures for the capture of biogas from landfill sites, for waste treatment and energy recovery, and finally for Canada ecotrust.

I invite our Liberal colleagues to listen to what I am going to say. In 2007, Steven Guilbeault of Greenpeace said the following: "We are pleased to see that after negotiating for more than a year, Quebec has finally obtained the money it needs to move towards meeting the Kyoto targets."

Who made it possible for Quebec to move towards meeting its Kyoto objectives? It was the Harper government, a Conservative government, which established the \$1.5-billion ecotrust fund in 2007 with monies from the budget surplus.

Not only did we have a plan to meet the targets we proposed, but this was also a plan that could only be implemented if the provinces agreed to the targets. It was a plan that was funded through the budget surplus, that did not further tax Canadians, and that provided money directly, without any conditions, other than the fundamental requirement that it had to help reduce climate change, which was philosophically important. Any and all measures taken to reach that goal were left entirely to the discretion of the provinces.

Mr. Harper, like a good Conservative who supported decentralization and like a true federalist leader, said that he was giving \$400 million to each province so it could move forward with its plan.

By 2015, after 10 years of Conservative government, the country had not only weathered the worst economic crisis, the worst recession in history since the 1930s, but it had also reduced greenhouse gas emissions by 2% and increased the gross domestic product for all Canadians while lopping three points off the GST and lowering income taxes for families with two children by an average of \$2,000 per year.

Government Orders

If that is not co-operative federalism, if those are not real results, if that is not a concrete environmental plan, then I do not know what is. Add to that the fact that we achieved royal assent for no less than 25 to 35 bills every session.

In contrast, during this session, in between being forced to grapple with scandals involving the carbon tax, illegal border crossings, and the Trans Mountain project, this government has barely managed to come up with four genuinely important bills.

● (2050)

By contrast, we expanded parks and protected Canada's wetlands. Our environmental record is exceptional.

Furthermore, we allowed debate. For example, we debated Bill C-23 on electoral reform for four days. The Liberals' electoral reform was debated for two hours.

I am sad, but I am happy to debate until midnight because debating is my passion.

Mr. Bernard Généreux (Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate my colleague on his fascinating speech on how we supported sustainable development in Canada without running unnecessary deficits.

As my colleague mentioned, we went through a significant economic crisis, but we still made unprecedented investments in the environment, which produced results.

The government is currently spending outrageous amounts of money left and right, as we saw yesterday with the \$4.5 billion it handed over to the United States to buy a pipeline we did not need.

Responsible managers are able to achieve clear economies of scale and look after the environment. Can my colleague speak to that?

● (2055)

Mr. Alupa Clarke: Mr. Speaker, day after day, the government is revealing itself to be a poor manager for our country. Politics, arguments, and ideologies aside, the Canadian Constitution calls for peace, order, and good government. In this Parliament, we can be comforted by the fact that, at the very least, there is peace and order. However, there certainly is not good governance.

Day after day, the Liberals face national crises, sometimes of their own making, and their solutions are almost behind the times. They are unable to balance the budget in a reasonable time, as they promised.

What I particularly liked about the Conservative government, and what I will like about the future 2019 Conservative government, is that it had the political courage to speak the truth and take real action.

Today, we are talking about the environment, and I have a theory. I am sure that the Paris Agreement, which is much more practical and effective, exists because Mr. Harper had the courage to withdraw from the Kyoto protocol before all the international elite. Everyone knew that the Kyoto protocol was not working. There were useless meetings where the international elite set completely unrealistic objectives, when meanwhile all the countries knew full well that they would never achieve those greenhouse gas reduction targets.

Canada was the first and only country to have the courage to say that the Kyoto protocol was not working and that it needed to be updated. It was the only country that had the courage to withdraw. The Paris Agreement and its reduction targets of 30% below 2005 levels by 2030 exist primarily because of the Conservative government and the \$1.5-billion ecotrust it created in 2007, which was a real and tangible example of federal co-operation.

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the member for his articulate speech. The former prime minister said that it was important that all Canadian governments remain competitive with the United States when it comes to the environment.

[*English*]

They continue to add new taxes that make us less and less competitive with the United States. The Liberals are making bad environmental policies that are not only adding extra costs for Canadians but making us less competitive. Is the member concerned about the competitiveness gap that the government is pursuing with regard to the environment? The Liberals always like to say that the environment goes hand in hand with the economy, but sometimes it does not, because there are trade-offs between the two.

Mr. Alupa Clarke: Mr. Speaker, my colleague could not be more right. The government has yet to propose to Canadians how it is going to respond to the fiscal reform related to the presidency of Mr. Trump, which has already had a great impact on us. I have read the *National Post* and *The Globe and Mail* in the last month, and most experts have been telling us that Canada's competitiveness has decreased drastically in the last several months.

We learned yesterday that not only is the government not responding to the fiscal reform being implemented in the U.S., but it is sending \$4.5 billion of taxpayer money to a Texas-based company, Kinder Morgan. We have all known the story, of course, since yesterday.

Worse than that, in the autumn session, the government tried to impose fiscal reform that would tax our small and medium-sized enterprises more and more. I am sure that the member for Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola is very concerned about that because he is the critic for small and medium-sized enterprises. It is a fiasco, and the government does not know how to deal with it, either domestically or internationally.

● (2100)

The Deputy Speaker: It being 9:02 p.m., pursuant to an order made on Tuesday, May 29, 2018, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the report stage of the bill now before the House.

The question is on Motion No. 1. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Government Orders

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 29, 2018, the division stands deferred until Thursday, May 31, 2018, at the expiry of the time provided for oral questions.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

FIREARMS ACT

Mr. Glen Motz (Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today on a question of privilege, which is in addition to the one I presented yesterday.

As you know, yesterday I raised a question of privilege regarding documents on the website of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police concerning the implementation of Bill C-71, a piece of legislation presently before the public safety committee. These RCMP documents presumed the passage of Bill C-71 without any concession to the fact that the bill is still subject to parliamentary approval.

In your deliberations on this matter, Mr. Speaker, I assume that you will visit the RCMP website to verify the content. I was advised today that the website has been modified as of today. The documents posted now have a disclaimer about Bill C-71 being a proposed law. In fact, I would note that when the document is printed out, it shows “date modified: 2018-05-30”, which is today. You may now add to the body of evidence presented yesterday this apparent admission of guilt by the RCMP by virtue of its modifications of its website, which reflects exactly the question of privilege that was raised yesterday. Covering things up after the fact does not make this right.

In summation, I would respectfully submit that a prima facie case of contempt of Parliament was clearly laid out yesterday, and the fact that the RCMP modified its website today confirms its acknowledgement of such.

The Deputy Speaker: I thank the member for Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner for his additional comments on the matter. We will get back to the House in due course on the question.

* * *

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2018, NO. 1

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-74, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 27, 2018 and other measures, as reported (with amendment) from the committee.

●(2105)

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Deputy Speaker: There are 409 motions in amendment standing on the Notice Paper for the report stage of Bill C-74. Motions Nos. 1 to 409 will be grouped for debate and voted upon according to the voting pattern available at the table.

[*Translation*]

I will now put Motions Nos. 1 to 409 to the House.

[*English*]

MOTIONS IN AMENDMENT

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC) moved:

Motion No. 1

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting the short title.

Motion No. 2

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 2.

Motion No. 3

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 3.

Motion No. 4

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 4.

Motion No. 5

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 5.

Motion No. 6

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 6.

Motion No. 7

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 7.

Motion No. 8

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 8.

Motion No. 9

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 9.

Motion No. 10

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 10.

Motion No. 11

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 11.

Motion No. 12

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 12.

Motion No. 13

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 13.

Motion No. 14

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 14.

Motion No. 15

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 15.

Motion No. 16

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 16.

Motion No. 17

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 17.

Motion No. 18

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 18.

Motion No. 19

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 19.

Motion No. 20

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 20.

Motion No. 21

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 21.

Motion No. 22

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 22.

Motion No. 23

Government Orders

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 23.
Motion No. 24

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 24.
Motion No. 25

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 25.
Motion No. 26

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 26.
Motion No. 27

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 27.
Motion No. 28

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 28.
Motion No. 29

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 29.
Motion No. 30

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 30.
Motion No. 31

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 31.
Motion No. 32

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 32.
Motion No. 33

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 33.
Motion No. 34

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 34.
Motion No. 35

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 35.
Motion No. 36

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 36.
Motion No. 37

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 37.
Motion No. 38

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 38.
Motion No. 39

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 39.
Motion No. 40

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 40.
Motion No. 41

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 41.
Motion No. 42

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 42.
Motion No. 43

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 43.
Motion No. 44

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 44.
Motion No. 45

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 45.
Motion No. 46

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 46.
Motion No. 47

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 47.
Motion No. 48

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 48.
Motion No. 49

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 49.
Motion No. 50

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 50.
Motion No. 51

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 51.
Motion No. 52

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 52.

Motion No. 53

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 53.
Motion No. 54

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 54.
Motion No. 55

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 55.
Motion No. 56

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 56.
Motion No. 57

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 57.
Motion No. 58

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 58.
Motion No. 59

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 59.
Motion No. 60

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 60.
Motion No. 61

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 61.
Motion No. 62

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 62.
Motion No. 63

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 63.
Motion No. 64

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 64.
Motion No. 65

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 65.
Motion No. 66

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 66.
Motion No. 67

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 67.
Motion No. 68

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 68.

● (2115)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 69

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 69.

[*English*]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC) moved:

Motion No. 70

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 70.
Motion No. 71

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 71.
Motion No. 72

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 72.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 73

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 73.
Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC) moved:

Motion No. 74

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 74.
Motion No. 75

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 75.
Motion No. 76

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 76.

*Government Orders**[English]***Hon. Kevin Sorenson (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC)** moved:

Motion No. 77

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 77.

Motion No. 78

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 78.

Motion No. 79

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 79.

Motion No. 80

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 80.

Motion No. 81

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 81.

Motion No. 82

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 82.

Motion No. 83

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 83.

Motion No. 84

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 84.

Motion No. 85

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 85.

Motion No. 86

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 86.

Motion No. 87

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 87.

Motion No. 88

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 88.

Motion No. 89

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 89.

Motion No. 90

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 90.

Motion No. 91

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 91.

Motion No. 92

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 92.

Motion No. 93

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 93.

Motion No. 94

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 94.

● (2120)

*[Translation]***Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP)** moved:

Motion No. 95

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 95.

*[English]***Hon. Kevin Sorenson (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC)** moved:

Motion No. 96

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 96.

*[Translation]***Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP)** moved:

Motion No. 97

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 97.

*[English]***Hon. Kevin Sorenson (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC)** moved:

Motion No. 98

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 98.

Motion n° 99

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 99.

Motion No. 100

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 100.

Motion No. 101

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 101.

Motion No. 102

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 102.

Motion No. 103

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 103.

Motion No. 104

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 104.

Motion No. 105

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 105.

Motion No. 106

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 106.

Motion No. 107

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 107.

Motion No. 108

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 108.

Motion No. 109

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 109.

Motion No. 110

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 110.

Motion No. 111

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 111.

Motion No. 112

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 112.

Motion No. 113

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 113.

Motion No. 114

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 114.

Motion No. 115

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 115.

Motion No. 116

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 116.

Motion No. 117

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 117.

Motion No. 118

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 118.

Motion No. 119

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 119.

Motion No. 120

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 120.

Motion No. 121

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 121.

Motion No. 122

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 122.

Motion No. 123

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 123.

Motion No. 124

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 124.

Motion No. 125

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 125.

Motion No. 126

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 126.

Motion No. 127

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 127.

Motion No. 128

Government Orders

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 305.

Motion No. 306

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 306.

Motion No. 307

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 307.

Motion No. 308

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 308.

Motion No. 309

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 309.

● (2155)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 310

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 310.

[*English*]

Hon. Kevin Sorenson (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC) moved:

Motion No. 311

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 311.

Motion No. 312

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 312.

Motion No. 313

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 313.

Motion No. 314

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 314.

Motion No. 315

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 315.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 316

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 316.

Motion No. 317

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 317.

[*English*]

Hon. Kevin Sorenson (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC) moved:

Motion No. 318

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 318.

Motion No. 319

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 319.

Motion No. 320

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 320.

Motion No. 321

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 321.

Motion No. 322

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 322.

Motion No. 323

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 323.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 324

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 324.

Hon. Kevin Sorenson (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC) moved:

Motion No. 325

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 325.

Motion No. 326

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 326.

Motion No. 327

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 327.

Motion No. 328

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 328.

● (2200)

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 329

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 329.

[*English*]

Hon. Kevin Sorenson (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC) moved:

Motion No. 330

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 330.

Motion No. 331

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 331.

Motion No. 332

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 332.

Motion No. 333

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 333.

Motion No. 334

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 334.

Motion No. 335

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 335.

Motion No. 336

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 336.

Motion No. 337

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 337.

Motion No. 338

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 338.

Motion No. 339

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 339.

Motion No. 340

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 340.

Motion No. 341

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 341.

Motion No. 342

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 342.

Motion No. 343

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 343.

Motion No. 344

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 344.

Motion No. 345

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 345.

Motion No. 346

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 346.

Motion No. 347

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 347.

Motion No. 348

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 348.

Motion No. 349

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 349.

Motion No. 350

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 350.

Motion No. 351

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 351.

Motion No. 352

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 352.

Motion No. 353

That Bill C-74 be amended by deleting Clause 353.

Government Orders

Hon. Kevin Sorenson (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC): Mr. Speaker, again, congratulations on working through 409 amendments. You did a great job. I listened intently, and you did not miss one, and we do appreciate that.

It is drawing close to 10:30 in the evening, and I am honoured to stand in this place once again to speak to the budget implementation act, 2018. On April 4, I stood in the House to speak to the budget. During that time, I focused my remarks primarily on our competitiveness, or I should say our lack of competitiveness, and the troubling effect of budget 2018 on our competitiveness and business investment in this country.

We are struggling today, as we were then, to attract capital from abroad, with foreign direct investment plunging last year to the lowest level since 2010. As I pointed out in the House over a month ago, the province of Alberta has experienced the worst decline in business investment in the country, much because of the NDP government we have there, much because of the lower price of oil, and much because of the Liberal government here.

Energy investment is at its lowest level on record, below even the worst of the 2009 global recession, with a loss of \$80 billion of investment and more than 110,000 jobs. Drilling rigs are leaving Canada, heading to the United States, where there is a more hospitable investment climate. There has been a significant decline in capital spending.

I stood in the House to debate the budget just one week after Kinder Morgan announced that it had suspended its work on the Trans Mountain expansion project and had given the Liberal government until May 31 to provide the necessary assurances that this project would go ahead. We know that the Liberals were funding protesters to protest against that pipeline straight from government programs here. That was the first time I had an opportunity to speak to this budget.

Kinder Morgan's skepticism was based on the fact that Canada had approved the project in November 2016, following an expanded environmental review process that included additional consultations with indigenous communities, yet more than three months into 2018, there was no movement and much added red tape, frustrating Kinder Morgan and others that would invest here in this country. Kinder Morgan saw nothing in immediate sight that would give it any confidence that it could go ahead, so it put the ultimatum of May 31.

I lay the blame for that unfortunate thing with Trans Mountain development at the feet of the Prime Minister, and rightfully so. The Liberal Prime Minister failed to take any concrete steps to ensure that the project was completed. This failure added to the significant economic difficulties facing my province of Alberta and a number of my constituents, as this project is a pivotal part of both Alberta's and the country's economic future.

While yesterday's announcement regarding the purchase of Trans Mountain by the federal government may help get our oil finally, some day, to new markets, it came at an extremely high price. It is a price taxpayers should not have to pay. Given what the government has done, chasing \$4.5 billion out of Canada to a Texas oil company so that it can invest in America and around the world, because it is very unlikely that it will come back here to invest soon, there is no

guarantee that the government is going to ever be able to build that pipeline.

Canadian taxpayers are on the hook for \$4.5 billion, and that shows the Prime Minister's failure. I have zero confidence that the government can see this pipeline through to completion. The private sector has more experience in building pipelines, more experience in building infrastructure, and more experience in building the infrastructure needed to move its product than any government ever has had.

• (2220)

Kinder Morgan never asked for a single dollar of taxpayer money. All the company wanted was certainty. Now, Kinder Morgan's assets have been sold. It is abandoning its expansion plans in Canada and taking its significant investment in this country elsewhere. It is doing so at a time when business investment in Canada has fallen by 5%, or \$12.7 billion, since 2015. During that same period, business investment in the United States has grown by 9%. Foreign direct investment plummeted by 42% in 2016, and then a further 27% in 2017.

Why is business investment so weak? There are many different reasons. One reason is all of the added red tape, the red tape piled on top of red tape in environmental assessments and reassessments. It has weakened investment in Canada, because Canadian businesses understand that they are facing rising costs, such as increased CPP and EI premiums, personal income taxes for entrepreneurs of over 53%, and, again, new carbon taxes.

Budget 2018 did not reveal exactly how much the carbon tax will cost the average Canadian. We have tried day after day in the House to get the Minister of Finance to tell us what that carbon tax is going to cost Canadian families, but he will not tell us.

Although the budget did not reveal how much, the Canadian Taxpayers Federation predicts that the carbon tax will cost \$2,500 per family at a time when taxpayers recognize they have less and less money in their pockets. Trevor Tombe of the University of Calgary estimates that it may cost \$1,100 per family. The Parliamentary Budget Officer recently released a report that found that the carbon tax will take \$10 billion out of the Canadian economy by 2022, while other estimates argue that the cost could be as much as \$35 billion per year. None of these numbers can be verified because, unfortunately, the Liberal government continues to refuse to tell Canadians exactly how much that carbon tax will cost them, just like they refused to tell us the total cost of the nationalization of the Trans Mountain pipeline.

Government Orders

What is the final cost of that pipeline? Is it \$4.5 billion for the assets of Trans Mountain today? What will those costs be by the time the pipeline is built, if it ever is built? We can ill afford the \$4.5 billion price tag, let alone the billions of dollars in untold costs, especially given our massive debt.

I would add that the finance minister has finally started to pick up on the Conservatives' talking points, because that \$12 million a day, or \$42 million a week, is the differential in the price for oil that we do not receive because we are not getting our oil to the Asian markets. This money could build a school or a hospital a day or a week.

In their first three years in power, the Liberals will have added \$60 billion to the national debt. Last year, Canada's net debt reached an all-time high of \$670 billion, or \$47,612 per Canadian family. The growing debt is a direct result of the Liberals' broken promises on their projected deficits. This fiscal year's deficit is \$18 billion, which is triple of what was promised.

In comparison, in our 10 years in government, we paid down the national debt. We took surpluses and paid down just under \$40 billion. However, during what was considered the worst recession since the Great Depression, we ran deficits. Although fundamentally opposed to debt and deficit spending, we realized, like every G7 country, that we needed to kick-start the economy. That was not enough for the Liberals or the NDP, but that is what we did. We invested in large infrastructure programs in Canada, the largest in Canadian history. With Canada's economic action plan, we got a significant return on this investment. We were the first G7 country to come out of the recession and back to growth.

I see that my time is up. I am thankful for the opportunity to speak on this budget implementation bill.

● (2225)

[Translation]

Ms. Linda Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I listened to my hon. colleague's speech with great interest, but I did not hear him talk about the 600,000 jobs that have been created in Canada since 2015.

I would like to hear my colleague's thoughts on the direct measure offered to SMEs. Their tax rate has been reduced from 11% in 2015 to 9% in 2019.

What kind of impact will that tax cut have on the SMEs in his riding?

[English]

Hon. Kevin Sorenson: Madam Speaker, when the Conservatives proposed the tax cut for small and medium-sized businesses, the Liberals initially opposed it. In the last election, the NDP signed onto that small business tax cut. The Liberals finally said they would do that too. In the first budget, in their first year, they did not do it. They gave us no sign they were ever going to do that. As a result of strong opposition by both the Conservatives and the NDP, the Liberals did put it in the budget, and we are thankful for that.

When we steal from Peter to pay Paul, we never have a problem with Paul; it is always Peter. The Liberals are simply taking money from small business. They say they are going to cut the small

business tax rate, but they are taking money away with the carbon tax. They are taking money away with the CPP premium increase. They are taking money away with an EI premium increase. The Liberals are simply taking money from one hand, putting it in their pocket, and claim to be giving back to small business. It is a shame.

[Translation]

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his intervention and for his many amendments, but we have to wonder what the Conservative strategy is here this evening. They moved 409 amendments to delete every clause of the bill, and yet among the clauses they want to delete, one of them provides the tax cut for SMEs that my colleague just mentioned.

Why did my colleague propose an amendment deleting the clause that provides a tax cut for SMEs and then contradict himself just now by asking for that very same tax cut for SMEs?

● (2230)

[English]

Hon. Kevin Sorenson: Madam Speaker, if we had more time tonight we would come up with more amendments. This is a bad budget. This whole budget should be put back on the shelf and started over again.

While I want to look forward and what we would continue to do, every once in a while, one has to look in the rear view mirror. When we were in power we cut the corporate tax rate from 22% to 15%. We were not going to watch head offices heading to the United States, so we lowered the corporate tax rate. We made Canada a place where Canadians wanted to invest, where they wanted to create jobs, where they wanted to have businesses, and we are seeing just the opposite today.

Manufacturing jobs are leaving Ontario and going to the United States or Mexico, and it is because of bad government here in Ottawa and at Queen's Park in Toronto by the Liberals there. That is why Canadians, especially those who live in Ontario, are saying they need a new government. They need hope. Here in the province of Ontario we hope that change will come with the Progressive Conservative Party, real true hope with a true future.

Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.): Madam Speaker, there is a different perspective on the Alberta.ca website, which states "Alberta's economic rebound surpassed expectations in 2017. The resurgence was broad-based, with nearly every sector of the economy expanding".

It says that real gross domestic product, GDP, grew at an estimated 4.5%; exports increased by nearly 30%; housing starts grew by 20%; and retail trade expanded by 7.5%.

Does the hon. member realize that his province is doing fantastically well, thanks to the changes we made in this budget?

Government Orders

Hon. Kevin Sorenson: Madam Speaker, I want to make sure I get his riding and name clear, because his quote will be in my householder. Albertans know that it is anything but what he stated. The future of Alberta looks great only because of Jason Kenney coming on the horizon. The future looks great because we have someone down the road who understands the importance of a pipeline, creating jobs, and putting people back to work. That is why Albertans are confident.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise tonight to speak to Bill C-74 at report stage. We have proposed a number of amendments, perhaps a more reasonable number than our Conservative colleagues did. I will go over our amendments, which seek to delete clauses 69, 73, 95, 97, 310, 316, 317, 324, and 329.

I would like to start by briefly describing the committee study of Bill C-74. The committee was given very little time to study this bill. We had to debate a 550-page bill at top speed, so we were unable to go into the details as thoroughly as every committee would surely have liked. The Liberal majority on the Standing Committee on Finance imposed time constraints on us, the same way it limits the amount of time we get to debate bills in the House.

Even so, we were able to come up with quite a few amendments that we hoped would go some way to improving the Liberal government's bill, which was clearly too timid. We had a few small victories, I will admit, but I will come back to those later. To sum up, during this study, we heard some interesting debates and some harsh criticism about certain aspects of the bill.

Again, we experienced something that happens far too often in committee, especially on the Standing Committee on Finance, where we are often asked to start studying a bill before it has actually been passed in the House, or, in the case of Bill C-74, before the House has even voted on it at second reading. It is almost as if the outcome were known in advance.

Other than that I think that we did constructive work. That is our main job as a constructive, progressive opposition, contrary to the other opposition parties that see their role differently. We on this side are a very constructive opposition.

The first amendment that we tried to make to the bill had to do with tax changes. We all heard about the Minister of Finance's reform. Well, the bottom line ended up in the minister's reform bill. We tried to make reasonable amendments to the implementation of the changes for the 2019 tax year, since the bill proposes tax measures will apply retroactively effective January 1, 2018. The NDP reasonably pointed out that it was not reasonable public policy to adopt retroactive tax measures. If the bill gets royal assent in June or July, it will have come into effect six months before it was passed. That is unacceptable. We tried to rectify the situation, but much to our party's chagrin, the Liberals opposed our efforts.

Medical cannabis is another important element of Bill C-74; it would establish an excise tax on cannabis products. Many witnesses that spoke to this issue were furious with the Liberal government, which has clearly indicated in this bill that it wants to tax medical cannabis. It did not even try to hide the fact that this flaw in the bill

means that cannabis will be more expensive for patients with a prescription when the bill comes into force.

The government refused to change the bill and to listen to reason. It is adamant that medical cannabis will be taxed. It could have chosen to create two separate regimes: one for recreational cannabis, which could be included in the same tax or excise regime for spirits, alcohol, and tobacco; and another for medical cannabis. Sadly, it refused.

• (2235)

The Liberals should have created a distinction for medical cannabis used by private users. Unfortunately, they refused to do so.

More than 10,000 Canadians wrote to the Standing Committee on Finance to criticize the Liberal government's approach. The bill only provides for exemption from excise duties and GST/HST if the cannabis has a drug identification number. This is not currently a reality, because it costs millions of dollars to get a medical drug approved in Canada. It is extremely long, tedious, and costly. Obviously that is a long way off.

We asked a number of questions and proposed amendments regarding all the changes to veterans' pensions. We are not completely convinced that the new veterans' pension plan proposed in Bill C-74 will be better than the current one. We asked the government to prove that these changes would truly benefit the majority of veterans, through an independent review conducted over the next few years. The government rejected this amendment.

We also proposed amendments on the whole issue of the carbon tax. Almost half of the bill has to do with this tax. We asked for more transparency in how the regime is enforced and about ensuring that industries pay for their pollution. We also asked for limits on the exemptions available to certain industries.

We did achieve one small victory that I want to mention. Under the bill, farmers would not have to pay the tax on fuel for farm machinery. In committee, we and some of the witnesses argued that fishers should also be eligible for an exemption for fuel used by their fishing boats. The Liberals rejected our amendment, then proposed a nearly identical one to do pretty much the same thing but with a few extra details. Maybe we can count that as a small victory.

We also sounded a very loud alarm about financial technology. That is why, at report stage today, we moved motions to delete clauses 310, 316, 317, 324, and 329 to get rid of all clauses related to financial technology.

Government Orders

The bill would enable banks to share and sell personal information about consumers, about their clients, to financial technology companies, such as those that sell insurance. We know that is happening more and more in the market. If this bill passes, banks will be able to buy what are known as financial technology companies, which sell insurance.

One of the most vocal opponents was the Canadian Association of Mutual Insurance Companies, which wanted to speak to this topic but was flatly denied that opportunity by the Minister of Finance. The association pointed out that this would jeopardize the long-standing separation between banks and insurance in Canada. We are worried that this could be the thin edge of the wedge. The committee did not have enough time to make sure these provisions are enough to protect the separation between banks and insurance companies.

We also asked a number of questions about enhancing the Canada pension plan, which we think could really use it, considering the whole issue of attribution of earnings. I may come back to that during questions and comments.

We also strongly denounced the government's lack of rigour in passing the last part of the bill, which we finally studied at 9:45 p.m. We had only 15 minutes left to complete the study and we were examining major changes to the Criminal Code at the Standing Committee on Finance. In 15 minutes, and with just one witness, we had to decide whether the changes were appropriate or not. Asking the Standing Committee on Finance to approve such important changes to the Criminal Code is proof of the government's complete lack of rigour. Many people were critical of that.

• (2240)

I am pleased to have had the opportunity to tell the members of the House what happened at committee. We remain strongly opposed to most of the clauses in Bill C-74.

Ms. Linda Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I listed to my hon. colleague carefully but I did not hear him talk about the Canada child benefit. I would like to hear his thoughts on the very positive effects of this measure, which was introduced in 2016 and will be enhanced. It is lifting children out of poverty and helping nine out of 10 Canadian families, for example by enabling them to enrol their kids in music lessons or sports programs.

What impact has this measure had in my colleague's riding since it was introduced in 2016 and as it continues to improve?

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault: Madam Speaker, I thought we were talking about Bill C-74. I realize that the indexation of the Canada child benefit is included in this bill. The NDP has not moved any amendments to remove that indexation, unlike the Conservatives, who want to delete every clause in the bill.

That being said, I have not been approached by a single constituent praising the merits of the Canada child benefit. What the committee heard about on a regular basis was the lack of universal affordable child care in Canada. Although Quebec has an excellent system, Canadians in the rest of the country struggle to find affordable child care. That is a recurring theme at the Standing Committee on Finance.

I just want my colleague to know that the lack of universal, affordable, high-quality child care is hindering our country's economic development and limiting women's participation in the workforce. That is a recurring theme, but the government is still doing nothing to address the issue.

• (2245)

[English]

Hon. Mike Lake (Edmonton—Wetaskiwin, CPC): Madam Speaker, I oftentimes disagree with my colleagues from the NDP, but I like to find common ground when we can. One of the things we found common ground on was during the election campaign, when both our parties ran on the idea of balanced budgets. Of course, roughly 60% of Canadians voted for a party that ran on a balanced budget platform. The other 40% voted Liberal, and they voted for a party that promised to balance the budget by 2019. We hear now from the Parliamentary Budget Officer that the budget will be balanced by 2045, at best.

I think back to a similar era, a Trudeau era, in the 1970s, when a prime minister Trudeau ran budget deficits in 14 out of 15 years. We paid the bill for those budget deficits in the mid-1990s with \$35 billion in cuts to health care, social services, and education. While the hon. member was probably not alive at that time, he can certainly understand the importance, I am sure, and maybe he would want to speak to the potential for future generations to be paying for these massive, unplanned Liberal budget deficits.

[Translation]

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault: Madam Speaker, I want to thank the member for giving me an opportunity to talk about the highly progressive fiscal framework we proposed in 2015. Our vision was to make bold investments for the future while raising the revenue we needed to finance top-notch programs. Unfortunately, that vision may not be shared by the Conservatives.

That said, the government's budget documents show that public debt charges will shoot up in the coming years, increasing from \$28 billion to about \$35 billion. I do not have the figures with me today because I had not been expecting this question. That \$35 billion a year is going straight into the pockets of Canadian and foreign banks and high-finance executives. In our opinion, that money is not going to the right place.

Interest rates will keep going up, which is why, according to the government's budget projections, \$35 billion a year will soon be lining the pockets of the big bankers and financiers of the world.

Ms. Linda Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to speak this evening. I would like to acknowledge those watching and following the debate on the budget at such a late hour. I am sure that they will be pleased to hear me speak to Bill C-74, budget implementation act, 2018, No. 1. This bill implements certain measures from budget 2018.

I will be talking about the EI system. I want to focus on a measure that I think is very important for Canadians, the modernization of the rules around working while on claim.

Government Orders

We want to improve the working while on claim pilot project. The provisions of working while on claim help claimants stay connected to the labour market by encouraging them to accept available work and earn extra income, while receiving employment insurance benefits. Under the rules of the current pilot project, claimants can keep half of their benefits for every dollar earned up to a maximum of 90% of the weekly insurable earnings. This pilot project is ending at the end of August 2018.

We intend to make amendments to the Employment Insurance Act in order to make the rules for the current pilot project permanent by default. To implement this measure, we plan to spend almost \$352 million over five years, beginning in 2018-19, and \$80 million every year after that.

We will also put in place transitional provisions for those claimants who have chosen, under the current pilot project, to revert back to the rules of the former pilot project launched in 2005. The claimants will continue to benefit from these optional rules until August 2021, which will give them three years to adapt to the new permanent rules.

We want to include maternity and sickness benefits. These provisions already apply to parental and caregiving benefits, but they do not currently apply to maternity and sickness benefits.

Canadians who wish to stage their return to work after an illness or the birth of a child have limited flexibility to do so without jeopardizing their EI benefits. Extending the new working while on claim benefits to maternity and sickness benefits will give affected Canadians greater flexibility. They will be able to keep a good part of their EI benefits if they wish to prepare to return to work.

The measures I just mentioned benefit all employment insurance claimants, including seasonal workers.

I will now talk about support for seasonal workers. Our government is aware of seasonal workers' concerns and the difficulties that some of them are having. That is why we announced a series of measures in budget 2018 to help ensure that unemployed workers in seasonal industries have access to the supports they need when they need them most.

First, we are allocating \$10 billion from existing departmental resources to provide immediate income support and training to affected workers. In that regard, we are developing agreements with key provinces, such as Quebec—where I proudly represent Rivière-des-Milles-Îles—New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island, to provide that money. Funding will be available as soon as an agreement is signed so that seasonal workers have access to programs and support as quickly as possible.

We have already signed a \$2.5-million agreement with the Government of New Brunswick. That additional funding will allow the province to offer seasonal workers seven weeks of work experience, workplace essential skills training, or general essential skills training with income support. Support will be offered to workers in the fishery, the agricultural industry, the forestry industry, and the tourism industry in the most affected areas of New Brunswick. I hope that there are people from New Brunswick listening to us this evening.

Other agreements will be announced soon.

Our government is also proposing to invest \$80 million in 2018-19 and \$150 million in 2019-20 and to work with the provinces in order to come up with local solutions to help seasonal workers.

● (2250)

We will be using the tools available to us, such as labour market development agreements. Together, we will find solutions that will help better adapt the employment insurance system to regional market conditions. Canada is vast and its regions differ from one another. It is important to be able to adjust to the different regions.

In closing, since being elected, we have set out to improve the employment insurance system to bring it more into line with the realities of today's workforce, since we want it to serve workers and employers. The legislative changes I just talked about are part of that commitment, and passing Bill C-74 is the next step toward achieving our objective.

I strongly recommend that all my colleagues in the House support this bill so that we can continue to support Canadian workers and families and, by extension, the middle class and those working hard to join it.

BILL C-74—NOTICE OF TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I regret to inform the House that an agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Orders 78(1) or 78(2) concerning the proceedings at the report stage and the third reading stage of Bill C-74, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 27, 2018 and other measures.

Pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 78(3), I give notice that a minister of the crown will propose at the next sitting a motion to allot a specific number of days or hours for the consideration and disposal of proceedings at the said stages.

● (2255)

[English]

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the member's contribution in this place. We all want to see good things happen in this country. However, the minister has given notice that fewer members of Parliament will be able to speak to an important piece of legislation. Given what we have just heard, how does the member feel about the fact that other members of Parliament, even in her own party, will be denied the ability to speak to the budget implementation bill? Again, there are over 20 divisions.

Government Orders

First of all, does she support cutting off debate in this way? Second, whatever happened to the commitment by the Liberals to allow full scrutiny of omnibus legislation? In fact, they originally said that they would not conduct omnibus budget legislation. She can answer those two things.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Linda Lapointe: Madam Speaker, I must say that I am quite frankly surprised by my colleague's comments. On the other side of the aisle today, they tried to adjourn the debate to stop us from sitting. Now I am talking about our budget, which is amazing. I do not understand. We absolutely must talk about our budget. I did not hear my colleague ask any questions about the 600 jobs that have been created since 2015, since we came to power. He did not mention that. I am sure that the Canada child benefit is making a huge difference. This \$600 per child every month, across Canada, is generating unbelievable economic growth—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order.

[*English*]

I just want to remind members that there is no going back and forth. The hon. member who asked the question had the opportunity to ask the question without interruption, and I would hope that he will ensure that he provides that respect back.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, it is an honour to rise tonight in this place to ask questions about the budget implementation bill. I appreciate that the hon. member did not speak to this specifically, but I keep waiting to see a budget bill from the current government that encompasses the climate action of budget 2005.

The current Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness was then the minister of finance. The hon. members of the Liberal Party can speak with the Minister of Public Safety about why budget 2005 included so many more actions that reduced greenhouse gases than the budget we have before us today. I wonder if my hon. colleague across the way has any thoughts as to why this budget would do so little to reduce greenhouse gases.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Linda Lapointe: Madam Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's question.

I am so proud to be part of a government that links economic growth with sustainable development, that is ensuring that we control greenhouse gases, and that will meet the Paris targets. We are clearly working very hard to manage the environment and we are definitely headed in the right direction.

[*English*]

Hon. Mike Lake (Edmonton—Wetaskiwin, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am going to ask two questions and give the hon. member the option to answer one or the other.

Here is one promise that was made in the Liberal platform in 2015: “After the next two fiscal years, the deficit will decline and our investment plan will return Canada to a balanced budget in 2019.” I am asking when that will happen.

The second promise that I want to read from the Liberal platform was just brought up by my hon. colleague here. The promise was regarding omnibus bills. It stated, “We will change the House of Commons Standing Orders to bring an end to this undemocratic practice.” When will that happen?

I want to give the hon. member the option to answer one of those two questions.

• (2300)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Linda Lapointe: Madam Speaker, my reply to my hon. colleague is that we are now going to achieve a goal that has eluded us for 40 years. In fact, Canada has the best debt-to-GDP ratio of all G7 countries. We have not seen that in 40 years.

[*English*]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise today to speak to the budget implementation bill. In particular, today I will be focusing my comments on the carbon pricing system that the government is proposing to put in place.

Our government is taking very seriously the challenges and opportunities presented by the threat of climate change and the evolution of clean growth. We have already announced historic investments in public transit, green infrastructure, and clean innovation, as well as a plan to put a price on carbon pollution across the country.

Canadians know that pollution is not free. In recent years, Canadians have encountered more frequent and extreme weather events, such as forest fires and floods. Disasters have cost billions of dollars in damages to taxpayers. As the climate changes, this will only get worse. Many people have lost homes and businesses.

For the last decade, the party opposite refused to act on climate change, and some outright denied that it was even real. In failing to implement a credible plan, they put our environment and our economy in jeopardy.

Today, we can no longer drag our feet. We need to act, and that is exactly what we are doing.

A central pillar of the plan is a price on pollution, which is widely recognized as one of the most efficient ways to curb greenhouse gas emissions. It also encourages people and businesses to save money and make cleaner choices, such as better insulating their homes and upgrading to more efficient equipment. As a result, carbon pricing is a foundation of Canada's clean growth and climate action plan. Pricing pollution has a track record of success in the world and here in Canada, where it has helped us tackle problems, such as acid rain, while supporting clean growth and innovation. A price on carbon is already in effect in nearly half the world's economy.

Government Orders

New analysis by Environment and Climate Change Canada confirms that a price on pollution across Canada would significantly reduce carbon pollution while maintaining a strong and growing economy. The study found that carbon pricing could reduce carbon pollution by up to 90 million tonnes across Canada in 2022, as much as taking 26 million cars off the road or shutting down more than 20 coal plants. Carbon pricing would make a substantial contribution to Canada's 2030 target, but it is not the only thing we are doing to cut emissions. Canada's climate plan includes many other measures that work together with carbon pricing to reduce pollution.

The study also found that GDP growth would remain strong with a nationwide price on carbon pollution. Canada's GDP is expected to grow by approximately 2% per year between now and 2022, with or without carbon pricing.

This does not include the huge opportunity of clean innovation. Carbon pricing would help Canadian companies create jobs and compete successfully in the global shift to cleaner growth, an opportunity the World Bank estimates will be worth \$23 trillion globally between now and 2030.

More than 80% of Canadians already live in jurisdictions with carbon pricing in place. Our approach recognizes the actions already taken by B.C., Alberta, Ontario, and Quebec. Those provinces had the strongest economic growth in the country last year. The pan-Canadian approach builds on the leadership taken by these jurisdictions and provides all provinces and territories the flexibility to implement the type of system that suits their circumstances. It also sets some common criteria to ensure that the price on pollution is fair and effective across the country.

To ensure that a price on carbon pollution is in place across Canada, the government committed to develop and implement a federal carbon pricing system in any province or territory that requests it, or that does not have a carbon pricing system that meets the federal standard.

Today, governments pricing carbon pollution in B.C., Alberta, Quebec, and Ontario use the revenues in a variety of ways. They can return money directly to households and businesses, cut taxes, or fund programs that reduce the cost of clean technology.

● (2305)

Provinces and territories have until September 1 to confirm their carbon pricing approach. Direct revenue from the application of the federal carbon pricing backstop will remain in the jurisdiction of origin.

In 2017, the four provinces with carbon pricing systems in place, which were British Columbia, Alberta, Ontario and Quebec, were also the top four performers in GDP growth across the country. That is the result of a long list of factors, but anyone who says carbon pricing hurts economies is not basing their argument on the evidence.

Since 2007, British Columbia's carbon tax has reduced emissions by between 5% to 15%. Meanwhile, provincial real GDP grew by more than 17% between 2007 and 2015, and per capita gasoline demand dropped by 15% over that period. British Columbia's growing clean technology sector now brings in an estimated \$1.7 billion in annual revenue. We see the same results in other countries.

In Sweden, which has the world's highest carbon tax at 137 euros per tonne, GDP and industry have grown while emissions have dropped.

In addition to estimating the costs, it is important to consider the benefits of reducing pollution. This includes the avoided costs of climate change, the long-term financial benefits of transitioning to a cleaner economy, and the benefits that may flow from innovations driven by carbon pricing.

Pollution from coal power plants results in health issues that cost the health care system over \$800 million annually, according to a study from 2014.

Canadian businesses already know that carbon pricing makes good sense and will help to ensure that they remain competitive in the emerging low-carbon economy. Carbon pollution pricing helps Canadian companies to create jobs and compete successfully in the global shift toward clean growth, an opportunity that the World Bank estimates will be worth \$23 trillion globally between now and 2030.

About 85% of the Canadian economy is already subject to a carbon pricing system, and every province has committed to adopt some form of carbon pricing.

Canada is creating a business environment that will strengthen and grow the clean economy. Success stories include CarbonCure, a business that retrofits concrete plants with a technology to recycle carbon dioxide to make stronger, greener concrete; and Solar Vision, a Quebec-based business providing solar lighting technologies; and many more examples.

The impacts of a changing climate are already being felt. From 1983 to 2004, insurance claims in Canada from severe weather events totalled almost \$400 million a year. In the past decade, that amount tripled to more than \$1 billion per year. Canadians expect polluters to pay because it is the right thing to do for our kids and grandkids.

We know that the costs of inaction are much greater than the costs of taking action now. Taking strong action to address climate change is a critical and urgent step, and making sure there is a carbon price across the country is a matter of fairness for all Canadians.

Canadians deserve a plan that spurs innovation and creates well-paying middle-class jobs. They deserve a serious, smart, and thoughtful plan to protect the environment and grow the economy, and that is exactly what this government is delivering.

I would also like to add that I very much appreciate the participation by the Minister of Innovation and Science in today's debate and for making sure that all of the relevant points in my speech were highlighted effectively.

Government Orders

• (2310)

Mr. Alupa Clarke (Beauport—Limoilou, CPC): Madam Speaker, I would ask the member for West Nova to be a reasonable person. I do not know how many times he said that we need to address climate change in a serious way. I am sure he listened to me tonight when I mentioned all of the programs that we put together, like the Canada EcoTrust for \$1.5 billion, which represented great federal co-operation with the province in reducing gas emissions.

The member has recited many numbers from the IMF, the World Bank, and the United Nations. Could he give us a number from his government as to how much the Liberal carbon tax will cost each family? He has cited numbers from all of those international organizations, but he is part of a government that has numbers hidden somewhere. How much is the Liberal carbon tax going to cost each family? Can we know this number, please?

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, if the opposition has been listening since this debate started, it will know that the manner in which people are going to be taxed, the manner in which the price on carbon is going to be introduced, is going to be based on an agreement between a province and the federal government. It is going to be different in each jurisdiction.

Furthermore, it all depends on how the money is going to be used. If the province decides to give that money back and cut cheques to people, it will be neutral. It all depends on how the province decides and plans to use the money. That point has been made over and over again. I know the opposition wants to continue to ask the question, because it thinks it is going to get the “gotcha” moment at some point, but the reality of the situation is that it is as clean and clear as that. It comes down to how the provinces decide to use the funds they generate.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech.

He is very energetic and passionate at this late hour, and that is to his credit. However, I would like to ask him a very specific question. The member for Sherbrooke spoke about this earlier today.

How is it that a government that wants to legalize marijuana is planning to tax people with prescriptions for medical marijuana?

The government is going to increase the fees and sometimes even the cost of marijuana, even though it is the only drug that works to assuage some people's persistent pain. Sometimes medication does not work and marijuana is the only thing that does. In recent months, desperate people have been coming to my office and asking for the Liberal government to listen to reason. They are saying that their costs are going to skyrocket and that they might have to go without the one drug that helps them because the Liberals want to tax it.

[*English*]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, I appreciate the fact that we are debating the budget, so the questions will be on the entirety of the budget. My remarks today were specifically on the price on carbon. However, when it comes to the price of medicine and the costs associated with that, the government has a clear position on what it is going to do and how it is going to move forward. We are going to look at pharmacare. We are going to look at how we can

make it affordable for people to get access to the medicines they need. It is preliminary to suggest how that will come out as it relates to medical marijuana, but I am certainly interested in seeing the results that come forward from the task force that has been set up to undertake that.

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster, CPC): Madam Speaker, I know we are hearing lots about carbon pricing, the carbon tax, and all this fun stuff. Where is the respect for provincial jurisdiction? I come from a province that has a climate change plan, and it is not being respected. The government is forcing a carbon tax on the people of Saskatchewan. I just want to know if he is proud of the lack of respect the government has for provincial jurisdiction.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, there is respect. The respect is shown in the way in which the federal government is choosing to engage with the provinces in terms of setting up that price on carbon and how that money is going to be translated and used within the province. When it comes to certain issues, one of those being the effect on the environment nationally, the role of the federal government is to set policy and set direction and to then work with the provinces to implement that and see how they want to use the revenues they are going to be receiving from that.

• (2315)

Mr. Pat Kelly (Calgary Rocky Ridge, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is always a pleasure to rise in this place. It is a tremendous honour and privilege to represent the constituents of Calgary Rocky Ridge. Many of the constituents of Calgary Rocky Ridge have very strong feelings on the budget.

It is no mystery that our party is opposed to it. We are opposed to the budget implementation act. Notwithstanding the 400-odd amendments that have been introduced and suggested, we will do what we can to try to salvage something from it. We will see how it goes with the amendments. However, I do not think any number of amendments could possibly salvage the budget in total. I am rather down on the budget, as are most of the constituents whom I have spoken to about it.

There are several key aspects of the budget that really still need to be addressed.

When the budget came out, the book was about 400 pages long. The budget implementation act is similar in length. Nowhere in any of these documents will we see the words “balanced budget”. One might ask if that is important or is it an issue. It is important for two reasons.

First, it is prudent management to eventually either have a balanced budget or some kind of a plan toward a balanced budget. All 10 provinces and all three territorial governments are either currently running a balanced budget or have a clearly articulated plan and path toward a balanced budget. The only jurisdiction, the only government in Canada that does not have any type of plan whatsoever for a balanced budget is the federal government. The only finance minister in Canada among all the provincial and territorial governments, including the federal government, who does not have a plan for a balanced budget is the federal finance minister. That is disappointing for its own sake, or even just on the point of policy alone.

Government Orders

Why this is particularly disappointing is that the government ran on a very clear promise. On page 12 of the Liberal platform in the 2015 election, it states:

We will run modest short-term deficits of less than \$10 billion in each of the next two fiscal years to fund historic investments in infrastructure and our middle class. After the next two fiscal years, the deficit will decline and our investment plan will return Canada to a balanced budget in 2019.

The Liberals promised no more than \$10 billion in deficits. They promised to return to a balanced budget in 2019. This was not something they tucked away in some obscure part of their platform in hopes that nobody would notice. This is something they took to the doors. They said that there would be a modest deficit only to facilitate the infrastructure spending they had planned.

I want to depart from that for one moment and raise how the Liberals' infrastructure plan is going along. Not too long ago the Prime Minister made his first visit to Calgary in quite some time. He came to make a historic spending announcement while he was there in the name of the Liberals' infrastructure plan, \$1.53 billion for the green line, an important infrastructure piece for the city of Calgary. It is a critical piece of infrastructure. The only problem is that these funds had been committed and announced by the previous government. The Liberals fly around the country re-announcing projects that were already announced in some cases, like this one, before they were even elected, taking credit for them, and expecting extraordinary credit for the projects. I do not want to digress too far. However, the point is that the budget is a broken election promise.

• (2320)

The Liberals promised no more than \$10 billion in deficits and a return to a balanced budget by 2019. The finance minister will not acknowledge in any way that these commitments were made and ignores all questions put to him, including at committee, where he was asked repeatedly when the budget would be balanced. He ignored these questions.

That alone is enough reason to render the budget and its implementation act unworthy of support, but I want to move briefly to the carbon tax. The previous speaker devoted his time to a defence of the carbon tax. Let us even set aside the arguments for and against a tax on carbon; what about evidence-based policy and what about transparency and openness with Canadians?

The government refuses to tell Canadians what the tax will cost. Surely that is a minimum standard to which the government could hold itself, to just simply be honest with Canadians and share what the tax is going to cost as the Liberals compel provinces to adopt it—some of them against their will, some of them in contravention of their own climate change strategies that they have developed through carbon capture, such as the Province of Saskatchewan—without telling Canadians what this tax will cost them and while claiming that it is revenue neutral.

“Do we not know what revenue neutral means?” a member asked in an earlier debate on this. Most Canadians know that “revenue neutral” is code for “it is really going to cost us a whole bunch”, and Liberals will not tell us how much. The first part of revenue neutral that is flagrantly false is that there will be GST on the carbon tax that the federal government is going to collect. That is not revenue

neutral. That is a tax on the tax, which the federal government is going to keep.

As for the latitude that the government says it is leaving provinces to decide how they will deal with the carbon tax, that is not revenue neutral to a family. If a family has to pay more tax on all the normal things that families spend money on, such as gasoline to get to work or to take their children to school, it does not matter whether they put gasoline in a car and drive a child to school or whether they pay the bus fee for their child; this tax would apply to all of them.

The tax puts giant holes in municipal governments' budgets, because municipalities have to pay this tax. They have to pay the tax when they fuel their buses so people can take public transit. They still have their cost increased and they still have to pay the carbon tax. Heating homes in a cold country and transportation are things that Canadians spend money on, and they are made more expensive by the carbon tax. I wish the government would please just spare us this talk of revenue neutrality, because it is not washing with Canadians. It really does not make any sense.

Perhaps the Prime Minister came closest to his true feelings when he encouraged Canadians to “make better choices” or change behaviour when people asked how they are going to be able to afford to fill their car with gas so they can go to work.

On page 290 of the budget, the finance minister basically took credit for pipelines that were yet to be built, such as the Trans Mountain expansion. The finance minister acknowledged the differential and the significant discount that Canadians receive for their energy products because of a shortage in pipeline and said that the revenue should improve because new pipe is going to reduce the differential.

• (2325)

Here we are. The pipeline is not any closer to being built. We just spent \$4.5 billion on an old pipeline, without even finding out what the cost is going to be to build the new pipeline and deal with all the obstacles that were preventing it from being built by Kinder Morgan. The Liberals' own budget projections rely on new tax revenue that will result from a pipeline that is not even built yet.

Mr. Terry Duguid (Parliamentary Secretary for Status of Women, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would acknowledge that back in 2006, and I remember it well, the finance minister of the day left a \$13-billion surplus, and the country was in deficit with the Harper government before the recession hit. Fast forward a few years, and the Harper government created a fake surplus by massively cutting veterans' organizations and women's organizations. That government closed status of women organizations and offices across the country. We know that they sold auto shares at a loss.

Government Orders

The hon. member spoke about evidence and evidence-based decision-making. Would he acknowledge those facts?

Mr. Pat Kelly: Madam Speaker, I would caution the member on his assertion that many of the things he said are facts. I will point out to the member that we have heard this, usually not on the record and usually in heckles that occasionally come across from the other side, about the massive deficits that were incurred. We know that the Liberals, when they were in opposition, threatened to bring down the government because the deficit that was on offer to deal with an unprecedented financial crisis, in conjunction with our G7 partners, was not a big enough deficit for them. They were going to bring down the government, because the deficit was not big enough. They wanted the biggest deficit possible at the time.

I will take no lessons from the Liberals on deficits.

Mr. Wayne Stetski (Kootenay—Columbia, NDP): Madam Speaker, over the last two and a half years, we have talked a lot in the House about the need for pay equity and equality for women. This budget is called a gender and growth budget. I am wondering whether my colleague finds it curious that despite that title, gender and growth, there is very little in the bill. Would the Conservatives agree that we need pay equity now?

Mr. Pat Kelly: Madam Speaker, the member brought up the issue of the budget's theme and title. What a cynical and disingenuous title and theme it is for a budget. It is insulting and condescending. It mentions the word gender some 400 times throughout, yet it imposes new taxes on women that many observers have pointed out will perhaps be disproportionately paid by women.

The shameless pandering of that party through the use of buzz words and distraction is indeed disappointing.

Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.): Madam Speaker, in a previous question, I indicated, from Alberta.ca, the incredible success Alberta is seeing in the growth of its economy and the growth of its retail sector and exports.

In his presentation, the hon. member spoke about the carbon pricing program in Alberta. I want to draw to his attention that a family of four—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. If I am having trouble hearing the question, it is a problem, and it is a problem as well for the person who will have to answer the question, which I know he is very capable of. Instead of having discussions back and forth between other MPs, they should wait and stand to ask questions, if they wish.

Could the hon. member for Guelph please wrap it up?

Mr. Lloyd Longfield: Madam Speaker, a family of four with an annual income of \$95,000 will receive a \$540 tax cut in a situation where they paid \$500, so they will actually get more money back as a result of the carbon pricing program.

Would the hon. member not agree that the people of Alberta are creating tremendous growth in their province and succeeding with the tax benefits through the carbon program?

• (2330)

Mr. Pat Kelly: Madam Speaker, that member is tonight hitting it out of the park. We can clip his comments and put them into our householders and our next election material.

My province has been through a devastating economic collapse. When we drop anything from high enough, it will bounce a little bit when it hits the bottom.

Mr. Dan Ruimy (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise in this House today to discuss Bill C-74, Budget Implementation Act, 2018, No. 1.

It is no secret that with our 2018 budget, our government has committed to putting people first and ensuring equal opportunity and fairness for all Canadians. Part of that commitment means taking steps forward to advancing equality, especially for women. This is not only the right thing to do but also the smart thing to do, because we know that equality between Canadian women and men will lead to greater prosperity for all Canadians.

We are doing this through a number of initiatives, including introducing a new employment insurance parental sharing benefit to support more equal parenting roles, as well as other initiatives to support greater participation of women in the workforce. We will also be putting forward proactive pay equity legislation to ensure that women and men in the federally regulated public and private sectors receive equal pay for work of equal value. These are just some of the budget 2018 measures aimed at promoting greater gender equality in Canada.

It should also be noted that in the spirit of putting people first, we are also taking steps to improve how our government delivers its services to all Canadians. We understand that Canadians expect services to be high quality, accessible, secure, and digitally enabled.

When it comes to the services provided by Employment and Social Development Canada, more commonly known as ESDC, we strive to meet and exceed those expectations. Since taking office, our government has listened to Canadians and worked hard to ensure that they get the best services possible. These efforts are reflected in the investments made in each of our budgets, and this budget is no different.

Budget 2018 will enable ESDC to explore modern approaches to service delivery, beginning with employment insurance. This budget committed to providing stable and predictable funding of up to \$90 million over three years, starting in 2018-19, for employment insurance claims processing and service delivery for all Canadians.

Government Orders

Building on earlier investments, we have proposed an additional \$127.7 million over three years to sustain service capacity and improve accessibility to call centre agents so that Canadians can receive timely and accurate information and assistance with their EI benefits. These services and channels are vital to Canadians, and it is of the utmost importance that we support a modern service delivery system that functions smoothly and works for all.

In budget 2018, we promised to make significant new investments to bolster federal government operations. We made this promise because we want to ensure that all Canadians receive the services they need and deserve, especially people from more vulnerable populations. This includes doing more to better serve indigenous peoples in Canada. That is why we committed to providing funding to help more indigenous peoples access the full range of federal social benefits, including the Canada child benefit, the Canada pension plan, and old age security. We will be accomplishing this by expanding outreach efforts to indigenous communities, and by conducting pilot outreach activities for urban indigenous communities.

We also know that Canadians rely on a broad range of supports in their communities. To make sure that people get the help they need, the Government of Canada provides funding to organizations across the country that deliver social services to Canadians. We are talking about services provided to vulnerable populations such as indigenous peoples, low-income Canadians, LGBTQ2 Canadians, newcomers, seniors, and persons with disabilities.

As announced in our latest budget, we will reallocate \$7.8 million over five years to increase awareness and understanding of available funding, and help organizations that serve vulnerable populations build much needed capacity.

With Bill C-74, we are also making important amendments to the Department of Employment and Social Development Act that will improve how Service Canada serves Canadians. Each year, ESDC spends more than \$122 billion on programs and services for Canadians. That includes employment insurance payments, the Canada pension plan, old age security, the guaranteed income supplement, and an additional \$1.9 billion dollars in grants and contributions.

• (2335)

Service Canada is an important partner in this work. Currently, the Department of Employment and Social Development Act provides Service Canada with the authority to deliver only ESDC programs and services. It does not provide for Service Canada to deliver other federal government programs and services or for delivery partnerships. Simply put, it just does not make sense.

We want to make sure that Canadians can benefit from a service delivery model that is better integrated so that they can more easily access the full range of federal services available to them. We can accomplish this by allowing other departments to use the Service Canada network.

Right now, for this to happen, the government must provide authority on a case-by-case basis. This approach hinders ESDC's ability to carry out its current service delivery responsibilities and to respond to evolving partnership opportunities. The changes we are

proposing in Bill C-74 will fix this. The bill proposes to give Service Canada the authority to provide services to the public on behalf of partners, including federal government institutions and other levels of government. Specifically, Bill C-74 proposes to clarify accountability between ESDC and service partners related to the management of Canadians' personal information.

The bill would also allow ESDC and service partners to recognize and use the Canada Revenue Agency's business number to manage business identity and allow ESDC to recover costs from and spend revenues on behalf of service delivery partners. For Canadians and Canadian businesses, this will mean better and more convenient access to the services they need.

The proposed amendments we are seeking through Bill C-74 would broaden the minister's mandate to provide service delivery for partners and help deliver better services to Canadians, including online services. With these changes, ESDC will be able to partner with federal institutions, provinces, territories, municipalities, and specified indigenous organizations without holding up the services that Canadians need and deserve.

I encourage all members of the House to support Bill C-74 and the much-needed amendments to the Department of Employment and Social Development Act. Let us continue to ensure that Canadians receive the kind of services they deserve: high-quality, accessible, secure, and digitally enabled.

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Madam Speaker, I certainly appreciate my fellow member from British Columbia and his presentation tonight. It is always good to have different views on these subjects.

The member mentioned at the beginning of his speech that he was in support of a benefit that would allow for a spouse to extend benefits to encourage both partners to spend time with their child in its first year. However, the leader of the official opposition, the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle, has put forward a private member's bill that would allow a couple to retain more of their income. It would also allow a single parent who is struggling to raise a child by herself or himself to be able to do so.

However, the benefit that the member mentioned would do absolutely nothing for single parents. Does he not think there should be more supports for couples at that very important time, and will he vote for the leader of the official opposition's private member's bill?

Mr. Dan Ruimy: Madam Speaker, what my colleague on the other side fails to recognize is the effect of the Canada child benefit. It far outweighs the program you are referring to.

Government Orders

• (2340)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I would remind the member that he is to address comments and questions to the Chair.

Mr. Dan Ruimy: Madam Speaker, the Canada child benefit has been proven to give more benefits to families with children. That is real action. That is what parents and families need to have to be able to get along today in this country.

Mrs. Karen Vecchio (Elgin—Middlesex—London, CPC): Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague. It is always a joy to listen to you.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I want to remind members to address questions and comments to the Chair. I know it is getting late, but I am sure they can do it.

Mrs. Karen Vecchio: Madam Speaker, the Liberals will be putting \$17.3 million into indigenous outreach when it comes to tax filing. This has a lot to do with the Canada child benefit and those types of things. We know the importance of lifting children out of poverty, and we recognize, from the HUMA committee, which the member sits on, that the indigenous community is a very vulnerable group.

How is the government planning on being respectful to taxpayers? I recognize that this is a very important group, but how are we going to have measurements on this to make sure that the \$17.3 million to get people to file their taxes is going to hit the target? I find this an excessive amount for people to just file their taxes.

Mr. Dan Ruimy: Madam Speaker, to answer this question, we have to look at the challenge. What we found in HUMA, for instance, was that a lot of vulnerable populations were not even aware of some of the programs that were available to them. Part of this budget will be used to educate the indigenous populations and the vulnerable populations that they actually have access to programs and funds. That is what is more important.

We know that seniors have to apply for their OAS and GIS benefits, and a lot of them do not. This is one of the programs we are hoping to fix in this budget.

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is indeed an honour to rise again and join the debate on Bill C-74.

Before I wrote my speech, I wanted to do a bit of research to remind myself exactly what the Prime Minister had promised regarding the use of omnibus bills. An interesting thing occurred.

When I googled the name of the Prime Minister and then used the word “promise”, the search screen auto-filled with a massive number of different promises from the Prime Minister. Guess what? They were all broken promises, every single one of them, because that is what the Prime Minister seems to do. He promises things he clearly has no intention of delivering on, and this is no different. Allow me to repeat this one. He said, “Stephen Harper has also used omnibus bills to prevent Parliament from properly reviewing and debating his proposals.” The Prime Minister promised his Liberal government would “bring an end to this undemocratic practice”, yet here we are. The Prime Minister is doing the complete opposite of what he promised he would do.

A constituent of mine recently suggested that the Prime Minister was basically a real-life Pinocchio. That comment troubles me. When we look Canadians sincerely in the eyes and we promise something that we have zero intention of delivering on, how do we let that go? How do we say “That’s okay”?

Here is a case in point. Over in the finance committee, we were reviewing this omnibus bill as best we could. Lo and behold, what did we find buried in it? We found legislation that proposed to modify the Criminal Code so white-collar crime might more easily go unpunished. Seriously, why is that in there?

I have defended governments because of the complex state and wanting to do things. Sometimes they have to be able to change multiple pieces of legislation so an omnibus bill may be okay. For example, paying the remuneration for justices probably can be added in as a measure because I do not believe there would be time, respectful of the House, to table that. I have defended the previous government and I have given the current government a lot on that as well. However, here is the thing. The Liberal members of the finance committee had absolutely no idea this corporate crime get out of jail for free clause was in the budget implementation act.

I have a great amount of respect for my fellow members of the finance committee on the government side. We have a productive and good relationship. I am proud of that fact even though we found this questionable clause. At the same time, it concerns me greatly that the Liberal government is proposing serious changes like this. Not only do the Liberals try to hide it in a budget implementation bill, they do not even tell their own caucus about it.

Who is really calling the shots and running the government? Why would it keep its own caucus in the dark? To be fair, I am not going to say that the Liberals are soft on corporate crime or that the secret payoff is intended to help Liberal corporate insider friends, but others are saying these exact things. In the absence of information there is misinformation. When something is intentionally hidden from view, people will speculate there must be a reason it is hidden. These things undermine the integrity of our justice system when it comes to prosecuting white-collar corporate crime.

Government Orders

I will give the benefit of the doubt to the government here. I do not believe the intent of this proposed legislative change is to help out white-collar criminals. In fact, I am certain there are arguments to be made why some believe this measure is a good thing in helping crack down on white-collar crime. However, we will not be having that debate because this clause is not before the justice committee where it belongs. That, of course, is because someone in the Prime Minister's Office thought it was a good idea to bury this proposal in the budget implementation act instead of in a justice bill where it belongs.

Bill C-74 is a budget implementation act omnibus bill. Bill C-75 is a criminal justice reform omnibus bill of 300 pages. It makes no sense that the Liberals would put this provision in Bill C-74 unless they wanted to evade scrutiny. Not one single witness came to committee to talk about this. That is a failure, either of us as parliamentarians or because someone on the government side thought the Liberals could pull a fast one.

● (2345)

Before moving on, I would like to thank the members of the finance committee for the collective work we have done exposing this questionable piece of legislation. We do what we can, and we try to do a good job.

Another troubling aspect of the budget implementation bill is the fact that it does not place Canada on a path to a balanced budget by 2019. That is another broken promise by the Prime Minister, which begs the question why the Prime Minister made that promise in the first place. Is it because he believes that a balanced budget is a good thing, or because he believes that others think it is a good thing and he will basically say anything that would help him win votes? We do not know the answer to that question. However, it is not unlike the promise "While governments grant permits for resource development, only communities can grant permission." We all know how that broken promise is turning out, which leads to my next question.

Out of the blue, the Prime Minister promised to borrow another \$4.5 billion so he can politically control the timeline of the Kinder Morgan pipeline. Where exactly is this money coming from? It is a massive amount of money, yet it is not anywhere in the budget. Further assuming that the Prime Minister actually intends to build the Trans Mountain pipeline, it will surely cost another \$7 billion or more. Combined, that is over \$11 billion. That is more than the modest \$10-billion deficit the Prime Minister promised.

Nowhere in this budget document is that out-of-the-blue spending referred to. This is all so that the Prime Minister can buy himself out of another broken promise, while at the same time breaking other promises. It gets complicated. With so many broken promises, one begins to lose track. This is not unlike his \$7-billion slush fund, which the Parliamentary Budget Officer has said contains "incomplete information and weaker spending controls". That is \$7 billion of borrowed money, with zero information on how that money will be spent, and we are going into an election next year.

Meanwhile, the Liberal government is busy ramming through changes to the Elections Act that would limit what everyone else can spend pre-writ, except of course the Liberal government itself. How does anyone support that? Basically, we have a Prime Minister who has a well-documented history of being willing to promise anything

to anyone to win votes, who will be armed with the equivalent of a \$7-billion Visa card going into an election.

I have sympathy for the members opposite, because we all know that when anyone dares to vote against the Prime Minister on the Liberal side, there are serious consequences, despite those promises for free votes and sunny ways.

In closing, there is no possible way I can support the budget implementation bill. To be candid, I would have a hard time supporting it even if I sat on the government side of the House, because it breaks so many of the promises the Prime Minister made to Canadians, the same Prime Minister who, once upon a time, claimed he was worried about cynicism in Canadian politics.

I can think of no previous prime minister in the past few decades, since I started closely following federal politics, who has broken more promises to Canadians than the current Prime Minister. The most troubling part is that, more often than not, it is a "do as I say, not as I do" approach, much like this omnibus bill I will be voting against. It was bad when Stephen Harper did it as prime minister, but despite the fact that the current Prime Minister said he would bring an end to what he called an "undemocratic practice", in reality he has taken it to a whole new level. From my perspective, that is not right. I look forward to hearing the comments from all members in this place.

● (2350)

Mr. Steven MacKinnon (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Madam Speaker, we have 600,000 new jobs, most of them full time, and the lowest unemployment rate on record. Nine out of 10 families are better off under our Canada child benefit. Infrastructure is being built, including in the member's home region. This country is leading the G7 in growth, and the member dares compare this budget bill with budget bills of the past, bills that amended the Navigable Waters Protection Act and repealed the long-form census. He dares speak of omnibus legislation, when he is a member of the party that invented the term "omnibus legislation".

If this is not a budget he can support, what on earth could he support, what kind of budget?

Mr. Dan Albas: Madam Speaker, the word "omnibus" in terms of parliamentary procedure means anytime one seeks to amend more than two acts at one time. Any act that does that would be described as omnibus.

When we did omnibus bills, as we did with our economic action plan, we actually took the part of the legislation that amended the Fisheries Act, for example, and sent it to the fisheries committee. When we did things on the environment, we sent it to the environment committee. Why did the government not send that division 20 dealing with the deferred prosecution agreements to the justice committee? It is because it does not want the scrutiny.

Adjournment Proceedings

Lastly, when it comes to infrastructure, when we said we would do infrastructure, we did it. In Kelowna, where there are cost overruns happening in British Columbia, according to the article I read in the *Kelowna Capital News*, it is because there is so much infrastructure going to the same small amount of people who are to contract for it that it has caused inflation to go up.

When it comes to the jobs and the 40-year lows in the unemployment rate, that is because more people have left the job markets, according to the Parliamentary Budget Officer. When the government members say it is because of them, it is not. It is because people are getting older and retiring, or losing hope and not—

• (2355)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member for Mississauga—Erin Mills.

Ms. Iqra Khalid (Mississauga—Erin Mills, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I thank the member opposite for his very impassioned speech and his dedication to having open debate and prolonging debate. Why did he and his party try to kill the debate earlier today? Why not have had that dialogue and continue to talk about the issues that are important to Canadians?

Mr. Dan Albas: Madam Speaker, simply put, parliamentary democracy involves both the government trying to present an agenda and the opposition trying to question that agenda, and to use procedural tactics that are not available when one does not have a majority. As the opposition, obviously we will use tools to be able to raise dissent, just like we did last Friday when the government tried to move and change our schedule. We use the tools available to us.

If this member has the good fortune of being able to grace the opposition benches, and I hope she has it at some point, then she will begin to understand that these tools are for all parliamentarians to hold the government to account so that we have a better public policy process in the end, and not just to have the single will of one Prime Minister who is intent on breaking every promise he can. I really do hope that member will consider that before she ends up on this side.

Mr. Larry Maguire (Brandon—Souris, CPC): Madam Speaker, my colleague's speech was very accurate and definitive. Could he expand on the \$7 billion slush fund the government has? The economy looks like it is boiling along so well. Would he agree with me that the reason he probably does not hear any backlash from the backbenchers or the ministers in the government is that they all want a piece of that \$7 billion?

Mr. Dan Albas: Madam Speaker, I am going to try to finish on a positive note. I served as the parliamentary secretary to the President of the Treasury Board in the last Parliament. The Treasury Board has an important function to make sure that when spending happens in government, there is proper oversight. The problem is when parliamentarians in this chamber cannot evaluate what those direct expenditures are for what the government proposes. The changes proposed in that particular section would blur the lines. Remember this, we hold the responsibility of making make sure that the powers and privileges of this House are maintained for the next generation of parliamentarians. It is important that we do that by opposing that

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): As we resume debate, I want to advise the next speaker that, unfortunately, I

will have to stop the debate, but he will be able to continue at a later date.

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary for Status of Women.

Mr. Terry Duguid (Parliamentary Secretary for Status of Women, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is indeed a privilege to be the final speaker in these final few minutes of Tuesday, May 30. When it comes to Canada's economy and the environment, our government has been absolutely clear that we believe the two go hand in hand. Canadians understand that pollution is not free. They understand, as we do, that the most effective way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions is to put a price on carbon pollution.

That is why we introduced the greenhouse gas pollution pricing act, part of the budget implementation act currently before this House. By giving businesses and households an incentive to innovate more and pollute less, we are fulfilling our commitment to invest in growth while respecting and helping to protect our shared environment.

This approach, investing in growth that strengthens and grows our middle class and helps people who are working hard to join it, is already paying off. Let us take a look at the results of our plan so far. The parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Public Services highlighted some of these. Since the government was elected, more than 600,000 jobs have been created, most of them full-time. Canada's unemployment rate is at the lowest level we have seen in 40 years. Finally, since 2016, Canada has led the G7 in economic growth.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The next time this matter is before the House the member will have eight minutes and 40 seconds to finish his speech.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

• (2400)

[English]

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Mr. Wayne Stetski (Kootenay—Columbia, NDP): Madam Speaker, in February, I rose in the House to ask the government to strengthen the legislation regarding Gatineau Park by establishing the park's boundaries in law and enshrining ecological integrity as a top priority for the management of the park.

At that time, the Prime Minister indicated that the government would work with the National Capital Commission to do "everything we can to protect this beautiful wilderness area for generations to come." Unfortunately, thus far, those efforts have stopped short of the common sense measures I raised.

Adjournment Proceedings

This year marks 80 years since Gatineau Park was established. Gatineau is one of the most diverse regions in Quebec and has enormous ecological value. The park is home to 50 mammal species, 230 species of birds, 50 tree species, and some 1,000 species of vascular plants. The park is also home to 125 species of conservation concern, including the Blanding's turtle and the eastern wolf. Also, 80% of all eastern red cedar trees in Quebec are in Gatineau Park.

In addition to its many ecological benefits, Gatineau Park also makes a significant economic and social contribution to the national capital region, receiving more than 2.6 million visits per year. If any members of Parliament have not yet been to the park, I encourage them to do so. They may even get there by bicycle. I know because I did that last year.

According to a study conducted by the National Capital Commission, the park generated approximately \$241.5 million to the local economy from September 2015 to August 2016, including through such things as spending at local restaurants, on sports and recreational equipment or services, and on other shopping related to visiting the park.

It is clear that Gatineau Park has a special place in the hearts of many residents of our nation's capital region. However, despite all of its obvious benefits, the park does not have the same legislative protection as those afforded to our national parks system.

For nearly 50 years now, the Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society has been striving for stronger protections for Gatineau Park. Despite the park's ecological and social importance in this region, there are still no restrictions on development within the park. There are also no set borders for the park, meaning that its future is dependent upon whoever sits on the National Capital Commission Board at any given time.

While the boundaries of the park have been recognized through NCC policy and an order in council, they can still be amended without the same oversight as an act of Parliament would require for a national park. The NCC is renewing the park's master plan this year which is great, but there is no reason to wait until the master plan is complete to strengthen the park's legislative protections. These processes can occur in parallel.

The government has repeatedly reiterated its commitment to protecting 17% of our land by 2020. Rouge National Urban Park in the GTA has given us an example of what national park conservation in an urban environment can look like. Let us use this opportunity to follow that example and strengthen the legislative protections for Gatineau Park.

It is worth noting that at one time or another all parties have made commitments to protect Gatineau Park. Former NDP MP Nycole Turmel introduced a private member's bill in 2012 that would have established the park's boundaries in law and emphasized ecological protection in the management of the park. The Prime Minister and the Liberal party voted in favour of Ms. Turmel's bill when they were in the opposition.

When I raised this issue in February, the Prime Minister described Gatineau Park as "a true jewel in our national capital region." He went on to say, "We will continue to work...to ensure that we are doing everything we can to protect—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Unfortunately, the time is up.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage.

• (2405)

Mr. Sean Casey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for Kootenay—Columbia for the question and for his interest in Gatineau Park.

Gatineau Park is a stunning natural conservation area located just minutes from the centre of our nation's capital. As the Prime Minister has said, the park's trails, forests, and lakes are truly a jewel of the capital region. With its diverse ecosystems and heritage features, Gatineau Park is a prime destination that attracts some 2.6 million visitors each year.

[Translation]

Conservation and preservation have been a top priority ever since Gatineau Park was created. The National Capital Commission works with all stakeholders in order to ensure that the park's resources are conserved while offering visitors environmentally friendly recreational experiences.

Gatineau Park's management plan, which was prepared by the NCC, establishes a vision of the park as a protected natural space managed mainly for conservation purposes. Recreation is secondary. Gatineau Park is the capital's conservation park.

[English]

As a result of this approach, all publicly held lands within Gatineau Park are reserved for park purposes. Any public infrastructure development is very carefully considered, with the overall goal of enhancing the conservation of the park's ecological integrity and cultural resources.

[Translation]

Furthermore, whenever possible, the NCC usually acquires privately owned properties located within the park boundaries for conservation reasons. In 2008, there were 405 private properties in Gatineau Park, covering an area of about 600 hectares. Since then, in accordance with its conservation goals for the park, the NCC has acquired more than a third of those properties. Today, there are just 344 private properties in the park, covering only 386 hectares.

[English]

The results of this emphasis on conservation have been positive. The 2016-17 "Report on Gatineau Park Ecosystems" found that the overall condition of the park is "good" and that this condition is stable. This is a clear improvement since the 2006 report, which found the park's condition to be "acceptable".

[Translation]

As for the boundary issue, Gatineau Park has very clear and well-defined boundaries. They were officially established by the NCC's board of directors in 1997. In 2008, they were approved by the government as a legal basis for any future land acquisition by the NCC within the park. The organization manages the park based on those long-term boundaries.

Adjournment Proceedings

[English]

To build on the successes achieved since 2005, the NCC is currently renewing the Gatineau Park master plan. Involving broad consultations with the public, local municipalities, the conservation community, user groups, and other stakeholder groups, the review process provides an opportunity to take the plan forward into the 21st century and preserve the health and integrity of the park for future generations.

Mr. Wayne Stetski: Madam Speaker, it is easy to go overtime when we are talking about Gatineau Park.

When the Prime Minister responded to my question in February, he said, "We will continue to work...to ensure that we are doing everything we can to protect this beautiful wilderness area for generations to come."

As we celebrate 80 years of this natural treasure, will the government take the necessary steps to protect it for future generations? I will ask the question again. Will the government amend the National Capital Act to protect the ecological integrity of Gatineau Park and establish its boundaries in law?

[Translation]

Mr. Sean Casey: Madam Speaker, we are proud of the work that the National Capital Commission has been doing for many years to

preserve the ecological integrity of Gatineau Park. The park is flourishing thanks to the NCC's long tradition of stewardship of green spaces in the capital.

[English]

As the conservation park of the capital, Gatineau Park's ecological integrity will always remain in the forefront, while still providing for public enjoyment. In fact, it is the NCC's conservation efforts and the work it does with different user groups to maintain the ecological integrity of the park that make Gatineau Park so popular.

• (2410)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member for Foothills is not present to raise the matter for which adjournment notice had been given. Accordingly, the notice is deemed withdrawn.

[Translation]

The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly the House stands adjourned until later this day at 10 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 12:10 a.m.)

CONTENTS

Wednesday, May 30, 2018

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Federal-Provincial Relations			
Mr. Barsalou-Duval	19907	Mr. Scheer	19911
Paramjit Kaur Deol		Mr. Trudeau	19911
Mr. Grewal	19907	Mr. Caron	19912
Heritage Park Historical Village		Mr. Trudeau	19912
Mr. Benzen	19907	Mr. Caron	19912
Mélanie Paul		Mr. Trudeau	19912
Mr. Hébert	19907	Mr. Cullen	19912
Chambly High School		Mr. Trudeau	19912
Mr. Dubé	19908	Mr. Cullen	19912
Lifetime Achievement Award		Mr. Trudeau	19912
Mr. McKay	19908	Mr. Rayes	19913
Beauce Art		Mr. Trudeau	19913
Mr. Bernier	19908	Mr. Rayes	19913
Teaching Excellence		Mr. Trudeau	19913
Mr. Vandal	19908	Mrs. Stubbs	19913
Bon Echo Provincial Park		Mr. Trudeau	19913
Mr. Bossio	19909	Mrs. Stubbs	19913
Multiple Sclerosis		Mr. Trudeau	19913
Mr. Diotte	19909	Ms. Raitt	19914
Henri-Bourassa High School		Mr. Trudeau	19914
Mr. Dubourg	19909	Ms. Raitt	19914
Multiple Sclerosis		Mr. Trudeau	19914
Ms. Fry	19909	Indigenous Affairs	
Red Deer & District Chamber of Commerce		Ms. Jolibois	19914
Mr. Dreeshen	19909	Mr. Trudeau	19914
Victims and Survivors of Crime Week		Mr. Saganash	19914
Ms. Lambropoulos	19910	Mr. Trudeau	19914
Walk a Mile in Her Shoes		Natural Resources	
Mr. Masse (Windsor West)	19910	Mr. Deltell	19914
Ukraine		Mr. Trudeau	19915
Mr. Bezan	19910	Mr. Deltell	19915
TELUS Days of Giving		Mr. Trudeau	19915
Mr. Boissonnault	19910	Mr. Poilievre	19915
		Mr. Trudeau	19915
		Mr. Poilievre	19915
		Mr. Trudeau	19915
		The Environment	
		Mr. Donnelly	19915
		Mr. Trudeau	19916
		Mr. Boulerice	19916
		Mr. Trudeau	19916
		Labour	
		Mr. Vandal	19916
		Mr. Trudeau	19916
		Democratic Reform	
		Mr. Richards	19916
		Mr. Trudeau	19916
		Mr. Richards	19916
		Mr. Trudeau	19917
		Mr. Berthold	19917
		Mr. Trudeau	19917

ORAL QUESTIONS

Natural Resources			
Mr. Scheer	19911		
Mr. Trudeau	19911		
Mr. Scheer	19911		
Mr. Trudeau	19911		
Mr. Scheer	19911		
Mr. Trudeau	19911		
Mr. Scheer	19911		
Mr. Trudeau	19911		

Mr. Brassard	19917
Mr. Trudeau	19917
Canadian Heritage	
Mr. Nantel	19917
Mr. Trudeau	19917
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship	
Ms. Kwan	19917
Mr. Trudeau	19917
Mr. Paul-Hus	19918
Mr. Trudeau	19918
Mr. Paul-Hus	19918
Mr. Trudeau	19918
Mrs. Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	19918
Mr. Trudeau	19918
Employment	
Mr. Hardie	19918
Mr. Trudeau	19918
Public Safety	
Mrs. Boucher	19918
Mr. Trudeau	19919
Indigenous Affairs	
Ms. Ashton	19919
Mr. Trudeau	19919
Democratic Reform	
Mr. El-Khoury	19919
Mr. Trudeau	19919
Justice	
Mr. Nicholson	19919
Mr. Trudeau	19919
Natural Resources	
Mr. Ste-Marie	19919
Mr. Trudeau	19919
Official Report	
Ms. Raitt	19920
PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS	
Rural Crime	
Motion	19920
Amendment agreed to	19921
(Motion, as amended, agreed to)	19921
Controlled Drugs and Substances Act	
Bill C-330. Second reading	19921
Motion negatived	19922
National Local Food Day Act	
Bill C-281. Second reading	19922
Motion agreed to	19923
United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act	
Bill C-262. Third reading	19923
Motion agreed to	19924
(Bill read the third time and passed)	19925

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS	
Criminal Code	
Ms. Wilson-Raybould	19925
Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Lamoureux	19925
Interparliamentary Delegations	
Mr. Maloney	19925
Committees of the House	
Fisheries and Oceans	
Mrs. Jordan	19925
National Defence	
Mr. Fuhr	19925
Agriculture and Agri-Food	
Mr. Finnigan	19925
Mr. Berthold	19925
Indigenous and Northern Affairs	
Ms. Mihychuk	19925
Public Accounts	
Mr. Sorenson	19926
Natural Resources	
Mrs. Stubbs	19926
Motion for concurrence	19926
Mr. Lamoureux	19927
Mr. Cannings	19927
Mr. Poilievre	19928
Motion	19929
Motion negatived	19930
Points of Order	
Main Estimates 2018-19	
Mr. Blaikie	19930

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS	
Aboriginal Cultural Property Repatriation Act	
Bill C-391. Second reading	19934
Mr. Shields	19934
Ms. Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	19935
Mr. Virani	19937
Mr. Waugh	19938
Mr. Ouellette	19939
Mr. Vandal	19940
Mr. Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	19941
Division on motion deferred	19942

GOVERNMENT ORDERS	
Export and Import Permits Act	
Bill C-47—Time Allocation Motion	
Ms. Chagger	19942
Motion	19942
Mr. O'Toole	19943
Mr. Duclos	19943
Ms. Laverdière	19943
Mr. Nater	19943
Ms. Brosseau	19944
Mr. Longfield	19944
Mr. Calkins	19944

Mr. Sorenson	19945	Motions Nos. 98 to 309	19961
Mr. Boulerice	19945	Mr. Dusseault	19965
Mr. Ouellette	19945	Motion No. 310	19965
Mr. Clarke	19946	Mr. Sorenson	19965
Mr. MacGregor	19946	Motions Nos. 311 to 315	19965
Mr. Maguire	19946	Mr. Dusseault	19965
Motion agreed to	19948	Motions Nos. 316 and 317	19965
Federal Sustainable Development Act		Mr. Sorenson	19965
Bill C-57. Report Stage	19948	Motions Nos. 318 to 323	19965
Mr. Nater	19948	Mr. Dusseault	19965
Mr. Lamoureux	19949	Motion No. 324	19965
Mr. Kelly	19950	Mr. Sorenson	19965
Mr. O'Toole	19950	Motions Nos. 325 to 328	19965
Mr. Longfield	19951	Mr. Dusseault	19965
Mr. Sweet	19952	Motion No. 329	19965
Mr. MacGregor	19952	Mr. Sorenson	19965
Mr. Kmiec	19954	Motions Nos. 330 to 404	19965
Mrs. Vecchio	19954	Ms. Bergen	19966
Mr. Kmiec	19954	Motions Nos. 405-409	19966
Mr. Clarke	19956	Mr. Sorenson	19967
Mr. Fast	19956	Ms. Lapointe	19968
Mr. Clarke	19956	Mr. Dusseault	19968
Mr. Généreux	19958	Mr. Longfield	19968
Mr. Albas	19958	Mr. Dusseault	19969
Division on Motion No. 1 deferred	19959	Ms. Lapointe	19970
Privilege		Mr. Lake	19970
Firearms Act		Ms. Lapointe	19970
Mr. Motz	19959	Bill C-74—Notice of time allocation motion	
Budget Implementation Act, 2018, No. 1		Mr. Duclos	19971
Bill C-74. Report stage	19959	Mr. Albas	19971
Speaker's Ruling		Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	19972
The Deputy Speaker	19959	Mr. Lake	19972
Motions in Amendment		Mr. Gerretsen	19972
Mr. Poilievre	19959	Mr. Clarke	19974
Motions Nos. 1 to 68	19959	Mr. Boulerice	19974
Mr. Dusseault	19960	Mrs. Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	19974
Motion No. 69	19960	Mr. Kelly	19974
Mr. Poilievre	19960	Mr. Duguid	19975
Motions Nos. 70 to 72	19960	Mr. Stetski	19976
Mr. Dusseault	19960	Mr. Longfield	19976
Motion No. 73	19960	Mr. Ruimy	19976
Mr. Poilievre	19960	Mr. Albas	19977
Motions Nos. 74 to 76	19960	Mrs. Vecchio	19978
Mr. Sorenson	19961	Mr. Albas	19978
Motions Nos. 77 to 94	19961	Mr. MacKinnon	19979
Mr. Dusseault	19961	Ms. Khalid	19980
Motion No. 95	19961	Mr. Maguire	19980
Mr. Sorenson	19961	Mr. Duguid	19980
Motion No. 96	19961		
Mr. Dusseault	19961	ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS	
Motion No. 97	19961	Canadian Heritage	
Mr. Sorenson	19961	Mr. Stetski	19980
		Mr. Casey (Charlottetown)	19981

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>