



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 148 • NUMBER 305 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Thursday, May 31, 2018

—

Speaker: The Honourable Geoff Regan

CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, May 31, 2018

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayer

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1005)
[English]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 11 petitions.

While I am on my feet, I move:

That the House do now proceed to orders of the day.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: Call in the members.

• (1040)
[Translation]

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

(Division No. 687)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra

Aldag

Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arya
Badawey
Bains
Beech
Blair
Bossio
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Charlottetown)
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCoursey
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duguid
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fergus
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gameau
Goodale
Graham
Hardie
Hébert
Housefather
Hutchings
Joly
Jordan
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Levitt
Long
Ludwig
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Soeurs)
Monsef
Murray
Nault
O'Connell
Oliver
Peschisolido
Philpott
Poissant
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Rusnak
Saini
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Amos
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Bittle
Boissonnault
Breton
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chen
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Easter
El-Khoury
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Gould
Hajdu
Harvey
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Jones
Jowhari
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Leslie
Lightbound
Longfield
Maloney
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-
Morrissey
Nassif
Ng
Oliphant
Paradis
Peterson
Picard
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Ruimy
Sahota
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi

Government Orders

Sorbara	Spengemann
Tabbara	Tan
Tassi	Tootoo
Trudeau	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Virani	Whalen
Wilson-Raybould	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young— 150

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Allison
Angus	Arnold
Aubin	Barlow
Barsalou-Duval	Benzen
Bergen	Bernier
Berthold	Bezan
Blaikie	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Block
Boucher	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Brassard
Brousseau	Calkins
Cannings	Carrie
Chong	Choquette
Diotte	Donnelly
Dreeshen	Dubé
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	Dusseau
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fortin
Gallant	Garrison
Généreux	Geniis
Gladu	Godin
Gourde	Hoback
Hughes	Jeneroux
Kelly	Kent
Kmiec	Kwan
Lake	Laverdière
Lukiwski	MacGregor
MacKenzie	Maguire
Malcolmson	Masse (Windsor West)
Mathysen	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)	Motz
Nantel	Nater
Nicholson	Nuttall
O'Toole	Paul-Hus
Pauzé	Quach
Ramsey	Rankin
Rempel	Richards
Saganash	Sansoucy
Schmale	Shields
Shipley	Sopuck
Sorenson	Stanton
Ste-Marie	Strahl
Stubbs	Sweet
Tilson	Trost
Trudel	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Vecchio
Warawa	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Wong	Yurdiga
Zimmer— 103	

PAIRED

Members

LeBlanc	Plamondon— 2
---------	--------------

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2018, NO. 1

BILL C-74—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.) moved:

That in relation to Bill C-74, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 27, 2018 and other measures, not more than five further hours shall be allotted to the consideration of the report stage and five hours 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 at the expiry of the five hours provided for the consideration of 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 said stages of the Bill shall be put forthwith and successively without further debate or amendment.

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 67.1, there will now be a 30-minute question period. 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.

The hon. House leader of the official opposition.

• (1045)

[English]

Hon. Candice Bergen (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in three days debate has been shut down in this House on five major bills. It is unbelievable—well, it is actually not unbelievable, because everything the Liberals said they would do while they were campaigning has been an absolute fabrication. Coming here self-righteously and saying, “We are not going to shut down debate” was just another big, phony act. It seems like everything the Liberals do is a big, phony act.

I saw the height of it last night when the minister gave notice of this time allocation. He said there had been consultations with the opposition on Bill C-74. That is outright misleading of the House and misleading Canadians. There has not been one iota, not one syllable, of consultation. Nobody has asked anybody on this side about how much time was needed for Bill C-74.

Not only are the Liberals breaking their word; now they are misleading the House on incredibly important issues. This is the carbon tax that is going to be implemented. We do not know how much it is going to cost because they will not tell Canadians, and now they are saying they have consulted with us on Bill C-74. That is not true. Why are the Liberals misleading this House?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians elected us to deliver an ambitious agenda, and Bill C-74 is an important step in our plan to help grow our economy by focusing on the middle class and helping those working hard to join it. The budget implementation act provides the legislative framework to implement key campaign commitments that were reiterated in budget 2018.

Government Orders

Through this bill, we are taking the next step in our ambitious plan to grow our economy by focusing on the middle class and helping those working hard to join it. Over the last two years, Canada's economic growth has been fuelled by a stronger middle class. Canadians' hard work, combined with historic investments in people and in communities, helped to create more good jobs, almost 600,000 of them since November 2015, with more help for those who need it most, which has meant more money for people to save, invest, and spend in their communities.

The Deputy Speaker: I am going to ask hon. members, both those posing questions and a minister who may be responding, to keep their interventions to no more than around one minute.

Questions, the hon. member for Berthier—Maskinongé.

Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau (Berthier—Maskinongé, NDP): Mr. Speaker, sadly, the minister obviously did not hear the question from the House leader of the official opposition. There has been absolutely no consultation on allocating time on Bill C-74. This is the fifth time that the Liberals are imposing closure in three days. This is unbelievable.

I have been here for seven years, and we were used to time allocation because we had a lot under the previous government, but we have never seen a government limit debate to the point where it is doing the bare minimum. It is an insult to democracy.

The Liberals promised they would do things differently, yet they are going ahead and shutting down debate. We are 338 MPs in this House and we are here to represent our constituents. How can the Liberals justify doing time allocation on an important bill like Bill C-74?

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Mr. Speaker, Canadians elected us to deliver an ambitious agenda, and Bill C-74 is an important step in our plan to grow the economy by focusing on the middle class and helping those working hard to join it. This bill has been debated extensively in the House and in the committee. We have seen four days of second reading debate, during which more than 45 members have spoken. This includes 13 Conservative members, six NDP members, and one member from the Green Party. At committee stage, we saw 13 meetings, during which more than 106 witnesses spoke.

We have made a commitment as a government to work collaboratively with all parties to ensure that Parliament works more efficiently. It is important for us to make every effort to reach a consensus about how much time is required by all parties to debate legislation in the House of Commons.

• (1050)

Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I just cannot believe the current government.

The Liberals got elected by telling Canadians that they were going to do things differently, that they were going to be open and transparent, that they were going to be truthful with Canadians, and that they would keep their promises. We have seen nothing but broken promises and no transparency.

The minister who is responding to questions on the budget for the finance minister does not even know how much her carbon tax would cost the average Canadian and how much reduction in

greenhouse gas emissions we are going to get. When will the minister come clean, be open and transparent, and start keeping the promises of the government?

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Mr. Speaker, we have been very clear. My department released information showing that carbon pricing works. It works by reducing emissions and by fostering innovation. The provinces that have a price on pollution right now are where 80% of Canadians live, and those provinces are not only tackling climate change but are also the fastest-growing economies in the country: Alberta, British Columbia, Quebec, and Ontario. We know that putting a price on pollution is important and that tackling climate change is important, and there is also a \$23 trillion economic opportunity.

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this debate is supposed to be about the government justifying the use of time allocation on Bill C-74. Instead we have a minister of the crown who is actually engaging in debate when we are supposed to be hearing the government justify time allocation.

She said that this bill received debate at committee; we did not hear one single witness on division 20, on the deferred prosecution agreement, which is a departure from the way we handle the Criminal Code. I would like to hear a justification from the minister as to why she is making it difficult for her own members to be able to discuss the bill, because there were concerns at that committee about this bill. Why is she pushing this bill forward and denying the ability to speak to it not only to us but to her own members?

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Mr. Speaker, Bill C-74 is an important step in our plan to grow our economy by focusing on the middle class and helping those who are working hard to join it.

This bill has been debated extensively in the House and at committee. As I said, there have been four days of second reading debate, during which more than 45 members spoke at committee stage. We have seen 13 meetings, during which more than 106 witnesses have spoken.

We want to work collaboratively with all parties to ensure that Parliament works more efficiently. It is important to make every effort to reach a consensus about how much time is required by all parties to debate legislation in the House of Commons.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct the minister when she said that Canadians voted for the Liberals. Actually, 39% of Canadians voted for the Liberals, and many of those Canadians voted for the Liberals because they made promises to do things differently, to treat Parliament with respect, and to make sure that every member here has their say. Instead we are here on the 40th occurrence of time allocation or closure as the government tries to make up for a slow parliamentary agenda. The government realizes that it is under a time crunch, so it is just going to ram things down Parliament's throat.

Government Orders

I cry shame on the government and my Liberal colleagues for abusing the trust of Canadians and for misleading them, because this is not how to treat Parliament with respect. This absolutely goes against all the promises the Liberals made.

Would the minister not agree that it is precisely this type of action that breeds cynicism in Canadian politics?

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Mr. Speaker, this bill has been debated extensively in the House and at committee. We remain committed to ensuring that members on all sides have sufficient and reasonable time to debate legislation in the House of Commons. Of course, we also recognize our responsibility to ensure that we deliver on our commitments to Canadians.

Let us talk about this. Through this bill, we are taking the next step in our ambitious plan to grow our economy by focusing on the middle class and helping those working hard to join it. Since November 2015, we have worked with Canadians to create more good jobs, almost 600,000, which helps those who need it most. It also means more money for people to save, invest, and spend in their communities.

•(1055)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it seems what we have witnessed from the opposition members is a will and desire to prevent any legislation from passing through the House. They want to continue to play games. We saw that yesterday when they attempted to adjourn the House because they were done working for the day. Yesterday they moved concurrence on a report, yet we have hundreds of reports. They will do anything to avoid debate.

My question to my colleague is this. Would she not agree that there is a responsibility of the government to move legislation forward that is going to have such a positive impact on Canadians in all regions of our country?

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Mr. Speaker, it is extremely important that we deliver on this ambitious agenda, because we are delivering for Canadians. We are helping to grow the economy. We are helping to create jobs in communities. We are making sure we are supporting the middle class, as well as those who are working hard to join it.

As I said, we wish we did not have to do this. However, we need to advance legislation. The opposition is deliberately delaying the government's agenda, and we have a duty to Canadians to ensure that all legislation is brought to a vote.

We remain committed to ensuring that members on all sides have sufficient and reasonable time to debate legislation, but we have a responsibility to deliver on our commitments to Canadians.

Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I can honestly say that I think all members on this side believe that our Confederation is in chaos right now. Never before have we seen a government so heavy-handed. Liberals can draw all the comparisons to the previous government that they want, but I will remind everyone that this government said it was going to do things differently. It was going to allow members to speak. This budget implementation bill has a \$7-billion slush fund in it. It also has a

carbon tax, and Liberals are not telling us the price of that tax or how it is going to affect Canadians. Canadians deserve to know that price, and the opposition deserves to be able to ask and to honestly debate these questions.

This Confederation is in chaos for multiple reasons. Why are Liberals doing this? Why are they thwarting the voices of Canadians?

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the member for York—Simcoe himself moved 100 closure motions.

In terms of putting a price on pollution, once again it is really important to note that putting a price on pollution works as part of our overall climate plan. Let us talk about our climate plan. It is putting a price on pollution and also making historic investments in public transportation. We know we can do better by investing in cleaner transportation, which saves time and money for Canadians and also reduces pollution. We are making historic investments in clean technologies, which are critically important. This is a \$23-trillion economic opportunity that we want to take advantage of.

There are many other reasons we need to take climate action, and we would hope the party opposite would support us.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this morning, we are seeing a prime example of Liberal arrogance. The Minister of Environment and Climate Change wants to push through a time allocation motion on her 550-page bill.

She keeps referring to debates that took place at second reading and in committee, but the bill before us is an entirely new document. The bill changed and was reprinted as amended by the Standing Committee on Finance. That reset the clock.

Yesterday, we got an hour and a half to debate this bill, from 10:30 p.m. to midnight. This morning, we were told that there are five hours remaining for debate at report stage on a 550-page bill. If we do the math, we find that parliamentarians will have had less than a minute per page to debate and make a decision at report stage. How unbelievably arrogant.

Why is the minister so determined to ram through a bill that it is 550 pages long and amends 44 acts?

How does she think parliamentarians can do their job under these conditions?

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Mr. Speaker, Canadians elected us to carry out an ambitious agenda. The budget implementation act, 2018, No. 1, provides the legislative framework to fulfill some key campaign commitments, which were reiterated in the 2018 budget.

Bill C-57 has been extensively debated in the House of Commons and in committee. We had four days of debate at second reading. More than 45 members spoke at that stage, including 13 Conservative Party members, six NDP members, and one Green Party member. There were 13 committee meetings, and no fewer than 106 witnesses testified.

Government Orders

• (1100)

[English]

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, it is all too common to rise in this place as a member of a smaller party that does not have the status to get onto speaking rosters early, and so on, to protest the use of time allocation time and time again. What is unusual about this debate today is the absence of a minister to defend this action that carries the bill through the House.

The Minister of Finance is not defending taking a budget bill to time allocation. Somehow the Minister of Environment and Climate Change and pipelines has drawn the short straw, and I wonder how on earth, with everything else on her plate, she thinks it is worthwhile to come here to tell members they do not have time to debate a budget bill.

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to rise in this House. I am a member of cabinet, I am a member of this government, and I am very proud to defend what we are doing to grow the economy, to support the middle class, and to deliver on our agenda, and that is exactly what Bill C-74 would do.

We have an ambitious agenda. It is to grow the economy and help the middle class and those working hard to join it, but let me be clear that it is also delivering over 600,000 jobs for Canadians and that hundreds of thousands of children are no longer living in poverty.

This bill has been debated extensively in the House and at committee, and I know the member opposite has had a chance to speak at second reading debate. It is important that we figure out how to move forward, but it is also important to deliver the agenda that Canadians expect.

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher (Beauport—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île d'Orléans—Charlevoix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to ask a question.

During the election campaign in 2015, the Liberals promised to be squeaky clean and as pure as the driven snow in terms of transparency.

Here is the reality today. With respect to free votes, they promised to make it the norm in the House—false. They said they would not resort to legislative tricks to avoid parliamentary scrutiny—false. They said they would not interfere with the work of government watchdogs—false. They promised to bring transparency to the appointment of Supreme Court judges—again, false. They promised to give the Parliamentary Budget Officer greater autonomy—false.

I would like to know why the Liberals are muzzling us in the House.

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Mr. Speaker, of course members have the opportunity to speak in the House of Commons. As I said, we have had four days of second reading debate, during which 45 members have spoken. We also had 13 committee meetings and heard from more than 106 witnesses.

However, when we have an opposition that is deliberately delaying our agenda, we have a duty to Canadians to ensure that all legislation is brought to a vote. We will continue to try to work with members of all parties, but we also have a duty to all Canadians.

[English]

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, on the 40th occasion of the “sunny ways” government shutting down public debate on very important legislation, I have a quote to read to the environment minister. I am curious whether she can tell if it was a Conservative or a Liberal member of Parliament who said this:

Canadians do not like it and they are waking up to the way the government is doing things. Who would have thought that Canadians would be familiar with procedures such as prorogation or time allocation during debates or the use of in camera in committees? Slowly but surely, Canadians are beginning to understand these procedures and beginning to question what the government meant when it promised, six and a half years ago, to be open, transparent and, most of all, accountable. I believe Canadians are beginning to feel that there is a contradiction between what has been promised and what is actually being done by the government.

Was it a Liberal or a Conservative who said that? We are having a hard time telling the difference.

• (1105)

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Mr. Speaker, what Canadians want to see is a government that delivers for them. Working with Canadians, we have created more than 600,000 jobs since November 2015, helping those who need assistance and helping to raise children out of poverty.

We have also been clear that while we do not like using time allocation, it is a tool that is needed to advance legislation when the opposition is deliberating delaying the government's agenda. We have a duty to ensure that all legislation is brought to a vote. Canadians want to see action. They want to make sure that we are delivering on what we said we would do, which is to grow the middle class, to take serious action on climate, and to grow the economy, and that is exactly what we are doing.

Ms. Yvonne Jones (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to outline that the government has consulted more with Canadians than any other government in our history, not just on budget measures but also on policy decisions. One thing that is for certain is that the Liberal government has been listening to Canadians. When we reflect on what is in the budget bill today, it is really the voice of Canadians speaking in this Parliament.

What we are doing with maternity and parental benefits for people in this country, what we are doing with changes to the Canada pension plan to help more people in this country, and what we have been able to do to strengthen the Canada child benefit has made such a difference to so many children and families in this country.

Could the minister tell us a little about how these initiatives are really reaching out to Canadians and responding to what Canadian families are asking for?

Government Orders

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Mr. Speaker, it is important to highlight what we are trying to do. With the Canada workers benefit, we are introducing a new, more generous, and accessible benefit that will put more money in the pockets of low-income workers than the working income tax benefit it replaces.

We are strengthening the Canada child benefit. I have heard from so many people in my riding about the importance of that benefit and raising children out of poverty. We are indexing the Canada child benefit starting this July, so that it will continue to increase in value every year, helping children and their families.

We have lowered the small business tax. This is really important. It will be lowered from 11% to 9% in 2019. This will leave more money for small business owners to reinvest and create jobs.

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed, not just because we are reaching the 40th time the government has used time allocation, but also in the minister who continues to rely on platitudes, such as “the middle class and those working hard to join it”, “the economy and the environment go together”, and “better is always possible”. Is better possible? This omnibus bill before Parliament that does not even have portions of other legislation it refers to approved by our legislature yet.

I would refer the minister to part 3, excise taxes for cannabis. We know that legalization of marijuana is the one promise the Prime Minister really wants to keep this summer. These excise tax provisions in Bill C-74 are being rushed through before the cannabis legalization has even passed. The Senate is still looking at removing home use, and that sort of thing.

How can the minister suggest to this House that this bill should be rushed through when its component parts are not even passed yet?

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Mr. Speaker, yes, better is possible under our government. Working with Canadians, we created more than 600,000 jobs. Those are jobs for Canadians in provinces and territories across the country.

Canada now has the best balance sheet in the G7, with the lowest debt-to-GDP ratio. Our debt is a function of our economy and it is shrinking steadily, and is projected to soon reach its lowest point in almost 40 years. We have the fastest growing economy in the G7. Therefore, better is always possible, and that is why we think this budget implementation act is so important.

• (1110)

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I think that with five time allocation motions over the last few days, it is becoming pretty clear that despite the election promises of the Liberals, they are essentially picking up where the Conservatives left off in how they manage House business. It is clearly a disappointment to Canadians who thought they were voting for something different.

However, the thing about time allocation is that we will hear a lot of members get up and say they want a chance to speak, and members must have that chance to speak. That is true, but the really nefarious thing about time allocation, in my opinion, is that there are all sorts of groups in civil society that want to weigh in on these bills, whether it is on a carbon tax or on Canada's accession to the arms

I was just talking to a colleague who told me that a petition was started on Friday, criticizing the government for Bill C-47's exclusion of Canadian arms exports to the U.S. for purposes of the Arms Trade Treaty. Today, that petition has over 30,000 signatures. Those are Canadians who want the time to make the case to the government to make those changes, and it is those Canadians in civil society who are also being robbed of the time to make a difference with respect to legislation.

I am wondering why the minister thinks it is acceptable to prevent civil society from weighing in on these bills.

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Mr. Speaker, we take consultation very seriously. That is why we conduct so much consultation with Canadians, civil society, indigenous communities and national indigenous organizations, business, and all Canadians and communities from coast to coast to coast.

In terms of Bill C-74, as I said, we have seen four days of second reading debate, during which more than 45 members have spoken. At committee stage we had 13 meetings during at which there were 106 witnesses.

We have made a commitment as a government to work collaboratively with all parties. However, we also need to make sure that when the opposition is deliberately delaying the government's agenda, we fulfill our a duty to Canadians to bring legislation to a vote.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will read the minister's mandate letter minister from the Prime Minister, which says that her work is to be “informed by performance measurement, evidence, and feedback”. It is to be informed by “collaboration”. She is instructed to secure “Improved partnerships with provincial, territorial, and municipal governments...to set a higher bar for openness and transparency...[to engage in] meaningful engagement with Opposition Members of Parliament”...[and] avoid escalating conflicts unnecessarily.”

The reality is that the carbon tax was imposed and announced at the beginning of a meeting with provincial environment ministers before one iota of discussion had happened. The government used the threat of withholding health care dollars to impose a carbon tax on provinces.

The minister cannot answer questions about the proportionate effect of emission reductions achieved by the carbon tax, which will disproportionately harm the working poor and low-income Canadians, and certain sectors in certain provinces, and undermine Canada's competitiveness. The Liberals know the costs of the carbon tax and that these will cascade through the Canadian economy, but they will not tell Canadians what it will cost them or what it will do to the whole economy.

Government Orders

Now the Liberals are cutting off debate and ramming through this bill. The Information Commissioner has said that there has never been a government in Canadian history that is more difficult to get information out of.

Is the minister not failing her mandate letter, just like the Prime Minister is failing Canadians?

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Mr. Speaker, we are actually fulfilling our mandate letter.

We have had extensive consultations on our national climate plan; in fact, a whole year of consultations were held on the climate plan. We continue to consult. We continue to work with provinces and territories.

Remember, it was because of inaction by the previous government to take any serious measures to tackle climate change that the provinces stepped up. Four provinces, Ontario, Quebec, Alberta, and British Columbia, covering 80% of Canadians, brought in a price on pollution. It was through their leadership that serious action was taken in the face of the complete inaction on climate change by the previous government.

We have consulted and will continue to consult. We will also continue to deliver on the agenda that Canadians expect. We understand that we need to take serious climate action. We also understand the need to get our resources to market, grow our economy, and create good jobs for Canadians.

● (1115)

Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will address a question that my colleague from the Green Party brought up. She asked why the Minister of Finance was not here to address this closure motion on the budget bill. However, I think it is very telling that the environment minister was put forward, because she has said quite publicly that she does not have any time for Canadians who do not share her narrow view of the world. Many of the Canadians she does not want to debate are actually sitting on this side of the House.

Part of our job is to debate and to ask those tough questions. The government has a lot of time for the Prime Minister going on vacation in India and to private islands. Actually, it is an indictment of the government's performance. The Liberals have passed 40% fewer bills than our government did within the same time in office.

On this side of the House, we are showing up and are ready to do our job. When are they on that side going to show up to do their jobs and work with us to get important bills passed for Canadians?

The Deputy Speaker: I would remind hon. members, because I know this comes up from time to time, that they should not make reference to either the absence or presence of members in the chamber.

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Mr. Speaker, we show up every day to do what Canadians expect, which is to deliver on our agenda.

Yes, it is unfortunate that we have to use time allocation. Why do we have to do it? It is because the opposition is deliberately delaying Bill C-74. They are delaying measures that would help Canadians. They are delaying the indexing of the Canada child benefit. They are delaying the new Canada workers benefit, which would give Canadians more money. They are delaying putting a price on carbon

pollution and supporting clean growth. They are delaying maternity and parental leave for parliamentarians.

We are here to get things done for Canadians, and we are going to continue to do that.

[*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.

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.

● (1155)

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

(*Division No. 688*)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Amos	Anandasangaree
Arseneault	Arya
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Baylis
Beech	Bittle
Blair	Boissonnault
Bossio	Breton
Caesar-Chavannes	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chen
Cornier	Cuzner
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeCourcey	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Eyking
Fergus	Fillmore
Finnigan	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)	Freeland
Gameau	Gerretsen
Goodale	Gould
Graham	Hajdu
Hardie	Harvey
Hébert	Holland
Housefather	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Joly	Jones
Jowhari	Khalid

Government Orders

Khera	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier	Lefebvre
Leslie	Levitt
Lighbound	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
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)	
Monsef	
Morrissey	Murray
Nassif	Nault
Ng	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
Paradis	Peschisolido
Peterson	Philpott
Picard	Poissant
Ratansi	Rioux
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Rota	Rudd
Ruimy	Rusnak
Sahota	Saini
Sangha	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Simms	Sorbara
Spengemann	Tabbara
Tan	Tassi
Tootoo	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Virani	Whalen
Wilson-Raybould	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young — 148

NAYS

Members

Aboultatif	Albas
Albrecht	Allison
Angus	Arnold
Aubin	Barlow
Barsalou-Duval	Benson
Benzen	Bergen
Bernier	Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Block	Boucher
Boulerice	Boutin-Sweet
Brassard	Brosseau
Calkins	Cannings
Carrie	Chong
Choquette	Clarke
Cooper	Davies
Diotte	Donnelly
Dreeshen	Dubé
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	Dusseau
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Fortin	Garrison
Généreux	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Gourde	Hoback
Jeneroux	Kelly
Kent	Kmiec
Kwan	Lake
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Laverdière
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	Lukiwski
MacGregor	MacKenzie
Maguire	Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)	Mathyssen
May (Saarnich—Gulf Islands)	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)

Moore	Motz
Nater	Nicholson
Nuttall	Paul-Hus
Pauzé	Quach
Ramsey	Rankin
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Saganash
Sansoucy	Saroya
Schmale	Shields
Shiple	Sorenson
Stanton	Ste-Marie
Stetski	Strahl
Stubbs	Sweet
Tilson	Trost
Trudel	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Vecchio
Warawa	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Wong	Zimmer — 108

PAIRED

Members

LeBlanc Plamondon — 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[English]

REPORT STAGE

The House resumed from May 30 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 amendments) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

The Speaker: The Parliamentary Secretary for Status of Women has eight and a half minutes remaining.

Mr. Terry Duguid (Parliamentary Secretary for Status of Women, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I started two minutes to midnight last night by stating that when it came to Canada's economy and environment, our government was very clear. 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.

I ended the evening by taking a look at the results of our plan so far.

Since the government was elected, more than 600,000 jobs have been created, most of them full-time. Canada's unemployment rate is at its lowest level in more than 40 years. Since 2016, Canada has led the G7 in economic growth. As well, the federal debt-to-GDP ratio, which is our debt relative to our economy, is not only on downward track, it is projected to be near its lowest level in nearly 40 years.

From these results, it is obvious that investing in our communities, in our people has been very good for our economy.

We have also taken steps to ensure a good business climate. We believe Canada is the best place in the world to invest and to do business, and we want to ensure it stays that way. We know low and competitive tax rates allow Canada's entrepreneurs to invest in their businesses and create even more good, well-paying jobs. That is why we cut the business tax rate to 10% this past January. It will fall even further next January, to 9%.

Government Orders

By this time next year, the combined federal-provincial-territorial average income tax rate for small business will be 12.2%, the lowest in the G7 and the third lowest among members of the OECD. This will mean up to \$7,500 in federal corporate tax savings per year to help Canadian entrepreneurs and innovators do what they do best, create jobs. That is good news for Canadian business and great news for the hard-working people who help these businesses succeed every day.

Let me turn to supporting parents by strengthening the Canada child benefit. Since 2016, the government has also been providing additional support to Canadian families through the CCB. Compared to the old system of child benefits, the CCB gives low and middle-income parents more money each month, tax free, to help with the high cost of raising kids. The CCB is simpler, more generous, and better targeted to give more help to people who need it most.

Since its introduction in 2016, the CCB has helped lift hundreds of thousands of Canadian children out of poverty. Thanks to the CCB, nine out of 10 Canadian families have extra help each month to pay for things like summer camps, new bikes, and back-to-school clothes. Families who receive the CCB will get, on average, about \$6,800 this year. That is money they are spending in their communities, supporting local businesses, helping to create more good, well-paying jobs for Canadians.

These investments and others our government is making in infrastructure, science and innovation, and skills and training are all designed to achieve one goal, which is to ensure the benefits of a growing economy are felt by more and more people, with good, well-paying jobs for the middle class and people working hard to join it.

We want Canadians to feel confident about the future and better prepared for what lies ahead. Part of achieving this entails making investments and taking action to protect Canada's air, water, and natural areas for our children and grandchildren, while creating a world-leading clean economy.

None of us need to be told that climate change is one of the most pressing challenges of our time. That is why the government worked with provincial, territorial, and indigenous partners to adopt the pan-Canadian framework on clean growth and climate change in December 2016. The plan provides provinces and territories with the flexibility to choose between systems: an explicit price-based system or a cap and trade system, which is prevalent in a number of our larger provinces.

A price on carbon pollution is already in place in four provinces: Ontario, Quebec, British Columbia, and Alberta, covering over 80% of the Canadian population. By the way, these provinces are also leading Canada in job creation and growth. All other provinces have committed to adopting some form of carbon pollution pricing.

● (1200)

The direct revenue from the carbon charges on pollution under the federal system would go back to the province or territory of origin. We have emphasized that many times in this place. This is the best way to support strong economic growth and secure a clean environment today and for many generations to come. That is what Canadians sent us here to do, and we are very proud to do it.

Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that during the campaign, we heard clear promises of no more omnibus bills, no more closure, yet it is happening all the time with the Liberal government.

The budget implementation bill has over 540 pages, an omnibus bill. Over 200 pages of that bill deal with the carbon tax, yet there is not one word about two things: first, how much it will cost the average family; and second, how much greenhouse gas reduction there will be from this carbon tax. The member calls it carbon pricing, but we all know it is a tax.

I would like my colleague to answer the question, which has been asked multiple times in the House. How much will the carbon tax cost the average Canadian family and how much greenhouse gas reduction will result from the carbon tax?

Mr. Terry Duguid: Mr. Speaker, I will say something that has been repeated in the House many times. Eighty per cent of our country has a price on carbon. I will use the example of British Columbia. A price on carbon was put in place over 10 years ago and Premier Campbell at the time said that it should be revenue neutral. The price on carbon was put in place and the people of British Columbia received a tax cut. It was revenue neutral.

As the hon. member well knows, the provinces will have the choice in how those funds are distributed. All of the funds will go back to the provinces.

● (1205)

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the government, the Liberal Party, has been promising pay equity implementation since 2004. Given that the all-party committee asked that the government table pay equity legislation by June 2017, which is now a year late; given that last year the labour minister said that the consultation on pay equity was complete, which we thought was complete in 2004; and given that the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives in last year's alternative federal budget asked that the government budget \$10 million a year to implement pay equity for federally regulated industries and this year the Canadian Labour Congress said to at least fund the establishment of the pay equity commissioner's office, why on earth is there nothing in the budget implementation bill for this long promise, actually a 42-year-old promise, by the Liberals?

Mr. Terry Duguid: Mr. Speaker, the member for Nanaimo—Ladysmith is a very active member of the Standing Committee on the Status of Women, on which I sit on behalf of the minister. I thank her for her advocacy and hard work.

Government Orders

I think most of us in the House believe that pay equity is long overdue. It will be introduced this fall, proactive pay equity legislation, along with pay transparency.

I want to remind the hon. member of all the other things, though, that we have done to advance equality in our country under the leadership of the Minister of Status of Women. The sustainability of the women's movement has been a major preoccupation of our minister. There are \$100 million over five years for a gender-based violence strategy; \$200 million over five years; support for women entrepreneurs and women in the trades.

We are on the march, and we should be advancing gender equality in our country.

Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am hearing about the importance of the provincial and territorial relationships with the federal government, whether it is on labour and pay equity or carbon pricing programs, and how important it is for the federal government to have a working relationship with the provinces and territories, something that the previous government did not have. Could the member please comment on that?

Mr. Terry Duguid: Mr. Speaker, the former prime minister met twice with the premiers in 10 years. Our Prime Minister has met with them numerous times. His door is open. On something like the pan-Canadian framework or the Canada health accord, we have been getting things done because we collaborate with our provinces.

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to Bill C-74, the Liberal government's budget implementation bill. When we consider the contents of the bill and the Liberal government's track record, it reveals a troubling path ahead for Canadians.

We have before us a budget bill that spends borrowed money recklessly. The result of that is a growing debt and higher taxes. Borrowed money always has to be paid back and it is paid back at a premium.

The Liberal government came into power touting modest deficits. The Prime Minister repeatedly promised Canadians that his government would borrow a modest \$10 billion a year to grow the economy. He also promised Canadians that the budget would return to balance in 2019. That promise went out the window very quickly.

The Prime Minister has added \$60 billion to the national debt in just three short years. Canada's net debt has reached an all-time high of \$670 billion. To put that into context, that breaks down to a debt of over \$47,000 per Canadian family. What about the plan to return to balance? The budget is not predicted to return to balance until 2045, a far cry from 2019.

The Liberals will wrongly try to take credit for the economic growth that Canada experienced in 2017. A growth rate of 3% in 2017 was largely a result of the oil and gas sector recovering and an unusually strong housing market. The responsible response to that growth should have been for the government to pay down the debt that it borrowed, so in the case of a fiscal downturn, we would be better positioned. However, now, despite all the Liberal spending, private sector forecasts show that Canada is heading for a slow down.

We have legislation before us to help us spend more money and add more debt. Ultimately, it is legislation that would make life more unaffordable for Canadians.

Canadians are already paying higher taxes under the Liberals. It seems that the Liberal government is always finding new ways to dip into the pockets of Canadians. For one, this budget bill would create a costly new carbon tax, which the Liberals are forcing on all provinces that do not have their own. Despite promises of a new era of co-operative federalism, the Liberal government is ramming ahead with its massive carbon tax grab.

My province of Saskatchewan has rejected the Liberal government's carbon tax, and rightly so. The carbon tax will come at a significant cost to the people of Saskatchewan, and the Liberal government is ignoring the basic economic reality that its carbon tax unfairly punishes farmers and rural communities.

My province of Saskatchewan has developed its own climate change strategy, a made-in-Saskatchewan plan that tackles climate change without imposing the unfair carbon tax on Saskatchewan families. However, the Liberal government refused to accept it. The Liberals are forcing it on Saskatchewan against its will.

Well then, what does this carbon tax achieve? We cannot tax our way to a cleaner environment and the carbon tax will not lead to a major emission reduction in Canada.

We can look to British Columbia as an example. British Columbia was the first province to implement a carbon tax. It also has the highest carbon tax in the country. Despite this, carbon emissions have continued to rise there. The real impact of its carbon tax is that British Columbians are now paying more for gas than anyone else in the North American continent.

I will reiterate that point, because it is an important point that needs to sink in. The carbon tax in British Columbia is not reducing greenhouse gas emissions, but it is making life less affordable for British Columbians, yet the Liberals continue to strong-arm the province of Saskatchewan.

One would think that given their passion for a carbon tax, the Liberals would be forthcoming with information about its impact. It is fair for Canadians to want to know just how much the federal price on carbon will cost them, but again and again the Liberal government refuses to release those details.

● (1210)

Finance officials have said that the Liberal carbon tax will cost an extra 11¢ per litre of gas and \$264 in extra costs for natural gas home heating annually. That alone is already a significant cost. However, there are additional costs and impacts of a \$50 per tonne carbon tax.

Government Orders

Repeated requests for information have been issued from this side of the House. We have asked the government over and over again to provide details on the cost of its carbon tax and the results it expects to achieve. However, any response received has been blacked out. What does the Liberal government have to hide? What is it covering up? If the government cannot answer a basic question on what its carbon tax will cost and achieve, it is absurd for it to force it on the province of Saskatchewan.

The Liberals are not only raising taxes on individual Canadians, they are making it more expensive to do business in Canada. Businesses are also being hit with increased costs due to the carbon tax. This is in addition to the increased CPP and EI premiums, higher income taxes for entrepreneurs, and punitive changes to the small business tax rate. While we consider these higher costs, we cannot forget that the United States is lowering its corporate tax rate. Business investment in Canada has dropped since 2015. Meanwhile, business investment in the United States has increased.

The natural resource sector has been particularly hit hard. The energy sector and the jobs it creates are very important to my riding of Battlefords—Lloydminster. The fact that over \$80 billion of investment in the energy sector has been lost in the last two years is very troubling for my constituents. They certainly are not comforted by the Prime Minister's repeated confession that he wants to phase out the oil sands.

The loss of business investment in Canada is a troubling trend, and the Liberals have offered nothing to Canadian businesses in this budget implementation act. The higher cost of doing business will hurt the bottom line for businesses. When it drives away business, results in job loss, and injects less money into our economy, everyone pays, and we all lose.

Bill C-74 offers Canadians a plan we cannot afford and does not move us ahead. Spending money we do not have on things we do not need is reckless and irresponsible. I would not run my personal household in that manner, and I would not teach my children to manage their finances in that way. Most of all, I cannot imagine that the members opposite would manage their personal finances that way and teach their children that as well. It begs the question: why is it that when the stakes are even higher, when the fiscal security of the country hangs in the balance, the Liberals would choose this route?

• (1215)

Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my colleague pointed out that the carbon tax will obviously be assigned to farmers as well. I have a farmer in my riding who estimates that the carbon tax alone will add \$6,000 to his fuel bill. That is just for the fuel on his farm and does not take into account getting his milk to the processors, getting feed to the farm, and the extra cost of fertilizer. It is obvious that these extra costs, \$6,000-plus or as high as \$10,000, will simply be added to the bill for the average Canadian family for groceries and other consumable products.

Trevor Tombe, at the University of Calgary, estimates that the carbon tax will add up to \$1,100 per family. We know that the Liberal government knows how much that is but refuses to tell us, because it is afraid that people will wake up to the fact that this is not a good thing for them.

I wonder if my colleague would comment on how this carbon tax to the farmers, which will be passed on to consumers, will help the middle class, which the government has continually said it is trying hard to help.

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Mr. Speaker, in Battlefords—Lloydminster, we have a rural farming community. We are spread over about 100,000 square kilometres. All the farmers I talk to acknowledge that they are going to have to pay the carbon tax on getting fertilizer delivered. They are going to have to pay the carbon tax on fuel to get groceries from the store, let alone the tax on the groceries already, because trucks have to drive them there. They are noticing that they are going to have to pay for their seed and their feed and everything. Every time they have to move, they are going to be paying more with the carbon tax. I spoke to one farmer who said that he is estimating that if this is enforced in Saskatchewan, he is going to be adding an extra \$25,000 to his farming costs, on top of the expenses he has already put in, which is unfortunate. That is on top of the rail mess we had, where farmers were not able to sell and move their grain so they could put cash into their next expenses.

• (1220)

Ms. Yvonne Jones (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the member opposite will agree that her constituents must be very happy with the new trade agreements the government has implemented over the last several years, allowing many farmers to get products to market for export from Canada that they could not before.

The member talks about the carbon tax. The federal government will set the overarching policy. It is up to her Province of Saskatchewan to implement that policy and tax it in a way that is fair, whether it chooses cap and trade or other carbon-tax measures. That is where the member should be having that discussion right now.

If we look at the stats in the member's riding on the number of jobs that have been created there since we took office and how families, and children in particular, in her riding have benefited as a result of the Canada child benefit, does the member not see the benefit of dollars going into the pockets of those families in her riding?

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Mr. Speaker, my riding is unique. The city I live in straddles the border, so we are actually bi-provincial. We have a lot of interesting dynamics where I am.

Government Orders

The thing to note is that Saskatchewan had a plan, and the current government refused to let Saskatchewan prove to Canada and the federal government that its plan worked. Saskatchewan sees that taxing Canadians is not helping. It is more money going into the coffers. Saskatchewan sees that it does not work. It is unfortunate that again and again the government is strong-arming my province and my premier. The majority of people in Saskatchewan do not want a carbon tax. We found a way to not have one, and the Liberals are forcing us to have one.

Mr. Dan Vandal (Saint Boniface—Saint Vital, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise today in this House to speak to the budget implementation bill, 2018, Bill C-74. I do so with great pride, as this budget would have a tremendously positive impact on the lives of the constituents I represent in Saint-Boniface—Saint-Vital and all Canadians across this great nation.

I have risen in this House previously and repeated the words I frequently heard at the door leading to the election, sentiments that are repeated today when I meet with constituents. Several weeks ago, we were in the constituency. I knocked on hundreds of doors. I had good conversations with constituents, and I spoke to hundreds of people about the benefits in budget 2018.

[*Translation*]

Canadians elected our government to improve the quality of life of the middle class and those working hard to join it.

This budget builds on the work undertaken by our government in the previous two budgets in order to make life easier for Canadians, to ensure that Canadians who need it have more money in their pockets, and to continue investing in communities to ensure a high standard of living.

[*English*]

Many conversations I have had with constituents were about the benefits of the Canada child benefit. It has had a very positive impact on their lives and has lessened their financial burdens. Nine out of 10 Canadian families receive the CCB, and they receive, on average, \$6,800 per year. This money directly improves the quality of life of Canadians, whether by ensuring that families can afford nutritious food or by helping them pay for extracurricular activities, such as music lessons or hockey programs.

This program will be indexed as of July, which means that the program will continue to grow and increase in value each and every year. I know that in my own constituency of Saint Boniface—Saint Vital, the CCB goes to over 8,800 families, directly benefiting 15,150 children. If we add the total benefits for those 15,150 children, we are looking at \$4,938,000 in benefits going to the children of Saint Boniface—Saint Vital.

Unlike the previous program, the Canada child benefit is tax-free. That almost \$5 million that is going to the children of Saint Boniface—Saint Vital is not taxed back at the end of the year. It stays with those families.

Budget 2018 would also introduce the new Canada workers benefit, which would give more money directly to low-income workers than the previous program did. The Canada workers benefit would increase the maximum benefit and the income level at which the benefit is phased out. This would allow low-income workers to

keep more of their paycheques and would lift approximately 70,000 Canadians out of poverty. In Manitoba alone, 86,000 workers would be eligible for the new program, an increase of 13,000.

• (1225)

[*Translation*]

I was also very pleased to be present for the announcement of the official languages action plan for which over \$400 million was allocated in budget 2018. As a representative of an official language minority community and a member of the Standing Committee on Official Languages for the past two years, I know that these funds are essential for communities across the country. The action plan will provide support for local official languages media, help increase francophone immigration, and support early childhood education in official language minority communities.

All of these issues were carefully examined in committee, and I want to thank the Minister of Canadian Heritage for the careful consideration she gave them and for making sure that they are a priority for our government in this budget.

[*English*]

Budget 2018 will also see an increase in federal transfer payments to Manitoba, up \$290 million from last year to \$4 billion in 2018-19. This transfer includes \$1.4 billion from the Canada health transfer, which is an increase of \$56.5 million, and \$518 million from the Canada social transfer.

I hear daily from constituents that their number one priority is health care. With this increase in transfer payments, it is clear that the health and well-being of Manitobans is a priority for this federal government. We are doing our part. We are providing provinces with the resources to provide efficient and reliable health care to all Canadians. In my province, while the Province of Manitoba continues to play partisan political games with the health of Manitobans, this federal government will continue to meet its obligations under the Canada health accord.

To change topics, the western economic diversification and the innovation and skills plans are files that are extremely important because of the direct impact they have not only on Manitoba but on all prairie provinces. Budget 2018 will see an increase of \$148 million for western diversification over five years. This will allow us to continue to grow the individual economies of the western provinces and invest in our communities. Out of this new commitment, \$35 million will be allocated to the new women entrepreneurship strategy. This new strategy is part of the government's commitment to increasing the opportunities for women in the workforce. It will be coordinated nationally but tailored regionally to the west.

Government Orders

It would be remiss of me if I did not speak of the historic investments that this budget makes to the Métis Nation. David Chartrand, vice-president of the Métis National Council, said “After 148 years of waiting to enter the federation, this budget finally brings us home.” I agree wholeheartedly with his sentiment, and I am proud to be in a government that is committed to renewing the relationship with the Métis Nation.

Budget 2018 invests over \$500 million over 10 years for various programming, including support for the Métis Nation housing strategy, post-secondary education, and the creation of a health strategy. This level and distinctions-based funding for the Métis Nation is historic. Never has a federal budget provided direct funding on such a large scale to the Métis Nation.

The emphasis on distinctions-based funding that was outlined in the government's principles respecting the Government of Canada's relationship with indigenous people is vital to this process of reconciliation. Reading directly from the principle, it says that “...a distinctions-based approach is needed to ensure that the unique rights, interests and circumstances of the First Nations, the Métis Nation and Inuit are acknowledged, affirmed, and implemented.” This budget reflects this priority and re-emphasizes our government's commitment to reconciliation and to building a relationship with all indigenous people.

The specific words used in the budget commitment to the Métis Nation should also be highlighted. The new funding is given to support the Métis Nation and to drive Métis-led initiatives. They support the Métis Nation's vision of self-determination. For too long, Ottawa has dictated to indigenous communities what the solution should be. To achieve reconciliation, we must move away from that model. There are problems in the communities, but the solutions to these problems must come from within the communities themselves.

• (1230)

[*Translation*]

For example, this budget provides for \$6 million over five years to help the Métis Nation collect health data and develop a health strategy. The Government of Canada will support the Métis Nation, but the strategy will be developed by the nation itself since it has the knowledge and expertise needed to solve its own problems.

[*English*]

Finally, it is important to note that the commitments in the budget reflect the commitments made in the Canada-Métis Nation Accord and reflect the priorities of the Métis Nation.

It would be impossible to outline in 10 minutes the full extent of the benefits that this budget provides for Canadians. However, since the tabling of the budget, I have been out and about in Saint Boniface—Saint Vital talking to constituents about our commitments, and I look forward to returning to Saint Boniface—Saint Vital to continue those conversations.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet (Hochelaga, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by quoting Mark Hancock, national president of the Canadian Union of Public Employees, on budget 2018:

Canadian women have waited long enough for pay equity. If the prime minister is serious about this commitment, we hope he'll be encouraging the remaining

provinces to follow suit with their own legislation so that women working in all sectors of the economy don't have to wait any longer.

There is nothing in the budget for pay equity. I am talking about pay equity, not the other programs. In Quebec, we have legislation on that. There is nothing about pay equity in Bill C-74, the budget implementation bill, either. The Liberals claim to want to improve life for the middle class.

Does my colleague think that the Liberals take women seriously?

Does this mean that the Liberals think that women are not part of the middle class or should not be part of it?

Mr. Dan Vandal: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for the question.

As the hon. member for Winnipeg South said earlier this morning, a strategic plan on pay equity will be presented in the fall. The well-being of women is certainly a priority for this government. Just look at the composition of cabinet.

Moreover, the budget for the western diversification program includes \$35 million for a women's entrepreneurship strategy. It is very important to our government.

[*English*]

Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am thankful to the hon. member for Saint Boniface—Saint Vital for his intervention today. I am delighted to hear him speak not only about the importance of the Métis Nation—the home of Louis Riel—but also about the spirit of the Métis across the Prairies and how important that is for Prairie culture.

The railroad is another part of Prairie culture, and yesterday we had an announcement about the port of Churchill. With a tentative agreement coming forward to get the rails moving back up to the northern port of Churchill, I wonder if the hon. member could comment on the significance of that for the province of Manitoba.

• (1235)

Mr. Dan Vandal: Mr. Speaker, as was announced yesterday, there is an agreement in principle to repair the railroad and connect it again to the port of Churchill. That is very important.

There are many significant factors in this initiative.

First of all, it is important to get goods and services to the residents of Churchill. They have suffered for too long. It has been a priority for our government, and I am very happy that people are going to get the services that they need. However, what is also important is the partnership with the leadership of over 30, I believe, first nations that are along that route.

This took longer than we wanted, frankly. We wanted the problem to go away immediately, but a solution required developing a relationship and growing that relationship to the point where we can have a fair partnership that includes first nations in the area. First nations will be a part of that solution.

Government Orders

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in successive budgets since the Liberal government came to power, there have been a number of opportunities for them to tackle some key issues. One of them was more promises about stock option loopholes, but another is the issue of corporate tax rates. Corporations depend on our tax dollars for infrastructure so that they can move their product. They depend on our tax dollars to establish clear administration of the legal system, as they exist under the rule of law. Corporations benefit from the expenditure of tax dollars to ensure that they have a good and proper business environment in Canada.

I am wondering if the hon. member can explain to the people of Canada why the government did not take this opportunity to make sure that corporations are paying their fair share so that the burden is not falling on the rest of Canadians.

Mr. Dan Vandal: Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. member remembers that our very first priority when we were elected was to cut taxes for the middle class and raise them on the highest 1%. That was the priority of our government, and it was the very first bill we did. It is something that benefits many tens of thousands of Canadians across our great country.

All we have to do is look at the results in the economy. We have the lowest unemployment rate in 40 years. Our country has created over 640,000 jobs since we became government. The economy is very strong.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am really glad to be able to take part in the debate on Bill C-74, because I am getting an opportunity that unfortunately many of my colleagues will not get, because as all my colleagues know, we are now debating a bill under time allocation yet again.

Notice was given last night in the late hours of the night, when a few of us were still here maintaining our presence until midnight. Then, of course, the government moved the motion on time allocation earlier today. This is, I think, the 40th time the government has done this, in spite of its election promises to work with parliamentarians and to show more respect for this place. Promising something and then doing the complete opposite is the kind of action that breeds a lot of cynicism for politics. I would dare say that a lot of people who voted for the Liberals in the last election were expecting a lot better than they are currently getting. However, we will revisit that issue in 2019. I will be very happy to talk to my constituents about it.

Bill C-74 is the government's budget implementation bill for 2018. It clocks in at a hefty 556 pages. I do not have a copy of the bill before me, but members can be assured that it also serves well as a giant doorstop. It amends 44 separate acts. One of them includes a measure to establish a new greenhouse gas pricing act. We in the NDP believe that because of how big the bill is and how much debate there is over carbon pricing right now, that particular aspect of the bill could have existed as a standalone bill to give it the comprehensive debate it deserves.

There is a problem with introducing bills of this size and trying to ram them through the legislative process in a quick manner. The reason is that one can sometimes lose the fine little details. For

example, it was discovered a couple of weeks ago that there is a measure buried in Bill C-74 under part 6, division 20, that appears to allow prosecutors to suspend criminal charges against companies in certain cases of corporate wrongdoing. We might legitimately ask in the House why a criminal justice matter is appearing in a budget bill.

I asked that question. I had the honour of serving as the NDP's justice critic last year, and I would expect such a measure to be in a criminal justice bill and to be studied at the appropriate committee, the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights.

Members need not take my word for it. We have quotes from the Liberal MP for Hull—Aylmer, who was a member of the finance committee. He said that the government seems to be “letting those with means have an easier time of it than those who don't have the means.”

The Liberal MP for Malpeque, who is the finance committee chair, also said that “...there is a huge question of whether this should be in a budget bill.”

Two Liberal MPs having discovered this and raised legitimate questions, but what did the Liberal-dominated finance committee do? It left that provision in and sent the bill right to the House, and here is where it is at.

That is one of the big problems with omnibus bills when they start throwing in all these different acts. Someone who thinks they are pretty clever in the PMO says, “We can just slip this in and I don't think it will get noticed.” They got caught this time. I do not know the merits of this particular part, but it deserved to go to the justice committee so that the justice committee, in its expertise, could call for the appropriate witnesses to deliberate as to whether this is really a good provision. It is not a measure that the finance committee is equipped to deal with, not when we are dealing with a 556-page bill.

I want to turn in the next part of my speech to the greenhouse gas pollution pricing. We believe this measure should have been put into a separate bill. I am among the people who believe we do need to have a price on carbon, since the evidence of climate change is there for all to see and we need to take some leadership. However, there is still a big debate going on in the country.

● (1240)

I believe it would have been to the government's advantage to split this off into a separate bill and to study it on its own merits. That way we could have called forth witnesses with expertise in this area who could have offered the appropriate testimony as to why carbon pricing schemes work and to deal with my Conservative colleagues' concerns about carbon pricing. They could have maybe offered some suggestions on how the government could mitigate the costs to low-income families and the costs to industries that are very fossil fuel reliant.

Government Orders

Speaking as the NDP's critic for agriculture, one of those sectors is agriculture. The Canadian Produce Marketing Association and the Canadian Horticultural Society have a problem with one aspect of Bill C-74 under part 5. They would like to see the definitions in the bill relating to farming encompass all primary agricultural activities and ensure that qualifying farming fuel would include natural gas and propane, which are increasingly common in the agricultural sector. They believe that after their consultations and research, the definitions in that part of the bill are incomplete and do not capture all of the primary agricultural activity. Agriculture is one of those sectors where farmers have to drive their tractors. They have to use natural gas to heat their greenhouses and it is a sector that, under current models, is very reliant on fossil fuels. We know there is a lot of innovation, research, and effort being made to transition off that, but the case as it stands now is that it is still heavily reliant on those fuels.

Given that so many farmers live so close to the margins and that the government has an ambitious agenda of reaching \$75 billion worth of exports by 2025, I believe this is part of the bill that could have been studied as a stand-alone bill. I know as the agriculture critic that I would love to have given some notice on behalf of my party and interested stakeholders.

I also want to talk about a few of the missed opportunities. I covered this in an exchange earlier today about the fact that there are no real measures in the bill to deal with tax evasion and avoidance. This is an issue that we have seen time and time again in Canada, where the wealthy and well connected are able to use tools at their disposal that ordinary Canadians just do not have, and are not paying their fair share. The Liberals failed to live up to a promise to get rid of tax loopholes associated with the stock options of rich CEOs.

Again, we see a failure to effectively deal with the corporate tax rate. As I mentioned before, corporations benefit from tax dollars being spent here. Our tax dollars build infrastructure like bridges, like roadways, and the railways that help corporations move their products. Our tax dollars pay for the administration of a legal system that ensures that corporations live under the rule of law and that if they ever have a conflict with a customer or a regulatory agency, the rule of law is there for them.

Our tax dollars also pay for social services that many workers require because they are not being paid a living wage. That is another issue that needs to be addressed. I know many of my colleagues in the House have constituents who are working full-time jobs, but still struggling to get by. They are having to make those hard choices between paying the rent and putting good quality food on the table.

I will end by talking about the government's recent purchase of the Kinder Morgan pipeline for \$4.5 billion. That was certainly not a part of its election platform and was not mentioned in the 2018 budget, so the government is going to have to explain to the House and to Canadians where that money is coming from. Are the Liberals going to raise it from the Canada pension plan? Are they going to raise it from tax dollars? We would like to see where that money is coming from.

When we look at gaping holes in our infrastructure, especially rural broadband, the situation with drinking water quality on first

nation reserves, the fact that the government can pony up \$4.5 billion for a piece of infrastructure that belongs in the twentieth century, but ignore all of these other problems that are so prevalent in the rest of the country really goes to the heart of where the Liberal government's priorities are.

In conclusion, I appreciate this opportunity to speak to Bill C-74.

● (1245)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened very closely as the member commented on tax policies.

The member did not make reference to the hundreds of millions of additional dollars the government has included in two budgets to go after tax evaders. The member did not make mention of the tax that was put on Canada's wealthiest 1%. I will remind the member opposite that he voted against that tax on Canada's wealthiest 1%. The member did not make mention of the tax cut given to the middle class. The member did not mention the hundreds of millions of dollars going through the Canada child benefit, and what about the GIS? Again, it is hundreds of millions of dollars. Those programs have lifted thousands of seniors and children out of poverty.

The NDP consistently vote against these types of measures. Does the member have any regrets about not supporting some of those tax cuts for our middle class, or some of the programs that have lifted thousands of children and seniors out of poverty?

Mr. Alistair MacGregor: Mr. Speaker, I did not mention those because that debate is now two years old. I can revisit it, if the member for Winnipeg North wants me to.

Speaking of seniors, the government is still failing to live up to its promise to establish a seniors price index. That was a clear promise that the government has broken.

With respect to the tax cuts for the middle class, the government keeps talking about them but has failed to define who the middle class is. This was not a middle-class tax cut; this was a middle tax bracket cut. It started with people earning \$45,000 and went up to people who earn \$90,000. Every Liberal member of Parliament gave themselves the maximum tax cut. With the median income in Canada being under \$45,000, people in my constituency got zero.

● (1250)

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear more of the views of my colleague, the member for Cowichan—Malahat—Langford.

Is the member hearing in his riding, as I am in mine, people's absolute astonishment at the Liberal government when it, for example, said to veterans that they were asking for more than it can give? What confidence should we have in a Liberal government that somehow found \$4.5 billion to buy the discredited 65-year-old Kinder Morgan pipeline, which was valued in 2007 at just \$550 million? Does the government really believe the pipeline has increased in value so much in the 10 years since Kinder Morgan bought that asset? What does that say about the government's priorities?

Government Orders

Mr. Alistair MacGregor: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Nanaimo—Ladysmith, my fantastic neighbour to the north, for that question. I am sure she will join me in recognizing the amazing work of the member for Courtenay—Alberni, who serves as our new veterans affairs critic.

We have spent many years working with veterans in our communities. When we hear talk about our veterans asking for too much, we think it is very shameful. I am sure the Prime Minister regrets making those comments.

The fact is that I believe we have a social, moral, and economic covenant with people who wear the uniform. When we ask them to serve on our behalf, we owe it to them to be with them every step of the way when they retire, when they need help, whether it is due mental or physical pain or trauma. That should be part of the full costing of any kind of military engagement. There should be continuous care from the moment people sign up until the moment they leave and the moment they are in old age. We have look after our veterans. It is the least we can do after asking them to do so much for us.

Ms. Yvonne Jones (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for many reasons, I am pleased to rise today to speak to the budget implementation bill. The first is that I really believe this budget is responding to Canadians across the country. We came in as a government with a commitment to consult with Canadians. That is what we have been doing and what we will continue to do. Throughout the consultations, all of us travelled through many communities, towns, provinces, and territories right across the country. We sat at tables in many community centres and listened to what people had to say, because we want to get this right. We want to make sure we are doing the right thing for Canadians.

When we came into office, we made a commitment to the middle class that we would do what is right and bring a better balance to middle-class Canadians, those who work hard and try to support their families, but who always feel they are at an unfair disadvantage. We have been very focused on that in every single decision and measure we have taken as a government.

We also made a commitment to indigenous people that we would right the wrongs of history by entering into a new relationship with them, a relationship based on reconciliation, respect, and that responds to needs and solutions, as we prepare them together. I know a lot of people have been impatient in and outside the chamber as the Government of Canada has taken on the unique and necessary mandate of moving forward in this country, but it is a commitment that we are acting on, and it is making a difference.

We also made a commitment to children in this country that we would do what we have to in order to raise them up out of poverty. That is why we implemented programs like the new child tax benefit, which will help thousands of children in this country get out of poverty.

We also made a commitment to workers in this country that we would continue to grow the economy. When we came into office, Alberta's economy was stagnant and declining. No pipelines were being built and no deals were even being made. We were not seeing economic growth in regions of Canada. In fact, if we go back just a

few years, many of my colleagues will remember that we were in a very tough situation in this country in terms of employment, but the Government of Canada did not falter. It stepped up and worked with industry to create jobs and a sustainable future for Canadians.

We diversified not only our populations but our industries. We welcomed many new companies to Canada to establish their bases of operation, companies like Amazon, who today employs hundreds of people across Canada, with the intention of employing hundreds more. We have signed trade deals and we are in the process of renegotiating the NAFTA deal, but in all of the deals, there were benefits for Canadians, for farmers, fishers, those in the auto sector, those creating jobs and trying to get goods to market.

I would never stand here and say that everything is perfect and that all of the problems have been fixed, as very well know that is not true, but I would say this. It is easy to be critical and hard to be positive, but once people make a good case on issues, it is much more effective than dwelling on all of the things they feel are not right. I will provide an example.

I represent a riding in eastern Canada, the riding of Labrador. It is nearly 300,000 square kilometres and much of it is isolated. I fly in and out of a lot of communities in my riding to visit my constituents. When I ran for election some years ago on the southern coast of Labrador, there was no highway connection. Every community was isolated. Today, it not only has highways, but they are being paved. In the last two years, we have invested more than \$60 million just to bring those highways to standard, to allow people access to that rural region of Canada, something that nobody ever did before. No governments before were interested in investing in that type of infrastructure.

● (1255)

Today in this country, we have the largest infrastructure program we have ever seen, and what is that program doing? It is helping all Canadians. It is not just investing in larger towns and cities, but all over the country, in indigenous, rural, northern, and urban communities. That is the way it should be, not the minority always being left behind, which is how I have felt for a very long time in the region I serve today.

Today, I look at the budget we are implementing in this country, and I look at how far my riding has progressed in just a few short years. It is absolutely astonishing. In my riding, we are doing more in the fishery today, in terms of job creation and new technology and advancement, than we have ever done before.

Government Orders

I hear people talk about the sharing of quotas and being upset because indigenous people are now being included in fishery allocations. I will be the first one to stand in the House of Commons and say that there need to be more indigenous Canadians involved in fishery allocations, because in many cases those fisheries are on the doorsteps of indigenous people. However, in many cases, a lot of these quotas went to other companies for 30 or 40 years, putting revenues in the pockets of single-based owners and not necessarily seeing benefits come to regions, communities, or populations of people. Is it a bad thing that people want to redistribute wealth in this country? I do not think so, as long as it is fair, balanced, and done in a reasonable way.

I want to speak a bit today about people in the employment sectors. I represent the region that is the largest exporter of iron ore in Canada: Labrador City and Wabush. We went through some really tough times in these communities. We saw a mine close down and hundreds of people who had given their life's work to this company lose up to 25% of their pension benefits, and there was no mechanism under law in this country to protect those benefits for workers.

The Minister of Finance stood in the House and said that, with this budget, we are going to make amendments to the Pension Act and ensure that there is protection of benefits for workers. That is what needs to be done. That is the right thing to do. Who would want to vote against that? After what we have seen happen in this country with Sears workers, steel workers, and other workers, why would one not want to step up and look at ways to protect the pension benefits of workers? That is what is in this budget implementation plan.

In addition to addressing the issues for children, indigenous people, and working people, the budget also makes significant investments in health care, housing, and social programs. We cannot overlook that fact. In Newfoundland and Labrador, we increased the transfers for health care this year. We added \$112 million in extra investments for mental health services. I was really proud to be with the Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, the area mental health and addiction services are run out of, and hear that we are going to see mental health beds opening in the hospital and new psychiatrists added in Labrador.

These are things that are valuable to citizens in our country. These are things people in my riding and across Canada have asked for, and we are delivering on them. As long as I am a member here, I will keep listening to what my constituents are saying and keep pushing in the right direction to ensure that, as citizens of this country, they get what is fair and balanced, and are not left behind because they happen to be removed from Ottawa or an urban centre. Just because someone is northern, rural, or indigenous, that does not mean he or she should not get the same benefits in this country.

● (1300)

Mr. Matt Jeneroux (Edmonton Riverbend, CPC): Mr. Speaker, before the parliamentary secretary pats herself on the back too much over the lack of investment in the energy sector, I want to remind her that the \$4.5-billion commitment by the finance minister was not a commitment to build a pipeline; the money is merely going to shareholders down south, who can now do what they want with it in

the United States. Before she congratulates herself too much on that, I wanted to point that out.

She mentioned that there were certain things she found that were not necessarily perfect. I am curious to know what exactly she meant by that statement. Perhaps there were certain things she found that she did not agree with. I will list a few, and she can choose which one she likes: the clam scam, the India trip, the Bahamas trip, the cancelling of energy east, the finance minister's tax changes, the electoral reform, the jobs leaving to the U.S., the illegal border crossings, or the infrastructure minister's \$800,000 office in Edmonton. Which one of those does she find was not that perfect?

Ms. Yvonne Jones: Mr. Speaker, the member opposite is talking about the acquisition of the Trans Mountain pipeline. I will say this to him. The Government of Canada stepped up when workers in Alberta and people in all of Canada needed it to step up, to ensure that we get a pipeline to tidewater, build up the oil industry in this country, and create an industry that will be sustainable going forward. That was something the government opposite could not, would not, and did not do.

If the Government of Canada was not going to stand up to support economic development and investment in this country to ensure the sustainability of workers in Canada, in my opinion it would not be doing service to the people of this country. However, we did not falter on our responsibility. We know this is in the best interests of Canadians. We know it is the right thing to do. We also know that we are balancing the economy and the environment, something the Conservatives know very little about, but we are doing it, while ensuring that we have the best interests of both the environment and working Canadians at heart in making that happen.

● (1305)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Karine Trudel (Jonquière, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my colleague spoke about fair and equitable treatment. I would also like to talk about fair and equitable treatment for people like the Sears employees and our retirees. We spoke a lot about that in the House. My colleague from Hamilton introduced a bill that is ready to be passed here in the House. In the last budget, the government only announced that it would conduct consultations and study the possibility of introducing certain elements of my colleague's bill.

On the topic of inequality, we have the opportunity to pass a bill that will eliminate it. I am referring to pensioners and Sears employees. There are also a number of other companies whose employees are worried about what will happen to their pensions.

What does my colleague think about this inequality and why will the government not pass the bill to protect pensions and all Canadian workers right now, here in the House?

*Government Orders**[English]*

Ms. Yvonne Jones: Mr. Speaker, one thing I can say for certain is that I have lived the terrible tragedy of what happened to so many steelworkers in my riding when Cliffs Natural Resources pulled out and left many of them losing up to 25% of their pension and health care benefits. That is wrong and should not be happening in our country. I have worked very hard in this caucus, with my colleagues from many different regions of Canada, along with members of other parties, to ensure that this issue is being dealt with.

I was pleased when the Minister of Finance announced in this budget that there would be a review of the pensions legislation and that it would be looked at in the context of protecting workers. The minister also announced and made a commitment to Canadians that we want to have a strong, stable, and secure retirement for everyone in this country. He also made assurances that we would be strengthening the Canada pension plan to provide greater benefits to parents and those Canadians who are impacted and need those benefits.

That is the road we are on. I would ask my colleagues to work with us to make sure we realize those goals.

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as the health critic for the New Democratic Party, it is a pleasure to rise in the House and speak to Bill C-74, the budget implementation bill, on behalf of our party. I am going to focus my remarks on a particular part of the budget bill that I believe is very much misconceived and in fact would do a lot of harm to Canadians across the country. I hope that the government will listen to these remarks and take them seriously, and be willing to make changes to the bill that is before us.

The issue on which I want to focus the attention of my colleagues in the House today is the proposal in this budget for the federal government to levy an excise tax on medical cannabis. Currently, the situation in Canada is that we do not tax medicine. Pharmaceuticals go through a process and get something called a “drug identification number”, or DIN. When that happens, the drugs are sold and purchased by Canadians tax-free, as they should be.

On the other hand, medical cannabis, which has been recognized as a medicine by the Supreme Court of Canada, and the medical cannabis industry is currently operating in every province of this country, does not currently enjoy that status. The result is that patients across the country who rely on medical cannabis for a variety of conditions and ailments are forced to pay sales tax on that medicine, whether that is the federal GST or an HST in the province, which is anywhere from 5% upward. In addition to that, most health insurance plans in this country do not reimburse patients for the cost of cannabis, so it is a double-edged sword for patients who rely on cannabis for relief of their conditions.

On top of that, in this budget the government is proposing to add an additional tax on medical cannabis, an excise tax, which would further increase the costs of this medicine for patients.

I want to speak for a few moments about the patients in this country: what patient groups think and why medical cannabis is such an important part of health treatment for so many Canadians.

CBD and THC are two of the prime operative molecules in cannabis, and it is now well known and established in the literature and in Canadians' anecdotal experience that these two substances have incredible medicinal properties. Among them, interchangeably, are the following: they are anti-inflammatories; they are antispasmodics; they help control nausea and provide nausea relief; they are ocular pressure reducers; they are very effective in helping to treat post-traumatic stress disorder, or PTSD; they are proving to be very effective in helping people who are addicted to opioids to get off opioids and replace that with cannabis therapy; and they are very important in seizure control.

That is just a sample of the documented, experienced attributes of cannabis, when used medicinally and under the care of physicians and other medical practitioners. It is a medicine. Again, we do not tax medicine in this country.

I want to talk about what an excise tax is. The Liberals want to add an excise tax on medical cannabis, and this is particularly inappropriate. An excise tax is colloquially known as a “sin tax”. That is, it is a tax specifically designed to discourage the use of something or to encourage the more responsible use of something. Typically, we see excise tax levied on things like tobacco, alcohol, and gasoline. This tax, though, would actually work to discourage the use of a medicine.

• (1310)

I want to talk for a moment about my exchange with the Prime Minister when I raised this issue directly with him last Wednesday and asked him to reconsider the excise tax on medical cannabis. After refusing to commit to withdrawing the excise tax, the Prime Minister, somewhat shockingly, went on to impugn the entire motive of the medical community by saying that he thought that medical cannabis was being misdirected and misused as a recreational substance. That is a shocking thing for any prime minister to say. He impugned the motives of every single physician in this country by suggesting that doctors are mis-prescribing cannabis to their patients, who are then misusing it for recreational purposes.

He impugned the motives of the hundreds of thousands of Canadians who use cannabis on a daily basis in a variety of forms: tinctures, creams, sublingual tablets, concentrates in edible form, and tea. He suggested that those people are not using cannabis to relieve the conditions of their illnesses but rather to get high.

What does that say to the thousands of veterans in this country who are using cannabis to help them deal with their PTSD? Is the Prime Minister saying that they are simply misusing that substance to get high? If that is the case, why is Veterans Affairs paying for it? That was shocking.

I cannot get any better than to quote from something a doctor said after this was posted online. Dr. Michael Verbora, who is on the faculty of McMaster University and is a physician who also holds an MBA, said:

Not sure why @JustinTrudeau thinks my children patients are faking seizures (to use CBD oil which has no recreational value) and my adult patients are faking their cancers, MS, and chronic pain! Completely clueless and uneducated. Spend a day in my clinic so you can see & learn.

Government Orders

That is what a physician said to the Prime Minister when he suggested that medical cannabis is actually some sort of front, some sort of excuse, for people to access recreational cannabis.

New Democrats have done what New Democrats do in the House. We do our homework. We work hard to make good policy. We listen to witnesses. We do evidence-based policy-making.

Every single patient group that appeared before the committee that studied the bill, every single patient group in this country that knows anything about cannabis, has stated that this excise tax is wrong and should be withdrawn.

My colleague moved nine amendments at committee, four of which dealt with withdrawing the damaging provisions of this excise tax on cannabis, and all four of those amendments were opposed and shot down by Liberal members on that committee.

Instead of listening to Canadians, listening to patients, listening to the opposition, and listening to the evidence, the Liberals are doubling down on a bad policy that is going to damage public health and patient health in this country.

The very first concept in medicine physicians learn in medical school is do no harm. That is the first principle of care. What the government is doing by taxing cannabis, by taxing a medicine and making it harder for people to access their medicine, is actually harming the health of patients in this country, and it is doing it deliberately and in full knowledge of the evidence that it is wrong.

I want to talk for a moment about children. There are children in this country who are using medicinal cannabis now, particularly for things like epilepsy control. Why would any government want to put a damaging excise tax on top of a sales tax on a substance that probably is not covered by that family's health care insurance plan, making it more difficult for children in this country to get medicine they need to control their seizures? That is what the Liberal government is doing. That is bad policy. It is bad health care. It is bad tax policy.

I urge the government to listen carefully to the evidence it is hearing from everyone who is knowledgeable about this issue and withdraw this ill-conceived, poorly conceived, damaging, and harmful tax on medicine.

• (1315)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am not 100% certain where the member is getting the entirety of his information, but the fact of the matter is that the budget, in particular the cannabis excise framework, specifically says that to help those who rely on pharmaceutical cannabis products to relieve pain or treat illness, the government will exempt these products from the excise duties, so long as they are acquired through a prescription. It goes on to say, similarly, “pharmaceutical products derived from cannabis will also be exempt, provided that the cannabis product has a Drug Identification Number and can only be acquired through a prescription.”

I recognize the fact that from time to time, things change and new drugs are brought on and therefore are given identification numbers. Some take a bit longer. Perhaps everything the member is trying to encompass in his argument is not included.

Could he at least acknowledge that there is an effort to try to make sure that these particular products, when received through a prescription, will actually be exempt from the tax?

Mr. Don Davies: Mr. Speaker, there is an absolutely clear answer to that.

It is correct that in this country right now, almost no medical cannabis products, which have been operating in this country for years now, have a drug identification number, a DIN. Probably some of them do. The government knows that, but what does it do? It goes ahead and levies a tax on medical cannabis, knowing that 99% of the products do not have a drug identification number, knowing that these products are going to be taxed. It then says, “Well, they could just get a drug identification number.”

The problem with getting a drug identification number is that it takes years. It is extremely expensive. It has to go through clinical trials. This means that Canadians, for a number of years into the future, until these products get drug identification numbers, which they may or may not get, will have to pay this excise tax.

I would turn it around and ask the member why the government does not just withdraw the excise tax on medical cannabis now and spare Canadians those years of excise tax that will have the absolutely predictable impact of keeping medicine out of the hands of the people who need it. Why does the government not just withdraw that?

• (1320)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach (Salaberry—Suroît, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my colleague's speech was admirable. I am appalled by the government's response to limit today's debate.

We have just five hours to analyze a bill with a massive scope. The bill is 550 pages long and amends 44 acts, including Bill C-47, which would impose a tax on people who use prescription medical marijuana. We are talking about children with cancer or children who suffer excruciating pain. This could have a negative impact on their quality of life.

The Prime Minister responded that this was for people who abuse marijuana and use it recreationally and who go see their doctors. He is indirectly accusing doctors of not doing due diligence and accusing people of abusing the system to avoid paying their fair share. Meanwhile, he is making patients suffer.

How could a government think this is responsible?

In terms of our democracy, if no members raise these issues, as my colleague from Vancouver Kingsway did, and if the government limits debate, we will lose this information since we do not have enough time to raise these issues in the House of Commons.

I would like to hear my colleague's thoughts on my comments and I would particularly like him to tell us whether Bill C-47 should be withdrawn from the list of 44 acts being amended by Bill C-74.

Government Orders

Does he think that the government should withdraw Bill C-47 from the 44 acts amended by this bill?

[English]

Mr. Don Davies: Mr. Speaker, I was in the House in the last Parliament when the previous government employed time allocation to curtail debate about 100 times. We objected to it on behalf of the New Democratic Party then, and I think many of my colleagues in the Liberal Party did as well. Therefore, it is somewhat hypocritical to see the Liberal government now employing the same tactic they raised against when they were in opposition.

This is a democratic chamber. People send us here to the House to debate issues. I have been told, from the very beginning, that our prime function here as members of Parliament is to scrutinize government spending. That is what we are here to do. To limit debate on a budget bill that is many hundreds of pages long offends some of the most basic precepts of democracy.

I would urge the government to withdraw that time allocation motion and allow us to do our job and represent the constituents who sent us here to do that job.

Hon. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is the big piece of legislation the government brings forward every year that outlines how much of taxpayers' money it is going to spend and where it is going to spend it. My comments are going to be focused on one piece, which is part 5, the greenhouse gas pollution pricing act.

When members hear "pollution pricing act", they may think we are going to spend money on reducing pollution. Actually, we are not talking about pollution writ large. There is nothing here that actually deals with things such as NO_x, SO_x, volatile organic compounds, and the fine particulate matter that sticks in our lungs that can reduce one's lifespan. It does not deal with the issue of methane.

The former Conservative government had great success in regulating those compounds to make sure that we steadily improved air quality across Canada. We achieved significant success. Canada has arguably the cleanest air in the world. I think we rank number three. We are right up there among those countries with the cleanest air. That is significantly due to the fact that the former Conservative government invested heavily in regulating those noxious substances.

However, this act is actually not about pollution writ large. It is about greenhouse gas emissions and the government trying to force through its right to impose a massive carbon tax on Canadians. All Canadians are going to have to pay this tax. The Prime Minister has said that there are some provinces that already levy a tax. He has said that they will have to increase that tax, and the provinces and territories that do not have the tax are going to be forced by the federal government to actually levy a carbon tax of \$50 per tonne. That will be expensive for Canadians, because it will affect everything Canadians use, whether it is groceries, whether it is home heating oil, whether it is natural gas, or whether it is gasoline at the pumps. Virtually nothing we consume here in Canada that we use on a daily basis will not be taxed under the Liberal carbon tax that is proposed in this bill.

Of course, the Prime Minister, when asked about carbon taxes, says that carbon taxes are good. He actually said that carbon taxes are good. The Prime Minister has made this carbon tax a foundational element of his climate change plan.

We, as Conservatives, believe that taxing Canadians is not the way forward if we want to address Canada's greenhouse gas emissions. There are many other ways we can address those. There are other tools that can be used to address greenhouse gas emissions, but simply taxing Canadians is not the way to do it.

The federal government has said that the carbon tax is going to be revenue neutral. In other words, it is not going to cost the taxpayer one cent. However, what the Prime Minister failed to say was that it is revenue neutral to the federal government, because it will transfer the revenues to the provinces. He wants Canadians to believe that the provinces and territories are going to refund that money back to their residents. In fact, there is not a province in Canada that has a carbon tax that is actually revenue neutral. What is happening is that the government sucks money out of one pocket of the taxpayer and dumps it into general revenue. Governments receive this money and spend it on their own political priorities, not on the priorities of Canadians.

Where we have seen this is in my home province of British Columbia. It was held up as a paragon of virtue carbon tax. It was a revenue neutral carbon tax brought in by former premier Gordon Campbell, a man I know well. He brought it in with the most sincere motives. Originally, that tax was, for the most part, revenue neutral. The government collected the tax and then returned it to taxpayers in the form of corporate and personal income tax reductions.

● (1325)

We recently had an election in B.C., and the NDP formed government. The first act of that government was to remove the revenue neutrality of that tax, which means that tax now goes into general revenues and is spent on the political priorities of that NDP government. We have seen this across the country, promises that this money will be invested in environmental initiatives, that the money will be given back, but that it will be invested in environmental initiatives. The governments pick winners and losers as to who will benefit from the money and who will not. We know that governments are woefully inadequate at picking winners and losers. They usually get it wrong.

The sad thing is that the Liberal government has been asked hundreds of times how much the carbon tax, which originally was supposed to be \$50 per tonne, will cost the average Canadian family. My colleagues in the House have asked the question of the minister. We have had different ministers at committee and we asked them all how much they expect this will cost the average Canadian family. We have heard no answer. In fact, in one now infamous exchange, I asked the Minister of Environment to tell us what the carbon tax would mean for the average Canadian family. She refused to answer. I asked again and again. Finally, she said that she would let her deputy minister answer the question and he proceeded not to answer the question at all. The Liberals have the information, but they are afraid to let Canadians know how badly this will harm them.

Government Orders

There is a hidden agenda at play. What Canadians do not know is that in the backrooms of the Liberal government, the Liberals are starting to talk about moving that carbon tax from \$50 per tonne in 2022 to \$100 to \$300 per tonne. Why? Because they have been told by economists that for a carbon tax to be effective, in other words for it to actually change the behaviour of Canadians, it will have to be \$200 to \$300 per tonne of greenhouse emissions. Imagine how expensive life in Canada will be with that kind of a tax. That is the secret plan.

The Liberals will not tell us that today, but there are indications in government documents that there are discussions on how they can hammer Canadians with a carbon tax sufficient to change the behaviour of Canadians, without regard for the impact this will have on individual Canadians and on the average Canadian family, on how much more expensive life will be.

I will go back to the British Columbia example where the so-called revenue neutral carbon tax was eventually replaced by a non-revenue neutral carbon tax where all the money would go to the government to spend on whatever it wanted. When that carbon tax was first implemented, the stated goal of that tax was to change behaviour to ensure greenhouse gas emissions would go down by 33%. That is a laudable goal. How did things work out? That tax has now been in place for some 10 years and to date carbon emissions are down by not 33%, not 30%, not 20%, not 10%, but by 2%. A decade of carbon taxes and all British Columbia got out of it was a 2% reduction. This tax will be harmful to Canadians and will have virtually no impact on greenhouse gas emissions.

We have asked the Minister of Environment to appear before committee to defend her estimates and this gas tax so we can find out what this will cost Canadians. She has yet to answer us and to publicly state whether she is prepared to come to committee and be accountable under the Westminster parliamentary system, as all ministers should be.

I am very disappointed with the Liberal government for bringing forward a tax policy that is going to harm Canadians without any benefit to our environment.

• (1330)

Mr. Ken Hardie (Fleetwood—Port Kells, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my riding is very close to the hon. member's, so I know the sky is not a different colour out our way.

I want to set a few things straight. I want to talk about the wonderful record of the previous Harper government on emissions. Emissions go down, especially when an economy is in the tank. Canada's economy was in the tank from about 2007 right up to the summer of 2015, when we were technically in a recession. Interestingly enough, in that same period, British Columbia, with a price on carbon, had Canada's best economy, and it has continued to be one of the best.

One other thing is this. I do not know if my hon. friend had the opportunities I had, but as soon as that carbon tax came in, I started to use transit a lot more, and I ended up ahead. You want the average impact on Canadian families? If my family is average, then we are doing okay. Does he have any comments on that?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I want to remind hon. members to put their questions through the Speaker, not directly to each other.

The hon. member for Abbotsford.

• (1335)

Hon. Ed Fast: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the member is average. He earns somewhere in the order of \$175,000 per year. That does not make him a member of the middle class that the Prime Minister wants to have others join.

I will go back to the question, which he avoided. How much did greenhouse gas emissions go down in British Columbia over nearly a decade by implementing the highest carbon tax in British Columbia of \$30 per tonne? It was 2% when it was supposed to go down by 33%. By any standard, that is failure.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech.

As we saw in committee, the Conservatives are very quick to criticize measures, but they have a hard time coming up with alternatives. That is exactly what we saw when Jason Kenney testified before the committee. He did his level best to discredit the carbon tax, just as the Conservatives are doing now. When my colleagues asked him what he would suggest doing instead, he had nothing to offer. The Conservatives certainly know how to oppose things, but they do not know how to come up with other options. That is what my colleague is doing too.

What does my colleague think we should do instead of taxing carbon if we want to meet our greenhouse gas reduction targets? I would hope members of all parties actually want to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

What would the member do to meet those targets?

[*English*]

Hon. Ed Fast: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to comment on what Mr. Kenney may or may not have said at committee. However, there is a very significant tool kit available to the government to address greenhouse gas emissions. I will start by talking about smart regulation.

Our Conservative government began the move toward reducing greenhouse gas emissions by regulating the light and heavy vehicle industry. We were the ones who regulated the traditional coal-fired electricity sector. We started the move toward phasing out methane across Canada. All initiatives can be done using smart regulation rather than taxation.

Another thing is smart, significant investments in technology. In fact, if we look at the Conference Board of Canada report on this issue, it has said that the most significant tool kit that any government has to move forward is using technology development. By looking at the trajectory of technology development, we will be able to use technology to address many of those environmental challenges.

Government Orders

There are other things, like investing in smart infrastructure, in natural sequestration, at which the government has not looked. It has done no science on it. There is also carbon capture and storage, which Saskatchewan has done so well. This technology is working today in Canada and it can significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

On the smart use of electricity grids, if we could combine electricity grids across the country, we could interconnect them so British Columbia, Manitoba, and Quebec could share electricity with other jurisdictions in a smart and environmentally responsible way. There is much that can be done. We have some answers.

Mr. Alexander Nuttall (Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to stand to speak about the budget implementation act.

I would like to start with some facts, which may appear at first glance, to be astounding. The Department of Finance and the Parliamentary Budget Officer have predicted that the budget will not be balanced until 2045.

My kids will not see a balanced budget until they are older than I am right now, and that is unacceptable. During that time frame, there will be an estimated \$450 billion in additional debt racked up, for a total of roughly \$1.1 trillion. It is our youth who will have to pay all of this back. The future our youth inherit is not the one that we inherited. Our youth are being left behind. We are currently sitting at 11.1% unemployment, while in the United States, the youth unemployment rate sits at only 8.4%. Now our youth will have to live with the shackles of this increased debt.

GDP is up 0.1% in two years. Eighty per cent of middle-class Canadians are feeling the tax increases since the government came into office. There was a \$60-billion increase in spending in the last two and a half years, up roughly 20%.

There is no doubt there that a spending problem exists within the Liberal government. Quite frankly, we can look almost anywhere to see it.

Corporate welfare is something I have spoken about over and over again. Why are we taxing Canadians who can barely make ends meet and giving those dollars to millionaires and billionaires so they can make more money? It seems to be done without a strategy or understanding the effects. It seems to be done without a clear measurement as to what is a success or a failure. I have examples: the Bombardier bailout just under a year ago; the superclusters, which were in the last budget and continued in this budget, \$900 million going to superclusters, mainly into urban areas, that were recommended by a committee, struck by the industry minister, that included people in charge of superclusters, like the MaRS in Toronto.

A few weeks ago, the Conservatives started saying no to corporate welfare when it came to Kinder Morgan. We did not want government dollars used to prop up the private sector in this circumstance. Not in our wildest dreams did the Conservatives believe we would see corporate welfare enacted when it came to Kinder Morgan, in fact, an outright nationalization of the entire program.

I would like to congratulate some people in the House, such as the member for Vancouver Quadra, the member for Pontiac, and the member for Burnaby North—Seymour, on owning one of the largest oil transportation companies in Canada. I thought they were environmental activists. Usually I would say, “If you can't beat 'em, join 'em.” What the Liberal government has done is first beat the oil industry and then it has joined it. Ironically, growth in the oil and gas sector last year was what drove our economy. Without the oil and gas sector, we would have had exactly zero growth.

This is not because of the Liberals, this is not because of the federal government; it is despite them. In the oil and gas sector, they have caused a lot of instability, because they have continued to attack it. When I look at Kinder Morgan, it makes me think the government has neglected what lies beneath our feet and has opted to rely on what is between the Prime Minister's ears. It is a failing strategy.

● (1340)

The Prime Minister created a carbon tax of \$50 per tonne to put in through 2023. After he did that, creating instability in the oil and gas sector, and in fact across our entire economy, threatening the way those who earn the least in our society actually make ends meet, he realized the ramifications of that decision. The ramifications are that projects like Kinder Morgan can no longer make it. They are no longer viable. The private sector has realized that, and then the Prime Minister realized it, and at the last second, he said he was going to step in, take money from people who earn almost nothing and invest it in this project the private sector is abandoning.

It is very interesting when we break down the carbon tax and look at the effect it is going to have on the average family. With fuel costs, there is the cost of actually producing that gasoline. It is about 50% of what we pay at the pump. Then there are provincial and federal excise taxes. Those taxes were originally put in place to deal with the ramifications of pulling out of that original resource. Then we have our new carbon tax that is being put in place on top of that. The government does not stop reaching into our pockets at the fuel pump, but says that it will charge HST on top of that. That is another 13%.

The carbon tax is going to cost average families \$2,500 per year. What does that mean? It means higher food costs, higher gas costs, and higher costs of everything Canadians consume. That is the three-year legacy of the Liberal government. The fact that middle-class Canadians do not have trust funds seems to be lost on the Prime Minister and the finance minister. The legacy that we see over and over again, in budget after budget, is that the government can take and take from Canada's middle class, that it can take and take from the economy, and it can put that money wherever it sees fit. Then when it realizes that is not working, the government will take and take to buy a failing project whose failure, by the way, the government was responsible for in the beginning by introducing more and more taxes.

Government Orders

It is more taxes on payrolls; more taxes on gasoline as a result of the carbon tax; more taxes on Canadians across this country. That does not even begin to deal with the fact of red tape and environmental assessment after environmental assessment, the issues and regulations that constantly hold down the Canadian economy. The Liberal government constantly holds down Canada's poorest people who are looking for jobs, who are searching for that next job, who are looking for growth, and who want to create a new life for their families.

Those are the effects of the Liberal budget. Those are the effects we have seen from three years of Liberal government. The family tax cut is gone. The arts and fitness tax credits have disappeared. The education and textbook tax credit is nowhere to be seen. The life vision of young Canadians is not the one we inherited, the one in which we believed that if we went out to work day in and day out, it would be easy. Manufacturing is not creating more jobs in Canada. The oil and gas sector, while it is moving forward, has seen incredible setbacks. The housing sector, while on fire, is preventing our young people from being able to actually access a home and own it for the first time.

These are the issues that we are seeing in the Canadian economy. It is these budgets that are driving this ship.

• (1345)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I just want to drill down into one particular aspect of the budget.

Subclause 20(1) deals with the small business deduction from the general corporate tax rate, a commitment that all the parties have advocated. Yesterday, when the Speaker grouped the 409 amendments, primarily by the Conservatives, the member for Carleton, seconded by the member for Portage—Lisgar, put forward a motion to delete clause 20, essentially deleting that reduction in the corporate tax rate.

I am just curious if the member plans to support that amendment when we vote on it.

Mr. Alexander Nuttall: Mr. Speaker, I think the point of the 400 amendments is that the budget should be deleted. When we look at it, we have had nothing but issue after issue with it. We want the government to go back to the drawing board, not to go back to the taxpayer and take from those who have the least in our society and give to millionaires and billionaires, but to help those people whom it keeps taking from to find a better life for themselves. If the member wants to focus on a single amendment, he can. However, the reality is that your government first said it would do it, then ran away from that promise, and then realized that it had to do it. Quite frankly, it should go back to the drawing board—

• (1350)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I might be interrupting the clip that the member can use on on YouTube, but the truth is that he said “your government”, as if he were speaking to me directly, so perhaps we can correct that.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I am sure the hon. member knows that he has to speak through the Chair, and that it was not my government, as I am perfectly neutral. I guarantee him that.

I will let the hon. member for Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte respond.

Mr. Alexander Nuttall: Mr. Speaker, I would at least hope that the Canadian government would be our government. However, the fact is, that is not the case anymore.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach (Salaberry—Suroît, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleague the following question. We have before us an omnibus bill. During the election campaign, the Liberals solemnly promised to never again introduce an omnibus bill because they did not want to follow in the Conservatives' footsteps. Now we are dealing with a 556-page bill that amends 44 laws to implement the budget, which was supposedly the most gender-balanced budget, but fails to put in place pay equity legislation, among other things.

I wonder whether my Conservative colleague believes that, after 40 years of Liberal promises to enact pay equity legislation and after making the same promise during the 2015 election campaign, in 2016, and again in the past two months, it was high time they followed through when the budget was tabled. In this budget, there is no mention of pay equity legislation, but there is still a huge gap between men and women, and a gap for youth. This is unacceptable in 2018 from a Prime Minister who calls himself a feminist and goes around the world patting himself on the back. We have yet to see such a bill in 2018.

[*English*]

Mr. Alexander Nuttall: Mr. Speaker, the member brought up a few things about omnibus bills, and so forth, and the promise made by the Liberals not to bring forth such bills to the House. I know it will leave everybody exasperated to hear that the Liberals made a promise and then abandoned it. I cannot believe it. It is incredible.

On the second point the member made with respect to the promise not to imitate the Conservatives, I can guarantee her that the current government is not imitating the Conservatives. If it were imitating the Conservatives, it would be bringing forth a budget to help those in society who have the least. It would be doing something to create jobs in this country, not taking money out of the economy constantly. It would be ensuring that people in this country have a right to earn a fair wage, not leaving us with lesser jobs, with the government picking up the pile it created in the beginning. Therefore, with all due respect, it is not imitating the Conservatives. I hope one day it will learn from us and start to.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Resuming debate. The hon. member for Calgary Shepard will have approximately five minutes, and will have the other five minutes of his debate after we return from question period.

The hon. member for Calgary Shepard.

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your giving me this time so I can speak on behalf of my constituents of Calgary Shepard, as well as the warning that I unfortunately have only five minutes before we begin question period.

Statements by Members

I am thinking about what to say about the third budget bill I have had a chance to debate in the House. I sit on the finance committee that was taken with this matter earlier in the month when it considered the contents of the legislation, as well as its implications for the Canadian economy and jobs in Canada. At the end of the day, the great hope is that every single budget will build on a plan or some type of goal or end journey that the government wants to get to in order to improve the situation of Canadian families, and of job-seekers as well. I just do not see that in this budget. I did not see this in the last budget and I did not see it in the budget before that. What I have seen is a series of failures to have a coherent plan on what they are trying to achieve. A lot of the time I think the government is simply making it up as it goes along.

One thing I will point out is that in this particular budget there was no chapter on defence spending. That was a big portion of the announced spending in the past two and a half years, but that is all it has really been. There was a bunch of news releases, a bunch of tweets, and maybe some Facebook posts, but there is nothing inside the budget that specifically talks about procurement. Over the next five to 10 years, procurement is expected to be one of the largest expenditures in our budget. We are seeing a continuous increase in the budgeted numbers for defence spending, with the same amount of equipment coming back to us, or actually less equipment, so the per-unit value of our spending is actually going down. Spending on defence is an important component, but we are always expecting to get something in return: equipment that the Canadian Forces can use to replace the equipment it now has, which is sometimes antiquated and other times has served out its proper life cycle.

They say that money is round and it rolls away. It is a Yiddish proverb. The chamber knows that I love Yiddish proverbs, and it is true in this case as well. In three consecutive budgets, we have seen deficits completely out of control, and the government is simply letting these roll away. It is money out the door and interest payments on debt that keeps going up. We have an \$18.1 billion deficit expected this year. The government and its caucus members will say, "Everything is going so great: Look how we have juiced up the economy, look how good the GDP growth numbers are."

However, what we have seen in the first quarter of this year, as is being reported in the media now, is that the economy has taken a serious hit. The housing market has drastically slowed down because of a successive series of changes, almost 20, to mortgage rules, including the latest one on January 1. The B20 mortgage rule changes have had a severe impact on new entrants in the market, those who want to buy a townhouse, a house, or who want to move up on the property ladder and expand because they need a bigger place to live, and those who want to downsize because they are coming to the end of their working lives and they want something simpler to live in and to have an easier means of taking care of their homes. All of those have been hit because, at mortgage-renewal time, they will now be facing a stress test. We know that the housing market in Canada and the different real estate markets in our small communities as well as our large metropolitan centres drive the economy. If we remove real estate growth and the construction of homes from our GDP numbers, we find that we do not have any growth. It is so critical. This mortgage stress test is expected to have an impact on job losses and reduce mortgage demand and housing by about 15%. Fifteen per cent translates into about 100,000 to

150,000 jobs that could disappear. These are well-paying jobs, not just brokers and real estate agents, but a lot of tradespeople who are in the business of building new homes, new condominiums, and new townhouses for Canadians to purchase, and for permanent residents to purchase as well. These people will be impacted by the successive series of mortgage rule changes. It is going to have an impact in the budget, something the budget has not planned for. The budget does not address this in any way. As I said, money is round and it is rolling away.

The government simply has no plan. This budget does not build on any type of long-term vision for the future. The Liberals have not set us up for success anywhere past 2019. It is as if the government is only thinking about the period between now and the next election. Planning from election to election is a bad way to set fiscal policy and public budgetary policy. Therefore, in the budget we will have accumulated, by the expected time frames in the forecast, nearly \$100 billion in new debt.

• (1355)

I see the signal to stop now, but I look forward to continuing my intervention after question period.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The hon. member for Calgary Shepard will have five minutes coming to him when we resume debate.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*Translation*]

PIPELINES

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, GPQ): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals were elected on a promise to put an end to the Harper era and the golden age of the oil industry. However, they are doing much worse by nationalizing the Trans Mountain pipeline with our money just to overrule British Columbia, which is against the pipeline. It is a dangerous precedent because Quebec has its own sword of Damocles, energy east.

We came very close to being in the same boat as British Columbia and having a pipeline forced on us. The public was right to rally to stop the project. However, now that Ottawa is nationalizing pipelines and imposing them on the provinces, the energy east supporters are coming out of the woodwork. They are calling on Ottawa to do the same thing that it did in British Columbia, in other words take action without considering how Quebecers feel about it.

We have to be just as concerned about the Liberals as we were about the Conservatives, and today we must still consider energy east as a real threat.

Statements by Members

•(1400)

*[English]***CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS IN SURREY—NEWTON**

Mr. Sukh Dhaliwal (Surrey—Newton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the strength of our communities is their people, who commit themselves to helping others. This past month, I attended several events where inspiring leadership has been on full display. The Mannkind Charity Foundation was founded by Rani and Dave Mann, whose dedication to giving back has made a difference around the world through many projects, including a donation of \$1 million to the Peace Arch Hospital and help for victims of the 2015 earthquake in Nepal. The Sahaara Canada Wellness Society fundraiser for mental health was organized by Deljit Bains and Bindi Bains Mackoruk, and the fundraiser for the Shakti Society, which empowers women, was organized by Sonia Andhi.

All these represent the very best Canada has to offer: compassion, generosity, and a commitment to making their communities better.

All members, please join me in thanking these organizations.

* * *

CROSS-CANADA RUN

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today for an outstanding constituent in my riding of Foothills, someone I hope my colleagues will have the opportunity to meet later this summer. On June 27, Dave Proctor will start an important journey, a 7,200-kilometre run across Canada. He will run more than 100 kilometres each day for 66 days, running for a Guinness world record.

Why would anyone take on such a gruelling challenge? David is doing this because he is a dad. This incredible father of three is a world-renowned runner, but this run is for his nine-year-old son Sam, who suffers from a rare disease. Through his determination, his strength, and his love, David hopes to raise \$1 million to help Canadians suffering with rare diseases, those searching for support and a cure.

I am looking forward to running beside Dave when he comes through Alberta, but let us be honest: I will probably be well behind him when he is running through Alberta.

I encourage all my colleagues to do the same when he comes through their communities. All of us in this chamber wish him all the best, and I know Canadians will be cheering for him every step of the way.

* * *

*[Translation]***MONT-JOLI ROTARY CLUB**

Mr. Rémi Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to rise in the House today to mark the 75th anniversary of the Mont-Joli Rotary Club. Since 1943, its members have been passionately committed to serving the interests of Mont-Joli and the surrounding area. They actively work to help those who get involved, in order to revitalize Mont-Joli and the surrounding area, and they also help people in need.

In 75 years, Mont-Joli Rotarians have helped inject more than \$2.5 million into the community. They have made a significant impact on Mont-Joli's social, cultural, sport, and economic development.

I want to thank all of the current and former members of the club for everything they have done over the past seven decades. Their desire to improve the lives of the people of Mont-Joli is a true positive force in the community.

* * *

*[English]***ALS AWARENESS MONTH**

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we have 30 remarkable days, 30 inspirational stories, and 30 chances to seize the day. That is what ALS Awareness Month is all about. From fundraising events like the Richmond-Vancouver Walk for ALS to breathtaking journeys around the top of the CN Tower, this June I challenge all parliamentarians to push the limits and seize the day for ALS Canada.

More than 3,000 Canadians live with ALS, and at least three succumb to it every day. No community is untouched. Here in Parliament, our hearts were broken when we lost our colleague Mauril Bélanger to ALS. His legacy now lives on every time our national anthem is sung.

This month, let us make every moment count. Let us work together to find a cure for ALS and use our voices to advocate for change on behalf of the ALS community. Let us share our story, spread the word about ALS, donate, volunteer, and participate. Whatever we do, let us take no moment for granted.

* * *

*[Translation]***AMYOTROPHIC LATERAL SCLEROSIS**

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez (Honoré-Mercier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 3,000 Canadian families living with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, or ALS, I want to point out that June is ALS Awareness Month.

ALS is a disease that gradually paralyzes people because the brain is no longer able to communicate with the muscles of the body. A movement that was simple yesterday becomes impossible. It is important to note that 80% of people with ALS die within two to five years of being diagnosed, which is what happened to our late colleague Mauril Bélanger.

There is no cure for ALS and few treatment options are available. Those with ALS fight with courage and determination, and I am thinking here of Nancy Roch in particular, for whom I have the utmost respect and admiration.

Canada must play a leading role in ALS research because research is what will enable us to look forward to a future without this terrible disease. I encourage people to support this cause, to wear a blue cornflower, and to participate in one of the walks that will take place across the country.

Statements by Members

Let's work together to fight this disease.

* * *

●(1405)

[English]

CANADA POST

Mr. Blaine Calkins (Red Deer—Lacombe, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today I rise in the House in support of the Town of Bentley, which just two weeks ago was told its retail postal services would be discontinued as of June 1. The very next day, parcels stopped coming to this small rural community, forcing residents to drive a minimum of 50 kilometres round trip to receive their items.

Canada Post has an obligation to provide a standard of postal service that meets the needs of the people of Canada. When seniors who do not drive or live on a fixed income cannot receive their medications or other essentials in the town where they live, their needs are clearly not being met. When small businesses and farmers are forced to leave their place of work for more than an hour to pick up or drop off parcels, their needs are not being met.

How are the residents of Bentley supposed to heed the Prime Minister's calls for Canadians to reduce their carbon footprint when they must travel so far just to pick up their mail?

The Minister of Public Services and Procurement must immediately take action to right this wrong and restore full postal services in Bentley. Bentley deserves better.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT

Mrs. Deborah Schulte (King—Vaughan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Environmental Protection Act is the primary law governing pollution prevention and the management of toxic chemicals. In 2017, after almost a year of work, the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development submitted a report with 87 recommendations to strengthen and modernize the act, and we look forward to the government's response in June. A strengthened CEPA would protect the environment, the economy, and the health of Canadians.

In the meantime, I am proud to have sponsored a petition calling on the government to modernize and strengthen CEPA, submitted by Kerry Mueller. It can be accessed online through the House of Commons e-petitions website. In just three weeks, over 10,000 Canadians have signed on. It is the biggest e-petition on environmental protection ever, with support from every province and territory. I urge everyone concerned about toxins in Canada to sign the petition.

* * *

BOYS AND GIRLS CLUBS OF CANADA

Ms. Sonia Sidhu (Brampton South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I would like to welcome the Boys and Girls Clubs of Canada to Ottawa as it hosts its first annual Unplug to Connect event. The Boys and Girls Clubs organization does incredible work in communities across Canada. Its life-changing programs focus on community-based service and on building relationships for children with their

peers and volunteers so that our youth have the skills they need for the future.

The local Peel chapter is located in my riding of Brampton South, and I have had the chance to get to know some of the amazing youth who are involved with the club. I applaud the outstanding work done by Michael Gyovai and the entire team at the Peel branch, who dedicate themselves to breaking down barriers and providing youth in Peel with a place to grow and thrive.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is my honour today to pay tribute to the 60,000 Canadians who work in the defence and security industries. These are the jobs equipping our military and first responders. Many of them are here for the CANSEC annual conference in Ottawa, and many of these employees are also veterans.

I was also proud to meet with Janna and the volunteers from Women in Defence & Security yesterday. It now has over 2,000 members working across this country in aerospace, defence, and security in high-skilled, highly trained jobs. They are our leaders. They are our builders in these sectors. I congratulate WIDS.

One of its members is a classmate of mine from military college, Christyn Cianfarani, a former naval officer, veteran, and now president of the Canadian Association of Defence and Security Industries. Christyn is leading this conference and bringing together great industry and great jobs for Canadians.

I want to thank them for kitting out our military with the equipment it needs.

Best wishes for the rest of the CANSEC conference.

* * *

[Translation]

BROME—MISSISQUOI IN OTTAWA DAY

Hon. Denis Paradis (Brome—Missisquoi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to welcome many representatives from the municipalities, organizations, and businesses in my riding to "Brome—Missisquoi in Ottawa Day". It is a great networking opportunity for various stakeholders from my region and senior officials from several departments.

Representatives from Accueil Notre-Dame, Club de la Bonne Humeur de Lac-Brome, Appalachian Corridor, *Le Saint-Armand* newspaper, the Knowlton Literary Association, Renaissance Brome Lake, Villas des Monts de Sutton, and Pettes Memorial Library, as well as representatives from the municipalities of Bedford, Eastman, Bolton-Est, Brigham, Bromont, Saint-Georges-de-Clarenceville, Dunham, Farnham, Frelighsburg, Brome Lake, Magog, Notre-Dame-de-Stanbridge, Orford, Saint-Armand, Sutton, and Venise-en-Québec all jumped at the chance.

Statements by Members

I have no doubt that today's event will serve to advance a number of projects in Brome—Missisquoi. Our region boasts many entrepreneurs, visionaries, and engaged individuals who want to contribute to the prosperity of our riding.

I invite my fellow parliamentarians to join us for a happy hour—

• (1410)

The Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Châteauguay—Lacolle.

* * *

CIRCUIT DU PAYSAN

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan (Châteauguay—Lacolle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since this week is Tourism Week in Canada, I want to take this opportunity to celebrate the 20th anniversary of the Circuit du paysan.

Boasting nearly 100 agrifood, cultural, and outdoor attractions, this marked route winds for almost 200 kilometres through the regional county municipalities of Jardins-de-Napierville, Roussillon, and Beauharnois-Salaberry. With stops at vineyards, cider mills, cheese factories, and farm stands, the Circuit du paysan is one of Quebec's most scenic culinary trails.

Popular among cyclists and vacationers alike, the Circuit du paysan showcases our region and draws in many of our neighbours from the south. Incidentally, I recently worked with my colleague from La Prairie to organize a regional round table on tourism for about 30 sector stakeholders to discuss their concerns and prospects.

I welcome all Canadians to visit us this summer.

* * *

[English]

ALS AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. David Tilson (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, if members will indulge me, I think we should all say how pleased we are to see the member for Scarborough Centre back in the House.

Each year in June we make everyone aware of ALS. Amyotrophic lateral sclerosis is a rapidly progressive, fatal motor neuron disease that leaves those affected in a state of progressive paralysis, but with full possession of their mental faculties. My father succumbed to ALS after a four-year fight, and so it has affected me personally. All members know of the courage of our late colleague, Mauril Bélanger, during his battle with this terrible disease.

Each year at this time, the Walk for ALS takes place to help raise funds for critical research and support, and there is encouraging news for this dreaded disease. Researchers believe it is a matter of when, not if, effective treatments will emerge, according to the ALS Society of Canada.

I encourage every member to wear a cornflower today to demonstrate our support for the fight against ALS, so that together, we can support victims and families and promote research to find a cure.

[Translation]

WORLD NO TOBACCO DAY

Ms. Linda Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate World No Tobacco Day.

[English]

As we know, tobacco is the leading preventable cause of disease and premature death in Canada.

[Translation]

That is why our government is committed to passing Bill S-5 to protect the health of Canadians, especially youth.

[English]

I am proud to see that it received royal assent last week.

With budget 2018, our government is renewing and enhancing the federal tobacco control strategy by investing over \$80 million.

[Translation]

In addition to helping Canadians stop smoking, this investment will support prevention efforts and reduce contraband tobacco. The goal is to get more Canadians to quit and reduce smoking deaths.

* * *

• (1415)

[English]

YOUTH

Ms. Sheri Benson (Saskatoon West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this winter I held a contest for grade 11 and 12 students. Using the theme of reconciliation, students were asked to submit their ideas for a private member's bill they felt would make a better Canada. Brody Beuker and Camilo Silva from Bethlehem High School will be visiting Ottawa next week to see me present their bill in the House of Commons.

I want to take this opportunity to recognize the incredible students who entered their amazing ideas: Shemaiah Aycardo, Ally Mae Clemente, Julia Skrypnyk, Adrianna Beaudin, Esprit Farmer; Stephanie Koban, Ian Perreault, Krizia Nan Macabudbud, Justine Cebedo, Ashley Turner, Alyssa Roach, Michelle Tim, Belle Joyal, and Travis Biller.

I was so impressed by the calibre of ideas received from these students.

Our youth are the future, and these young people are proof that our future is in very good hands.

* * *

QUEEN ELIZABETH II

Hon. Peter Van Loan (York—Simcoe, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, June 2, marks the 65th anniversary of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II's coronation in 1953.

Oral Questions

Her having ascended to the throne the previous year, the Queen's coronation ceremony was a grand occasion marked by celebrations across the United Kingdom, Canada, and the Commonwealth. It was the first televised coronation, watched by more than 20 million people around the world. The Canadian delegation was led by Prime Minister St. Laurent and Conservative opposition leader George Drew.

To mark the occasion, which was a national holiday in Canada, bronze coronation medallions were distributed to schoolchildren, and Her Majesty's royal standard was flown from the Peace Tower. Military tattoos, parades, fireworks, and concerts were held in cities, towns, and villages all across Canada.

For more than 65 years, Her Majesty has been a steady hand, a source and symbol of continuity, tradition, caring, wisdom, and duty in our fast-paced, ever-changing world. For many, she is Canada's grandmother, beloved and non-partisan, looking out for our best interests. We wish her well on this anniversary.

* * *

RAMADAN

Mrs. Salma Zahid (Scarborough Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to wish *Ramadan Mubarak* to Muslims in Canada and around the world celebrating the holy month of Ramadan.

It is a time when we reflect on empathy, discipline, compassion, and charity. We fast during the daytime and gather with friends and family at night to share a meal and a prayer.

This year, as we celebrate the 30th anniversary of the Canadian Multiculturalism Act, let us take this time to reaffirm our commitment to the diversity that makes Canada strong.

Though I cannot join the fast this year due to my ongoing treatment for non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, I am happy to report that treatment is going well.

From the bottom of my heart, I would really like to thank the people of Scarborough Centre, my family, and my friends on both sides of the aisle for all their prayers and support and for all the good wishes I have received in the last three and a half months.

[Member spoke in Arabic and provided the following translation:]

God willing,

[English]

I look forward to joining all of my colleagues in the fall to continue our work for all Canadians.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[English]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today our thoughts are with the families of steel and aluminum workers in Ontario, Quebec, and Saskatchewan. The Prime Minister went to these communities on a victory tour. He personally promised those

families that he had fixed the issue. He walked into those communities as a saviour.

Today the Prime Minister is a failure. What is his plan to fix this tariff issue?

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order. Order.

• (1420)

[Translation]

Order. The hon. member for Thérèse-De Blainville should not heckle.

[English]

The hon. Minister of Transport.

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleague across the way should know better. This is not the time to be partisan. This is about Canadian workers.

We have been unequivocal. These tariffs are completely unacceptable. The Canadian and American economies are so closely linked that these tariffs will harm workers on both sides of the border. We will defend our steel and aluminum industry, as well as Canadian workers. We will impose trade restriction measures of up to \$16.6 billion worth of U.S. imports. The U.S. tariffs are in violation—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Durham.

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives are not partisan when fighting for Canadian interests. The families impacted by this decision do not want more platitudes from the Liberals. They want a plan. The Prime Minister has known for months that this was coming. He did nothing. The Conservative Party has been working with the government. We are Team Canada, but Team Canada needs a plan.

What is the government's plan to fix this tariff issue?

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadian steel and aluminum workers have our full support. These tariffs are completely unacceptable. In response, we intend to impose tariffs against imports of steel, aluminum, and other products from the U.S. This means that we are imposing dollar-for-dollar tariffs for every dollar levied against Canadians by the U.S.

As the Prime Minister told steel and aluminum workers when he visited their manufacturing plants across the country, this government will always stand up for them.

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government has focused on non-trade issues at the NAFTA table and there is no U.S. trade contingency plan in the budget, and then the Prime Minister went to the president's hometown to deliver a speech that many viewed as a critique of the president. So far, the Prime Minister's plan has failed Canadians.

Will the government agree to sit down with the Conservative Party and let us work together to help these workers?

Oral Questions

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government will always stand up for the Canadian steel industry and its workers. Today, we announced that Canada will impose up to \$16.6 billion worth of tariffs on steel, aluminum, and other imports from the U.S. Today we are beginning a 15-day consultation period with Canadians on these countermeasures. Our steel and aluminum workers need to know that we have their backs.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the reality is that the Liberal government's report card when it comes to trade relations with the United States is abysmal. We have no softwood lumber agreement, and NAFTA negotiations have hit a dead end. Liberal incompetence reached a new low today, since the Prime Minister has once again been unable to stand up for our aluminum and steel industry.

How many jobs will be lost in Canada as a direct result of 25% tariffs on steel and 10% on aluminium? What do the Liberals plan to do for workers?

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have been unequivocal. These tariffs are completely unacceptable. The Canadian and American economies are so closely linked that these tariffs will harm workers on both sides of the border.

We will defend our industries, as well as Canadian workers. We will impose trade restriction measures of up to \$16.6 billion worth of U.S. imports. This American decision is contrary to NAFTA and WTO rules, and we will do everything we can to dispute it.

We want Canadian workers to know that their government will stand up for them.

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we want more than just words. Here are some words: last March, the Prime Minister personally assured aluminum workers in Saguenay that the problem with the U.S. tariffs was over. He informed the workers that the U.S. President had told him that as long as there was a free trade agreement, there would not be any tariffs.

He took the President at his word, without saying or doing a single thing to oppose the threat of U.S. protectionism. The Prime Minister's enormous gullibility has put thousands of jobs at risk. He has no plan for this industry. Besides words, what concrete measures is he going to take for the families of workers who are worried sick about their future today?

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our colleague should be ashamed of his partisan posturing. We will always defend our industries and Canadian workers. We will impose trade restrictions of up to \$16.16 billion worth of U.S. imports, and today we are beginning a 15-day consultation period with Canadians on our countermeasures.

Steel and aluminum workers can count on the support of their government.

•(1425)

Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau (Berthier—Maskinongé, NDP): Mr. Speaker, after months of paralyzing uncertainty, the U.S. president has decided to impose punitive tariffs on our aluminum and steel industries claiming that our exports threaten national security.

Thousands of Canadian jobs are in jeopardy and we have had enough of Donald Trump's threats. Canadian workers are the ones who are caught in the middle of this trade war.

Where is the Liberal government's plan to protect Canadian workers?

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have been unequivocal. These tariffs are completely unacceptable. The Canadian and American economies are so closely linked that these tariffs will harm workers on both sides of the border. We will defend our steel and aluminum industry, as well as Canadian workers. The American decision goes against NAFTA and the WTO rules. We will do everything we can to dispute it.

Canadian workers can count on their government.

[*English*]

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Mr. Speaker, no one is surprised that President Trump imposed tariffs today—he has been tweeting about it for months—no one except for the Liberals. The Liberals watched this deadline day after day, week after week, and failed to secure an exemption for Canadian workers.

Steel and aluminum workers are worried about how they are going to take care of their families. Will the government assure the tens of thousands of workers who are now caught in this trade war that their jobs are protected?

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadian steel and aluminum workers have our full support. These tariffs are completely unacceptable, and we have made that very clear. In response, we intend to impose tariffs against imports of steel, aluminum, and other products from the U.S. This means we are imposing dollar for dollar tariffs for every dollar levied against Canada by the U.S.

As the Prime Minister told steel and aluminum workers when he visited their manufacturing plants across the country, this government will always stand up for them.

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Mr. Speaker, if this is their full support, then workers in Canada are disappointed with their failure to get a full exemption. We all know the tariffs imposed by the White House are a threatening tactic to get what it wants out of NAFTA.

The question all Canadians have for the government is why it could not secure a full exemption. Canada has been the Americans' closest friend, neighbour, and ally, but now Canadian workers are under attack, and they will pay the price for this failed Liberal leadership. What will the government do to actually protect workers and their jobs?

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government will always stand up for Canadian steel and aluminum workers, and we have made it very clear that the tariffs imposed by the United States today are completely unacceptable and have nothing to do with national security.

Oral Questions

We have announced that Canada will impose up to \$16.6 billion worth of tariffs on steel, aluminum, and other products. Today we are beginning our consultation with Canadians with respect to the measures we are taking. Our steel and aluminum workers need to know that we will have their backs.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Karine Trudel (Jonquière, NDP): Mr. Speaker, here we are talking about this tax today. It is clearly a failure of the Trudeau government. The tariffs announced by the United States will affect thousands of workers in Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean. These tariffs could also affect SMEs and the industry's entire value chain—

The Speaker: I would remind the hon. member not to use the name of another member. She can now finish her question.

Ms. Karine Trudel: Mr. Speaker, I apologize. I will start over. The tariffs announced by the United States will affect thousands of workers in Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean. These tariffs could also affect SMEs and the industry's entire value chain. While Canada and the United States go back and forth with tariffs and counter-tariffs, workers could end up suffering.

What measures will the government take to protect workers in my region and across the country?

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, these tariffs are unacceptable, and we will take strong action to protect Canada's interests.

These tariffs will hurt American workers and the industry. The United States actually has a surplus in the steel and aluminum trade with Canada. Canada is a reliable supplier of steel and aluminum for the American defence and security sector.

The idea that Canada could constitute a threat to national security is frankly absurd. Canadian workers need to know that their government will always have their backs.

* * *

• (1430)

[*English*]

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Ron Liepert (Calgary Signal Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Prime Minister invoked the name of Peter Lougheed in trying to justify his nationalization of the Kinder Morgan pipeline. I worked with Peter Lougheed back in the 1980s, and Peter Lougheed never nationalized a pipeline. He never nationalized anything. In fact, Peter Lougheed defended Alberta's resources from the Prime Minister's father, who attempted to destroy the energy industry in Alberta.

Will the Prime Minister stand up in this House and apologize, something he has become very good at lately in the House, for sullyng the premier's name, all in the vein of trying to justify nationalization of a pipeline?

Ms. Kim Rudd (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what we are doing is investing to protect thousands of jobs in Alberta, and indeed, across the country. During 10 years, the Conservatives' rigid ideology failed to build pipelines to markets, other than those to the United States, and failed Canadian workers. When the Prime Minister went to Fort

McMurray and met energy sector workers, he told them that this government will have their backs. This is an investment in hard-working Canadians.

Conservatives might think it is too risky to bid on Canadian workers, but we will always stand up for them.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, New Brunswick's *Telegraph-Journal* says the Prime Minister doomed energy east by moving the goal posts and changing the rules at the last minute to “make approval more difficult” with an “impossible and unrealistic” standard and that the Liberals are “making Canada uncompetitive on the world stage and endangering the future of our energy sector.” That is true, and the Prime Minister killed two other pipelines with uncertainty and red tape too.

When will the Prime Minister stop forcing investment out of Canada?

Ms. Kim Rudd (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is an absurd comparison of the two pipelines. Suggesting political interference was somehow the answer lies at the heart of the Conservative Party's failure on pipelines. It is shocking that the Conservatives cannot tell the difference between a project that is facing political interference by a provincial government and a project that a company dropped because it simply saw no business case for it.

The Trans Mountain expansion project is in Canada's national interest. It means thousands of good-paying jobs that will strengthen and grow our middle class.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is failing, and worse, dividing Canadians. Like the Saint John mayor, the paper says Liberals are leaving the east without key infrastructure, and “Energy East didn't need a buyout. It just needed Ottawa to make the case for it.” Actually, that is just like Trans Mountain, except the Liberals approved it with different rules, but “the interests of the Maritimes have been ignored.... A shame that, with Energy East, it was the interest of the whole country scuttled by remarkable incompetence.”

Why will the Prime Minister not stop picking favourites in pipelines and provinces and champion Canadian energy for all?

Ms. Kim Rudd (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the reality is that the B.C. government has been intimidating a private company and a project that has been approved by both the federal and provincial governments. We will not be intimidated. This project is in the national interest, and we are taking action to ensure that it is built for the benefit of all Canadians.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

Mr. Bernard Généreux (Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when the Liberals came to power, there were four viable private sector pipelines. Now there are none.

How many other private enterprises does the Prime Minister intend to first sabotage and then go behind the scenes to nationalize for billions of dollars? Is this his attempt at making his father's dream come true with national energy program version 2.0?

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what we are doing is investing to protect thousands of jobs in Alberta and across the country. For 10 years, the Conservatives' rigid ideology kept them from building pipelines to transport our resources anywhere other than the United States. They failed in their duty to Canadian workers. When the Prime Minister went to Fort McMurray and met with energy sector workers, he told them the government would have their backs. This investment is an investment in hard-working Canadians.

● (1435)

[English]

Hon. Michelle Rempel (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my colleague opposite just said that private companies did not see a business case for pipelines in Canada. They did during our government, when we did not have a tanker ban, when we did not put in place a carbon tax, when we were not politically vetoing major projects that had already passed major environmental reviews. The reality is that there is no business case in Canada for major resource projects because of the Prime Minister and his bad policies.

Will the member get up, correct the record, and say that there is no business case in Canada for private investment in the energy sector because of them?

Ms. Kim Rudd (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the previous government spent 10 years pitting the environment and the economy against each other. It pitted us against each other. It polarized us. That is not who we are.

The majority of Canadians support this project. The majority of Canadians understand that we are in a transition to a clean growth economy and that we will not get there overnight, but we will get there.

This week is about providing Canadian families with certainty. No political interference should ever get in the way of that. Make no mistake, this investment is in Canada's future.

Hon. Michelle Rempel (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the political interference that has occurred in the natural resource sector was under the government when it vetoed the northern gateway pipeline.

It is so rich for the Liberals to stand and talk about political polarization, when we have everybody in the country united around one thing, that we should not have to spend \$4.5 billion to send private investment outside the country. The government needs to stand up and take accountability for the fact that it is chasing away investment from this country. It will do it for years to come.

Why will the government not take responsibility for its failures?

Ms. Kim Rudd (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we will take no lessons from the party opposite on how to support a pipeline and actually get one built.

Let us be clear, the permit for the northern gateway project was quashed by the court because of the absolute failure on the part of the Harper Conservatives—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order, order. The hon. opposition House leader has been talking throughout the answer. I would ask her not to do that, and I would ask all members on both sides not to speak when someone else has the floor.

Order. The hon. parliamentary secretary has the floor.

Ms. Kim Rudd: Mr. Speaker, as I said, the permit for the northern gateway project was quashed in court because of the absolute failure on the part of the Harper Conservatives to appropriately consult indigenous peoples. We will take our role in this process very seriously, and we will continue to work with indigenous communities, municipalities, provinces, and territories to ensure that good projects move forward and create good jobs.

* * *

[Translation]

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Mr. Romeo Saganash (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, NDP): Mr. Speaker, yesterday was a remarkable day since my bill to ensure that our laws respect the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples was passed. Yesterday, I also asked the Prime Minister whether his decision to impose a pipeline despite opposition from first nations upheld the honour of the crown. However, as we saw, he did not answer.

Does this government believe that its approach to the pipeline respects the letter and the spirit of the declaration?

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the New Democrats applauded Premier Notley's environmental protection plan. I would like to remind them of something that they seem to have forgotten, and that is that Ms. Notley's plan included limiting greenhouse gas emissions from the oil sands, putting a price on carbon, building a pipeline to get resources to markets other than the United States, and holding many consultations with Canada's indigenous people. That is an example of real leadership on climate change.

[English]

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals spent so much money on a pipeline, they cannot afford new talking points.

Oral Questions

Yesterday was an historic day for Canada, because we voted 206 to 79 to pass Bill C-262, enshrining the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples into Canadian law. We must thank my friend, the member for Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, for a lifetime of dedication fighting for the rights of aboriginal people.

Now it is time for the Liberal government to put action behind its words and its vote. Will it respect UNDRIP and commit not to put a shovel into the ground on their new pipeline until after all the aboriginal rights and title cases have been resolved?

• (1440)

Ms. Kim Rudd (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the member opposite that we took additional time and steps to review the process to make it more rigorous. We extended consultation to ensure we were meeting and indeed exceeding our duty to consult indigenous peoples. That is something the Harper government failed to do.

The permit for northern gateway was quashed in court because of a lack of consultation by the former Conservative government. As a project that was subject to the most exhaustive review of any pipeline in Canadian history, this pipeline will be built.

* * *

TAXATION

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, these Trump tariffs will be damaging on Canadian steel and aluminum producers, almost as damaging as the Liberal tariffs that are being imposed on those very same Canadian companies in the form of carbon taxes and higher payroll taxes, taxes that their competitors south of the border will not have to pay.

In light of today's trade dispute, will the government exempt Canadian companies from these punitive taxes so they can compete against their American counterparts?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it seems the party opposite has learned nothing. The environment and the economy go together. We have been clear that we are going to tackle climate change. We are going to take serious action. We are going to put a price on pollution. We are phasing out coal. We are making historic investments in public transportation, green infrastructure and clean technology, which is a \$23 trillion opportunity. Why does the party opposite not get with the program?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal program is to move jobs and industry out of this country to jurisdictions that have poorer environmental standards and where jobs will not come to Canadian workers.

These taxes will impose higher costs on Canadian enterprises and Canadian workers, right at a time when they can least afford to face those kinds of costs. Will the government exempt Canadian businesses that are competing fiercely with companies south of the border from these new taxes and protect Canadian jobs?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to stand up today, wearing a hammer necklace in memory of my hometown “the

Hammer”. We will stand up for Canadian jobs. We will stand up for steelworkers and aluminum workers, while also growing the economy.

Once again, I wish the party opposite would understand that in the 21st century the economy and the environment go hand in hand.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government is hammering Canadian businesses with higher taxes and higher costs. Outside of Canada companies will not have to pay these taxes. In fact, businesses will be able to set up shop and hire workers in competing jurisdictions without any of the burdens the Liberal government is imposing here at home.

Today is the day, with all the events that are before us now, for the government to announce that it will exempt Canadian businesses from these new taxes, stand up to Donald Trump, and support Canadian jobs. Will it do that?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is really disappointing that the party opposite would use the announcement by the U.S. administration to advance its own political agenda. Why does its members not stand with us and Canadian workers in standing up for what is right? That is exactly what we are doing. They should stop politicizing this issue and stand with Canadians.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are standing with Canadian workers. We are standing against the taxes that will kill jobs for Canadian workers.

The government continues to pile on one new tax after another, a carbon tax, higher payroll taxes, taxes on Canadian jobs. The only effect of that will be to drive industry to competing jurisdictions like the United States of America.

Why will the Liberals not stand up to Donald Trump, step back from these taxes, and protect Canadian jobs?

Mr. Joël Lightbound (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the member opposite that 85% of Canadians already live in a jurisdiction where there is a price on carbon. I can also tell him that 100% of small businesses will get a tax break, a tax reduction in the new budget, going to 9%.

Those are the actions we are taking, among many, to ensure that we support Canadian businesses and create jobs. We have created 600,000 jobs over the last two years, something the Conservatives never could achieve in 10 years.

Oral Questions

•(1445)

NATURAL RESOURCES

Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, a cabinet directive, in effect since 1995, compels all ministers to complete and submit a sustainability assessment on any proposal to cabinet. The Liberals proudly claim their deep commitment to ensuring sustainability considerations for all their decisions, including impacts to the environment and indigenous rights.

Did the finance minister comply with this directive and submit a sustainability assessment on his decision to buy the Kinder Morgan pipeline? If no, why not? If yes, will he publicly disclose it?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us be clear that the TMX included a full environmental assessment. We considered all different factors involved, including the impacts on climate change. It fits within Alberta's hard cap on emissions. It fits within our client plan.

Yes, of course we look at the environmental impacts of all decisions we make. We also look at the jobs impact. We wish the party opposite would do the same.

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in 2016, the Prime Minister said that while governments granted permits for resource development, only communities granted permission.

Vancouver, Burnaby, the Squamish, the Tsleil-Waututh, the Coldwater Nations, and many others along the Kinder Morgan route have said no. However, the government has taken direct ownership for driving this pipeline straight through these communities.

What does the Prime Minister plan to do when tens of thousands, maybe hundreds of thousands, of citizens demonstrate and hold him to account for his flawed pipeline and broken promise?

Ms. Kim Rudd (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the safety and security of the public in energy infrastructure is a priority for this government. Unlike the Harper Conservatives, who labelled environmental groups as foreign-funded radicals, we accept a diversity of views and opinions. However, we expect people to express their views peacefully and in accordance with the law.

We recognize that not everyone agrees with those decisions, but we remain committed to working to ensure a strong economy, while taking leadership on the environment. Our goal now is to ensure that this project moves forward to create economic benefits for all Canadians.

* * *

[Translation]

SCIENCE

Mr. Rémi Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, contrary to what the Conservatives would have people believe, all members on this side of the House are extremely proud of our Prime Minister, who is putting in place practical measures to defend the interests of Canadians and Canadian companies.

On another note, world-renowned researchers across the country are generating new knowledge and inspiring new generations of scientists. Recently, our government made historic investments in research and science.

Could the Minister of Science tell us more—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

[English]

The Speaker: Order, please. Thanks for the help, but no thank you.

The hon. Minister for Science.

[Translation]

Hon. Kirsty Duncan (Minister of Science and Minister of Sport and Persons with Disabilities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his important support for research.

[English]

Our government knows that if we want our researchers to soar to new heights, they need support.

[Translation]

That is why we announced the largest investment in research in Canada's history. This week, I announced a \$158-million investment through Insight development grants and Insight grants.

[English]

This investment will support 800 research projects across Canada, and will build a healthier, stronger, and more prosperous country.

* * *

[Translation]

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians all agree that Canada must not give preferential treatment to foreigners who enter the country illegally.

Quebec's Liberal government clearly told the federal Liberal government that it is being overwhelmed by illegal migrants and that it does not want any more.

Yesterday, we learned that the Liberal Ontario government, under the pretext of the provincial election, is refusing to accept any more illegal migrants.

If the two largest Canadian provinces are already overwhelmed, what is the minister's plan for managing this never-ending crisis?

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I completely disagree with my colleague's comments. We have been working all along with Quebec and Ontario on the issue of refugee claimants. We held our 10th meeting last night.

Oral Questions

Like Canada, Quebec is open to receiving refugee claimants as long as the rules are followed when an individual makes a refugee claim.

• (1450)

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would remind the minister that Quebec said earlier that it is anxiously awaiting a triage plan.

The level of Liberal hypocrisy is really beyond the pale. The Minister of Immigration says that illegal migrants are not welcome, but the Minister of Transport is saying that there is a process in place for illegal migrants who want to settle in Ontario.

The minister took a nice trip to Nigeria, but could not be bothered to go to Saint-Bernard-de-Lacolle to see the magnitude of the problem for himself. The minister needs to understand that the problem is here in Canada.

Will the minister finally acknowledge the problem caused by his Prime Minister, take his responsibilities seriously, and fix the problem?

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are working continuously on this important issue. I disagree with my colleague when he says that we only need to tackle this problem here in Canada.

We have introduced an outreach program in the United States to educate diaspora communities that might be thinking of coming to Canada. Right now, the majority of people crossing the border at Lacolle are from Nigeria, so our minister's visit to Nigeria was extremely important and is producing results.

* * *

[English]

ETHICS

Mr. Mel Arnold (North Okanagan—Shuswap, CPC): Mr. Speaker, here are the facts. The Liberals expropriated 25% of a fishing quota from a company and gave it to the brother of a Liberal MP and a former Liberal MP. They claimed it was for reconciliation, but now they are being sued by a first nation.

The company they awarded the quota to does not even have a boat, so it will not be able to harvest the expropriated quota. Therefore, there is no reconciliation, no harvesting, no jobs.

Will the Prime Minister do the right thing and reverse this unethical expropriation?

Mr. Terry Beech (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our decision to introduce indigenous participation is consistent with our government's commitment to develop renewed relationships in Canada with indigenous peoples. The minister made this decision to allow for an increase in indigenous participation in the fishery, and we reject any claim to the contrary in the strongest terms.

Our government is proud of this decision and will continue to focus on how it will directly benefit the people of Atlantic Canada and Quebec.

Mr. Mel Arnold (North Okanagan—Shuswap, CPC): Mr. Speaker, contrary to Liberal claims, our Conservative government initiated a process to include first nations, and I can send that press release to the member if he wishes. It would increase the total allowable catch, allowing new entrants, without stealing it away from another existing holder.

The minister has made such a botchery and ethical mess of this deal and put at risk the people and jobs in Grand Bank, Newfoundland.

Could the minister confirm that his lucky winner will not even be able to harvest its quota this year?

Mr. Terry Beech (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I stated in the House many times, these claims are completely unsubstantiated. The fact that there is a new participant in the surf clam industry should not be a surprise. As the member just stated, the Conservatives went through a similar process. The only difference, both in fact and opinion, is that they did not include indigenous people when they went through their process.

We are proud of our robust process that allowed us to pick the best expression of interest to ensure that the highest number of Atlantic Canadians and people from Quebec benefited from this decision.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the CRTC report on the future of our culture is clear: the system has to be fair. That means that the GST breaks for Netflix are unacceptable.

Above all, everyone should support content from here. Unlike the government, the CRTC listened and understood what measures needed to be taken. One of the briefs submitted to the CRTC was entitled "We do not need any more reports, just action from the government".

I cannot make this up. That was the title of the brief. Everyone is calling for the same thing.

Will the Minister of Canadian Heritage heed that call?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairperson of the CRTC and his team for their work, as well as all the stakeholders who took part in the study that I commissioned last September.

Ultimately, our objective is to modernize our laws to protect and promote our culture in the 21st century. The Minister of Innovation and I will have the opportunity to make announcements shortly regarding the modernization of the Broadcasting Act and the Telecommunications Act.

Unlike the Harper Conservatives, who made draconian cuts to the cultural sector and waged war on it, we are taking action.

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Ms. Brigitte Sansoucy (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, NDP): Mr. Speaker, seasonal workers are stretched so thin that *L'Acadie Nouvelle* has reported that workers are gathering at the church in Lamèque to pray for the workers who can no longer feed their families.

A number of organizations agree that the Liberals are flying by the seat of their pants. These seasonal workers do not need a miracle. They do not need training. They need permanent, concrete solutions to fix the EI spring gap in the long term.

Will the Prime Minister and the minister finally keep their promise?

• (1455)

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for giving me the opportunity to talk about this incredibly important topic. As she knows, a very important and never-before-seen feature appeared in budget 2018, and this shows that the Canadian government is already involved and is already aware of the measures it must take to support workers, families, and businesses with respect to seasonal work. She also knows that in the coming months and in the next two years, there will be a historic investment of \$230 million to support these communities.

* * *

DEMOCRATIC REFORM

Mr. Joël Godin (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are obviously very nervous. Canadians are waking up to the fact that this government is making a terrible mess of our beautiful country. The Liberals are panicking. Their so-called democratic reform is another tactic to try to keep the other political parties quiet. They want to limit how much political parties can spend leading up to election campaigns.

What is the problem with that? Will the same rules apply to the government? In other words, will their ministers be limited in how many announcements they can make and how much they can spend during that same period?

Hon. Karina Gould (Minister of Democratic Institutions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as you know, we introduced Bill C-76 and we hope we can work with all of our House of Commons colleagues to improve democracy so Canadians can vote. Many Canadians, 176 in fact, were not able to vote in the last election. This is a real problem for future voters. What are we going to do about it here? We are going to work together to make sure everyone in Canada can vote. [English]

Mr. Blake Richards (Banff—Airdrie, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we all know that the Liberals love to spend money that is not theirs, and the Liberal government routinely spends millions of dollars in ridings where by-elections are being called, trying to buy its way out of trouble. That money belongs to Canadian taxpayers and not to the Liberal Party.

Meanwhile, the Prime Minister is trying to restrict the opposition parties from spending their own money to speak to Canadians, but he will not ban ministerial travel or advertising in the pre-election period, because this gives the Liberals an advantage.

Oral Questions

When will the Prime Minister stop using taxpayers' money to try to buy elections for the Liberal Party?

Hon. Karina Gould (Minister of Democratic Institutions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I told my hon. colleague in committee, Bill C-76 does not limit travel at all. When he is talking about advertising, it limits it for any party during the period, and that is only with regard to advertising. Perhaps he is thinking about a previous Conservative minister who perhaps put a CPC logo when he was delivering Canada child benefit cheques. That is why we are doing this, because Canadians want to ensure integrity in our electoral system.

* * *

CARBON PRICING

Hon. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today the House is debating the 2018 budget, which imposes a massive carbon tax on Canadians. Now, other ministers have agreed to appear before committees to defend their spending plans. Sadly, despite repeated requests, the environment minister will not publicly say whether she will come to committee to defend her harmful carbon tax. The buck stops with the minister.

Canadians are demanding to know, will she publicly defend her carbon tax plan before we have to vote on it? Will she answer, and is it yes or no?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have appeared before committee many, many times on issues unrelated to carbon pricing, and the question from the party opposite is always on carbon pricing. Every day in the House I defend putting a price on pollution. Let us be clear: 80% of Canadians live in a province that has actually stepped up and said that we want to take action on climate change. Alberta, British Columbia, Ontario, and Quebec put a price on pollution. They are tackling climate change, and guess what? Their economies are the fastest-growing in the country. That is what we want to see. We want to see more jobs and less emissions, and tackle climate change. We owe it to our kids.

* * *

• (1500)

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Ms. Julie Dabrusin (Toronto—Danforth, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the sun is out, and Canadians are turning their minds to summer travel. There is no better place to travel than across our country from coast to coast to coast, and many people will be including in their plans a trip to Ottawa to celebrate Canada Day.

Can the Minister of Canadian Heritage please update the House on the planning for July 1?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada Day is a time when Canadians of all ages can take part in a wide range of activities that celebrate our communities.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

This year, Canada Day programming will showcase the important contributions of indigenous peoples and the inspiring women who shaped this nation.

Artists such as Arkells, Lights, Brigitte Boisjoli, Charlotte Cardin, and Iskwé will be on stage on July 1.

[English]

I look forward to all Canadians from coast to coast coming to Parliament Hill for July 1 to celebrate Canada Day together.

* * *

[Translation]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher (Beauport—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île d'Orléans—Charlevoix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we know the Prime Minister is eager to show my wonderful riding off to the whole world during the G7 meeting. We also know that events like these attract protesters and vandals.

We all deplore that type of violence, and the Prime Minister must stop denying its existence. He needs to step up and provide assurances to people affected by the G7.

Can he tell us if his government has set aside a special fund to compensate the people who end up being victims of vandalism?

[English]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, arrangements are firmly in place to deal with all eventualities around the G7 summit. Obviously, meetings of the G7 are extremely important to the participants, but also to many other countries around the world. Security is important. That is the responsibility of the host country. The arrangements have been put in place, and the opposition parties have been briefed. Canadians can count on the excellent professionalism of their police and security services.

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the shortfall for clean water for first nations on reserve is \$3.2 billion. The shortfall on housing is much more severe. When I am dealing, as I was this week, with a young mother with a chronically sick child living in a mould-infested shack, what am I to tell her? Do I tell her that she is now a part owner of a 65-year-old pipeline, or that it is not going to be Doug Ford driving the first bulldozer through first nation territory but the Prime Minister?

Why is it that with first nation children, change is always incremental, but Texas oil investors get from the Prime Minister what they want, when they want it?

Hon. Jane Philpott (Minister of Indigenous Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the House we all agreed together, or at least most of the parties agreed, that we respect the rights of indigenous peoples. Our government has embarked on a new relationship with indigenous peoples. We are making the appropriate investments, \$17 billion in the last three budgets. There are 13,000 homes being built

across the country. There are 62 drinking water advisories that have been lifted across the country. There are new investments in schools, health care, and infrastructure. We are getting the work done.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Hon. John McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for the sixth time, Bill Browder was arrested on an Interpol arrest warrant. Mr. Browder has been tireless in his advocacy of the Magnitsky legislation. To retaliate, Russia has added him to the Interpol warrant list. Could the Minister of Public Safety speak to what the Government of Canada is doing to ensure that individuals unjustly blacklisted by Russia, such as Mr. Browder, will not be unlawfully detained if they come to Canada?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last fall, I condemned Russia's abuse of the Interpol notice system to try to block Bill Browder from visiting Canada to celebrate the passage of Canada's Magnitsky act. As I said then, "Canada will decide admissibility to Canada, not the Kremlin." Interpol notices are a valuable tool that should not be perverted for other purposes, such as foreign political interference.

When Mr. Browder was in Canada earlier this year, he was welcomed and celebrated as a human rights champion, including by all sides in the House, and I am sure this will continue.

* * *

[Translation]

ETHICS

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we know that anything goes with the Liberals, as long as they do not get caught red-handed.

I have spoken out multiple times about the conflict of interest created by the Prime Minister's family trip to the Aga Khan's private island. This morning, the media reported that a memo on meetings between the Prime Minister's Office and the Aga Khan's office had been almost completely redacted. So much for Liberal transparency.

If transparency is so important to the Prime Minister's Office, why were 251 of the 316 pages redacted? What are they hiding?

● (1505)

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can assure the member that at the end of the day, we have a Prime Minister who is committed to working with the Ethics Commissioner in full co-operation, which has been illustrated on numerous occasions.

We, on this side of the House, have full confidence in our independent offices, whether it is the commissioner's office or Elections Canada. This is important in terms of our parliamentary traditions and history, and we support that.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

IMMIGRATION, CITIZENSHIP AND REFUGEES

Mr. Rhéal Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, GPQ): Mr. Speaker, on April 26, The Canadian Press reported that Ottawa was late in delivering its promised plan for triaging asylum seekers. On April 18, the minister had promised that the plan would be released within a few days. Then, the government said it would be out in a few weeks. Now it says it will be a few months.

Does the minister realize that while he plays around, killing time, asylum seekers continue to pour in every day through Roxham Road?

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are working on a triage plan in close collaboration with Quebec and Ontario, because we know that many asylum seekers are heading for Ontario.

We have been working closely with officials from Ontario's Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration, and we have made considerable progress. However, we need to wait until Ontario chooses a new government before we can finalize the arrangements we have made.

Mr. Rhéal Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, GPQ): That's just it, Mr. Speaker. The government is talking and waiting, but meanwhile things are simply not working.

The government is saying that the triage plan is being held up by the election in Ontario. What will the Liberals' excuse be once the election is over? Will asylum seekers stop coming through Quebec because there is an election in Ontario? When the election is over, will the Liberals blame the delay on the Saint-Jean holiday, the construction holiday, the election in Quebec, or the Christmas holidays? What will their excuse be?

We need a triage plan now. Is that so hard to understand?

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, perhaps my colleague does not understand that a triage plan does not just involve asking people whether they want to go right or left. It is much more complex than that.

Ontario needs to commit to transporting asylum seekers, receiving them, and implementing various programs like those in Quebec. It is very complex. We need to deal with reality, and I can assure the House that we will not stop for June 24.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, today, President Trump decided to slap tariffs of 25% and 10% on steel and aluminum.

Since Mr. Trump's arrival, Canada has not managed to re-establish a balance of power. The Liberal government's strategy is to kowtow to the U.S. in the hope of avoiding its wrath. In the meantime, very important sectors of Quebec's economy are being attacked on all sides.

Will the Prime Minister admit that his strategy has failed and will have disastrous consequences for Quebec's economy?

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we disagree with the tariffs imposed by the United States. We are standing up for our aluminum and steel workers. We have been clear about the measures we will take in the next few weeks in response to what the United States has done. We are here for Quebec and Canadian workers. We fully reject the reason given by the United States to justify its tariffs.

* * *

[English]

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: I draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in the gallery of this year's recipients of the Governor General's Performing Arts Awards.

The recipients of the Lifetime Artistic Achievement Awards are Andrew Alexander, Geneviève Bujold, Peter Hermdorf, Angela Hewitt, Ginette Laurin, and Murray McLauchlan.

The recipient of the Ramon John Hnatyshyn Award for Voluntarism in the Performing Arts is Florence Junca Adenot.

The recipients of the National Arts Centre Award are Tegan and Sara Quin.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: I invite all hon. members to meet the recipients at a reception in room 216-N after the votes. It is up to members, obviously, whether they stay for votes, but I am guessing most will.

* * *

● (1510)

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Hon. Andrew Leslie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs (Canada-U.S. Relations), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among the parties and if you seek it, I think you would find unanimous consent for the following motion. I move:

That the House (a) stand with steel and aluminum workers in Saguenay, Hamilton, Sault Ste. Marie, Regina, and all across Canada; (b) agree that US action today on steel and aluminum is unacceptable, even more so because it is being done on national security grounds; and (c) and that the House is of the view that Canada should retaliate.

[Translation]

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

Hon. members: Agreed.

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

Hon. members: Agreed.

Government Orders

(Motion agreed to)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

FEDERAL SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT ACT

The House resumed from May 30 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.

The Speaker: It being 3:13 p.m., pursuant to the order made on Tuesday, May 29, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at report stage of Bill C-57.

Call in the members.

And the bells having rung

● (1520)

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 689)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Allison
Arnold	Barlow
Benzen	Bergen
Bernier	Berthold
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Block
Boucher	Brassard
Carrie	Chong
Clarke	Cooper
Diotte	Dreeshen
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast	Finley
Gallant	Généreux
Genuis	Gladu
Godin	Gourde
Hoback	Jeneroux
Kelly	Kmiec
Lake	Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lloyd	Lobb
Lukiwski	MacKenzie
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)	Nater
Nicholson	Nuttall
O'Toole	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Saroya	Schmale
Shields	Shipley
Sorenson	Stanton
Strahl	Stubbs
Sweet	Tilson
Trost	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Vecchio
Waugh	Webber
Wong	Yurdiga
Zimmer — 69	

NAYS

Members

Alldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Amos
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Aubin
Ayoub	Badawey

Bagnell	Bains
Barsalou-Duval	Baylis
Beech	Benson
Bittle	Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Boissonnault
Bossio	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Breton
Brousseau	Caesar-Chavannes
Cannings	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chen
Choquette	Cornier
Cullen	Cuzner
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeCoursey	Dhalwal
Dhillon	Donnelly
Drouin	Dubé
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	Dusseault
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Eyking
Fergus	Fillmore
Finnigan	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser (Central Nova)
Freeland	Garneau
Garrison	Gerretsen
Goodale	Gould
Graham	Hajdu
Hardie	Harvey
Hébert	Holland
Housefather	Hughes
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Jolibois
Joly	Jones
Jowhari	Khalid
Khera	Kwan
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Laverdière
Lebouthillier	Lefebvre
Leslie	Levitt
Lightbound	Long
Longfield	Ludwig
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malcolmson	Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)	Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
May (Saanch—Gulf Islands)	McCrimmon
McDonald	McGuinity
McKay	McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendès	Mendicino
Mihychuk	Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Érables)
Soeurs	Moore
Monsef	Murray
Morrissey	Nault
Nassif	O'Connell
Ng	Oliver
Oliphant	Paupé
Paradis	Peterson
Peschisolido	Picard
Philpott	Quach
Poissant	Ramsey
Qualtrough	Ratansi
Rankin	Robillard
Rioux	Rogers
Rodriguez	Rudd
Romanado	Rusnak
Ruimy	Sahota
Saganash	Sangha
Saini	Sarai
Sansoucy	Schieffe
Scarpaleggia	Serré
Schulte	Sheehan
Shanahan	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Simms
Sikand	Spengemann
Sorbara	Stetski
Ste-Marie	Tan
Tabbara	Tootoo
Tassi	Trudel
Trudeau	

Government Orders

Vandal
Vaughan
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Young

Vandenbeld
Virani
Wilson-Raybould
Yip
Zahid— 188

PAIRED

Members

LeBlanc

Plamondon— 2

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 defeated.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Ottawa Centre, Lib.) moved that Bill C-57, an act to amend the Federal Sustainable Development Act, be concurred in at report stage.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And five or more members having risen:

• (1525)

[*English*]

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

(*Division No. 690*)

YEAS

Members

Abouttaif
Albrecht
Alghabra
Allison
Anandasangaree
Arnold
Arya
Aubin
Badawey
Bains
Barsalou-Duval
Beech
Benzen
Bernier
Bittle
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Block
Bossio
Boulerice
Brassard
Brosseau
Cannings
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chen
Choquette
Cooper
Cullen
Dabrusin
DeCoursey

Albas
Aldag
Alleslev
Amos
Angus
Arseneault
Ashton
Ayoub
Bagnell
Barlow
Baylis
Benson
Bergen
Berthold
Blair
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boissonnault
Boucher
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Carrie
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chong
Clarke
Cormier
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal

Dhillon
Donnelly
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
Eglinski
El-Khoury
Eyking
Fast
Fillmore
Finnigan
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gameau
Généreux
Gerretsen
Godin
Gould
Graham
Hardie
Hébert
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Jeneroux
Joly
Jowhari
Khalid
Kmiec
Lake
Lametti
Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lloyd
Long
Ludwig
MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Mathysen
May (Cambridge)
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Soeurs)
Monsef
Morrissey
Nassif
Nault
Nicholson
O'Connell
Oliver
Paradis
Peschisolido
Philpott
Poissant
Qualtrough
Rankin
Reid
Richards
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Rusnak
Sahota
Sangha
Saroya
Schiefke
Schulte
Shanahan
Shields
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara

Diotte
Dreeshen
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dusseault
Easter
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fergus
Finley
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (Central Nova)
Gallant
Garrison
Genuis
Gladu
Goodale
Gourde
Hajdu
Harvey
Hoback
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Jolibois
Jones
Kelly
Khera
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lightbound
Lobb
Longfield
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McCrimmon
McGuinity
McKenna
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)
Moore
Murray
Nater
Ng
Nuttall
Oliphant
O'Toole
Pauzé
Peterson
Picard
Quach
Ramsey
Ratansi
Rempel
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Ruimy
Saganash
Saini
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Schmale
Serré
Sheehan
Shipley
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorenson

Business of the House

Spengemann
Ste-Marie
Strahl
Sweet
Tan
Tilson
Trudeau
Van Kesteren
Vandal
Vaughan
Viersen
Wagh
Whalen
Wong
Yip
Yurdiga
Zimmer — 255

Stanton
Stetski
Stubbs
Tabbara
Tassi
Tootoo
Trudel
Van Loan
Vandenbeld
Vecchio
Virani
Webber
Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewskyj
Young
Zahid

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Members

LeBlanc

Plamondon — 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, just prior to the votes, the House voted unanimously to support steel and aluminum workers and their families across this country, which I support.

There was a small omission. There have been discussions among the parties to make one small addition, which is an important one to the people of Kitimat, British Columbia, and I would ask for the unanimous consent of the House to amend the motion.

Nine out of 10 aluminum smelters in Canada are, of course, located in Quebec, but there is one outside of Quebec, and that is in Kitimat in British Columbia. Those families would very much also appreciate the support of the House of Commons in what is obviously a very stressful and difficult time.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

• (1530)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Candice Bergen (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions relating to the business that we are going to be dealing with next week. In the last couple of days the government has used time allocation a number of times for bills that it is moving ahead—not that we agree with it, but it is within the government's purview to do it.

Standing Order 78 says “A Minister of the Crown who from his or her place in the House, at a previous sitting, has stated that an agreement could not be reached...” and then it goes on to the provision. We know that the government did not speak to us in the opposition at all, not to me or the NDP, about bill C-74, but it has moved time allocation on that bill even though the Liberals have not talked to us.

My first question is this: are they planning on moving time allocation on bills that they have not even talked with us about?

My second question is also related to that matter. Regarding the business of the House, I would like to know why the government House leader is not following the custom of sitting down with the opposition to discuss priority bills that the government wants to pass or advance before the June adjournment. It is very normal practice that the government House leader would sit down and talk with us and let us know.

Other bills have been discussed previously, but because she has not done that here, there is a vacuum in the House that has led to some unnecessary chaos and unintended consequences. In fact, we have not had a House leadership meeting in nine days.

I have those two questions, and I also would like to ask the government if it could tell us what business we will be looking at this next week.

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would encourage the opposition House leader to speak to the government House leader on the questions that she has just raised.

In the meantime, this afternoon we will continue with report stage of Bill C-74, the Budget Implementation Act, 2018, No. 1.

Following this debate, we will turn to Bill C-47, the arms trade treaty, also at report stage.

[Translation]

Tomorrow morning, we will begin third reading of Bill C-57, an act to amend the Federal Sustainable Development Act. Monday and Wednesday shall be allotted days. Next week, priority will be given to the following bills: Bill-C-74, budget implementation act, 2018, No. 1; Bill C-69 on environmental assessments; Bill C-75 on modernizing the justice system; and Bill C-47 on the Arms Trade Treaty.

[English]

Mr. John Nater: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would draw your attention to page 363 of the 24th edition of Erskine May, which says that during the weekly business statement members are permitted in the U.K. parliament to ask supplementary questions to the weekly business statement.

To the Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, could he perhaps answer the questions asked by the hon. House leader for the opposition about which time allocation motion will be forthcoming and what the priority bills of the government are for this week?

Government Orders

The Speaker: That may be the practice in Westminster, but it has not been the practice here, as I think the member knows. If he would like that to be the practice, I respect that.

The hon. Minister of Transport is rising on a point.

Hon. Marc Garneau: Mr. Speaker, it is for one last time, I hope.

You know that rail safety is my top priority.

[Translation]

Pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I am very proud to table, one year early, the report from the study on the Railway Safety Act.

* * *

[English]

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2018, NO. 1

The House resumed 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, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): Mr. Speaker, could you tell me how much time I have left?

The Speaker: I apologize. I should have done that already. The hon. member for Calgary Shepard has five minutes remaining.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be restarting the debate with the time I have left. After the interesting and lively question period we had, I want to return to a few points I made yesterday on a different bill, because it speaks to the substance of the budget in the end.

A mantra the government has used repeatedly in the House, and it used it again in question period, is that “the environment and the economy go together.” Those were the exact words used by the Minister of Environment.

In the budget book, my hope would have been to have actually seen an attempt to get a balance between the environment and the economy, but the Liberals failed to do so. We can see that in the repeated deficits they have created year after year. They are structural and they are occurring at a time when we are seeing growth in the economy.

It is not stellar growth. In fact, we are not the leading economy in the G7. We are a middling country in the G7. There is a lot of growth the government has hurt. The PBO reported that we are losing up to 0.4%, perhaps 0.5% in GDP growth. This is a penalty on Canadians. It is a penalty on middle-class families.

I asked the Parliamentary Budget Office staff at a committee if they had ever seen the Government of Canada impose a policy decision that resulted in the loss of a half a percentage of GDP growth. For a moment they were stunned and silent, and actually said “no”. They have not gotten back to the committee since then with an example of the Canadian government purposely reducing economic growth through its own policy decision.

I talked earlier about how the first quarter of the year is being reported as one of the slowest in two years in terms of growth, partly because of the mortgage decisions. Nineteen to 20 mortgage decisions have been taken by the Government of Canada over the

past two years that have hurt the ability of middle-class Canadians, and in fact all Canadians, to purchase their first homes, move down or move up the housing ladder, and invest in themselves for the future. There was the stress test. We know the B20 rule, introduced January 1, has hurt Canadians.

I tried to raise this matter at the finance committee yesterday as material to the budget, because indeed the budget outlook is dependent on ensuring strong economic growth. Yesterday, when I raised the matter, it was voted down by every single Liberal member on the committee, without a single word spoken as to an explanation. The members simply voted it down. They did not want to hear it, and why would they want to when the news is all bad?

I used the Yiddish proverb before that “money is round and it rolls away from you”. It is rolling away from the Government of Canada. These runaway deficits are ensuring that future generations of Canadians will have to pay for this uncontrolled spending that the Government of Canada has pursued, and for very little purpose. There is no actual end goal to any of this. There is no end purpose to these three budget bills that they have provided to us so far, and the implementation of them. We do not know when the budget will be balanced. We know when they talk about the environment and the economy going hand in hand what they actually mean is one hand is in the pocket of the taxpayer fishing out carbon taxes and the other hand is in the pocket of Canadians fishing out higher small business taxes and higher payroll taxes.

I will mention that the Liberals did abandon a great deal of the disastrous small business tax they were going to try to impose back in the fall, but I still have constituents today who will be severely and deeply affected by these new small business tax plans.

These are not rich Canadians. These are people who in their line of business are not earning anywhere near the highest marginal effective tax rate. They are simply in a business that is proving to be profitable, and each spouse wants to take a little out of the business to pay themselves. The taxes being proposed in the budget and the changes to the small business taxation being proposed to dividend schemes and passive income in this budget will hurt those small business owners in my riding. It is a new set of people who are going to be hurt by them, not the same individuals who stood up and vociferously opposed the government in the fall for the tax changes it proposed.

I will be opposing the budget bill. It is another failure. We have three consecutive failed budget bills that will not achieve any of the goals of balancing the environment and the economy.

• (1535)

Ms. Filomena Tassi (Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to focus my question on economic growth. That was a large part of my colleague's speech this afternoon.

We made a clear decision. We believed that Canadians were very hard-working and we knew that investing in Canadians was going to lead to economic growth. Over the past two and a half years, that has proven to be true. With our investments and the hard work of Canadians, the result has been that more than 600,000 jobs have been created since November 2015.

Privilege

Also, Canada has the best balance sheet in the G7, with the lowest debt-to-GDP ratio. Our debt as a function of our economy is shrinking steadily, and it is projected to soon be at the lowest point in almost 40 years.

Does the hon. member accept these facts?

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Mr. Speaker, first, the finance committee has observed repeatedly that the debt-to-GDP ratio is not a fiscal anchor upon which one can build a public budget.

Second, the member knows, of course, that most of the jobs being created are in the public sector. We need private sector job creation to pay for those public sector jobs.

If we look at Greece before it went into its economic death spiral, it had the same type of trend. It had a reducing debt-to-GDP ratio, and then it suddenly skyrocketed. When we hit the debt wall, that figure instantly begins to change, something the Alberta government experienced in the 1990s when it hit the debt wall. When it did so, and the banks and international institutions refused to lend to it, successive governments had to pay the price. The price was then paid by the taxpayers of Alberta through higher taxes at the pumps, higher taxes on income, and deep cuts to public services. That will be the end result of this Liberal budget.

• (1540)

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, one of the things my Alberta colleague also talked about in his intervention was the fact that 200 pages of this budget deal with a carbon tax, a carbon tax on which we have not had any answers from the Liberal government in terms of what the costs will be. For example, we had the Minister of Agriculture at committee on Monday, and I asked him several times if he could tell us what the costs of the carbon tax would be for the average farm or agribusiness. He refused to answer that question. In fact, he said many times that farmers are appreciative of the carbon tax and that it is what they voted for. I have letters from literally dozens of farmers that say it is exactly what they did not vote for.

Can my colleague tell me what he feels the impact of a carbon tax will be on the average Canadian family?

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Mr. Speaker, I was remiss not to mention that, indeed, 200 pages of the budget bill, because it is an omnibus budget bill, contain within them the mechanisms by which the carbon tax will be administered. The Liberals initially said the carbon tax would be very simple. It is nothing of the sort. There is a litany of exemptions and exceptions being applied to the carbon tax.

The question of who will pay and how much they will pay is an interesting one. At committee, the Government of Canada claimed that it could not calculate it. I then raised the fact that the Alberta government was able to calculate the average cost to the average family in Alberta. It is interesting that a provincial government could calculate it, but the Canadian government could not.

The Conservative members moved eight amendments at committee to try to extract that information for the report to Parliament that was tabled. Eight times every single Liberal member voted against greater transparency on the carbon tax. When we talk about the carbon tax cover-up, we mean examples like this. Eight times members of Parliament on the Conservative side offered up distinct,

legitimate, reasonable amendments to provide a more succinct report to Parliament that would provide exactly that type of information so that Canadians would know the cost to them and how much GHG emissions would be reduced in return for this carbon tax being levied upon them, and eight times, every single Liberal MP voted against them.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I regret to bring to your attention a possible breach of privilege. The matter came to my attention in an article by *The Globe and Mail* reporter Bill Curry. Mr. Curry indicates that a ministerial staff member allegedly intimidated an important would-be witness to the Standing Committee on Finance. The Canadian Association of Mutual Insurance Companies planned to raise concerns about the budget implementation act's amendments to the Banking Act.

The article stated:

An insurance lobby group says it was the subject of two "angry" phone calls from Finance Minister Bill Morneau's office aimed at blocking it from raising privacy concerns over new measures in the budget bill related to how banks use customer data. In an interview with *The Globe and Mail*, Normand Lafrenière, president of the Canadian Association of Mutual Insurance Companies, said the first call came on April 12 from the Finance Minister's senior policy adviser, Ian Foucher.

"I was asked not to meet with MPs and senators," said Mr. Lafrenière, who has led the organization for 25 years after a public-service career that included senior positions at the Finance Department.

Furthermore, the article indicates that a member of the minister's office said this to the group:

Are you going to play ball with us or not? You better not appear in front of committees, and stop talking to senators and stop talking to MPs. Everything will be taken care of through regulations that will be published down the road.

These threatening comments may have prevented members from hearing testimony on an important bill. This group indicated in the same article that it was trying to raise objections to amendments to the Bank Act that had an effect on the privacy rights of Canadians.

The Minister of Finance has enormous legislative and regulatory powers over the industry that the would-be witnesses represent. That is why such a call from his office demanding their silence would have had great power to intimidate.

The group never testified before the House of Commons finance committee. Members of the government may point out that none of the opposition MPs on the committee put the group forward to serve as witnesses. However, and this may be true, but I do not know for sure, that might have been because the group was hesitant to lobby opposition MPs to be put on the witness list in the first place.

In chapter 3 of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, authors Bosc and Gagnon indicate:

Government Orders

A Member may also be obstructed or interfered with in the performance of his or her parliamentary functions by non-physical means. In ruling on such matters, the Speaker examines the effect the incident or event had on the Member's ability to fulfill his or her parliamentary responsibilities.

For a minister's office to silence a group over which the minister has regulatory power deprives parliamentary committees of valuable witness testimony and prevents members from doing their jobs. I am such a member. I am on the finance committee as a vice-chair, but other committee members would have benefited from having this testimony, which may have been effectively blocked by a threat emanating from the minister's office. If this had been a phone call from just a random person on the street telling a potential witness not to testify, I am sure that potential witness could simply ignore the call. However, when the call comes from the office of the minister that regulates one's industry, and language like, "Are you going to play ball? You better not testify. Don't talk to MPs", is used, people are obviously tempted to stay silent to protect their interests or to avoid regulatory or legislative harm. That is why I believe that my privileges and those of other members on the committee may have been breached by our inability to hear the witnesses and question them.

Therefore, I ask that you rule on whether it is appropriate for ministerial staff members to tell groups not to testify. I also ask that you determine if this case represents a prima facie case of a breach in privilege.

• (1545)

The Deputy Speaker: I thank the hon. member for Carleton for bringing this to the attention of the House. We will take it under advisement and get back to the House in due course.

I see the hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader rising. Is it on the question of privilege?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have had the opportunity to hear the concerns raised by the member. We will take it, as always, and look into the matter. We will want to report back to the House at some point in time.

The Deputy Speaker: That is duly noted. In the short time ahead, perhaps when he is able to, we will hear from the parliamentary secretary on the question as well.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan.

* * *

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2018, NO. 1

The House resumed 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, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to have the opportunity today to speak to the budget implementation act. Ronald Reagan once said, "Government's view of the economy could be summed up in a few short phrases: If it moves, tax it. If it keeps moving, regulate it. And if it stops moving, subsidize it." That quote is often interpreted as tongue in cheek, but it is a fairly good description of

the current government's economic policy: "If it moves, tax it. If it keeps moving, regulate it. And if it stops moving, subsidize it."

With this budget bill, we have an opportunity to discuss a whole range of problems in terms of the government's economic plan, problems that are well summed up in that quotation. I am going to address as many of them today as time allows, the first being the carbon tax and the carbon tax cover-up.

We have a government that is imposing new taxes on Canadians at a feverish pace. In particular, through the carbon tax, the Liberals are requiring every province to impose a carbon tax. If a province will not, the Liberals will themselves impose a carbon tax on that province. This carbon tax is not revenue neutral to the federal government, because we know that the government will collect GST on the carbon tax, and the Liberals have consistently refused calls from the opposition not to collect GST on the carbon tax.

The Liberals believe that this is the right approach, but they also believe that Canadians should not have access to the information they used to make their determination. We have an ongoing carbon tax cover-up in which the government refuses to give Canadians basic information about how much the federal carbon tax will cost. The provinces that have imposed carbon taxes have been, in fact, much more forthright with the data.

I would say that if the government has an opinion on the carbon tax one way or another, it should be willing to present the information and the analysis that led it to that decision so that Canadians can see it, agree with it or disagree with it, and have that discussion. Instead, it is a government that, on the one hand, claims to be confident in the rightness of its position, but, on the other hand, refuses to give this information.

We have in this budget bill the government moving forward with its federal carbon tax and continuing to refuse to give information about how much it will cost the average Canadian family. We know this will impose significant costs on the economy as a whole. Canadians have a right to know, the middle class and those working hard to join it have a right to know, how much the carbon tax will cost them.

There is a discussion on how we support economic development, which is always part of the budget and certainly is quite in discussion today. Our approach, on this side of the House, is to say that the best way to encourage economic development is to think about existing businesses and also to think about businesses that do not yet exist and could exist. It is to create the conditions for economic growth, for investment, and for new, innovative ideas, not to prejudice where those ideas are going to come from or what they are going to look like.

Government Orders

Government is inevitably poorly disposed to fully know where the next big economic opportunity is going to be. Economic growth does not happen because the government decides it is going to spend a whole bunch of money on this supercluster fetish we have. Instead, economic growth happens when individual entrepreneurs have new ideas, and they make sacrifices to make investments in themselves and their communities and their own businesses that then allow for growth and job creation. The approach we take is to favour simplification of regulations and tax reductions for individuals and businesses, especially small businesses, that create opportunities.

Under the previous government, we lowered the business tax rate, which actually led to an increase in business tax revenues. Business tax revenues went up as the rate of business taxation went down, and that shows that giving opportunity and resources and mechanisms to the private sector is how to create jobs and opportunity. Even the government was better off from lowering business taxes. We lowered the small-business tax rate. We had it booked in as being lowered to 9%. The current government broke that promise, and then un-broke that promise, at least for now, as a justification for some of the draconian regulatory changes it wanted to make for small business. The Liberals have an on-again, off-again relationship with supporting small-business tax reductions, but Canadian small-business owners know they can go steady with the opposition.

● (1550)

The way Liberals have approached small business to try to make these regulatory changes that increase costs and reduce certainty for small business is not the way to create confidence in our economy or to attract investment. Our approach was to lower personal income taxes, lower business taxes, and, by the way, always to target those tax reductions to those Canadians who needed them the most.

We cut the GST, which is the tax everybody pays. We lowered the lowest marginal tax rate. By any standard of progressivity, the tax reductions that the Conservative government made were more progressive than any the Liberal government has even talked about. In fact, we know from various analysis that have been done that the Liberal government is increasing taxes through the carbon tax and other changes, including the elimination of tax credits and so forth, that hit those in the middle class and those working hard to join it very hard. It also hits small businesses, the engines of economic growth. These businesses are not looking for a government subsidy. They are not looking for a supercluster. They are looking for the regulatory and taxation environment that allows them to succeed.

The Liberal government's approach is totally different. It thinks that the Prime Minister, in his wisdom, knows best where the next big opportunities will come. The Liberals then pick these areas of government spending to create economic growth, allegedly, while increasing the burden on those small individual operators who do not ask for government subsidies, but simply want to be left alone to create opportunity. It is asking successful small businesses to pay more so that other big, well-connected insiders will pay less.

We do not think that is the right approach, spending hard-earned Canadian tax dollars subsidizing business. We do not think that is fair to other businesses that do not receive those subsidies. We do not feel those policies are fair to ordinary Canadians, who have to pay taxes, that then go to already wealthy companies. That is the Liberal

approach, which is subsidizing friends and insiders through corporate welfare instead of creating conditions that allow for long-term economic growth and success through innovation.

The approach of the government, on the one hand, trying to constrain the private sector and, on the other hand, wanting to then subsidize things is most evident in the case of its approach to pipelines. All the government had to do, if it wanted pipelines to succeed, was to continue with the successful policies under the previous government, which got four pipelines built and led to a fifth one being approved. The Liberal government will tell us that the Conservatives did not get any pipelines to tidewater except, except.

It was under the Conservative government that every pipeline project that was proposed was approved. It stretches the imagination to think how it expects pipelines that were not proposed to have been built. We approved pipelines through a strong, fair but clear and accessible process to be built. Under the Liberal government, it immediately acted to kill the northern gateway pipeline.

Canadians are probably wondering why the government is buying out and subsidizing one pipeline to the west coast, while it intentionally and then further through legislation is killing another pipeline to the west coast. If it just got out of the way, perhaps we would have two pipelines proceeding to the west coast. Certainly we would have one.

There is the energy east pipeline, which, by piling additional burdens and challenges on, the government stopped. Then, after killing pipelines, intentionally, directly through government policy, it decided that there was actually one in which it wanted to look more interested. We still do not know if the strategy is going to bear fruit. It is spending \$4.5 billion buying the existing pipeline, not building a new pipeline or even expanding one. It is spending \$4.5 billion buying existing pipeline infrastructure. Then the government says that it will spend a whole bunch more, billions of dollars more, on a project that when the previous government was in place, the private sector was quite ready and keen to build. Now the Liberal government says that it is going to spend all this money to build it.

What happens if it does not work out at some point along the way? It is very likely the government will just be pouring more and more money into something that could have and should have been done by the private sector.

● (1555)

The government's approach to the economy is a failed approach. It is to tax and regulate success, while piling on money in subsidy to everything else. We in the opposition present a strong alternative that will actually lead to economic success in the long term for Canada.

Government Orders

Ms. Filomena Tassi (Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are proud of the tax cuts we have implemented as a government.

We reduced taxes on the middle class. How did we do that? By increasing taxes on the top 1%. We also reduced taxes on small businesses, and we are proud of that. We know the importance of small business in this economy.

With respect to the child benefit, we increased it, so nine out of 10 families benefit from the increase. Millionaires do not get cheques anymore, but that is because millionaires do not need the cheques from the child benefit. However, nine out of 10 families benefit, and it has lifted over 300,000 children out of poverty.

We are so proud of these accomplishments that we have attained through this budget and previous budgets. Also, in this budget, as the member knows, we will be indexing that child benefit, which will start in July.

However, the member's speech today focused a lot on the pipeline question. I have two specific questions for the member with respect to his focus. Is climate change real? If it is, what is his plan?

• (1600)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, yes, climate change is real. Yes, our party accepts absolutely the science of that. In fact, we were the first government in Canadian history to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. They went up under the previous Liberal government that signed Kyoto. They went down under the Conservative government. They went down despite overall economic growth. When emissions were rising in the rest of the world, they went down in Canada, despite the fact that we were less hard hit by the recession than many other countries.

The member asks what our plan is. We did it. What is her plan?

All the Liberals talk about is raising taxes, yet they have no success when it comes to actually delivering on the things about which they talk. They tell us that the environment and the economy go hand in hand. Well, under the current government, they go hand in hand in the wrong direction.

The member talked about cheques to millionaires. They are sending clusters of cheques to millionaires in these supercluster billionaire bailouts for which they are using taxpayer money.

Therefore, it is a bit rich for the member to talk about not sending cheques to the rich when that is precisely the Liberals' industry policy: give money to already established companies with no consideration for the entrepreneurs or the companies that could have been built but cannot now because of the new regulations and new taxes imposed by the government.

Mr. Wayne Long (Saint John—Rothesay, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to members opposite talk about the pipeline, about how the Conservatives built different pipelines, and that they had all the answers and could get pipelines built. The Leader of the Opposition was in my riding of Saint John—Rothesay three weeks ago, talking about the pipeline, saying he could build it.

However, one thing I am very curious about is an article on the Leader of the Opposition's website in which it says he "is listening to

Quebecers". He talks about giving Quebec added jurisdiction and responsibilities over its territory, that it will have the right to decide what happens in its territory on all issues.

How does the member opposite square that? On one side, the Leader of the Opposition says that he would build energy east. On the other side, he stands in Quebec and talks about how he is there to protect their jurisdictional rights.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, I know the member loves it when Conservatives visit his riding. I can assure him that is going to happen. St. John is a beautiful place, and our leader and I, and other members of our caucus, will be making regular visits over the next year to continue to talk about our positive economic message.

When it comes to energy east, I am sure his constituents are asking him this question. Why did the government set up a regulatory system designed to kill the energy east pipeline, while it then put a whole bunch of public money into the west?

Unlike Liberal ministers, I am going to answer the question. I know that is something the minister does not normally hear happen in this place. I miscalled him the "minister", and I am sorry about that error. After being removed from a committee for voting based on his conscience, it is unlikely he is going to be heading there.

However, the member asked about respecting jurisdiction in Quebec. Let us be clear. This party believes in respecting provincial jurisdiction and not having provinces make decisions in federal jurisdiction. That is not a difficult distinction. On matters of jurisdiction in Quebec, Alberta, or B.C., the federal government should not interfere. The provinces should be able to make those decisions. On areas that are clearly within federal jurisdiction, they are within federal jurisdiction. That has clearly been our practice and our position.

[*Translation*]

I can also say it in French, if they want.

The Deputy Speaker: I see other members who want to ask questions, but the member's time has expired. Perhaps they can ask another time, during another period for questions and comments.

[*English*]

Ms. Irene Mathysen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals had an opportunity with this implementation act to build an economy that would lift everyone up, people who counted on them, instead of just the wealthy few at a top with their tax havens. Unfortunately, the Liberals decided instead to defend the interests of their corporate and privileged, consigning the rest of Canada to the back seat.

Budget 2018 and Bill C-74 reveal once again the Liberals' true nature.

Government Orders

I remember in 2004 the damage done to our country after 13 years of Liberal rule, most of those years in majority governments that accomplished little to nothing in the way of fairness and equity for working Canadians. Those Liberals made the most drastic cuts to our public broadcaster, did little to nothing in the way of implementing a universal child care program, nothing to reverse the devastating effects of colonialism on indigenous peoples, except as a last ditch effort to stay in power, and undermined the health care system with cuts to transfer payments to the provinces.

We hoped for more progress than setting the bar at red book promises unfulfilled. For close to three years now, the NDP caucus has been calling on the Liberals to actually be the progressive, positive government they promised us in 2015.

This bill betrays all women who believed the so-called “gender budget” would include much anticipated pay equity legislation, because it does not. The Liberals promised pay equity 40 years ago, again in 2016, and again a month ago in the budget speech. Canadians want to know when the Liberals will finally deliver pay equity.

Despite the smearing of its image by right-wing ideologues, the fact is that the public service has done more than the private sector in achieving gender equity in Canada. While there is still work to do on the equity front, women and men from historically disadvantaged groups, such as disabled persons, indigenous peoples, single parents, seniors, young people, and people of colour, are all represented in the public service workforce in greater percentages than they occur in Canada's population. They are employed at all levels of management and labour in the workforce more proportionately than in the private sector.

Labour researchers and academics have pointed out that this advantage is at least in part the result of the fact workers in the Canadian public service have union representation guaranteed under our Constitution. However, recent reports indicate that the equity and fairness established in the public service is eroding as a result of austerity measures, privatization, and contracting out. The effect of this offloading, besides being inefficient, is that public sector workers are beginning to experience greater levels of workplace precarity. We know too that this precarity impacts diverse members of the workforce who can least afford it.

We need to consider the legacy we are leaving to future generations, those who leave post-secondary and graduate schools with a burden of debt that is insurmountable only to face a world where jobs are scarce. When work can be found, it is more often than not part-time, underpaid, without benefits, and short-term. We need to give future generations more than the finance minister's statement, telling them to suck it up and get used to a lifetime of precarious work.

Future generations will need a robust economy because they will incur the burden of supporting us in our dotage with their tax dollars. We need to seriously consider the legacy we leave. However, we also know it is bigger than that.

We need to take care of each other for everyone to thrive. We need to create a Canada where no one experiences the isolation and degrading health consequences of homelessness, poverty, or mental

illness, a Canada with free and equal access to education, health care, child care, pharmacare, housing, clean air, and clean water.

We know what works and what does not. If what we want is to create a healthy sustainable equitable economy where every citizen has equal access to opportunity and is able to thrive and prosper, the Canada we know is possible, the Canada that can be, the work begins now, with federal budgets. Sadly, the Liberals' budget implementation act is even more timid than the budget. It offers no real plan to reduce inequities or build an economy that would benefit all Canadians.

● (1605)

I would like to take this opportunity today to speak about the ways in which Bill C-74 could have addressed inequalities and build an economy that would benefit all Canadians.

This legislation could have contained provisions to assist rural communities. It does not. The Liberals had an opportunity in their 2018 budget to help rural communities, but instead chose to focus on the interests of their rich friends and their own ridings. In the meantime, they tell people in rural communities to wait for improved employment insurance, cellular infrastructure, and broadband Internet access.

In just the past few days, we have seen announcements from big banks about closing branches in Burford, Blyth, and Clifford in Ontario, and Kipling and Preeceville in Saskatchewan. These closures will leave Blyth and Kipling with no local banking options. In Saskatchewan, the nearest TD branch to Preeceville is an hour to an hour and 45 minutes away.

All of these communities have post offices. A postal banking system would allow members of this community access to banking services that are affordable and competitive, not to mention profitable for Canada Post. In the U.K., corporate banks have actually reversed their opposition to postal banking, because they know it absolves them from the community ire they would experience when they close branches in rural and remote communities, which these banks say do not reap enough profit.

When will the government see the postal banking light? We will have an opportunity in that regard later this session when my motion M-166 comes to the floor of the House for a vote. I urge every member here to support it. We have the opportunity to make effective and progressive change, even if the government avoids it in budget implementation acts. We will have that opportunity very shortly.

A postal banking system would address inequality in this country, something Bill C-74 does not do, even though that should be the goal of government in a social democracy such as ours. Instead we see Canadians who live in rural and remote communities, Canadians with low income, and first nations peoples living on reserve forced to use predatory lenders or to rely on the whim of a local business person or local variety store to access their own money.

Government Orders

A universal pharmacare program would create equal access to life-saving and life-enhancing medications for all Canadians as well. I see nothing in this legislation that addresses that need. In fact, we continue with a patchwork system of access to abortion and birth control that creates inequality and forces Canadians who require those services to either pay exorbitant out-of-pocket costs or travel unreasonable hours to access these services. Monday was International Birth Control Day. It is the federal government's responsibility to ensure equal access for all Canadians needing birth control, but the government has failed. Access is neither universal, equal, nor affordable across this country.

I give the following by way of example: the NuvaRing is available on public formularies in five provinces and one territory, but not the others; IUDs are available in three provinces, but not everywhere; emergency contraceptives are covered only in Alberta; and Quebec covers the patch, but no other province or territory does.

Canada has a human rights obligation to ensure that everyone in every province or territory has the same access to the highest quality medications. Why then does a woman in Manitoba and Quebec have access to more birth control methods than a woman in Saskatchewan? Making all birth control and all sexual and reproductive medications free for all of us is about fairness and gender equality. That is the reason I introduced M-65 to continue the push for equal access to birth control for all Canadians.

My constituents in London-Fanshawe do not believe the economy is working for them. What they see instead is an uneven playing field, where only the few at the top can benefit, at the expense of everyone else. They struggle to pay their bills and care for their parents and children in a community gutted by the loss of well-paid jobs moving offshore as a result of globalization, with no protection from either Liberal or Conservative governments.

•(1610)

Finally, this 556-page-long bill amends 44 pieces of legislation. During the last election campaign, the Liberals promised to abolish omnibus bills because they are undemocratic, yet they chose to restrict the length of debate on this substantial bill at the finance committee. This is not democracy and it is a far cry from the sunny ways promised to Canadians in 2015.

We can do better. We are here to do better. Canadians demand better. Do not let the Liberals tell us it cannot be done.

•(1615)

Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my colleague from London—Fanshawe came up with a number of really important points. The bill we are debating is putting in place a brand new carbon tax, which has been deemed to be one of the biggest taxes ever put on Canadian businesses and job creators. Like her riding, my riding has a lot of manufacturers, and today we heard the horrible news about tariffs being put on Canadian steel and aluminum. Companies want certainty. They want to know how much it is going to cost them to do business in Canada, yet the Liberals are putting in this tax without letting Canadians how much it is going to cost. They know, but they will not release the information.

I had a motion on the table to allow the carbon tax to be transparent so that Canadians and job creators would know how

much it is going to cost them. Could the member comment on whether she supports having this new carbon tax and information on how much it would cost Canadian job creators and Canadians in their day-to-day activities? Moreover, does she support its being transparent before it is implemented on the Canadian public?

Ms. Irene Mathysen: Mr. Speaker, I absolutely agree that all taxation and all of the work of the government should be transparent. Unfortunately, we have not seen that. I would like transparency with regard to tax shelters. There is \$199 billion that goes out the door because corporations do not pay their fair share of taxes.

We are in the middle of a trade war. We have a government that does not fully support small business as it should. Things are extremely difficult.

A little transparency would go a long way, the kind of transparency proposed by my colleague from Victoria in the last session and in a bill he plans to introduce very shortly that would compel the Government of Canada to eliminate the loopholes available to those with huge incomes and the sham of businesses using tax havens to undercut what they owe, not just to the government but to all of the people of Canada in terms of support for the services and things we need as a democratic, safe, secure, and beneficial community.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague and congratulate her on her comments, which are very relevant, as usual, and in the interest of workers, as well as families in her region in Ontario and across the country.

There is something in the budget implementation bill that I cannot understand. The Liberal government will be taxing medical marijuana. In some cases, marijuana is the only medication that can ease regular, permanent, and intense pain. Other drugs do not work. These people are very worried, because they have just learned that they will probably have to pay much more for their medical marijuana.

I do not understand the Liberal government's decision. I would like to hear my colleague's opinion on the subject and his comments on how this decision could have an impact on people who, because of the tax, may have to think twice before using medication.

[*English*]

Ms. Irene Mathysen: Mr. Speaker, that is an important question. The reality is that there are many Canadians who rely on medical marijuana, and I am thinking of our veterans first and foremost and the service they gave to this country. The injuries they returned home with need to be addressed, and their service needs to be respected. Therefore, they deserve the very best with respect to medical support, and that includes medical marijuana.

Government Orders

One of the things we are very concerned about is the fact that indigenous people who require medical marijuana are being taxed, and those taxes very often put that medication out of reach.

More to the point, we need to look at pharmacare and how it could alleviate financial pressures, not just on those who need medical marijuana but on all Canadians. There are people across this country who cannot afford life-saving and life-improving medications. That should never happen in a country like this. When Tommy Douglas spoke of universal health care, he said the first step would be to support hospitals and doctors, and the next step to make sure that people have access to medications and support services in their homes. I ask the government to take the next step: let us have pharmacare, let us fulfill Douglas's dream, and let us make this a truly fair and supportive country.

● (1620)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alupa Clarke (Beauport—Limoilou, CPC): Mr. Speaker, thank you for recognizing me. First of all, I would like to say hello to all the people of Beauport—Limoilou, many of whom are listening today, and to thank them for all their work. They are definitely listening. When I go door to door, many of them tell me that they watch CPAC.

I would like to say something about what the hon. Liberal member for Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas said in response to the speech of my colleague from Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan. She engaged in the usual Liberal demagoguery. She asked if we believed in climate change. I really would like my constituents to listen closely, because I want to make this clear to them and to all Canadians: we, the Conservatives, believe so strongly in climate change that, in 2007, Mr. Harper held a joint press conference with Mr. Charest to announce the implementation of the new Canada ecotrust program, supported by a total investment of \$1.5 billion. The aim of the program was to give each province hundreds of millions of dollars to help with their respective climate change plans. It is easy to look this up on Google by entering “ecoTrust,” “2007,” “Harper,” “Charest.” Not only did Mr. Charest commend the Conservative government's initiative, but even Steven Guilbeault from Greenpeace at the time—and I am certain that my colleague from Mégantic—L'Érable will find this hard to believe—saluted the initiative as something unheard of.

There is a reason why greenhouse gas emissions decreased by 2% under the decade-long Conservative reign. We had a plan, a plan with bold targets that the Liberals made their own.

Now let us talk a bit about the 2018-19 budget, which continues in the same vein as the other two budgets presented so far by the hon. member for Papineau's Liberal government. I would like to begin by saying that the government has been in reaction mode for the past three years and almost never in action mode.

It is in reaction mode when it comes to the softwood lumber crisis, although we do not hear much about it because the softwood lumber rates are still pretty attractive. However, the fact remains that this is a crisis and that, right now, industrial producers in the U.S. are collecting billions of dollars that they will eventually recover, as they do in every softwood lumber crisis.

The Liberal government is in reaction mode when it comes to NAFTA. They will say that they are not the ones who put Mr. Trump in office, but this is yet another major issue that has been taking up their time in the past year, and they are still in reaction mode. They are also in reaction mode when it comes to the imminent tariffs on aluminum and steel.

The Liberals are in reaction mode when it comes to almost every major issue in Canada. They are in reaction mode when it comes to natural resources development, for example with regard to Kinder Morgan's Trans Mountain pipeline. Once again they were in reaction mode, because Kinder Morgan said that it would walk if the government could not assume responsibility and tell British Columbia in no uncertain terms that this was a matter of federal jurisdiction.

All of this shows that the Prime Minister is not the great diplomat he pretends to be across the globe, and in celebrity news and other media. He is such a poor diplomat that he was unable to avoid the softwood lumber crisis with Obama. He is such a poor diplomat that he has supposedly had a wonderful relationship with Mr. Trump for the past year and a half. He speaks to him on the telephone I do not know how many times a month, but that did not prevent Mr. Trump from taking deliberate action against Canada, as we saw today with the tariffs on steel and aluminum.

I would like to make a comparison. We, the Conservatives, were a government of action. We negotiated 46 free-trade agreements. We sent Canadian troops to Kandahar to demonstrate our willingness to co-operate with NATO and the G7 and to make a show of military force. We invested hugely in national defence, increasing our investments from 0.8% to almost 1.2% of the GDP following the dark days of Jean Chrétien's Liberal government. We settled the softwood lumber issue in 2007, during the last crisis. We implemented the national shipbuilding strategy, investing more than \$30 billion to renew our military fleet, to renew the Canadian Coast Guard's exploration fleet in the Canadian Arctic, and to renew the fleet of icebreakers. The first of these icebreakers, the majestic *Diefenbaker*, will soon be under construction.

● (1625)

Let us not forget that we also told Mr. Putin to get out of Ukraine. There is no doubt that we were a government of action.

When the budget was tabled, several journalists said that it was more of a political platform than a budget. I find that interesting. In their opinion, the political platform contained no concrete fiscal measures to prepare Canada for tomorrow, for the next 10 years, or for the next century, as our founding fathers intended in 1867. Rather, it contained proposals, in particular concerning social housing. The NDP must be very happy. The Liberals promised billions of dollars if the provinces gave their assent. That was a promise.

Government Orders

The Liberals also made proposals concerning pharmacare. Once again, they were conditional on studies demonstrating the usefulness of such a plan. That, too, was a promise. The promises go on page after page in the budget, and it is obvious that it is a political platform. That is why the Liberals used the word “woman” more than 400 times, 30 times on each page. That is just demagoguery and totally abusive.

I would like to quote a very interesting CBC journalist, Chris Hall. Since he works at the CBC, the Liberals will surely believe him. He said that the government recently spent \$233,000 to organize round table discussions to find out whether Canadians understood the message, and not the content, of their budget. I will quote Mr. Hall:

[*English*]

In particular, the report said the findings suggest middle-class Canadians—the very demographic the Liberals have been courting since their election with both policy initiatives and political messaging—don't feel their lives are getting better.

[*Translation*]

They are correct in thinking that their lives are not getting better. Even Chris Hall concluded, in light of these studies, that the 2018-19 budget is not a document that provides guidelines, includes concrete measures, or outlines actual achievements in progress. It is a political document that proposes ideologies.

The budget also contains a number of disappointments and shortcomings, precisely because it does not contain any actions. It does not respond to the fiscal reforms enacted by U.S. President Trump that give American companies an undue competitive advantage.

The 2018-19 federal budget does not address the tariffs on aluminum and steel either, although we all saw them coming. It does not specify what measures will be taken to implement carbon pricing. Most of all, it does not say how much it will cost every single Canadian. You would think it would at least do that. Some analysts say that it will cost approximately \$2,500 per Canadian per year.

This budget is full of proposals but has no concrete measures, and it perpetuates broken promises. Instead of \$10-billion deficits for two consecutive years, we have \$19-billion deficits accumulating year over year until 2045. This year, we were supposed to have a deficit of \$6 billion, but it has reached almost \$20 billion. The Liberals also broke their promise to balance the budget. This is the first time that the federal government has not had a concrete plan to balance the budget.

We were supposed to run up deficits in order to invest in the largest infrastructure program in history, because with the Liberals everything is historic. Only \$7 billion of the \$180 billion of this program has been injected into the Canadian economy.

• (1630)

This is a very disappointing budget and, unfortunately, dear people of Beauport—Limoilou, taxes keep going up and the Liberal carbon tax is just the start.

[*English*]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I could not agree less with the member's comments, specifically with respect to the government always taking a reactionary approach to things. As a matter of fact, our signature policies are the exact opposite. They are policies that are taking a proactive approach to things, such as what we are doing with our environment and how we are going to protect the environment for future generations. We have made sure that the Canada child benefit is indexed moving forward. We have made sure that the worker credit is available to those who are on social assistance and want to get back into the workforce.

When it comes to things like that, would the member not agree that there are at least a couple of things in this budget that are progressive and forward-looking?

Mr. Alupa Clarke: Mr. Speaker, it is quite funny. The hon. member spoke about the Canada child benefit and the income tax for workers. The CBC report I spoke about previously said that at the round tables, Canadians said they do not know how much that helped them, and they do not even know that this is going on right now.

People I meet in my riding, Beauport—Limoilou, say they are aware that the Canada child benefit is a way to buy votes, and that is it. That is the basic thing the Liberals are doing with that. It is hard for people to make the choice. Of course, it is a lot of money, but they know that it is a lot of money that their kids will have to pay in 30 years, so it is a poison gift. That is all it is about.

Most of the Liberals' measures are not in action but in reaction, and when they are in action, as some surely are, it is a poison gift for the future. How can the government be proud of those kinds of measures, when that is the case?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, GPQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleague to speak about his reaction to the budget implementation bill, as it concerns the demands of Quebeckers.

The forestry industry needs help, for example, with the spruce budworm. The budget and this bill mention around \$75 million to fight this pest. However, when we take a close look at this document, we see that most of this money is going to the Maritimes. Is this a gift to the Irving family from the Liberals? We have to wonder. There is not one cent for Quebec even though the infestation has affected an area in Quebec that is larger than all of New Brunswick. That says a lot.

Government Orders

One thing Quebec has been calling for for a long time is to increase transfers for health care, social services, and education. That is what Quebecers want, and that is what the provincial government and all the members of Quebec's National Assembly want. However, once again, no money was set aside for that in the last budget. I am also reminded of Davie shipyard, which employs hundreds of workers near my colleague's riding. The announcements about Davie are still vague. It may get a few crumbs later, but we are talking about a multi-billion-dollar project to renew the Canadian fleet over the next few years. That work is again mostly concentrated in Nova Scotia, in the Maritimes, even though there are 40 or so Liberal MPs from Quebec. I would like to hear my colleague's thoughts on this subject.

• (1635)

Mr. Alupa Clarke: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his questions. Questions like these are why I have been urging him to join the Conservatives for three years, along with the member for Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, though I am not too sure about him, since his socialism is a little too intense. I think he may be too deeply entrenched in socialism.

About Davie, it takes political leadership. In 2015, one month before the election, we awarded the contract for the *Asterix*. It was the crowning achievement of Canada's largest shipyard, which is located in Lévis. Social transfers are also very important. The Conservative government provided health and education transfers with no strings attached. We fixed the fiscal imbalance by giving \$800 million to Quebec. Charest acknowledged that in no uncertain terms.

First and foremost, as we have been proving since 1867, and as the history books will surely show, we are a Conservative political government when we form government. We support decentralization and respect the spirit and the letter of the Constitution, the British North America Act, our greatest constitutional document. We respect provincial and federal areas of jurisdiction. That is what is so great about the Conservatives.

The Deputy Speaker: Before we resume debate, it is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the question to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment is as follows: the hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to talk about the budget implementation bill.

What I have to say might come as a surprise to my colleagues opposite. I want to talk about something I like in this bill. That might come as a surprise because it is something I rarely do, but this is an issue that is important to me. This bill allocates a significant and much-appreciated amount of money to scientific research, which was a priority for many people in my riding and the greater Montreal area. I am pleased to see that a portion of the money to be invested in research centres, in university centres, will be going to basic research. That is something important that we, the NDP, along with other political parties, have advocated for years. This is an investment in the future that will help us better understand our world; that is something worth talking about.

Okay, I am done with the praise. Now for the criticism. I have been generous. Although there are investments in scientific research, there is unfortunately very little for the university sector. There are a few crumbs for student debt and tuition fees. I want to talk about universities because, unfortunately, very few people do. So many students finish school with huge debts of \$20,000, \$30,000, \$40,000, even \$50,000. Consider a young couple trying to start a new life with a burden like this. Our bold young heroes go to the Caisse populaire hoping to be able to buy a house or a condo. It seems odd that they would ask for a mortgage when they already have such a huge debt. Once again, it would have been nice if the Liberals had kept their election promise and looked at the issue of student debt. Unfortunately, they did not, and our students will continue to suffer. We find that deplorable.

Now I will address health care. No one will be surprised, because I mentioned it yesterday. I also asked my colleague from London about this earlier, and I will reiterate that I do not understand why the Liberal government decided to tax medical cannabis. Medical marijuana helps people, and it used to be exempt from tax. For reasons neither I or anyone else can understand, the Liberal government decided to put a tax on it. This will have a major impact on these people. Often, it is the only medication that helps them control their pain. Some of them have had serious operations and others are cancer survivors. Earlier, my colleague pointed out that, in some cases, marijuana can help our veterans get through certain illnesses or post-traumatic shock. Now, people may have to choose between taking their medication and buying their groceries because they may not be able to pay the additional cost due to the Liberal government's tax. I would like some answers.

While we are on the topic of medication, there is something missing in the budget. I want to talk for a few minutes about what is missing in the budget. A government has to make choices. We can talk about what is in the budget, but often what is missing in the budget is more important and has a greater impact on people's lives. Take pharmacare, for example. I was talking about medical marijuana just now, but pharmacare would make a major change in the quality of life and purchasing power of Canadians across the country. Prescription drugs are too expensive, and that places a considerable burden on our elderly, who are often low earners. How is it that we are not covered for dental or vision care? How is it that we do not have a universal public drug insurance plan?

Government Orders

As my colleague mentioned earlier, Tommy Douglas, former premier of Saskatchewan, was clear. According to him, the first step is to ensure that everyone has access to medicare with hospitals, doctors, and nurses. The second step is to make sure that people have access to home care and are able to afford their medications. We have not yet accomplished the second step, but we hope that we will soon because it has a major impact on people's quality of life and their ability to take care of themselves. We are the only country in the world with a public health care system that does not also have a public pharmacare program. The two must go hand in hand.

• (1640)

It is really the combination of the two that is truly effective. We want a universal public pharmacare program in co-operation with the provinces. It is true that the Government of Quebec already offers such a program, but it is flawed, and some people still have to pay for drug coverage in group insurance plans, which is extremely expensive. With regard to the labour market, this is always an issue that comes up in collective bargaining because increased drug costs is what puts the biggest strain on the health care system. If our health care spending seems out of control, it is mainly because we do not have a good universal public pharmacare program.

My colleague from Joliette referred to the fact that the Liberal government keeps making cuts to health care transfers, a trend that began under the previous government. Absolutely nothing has changed in that regard.

According to our estimates, over a 10-year period, the federal government cut health care transfers by \$31 billion compared to what the provinces were previously getting under the federal-provincial agreement that was negotiated. Reducing the annual growth of federal health transfers has had a major impact on our hospitals, on our ability to take care of people, and on emergency room wait times, which can reach up to 20 hours or even 24 hours. We think that could have been changed, but there is nothing about it in the most recent Liberal budget.

There are certain things missing from the bill that could make a huge difference in people's lives.

One example is a public child care program. We have one in Quebec. It used to be even better, but it is still pretty good. More spaces would be nice. If there were a federal Canada-wide program, that would help the Quebec program as well as Canadians in the other provinces, who currently have nothing. Those people receive a cheque, which, granted, is a little better than before, but it covers only two or three days' worth of private child care. Children usually need to go to day care 20 days per month. When child care costs between \$40 and \$60 a day, people start to wonder whether they should go to work for minimum wage or stay at home. This leads to lost productivity. This is also unfair to women, given that, still today, they are often the ones who have the responsibility—I almost said the burden, but it is not a burden to look after one's children, it is fun—of caring for their families.

According to one study by an economist by the name of Mr. Fortin, when Quebec created its child care program, roughly 70,000 women returned to the workforce. This social measure has a very positive impact on women and on productivity, since it means more people in the workforce. It makes a difference.

Let us now talk about social housing. Housing is the biggest expense for every family. People in Toronto, Vancouver, or Montreal spend 40% to 50% of their income on housing. That plunges them into poverty.

The Liberals made fine promises on that and then announced billions of dollars. Sadly, those billions of dollars will not be available until after the next federal election, and in some cases they are allocated for after the 2023 federal election. The housing crisis is real. Families have real needs. While some parents skip meals because their housing is too expensive and they do not have enough money to put food on the table, the Liberal government is putting things off until later.

What can the government do to fund a good social housing program? It can tackle tax havens, tax evasion, and tax loopholes for CEOs who earn tens of millions of dollars annually. Again, this budget is truly a dismal failure.

The Liberal government signs new agreements with tax havens and does absolutely nothing but tell us how much it is spending, which in the end is inaccurate. We lose \$8 billion to \$15 billion a year to tax evasion and our agreements with tax havens. We do not need to wait for the United Nations, the OECD, or the G7 to take action. We can take this on ourselves because we have bilateral tax agreements with some tax havens and certain countries. Bilateral means that there are only two players, namely Canada and another country.

Why are we unable to sit down and renegotiate these agreements? Losing billions of dollars in taxes makes no sense. We need that money for our universities, our hospitals, and social housing. It would make a difference in people's lives.

• (1645)

I hope that the Liberals will eventually understand this.

[*English*]

Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his passionate speech, because he really hits on some of the important things that are not in this budget.

I would like to commend the Prime Minister, though. Let us talk about his successes. Because people on the other side say this is a progressive budget, let us talk about what he is doing progressively.

He is progressively killing our traditional job markets. Let us look at our energy sector. We know that the Prime Minister says that he wants to phase out the energy sector, and he is doing that quite successfully. He says he wants to transition away from manufacturing. Today, we heard about the tariffs from Mr. Trump, which are going to affect a lot of manufacturing, specifically in Ontario and Quebec. There is no deal on softwood lumber. He is successfully killing that industry. In our mining industry, because of his red tape and environmental changes, he is successfully killing those jobs and investments. Our fishing industry, because of the oceans protection plan, is being killed.

Could the member point out in the budget where there is anything to improve the ability of Canadian sectors to compete?

Government Orders

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

I would first like to clarify something. The NDP believes that the energy sector includes more than just the oil industry. There are others. This industry is indeed important, but there are other things we could invest in, such as renewable energies. There is almost nothing in the budget for this.

All of a sudden, the government seems to have \$12 billion to \$15 billion to buy a 65-year-old pipeline that is leaking everywhere. We do not understand why. Furthermore, it seems prepared to take on all of the risks associated with this project, which the private sector deemed too risky. The government bought just the pipeline for \$4.5 billion, but Kinder Morgan said that it would cost \$7.4 billion to complete the expansion. We are already at more than \$12 billion.

The government could have done some amazing things, like invest in renewable energies and create exciting, green jobs for the future. Unfortunately, the Liberals are still living in the past.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saainich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech. I completely agree with him about medications and cannabis. I proposed amendments in committee to eliminate taxes on essential medications, but they were unfortunately rejected.

I want to add something about the major campaign to combat climate change, since there are some things missing from the budget, especially with respect to energy efficiency. For example, there is no program like the eco-energy innovation initiative.

• (1650)

[*English*]

I used to be such a fan of what was put forward by previous governments. The 2005 budget, which came forward when the current Minister of Public Safety was the minister of finance, was full of great climate action pieces that are completely missing now. I wonder if my colleague has any thoughts about why those are missing in action.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her attempt to make amendments to help people who need medical marijuana. Once again, she came up against the Liberal government. My colleague is quite right in pointing out the lack of investments and tax credits for energy efficiency, particularly regarding homes.

I recently attended the summit for a just energy transition, which was held in Montreal and hosted by some environmental groups and unions. The Conseil du patronat du Québec and some major investors were also in attendance. One sector that can really make a difference and change things is the building and construction industry. We often hear about transportation, but other things can be done too, including in agriculture and in building and construction.

We used to have a good tax credit for energy efficient retrofits that worked really well and helped Canadians save money. It was also helping to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and lower people's electricity bills. It was a win-win-win situation. Unfortunately, it disappeared, and we do not understand why the Liberal government

is not bringing it back. It was not a very expensive measure, but it helped reduce our energy use considerably and it improved people's lives because it helped them save a little money. It would have been nice to see that in the budget.

[*English*]

Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be here to speak to this budget implementation bill. My speech today will be called “promises, priorities and plans”. When we put a budget together, we should consider the amount of money we will need to keep all the promises we have made. Of course, there is not an endless amount of money in the world so there is a need to prioritize those promises we have made to ensure we hit the important ones and put those first.

Then it is important to have plans. We all know that without plans, we may spend a lot of money and not really accomplish anything, which we have seen an incredible amount of from the Liberal government.

With respect to promises, one of the early promises made by the government, which we hear repeatedly, was that it would run very small deficits, a small deficit of \$10 billion in the first year, coming to balance in the fourth year. However, we have seen double that deficit in the first year, double the deficit in the second year, and triple that deficit in this budget. There is no end in sight with respect to balancing the budget. It is certainly not going to be in the fourth year of the mandate. Now it looks like it may not be until 2045. This is promise was broken into about 1.5 trillion pieces.

The other thing is that a lot of promises were made that were extremely important to rural communities across Canada. The first one was the restoration of home mail delivery, which for people who are living in very rural places, especially those who are elderly, is a very important service.

Even more important than that was the promise about infrastructure money. Members can remember that we were going to spend infrastructure money to create jobs and get the economy going, and that money was going to be spent on roads and bridges in municipalities. This is a critical thing in ridings like Sarnia—Lambton, where we have a lot of roads and bridges that need to be fixed, and the municipality certainly does not have the money to fix them. I was disappointed with the last budget when the government took \$15 billion from those municipalities and put it into the infrastructure bank. Of course we have seen nothing come out of that whole situation.

Then there was the Asian Infrastructure Bank to which the government gave another half a billion of taxpayer dollars to build roads and bridges in Asia, which is not helping the rural community at all. Thus was another broken promise.

Government Orders

One of the most disturbing promises broken by the government was that of openness, transparency, and a higher ethical standard. Every time we ask questions about what is in this budget, such as the carbon tax that is outlined heavily in the budget, the government refuses to say how much it will cost the average Canadian taxpayer. The average Canadian taxpayer wants to know. If it is not a bad number, then why is it afraid to say it? Obviously, if it does not want to tell Canadians, it is because it is bad news.

Beyond not telling them how much it will cost, it will not even tell us what it will accomplish. The environment minister has been asked multiple times at committee, and here in the House, what kind of a greenhouse gas reduction she expects from this, and she has no answer. There is a huge amount of money being spent in the budget in this area. There is a huge amount of tax that will be paid by Canadians, yet there is no openness and transparency from the government with respect to those issues.

The government promised not to use omnibus bills, and here we are again with this huge budget bill. So many things have been snuck into this bill that if we did not really read all the pages, we might not be aware of them. My colleagues to the left have already talked about the medicinal marijuana issue and the taxes associated with that. However, more so, there is language in the budget bill that suggests that if people had a drug information number, they would be exempt. The fact remains that there is no drug exemption number for any medicinal marijuana because of the variability of all the components. Therefore, that is just another misrepresentation in the budget bill.

With respect to the taxes on cigarettes' portion of the bill, there is an escalating tax that continues to go up in perpetuity, without any parliamentary vote and without Canadians being able to talk about that. This is the same kind of deceptive tax that was put on beer and wine. It is fine for the government to put a sin tax on something when it wants to, but when it wants to hide a tax in there that continues to go up and generates revenue for the government, and it sneaks it onto page 324, Canadians may never get to that.

Therefore, there is no openness and no transparency in omnibus bills.

• (1655)

As members know, I am a passionate advocate for palliative care, so I was very excited when the government said it would spend \$3 billion on home and palliative care in the 2016 budget. Then the government updated the 2017 budget and said that it would spend \$6 billion over 10 years. It was a little more paced out, but at least it was something. I was really disappointed to see the word “palliative” removed from the 2018 budget. It was taken out altogether, even though the government supported my private member's bill, Bill C-277, on consistent access for palliative care for all Canadians. Surely, if we want there to be consistent access, we know we will have to plan something to back up that promise and put money in the budget. I was very disappointed there was nothing in the budget on that.

I will go to priorities.

One would think that in a country with one person out of six being a senior, maybe seniors would be a priority, but no. The

Liberal government took position of minister for seniors away, and there is relatively nothing in budget 2018 that will help seniors, many of whom really struggle to afford to live and pay for many of the things they need, such as cataract surgery, perhaps hearing aids or dentures. I certainly heard this when I went door to door. A priority has been missed.

Then there is the agriculture sector. Agriculture is hugely important in Canada. Everyone can agree that we need to eat. This is one of our largest industries. What is the government doing? First, it is loading all kinds of bureaucracy on the Canadian agriculture industry that does not apply to other people. It has taken away pesticides without any replacement. Those very pesticides are used by countries that then import their food to Canada, putting us at a competitive disadvantage. Most recently, it decided it would not allow the sale of premixed feed that contains antibiotic. This product has been sold safely for quite a number of years. Again, it is a burden on our industry that is not on other industries outside of the country that ship products into Canada.

There is very little support for research in agriculture, very little support for the industry overall, and total betrayal when it comes to the agreement that was made with respect to the TPP, that farmers would be compensated for the quota they had to give up. That is gone. They still have to give up the quota, but they do not get the compensation. It is another broken promise for the agriculture industry.

Regarding health care, the government's priorities are really screwed up. The government putting \$80 million in a budget to get people to stop smoking tobacco is a wonderful thing. However, to then put \$800 million in the budget to get people to start smoking marijuana just does not seem like the right message from a health point of view, especially when we consider the danger to children.

Then there is the \$7-billion slush fund. I am not sure what kind of priority that is backing up in an election year, but I can only guess. That is a disappointment as well.

Then there are plans. We do not see any plans. We have talked about how there is no climate change plan and no answers on the carbon tax. What about NAFTA? The Liberals have known for over a year that tariffs could be put on the steel industry. There is no plan and no money in the budget to address that whatsoever.

What about this \$4.5-billion pipeline? Members can hear that my voice is a bit hoarse from having a \$4.5-billion pipeline that is 65 years old being shoved down my throat. Where was the plan for that in the budget? It is missing.

Overall, when we look at this budget, we can see that when it comes to promises, priorities, and plans, the Liberals have broken their promises, their priorities are definitely screwed up, and they have no plan to achieve anything. That is a super disappointment.

Government Orders

• (1700)

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member for Sarnia—Lambton touched on many things in this budget. She has experience in the workforce in corporate Canada. Can members imagine any company or business preparing a budget, with a substantial piece of it going toward, say, a carbon tax, which is 200 pages of this omnibus bill, having done zero analysis on what the impact a carbon tax would have Canadian businesses, Canadian farmers, Canadian agribusinesses, and Canadian families? Can anyone imagine a business having a huge part of that budget with no financial implications of what the impact of that would be?

Could my colleague talk about what she is hearing from her constituents about their concerns with the carbon tax and having no idea what the impact this carbon tax is going to have on them moving forward?

Ms. Marilyn Gladu: Mr. Speaker, what I am hearing from the small businesses in Sarnia—Lambton is that they are being pushed right to the brink. Many of them are going under. The Liberal government has done nothing but load burden onto them, with extra CPP and carbon taxes, with the Ontario Liberals under the Wynne government helping them out with a \$15 minimum wage, etc. They are pushed to the max.

However, I am right on the border between Canada and the U.S. People can move their business across the states where there is no carbon tax. They can move their business across to the states where Trump is busy getting rid of the bureaucratic regulations that are so arduous for small business.

Definitely, anybody who wants to stay in business has to stay competitive. The Liberal government does not seem to understand that and it has not helped any Canadian businesses accomplish that.

Ms. Sheri Benson (Saskatoon West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of working with my colleague from Sarnia—Lambton at the pay equity committee on one of the very first initiatives of this Parliament. I loved her theme of promises, priorities, and plans. With respect to her initiative on palliative care, we did the work, the committee made a recommendation, and the government promised to follow up on it. However, now we continue to get promises with no implementation, just a repeat of an announcement and no money in the budget.

Does she want to comment on the fact that people are starting to become cynical? To be quite honest, they have a reason to be cynical.

• (1705)

Ms. Marilyn Gladu: Mr. Speaker, that excellent question gives me another opportunity to talk about the promises, the priorities, and the plans with respect to gender equality.

My colleague and I sat on the committee that looked at pay equity. Recommendations were made and the government promised to bring forward legislation. As well, the government made 365 references to doing something for gender in the budget bill, and zero dollars for pay equity. This is not good.

Obviously, as the first female engineer in the House, I am a strong advocate for women and for equality for women. It has just been a total smoke and mirror show on the part of the government. It talks a

good story on gender and gender-based violence elimination, and all these things. At the end of the day, very little effort is being spent.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, if people heard a laugh on CPAC, that was me laughing out loud at my friend from Sarnia—Lambton's sore throat from having the pipeline shoved down it.

The hon. member is really a very congenial member of this place, so I hope she will forgive this one tiny correction. She may want to comment on it. Some parts of the United States do have carbon taxes. There is a big tariff put on every barrel of oil sent to the state of Hawaii, for example. Of course California is part of the shared carbon market with Ontario and Quebec.

However, I know we will not agree on this issue, and I hope she will forgive my adding in a little correction.

Ms. Marilyn Gladu: Mr. Speaker, I always want to get the facts straight. I stand corrected by the member, although I would point out that there is not a lot of competition of business directly in Sarnia—Lambton with California, because that is a very long drive. Over Michigan state and the surrounding states, there is an opportunity to really see businesses leaving Canada and taking up residency in the U.S. because of the better conditions for business there.

Mr. Jamie Schmale (Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to Bill C-74, the budget implementation act.

The Prime Minister has introduced this omnibus budget bill that spends money we do not have on things we do not need and piles debt upon debt and taxes us to pay for it. The Liberal government continues to spend and spend while Canadian taxpayers foot the bill and Canadian businesses flee to the United States.

The government has increased spending by 20%, or \$60 billion, in its first three years, and there is no evidence that it created any growth in the Canadian economy. Despite this record spending, Canada is headed for a slowdown. Private sector forecasts show growth of 2% in 2018 and 1.6% in 2019.

Budget 2016 promised that spending would raise the level of GDP by 0.5% in 2016-17 and by 1.0% in 2017-18. However, the Parliamentary Budget Officer has estimated that infrastructure spending actually contributed a tiny 0.1% to GDP growth in both years.

At a time when the government has to buy a pipeline no one wanted to sell and no one wanted to buy in order to cover its own failed energy policy; at a time when we cannot seem to get agreements with our largest trading partner on softwood lumber, steel, and aluminum on the North American Free Trade Agreement; at a time when investor confidence in Canada has hit rock bottom; at a time when our country has one trillion dollars of market debt, a debt upon which the Government of Canada pays interest—the Liberal government plans on installing a job-killing carbon tax. Nearly 200 pages of Bill C-74 are dedicated to this complicated and costly new carbon tax. If Canadians have not had enough already, this new tax will raise the cost of heat, groceries, and pretty much everything.

Government Orders

Finance officials have said that the Liberals' carbon tax will raise the price of gasoline by 11¢ per litre, or about \$8 on an average fill-up. It will cost Canadian families an extra \$264 in natural gas home heating per year. Oil heating costs will rise even more.

We know this carbon tax is going to cost Canadians much more and we know the Liberals know it, but they refuse to come clean, and that is the issue we have on this side of the House. They refuse to tell us exactly how much the carbon tax will cost the average Canadian family.

Mr. Trevor Tombe, at the University of Calgary, estimates \$1,100 for a family per year. The Canadian Taxpayers Federation estimates that the carbon tax will cost as much as \$2,500 per family per year.

Environment Canada has told the minister that a price on carbon would have to go as high as \$100 per tonne in 2020 and \$300 per tonne in 2050 to meet its 2030 GHG targets. Carbon taxes are not effective in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. According to the Conference Board and the Canadian Academy of Engineering, even if carbon taxes were to reach \$200 per tonne by 2025, it would only result in a 1.5% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.

After direct questioning by the member for Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa, the environment minister at committee refused to give a number when asked. The government knows if and how much the carbon tax will reduce greenhouse gas emissions; however, it just will not make that number public. Perhaps the government has learned its lesson after so many failed promises in its 2015 platform: I am guessing it is better to say nothing than to continue to break promises. Unfortunately, we cannot run a government that way, and Canadians are demanding answers.

The government, through Natural Resources Canada, wants to spend \$280,000 to try to find out why investor confidence in Canada is so low. Before Canadians from coast to coast to coast pick up the phone to call the minister in hopes of landing that \$280,000 contract, the closing date was April 19.

• (1710)

It does not really take many people to figure out why Canadian competitiveness is so weak, why investor confidence is so low, and why Canadian businesses are fleeing south. Canadian competitiveness is weak because of rising costs as Canadian businesses face these increases. We are seeing new carbon taxes and increased CPP and EI premiums. Personal income taxes for entrepreneurs are now over 53% at the top marginal rate. Thousands of local businesses will no longer qualify for the small business tax rate or will see it reduced. Tough new rules will raise taxes on compensation paid in the family business.

According to Jack Mintz, Canadian businesses are facing a competitive tsunami that could wallop jobs and investment, as U.S. tax reform and the reduction in the corporate rate from 35% to 21% will make Canada less competitive and increase the appeal of moving to the United States.

Budget 2018 offered nothing to Canadian businesses. The U.K., the U.S. and France have all embarked on major tax reforms, simplifying the tax code and lowering overall tax rates. Canada is moving in the complete opposite direction, with more taxes and

more regulation. Investor confidence has fallen by 5%, or \$12.7 billion, since 2015.

During the same period, business investments in the United States increased by 9%, amounting to an additional \$198 billion of investment spending. Foreign direct investment into Canada plummeted by 42% in 2016 and then a further 27% in 2017. The natural resources sector is being hit particularly hard, as regulation is discouraging investment. The pipeline shortage means that Canada's oil and gas companies receive lower prices for oil, approximately \$24 less per barrel, because they are forced to ship to a part of the United States glutted with oil and gas. This is costing the Canadian economy approximately \$50 million per day. In the last two years, \$84 billion of investment in the energy sector has been cancelled.

Economist Germain Belzile, a senior researcher at the Montreal Economic Institute, stated:

People are giving up on Canada as a safe place to invest in natural resources.

It's seen as a very hostile environment now.

Doug Porter, chief economist and managing director of BMO Financial Group, stated:

I think Canada has a very weak competitive position. I think we're going to get crushed in the next recession....

The Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers, a leading industry association in the oil and gas sector, advises that the sector is seeing companies, including Canadian firms, looking at allocating more capital dollars in the U.S., while investment in Canada is decreasing.

RBC president and CEO Dave McKay, the head of one of Canada's largest banks, is urging the federal government to stem the flow of investment capital from this country to the United States because, he warns, it is already leaving in real time. Canadian businesses are fleeing south because the entrepreneurial climate in Canada has soured.

Canadians have lost faith in their government. In his first three years in power, the Prime Minister added \$60 billion to the national debt. Last year, Canada's national debt reached an all-time high of \$670 billion, or \$47,612 per Canadian family, and the budget will not return to balance until 2045, when my son will be 33 years of age and quite possibly raising my grandchildren.

The finance minister's attack on small business last fall demonstrated just how out of touch the government is with what is going on in the economy, although the finance minister did climb down significantly on taxing passive investment income. Instead of the proposed 73% tax rate, the government will gradually withdraw eligibility for the small business tax rate for those companies with investment income greater than \$50,000.

Government Orders

I could go on and on and I am sure members would enjoy that a lot, but I understand my time is running out, so I will wrap it up before I am cut off. I look forward to questions and to speaking more about how this Liberal budget is failing Canadian families.

• (1715)

Mr. Wayne Stetski (Kootenay—Columbia, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I live in British Columbia and I have for many years. Of course, we have had a carbon tax in place for well over a decade. When I was mayor of Cranbrook, we used to be able to take the money we would have had to pay for carbon taxes and reinvest it in improvements in the city to reduce heat loss or put in charging stations for electric vehicles. At worst, I guess it was a balance. At best, we were reinvesting in a better future.

Over the last year and a half, I held three sessions with local business people in three different communities. I invited the mayor and the MLA, and then I invited small businesses to come and meet with all three levels of government at the same time to try to maximize the use of their time. Not once did a carbon tax come up as an issue from any of the small businesses we met with.

Putting carbon taxes aside, what would the member have liked to have seen in this budget to help small businesses?

Mr. Jamie Schmale: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question. I get it at the door all the time. Anywhere I go, I represent a rural community. Rural people use oil to heat their homes, or they use propane or other sources that will be impacted because of this carbon tax. It seems every direction they look, life is becoming more and more unaffordable.

That is really causing a problem all across the country, but I will specifically look at Ontario, where we have some of the highest electricity rates anywhere in North America. That is again because of bad government decisions that are forcing people into poverty. People are making decisions on whether they pay the rent or their electricity bill, or whether they eat this month or get their prescription drugs, and the list goes on. This is because people are being left with less and less in their pockets because their cheques just are not going far enough, and that is because of taxes.

As taxes are implemented throughout the marketplace, businesses start to increase their prices throughout the marketplace, so everything starts to get more expensive. If people are not getting an increase to offset the rising prices—because it is a government increase, not an organic increase—that hurts people. That is what I am seeing in rural Canada. I think small businesses would like the government to just get the heck out of the way.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, GPQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleague if he agrees with me about one of the major shortcomings in this bill, with its many hundreds of pages, and in the previous one. I am talking about strengthening tools to better combat the use of tax havens.

Fraudsters are doing things that are against the law, and not enough investigations are being carried out or charges being laid. The big problem is the legal use of tax havens. Because of two regulations in section 5907 of the Income Tax Regulations,

multinationals and big corporations can transfer their money to tax havens to dodge their tax obligations and pay no tax in Canada.

My colleague talks about the cost of living going up because of rising taxes. Meanwhile, those who have the means to contribute more use tax havens to avoid doing so. There is nothing about this in the last budget or the budget implementation bill.

Shouldn't the Liberal government be doing something about it?

• (1720)

[*English*]

Mr. Jamie Schmale: Mr. Speaker, I agree that everyone needs to pay their fair share in taxes. When the United States lowered its tax rate, companies brought money back into the country. As I said, I agree that people need to pay their fair share, but off the top of my head, I believe that when the tax rate was reduced, Apple brought \$300 million back that was offshore. It brought it into the economy to spend on wages, research and development, expansion, and bonuses. That was brought in because taxes were lowered, giving businesses an advantage and allowing them to contribute to the economy at home.

That is one way it can be done. I am sure the government has its ideas as well. However, if we want to use one example, that is one we could use.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: Before we resume debate, I must inform the hon. member for Beauport—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île d'Orléans—Charlevoix that she has about seven minutes to go before private members' business. As usual, I will let her know when her time is up.

The hon. member for Beauport—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île d'Orléans—Charlevoix.

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher (Beauport—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île d'Orléans—Charlevoix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am proud to take part in this discussion today.

I do not know whether to laugh or cry, but yesterday or the day before, I unwillingly became a millionaire, since we are all now owners of Kinder Morgan's infamous Trans Mountain pipeline. Everyone is pleased. I see all my colleagues smiling. I did not expect that. We are used to a government that claims to be extremely transparent, but it is anything but. This government is about as transparent as a bottle of Pepsi.

That being said, I would like to talk more generally about the Liberals' supposed transparency when it comes to the budget or to any bill, for that matter. They promised in their 2015 election platform that they would do things differently from Mr. Harper and the NDP member for Outremont. That is the first thing they said. People may not like Mr. Harper, but one must admit that he had one good quality, and that is that he always did what he said he would. That was his trademark.

The Liberal platform, which I have here, sets out a number of promises. I will quote from it because spoken words fly away, but written words remain. It reads, and I quote:

We will run modest deficits for three years so that we can invest in growth for the middle class and credibly offer a plan to balance the budget in 2019.

Excuse me for telling the truth, but that is what is written here in black and white. I feel as though I am acting in some sort of comedy. Not only are those words untrue, but the deficit is three times higher than the Liberals promised it would be. Again in the Liberals' election platform—not in ours since we do not make promises that we cannot keep—it reads, and I quote:

The foundation of the fiscal plan over our mandate is a planning framework that is realistic, sustainable, prudent, and transparent.

I have a hard time believing that, since the Liberals are using taxpayers' money to buy pipelines without asking permission here in the House and they are promising to make changes to the EI system.

By the way, the Liberals recently threw \$10 million at the EI spring gap and provided some training. In my riding, many people are affected by this gap, but only 26 of them were eligible for the training. However, what bothers me the most is that, when the Liberals announced the \$10-million investment, it was really appreciated, but then they held so many consultations that I think they forgot to consult the regions.

When you live in a remote area, an English or a computer course is not what you need the most, especially since very little English is spoken in Beauport—Côte-de-Beauport—Île d'Orléans—Charlevoix. We mainly speak French. Manual labour is what rural regions need the most. This \$10 million should have been used to fix the spring gap by providing training adapted to the actual needs of the people in the regions who were requesting it, rather than providing the training that public servants, who do not know anything about our regions, thought they needed. In my mind, that was the greatest loss.

I studied the budget from cover to cover and found very little for rural areas, whether for the Gaspé or my region of Beauport—Côte-de-Beauport—Île d'Orléans—Charlevoix. It focused a lot on the Maritimes, which have many MPs. However, there are just as many MPs in rural areas who received nothing, because they are not Liberals.

• (1725)

The rural regions just want to be heard. It is not a partisan issue. When the government spends taxpayer money to consult people over and over again, it should take what they say into consideration. I recently consulted my constituents and wrote a report on the spring gap in my riding. I met with the unemployed, business people, mayors, and municipal councillors, and we all came to the same conclusion: today's employment insurance system does not reflect what we would expect to see in 2018. It is outdated. It needs to be modernized.

The Liberal government has claimed to be transparent from the start. However, every time we hold the government to account, it never responds. The Liberals are as transparent as a bottle of Pepsi: dark and impossible to see through.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Beauport—Côte-de-Beauport—Île d'Orléans—Charlevoix will have three and a half minutes for her speech and five minutes for questions and comments when the House resumes debate on this motion.

Private Members' Business

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]

OPPORTUNITY FOR WORKERS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

The House resumed from April 16 consideration of the motion that Bill C-395, An Act to amend the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Hon. Mike Lake (Edmonton—Wetaskiwin, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln once said, "If there is anything that a man can do well, I say let him do it. Give him a chance." In 2018, of course, we refer to people instead of men, but the message is still the same.

While I would suggest that all of us in this place would agree with this sentiment, there are areas where we can do much better in this regard, and we are talking about one of them this evening. For people with disabilities in Canada today, we do not do enough to recognize and cultivate skills and abilities. Rather, we tend to focus almost exclusively on the challenges. When we do recognize an area where an individual can contribute, we often do something that is almost inconceivable: We actually penalize people who are able to overcome the odds and find a job. In 2018, in Canada, individuals with a disability can get a job that properly compensates them for their work, but end up being worse off than if they had not been working. This is because governments take away more in benefits than the individuals make in their new job.

With this simple piece of legislation we are dealing with today, we have the opportunity to change that. As the parent of a 22-year-old son with autism, I would like to thank the member for Carleton for this very important and non-partisan initiative. After quoting a Republican, Lincoln, I will quote John F. Kennedy to highlight the non-partisan nature of this discussion. He said, "Things do not happen. Things are made to happen."

With this bill, we have the opportunity to show federal leadership to make something happen while respecting provincial jurisdiction. The bill is quite brilliant in its simplicity. It is just a page and a half long and sets in place a mechanism to determine areas where the clawback of income in terms of taxes and lost benefits for persons with disabilities who work is greater than the income they receive from that work. When such a situation exists, the bill would allow the finance minister to take action to fix the problem. This may seem like common sense because it is common sense, and it is incumbent on us to make it happen.

Others will talk a bit more about the details of the opportunity for workers with disabilities act, but I am going to use the rest of my time today to share a bit about my son Jaden, and use his example to highlight the importance of this bill.

Private Members' Business

Jaden and I travel around the country and do a presentation called “Expect More, An Autism Adventure”. We talk about the idea that we can move from inclusion, which is really important, to contribution. When I talk about inclusion in Jaden's life, I talk about things like his schooling, the school system he went to from K to 12 with a full-time aid helping him. I think about hockey and bowling, where he took part on regular teams in regular leagues, often with a bit of support from his dad or some of the other coaches. I think about musical theatre. His story in musical theatre is really a cool one that I will get to in a second. Jaden has some challenges, of course. He is non-verbal, and everybody in this House has probably met Jaden at one time or another and given him a high five. He has trouble with things that are abstract.

I like to tell stories about Jaden to highlight some of his difficulties understanding what is okay and not okay. I think back to when he was nine years old and we went to McDonald's at West Edmonton Mall between Christmas and New Years. We were picking up food for a bunch of people and were walking out and I was not holding his hand because I was carrying all of this food for these people. Because I was not able to hold his hand, Jaden had a bit of free reign. All of a sudden, he got the giggles and turned around and ran back to the counter at McDonald's and ran behind the full length of the counter. He reached into the bin where they hold the crushed Smarties in front of everybody in line, and grabbed a handful of crushed Smarties and stuffed them in his face. He was eating these crushed Smarties with the biggest smile on his face while about 70 people in line—it was very busy—looked on and were somewhat aghast at the situation. I just ran to him, found someone who looked like a manager, and quickly explained that Jaden has autism, and we walked out.

We often talk about these challenges, but what I love about Jaden's situation and the inclusion story of Jaden, his situation in school, was the fact that Jaden had a very supportive environment. When I think about musical theatre, I think about the teachers and students who were involved in musical theatre who, because they had gone to school with Jaden for 10 years leading up to his grade-10 year, recognized that Jaden loved theatre, movies, and music and thought that he might be able to have a part in a musical theatre production. The first year, they did *Oliver!*, and they put Jaden in a group scene where he practised the moves and took part in a couple of group scenes, and kids were on the side of the stage watching to make sure he did not take off and just wander offstage. The second year, they pushed him a bit further. They did *Bye Bye Birdie*. There were some scenes with choreography. They were able to teach Jaden the choreography.

● (1730)

The third year, his last year of musical theatre, in *Joseph and the Amazing Technicolor Dreamcoat*, one of the girls, in her senior year, asked if she could be Jaden's wife in the play. There were many scenes where there were couples dancing, and she taught Jaden to kind of improvise in those scenes. When the other boys picked up the girls and threw them in the air, Jaden put his hands on her hips and she jumped, to make it look like he was throwing her in the air. It was amazing. He did much better than anybody thought he could do. It was a perfect example of inclusion.

However, it is one thing to look at inclusion; it is another thing to look at where we go beyond that. Inclusion offered the opportunity for people to see what Jaden was good at, but the school was challenged with finding a next step for him, something I call moving from inclusion to contribution. We talk about this often.

In Jaden's case, because he had been included in so many different aspects of school life all these years, there were kids who remembered what he was good at. They remembered that, up until grade 4, he was the first kid to do times tables, or that he got 100% on most of his spelling tests, because he sees the world a little differently than everybody else. Jaden did a great job in musical theatre, better than we ever thought he would, but, to be honest, even as his father, I would admit that Jaden is probably not going to have a career in musical theatre. He did better than we thought he would, but musical theatre is not necessarily his calling or gift.

However, it did challenge people to think that maybe he was capable of doing more than they thought. His aide and the school, the teachers and the students, had him working in the school library. Jaden was astonishing, working in the library. He would scan the books, put them all in a pile, put them on the cart in order, and then run around the library putting them away. He would put them away faster than anybody else.

It was pretty cool watching Jaden in the library. Not only would he put the books away faster than anybody else, never making a mistake, but he would walk by books that were already on a library shelf and would notice that they were in the wrong place, out of all of the books on the shelf. He would grab them as he was walking by, put them on his cart, and when he got to where they belonged, he would just put them where they belonged without even skipping a beat.

Jaden has this incredible skill and ability that were noticed by students and teachers as he was going through his schooling. As we move forward, we ask what the vocational opportunities for Jaden are. We can think about how much work went into developing, understanding, and cultivating Jaden's skill level and finding those abilities. Now Jaden is going to potentially have the opportunity to work in a school environment or a library environment, or something similar to that.

The circumstance in this country right now is that Jaden may have that opportunity to work. Jaden is incredibly excited to work; he cries at the end of his shift because he wants to keep working. I do not know how many members in the House cry at the end of their House duty, but it is probably not because they want to keep it going. In Jaden's case, that is how much he loves working. We are in a circumstance where Jaden could be worse off when he is working, because of these clawbacks, these systems we have in place. However, we can remedy that with the particular piece of legislation we are dealing with today.

Private Members' Business

I would challenge members of the House to think about Jaden's circumstance. We can think about the decision that we have to make for him, or that people with disabilities might have to make. They can go out and do something they are good at. They can make a decision to be compensated fairly for the work they do, or they can volunteer for that work, doing it for free, and they would be better off financially. That is an insane choice to have to make. How many of us think that this would be okay, if we had to make that choice? If Jaden was to work for free, he might be better off financially than if he was to actually get paid what his work is worth. That is the circumstance we are dealing with. That is what this bill is meant to solve.

I want to thank the member for Carleton for bringing forward this very important issue. I know that he worked very hard to find something he could use his private member's bill on that would be non-partisan in nature and that members from all parties could support.

• (1735)

I talked to a couple of NDP members today, and I know the NDP will be supportive, as it supported the Canadian autism partnership last year. It is quite a thing to find Conservative and NDP members in agreement on issues, but there are a couple of areas where we did find some agreement. I do not know what the Liberal position is on this, but I hope the Liberals will also support this. I am thankful for the opportunity to speak to this, and I look forward to hearing the rest of the debate.

Mr. Joël Lightbound (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am happy to outline the government's position on Bill C-395, an act to amend the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act.

I want to commend the member for Carleton, because the end he is seeking to achieve in this legislation is noble and good. However, the means to reach that end are not consistent with our vision of federalism and productive collaboration with provinces and territories.

The bill seeks to help encourage more people to enter the workforce. The government is taking, and has taken, substantive steps toward the same end. The government believes that in order to face the challenges of today and tomorrow, we will need the hard work and creativity of all Canadians.

• (1740)

[*Translation*]

We are here because our constituents put us here and, as legislators, we must not only do the right thing, we must also do it right. The debate we are about to have hinges on that nuance. That will be central to the debate today because there is a wide gulf between the approach we are proposing and this proposed approach.

The approach proposed in this bill involves imposing more conditions on the provinces and then talking to them about it after the fact. That is not our vision of federalism and the work we need to do with the provinces. The provinces want us to work with them, to collaborate, especially on matters that are under their jurisdiction.

The previous government was in power for 10 years and could have introduced a condition like this, but it did not. The previous

government was in power for 10 years and my colleague from Carleton was the minister in charge of the portfolio, but not once in 10 years did he meet with his provincial counterparts to discuss this important issue.

[*English*]

The bill seeks to introduce a condition to the Canada social transfer whereby the transfer payments to provinces and territories would be reduced in cases where persons with disabilities face marginal effective tax rates above 100%. These high marginal effective tax rates are largely the result of the design of provincial and territorial social assistance programs.

The provisions of this bill are not consistent with the intent of the Canada social transfer, which exists to provide funding to provincial and territorial governments while allowing flexibility in the design and administration of programs in their areas of responsibility, including the delivery of social assistance.

What the bill is proposing would amount to an encroachment on an area of provincial and territorial jurisdiction. Provincial and territorial governments are accountable directly to their residents for their spending in their areas of responsibility, and that includes program spending that results from the Canada social transfer payments.

Our government is committed to helping the next generation of Canadians succeed. We believe that every Canadian deserves an equal and fair chance at success, so we agree that removing barriers to entering and staying in the workforce is a principled goal.

However, this is a challenge that no order of government can take on alone. We need the support of our partners. Introducing a condition that could result in reduced CST payments to provinces and territories, which is what this bill proposes, could effectively jeopardize social programming for all Canadians, including post-secondary education, social assistance and social services, and support for children, while doing nothing to address the barriers to employment for persons with disabilities. In other words, this is not a preferable scenario.

There are more effective ways of improving access to good jobs for persons with disabilities. A more collaborative approach with provincial and territorial governments, one that seeks to address labour market barriers faced by persons with disabilities, would achieve more than what is being proposed today.

Our government recognizes the importance of the issue raised by the bill. We are committed to working with provinces and territories to figure out how to give persons with disabilities more opportunities to work and more incentives to join and stay in the workforce. In fact, our government has taken many actions to do just that.

In budget 2018, we introduced the new Canada workers benefit. This new benefit is a strengthened version of the working income tax benefit and will come into effect next year. The new Canada workers benefit will put more money in the pockets of low-income workers and, in doing so, give people help as they transition to work.

Private Members' Business

For example, a low-income worker earning \$15,000 could receive up to almost \$500 more from the Canada workers benefit in 2019 than in 2018 under the current system. The government also proposes to increase the maximum benefit provided through the Canada workers benefit disability supplement by an additional \$160 to offer greater support to eligible Canadians with disabilities.

The Canada workers benefit will offer real help to more than two million Canadians who are working hard to join the middle class. Enhancements to the benefit, starting in 2019, will also raise roughly 70,000 Canadians out of poverty. This improved benefit will help low-income working Canadians, including those with disabilities, make ends meet.

In budget 2018, the government also provided funding for a new program to develop and enhance pre-apprenticeship training. Working in partnership with provinces, territories, post-secondary institutions, training providers, unions, and employers, it will help Canadians, particularly under-represented groups, including women, indigenous people, persons with disabilities, and newcomers, to explore the trades, gain work experience, make informed career choices, and develop the skills needed to succeed.

We know that labour market barriers faced by persons with disabilities are broader than financial disincentives. That is why the government has committed to introducing accessibility legislation to proactively identify, remove, and prevent accessibility barriers for persons with disabilities in the federal jurisdiction.

Since taking office, the government has also made a number of investments in federal programming to support persons with disabilities. I will now detail a few examples from our first two budgets.

To increase investments in training and employment supports under the labour market development agreements and workforce development agreements, budget 2017 provided \$2.7 billion over six years, starting in 2017-18. These agreements are the means by which the federal government transfers funds to provinces and territories to improve employment opportunities, including for persons with disabilities.

Budget 2017 also provided close to \$400 million over three years to support the youth employment strategy, which includes funding for vulnerable youth, including youth with disabilities, to overcome barriers to employment.

Budget 2016 and budget 2017 provided \$81 million over 10 years to expand the enabling accessibility fund, which funds capital projects that improve the accessibility of community and workplace infrastructure.

Also, budget 2016 provided \$73 million over four years to support new work-integrated learning opportunities for young Canadians in the science, technology, engineering, mathematics, and business fields. The program provides wage incentives for employers who hire from under-represented groups, including persons with disabilities.

Our government's position is clear: We need to ensure that the benefits of a growing economy are felt by more and more people, with good, well-paying jobs for the middle class. We need to

maximize workforce participation, including for persons with disabilities, and create more incentives for people to join and stay in the workforce. The new Canada workers benefit, and the increased disability supplement that is provided through this benefit, is a step in the right direction.

Again, I would like to thank my colleague for raising that important issue in the House through Bill C-395. As I mentioned in my opening remarks, I believe the end he is seeking to achieve is a good and noble one, and we share that objective. However, the means he has chosen to achieve it, essentially coercing the provinces through a condition to the Canada social transfer, is not the right way to go. This is something that can be better achieved through collaborating and working with the provinces and territories.

● (1745)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Madam Speaker, it is rare for me to agree with the member for Carleton, the bill's sponsor, but today, I can inform him that the NDP will be supporting his initiative. We believe it is a step in the right direction. It is a shame to hear the Liberals tell the House that they will not be following our lead and supporting people with disabilities and their integration into the workforce. This is a concrete measure to correct a situation that is unfair to people with disabilities.

I have somewhat personal reasons, family reasons, for being pleased to be talking about this bill. My mother was a practical nurse, and she spent most of her career working with children with severe disabilities. I think that is why I was brought up to respect differences and see the potential in all human beings, even those with certain conditions or limitations that make life more difficult or create special challenges in the environment we live in.

What can we do to give people with disabilities the respect and support they need to live the richest, fullest, and best lives possible? How can we all work together to promote equal opportunities? The phrase "equal opportunities" is all too often used as a kind of slogan, but the concept has very real consequences for people with physical or intellectual disabilities. If we truly want our society to be united and inclusive, we need to do everything we can to make life easier for people with disabilities and give them the same opportunities that are available to each of us, so they can fulfill their dreams and live life to the fullest just as anyone else.

Private Members' Business

I would now like to talk about an important document that has inspired progressive and humanist philosophy for more than 200 years. I am talking about the UN's Universal Declaration of Human Rights. One important sentence underlined the first step of the revolution. For the first time, a document was adopted and said, "Men are born free and remain free and equal in rights." However, that is not the exact sentence. The document actually said, "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights."

Rights are important, but we must also consider the notion of dignity in how we organize society, manage the country, and take care of the poorest and least fortunate, or of those who face particular challenges as a result of personal conditions or limitations.

The current process for a person with a disability who is receiving benefits and then finds a job, joins the workforce, and receives employment income is unacceptable. Right now, these people are penalized. This bill is important because it fixes this problem and helps persons with disabilities who do not have the same opportunities as the majority of the population. These people are clearly in a difficult position. I was going to say that they face discrimination, and that is practically the case.

When you look at the statistics from the federal human development department, you can see that there is a \$10,000 difference in the average annual income between a person with a disability and an able-bodied person. If you are talking about an income of about \$22,000 a year for a person with a disability and an income of \$32,000 a year for an able-bodied person, that is a big difference.

● (1750)

It is a huge difference, practically a third less income on average. What can we do to fix the problem? What can the government do to level the playing field and give everyone the same opportunities?

Lower salaries are not the only problem. There is also a stark difference in workforce participation. The employment rate among so-called "able-bodied" people, a term I always put in air quotes because this terminology needs to be used carefully, is about 75%. By contrast, the employment rate among people with limitations or disabilities, to use the terms employed by Statistics Canada, is just 50%. There is a difference of 25% in the employment rate of people without disabilities and people with disabilities. This is a massive difference that affects many people.

When we talk about people with limitations or disabilities, we are talking about roughly 10% of Canadians. One out of 10 Canadians is in this situation. This is a major concern for us. What concrete steps and measures can we take to help these Canadians enter and participate in the workforce, boost their employment, and earn higher incomes to improve their quality of life?

We are talking about one in 10 people or 2.3 million Canadians. All of those people have an income of less than \$10,000 a year on average and their rate of employment is 25% lower than that of people who report living without a disability or limitation. That is unfair and discriminatory.

I would like to come back to the idea of equal opportunities for all and the fact that all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. There is a problem here, and I thank my Conservative

colleague for noticing it and for introducing a bill to address it. His bill is not perfect, but it is a step in the right direction.

That is why the NDP will support the bill at second reading so that we can examine it in committee, hear from various experts and stakeholders, and see what amendments or improvements could be made to it.

What does the essence of the bill tell us? This bill seeks to ensure that people with disabilities who have an employment income will not potentially lose benefits because of the finance department's tax measures.

This is a ridiculous situation. People with disabilities who are receiving benefits are penalized if they get a job because then they lose some of their benefits. It is therefore not worth it to them to get a job and join the labour force.

As progressive New Democrats, we do not want this situation to continue. We think that the measures set out in this bill could help people. They need serious, realistic, and measurable incentives to join the workforce.

The bill will adapt the benefits to the needs of people with disabilities and reduce barriers to employment. It is extremely important to keep that in mind. We think that such a change is extremely important, since it will also allow for better tax redistribution.

Ultimately, the legislation will help provide more opportunities for people with disabilities to enter the labour market. To my knowledge, this bill would put in place a tax incentive that would help the provinces ensure that a person with a disability who enters the labour market would not be impoverished in doing so.

When we go to work, our income should go up, not down. That is the least we can ask of a government that wants to treat everyone equally. We must help people with disabilities enter the labour market and join the average Canadian and Quebecker.

● (1755)

That is why we will be supporting this bill at second reading.

[English]

Mrs. Karen Vecchio (Elgin—Middlesex—London, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am happy to speak today on this terrific bill put forward by my colleague from Carleton. I would like to begin my speech today with a quote:

On behalf of the Rick Hansen Foundation, I support the Opportunity for Workers and Disabilities Act. Nobody, including people with disabilities should be worse off once working. Addressing this issue is important and I am pleased that with the tabling of this Bill, rightful attention will be focused on finding an appropriate solution. We see this as a win-win for people with disabilities and Canadian society as a whole. An inclusive Canada is a stronger Canada.

Private Members' Business

That was said by our very own Paralympian, Rick Hansen, founder and CEO of the Rick Hansen Foundation, one of Canada's best men for showing what people can do with a disability, that they can still be tremendous.

The bill can be viewed in a variety of ways, whether it is what is fiscally best for Canada's economy or how we can empower Canadians to provide another way and tool for inclusion. I will focus on the latter, as I know my hon. colleague has provided the positive fiscal side to this. I come to the House wanting to do what is in the best interests of Canadians, knowing how smart, thorough legislation and policies can have a positive impact on their lives. That is the one thing this bill does.

I had the opportunity to work on the Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and Persons with Disabilities. We did a poverty reduction study that was tabled last year. Throughout that study we had an opportunity to speak to many people. One group was people with disabilities. Through the work of the committee, we met organizations and community leaders and recognized that work, whether paid or unpaid, is good for one's health and well-being. It contributes to overall happiness, helps build confidence and self-esteem, and rewards us financially.

The great thing about the bill is that not only is it doing something that is fiscally right for Canadians, it is also adding the human aspect, which the government and this Parliament speak about all the time. How can we make ourselves a more inclusive society? That is exactly what the bill does.

Whether we are looking at person with an intellectual or physical disability, the premise is the same: work keeps one busy. It enables socialization and provides monetary incentives that support one's interests. We know that working helps improve mental health, and helps one recover more quickly in many cases.

While reviewing information for this speech today, I found a quote from Randy Lewis, a man who has hired over 1,000 people with disabilities. Here again is another man we talked about a lot during the study by the human resources committee, because many times we referred to the incredible work he was doing. Randy was the former senior vice-president of Walgreens. He stated:

I am the father of an adult child with autism who works full-time. I am also the former Senior Vice President of Walgreens who hired over a thousand people with disabilities in its distribution centers. Eliminating disincentives through the Opportunity Act is a good first step toward increasing one's desire to participate in the workforce. However, if we are to substantially increase the desire to work, we also need to eliminate the fear of not being able to restore benefits quickly should employment not be successful and also ensure that the financial benefits of working exceed the financial benefits of not working.

That is exactly what we are asking for in the bill. We are asking for the Minister of Finance to review this. This is really important. We have to make sure that when we were doing this, we keep in mind the impact of switching from being on disability to getting out there and working. What impact does that have on the bottom line?

We talk a lot about marginal income tax rates, and we can see their negative impact. In this bill, we are looking at and focusing on means tested social programs, including the housing program and drug benefits, and negative impacts, including clawbacks via taxes, such that at the end of the day, someone who might have gone to work ends up coming home with less income as a result.

I refer to my time working for Joe Preston. We saw many people come into the office with disabilities who just wanted to work. They wanted to have dignity. I can think of one man who came in, who is a tremendous man in our community who volunteers a lot. He wanted to run for city council. The problem was that although the stipend was very small, working as a city councillor would remove all of the benefits he had. At the end of the day, financially he was not ending up with a lot more cash in his pocket, but what he was losing was huge.

● (1800)

He was going to lose the assistance that paid for his medication through the drug plan available through Ontario Works. All those things the ODSP had provided for him were going to be gone. He just wanted to contribute to society and continue to make it a better place to live, but it was better for him not to participate in that election, because he would have ended up with less.

We talk about wanting inclusion. We want people to be part of our society. We know it is good for them.

Another thing we focused on throughout the poverty reduction study was opportunities for Canadians to work. We know that Canadians with disabilities are the largest population when we are talking about the poverty line. When we scrutinize the data that is available to us, we recognize that many times, people with disabilities are the most vulnerable and are living with the least.

A report from the Library of Parliament showed that low-income working Canadians with disabilities are facing tax rates of over 100%. Imagine, all they want to do is get out there and work and be contributing members of society, and they walk home with less, less to feed their families and less when it comes to so many of the things that make their lives viable.

We have to understand that this is a real struggle. I believe that many disabled Canadians want to go to work, but it is a problem when it comes to financial stability, not only for themselves but for their families. What we know is that when some of these people work more, they end up coming home with less. That is something we are asking the Minister of Finance to look at to see how they are impacted.

Reviewing these benefits and making sure that Canadians are better off working must be done so we have an inclusive society. This is what we need to look at. These are people with MS, autism, Down syndrome, ALS, and many other disabilities where someone is still able to work and make personal gains. The bill is proposing exactly that. It recognizes the worthiness of Canadians.

The HUMA committee tabled the poverty reduction study last year, and I want to refer to a couple of the recommendations we made. Recommendation 3 reads:

Private Members' Business

That Finance Canada and the Canada Revenue Agency review taxes for low-income workers to ensure that no families are forced into poverty as a result of taxes.

Recommendation 4 reads:

That Employment and Social Development Canada, Finance Canada and the Canada Revenue Agency work with provinces and territories to strengthen and coordinate income support program policies so that participants do not face marginal effective tax rates that discourage labour force participation.

Recommendations 20 and 21 are also very supportive of the bill. That is exactly what we talked about in the HUMA committee. The fact that this bill is in line with what we were talking about to make things better is a good thing. Recommendation 21 is really about social development and what we can do there.

We understand that in many cases, people are concerned about jurisdiction. Levels of government need to work together on the Canada social transfers, what we need to do, and how we can do it. Canada social transfers were established back in 2004. There were two types of transfers at that time. They are block transfers and a variety of different things. I know that our wonderful member will explain that further.

We must make sure that these fine social programs provide flexibility for the provinces. Many of us have had debates about health transfers. We provide the money in blocks, many times with no strings attached. That is what we are looking at here. We want to make sure that the money is earmarked and is being used appropriately.

We talk about the transfers and eligibility. To receive funding, provincial or territorial governments must not impose minimum residency requirements as a condition. Those are important things, but there are other things when we look at these conditions. We want to make sure that the transferred money is appropriate. That is something our member for Carleton has looked at: making sure that, at the end of the day, Canadians are better off and that we can review the impacts and how we work with our provincial and territorial partners.

I want to finish off with a quote from Dr. Ian Lee. He is an associate professor at the Sprott School of Business at Carleton University. He appeared at the committee. He indicated support for the bill. He said that the bill proposed by the hon. member represents an important precedent in policy: that integration of people into the workforce who are in receipt of some sort of disability payment from government that mandates the clawback incurred from working again cannot make the citizen worse off than before.

I recognize that this is an excellent bill and will do excellent things for Canadians. I hope everyone will support it.

• (1805)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise in the House today to speak to Bill C-395, the opportunities act. I want to take an opportunity very quickly to thank the member for Carleton for bringing this forward. I know the opportunity to present a private member's bill does not come along that often, and many members in the House will not have an opportunity to see one through to completion. When people take the time they are allotted for a cause and purpose like this, it is to be commended. The member, through his private member's bill, is really starting to highlight and draw attention to a very important

issue that we need to be looking at closely. We need to be examining it and figuring out what can be done. The bill he has introduced puts us on the right path and in the direction of being able to start having this discussion.

I am going to focus my comments on the problem that exists. My staff and I had an opportunity to research this and look at some of the problems. I would like to talk about those as well as about some statistics we were able to find that highlight even further the problem that exists. I will then talk a bit about some of the recommendations out there and the Canada social transfer component and what this bill would do to change that.

The first thing we have to understand is the marginal effective tax rate that so many people who are receiving some kind of social assistance or disability payment, or whatever it might be from the government, are dealing with. In particular, as it relates to people with disabilities, what we are finding is that they are less interested in getting into the marketplace because of the clawback that would happen when they get into the workforce and start to generate income. Their disability payments would be clawed back. Therefore, their marginal effective rate of tax would actually start to increase.

According to figures we were able to obtain from the Library of Parliament, a person with a disability working 30 hours a week in Ontario pays a marginal effective tax rate of up to 70%. If members think that is astonishing, in Alberta it can be as much as 115% for a person who has a disability and is working 40 hours a week. Another term for this is what is referred to as the "welfare wall". That was coined by the Centre for Research on Work and Disability Policy. It refers to a cluster of factors that together act as a trap for people on social assistance, or "welfare", the term it uses, and makes it difficult for them to move off that program of income support. I think that is exactly the case we are seeing here for people with disabilities with the disability payments they are getting.

This problem is also well documented by the Caledon Institute of Social Policy in a 1993 study, which found that Ontario social assistance recipients who supplement their social benefits by working get to keep only a very small fraction of these earnings. Basically, there is a wall, called the "welfare wall", put up in front of people that is preventing them from actually getting into the workforce. In particular, the more they work, the more is clawed back. Therefore, even if they do start to get into the workforce, there is a disincentive to continue to work more.

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, the OECD, did a study on this and found that unemployment rates of persons with disabilities in 2006 were 50% higher than for Canadians without disabilities. The OECD concluded:

Much of Canada's sickness and disability policy reform efforts so far have been piecemeal rather than co-ordinated, and had seemingly limited overall impact on a system that remains complex and fragmented.

Private Members' Business

I mentioned earlier that I would talk about some statistics. This is from Statistics Canada. According to a 2012 Canadian survey on disability, there were over 650,000 disabled individuals, aged 15 to 64, who were not in the labour force who either used to work or indicated that they were capable of working. Of these, 94,000 reported feeling that if they were employed, they would lose additional support.

● (1810)

That is key. These are people thinking to themselves that if they start working, they will lose support. They are not even in the participation rates, because many of them are not actually looking for jobs, because they fear these clawbacks.

The unemployment rate for persons with disabilities is 11%, compared to 6% for people without disabilities, which is almost double. It is important to mention that the unemployment rate always includes people who are actively looking for work, and that is why we have to talk about the participation rate, which is equally important. The participation rate is 55% for people with disabilities versus 84% for people without disabilities.

I have outlined why I see a big problem here. I would agree with the member that we are not doing enough to combat this problem. We are not doing enough to put additional measures in place to discourage the welfare wall that has been created.

That is why I think the part of the member's bill that talks about the minister collecting data and reporting back to Parliament on a regular basis is extremely important. By getting that information, we can have a discussion about it. Quite frankly, a lot of Canadians are not having a discussion about this, because they are not aware of the information and do not realize the impact.

My colleague on the other side talked a little bit about the HUMA recommendations. I admit that I am not a member of the committee, but I did look at the report it produced. It had four recommendations that I believe are related to this.

The first is "that the government task the Parliamentary Budget Officer with reporting annually on the marginal effective tax rates... that low-income disabled people pay in each province."

The second recommendation is "that, at the next meeting of the federal-provincial Finance Ministers, all governments agree", which I think is the key word here, "on a coordinated plan to cap [marginal effective tax rates] at...50% for all disabled Canadians". It goes on to give more detail. I think it is key that we recognize that the word "agree" was used there because of the problem that is presented by the Canada social transfer.

The difference between this bill and the HUMA report is that the bill directs the federal government to do something with the Canada social transfer.

I know the member across the way mentioned that the Canada social transfer has one single condition, but there is a valid reason for that. Under section 25.1 of the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act, provinces and territories must meet a national standard of having no minimum residency period. That is the sole criterion, and this was done intentionally to create a scenario in which the

provinces are responsible to the people, as opposed to being responsible to the federal government.

That is probably what has motivated the government, through the parliamentary secretary, to explain why it might not be supporting it. This bill would have been a lot more palatable if it did not have the component regarding the Canada social transfer. If it did not, we would have been able to get that information on a regular basis.

I am very supportive of the concept and what I have heard, but to be completely honest, I am still deliberating as to how I am going to vote on this. I think this is a noble effort, and I know what people with disabilities face.

As a personal anecdote, I have a nephew with Down syndrome. He has great and amazing supports right now, but we worry about what supports he is going to have after he finishes high school.

I will leave it at that.

● (1815)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Before resuming debate, I want to advise the next speaker that unfortunately she will have to pare down her speech, as she will have only six minutes.

The hon. member for Sarnia—Lambton.

Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is an extreme pleasure to rise to speak to this private member's bill from the member for Carleton. Once again he has shown himself to be very intelligent and caring in bringing forward a bill that would help disabled people work without being punished by having their wages and benefits clawed back.

I will spend some of my time addressing a concern from members opposite that this is perhaps not the jurisdiction in which action can be taken. There are many federal programs that have conditions associated with them. I will, as the health shadow minister, talk about the Canada Health Act, which contains conditions that the provinces need to comply with. Health care has to be universal, it has to be portable, and it has to be accessible. As well, there are a number of conditions about administration that go with that act.

The member opposite just read the social transfer criteria, and there are conditions that go along with that transfer. We have certainly seen that infrastructure programs the government brings forward sometimes have conditions, whether it is emissions, how much federal money goes in, and how much provincial money goes along with that. Conditions can be applied, and even in extreme cases, there are times—such as in the case of the carbon tax, for example—that the government has forced conditions on the provinces, so the federal government does have the jurisdiction to bring these changes forward.

We should keep in mind with this private member's bill that we are not telling the provinces how to implement the principle; we are just describing the principle that disabled people who want to work should not have their wages and benefits clawed back. They should not be punished for that. We need to find ways that will encourage them to work, because we know that when they work, it is good for their mental health, they have a sense of accomplishment, they feel part of the community, and overall it is a positive experience.

One of my colleagues talked about the welfare wall. The principles expressed in this bill may have even broader implications for people in that trap, because they have the same issue that disabled people are having. If they start to work, their wages and benefits are clawed back, and that is a disincentive to them. This principle is an excellent one, but I would argue that it may have even broader consequences.

The Standing Committee on Human Rights, Skills and Social Development studied this matter. This bill aligns directly with one of its recommendations, which said that we need to find ways, with the things that we can control at the federal level, to help those who have lower incomes. This private member's bill would do that. It is within the federal government's power to put these conditions in place on the transfers to the provinces, and I think provinces will embrace and support the idea that disabled people should be able to work and not be punished for doing so.

My palliative care bill, for example, was brought in at the federal level, recognizing that the execution of palliative care is under provincial jurisdiction. It was with the support of the provinces, which have come alongside and have been very happy to participate, with the federal government doing what it can do and the provinces bringing the wherewithal and the how-to of the execution. The circumstances here are very similar.

Once again I want to thank the member for Carleton for his thoughtfulness in bringing forward something that I consider to be a great balance of fiscal responsibility and social compassion. It is to the credit of everyone in this House to support this private member's bill and do what we can to ensure that disabled people can take on work that will enrich their lives without being punished.

• (1820)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Madam Speaker, when Tim Hortons franchise owner Mark Wafer hired a young man with Down's syndrome named Clint, he probably did not realize that it would turn out to be one of the best business decisions of his life.

Clint did all the same tasks as his co-workers and made the same money with no government wage subsidy or workplace tokenism. He arrived early, left late, and refused to take breaks all day long. Mark has since hired over 200 employees with disabilities just like Clint, who together made his six Tim Hortons locations among the most profitable in the legendary chain.

There are a million Canadians with disabilities who work, including 328,000 with severe disabilities. However, many people with disabilities do not have jobs. What is stopping them?

In many cases, the government is. Programs like income assistance, housing, drug benefits, and others are clawed back when

Private Members' Business

people on disability get jobs. With these clawbacks plus taxes, often the harder people work, the poorer they become.

For example, a minimum wage-earning worker on disability in Saskatchewan who goes from part-time to full-time work actually sees his take-home pay drop. Stats Canada reports that 84,000 Canadians with disabilities who are able to work do not, because they fear they would lose income if they did.

Mark from Tim Hortons said one of his best workers had to quit because he would lose \$10,000 in medication assistance if he kept working, so Mark asked an official with the Ontario disability support plan what the best way to get off of disability was. She said, "Die."

Policies that cancel out people's wages signal that their work has no value. That is not true and it is not right, and we can fix it. The opportunity for workers with disabilities act would require government at all levels to allow people to earn more in wages than they lose in clawbacks and taxes.

The bill knocks down the welfare wall and makes work pay, because there is dignity in labour. Ask Walgreens vice-president, Randy Lewis, the father of an autistic son. He hired over 1,000 workers with disabilities at the company's ruthlessly competitive distribution centres. These workers profited the company, and the jobs freed people from poverty. To quote Lewis' book:

Also on the team was Derrill Perry, a forty-nine-year-old-year old man with a developmental disability, who had been employed in a workshop where he was paid less than a dollar an hour... On the day he earned his first Walgreens paycheck, he handed it to his mother, and she began to cry. He used part of that paycheck to treat his parents to a dinner out—first time to pay the bill at a restaurant.

Lewis met Derrill's parents at the company's open house. He writes:

When I reached out to shake Derrill's dad's hand, he pulled me in for a hug and whispered in my ear, "Thank you. My family is finally safe. Now I can die knowing they'll be all right."

Within a year, Derrill's father died. Derrill was the sole support for his mother—his salary more than either of his parents had ever earned.

By passing the opportunity for workers with disabilities act, we tell the Derrills, the Clints, the Marks, and the millions of others who work or want to work that we will never count them out again, that they matter, that they have worth, that there is treasure in each and every one of them. While for the longest time we understood that they needed us, we now know that we need them too.

• (1825)

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): 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.

Government Orders

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

Pursuant to order made Tuesday, May 29, the recorded division stands deferred until Wednesday, June 6, at the expiry of the time provided for oral questions.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1830)

[*Translation*]

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2018, NO. 1

The House resumed 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, and of the motion in Group No. 1.

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher (Beauport—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île d'Orléans—Charlevoix, CPC): Madam Speaker, as I was saying earlier, the thing that really disappoints me about Bill C-74 is that it leaves out the people from the rural regions, where I am from. In its 2015 election platform, the Liberal government said it wanted to do things differently and that it did not want to use omnibus bills. Bill C-74 is an omnibus bill. The election platform states, "We will not resort to legislative tricks to avoid scrutiny."

Since the Liberal government came to power, it has been promising heaven and earth to Canadians. However, we do not always get heaven and earth. I will explain. Every time the Liberals said that they were transparent, we realized that they were pulling a fast one on us. Without really knowing it, we all became millionaires yesterday with the purchase of Kinder Morgan's Trans Mountain pipeline.

I am very disappointed that, after conducting so many consultations across the country, the Liberals did not listen to ordinary Canadians who live in remote areas. This budget contains nothing for them. It is too bad, because we have to remember that it is people in rural areas who feed our cities, and not the other way around. It is people who live in those small communities who could really use a bit of help.

As for employment insurance, the Liberals invested \$10 million to provide training to the unemployed, but only 26 people in my riding were eligible. Furthermore, the training offered is not appropriate for the rural community I represent. What we need in our rural communities is manual labour, like farmers and seasonal workers, in other words, people who have to deal with the EI spring gap. These people need training that reflects their reality, not the reality of a few

people who draft legislation and who have never set foot in our ridings.

Every region is different. In my riding alone, we have six different realities. There is an urban reality, a semi-urban reality, a rural reality, agriculture, tourism, and many other different things. This budget, however, does not correspond to the reality of ordinary Canadians. It is more suited to the reality of people who work in an office in the Liberal universe.

In closing, I am very disappointed and I will not be supporting this bill.

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for her excellent speech on the budget and other aspects of the government's fiscal plan. I would like to ask a question about the carbon tax. The government has a position on this, and it differs from ours. It is not unusual in a democracy to have different points of view, but the problem in this case is that the government does not want to provide the information. We have a carbon tax cover-up. The government does not want to disclose the information about the impact on families.

I would like to know what my colleague thinks of that.

• (1835)

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague. I am very pleased that he is shining a spotlight on the Liberal government's lack of transparency. Let us think back to the election platform. I am not the one who originally said that written words are more powerful than spoken words. It is in black and white that the Liberals said they wanted to do things differently and to be transparent. Being transparent when we want to do things differently means opening the books. They state clearly in their election platform. However, every time we receive a file, it is redacted. We cannot get the whole truth.

We learned today that the government redacted or kept secret correspondence concerning all the questions we asked about the Aga Khan's travel. More than 80% of the hundreds of pages of correspondence exchanged by representatives of the Aga Kahn during the three months preceding the meetings between the Prime Minister and the super-rich leader were redacted. That is the case for many files. We highlighted certain files.

They say they want to do things differently, but I would just like to point one thing out. I think they are obsessed with Mr. Harper, which is a compliment to him. Unlike them, however, Mr. Harper said what he was going to do and did what he said he would, even if people did not like it. The Liberals said they would do things differently, but they are actually doing things worse than us. That is a shame, because that is the line they fed people. They told people to vote for them, but now we know it was all a charade.

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet (Hochelaga, NDP): Madam Speaker, during question period today, my colleague from Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot asked a question about the spring gap. The story she told us was so sad. In the Maritimes, people are going to church to pray for a miracle because they have no more money to feed their families. There is nothing about employment insurance in this budget, nor is there anything about it in Bill C-74.

Government Orders

Does my colleague think that, instead of waiting and cutting taxes for the rich, the federal government should have done something about the employment insurance spring gap?

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for the question. In the past we were accused of not working for workers. In my riding I recently held a town hall on the spring gap and employment insurance. Indeed, we have hit a wall. It is becoming increasingly urgent to tackle this wall. We have to reform the system or see the situation in a different way. It is not just in New Brunswick that people go through the spring gap or end up going to the churches. It is in small communities like mine that people survive on seasonal employment. We have to look at this closely and work together to find a tangible way to counter the effect of the spring gap. That is extremely important. In my riding alone, there is a suicide prevention centre. The centre is getting a growing number of calls from people who are financially strapped. The employment rate varies from region to region. In the Quebec City region, the unemployment rate is 5%, which is very low, but people there get only 14 weeks of employment insurance. The rest of the time they end up in the spring gap, and that is a problem for many people and families in my riding.

[*English*]

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am happy to speak today to Bill C-74. Once again, as with many speeches I have given in this place, I rise with a bit of a sense of irony.

Budget implementation bills are often complex because they implement the budget and execute measures in a number of areas of law and regulatory action, so they tend to number in the hundreds of pages. My friends in the Liberal Party used to decry the use of omnibus legislation, but here we are with Bill C-74, once again an omnibus bill subject to time allocation. These are "assaults on democracy" in the words of my Liberal friends when they were in opposition, and now they are statecraft for getting things done in the chamber. They are becoming very adept at it, setting records in the use of time allocation per day.

Nonetheless, at this report stage debate I am going to reiterate some of the concerns I have with the budget. They are fundamental economic concerns that all Canadians should share.

I am going to highlight one quote from the Minister of Finance, taken from near the end of his budget speech, which we all listened to here. In many ways it typifies the problems with the Liberal Party and its approach to governing and its reckless abuse of the public purse. Near the end of his speech the finance minister said, "With this budget, we are doubling down on our plan to invest in the middle class and in people working hard to join it."

Most Canadians, even those who do not follow politics that much, have heard that trope many times, that platitude that "we're here for the middle class and those working hard to join it". Today in debate the Minister of Environment almost accidentally kept spouting that phrase. It is something rote in their learning.

The Fraser Institute has confirmed that most Canadians have seen less under the Liberal government. They have seen tax increases despite some of the changes made to the child care benefit. If we look at the total tax burden on Canadians, the elimination of tax

credits for young people in sports and music, the elimination of the transit tax credit, higher income taxes, changes to the tax treatment of dividends, the carbon tax, EI and payroll taxes, we see that the Liberals have raised taxes dozens of times indirectly or directly. We even joke that they tax our Saturday night, because there is now an automatic tax on wine, spirits, and beer, and they are taxing Uber rides home. The Liberals are running out of things to tax. That is why most Canadians are actually not better off under the Liberals. They are far worse off.

What is troubling about the minister's quote is his use of the word "invest". That is his euphemism for spending. The word "invest" appeared 456 times in the minister's budget speech and document. Why should that concern Canadians? It should because it means there are 456 areas within the scope of government where the Liberals are increasing spending.

The rate of increased government spending is absolutely reckless, a 20% increase in spending in just over two years, accounting for \$58 billion in new money. As the Auditor General has shown through his reports and from reports by Finance Canada, very little of that actually went to infrastructure. Are Canadians 20% better off?

When the government is running huge deficits in the midst of a recession, do we see logic to any of this increased spending? That number does not even reflect this week. This week we bought a pipeline. That is another \$4.5 billion.

We are approaching a level where the Liberal government, which is just past half of its mandate, has put a more than 20% increase in spending by the public purse.

In my last speech I turned around the minister's phrase, "We're going to double down on investing." Double down on spending is what he was saying. I joked about the Liberal double-double. Most Canadians love their double-double, cream and sugar, but the Liberal double-double is doubling the tax burden and doubling deficits.

• (1840)

We remember the Prime Minister assuring Canadians that he was going to run a deficit as prime minister, but never more than \$10 billion. It was a Liberal double-double: two years of \$20-billion deficits while raising taxes. Therefore, Liberals are bringing in more revenue by taking more from Canadians, small businesses, entrepreneurs, households, and seniors, and yet they are even outstripping what they are bringing in. It is truly astounding.

Now we can factor in their decisions with respect to the resource economy and being forced to buy an asset because they cannot find private sector buyers. Confidence in the Canadian economy and the ability to get projects done here is shrinking, so the government now feels that it should replace the private sector. That has put another \$4.5-billion burden on taxpayers.

Government Orders

What was not in the budget, despite all the purported investments—remember I said that he used the term “invest” more than 400 times—was investment, or spending, or provision made for NAFTA or U.S. trade changes. There was zero money allocated for that. Most Canadians, when they look at budgets, forecasting, or spending, have a rainy-day fund in case something goes bad or there is an unexpected problem. The government knew there were risks related to NAFTA, it knew there were risks related to steel and aluminum tariffs, and yet it allocated zero for that risk.

We have already seen the impact of the Prime Minister's inability to get a deal on softwood and the tariffs applied there now. Tonight, in a few hours, we are going to see tariffs applied on steel and aluminum. It does not have to be that way. NAFTA and provision for the NAFTA negotiations were mentioned on a couple of pages in the budget document, but there is no actual plan for a contingency. For a government that spends the money of Canadians so cavalierly, to have allocated zero to risks associated with trade is troubling. We are seeing that play out today.

The Conservatives have tried to work very closely with the government on NAFTA. In 10 months or so, I have asked maybe six or seven questions on the most fundamental economic agreement for Canada. In fact, I have praised the minister, particularly his efforts in January with respect to auto parts, but the Team Canada approach means that the Liberals have to listen to the team that actually negotiated the NAFTA trade agreement and was able to secure deals that respected supply managed farms and small businesses that kept us competitive. The very team that wants to help is being ignored, particularly when it comes to linking trade and security, which both Democrats and Republicans want to do. In this budget, there is zero provided for a response to the tariffs that will be setting in on our steel and aluminum industries. It was terrible that the Prime Minister went to these communities and insinuated that he had dealt with it. He went on a victory tour, and here we are with no deal.

I also raise the fact that Liberals are rushing through this budget implementation bill when the very things they are doing in it are not complete yet. Of course, the bill is full of tax increases, and one of the special ones the Prime Minister is looking at is in part 3 of this bill, the excise tax provisions for cannabis. That really seems to be the only legislative agenda the Liberals want to keep on track: the legalization of marijuana. In this bill, they are already planning the excise tax regime. The only problem is that marijuana is not yet legal. In fact, the Senate has been proposing changes with respect to home-grown cannabis. In this omnibus bill that the Liberals are rushing through with time allocation, there are provisions on other related legislation that has not even passed yet.

Why the rush, particularly when the Senate is dealing with it and we have heard concerns from chiefs of police and pediatricians with the Canadian Medical Association? With the current government, it is a matter of damn the torpedoes: use time allocation and omnibus bills to get it done. The key thing is that when they say they are going to invest, Canadians had better get a hold of their wallets.

•(1845)

Mr. Scott Simms (Coast of Bays—Central—Notre Dame, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the member talked about the spending issue. I recall back in 2008 when spending by the federal government at the time was rising at an exponential rate. Conservatives will use the

excuse that they were spending because the recession was settling in, but the spending took place before signs of the recession started settling in.

The member talked about the \$4.5 billion for the Trans Mountain pipeline as a government investment in people. A few decades ago, the Government of Canada decided to invest to save the Hibernia project off the coast of Newfoundland and Labrador. It turns out that it saved the whole project, which has returned dividends since then, as it is now turning a healthy profit. That was done by a Conservative government. I wonder if he thinks that was a bad investment.

•(1850)

Hon. Erin O'Toole: Madam Speaker, my friend is one of my favourite Newfoundland and Labrador MPs. He speaks up for the things he believes in, and I respect that.

He seems to suggest that the recession was a big surprise in 2008-09 as there was a global banking failure and the entire global community was working on a response. The key distinction is when a deficit was run in the midst of the biggest global meltdown since the 1930s, Prime Minister Harper had a plan to get out of deficit. The current Prime Minister is running a deficit that is double what he promised Canadians. Now his own department has said that it will not be balanced by 2019; it will be more like 2030. Therefore, there is no plan.

The difference between the \$4.5 billion spent this week to buy a 60-year-old pipeline is that the Prime Minister created this issue. I think my friend from Newfoundland will appreciate this joke when I use it. The Prime Minister killed northern gateway arbitrarily, passed laws that killed energy east, and Trans Mountain is on the brink. The Prime Minister is a serial pipeline killer, and someone needs to stop him.

The difference with Hibernia is that there was not a private sector player at the time when there was distress to a large investment that would help a region. They are very different circumstances. The Prime Minister is now spending our money to get out of a problem he created.

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Madam Speaker, I listened closely to the member's speech, in particular, the portions on trade. Given the realities of today and where we find ourselves, I am wondering why more provisions were not in place in the budget to assure that Canada would be in a strong position. Given the tariffs we were facing, and now the new auto tariffs that are coming forward at us, and certainly the lack of a softwood lumber agreement, there are a lot of Liberal failures on the trade file.

Government Orders

Today I hope the Conservatives and my colleague will agree with the NDP that we need this permanent exemption. It is critical to this sector to ensure its viability, and also the protection of jobs in our country.

I am wondering if he could speak a little further to the reflection that there were no plans B, C, D, E or F, which is quite necessary, given our current relationship with the U.S., and that is not reflected because there is absolutely no money in the budget to ensure those industries are protected.

Hon. Erin O'Toole: Madam Speaker, I appreciate the intervention from the NDP's trade critic. I have enjoyed appearing on the odd panel with her over time as we both try and speak on the issue. She knows that both parties have tried to work as team Canada, where the time permits and where we can. It is troubling. She is right. There was no plan B contained in the budget. For a budget that mentions investing and spending 456 times, there was zero allocated for risks associated to steel, aluminum, or NAFTA in general. That was not a prudent plan when we knew there were risks associated with large swaths of the economy.

As the member will know, the other parties have been trying to also supplement the government's efforts. In February, I was with the member for Prince Albert down in Washington talking about trade, security, and North American defence. All of these things are linked in the United States. Therefore, I hope we can use this setback today as a time to really leverage the strength of the team, leverage the ability to talk about that security partnership with people who have been a part of it, and to talk about the NAFTA trade agreement with the party that created it.

Mr. Bob Saroya (Markham—Unionville, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is an honour to stand in the House today and debate Bill C-74, the budget implementation act. We see yet again that the government really cannot help itself.

I am concerned, like many other Canadians, about the direction the government is taking our country. Another year goes by of mismanagement of taxpayer money. The Liberals' fiscal policy is complete disregard for the businesses and hard-working families across the country. This budget represents big government and little incentive for businessmen and women to set up a shop or continue operating in Canada. I cannot believe how the Liberals expect our economy to grow when they are creating less competition and scaring businesses out of our country.

I would like to focus on a few key points.

The first is that the economy is slowing down. This is a result of the cost of doing business in the country continuing to rise. There is no plan for Canada to become competitive again. Never has the government spent so much and achieved so little.

Second, the government does not, by any stretch of the imagination, have a revenue problem; it has a spending problem. The Liberals just cannot seem to put the taxpayer credit card away, and it is getting out of control.

Third, there is no focus on the debt. The government continues to run a massive deficit and we are stuck in the same cycle of growing debt and deficit. Canadians know this is irresponsible.

The government is failing Canadians. Let us look at the facts.

Canada started the new fiscal year on April 1 with a trillion dollars of market debt. This is the total debt upon which the Government of Canada pays interest. The net debt is \$669 billion. This debt continues to grow by the hour, leaving future generations to foot the bill. Canada is hurting right now. Each Canadian's share in the national debt is over \$17,000 and growing by the minute. This is not sustainable. We need to get Canada back on track. The Liberals have broken their deficit promise. The Prime Minister now claims the debt will keep growing but more slowly than the economy. The Prime Minister says the debt-to-GDP ratio will fall, but the record shows otherwise. In his first three years in power, the Prime Minister will add \$60 billion to the national debt.

We cannot believe the government. To meet its new fiscal promise, the 2018 budget claimed that direct program spending would only grow by 1.6% per year for the next five years, when the record so far has been showing 5.6% per year, which is three times higher than the Prime Minister now promises. It seems like every week the Liberals have new spending ideas. I cannot stress this enough. This cycle is not sustainable.

On top of that, the government's current fiscal promise requires that there be no additional spending in next year's pre-election budget. However, dollar signs are already dancing in the Liberals' heads. They have set up a panel to design a new national pharmacare program, which the PBO costed out at \$19 billion per year, enough to double the deficit.

The same taxpayers, who will pay these costs on their regular taxes, have their own bills to pay, their own financial needs and stresses. In 2017, Canadian households had a record \$1.74 of debt for every dollar of disposable income.

• (1855)

As interest rates rise over the next three years, debt payments will consume a larger share of household income. This will be a higher rate than at any time in the last three decades, costing a family with a net income \$100,000 about \$2,000 more than they were paying last year.

The PBO report on the subject last year said, "we are projecting that the household sector will become increasingly vulnerable to negative shocks." The government is deepening the problem. As households are shocked with higher interest on their credits cards and mortgages, their taxes will need to rise to pay a one-third or \$8 billion increase in federal government debt interest. Canadians need a government that can provide them with tax cuts, not hikes, that feed their out-of-control spending.

Government Orders

Canadians know how to spend their own hard-earned money better than the Liberal government does. Last year, Canada's net debt reached an all-time high of \$670 billion or \$47,612 per Canadian family. Where will the Liberals draw the line?

We have seen increases in taxes on businesses, the ending of income sprinkling, the ending of incoming splitting, and young professionals leaving our country to operate their businesses anywhere else but in Canada. The natural resources industry is facing major regulations and discouragement. Businesses are really feeling the pinch, and that is just the tip of the iceberg.

The higher taxes that hit the middle class since the Liberals came to power affect 81% of middle-income Canadians. The average income tax increase for middle-income families is \$840 since the liberal government came into power.

We have seen higher Canada pension plan premiums, up to \$2,200 per household, as well as a national carbon price, up to \$2,500 per household. The Liberal government cancelled the family tax cut, up to \$2,000 per household. On top of that, it cancelled the arts and fitness tax credit, up to \$225 per child. It also cancelled the education and textbook tax credit, which was up to \$560 per student. It has also created higher employment Insurance premiums, up to \$85 per worker.

According to the Statistics Canada, the government's spending has been increasing at an annual rate of about 6.5% to 7% per year. This is three times the combined rate of inflation and population growth. This has to stop. The Canadian government is supported by taxpayers. The Liberals need to respect the taxpayers and think about putting the credit card away.

The long and the short of the issue is simple. The government has failed on the economy and the massive debt with nothing to show for it. We continue to see plummeting investment, with businesses and jobs leaving Canada. There is a continuation of higher taxes and rising cost of living for Canadian middle class. Canadians are uncertain about what these changes mean for them. Businesses are struggling to compete. The United States wants to take our jobs and the Prime Minister is allowing it.

The government needs to get its spending under control and do what is right for the taxpayers who foot the bill.

• (1900)

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Madam Speaker, I want to bring up an issue, although the member did not bring up in his speech, that I think is of concern to a lot of us in the House, and that is the lack of any investment to protect good media jobs and local news in our communities. I represent five small municipalities that all have small papers. They work very hard to keep those papers going.

We are seeing a crisis in the media sector across the country where jobs are being threatened. However, there really does not seem to be any relief on the horizon from the Liberal government. That is certainly reflected in the budget bill. There is absolutely nothing in it to represent the imminent danger these workers are facing across our country.

Jerry Dias, the national president of Unifor, said "I'm disappointed that this budget provides no aid for local news, which is in imminent danger." He also said, "Canadian newsrooms have shrunk by at least 30% in the last four years, with more newspaper closures and journalist layoffs expected to come, so solutions are needed now."

I wonder if the member agrees with me that local media is critical for all our constituents, certainly for the communities we represent, and that there should be a reflection of that in the budget.

• (1905)

Mr. Bob Saroya: Madam Speaker, this is just the beginning of the job-cutting situation. The government just keeps spending.

Government spending is out of control. Taxes are going higher. Middle-class families are hurting. On top of that, what is going on south of the country, with 25% tax on steel and 10% tax on other products, is going to affect them even more.

We have been talking, back and forth, about the government needing to do something. The last six months or a year, we knew where it was going with NAFTA. The government showed no interest in it. In the last budget, there was nothing to protect jobs, and there was nothing for tax relief for middle-class families.

I absolutely agree with the hon. member that the government shows no incentive to work on this issue.

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for the work he does in his riding and here in this place. We certainly appreciate his very significant contribution as a member of Parliament.

I want to ask for his perspective on this whole issue of the government buying out pipelines. We have seen the failure of pipeline projects under the current government. There were a number of projects pursued and proposed by the private sector. First, we had the failure of the northern gateway project, which was the intention of the government. It is legislating to prevent that pipeline from going forward in the future, unless someone repeals that legislation, which of course we will do. Then it piled on all sorts of additional conditions to prevent energy east from going forward. Now it is using taxpayers' money to buy another pipeline.

Does the member think there is any logic or consistency to, on the one hand, trying to kill pipelines and, on the other hand, trying to exclude the private sector while effectively putting taxpayers on the hook for something the private sector, under any other conditions, would have been prepared to invest in?

Mr. Bob Saroya: Madam Speaker, absolutely, energy east and northern gateway were the two pipelines that were killed by the Prime Minister.

We did not have to put any money toward the Kinder Morgan pipeline. The government effort was spent to negotiate for a 65-year-old pipeline, and we will need to put another \$10 billion or \$11 billion or \$15 billion on top of that. Will we get a return on this pipeline? Absolutely not. This is simply an abuse of taxpayers' money.

Government Orders

Mr. Kevin Waugh (Saskatoon—Grasswood, CPC): Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak to Bill C-74, the budget implementation bill. It is a hulking 556-page piece of legislation that promises nothing at all to Canadians except higher taxes and lower economic opportunities for hard-working Canadians across this great country.

There are many significant flaws in this bill, which are far from the sunny ways promised to Canadians during the last election, in 2015. From a carbon tax to great debt and broken promises, this bill inflicts severe costs upon Canadians without giving them anywhere near the equivalent benefits in return. Day in and day out, Canadians work hard for the money they earn, and they expect the government to support them, rather than work against them, when they pay for things like groceries, electricity, and even heating for their homes.

The Liberals are planning to implement a carbon tax, which will raise the cost of all these essential amenities and, in doing so, make life more expensive and thus more unaffordable for Canadians across the country. Rather than supporting the middle class, as they claim, the Liberals are putting the government before people.

How much more will Canadian families pay in taxes each year as a result of this carbon tax? Like all Canadians, we would like to know, but the government does not want to share what the cost is, because it wants to hide it from Canadians. It is hiding this information, and it is demonstrating that it does not trust Canadians to have a say in what they do with their own money. This is simply not fair to Canadian taxpayers.

The Liberals have shown, through their broken promises and complete lack of interest in reducing the federal deficit, that they never cared much about the taxpayer anyway. While Canadians expect members of Parliament to debate bills on their behalf, members are negatively impacted in their ability to do so when the Liberals simply cover up critical information that is relevant in our conversation here tonight.

There is no question that the carbon tax would hit Canadians hard. The Parliamentary Budget Officer reports that the carbon tax would cause \$10 billion to vanish from the Canadian economy by 2022. That means fewer jobs and fewer economic opportunities for people here at home. We are already seeing that. Unfortunately, we do not know how much this carbon tax will cost everyday Canadian families. The Liberals have this information, but they have decided that they know best and will not release it.

These actions severely harm the quality of debate in this chamber on behalf of all Canadians, and therefore one of the key mechanisms by which the government is held to account. These actions do nothing to improve transparency, which, by the way, is what the Liberals ran on during the election cycle in 2015.

The Liberal government has repeatedly demonstrated that when it comes to strategies to combat climate change, the only plan it will accept is a carbon tax. It is a narrow view. No alternatives exist, other than those that punish taxpayers and raise costs for people across this fine country.

Of course, the government cannot even tell us what benefits this carbon tax will bring Canadians. The Ecofiscal Commission estimates that carbon taxes will need to be as high as \$200 a tonne or more in order to reach the Liberal government's goal of reducing

carbon emissions to 30% of 2005 levels by 2030. As the policy currently stands, the carbon tax will not come anywhere close to reaching that goal. What the carbon tax will do, though, is increase the financial burden on Canadian families from coast to coast. They will have to bear the brunt of this tax through high consumer costs; reduced competitiveness, which we saw today in the aluminum and steel industry; and falling foreign direct investment in Canada's economy. We do not have to talk about that, when the government just recently bought an existing pipeline for \$4.5 billion.

• (1910)

These are families whom the Liberal government promised the world to. These are the same families who were told by the Liberal government that their taxes would be lower and that the federal deficit would be erased by 2019. That is only next year. Instead of receiving the results they were promised, these families got something else. They got large government deficits, in fact vague government deficits. We do not even know when the budget will ever be balanced again. They got extra federal debt, a Liberal government with no plans to balance the books at any time in the foreseeable future, and now a carbon tax that would raise their daily living costs and do little to reduce carbon emissions.

Let us look at my province, Saskatchewan. The provincial environment minister estimates that the implementation of the Liberal carbon tax would cost the Saskatchewan economy \$4 billion over just five years. No wonder the Government of Saskatchewan is determined to challenge this carbon tax all the way to the Supreme Court. I am proud to stand here and represent the people of Saskatchewan, and in particular Saskatoon—Grasswood, because right now we are the only jurisdiction, provincial or territorial, that has not signed on to this massive Liberal carbon tax.

Communities in Saskatchewan recognize that the carbon tax is nothing but high costs for little or no benefit. There is no Houdini in the province of Saskatchewan. We know the Liberal government is up to no good. It just cannot fool prairie people, and tonight I am proud to say that Saskatchewan is the only jurisdiction in this country that has not signed and will not sign on to the Liberal carbon tax. It is a debt now. We have talked about this debt being passed on to future generations of Canadians, who have no say whatsoever but nonetheless will be born into a situation where they inherit the costs incurred by the Liberals.

During the election of 2015, I was fortunate that my daughter gave birth to my first granddaughter. I was very happy. However, today, when I look at the debt of the current government, which has no plans at all of balancing the budget, I really feel for Avery Thornhill, my two-and-a-half-year-old granddaughter. She will be paying for this for the rest of her life. She is only two and a half years old, and we hope that she lives many years, into her eighties or nineties.

Government Orders

Liberals have reckless spending, and they continue to have reckless spending with the carbon tax. Avery Thornhill will never get a chance to have the budget everyone wants, which is an equal budget. Assuming that no external events occur, such as another recession, Canadians will be living with federal deficits at least until 2051. Is that fair to all our grandchildren, when we tell them in 2018 that we have no hope at all of balancing the budget? Maybe it will be balanced by 2051, but as the current government continues to spend recklessly, it could be 2060 or 2070. What a burden we are putting, not only on our own children but on our grandchildren. We are very disappointed.

Canadians deserve many things from the Liberal government. They deserve respect, transparency, fairness, and prosperity, which we all know we have not seen and will not see in the future from the Liberal government.

• (1915)

Mr. Greg Fergus (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to congratulate the hon. member on his first grandchild. My daughter is expecting a child in two months, which will be the first grandchild on my side.

I am so proud and happy about the Canada that my granddaughter or grandson is going to inherit. They will inherit a Canada that is competitive. Why is it competitive? It is because we are finally making sure that the environment and the economy go hand in hand, and are finally going to put a price on pollution, to make sure that there can be a greener Canada, a better Canada. We also know that we are making Canada a more innovative place, because of the policies of the government.

I am so delighted that the next generations of Canadians will come into a more competitive, greener, more secure, more prosperous, and inclusive Canada. It is going to be great news for all grandchildren and future generations of this country.

• (1920)

Mr. Kevin Waugh: Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate our colleague. Two and a half or three months from now he will have the same joy that I had in 2015.

I will say this, why does the Liberal government not show us the numbers? Show us the numbers, instead of blacking out what the carbon tax will cost Canadians. That is all we have asked for here for the last two or three months. Show us the numbers. If the government wants Saskatchewan to come on board and join the other provinces and the territories that have been hooped into this agreement on carbon tax, why would the government not show Canadians, and people in Saskatchewan in particular, what the carbon tax will cost? That is all we are asking for. Show me the cost of this.

I know that the debt is not going to level out until at least 2051. By not showing us the carbon tax costs, it may be decades or even a century later by the time we have a level budget.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet (Hochelaga, NDP): Madam Speaker, speaking of children and grandchildren, I wonder whether my colleagues, especially the one who gave the speech, realize that 1.15 million children in Canada live in food insecurity.

In the meantime, the Liberal government is spending \$4.4 billion of our tax dollars to buy a pipeline that will end up costing even more. There are also the deductions for stock options that cost the federal government roughly \$800 million a year.

I have a question for my colleague. Does he agree that the federal government should have kept its promise to limit the stock option deductions, which are costing us so much?

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Waugh: Madam Speaker, first of all, Kinder Morgan did not ask for the government to buy them out.

Back in 2016, the government should have started the process of getting this pipeline built, moving it out to British Columbia, so that Saskatchewan and Alberta could share the wealth with the other provinces and territories in this country.

The Kinder Morgan sale of \$4.5 billion is just a start. We are only buying the existing pipeline, plus some permits. The costs of this are going to escalate, without question. Will they double to \$9 billion? I have heard those numbers.

This is another form of taxing Canadians. Will the government even attempt to get this pipeline built to tidewater? That is the other question.

Mr. Randy Boissonnault (Edmonton Centre, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have a quick question for the member.

For young Avery, how do we get the message out to her that we have the lowest debt-to-GDP ratio since 1977, the best economic outlook, including 600,000 jobs that have been created, and are leading growth in the G7, yet the former government added \$160 billion in debt with nothing to show for it, not even a pipeline to tidewater.

Mr. Kevin Waugh: Madam Speaker, that member from Alberta should also know about the billions of dollars that have left that province in the last year alone. It is probably close to \$80 billion.

As companies leave every single day, heading south, I wonder if the member could go to his constituents to ask them how they feel about the investment that has gone from Canada to other parts of this world.

Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC): Madam Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise on behalf of the people of Barrie—Innisfil at report stage of Bill C-74.

As I rise in the House, it is not lost on me that I am in the people's House, the people who elected all 338 of us to come here.

Imagine if the Liberals ran their household the way they are running the government, with debt and deficits piling up. I will go through some statistics later on to show just how dire the situation is for the future of the economy and the future of our children, who will have to pay for Liberal debt and deficits. Today's debt and deficits are certainly tomorrow's tax increases and service cuts.

Government Orders

As somebody who has lived through that in Ontario, fortunately we have an election coming up and I believe strongly that we are going to see a change in government. I am actually fearful for whoever forms the Government of Ontario, whether the Conservatives or the NDP, because often when governments are elected, they go in and say that the cupboards are bare. However, I believe there are no cupboards left in Ontario, to be quite frank.

Certainly, the federal government is utilizing the same strategy and playbook, which I have spoken about many times in the House, as the current Liberal government in Ontario. I believe that our cupboards will soon be bare at the federal level. I have said many times before that the current government has access to a bigger piggy bank of Canadians, but it is on the same path as that Ontario Liberal government.

Of course, we found out yesterday that we will be \$4.5 billion further in the hole because, all of a sudden, the Prime Minister who painted himself into a corner with the Trans Mountain pipeline and is spending \$4.5 billion of Canadian tax dollars to buy his way out of a political problem he created.

As we debate the budget and look into it, there are signs that Canada's economy is slowing down, and the government has and is doing little to improve it. There was a growth in the economy in 2017, but it was not really due to Liberal policy. It was in spite of Liberal policy.

I learned long ago that government does not create jobs. Government creates the environment for jobs and job growth. When we look at what is happening, particularly down in the United States with its regulatory process and a tax regime that are completely contrary to where we are here in Canada, there are some significant fears for our future prospects from an economic standpoint.

The growth that we have seen has largely been due to the oil and gas sector, as well as a very strong housing market right across the country. That housing market had record-high price increases in 2016, followed by another 9% in 2017. Oil and gas for that matter soared 40% in 2017 because of higher prices in the oil sands. Therefore, our exports grew. However, the Liberals did not create this economic growth. It was caused in large part by our natural resource sector, the same natural resource sector that the Prime Minister and operatives within his office have so much disdain for, and certainly the housing market contributed to it as well. Unfortunately, the government has neglected what lies beneath our feet and has opted to rely only upon what is between the Prime Minister's ears.

The Prime Minister promised that GDP in 2016-17 would increase by 0.5% and in 2017-18 by 1%. The government believes its reckless, out-of-control spending has actually helped the GDP figures. In fact, we just heard the on the other side from Edmonton stand up and espouse the greatness of the GDP. However, in reality, the Parliamentary Budget Officer has estimated that for all of the spending in the last few years, GDP has only increased by 0.1% in those two years, which is next to nothing. All that money has been spent for what?

The Liberals, with their reckless spending, claim to help, but the government has spent \$60 billion in the past three years. Spending

has increased by 20%. Taxes have increased for over 80% of Canadians, and the GDP has actually only gone up by 0.1%. Let that sink in for a second.

• (1925)

Why is this such an issue? With an underperforming Canadian economy, budget 2018 needed to be better. It has negatively impacted Canadians. I believe there is a serious impact on young Canadians, especially young Canadians who are living with disabilities. Since the Liberals have come to power, 81% of middle-income families are seeing higher taxes. So much for helping the middle class and those working hard to join it.

The fact and the reality is that life is much harder under the government. I will stand here and look into that lens and ask people to think about this. In the past two and a half years, has their life become better? I think the overwhelming answer to that would be "no". I am certainly hearing it in my riding of Barrie—Innisfil. The average family is paying \$840 more in taxes than they used to. The carbon tax is another way for the Liberals to make life harder for Canadians.

According to the Canadian Taxpayers Federation, the carbon tax is going to cost the average Canadian family approximately \$2,500 or more a year. We would love to find out what the government is charging on this carbon tax and what Canadian families are going to make, but that number that we have asked for has been redacted. The government knows how much it is going to cost the average Canadian family, but it refuses to give us the answer, yet here it is asking Canadians to buy into a carbon tax, but buy into what? That is legitimate question. More money will be needed for higher gas prices because everything cascades down in the economy to food and just about everything else, and that is unacceptable. Certainly life will become harder as the carbon tax kicks in.

What is that money used for? What can the average Canadian family use it for? It can be used for putting kids into hockey. It can make things more accessible for day programs, camps, etc., but unfortunately the Liberals just do not get it. Budget 2018 is hard evidence that the Liberal government does not understand that everyday people, the average Canadian family, is not rich enough to afford \$2,500 dollars a year in additional carbon taxes. That may be easy for the Prime Minister and the environment minister and the finance minister to afford, but the reality is that the average Canadian family cannot afford that.

Look at the debt. As I mentioned, the Prime Minister has added \$60 billion in debt in just three years. In total, each family in this country owes the government \$47,612. Budget 2018 has no plan to return to a balanced budget, yet the Prime Minister stood in the last election with his hand over his heart and said that the budget would be balanced by 2019. We know that is not the case because this year it is \$19 billion.

Government Orders

The Department of Finance has said and predicted that we will not return to a balanced budget until the year 2045. Think about that for our kids. My 14-year-old will be 41 years old by the time we return to a balanced budget in this country. He is the one who will be paying for the irresponsible spending of the government. During that time frame it is expected that \$450 billion will be added to the debt for a total of \$1.1 trillion. It is our youth who will pay this debt. Every time I have a school tour, and I have had many of them this week, they asked me about issues. I talk about that debt and deficit because, again, the deficits and debt of today are the tax increases and spending cuts of tomorrow.

Look at the tax credits that have been cut. Budget 2018 takes them right away from families and, I would argue, disproportionately from the people who can least afford it, namely, lower-income and vulnerable Canadians. The budget is a failure of epic proportions for the future of our kids, the future of this country, and there is no way I can support it.

● (1930)

The Speaker: It being 7:33 p.m., pursuant to order made earlier today, it is my duty to interrupt 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. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 2 to 46.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 2 to 46.

[*Translation*]

The question is on Motion No. 47. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 48 to 67.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 47 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 48 to 67.

● (1935)

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 68. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 70 to 72, 74 to 94, 96 and 98 to 119. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 68 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 70 to 72, 74 to 94, 96 and 98 to 119.

[*Translation*]

The question is on Motion No. 69. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 73, 95, and 97.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 69 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 73, 95, and 97.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 120. The vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 121 to 185. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 120 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 121 to 185.

[*Translation*]

The question is on Motion No. 186. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 187 to 198.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 186 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 187 to 198.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 199. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 200 and 201. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 199 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 200 and 201.

[*Translation*]

The question is on Motion No. 202. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 203 to 213.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 202 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 203 to 213.

● (1940)

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 214. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 215 to 219. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 214 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 215 to 219.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 220. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 221.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Government Orders

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 220 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motion No. 221. [English]

The next question is on Motion No. 222. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 222 stands deferred.

[Translation]

The next question is on Motion No. 223. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 224.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 223 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motion No. 224. [English]

The next question is on Motion No. 225. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 226 to 230. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 225 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 226 to 230.

[Translation]

The question is on Motion No. 231. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 232 to 244.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The recorded division on Motion No. 231 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 232 to 244.

[English]

The next question is on Motion No. 245. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 246. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 245 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motion No. 246.

Government Orders

[Translation]

The next question is on Motion No. 247. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 248 and 249.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The recorded division on Motion No. 247 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 248 and 249.

● (1945)

[English]

The next question is on Motion No. 250. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 251 to 256. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: A recorded division on Motion No. 250 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 251 to 256.

[Translation]

The next question is on Motion No. 257. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 258 to 264.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 257 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 258 to 264.

[English]

The next question is on Motion No. 265. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 266 and 267. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: A recorded division on Motion No. 265 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions No. 266 and 267.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 268. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 269 to 283.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 268 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 269 to 283.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 284. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 285 to 296. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 284 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions No. 285 to 296.

● (1950)

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 297. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 298 to 309.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 297 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 298 to 309.

[*English*]

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 310. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 316, 317, 324, and 329.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 310 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions No. 316, 317, 324, and 329.

[*Translation*]

The question is on Motion No. 311. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 312 to 315, 318 to 323, 325 to 328, and 330 to 358.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

Government Orders

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 311 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 312 to 315, 318 to 323, 325 to 328, and 330 to 358.

[*English*]

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 359.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division Motion No. 359 stands deferred.

[*Translation*]

The question is on Motion No. 360. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 360 stands deferred.

[*English*]

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 361. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 362 to 402.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 361 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 362 to 402.

● (1955)

[*Translation*]

The question is on Motion No. 403. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 404 to 409. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: The recorded division on Motion No. 403 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 404 to 409.

[*English*]

The Speaker: Normally at this time, the House would proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded divisions at the report stage of the bill. However, pursuant to an order made on Tuesday, May 29, 2018, the divisions stand deferred until Monday, June 4, 2018, at the expiry of the time provided for oral questions.

* * *

EXPORT AND IMPORT PERMITS ACT

The House resumed from May 28 consideration of 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), as reported (with amendment) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thoroughly enjoyed your reading of the amendments and I think you did a splendid job getting through them all. I hear a member opposite saying “on division”. These are two of my favourite words spoken in this Parliament. I will want to see those recorded votes when they happen.

Government Orders

I am rising today to speak to Bill C-47, which is a bill that would implement an international arms control treaty. In preparation for speaking on this bill, I went through past interventions given by other members in which they contributed their thoughts as to the impact that the bill will have on their constituents. I went through the intervention from the member for Portage—Lisgar on this particular bill, and that is where I would like to begin.

I am going to refer to the bill as the companion bill to Bill C-71, which is a piece of firearms legislation that the government has introduced as well. I do not think we can look at either of the bills separately. I look at the bills as logically following one from the other. They have the same idea behind them.

In the intervention, the member said:

At best, despite amendments, we are in a place where Canadians...cannot trust the government on firearms...Despite earlier attempts through Bill C-47, the government has failed to recognize the legitimacy of lawful firearms ownership and has moved to create all sorts of unnecessary problems and red tape for responsible firearms owners.

We see in the companion bill to Bill C-47, which is Bill C-71, that in fact the government is making lawful and legitimate firearms ownership more complicated, more complex, and more difficult for Canadians.

Firearms ownership allows Canadians to hunt and participate in sports like sharpshooting, and to prepare for biathlon. This is a part of our inheritance and heritage that Canadians enjoy. There are Canadians who have been doing these types of activities for generations in Canada. It is a great part of our Canadian history and it is part of our dual national history. Both French Canadians and English Canadians have been participating in these types of activities and have contributed to the growth of Canada's lands in a dominion that formed our great Confederation.

Another member said about Bill C-47:

Most critically, it effectively recreates the federal gun registry by requiring the tracking of all imported and exported firearms and requires that the information be available to the minister for six years. Given that those are calendar years, it could be up to seven years.

Firearms groups and individual owners have repeatedly expressed concerns about the implications of [those six years]. They want a strong system of arms control, but they point out that in fact we already have one.

We know that many of the provisions that are being proposed in this ATT are already being done. There is nothing really new here. We know there is already tracking and recording, and more of it is being done right now. The Canada Border Services Agency and Statistics Canada collect information on all items exported from Canada and classify these items using categories negotiated by the World Customs Organization. Therefore, we have to ask ourselves why we are implementing a treaty that will simply add onto red tape and the bureaucracy that we already have here in Ottawa.

The previous member I spoke of also went into some of the details. Both the ATT and its companion bill, Bill C-71, do not mention organized crime and will, in fact, do nothing to stop gangsters from obtaining firearms in Canada and using them in their illicit activities, because people who do not obey the law today and who participate in gangsterism and gang activities will not obey the law either way. They are earning their living through illicit activities like counterfeiting and human trafficking, so they will not be interested in caring about the contents of Bill C-47 and its

companion bill, Bill C-71. This is simply more bureaucracy and more red tape being imposed on law-abiding Canadians, who of course are going to try their best to obey the law.

● (2000)

An argument that could be made too on Bill C-47 is that it is actually going to impose restrictions on the Department of National Defence, which is traditionally exempted from the export control system so as to be able to provide military aid or government-to-government gifts, such as the loaning or gifting of equipment to another government or a potential ally that we are supporting.

In spending this past weekend at the spring session of the NATO organizations meetings in Poland, I was able to hear from other member states that are looking forward to receiving more support from the Canadian government, Ukraine and Georgia. Our allies in the Baltic states are all hoping to see Canada step up and provide more support. They are satisfied with what we have done up to now, but they want to see more of it, so how does it make it simpler for us to add the Department of National Defence to the list of those who have to comply with this export control treaty?

In fact, it will make it more complicated and more bureaucratic. There will be more red tape involved in trying to support our allies in NATO, and it does not help in any way. That is in article 5 of the ATT.

There are other countries we could be supporting as well. We may want to provide them with additional support. I remember that in the past two and a half years the Canadian government said it would support the Kurdistan Regional Government's fight versus ISIS. I am privileged to chair in this House the pro-Kurdish group, the Parliamentary Friends of the Kurds. I have spoken to many Kurdish leaders, both in Canada and outside of Canada, including Syrian leaders and others, who at one point were promised they would be able to obtain Canadian weapons to support the fight versus Daesh. Those weapons eventually never came.

Would it have made it simpler to impose more red tape, more arms controls on people we are supporting publicly and encouraging to take the fight directly to terrorist organizations like Daesh, which were trying to set up a proto-state? No, it would not. That is my concern with treaties such as this one, which I will be opposing and happily voting against.

Government Orders

There is a Yiddish proverb that goes, “Uphill we always climb with caution, downhill we dash, carefree.” I am afraid we are dashing carefree down this hill. There is the perception that more government, more red tape, and more bureaucracy makes us safer, makes our communities better, and achieves some type of vague public policy goal whereby more government equals greater safety for Canadians. Tell that to rural Canadians. Tell that to people who live just south of my riding, who are afraid enough at night that they turn off their porch lights so people do not know their homes are there. That way, they do not have to deal with Calgary gangsters coming out to rural communities to commit crimes, to invade their homes and steal their property because it is easier than doing it in the city because there are fewer police officers in our rural communities. It is just a fact of life that there are fewer people and fewer police officers. It is simple logic. It just happens that way.

I hear the member for Foothills saying it is in his riding, and there are many members with ridings next to each other. My kids actually go to school in his riding. This is something rural Canadians have to deal with. How would Bill C-47 help them? It would not. It would not make life any easier for them, and neither would the companion bill, Bill C-71.

Law-abiding Canadians are going to keep abiding by the law. They are going to obey the law. We can count on firearms owners to do just that every single time. Therefore, why are we dashing carefree down that hill, expecting that more government, more bureaucracy, more red tape at the bottom of the hill will somehow keep us safer? They can introduce all the rules they want in the world, and it still will not help.

The Speaker is giving me the sign that I have one minute left, and here I was going to read to the chamber the list of states that have neither signed nor acceded to the ATT and the states that have signed but not yet ratified the ATT. It would have been riveting reading for the members of this House to understand exactly the number of states that are not participating in this treaty. Many of those who will not be participating in this treaty are arms dealers and many of them share weapons among themselves. They are not regimes that can be expected to obey any type of international law in the near future. For the most part, these are regimes we do not count among our friends, either. The governments that will obey this agreement are law-abiding, lawful western governments, and this measure would be restricting their ability to support their allies overseas.

I will be happily voting against this bill—it is a bad bill—as well as the companion bill, Bill C-71, and I look forward to the debate in this House.

• (2005)

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to add to what my friend from Calgary Shepard said by pointing out that Conservatives at the committee at which the bill was considered, and I am a member of that committee, put forward an amendment to try to improve the bill, an amendment that would have protected law-abiding firearms owners. We did this working with stakeholders, in good faith, and frankly, the government had given us every reason to believe that it might be open to that. We know that there were concerns among some of the rural members, some of which leaked out of caucus discussions, who

are very worried about the way the government approaches firearms owners.

We put forward a reasonable amendment to try to help the government improve the bill. The member for Durham proposed an amendment that said:

The Brokering Control List may not include small arms that are rifles, carbines, revolvers or pistols intended for hunting or sport, for recreational use, or for a cultural or historical purpose.

That would have been a clear exclusion in the bill that would have allowed us to accede to the Arms Trade Treaty while still providing protection for firearms owners. The government, while professing to not want to go after law-abiding firearms owners through the bill, refused this amendment.

It was not, at the end of the day, about acceding to the treaty at all, because the Liberals had a choice. They could have supported a reasoned Conservative amendment to improve the legislation, yet they refused to accept that amendment. They came up with an alternative amendment that did not address the issue and that whitewashed the question.

I wonder if the member could elaborate on his comments in terms of how the government is using every opportunity, whether it is this bill or Bill C-71, to go after law-abiding firearms owners. When the Liberals could have accepted an amendment that would have addressed this issue, they refused that amendment.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Mr. Speaker, we on the Conservative side propose amendments at committee, because we are trying to climb uphill, back to my Yiddish proverb. We are cautiously hoping the government will consider reasonable, rational amendments that will improve government legislation. Often, the Liberals vote them down. As happened at finance committee, the government sometimes votes them down without saying a single word.

In this case, the member is right. Our side proposed a reasonable amendment that would have provided protection for firearms owners in Canada to continue hunting and sharpshooting. It was a reasonable protection afforded to them directly in the language of the bill, not in the preamble, that would have allowed them to continue the practices of our ancestors, a generation of Canadians who have lawfully hunted for their food for subsistence or who have hunted with their kids and family members as part of their family traditions. They have participated in sharpshooting clubs on weekends and enjoyed a sport that is widely practised in Canada.

I do not understand why Liberal caucus members could not support such a reasonable amendment. It might be because they knew that Bill C-71, the companion bill, was coming down, and therefore, they could not bring themselves to support such a reasonable action to protect firearms owners.

• (2010)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ramez Ayoub (Thérèse-De Blainville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, did I just hear the opposition member say that he was in contact with Syrians and people in the Middle East who asked for guns and Canada was providing them?

Government Orders

That is a rather troubling assertion.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Mr. Speaker, the member misunderstood.

I said that the Kurdistan government, in northern Iraq, had asked for help from the Government of Canada, which promised at the time to provide it. This assistance would have been used to fight Daesh. It was the Kurdistan government, in northern Iraq, that made this request. The Government of Canada tried to provide this assistance but, of course, it never did.

[*English*]

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, first, I want to take this opportunity to thank my colleague, the member for Calgary Shepard, who articulated so very well the issues we are facing, certainly not only in rural Alberta but in rural communities across the country.

I would like to start by telling a story about an incident that happened in my constituency not long ago. Friends of mine told me about burglars coming into their house. Their children were in the basement. It was the middle of the day. They came down the stairs to the basement, armed. Their very large 17-year-old son was able to walk up the stairs and scare these burglars off, but they were very concerned about what could have happened to their three kids who were home alone that day. Of course, the burglars did not leave empty-handed; they took four vehicles from the farm on their way out the gate.

This is what residents throughout rural Canada are facing right now: a steep increase in rural crime. The Liberal government had an opportunity over this past year to address this issue.

I was very proud to be a member of the rural crime task force, which was made up of several Conservative Alberta members of Parliament. We held town halls throughout the province over the last six or seven months. We put together a list of more than a dozen very strong recommendations that we will be presenting to the government later this spring.

Many of the messages we heard from constituents were clear, no matter which open house we attended throughout Alberta. People were asking for stiffer penalties. People were asking for action against gang violence. People were asking for action to be taken against the illegal gun trade. People were asking for programs to address mental health. So many of these crimes are just a revolving door. A criminal robs a farmyard, goes to jail, gets a minimal fine, and is back out there, sometimes in hours, sometimes within days, repeating the crime.

Not one single time did I hear from the hundreds of Albertans that what they were really looking for was not one but maybe two gun registries. They were certainly not looking for a reduction in sentences for serious crimes.

When we look at the action the Liberal government is taking, it is going in the exact opposite direction that every rural Canadian is asking for. Rural Canadians are asking for stiffer fines and penalties and jail time. Canadians are asking for resources for our police services. Canadians are asking for a focus and a priority on safe communities. They are not asking for the Liberal government to ram through three bills that go against every single message we are getting from rural Canadians.

Let us take a look at Bill C-75, reforms to the Criminal Code and the Youth Criminal Justice Act, which would take dozens of crimes that were federal crimes and reduce them to summary conviction offences that may receive sentences of two years less a day. These include possession of goods from crime, theft, terrorist acts, and kidnapping children under 14 years old. I do not know where the common sense comes from with such a bill.

Canadians are asking us for exactly the opposite. I have not heard from one single Canadian that we need to address rural crime by reducing sentences to solve the problem. The government is not just reducing it from 10 years but is reducing it so that they may get a fine and be back on the streets. That is exactly what we are trying to prevent. It does not make sense. It is certainly frustrating for Canadians in our rural communities to see that this is the direction the government is going.

One of the first jobs of any government, no matter what the level, is to protect its citizens. This does anything but. It sends a very poor message to Canadians across the country who are looking for their government to stand up and protect them. The Liberal government is doing the exact opposite. It is going out of its way to ensure that criminals are the ones who are the priority.

Let us take a look at Bill C-71, which is on the Firearms Act. It would do nothing to address gang violence. It would do nothing to address gun crime. It certainly would not do anything to address rural crime issues.

● (2015)

This is another attack on law-abiding firearms owners and establishes another back-door gun registry. I would argue that Bill C-47 is another back-door gun registry. When the Liberal government has multiple opportunities to address the real crime issue, and I am being specific about that, because that is something that hits very close to home in my constituency, the Liberals put up window dressing on taking a hard stance on violent crime and gun crime, but all they are doing is attacking law-abiding firearms owners, who are certainly not the problem.

I am going to tell another story of a man in my riding, Eddie Maurice, in Okotoks, who many members may have heard of, who is now charged with a crime. He was protecting his property and young daughter from burglars who were going through his yard, his acreage. I can guarantee that the burglars on his property had not gone to Canadian Tire to purchase their firearms and make sure they were registered.

These bills are attacking the wrong people, and that is what Conservatives are finding to be incredibly frustrating with these two bills that are being rammed through by the Liberal government.

What Canadians are looking for is a Liberal government that is going to support them. Bill C-47 would not reduce illegal weapons coming into Canada. It would not reduce rural crime, and as I said before, it would not reduce gun violence or gang violence.

Government Orders

I would like my Liberal colleagues, during the question and answer period, to explain to me how, with the suite of legislation they are trying to ram through by the end of this session, I can go home to my constituents and tell them with all sincerity that I feel we have taken steps to protect their homes, properties, and families. I do not believe these bills would do any of those things.

When Conservatives were in government, a similar bill was before us, but we did not follow through on signing the arms treaty, because we were concerned about the limitations and the impact it would have on law-abiding firearms owners.

I would also point out that the Liberal government had some difficulty meeting some of its promises in its first mandate, but the promise I heard, in the words of the parliamentary secretary, is that it would in no way put any government restrictions on law-abiding Canadian citizens. I would argue that these pieces of legislation would do just that. If the Liberal government were concerned about putting forward legislation that would not impact law-abiding citizens, the language in this bill should have provided a certain level of certainty and legal assurances for Canadians that this would exempt them from some of these registrations. However, it asks our law-abiding firearms owners to go through even more hoops rather than addressing what I think is the most serious issue, and that is crime, especially in rural communities.

In conclusion, I strongly believe that for any government, the safety of Canadians and our communities is paramount and should be among its top priorities. I would ask my Liberal colleagues on the other side in government to take a hard second look at what their priorities are. Instead of attacking law-abiding firearms owners, put your focus on ensuring that rural communities are safe. I will be voting against this piece of legislation, because it does not do that.

● (2020)

The Speaker: I would remind the hon. member for Foothills that when someone says “you” here, it generally means the person is talking to the Speaker, so I would ask him to direct his comments to the floor.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Hochelaga.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet (Hochelaga, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we were talking about exporting arms to other countries, so my questions will be related to that.

What is the use of legislation on arms export permits when more than half the arms sold by Canada are sold to the United States, a country that has not signed the Arms Trade Treaty and whose president has decided to relax the rules for arms exports? Does the member believe that this is in keeping with the letter and the spirit of the treaty?

[*English*]

Mr. John Barlow: Mr. Speaker, I think our main concern with this treaty is the additional bureaucracy and red tape that it would add to the system. One of the concerns that we have is the additional cost that it would put on our businesses.

There is also a safety concern, as my colleague was talking about, where we could have warehouses with a substantial backlog of

firearms, which are either going to be exported to other countries or be imported from other countries and moved across Canada. This is a huge safety concern, because we do not have the infrastructure in the country to be stamping all of these firearms. We do not have the equipment, or very few businesses have the equipment, to do that. This is something that has been overlooked in a lot of the discussion on this bill. The safety implications of having a large storehouse or backlog of many firearms sitting in warehouses is that the people who are going to be accessing firearms illegally would certainly have an opportunity to get their hands on a large cache of firearms. They will know that the firearms will be there waiting to be stamped before they can be exported.

Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I took, with reason, the member's comments about rural communities being attacked, and this is another attack on rural communities. The message we have seen from the Liberal government to rural communities concerns me. The first concern is that only \$2 billion of the \$180 billion in infrastructure funding is going to rural areas. Then we have this attack on guns. We have a carbon tax that people in rural communities are going to suffer disproportionately from, because they have to drive long distances. In addition to that, we have an all out war on agriculture, and no action to address the logjam of grain cars. It just seems like another attack in a long line of attacks.

I wonder if my colleague is hearing similar comments at the door in his riding.

Mr. John Barlow: Mr. Speaker, I would break that up into two parts.

First, absolutely, I am hearing that from rural Canadians, not only in my constituency but also across the country, from people who are questioning this attack on rural Canada. Certainly, for me in the west, we always kind of heard “east versus west”, but the comments I am hearing now are “urban versus rural”. Everything the Liberal government is doing now is focused on urban issues, with no priority and, I would go so far as to say, neglect of rural issues.

Second, in rural Canada, when we are talking about the crisis from the increase in rural crime, the Liberals are talking about imposing a firearms registry and attacking law-abiding firearms owners. I hope they would see their misplaced priorities in that sense.

● (2025)

Mr. Jim Eglinski (Yellowhead, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for being part of our rural task force dealing with rural crime. We have had many round tables, as the member mentioned.

While we were doing that, the Alberta government reacted. The NDP government reacted by putting more policemen on the road and putting more money towards combatting rural crime, yet, we have a Liberal government across the aisle that is doing just the opposite in reducing crime.

I wonder if he could speak briefly about where he sees the big difference between an NDP provincial government and the federal Liberal government.

Government Orders

Mr. John Barlow: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Yellowhead, who took very active leadership in the rural crime task force, and for his work as a police officer for many years.

It was good to see the provincial government in Alberta set up the rural crime task force as well. Four teams across Alberta are moving to address hot spots in Alberta, and we are seeing them have a very strong impact. I wish the federal government would also start looking outside the box to find new and innovative ways to address rural crime.

Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have to start by saying what a delight it is tonight to hear the Conservative members from Alberta giving accolades to Premier Notley for taking strong action to protect rural Albertans. It certainly is an important issue, but it is absolutely not what we are here to debate tonight. I am pleased to say that I will be the first speaker tonight who will actually speak to Bill C-47. My colleagues and I are opposed to this bill, but for completely different reasons.

Why is this bill important and why is it important that we get it right? Canada is now the second-largest arms dealer in the Middle East. In the past 25 years, Canada has sold \$5.8 billion in weapons to countries with deeply questionable human rights records. In 2014-15, only 10 export permits were denied out of over 7,000 applications. Reports over the past year have indicated that Canadian sales of military-related equipment have increased to countries with poor human rights records.

It is time for the federal government to step up. I am pleased to say that the response to my colleague, the member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie, has been the same as the response to me on this issue, in terms of the Liberals' attitude to the arms trade deal.

Over 30,000 people have signed an Avaaz petition since last Friday asking the Liberals to fix this bill. The petition reads:

As a concerned Canadian, I strongly urge you to pass an arms bill that will stop exports to any party involved in human rights violations, and to close the crazy loophole with US arms exports. It's unacceptable for Canadians to have zero visibility into where our weapons end up and we urge you to ensure that bill C-47 addresses that.

As I mentioned, in my almost 10 years in this place, the most responses I have ever received from my constituents have been those opposing the sale of the LAVs to Saudi Arabia. There we are: Canadians are not happy with the approach the government is taking.

Therefore, while we welcome the decision by the government to move forward and to become a state party to the Arms Trade Treaty, we are deeply troubled at the approach it is taking because, frankly, it is not living up to the treaty.

When the Liberal government announced that Canada would finally accede to the Arms Trade Treaty, my colleagues and I, particularly my colleague from Laurier—Sainte-Marie, were thrilled. Of course, my former colleague, Paul Dewar, was outspoken on this for all of the years he was in the House of Commons.

Sadly, instead, Bill C-47 is one more broken Liberal promise. They are not, in fact, taking the action necessary to actually implement in Canada, into Canadian law, the full Arms Trade Treaty. As many people have said, they make a mockery of the Arms Trade Treaty.

The first derogation from this treaty is a massive one, in that the bill does not cover any of our exports to the United States. We do not know the exact percentage, and I will tell my colleagues why in a minute, but well over 50% of our arms exports are to the United States. We do not know the actual percentage because those exports are not tracked, and not even reported. Thus, we have no idea how many of our arms are being sold to the United States. This is important because we exclude from this bill any arms that are manufactured by a Canadian manufacturer here in Canada, but sold by another nation. That is, in fact, what has been going on with Canadian manufacturers of arms for export. They simply sell them to an American entity or a similar entity they have incorporated in the United States, and those in turn sell them to foreign entities who are major human rights violators. This is all the more important now as President Trump is lowering the bar for export to countries that are serious human rights violators.

● (2030)

Members here will recall the proposed sale of helicopters to the Government of the Philippines. They will remember that the president of the Philippines had boasted about throwing a man from a helicopter and that he would do it again. However, there are reports the company in question now plans to send helicopter parts to the United States, assemble them there, and then send them to the Philippines. Clearly, that is a cannon hole we are shooting through this arms treaty. It violates the letter and spirit of the Arms Trade Treaty. The treaty calls for universal adherence. That means that Canada should have laws in place that prohibit any sale by Canadian corporations to nations that are major human rights violators.

The second derogation is that in some cases in Canada an export permit is not even needed. Agreements between the defence department or with the Canadian Commercial Corporation do not require a permit, and they are free to sell to whoever they want. Those are also exempted from this bill.

What does Bill C-47 do to solve the problem? It does next to nothing, because Canadian corporations that are major arms manufacturers and traders have already figured out how to get around this, and the Liberal government is enabling that with this bill before us right now.

There was the infamous case of the light armoured vehicles, LAVs, sold by a Canadian manufacturer to Saudi Arabia. Despite clear reports of human rights violations, the current government refused to even investigate the sale. First, it suggested that the deal had already been completed by the Conservatives. Then it denied that there was any real evidence of the nefarious use of the LAVs by Saudi Arabia. Then, when the reports became so clear that there were in fact human rights violations going on with those very LAVS, it investigated, but again denied there was proof of human rights violations enabled by the use of Canadian LAVs.

Government Orders

There is also the embarrassing case of a UN report of a Canadian company selling 170 armed vehicles to support the brutal civil war in South Sudan. I just sat through a briefing by Global Affairs officials advising us of all the aid that Canada is giving to a number of African nations, including South Sudan, because of this brutal war. Human rights observers, including UN experts, have documented how South Sudan's army has engaged in massacres, rapes, looting, arbitrary arrests, and a scorched-earth strategy against civilians since the war erupted. Tens of thousands have died in the violence since then, making it one of the world's bloodiest conflicts. A UN expert panel said in a report submitted to the Security Council that the armoured vehicles sold to South Sudan were manufactured by the Canadian-owned Streit Group at a factory in the United Arab Emirates. The company simply takes the parts, has them put together in another nation, and then sells them to these human rights violators. It is absolutely absurd for Canada to be saying that we should be imposing sanctions on South Sudan and pouring in dollars to deal with the human rights abuses when in fact we are putting in place a law that would enable Canadian manufacturers to sell the very arms that are causing the atrocities in South Sudan.

In closing, we have heard from tens of thousands of Canadians who are absolutely opposed to the direction the government is taking. It is an international embarrassment. If the government wants to be on the Security Council, it should take back its bill, revise it, and make it consistent with the Arms Trade Treaty.

● (2035)

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when this bill was studied at committee, we heard many different criticisms by different groups for different reasons. I think we can see a certain relationship between the criticisms, on the one hand, that this bill is targeting people it should not be targeting, namely law-abiding firearms owners, and on the other hand, its preservation of the fundamental structure of our existing system, one in which decisions about arms sales are ultimately discretionary.

When we had public servants before the committee, I asked specifically about a recent arms deal, the one with Azerbaijan, because I know it is of concern to many in the Canadian Armenian community because of the reality of an ongoing conflict between Azerbaijan and Armenia over the Artsakh region. There were border clashes recently, which most people agree were started on the Azeri side and that resulted in many people being killed. We posed those questions, and we were told at committee that this was a matter of commercial confidence, so we could not even get an explanation about that.

Although we might disagree on the particulars of some of these arms sales, surely we should be able to get answer to questions, especially when these questions are not about commercial particulars but about regional peace and stability in the region and how an arms sale might affect that? At the same time, does the member agree with us that this bill inappropriately targets responsible firearms owners in Canada by including things like small arms that could be used for sport and hunting.

Ms. Linda Duncan: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, I cannot agree. The whole point of the treaty is to prohibit the sale and export of weapons to nations that are major human rights violators. It is to

prohibit our nation, and all other nations that sign onto the treaty, from supporting atrocities. It does not matter if it is a rifle, a LAV tank, or a bomb, we should not be selling arms to nations where we know absolutely they will be used for war atrocities.

My colleague tried to table an amendment that would not allow for this exemption, where one could simply sell to a United States broker and in turn have it sold to a country that was committing atrocities.

Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I was at committee today when the member asked the Department of Foreign Trade and Development about South Sudan. The officials seemed entirely unaware that this was occurring. I have heard the statistics that the member has shared about the number of times parts are shipped somewhere and then shipped somewhere else and assembled into weapons that go to countries that have human rights violations. She quoted statistics from 2014 about the lack of denial of any of these export certificates in Canada. Could she elaborate on the kind of amendments she would like to see to fix the bill?

Ms. Linda Duncan: Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to have a question from the member. As I mentioned, my colleague has already submitted that amendment, which was turned down by the committee and by the minister who has brought forward this bill. It would not allow manufacturers of armaments to short circuit the Arms Trade Treaty by simply selling them or brokering them through another country. Whether the officials know this or not, they are not allowed to take policy positions. We know regularly when officials come before committee, they say they cannot express a policy, that we have to ask the politicians.

It is very clear on the evidence that we have been sitting by and allowing the sale of weapons manufactured by Canadian companies to nations committing serious war atrocities, and it needs to end.

● (2040)

Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here tonight to speak to Bill C-47. I want to note right up front that I am a bit disappointed that the government seems to have disengaged from the debate.

This is my first opportunity to consider this issue, and I am happy to stay here until midnight tonight. I was looking forward to the opportunity to ask questions and to hear the answers. It is important for Canadians as we debate this important issue.

The Liberals have a majority government and they will get the bill through, but to disengage, to not even participate in the debate is a bit disappointing.

Government Orders

Before I get into the specifics of Bill C-47, I want to draw attention to the connection among Bill C-71, Bill C-75, and Bill C-47. It speaks to the Liberals ideological perspective on things that are not driven in practicality.

Bill C-71 is the Liberal government's back door firearms registry. In spite of what the Liberals say, if it looks like a duck, walks like a duck, it is a duck. They claim the bill will protect cities from guns and gangs. People who have only lived in big cities like Toronto, Montreal, or Ottawa, might not understand that a law-abiding hunter or farmer who lives in a rural area considers a firearm a tool. It is a tool for ranchers and hunters. It is a tool for indigenous people.

Bill C-47 would impact law-abiding hunters and farmers, as would Bill C-71, but not in a practical way, not in a way that would make a difference. It would not make a difference in guns and gangs in cities, especially Bill C-71. However, it would create an added level of bureaucracy for many of our rural communities and our hunters and farmers.

Bill C-75 is about Liberal ideology, not practicality. Some people commit pretty serious and significant crimes. Bill C-75 proposes to reduce sentences. Do the Liberals want to reduce sentences for terrorist activities, or for crimes such as administering a noxious substance or date rape? If something ever happened to my daughter, I would be absolutely appalled if the sentence was reduced.

There was a very disturbing court case in Kamloops involving the death of a young girl. The Twitter world was filled with people, saying justice was not done with respect to the sentence given to the person who murdered this child. Everyone had a sense that justice had not been done, yet Bill C-75 would further reduce criminal sentences for what would truly be horrific crimes.

I will get into the specifics of Bill C-47. This legislation was introduced in April, 2017. Let us talk about time management. It was introduced in April, 2017 and we are now going into June, 2018, with late night sittings so the Liberals can get what they believe to be important legislation through the House? That significantly indicates bad management of House time.

Bill C-47 would control the transfer of eight different categories of military equipment. The one we find to be the most troubling is category 8, small arms and light weapons. I understand an amendment was introduced at committee that would add "The Brokering Control List may not include small arms that are rifles, carbines, revolvers or pistols intended for hunting or sport, for recreational use, or for a cultural or historical purpose."

● (2045)

It was quite a reasonable amendment, but it was voted down. I wanted to ask the government tonight why it voted it down because it would have given many of us greater comfort in how we looked at the bill.

The government tends to look at anything the UN does without criticism. If the UN says we should do this, the Liberals tend to say, absolutely, how fast, and how quickly. They do not spend as much time as they might reflecting on what we do in Canada.

I would beg to differ from my colleague from the NDP. We do have a responsive system. We have a Trades Control Bureau. To a

greater degree, this system has worked pretty well. Would it be better to have something that everyone uses? Absolutely, if everyone used it. We only need to look at the list of the countries that have not or will not signed onto this agreement. We have to recognize that this agreement will not accomplish what it is intended to accomplish.

I encourage anyone who might have an interest in this issue to go online and look at the list of countries that have signed on to the treaty and implemented it. However, look to the larger category of countries that have said no. People will quickly recognize that we are not creating a solution in Canada. We are going to be creating increased challenges.

Another area that the Liberals should be reflecting on is this. The Department of National Defence has always been excluded from our internal systems. Under this treaty, it will be included. Is that going to affect the nimbleness of our military, its ability to respond in a rapid response? Perhaps the Liberals have not done as much due diligence in that area. We need to ensure our military can react rapidly to trouble spots around the world and send assistance. We often thought that sending assistance was the correct response. This does nothing for law-abiding citizens.

Yesterday in the House, the Liberals voted for the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Over a year ago, at the UN, they committed to its implementation. With respect to Bill C-71, today at committee one of the first nations leadership said "We had no consultations." This is another example of the Liberals telling them what they are going to do. I would suggest that the Mohawk Council of Akwesasne would say that with the borders between the U.S. and Canada, the bill would impact the people, that the council did not even know about it. The fact is that over a year and a half ago, the Liberals committed to consultations under article 19, but they have not followed through in any meaningful way to that commitment.

I am disappointed that we have not had engagement, but, quite frankly, the treaty goals in the bill will not be met. Meanwhile we will create some new regulatory burdens for our Department of National Defence and people in the fishing and hunting community who will keep having to do more and more under a Liberal government. I am sure they must be terribly frustrated. This is one more example of its lack of understanding on that issue.

● (2050)

Mr. Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, one of the things that really affect my riding is rural crime. I know the member talked fairly extensively about that.

When I get back home and people ask me why the government is doing this or that, I always say that the government does not see past the city limits.

I wonder whether my hon. colleague has had the same experience back home.

Government Orders

Mrs. Cathy McLeod: Mr. Speaker, I have had the benefit of growing up in an urban area, understanding the urban perspective, and then spending many years of my life living in a more rural community.

I often talk about my neighbour shooting a cougar that was stalking the children. It was a tool of living in a rural community. If people do not have the opportunities to live and experience both the urban and the rural lifestyles, or, even worse, if they are not willing to engage in debate about this issue, they do not understand what is happening.

Mr. Romeo Saganash (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the presentation made by my hon. colleague, a former colleague on the indigenous affairs committee.

She quoted article 19 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in our debate on Bill C-262 when talking about the situation in Akwesasne.

It was quite interesting in this context, because article 19 talks about consultation and co-operation “in good faith with the indigenous peoples concerned through their own representative institutions”.

First of all, whom does the member consider the representative institution in Akwesasne? Second, I find it curious that members cite indigenous issues and indigenous people in situations that serve their arguments but not in the situation where the House was debating a vote to support indigenous peoples and their fundamental human rights in this place.

Mrs. Cathy McLeod: Mr. Speaker, what I was pointing out was not in terms of supporting my argument; it was in terms of supporting the discussion that the Liberals say one thing and do another, which I have been pointing out.

The Liberals are the ones who went to the UN and committed to implementing the declaration. It was not the Conservatives; it was the Liberals. They are the ones who did not actually have an engagement process, and they have not created the engagement process they committed to. It was not the Conservatives who committed to it; it was the Liberals. They have failed.

Today at committee, on Bill C-71, we had some representatives from indigenous communities saying there was nothing. The member does address a good issue, in terms of the representative bodies across the country, whether it is Inuit, Métis, or first nations. That is important work that has to be determined, but in the meantime I am simply pointing out the hypocrisy of the Liberals on this issue.

Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, one of the things I value about my colleague is that she has a great memory for history.

I was not in politics at the time, but my recollection is that the long-gun registry was a losing issue for the Liberal Party. When I look at this legislation, Bill C-71, it looks like a sneaky way of bringing that back, which would be a really bad idea for the Liberals to do.

Am I missing anything? Could the member elaborate?

●(2055)

Mrs. Cathy McLeod: Mr. Speaker, again, if it looks like a duck and it walks like a duck, it is a duck. In my opinion, Bill C-71 is a backdoor registry, and Bill C-47 is increasing the complications for our law-abiding hunters and fishers.

I think this answers the member's questions. It is a long-gun registry, just not in name.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Moose Jaw—Lake Centre—Lanigan, CPC): Madam Speaker, once again, it is a pleasure to rise in this place to give my comments in tonight's debate on Bill C-47, but before I do so, perhaps I can expand upon a couple of the comments made by my colleague from Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, who talked a little about the procedural aspects of what is happening tonight.

If anyone is actually watching these proceedings tonight, they would notice that there is no debate happening. We are scheduled for debate, we are supposed to be having debate, but “debate” means that there are two sides debating, and the Liberals have chosen not to participate in this debate. That is their prerogative, and they can certainly do as they wish, but from a procedural standpoint, I would like to point out a couple of items.

Number one, if the discussion on Bill C-47 collapses, and by that I mean if no further speaker stands to offer comments, it means that the bill would get passed. Why is that important? It is because, as the government knows, there was an offer made earlier tonight to members on the government side that if Bill C-47 collapsed—in other words, if no one got up to speak—and if the government would not introduce another bill, we would all go home. Not to make it appear that we do not want to do our jobs, the reality is that every extended hour we spend in this place is costing the taxpayers tens of thousands of dollars. The lights have to remain on, staff have to be here, security has to be here, the cafeterias have to remain open, and, ultimately, Bill C-47 will be passed. The government knows that. It has a majority, yet we sit here wasting taxpayers' dollars and not even participating in the debate.

I find it shameful that members on the government side who say they want to actively debate will not even comment on their own legislation. I will put on the record that the government is playing games here. We could all be cutting back on the expenses that taxpayers are being forced to pay, but Liberals do not see it that way, and I find that almost unconscionable. That is on the procedural side of things.

I will turn my remarks now to Bill C-47. I will make a couple of brief comments on the bill itself, which of course is about the Arms Trade Treaty. The reason I am bringing it up is the fact that any arms treaty should recognize the legitimacy of responsible gun owners who wish to own guns for their personal use, for their recreational and sporting activities, but the treaty does not recognize the legitimacy of that. For that reason, and that reason alone, I cannot support Bill C-47.

Government Orders

However, we should not be surprised, because this is just the latest in a long litany of Liberal attempts at gun control that have ended badly. The member for Sarnia—Lambton referenced it just a few moments ago when she talked about the failed Liberal long-gun registry back in the 1990s and early 2000s. For those who have perhaps forgotten the history, let me remind them that in 1995, then justice minister Allan Rock introduced the long-gun registry as a piece of legislation in this place, ostensibly and purportedly, according to him, that it would save lives.

History has taught us many things, and one of the things it has taught us about this failed attempt at a good piece of legislation was that the long-gun registry did nothing to save lives. What it did do, as was found out in later years, was cost Canadian taxpayers billions upon billions of dollars. In fact, in 1995, the then justice minister, the hon. Allan Rock, stated in this place that, by his estimations, the long-gun registry, once fully implemented, would only cost \$2 million a year. At that point in time, many people took him at his word, because there were no real records or precedents for what a registry of that sort would cost taxpayers, but, luckily, for the taxpayers of Canada, a former colleague of mine, Mr. Garry Breitkreuz, from Yorkton, Saskatchewan, knew that this figure of \$2 million was obscenely low, that it certainly could not be anywhere close to that and that it would cost much more. Hence, for years thereafter, Garry Breitkreuz filed ATIPs, access to information requests, time after time, month after month, year after year, getting limited, if any, response from the government.

• (2100)

Finally, after years of diligent and persistent requesting of the government for pertinent information on the cost of the gun registry, it was revealed that the gun registry did not cost \$2 million, but \$2 billion.

What did it accomplish? Did it accomplish anything? Did it save lives? Well, I am here to argue that it most certainly did not. Why not? It is because the one fundamental flaw in the rationale and reasoning of Allan Rock, back in those days, supported by every Liberal in Canada is seemed, was that criminals do not register guns.

We have seen over the years an influx of illegal handguns and other guns coming across the border from the United States to Canada, but the people who brought these illegal guns across the border had no plans to register their weapons. Therefore, the gun registry legislation was absolutely worthless. To say it cost \$2 billion for a worthless piece of legislation and call it obscene is being kind to the word obscene. It absolutely was one of the largest fiscal mistakes the former Liberal government has made in that party's long history.

I do not think the current government has learned anything from these past mistakes, because we see them time and time again trying to introduce legislation that would in fact be a back door gun registry. Whether it be Bill C-47, Bill C-71, or Bill C-75, we know that what the Liberals would love to see is another gun registry being enacted here in Canada. However, I can assure members that if they try to do that, if they try to force their position on Canadians, on rural Canadians in particular, legitimate gun owners would again be absolutely beside themselves. The first time the Liberals tried to

force the gun registry on legitimate gun owners and on rural Canada, the reaction was visceral, and it will be again.

I will conclude with a true story that happened when I was on the campaign trail in 2004. During the campaign, when I was door-knocking, I did not know the gentleman living at the residence I visited, but I saw in my identification that he was a former RCMP officer. I naturally thought that he was probably going to be in favour of this. Well, how wrong I was. When I got to the door, I was met with hostility on every issue I brought forward to the point where I actually started losing my temper, which I normally do not do, particularly when I am door-knocking. It finally got to a point, after many arguments on different issues, that the gentleman asked me "What do you think you're going to do about the gun registry?" I said, "We're going to scrap it." He said "I worked for the gun registry." I said "Well, in that case, don't vote for me." He said, "I won't, and get off my doorstep."

I was laughing by the time I got to the sidewalk because it was so bizarre, but it just illustrates the visceral reaction that so many people have about this very contentious issue.

The gun registry that the Liberal government of the day tried to force down the throats of rural Canadians was something that should never have happened in the first place, but it did, unfortunately. However, for \$2 billion in taxpayers' dollars, it is something that Canadians, particularly rural Canadians, will never forget, and because of that, when they see the current government introducing legislation like Bill C-47, Bill C-71, or Bill C-75, they harken back to the dark days of the 1990s when the Liberal government tried to force this obscene long-gun registry down their throats.

Fool me once, shame on me. Fool me twice, shame on the Liberal government.

• (2105)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to address one particular point.

We have had a couple of opposition members raise the issue of participation. The only thing I want to emphasize is that in the past, even with Stephen Harper, and often towards the end of a parliamentary session, we had time allocation, extended hours, and so forth.

Tonight we are in extended hours. The intention is to allow members who want to address the proposed legislation to do so. If it collapses, then we will continue to move on with other proposed legislation. That is something Stephen Harper and other governments have done. We should not be shy of working extra hours, as many Canadians have that expectation, to get legislation moving.

Government Orders

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: Madam Speaker, I appreciate my friend's comments to try to spin this, but the reality is that he knows as well as I do, although he probably will never admit it, that there was an agreement that was proposed to the members opposite that if Bill C-47 were left to collapse, there would be no new legislation introduced tonight. Members would simply go home and save the taxpayers, I would say, probably at least \$30,000 or \$40,000 from our not staying here until midnight.

That is the right of the members opposite to say no. We will gladly stay here until midnight and debate the merits of Bill C-47, but what I find absolutely unconscionable is that there is no participation by the Liberals. They were the ones who introduced this bill. They were the ones who put it on the schedule for debate tonight. It was them not us, yet they are not putting up even one speaker to support or defend this legislation. That is the worst of all scenarios, game playing and a waste of taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Dane Lloyd (Sturgeon River—Parkland, CPC): Madam Speaker, I was talking to one of my colleague's former colleagues, the hon. John Williams of Edmonton—St. Albert, a few months ago and he relayed a story to me about a conversation he had with a deputy minister at Public Safety. The deputy minister said, "You could give us a billion dollars every year and we could never stop the flow of illegal guns coming in from the United States of America." This is a problem that Canada has had for a very long time. Could the member comment on how he thinks taxpayer resources could be better spent to tackle gun crime and gun violence in this country?

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: Madam Speaker, my colleague is right about one thing: there are many other things that could be done to benefit Canadians than throwing \$2 billion of taxpayer money down the drain, as happened in the 1990s with the failed Liberal gun registry. Let us think for a moment about where some of that money could be spent: health care, and certainly on infrastructure needs. However, to literally flush \$2 billion of taxpayer money down the drain on a piece of legislation that had no hope in hades of saving lives, as was its purported purpose, is something that I find almost incomprehensible. It was an absolutely dark chapter in the life of Parliament when that legislation passed, and ultimately Canadians understood that this was something that would hopefully never happen again.

Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC): Madam Speaker, I know the hon. member mentioned Bill C-71, and like everything else we see from the current Liberal government, a lot of it is all optics. In Bill C-71 in particular, it speaks about guns and gangs zero times, but the words "register" and "registrar" are used there well over 30 times. What is the member's his opinion of that?

● (2110)

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: Madam Speaker, I will be brief because I know that our time is tight. Quite frankly, resources could be best spent in perhaps increasing the police forces across Canada and perhaps in educating well-meaning and recreational hunters and shooters about the proper use of guns. However, to suggest that this piece of legislation or Bill C-71 would do anything to combat crime is a farce, because the legislation does not say anything about that. We do have a problem with crime, particularly rural crime, in this country, but Bill C-71 does not address that and Bill C-47 certainly does not. If the Liberals are serious about trying to prevent and eliminate crime across rural Canada, there are better ways to do it than this.

Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am here tonight to talk about the arms control treaty. I would like to say that I am delighted to be here, but I find that when the government decides to force us into these midnight sittings and then chooses not to participate in the debate, it is a bit of a one-sided conversation. Normally, when I show up to bring my viewpoints on why I am going to oppose a piece of legislation, I am looking to hear from the government about why it thinks this legislation is such a good idea, but I guess I am not going to hear that tonight.

First, I will talk about arms internationally, and then I will talk a bit about arms at home and some of the concerns I have with the bill.

First, there is this arms treaty that the UN is trying to get people to sign on to. My first concern is that there are a lot of countries that have not signed on to it. One of them, of course, is the U.S. This is concerning to me. If this was such a great treaty, a lot of countries ought to be signing on.

Here in Canada, we have the Trade Controls Bureau, which supposedly keeps us from shipping weapons to places where they would be used in internal and external conflicts, and used by people who commit human rights violations. I had the opportunity to sit at committee this afternoon, and the member for Edmonton Strathcona has already testified that she asked a question about arms that are being shipped through the U.S. into South Sudan.

This is not an isolated incident. There are parts of guns that are being assembled in other countries and sent to places where there are conflicts and human rights violations. She gave a statistic showing that the applications for these permits are pretty much all approved. Only 10 out of 7,000 in 2014 were turned down. Therefore, it appears that there is not enough traceability from where parts begin or arms are created to where they ultimately end up. That is something that ought to be fixed if we are really trying to meet the intent of the bill, which I think is to try to make sure we control where arms are going.

I was fortunate enough to go to Geneva, Switzerland with the World Health Organization as part of the Canadian delegation with the health minister. I was astounded when I was there to hear some of the members from countries across the world talk about how 684 hospitals were bombed last year. This is unbelievable and totally against the Geneva convention. In many cases, the weapons that are being used are weapons originating in countries that did not intend for them to be used in such a way. Therefore, we definitely need to tighten this up.

Government Orders

The Congo, for example, is at the point where its minister of health is talking about rebuilding its structure and having only 44% of the country with any kind of medical service access. It is definitely a serious issue.

If we focus on arms internationally, I talked about having better traceability. Definitely for those places that we know are committing human rights violations, we should have some eyes on the ground there to detect and eliminate those passages.

In terms of arms at home, it is important to state that we currently do not have a problem with law-abiding gun owners in Canada. We have to state this again and again. We are not having difficulty with law-abiding gun owners in Canada. We will kill more people with drug-impaired driving than we will with lawful guns in Canada. The Liberal government is rushing to legalize marijuana, which will double the number of people killed in that way. The Liberals are pretending there is a problem where there really is not.

The problem in Canada is guns and gangs in big cities, which is a problem with people who do not obey the law. If they do not obey the current gun laws, they are not going to obey future gun laws. It would be naive to think otherwise. That point cannot be made often enough. There is no problem with lawful gun ownership in Canada.

•(2115)

I have heard the testimony of some witnesses who talked about rural ridings. I happened to have a contingent of rural ridings in Sarnia—Lambton, perhaps not as rural as some of the people who have spoken, but there are a large number of folks there who are gun owners, many of whom are farmers. When there are no police close by or the police response time is measured in hours, not minutes, people need protection. Not only that, there are many times when one may have to take action. In the place where I live, we have cougars. It has not just happened in one year, but in multiple years, that when the weather is mild the cougars come down and attack the pigs and horses on the various farms around and the farmers have to shoot them. That is protection. I have friends who have a lot of horses. If a horse has to be put down, they do it humanely and they use a gun. In the rural environment, guns are a tool that is used wisely.

I have said before and I will say again that we do not have a problem with law-abiding gun owners. The other thing I would say is there are a lot of people who hunt for enjoyment or who have guns to practise shooting at a shooting gallery. I do not personally own a gun. However, I do not begrudge those who want the right to do so. I know that a lot of the people in the rural environment where I live have multiple guns. They have a different one for pheasant, for turkey, for moose, and for the deer. Apparently, there is quite a skill to this whole thing. What all Canadians want is to make sure that we take more control of things that could kill multiple people. We have all seen the news when people take a weapon that can shoot 50 rounds and really do huge damage. Therefore, I think there is a way of balancing that and making sure that the people who are getting guns are of sound mind. Everyone would agree that is also important.

This legislation does nothing to address any of that. This legislation, along with Bill C-71, is really a backdoor gun registry. It is bringing that back. I appreciate the history that the member for

Moose Jaw—Lake Centre—Lanigan gave me, because I do recall that the long-gun registry did not turn out well for the Liberals. Bill C-47 and Bill C-71 will bring them to the same fate.

The other thing is that the bill is introducing a lot of red tape, bureaucracy, record keeping, and costs to businesses. I am not a fan of that.

If we talk about Bill C-71, the sort of partner legislation to this bill, there are a lot of unanswered questions about who does the background checks, who assesses that they are okay, and how people access the records. There is language that suggests it is a judicial process. What does that mean? Does it mean one needs to get a warrant to get that information? Is that information generally available to security organizations? Who can really access that information? Those questions need to be answered.

Also, in Bill C-71, I do not know why the government would take out the authorization to transport guns to and from gunsmiths, gun stores, border points, and gun shows. If people who own guns have to get their gun fixed, they have to take it to a gunsmith. Eliminating people's ability to transport guns to a gunsmith seems ridiculous. Similarly, if people are a fan of guns, they would go to gun shows. How would they get the guns there if they are not allowed to transport them? It just seems like a lot of roadblocks are being put up for people who are law-abiding citizens with whom we do not have an issue.

Overall, when I look at this legislation, it appears to me that it does not address the goal, which is to make sure that arms do not fall into the hands of people who would use them for human rights violations, in conflicts, or against Canada. It also does not do anything to address the issues with crime in Canada due to guns and gangs. For that reason, I will strongly oppose this legislation.

I would repeat that it is really too bad that the government has chosen not to put up any speakers in this debate tonight.

•(2120)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There does not appear to be a quorum in the House.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I will ask the Clerk to count the members present.

And the count having been taken:

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): We do have quorum.

Was the hon. member only rising with respect to a quorum count or did he actually want to ask a question?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a question as well.

Government Orders

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Questions and comments, the hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan.

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, my colleagues are already excited. Just think how excited they will be after I ask the question. However, I am glad that, perhaps unusually for the Liberal side, I finally have a bit of an audience, not to imply, of course, that they were not here.

I want to ask my colleague for her view on the amendment the Conservatives proposed at committee. Members should know that Conservatives were very constructive as part of this legislative process. We introduced an amendment. My colleague from P.E.I is laughing. However, he should stay and hear this amendment, because I know there are many firearms owners in his riding, who I look forward to visiting with soon, who are concerned about this bill.

The Conservatives proposed an amendment at committee that said, “The Brokering Control List may not include small arms that are rifles, carbines, revolvers or pistols intended for hunting or sport, for recreational use, or for a cultural or historical purpose.”

This was an amendment that was asked for by stakeholders. It would have preserved the rest of the bill, the architecture of the bill, but it also would have provided clear protection. Let us be clear. There is a difference between, generally speaking, the kind of firearms that are used for recreational purposes, for duck hunting, and the ones that are used in military grade atrocities and that sort of thing.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I just want to allow for another question. I would ask individuals when they are asking their questions to keep their remarks to a minimum.

The hon. member for Sarnia—Lambton.

Ms. Marilyn Gladu: Madam Speaker, definitely I think that amendment would have been in line with what I said, which is that we do not have a problem today in Canada with lawful gun owners. Therefore, exempting them from this would have been the right thing to do. That said, the government has a propensity to not accept amendments. I know I have been frustrated at the health committee when I have brought multiple amendments that are well thought out, and the government has totally ignored them.

Furthermore, when things go from this House over to the other place, amendments are brought back, typically ones that are exactly the same as we brought at committee here, and they are refused again, which seems a huge waste of taxpayer money. I am not opposed at all to that amendment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for her speech.

I am going to ask her a very simple question. With respect to Bill C-47, what does she think of the fact that Canada sold arms to Saudi Arabia and that those arms may have been used against civilians? Does she think that is a good thing or a bad thing?

[*English*]

Ms. Marilyn Gladu: Madam Speaker, when we start out and take on a contract, we have intentions and do not think they will be used

incorrectly. However, when we find information to the contrary, then we have to reevaluate our decisions. I think it is clear that we want to make sure that Canada is not contributing to violence against women and girls, that we are not contributing to violence in the world, and that we are not contributing to conflict in the world.

I hinted in my speech about how we need to get better traceability on where weapons are going, and what is happening with them. When information presents itself, I think we need to take action.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to participate in this important debate. I agree with some of the things my Conservative colleague just said, but I disagree with others. One of the things we have in common is that neither of us understands why the Liberal members here are so scared.

It is your bill. Why are you not talking? Why are you refusing to debate your own bill? Are you trying to hide? Are you ashamed? Is it that you are not proud of it? Why do you not want to talk? Is it that you do not like confrontation, because it makes you uncomfortable?

You are making us sit until midnight every night because you are behind—

● (2125)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. Order. I must remind the member to address the Chair, not individuals or the government. The hon. member for Rosemont—La Petite Patrie.

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice: Madam Speaker, the Liberal government has fallen behind on its legislative agenda. It is forcing parliamentarians to stay late into the night to study its bills because it is incapable of moving its legislative agenda forward. Now it is asking us to debate an important bill that speaks to significant Canadian and, dare I say it, Liberal values, like freedom and respect. However, the Liberals refuse to talk about it. It is utterly baffling. It would be all the more baffling if we were talking about another bill to legalize a certain substance, but that is not the topic of tonight's debate.

It is somewhat surreal that only the official opposition, the second opposition party, and the others are interested in debating this major bill governing Canada's arms exports to other countries. I will come back to this, because it speaks to fundamental values we hold. There is a general tendency to puff up with pride when this subject comes up, but when the time comes to choose between profits and respecting certain rights, the Liberal government shows its true colours. Again, this bill is not reflective of the standards, values, and principles that we have embraced as a society and that the government claims to care about here and around the world.

Before I continue, I would like to acknowledge the tireless work and absolutely amazing job being done by my colleague from Laurier—Sainte-Marie on this file, specifically at the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development. I also want to applaud her assistant, Jennifer Pedersen, who has been doing fantastic work on this file for years now.

Government Orders

This evening we are debating Bill C-47, introduced by the federal government, which should be capable of applying the principles of such an important treaty as the Arms Trade Treaty, or ATT. The Arms Trade Treaty is pretty simple. The general principle states that we should not sell arms to a country if we have any reason to suspect, based on overwhelming evidence, that it might use those weapons against civilian populations, either its own or in neighbouring countries.

Unfortunately, we seriously doubt that the Liberal government's Bill C-47 will manage to address this very basic concern. We must prohibit the sale of weapons to countries that violate human rights. This leads us to reflect on some philosophical and political questions. Who are we as a society? What role do we want to play in the world? What is our own identity? If we are proud to be a country that respects human rights here and abroad, we cannot have a double standard. Human rights are not optional. We cannot be satisfied with respecting them only when it suits us, only to make an exception when other interests prevail.

Respecting human rights means always. As progressives, New Democrats, and humanists, we want to make sure those rights are respected. That is part of our values as Quebeckers and Canadians. We cannot say one thing and then do the opposite. Unfortunately, Bill C-47 provides absolutely no guarantee that our identity and the image we want to project to the world will be respected.

Let us remember that, once the Liberals took office, they signed an export permit for the sale of weapons to Saudi Arabia. We now know that those weapons were used against civilian populations in Saudi Arabia and likely against civilian populations in Yemen, a neighbouring country torn by a very intense civil war. However, the Liberals tried to mislead us. The Prime Minister told us that there was no problem and that Canada had only sold Saudi Arabia Jeeps, or vehicles that were practically buses.

• (2130)

It turns out that the Jeeps in question were armoured vehicles, some light and some heavy. Normally, a government that respected the principles of the Arms Trade Treaty would not have signed the export permit.

I understand that a contract had been signed previously, but the government still could have exercised due diligence, respected our international commitments, and refused to issue the permit because there was too great a risk that those weapons would be used against the civilian population. Instead, the Liberal government decided to thumb its nose at all of those values and sign the export contract for the weapons.

After that, I do not understand how the Liberals can show their faces on the international stage and say that they are champions of human rights and that they want to win back Canada's seat on the United Nations Security Council, when they are not even capable of abiding by that treaty. The government introduced a bill to say that it will abide by the treaty, but there is no guarantee that it will do so.

In fact, there is a giant gaping loophole the size of the Grand Canyon in this bill.

Before moving on to that topic, I want to mention that the Liberal government's current bill includes absolutely nothing for re-

evaluating existing export permits. Even if we were determined to act in good faith and there was no information or event to suggest that these arms could be used against civilians, there still should be an export permit re-evaluation mechanism.

However, Bill C-47 includes no measure for re-evaluating permits, even if there are credible allegations of human rights violations. That means that we are rushing to sell arms before getting all the information, and once the other country violates human rights and attacks civilians, we wash our hands of the whole thing, because there is no export permit re-evaluation process. It is quite incredible.

The huge loophole I was talking about a minute ago is that all exports of military goods to the United States are exempt. Under Bill C-47, exports of military materiel, arms, equipment, or partial equipment to the United States do not fall under the ax of the Liberal government's Bill C-47.

That means that we could sell arms to the United States, which could then sell them to a dictatorship that might attack civilians. There is nothing we could do about that under this bill.

We could sell a piece of equipment, a rifle part or a cannon part, to the United States, which could then sell them to people or governments that violate human rights and that would not fall on the chopping block of Bill C-47. Such sales represent half of our exports.

The Liberals have managed to circumvent the Arms Trade Treaty. If this bill had teeth, half of our exports could not be evaluated by this bill. It is unfathomable.

• (2135)

[*English*]

Mr. Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Madam Speaker, we have been having a great back and forth this evening between the NDP and the Conservative Party. I wonder if the member has any inclination as to what the Liberals thoughts are on this tonight.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

I am an objective observer, but they obviously must not be too proud of their bill, since they are all staring at their computers, iPads, or notes. They refuse to listen to the opposition's comments, even though the bill is like Gruyère cheese with no teeth. The bill does not comply with the UN Arms Trade Treaty, since it exempts all of our arms exports to the United States.

One more thing: the bill has no influence or power over the Canadian Commercial Corporation, or CCC. This is the crown corporation that sold helicopters to the Duterte government in the Philippines, but the Liberal bill would not allow us to do anything about CCC.

Mr. Joël Godin (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, CPC): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie for his excellent speech. During question period this week, we heard even more of his expressions. I had the privilege of participating in an environment committee hearing today, and he had a good run.

Government Orders

Did my colleague expect better from the Liberal government? Did he expect the Liberals to step up and keep their election promises? His speech seemed to raise a big question mark, but I am wondering if he expected better.

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his extremely pertinent question. I want to take this opportunity to remind everyone that a few years ago, there was an excellent game show on Quebec television called *Fais-moi un dessin*, or draw me a picture. People could draw one picture, two pictures, three pictures—all kinds of pictures.

I have a sad feeling that we have a government with no clear direction, except that it tends to do the opposite of what it said in the election campaign. I could recite a list, and it is quite fascinating. It includes combatting tax havens, creating a strong environmental assessment process, closing tax loopholes for CEOs, reforming the electoral system, and now, combatting climate change.

Yes, I do agree with my colleague. The Liberals are doing the opposite of what they told us they would do two and a half years ago.

[*English*]

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, I wonder if this debate is a harbinger of where we are going to be after 2019, with mostly Conservatives and New Democrats giving speeches. We are hearing as much from the Liberals in the House today as we did from Rachel Notley in the last election about the carbon tax, just to make sure this is not a totally Conservative-NDP love-in.

I want to ask the NDP about the amendment that Conservatives proposed in committee. It would have ensured that the brokering control list did not include small arms such as rifles, carbines, revolvers, or pistols intended for hunting or sport.

We agree with the NDP in principle that Canada should not be selling arms that go on to be used in atrocities or violations of human rights. However, very clearly ensuring that the brokering control list does not include certain kinds of weapons that are very much intended for hunting and recreation does not raise problems in terms of human rights.

Would the NDP agree with us that this is a good amendment and that providing protection for those kinds of tools does not raise any kind of attendant human rights concern?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice: Madam Speaker, it is amusing to see Liberal members on the other side who have been muzzled and seem a bit restless. They seem to want to participate in the discussion, but unfortunately, they are not allowed to talk.

Indeed, this bill must address the wholesale trade of arms to governments that will give them to their armies to use. I agree with my colleague that we must protect the rights of our hunters and fishers, but that is not exactly the purpose and nature of this bill. I agree that people who use weapons for recreational activities or hunting should be protected. This is true.

● (2140)

[*English*]

Mr. Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to stand today to speak to Bill C-47. In some ways, I think the bill is connected to Bill C-71. I was very much looking forward to speaking to this bill, because the good people of Peace River—Westlock sent me here, and one of the mandates I ran on was to protect the rights of firearms owners in Canada. I am incredibly pleased to speak to this.

We, on the Conservative side, have always stood up for the rights of firearms owners. I was particularly interested in being here tonight to see what the Liberals had to say and to hold the Liberal government to account on what they had to say about this particular bill. We have been here this evening for a very long time, and we have not heard from a single Liberal, not in the time I have been sitting here.

It is disappointing that we have not been able to hold them to account and ask the tough questions that need to be asked. I see that the member for Kildonan—St. Paul is here this evening. I know that the member for Kildonan—St. Paul is a big fan of mine, and she always likes to participate in debates. We sit on committee together. I know that she definitely enjoys my speeches.

This evening she has not been engaged whatsoever with the topic at hand. She has not participated. She has not given a speech. She has not even asked a question. I have been very disappointed with the member for Kildonan—St. Paul that she has not outlined her opinion on Bill C-47. I have not heard a single word from her. She has been sitting here all night. We have been laying out our opinions on the bill. We have been telling Canadians what the good people of Peace River—Westlock think and have to say about firearms rights and this backdoor long-gun registry the Liberals are bringing in, particularly with Bill C-47 but also with Bill C-71.

I was looking forward to hearing what the member for Kildonan—St. Paul had to say. I know we have a great relationship. We work together on committee. We rarely agree on things, but we definitely like to spar back and forth. I was looking forward to hearing what she had to say this evening. Unfortunately, to this point, anyway, she has not gotten up to ask any questions or to lay out her opinions about this particular bill. I am not sure what the people from Kildonan—St. Paul think about that. I hope to hear from her.

Bill C-47 is an important piece of legislation. It brings Canada in line with the UN treaty that was previously signed. I am not quite sure if I am totally excited about that. I know that the Liberal government has undermined Canadians' trust in it whenever it comes to firearms. When this particular bill was introduced, I remember sitting here with the member for Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies. We went through the bill together.

I remember being triggered by some of the words in there: “list”, “permit”, “record”. These are words firearms owners in Canada are not excited to read whenever there is any kind of firearms legislation. If we see words like “list”, “permit”, “record”, “registry”, or “registrar”, it sends alarm bells to firearms owners across Canada. I know that when the bill came in, we had a look at it. Those words appeared in Bill C-47 69 times.

Government Orders

We put out a call to firearms owners across Canada, and believe me, we heard back, loud and clear, that Canadian firearms owners, licensed firearms owners, do not trust the Liberals whatsoever when it comes to handling their rights in Canada.

We heard back strongly that this was not the direction we needed to go. The Conservatives, being the adults in the room this evening, have brought forward an amendment that would help alleviate the fears. We do not often like to help the Liberals when they stick their foot in it, but this time we thought, for the sake of the country, we would help them. We proposed amendments to help out Canadian legal firearms owners to make sure that their rights were protected, because that is, in fact what I was sent here, on behalf of the good people of Peace River—Westlock, to do, to stand up for the rights of firearms owners.

● (2145)

This is just part of the ongoing trend of lack of accountability from those folks. We see it again tonight, when they are not willing to stand and defend their own legislation. We see it time and again. In the Liberals' last platform, I heard over and over again how they would have a new level of openness, that there would be transparency on every level. However, tonight we are debating important legislation and nobody is laying out his or her view of the bill.

One of the other things that is very concerning about the government is that it does not see past city limits. When I say that, I am thinking specifically of the rural crime issue in Canada, particularly in Saskatchewan and Alberta. It is tied to some degree to the downturn in the economy. We have seen a correlation in the downturn in the economy with a rise in rural crime. I lay the blame for that squarely at the feet of the Liberal government. It has done nothing to protect the Canadian economy. In fact, it has thrown gasoline on the fire when it should have brought out the water hose. We have definitely seen the wrong output from the government. Then, to top it all off, when it should be focusing on the economy, it brings forward anti-firearm legislation. That just shows how out of touch the Liberal government is with the Canadian population.

After Liberals introduce this legislation, they turn tail and run. They cannot even stand in this place and defend their actions when it comes to Bill C-47, tonight in particular. I was looking forward to sparring on this legislation, but here we are with the NDP and the Conservatives are having a robust debate in the House of Commons. It has been significantly frustrating to pin down the Liberals when it comes to holding up the rights of Canadians.

I go back to the language in the bill. I mentioned earlier that words like “list”, “permit”, “record”, and “registry” show up 69 times in Bill C-47 and over 30 times in Bill C-71. However, there is no mention of gangs or gun violence whatsoever. This shows that Liberals do not understand the issue. The issue is not a particular firearm. The issue is that they have undermined the economy and Canadians' respect for firearms.

We are calling on the government to do something about rural crime and they bring forward firearm legislation that only goes after law-abiding citizens. If the law is changed, these citizens will comply with it. It is why they are called “law-abiding citizens”. It is

why they have firearms licences. It is why they lawfully own firearms.

Criminals are not too concerned about where or how firearms are purchased. They are going to be out there regardless. We need to ensure we hold the government to account. We need to ensure that when we try to target issues like gang violence in the country, we put forward legislation that will do that. If we want to target gangs, we should be resourcing our police departments properly.

I will definitely be voting against Bill C-47.

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is fascinating to hear the opposition complaining about having to be here, and this is only day three of extended hours.

The Conservatives say they are willing to stop debate on Bill C-47, but only if the government agrees not to call any other legislation. That makes no sense. They have been complaining about not having enough time to debate legislation, and extending the hours allows them to debate important legislation, so why do they suddenly not want to debate?

The government has been asking for information. The NDP has provided it, but the Conservatives have refused to provide it. Why do they ask for more debate time and then complain about getting it?

The government has spoken on this legislation, and we are now ready to advance it to the next stage. I would encourage opposition members to share information, as there is a better way to work in this place if they are willing to do so. We have not seen their desire to do so yet, but perhaps there is a way forward to be better.

They say they are eager to debate legislation, and yet they forced a vote on Bill C-57 when the House supported the bill. They did the same thing for private member's bill, Bill C-391.

If Conservative members can confirm that no members want to speak to Bill C-47 and they are prepared to let the debate collapse, then we would most certainly be happy to see the clock at midnight.

● (2150)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Does the hon. member have unanimous consent to see the clock at midnight?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Arnold Viersen: Madam Speaker, I would be happy to stay here all night to debate this piece of legislation.

I was hoping for a question from my hon. colleague from Kildonan—St. Paul. I did ask for her to interact with me earlier.

It is great to be here tonight, and I was hoping to hear what the Liberals had to say about this particular piece of legislation. We have been here for several hours now, but I have not heard a peep from the Liberals on Bill C-47, the Liberal government's backdoor long-gun registry. I am happy to be here tonight to debate Bill C-47.

Adjournment Proceedings

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, the point that has been raised tonight, and it is an important point, is that when we have a piece of government legislation, regardless of the hour and regardless of the context, one would think the Liberals would be proud of it, yet at committee we heard witnesses on all sides of this issue who were critical of the bill. They did not see it in some cases as actually implementing the treaty. They also saw it as imposing all kinds of red tape for firearms owners.

The Liberals refused reasoned amendments that would have fixed the concerns of law-abiding firearms owners while preserving the basic structure of the system we have in place in terms of arms control, which gives discretion to the minister on whether or not to approve the sale of arms. For any of the controversial arms sales that have been discussed in the House many times, it is still ultimately up to the discretion of the minister as to how they proceed.

The point is that members of the government are embarrassed about their own legislation. That is the point. I wonder if the member could comment on that.

Mr. Arnold Viersen: Madam Speaker, I was very concerned that I did not get a question out of the member for Kildonan—St. Paul, but I will take it up with her later for sure.

The one thing that I forgot to mention in my speech earlier is that this particular bill may make firearms more expensive in Canada. They are already very expensive, and I am concerned that in the context of standing up for the rights of firearms owners, this is often a piece that is overlooked. This legislation would mean it would cost Canadian firearms owners significantly more to get firearms in Canada. This is another reason to oppose this legislation.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The question is on Motion No. 1. Shall I dispense?

Some hon. members: No.

[*Chair read text of motion to House*]

• (2155)

[*English*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The recorded division on Motion No. 1 stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 2. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The recorded division on Motion No. 2 stands deferred.

Normally at this time the House would proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded divisions at the report stage of the bill. However, pursuant to order made on Tuesday, May 29 the divisions stand deferred until Monday, June 4, at the expiry of the time provided for oral questions.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I suspect if you were to canvass the House, you would find unanimous consent to call it 12 o'clock midnight.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

[*English*]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, *Les Mis* is one of my favourite plays, and events in Iran bring to mind one of its signature choruses:

Do you hear the people sing?
Singing the song of angry men?
It is the music of a people
Who will not be slaves again!
When the beating of your heart
Echoes the beating of the drums
There is a life about to start
When tomorrow comes!

Adjournment Proceedings

The heroes in the streets of Iran are an inspiration to us all. They inspire me and the work that I do, because I know that I will never have to sacrifice nearly as much as they do for the things that we often take for granted here.

By speaking out against injustice in small and big ways, they risk and give their lives. Their movement is the universal cry for human freedom, not specifically about individual economic grievances, but rather against a system that denies their dignity, their humanity, and their value. The everyday people of Iran are singing the song of angry men, the music of a people who will not be slaves again. The movement that they started lives on.

In the chorus I cited, *Les Mis* uses the word “men” to refer to men and women. Notably, the most iconic image of the new revolutionary movement in Iran is of a woman standing in the street waving her head scarf in defiance of the national uniform imposed on women by the regime. This is a portrait of courage, simple, clear, and defiant.

During my initial question on this issue, I challenged the government's lack of response to the protests in Iran. I also cited specific acts of violence against LGBT people in Iran as one particular example of human rights abuse. I note, naturally, that this is one of many examples. I referenced it, in part, because it is the one issue that the government is most likely to pay lip-service to. We hear virtually nothing from it about the rights of Baha'is, Christians, Kurds, and other minorities who experience persecution in Iran and elsewhere.

The new revolutionary movement in Iran is one of social and communal solidarity. It includes people of all social, ethnic, cultural, and religious groups. When I posed the question to the Prime Minister, he did pay lip service. He said, “we are always unequivocal about standing up for LGBTQ rights.” In a context where children with these inclinations are forced to undergo electric shock therapy, what statements has the government made about these issues in Iran? I would like to know what, if any, statements it has made on that.

Most fundamentally, we have a government here that has still declined to express support for the message of these protests, and that has declined thus far to endorse the movement for freedom in Iran. The Prime Minister addressed the protest movement, months late, for the first time only, in response to my question in the House. He said, quite rightly, “The Iranian people must be able to freely assemble without facing violence or imprisonment.” I agree with that, but it is important for the government to endorse the message of the protestors which was my question, that is, to endorse their call for a new political system, a system that is consistent with their fundamental human rights.

The Liberal government has a member who called the current Iranian regime “elected”. The Liberals have spoken about aerospace opportunities in Iran. They are in fact subsidizing Bombardier's investments in Iran.

I would say this. Let us put aside the pursuit of closer relations with the current corrupt theocratic regime in Iran and think instead about the relations we will have with the next government of Iran when the people succeed, and they will succeed. When the people succeed in creating a new government reflective of Iran's history and values and of universal human values, then how will that

government view Canada? Will they thank us for being there for the people in their time of need, or will they condemn us for prioritizing our relationship with their oppressors?

Do you hear the people sing
Lost in the valley of the night?
It is the music of a people
Who are climbing to the light.
For the wretched of the earth
There is a flame that never dies.
Even the darkest night will end
And the sun will rise.

● (2200)

Mr. Marco Mendicino (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to begin by saying that we hear the people sing for human rights, for justice, and we are calling on the member and all of his caucus to support the good work of this government in pursuing those laudable objectives around the world.

When it comes to our record on Iran, this government has been very clear. We condemn its support for terrorist organizations, its threats toward Israel, its ballistic missile program, and its support for the Assad regime. We continue to call on Iran to respect the human rights and democratic rights of the Iranian people. The protection and promotion of all human rights, at its core, influences and inspires this government's foreign policy.

The lack of respect for human rights in Iran is a serious concern, including the high number of executions, particularly for juveniles; widespread discrimination against women; discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity; restrictions on freedom of expression; and serious and systemic discrimination and harassment of ethnic and religious minorities. This is why our government is committed to holding Iran to account for its violations of these rights. Again, I call on my hon. colleague and the entire Conservative Party of Canada to put aside partisan differences and join this government in pursuing those objectives.

Contrary to what the member says, when the protest took place in Iran in December 2017 and January 2018, Canada was one of the first countries to publicly express support for the right of the Iranian people to protest peacefully. On December 30, we publicly called on the Iranian authorities to uphold and respect democratic and human rights, and on January 3 of this year, the Minister of Foreign Affairs expressed deep concern about the deaths and detentions of protestors in Iran. As she said then, “The Iranian people have the right to freely assemble and express themselves without facing violence or imprisonment.”

Let me be clear. As long as Maryam Mombeini is not able to leave Iran, the focus of any discussions with Iran will be on getting her home to Canada. We also continue to demand answers from the government of Iran on the detention and death of Kavous Seyed-Emami. We will continue to use every means at Canada's disposal to seek further information.

The member opposite raised in question period the issue of LGBTQ2 rights. There has never been a Canadian government so committed to the promotion and protection of LGBTQ2 rights as this one. From Bill C-66 to the appointment of my hon. colleague, the member for Edmonton Centre, as a special adviser on LGBTQ2 issues, to the Prime Minister's historic pardon in the House, our government's commitment is clear. During the UN Universal Periodic Review, Canada took a very firm position related to sexual orientation and gender identity more frequently than any other country.

Our record when it comes to Iran is clear. Our record when it comes to the pursuit of human rights and social justice causes around the world is clear.

Finally, once again, I call on the hon. member to put aside partisan causes and support this government. Let us do good together.

• (2205)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, I thank my friend across the way for strong words in this moment on the case of Iran. However, the opposition will not shy away from asking tough questions about instances of the government's lack of response on human rights when it is warranted, and we do so out of concern for the people we have spoken about.

There are still outstanding issues in terms of the government's response. The member spoke about the right to protest but still not about the government endorsing the protest movement, and I think that is an important distinction. Maybe he is not authorized to go that far, but I hope the Prime Minister or the minister will.

There was a Liberal MP who still has not backed away from a statement he made when he said, at the time of the protest, that he hoped "that the brave nation of Iran have the opportunity to air their legitimate financial, social and political concerns with the support of their elected government". That is, he referred to the government of Iran as the "elected government".

Adjournment Proceedings

Will the member join me in repudiating that and saying that the statement of the Liberal member for Richmond Hill was wrong and that it does not reflect the position of the Government of Canada? I think that is something the people want and need to hear.

Mr. Marco Mendicino: Madam Speaker, let me be clear on this issue. Human rights are central to our government's foreign policy. We welcome and use every opportunity to raise our concerns on these issues, including with any Iranian counterparts.

Let me reiterate a key point. Our government's chief priority is the safety and security of Maryam Mombeini. It is to ensure that every Iranian is afforded due process and is able to enjoy universal human rights, of which Canada was one of the seminal advocates at the United Nations.

Once again, the Minister of Foreign Affairs has spoken personally with her counterparts on several occasions. As long as Maryam Mombeini and others are not able to leave Iran, the focus of any discussions with Iran will be on getting her home to Canada and getting answers to questions we have regarding the death of Kavous Seyed-Emami.

It is time for the partisanship to end on the other side of the House. It is time for the Conservative Party to join the Government of Canada in the pursuit of social justice and the pursuit of human rights for all.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Pursuant to order made on Tuesday, May 29, the motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted.

[*English*]

Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10:00 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 10:07 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 31, 2018

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions

Mr. Lamoureux.....	19983
Motion.....	19983
Motion agreed to.....	19984

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Budget Implementation Act, 2018, No. 1

Bill C-74—Time Allocation Motion

Mr. Duclos.....	19984
Motion.....	19984
Ms. Bergen.....	19984
Ms. McKenna.....	19984
Ms. Brosseau.....	19985
Ms. Gladu.....	19985
Mr. Albas.....	19985
Mr. MacGregor.....	19985
Mr. Lamoureux.....	19986
Mr. Brassard.....	19986
Mr. Dusseault.....	19986
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands).....	19987
Mrs. Boucher.....	19987
Ms. Malcolmson.....	19987
Ms. Jones.....	19987
Mr. O'Toole.....	19988
Mr. Blaikie.....	19988
Mrs. Stubbs.....	19988
Mr. Carrie.....	19989
Motion agreed to.....	19990

Report Stage

Bill C-74. Report stage.....	19990
Mr. Duguid.....	19990
Mr. Albrecht.....	19991
Ms. Malcolmson.....	19991
Mr. Longfield.....	19992
Mrs. Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster).....	19992
Mr. Albrecht.....	19993
Ms. Jones.....	19993
Mr. Vandal.....	19994
Ms. Boutin-Sweet.....	19995
Mr. Longfield.....	19995
Mr. MacGregor.....	19996
Mr. MacGregor.....	19996
Mr. Lamoureux.....	19997
Ms. Malcolmson.....	19997
Ms. Jones.....	19998
Mr. Jeneroux.....	19999
Ms. Trudel.....	19999
Mr. Davies.....	20000
Mr. Gerretsen.....	20001
Ms. Quach.....	20001
Mr. Fast.....	20002

Mr. Hardie.....	20003
Mr. Dusseault.....	20003
Mr. Nuttall.....	20004
Mr. Gerretsen.....	20005
Ms. Quach.....	20005
Mr. Kmiec.....	20005

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Pipelines

Ms. Paupé.....	20006
----------------	-------

Charitable Organizations in Surrey—Newton

Mr. Dhaliwal.....	20007
-------------------	-------

Cross-Canada Run

Mr. Barlow.....	20007
-----------------	-------

Mont-Joli Rotary Club

Mr. Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia).....	20007
--	-------

ALS Awareness Month

Mr. Davies.....	20007
-----------------	-------

Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis

Mr. Rodriguez.....	20007
--------------------	-------

Canada Post

Mr. Calkins.....	20008
------------------	-------

Environmental Protection Act

Mrs. Schulte.....	20008
-------------------	-------

Boys and Girls Clubs of Canada

Ms. Sidhu (Brampton South).....	20008
---------------------------------	-------

National Defence

Mr. O'Toole.....	20008
------------------	-------

Brome—Missisquoi in Ottawa Day

Mr. Paradis.....	20008
------------------	-------

Circuit du paysan

Mrs. Shanahan.....	20009
--------------------	-------

ALS Awareness Month

Mr. Tilson.....	20009
-----------------	-------

World No Tobacco Day

Ms. Lapointe.....	20009
-------------------	-------

Youth

Ms. Benson.....	20009
-----------------	-------

Queen Elizabeth II

Mr. Van Loan.....	20009
-------------------	-------

Ramadan

Mrs. Zahid.....	20010
-----------------	-------

ORAL QUESTIONS

International Trade

Mr. O'Toole.....	20010
------------------	-------

Mr. Garneau	20010	Mr. Paul-Hus	20016
Mr. O'Toole	20010	Mr. Garneau	20016
Mr. Garneau	20010		
Mr. O'Toole	20010	Ethics	
Mr. Garneau	20011	Mr. Arnold	20016
Mr. Berthold	20011	Mr. Beech	20016
Mr. Garneau	20011	Mr. Arnold	20016
Mr. Berthold	20011	Mr. Beech	20016
Mr. Garneau	20011		
Ms. Brosseau	20011	Canadian Heritage	
Mr. Garneau	20011	Mr. Nantel	20016
Ms. Ramsey	20011	Ms. Joly	20016
Mr. Garneau	20011		
Ms. Ramsey	20011	Employment Insurance	
Mr. Garneau	20011	Ms. Sansoucy	20017
Ms. Trudel	20012	Mr. Duclos	20017
Mr. Garneau	20012		
Natural Resources		Democratic Reform	
Mr. Liepert	20012	Mr. Godin	20017
Ms. Rudd	20012	Ms. Gould	20017
Mrs. Stubbs	20012	Mr. Richards	20017
Ms. Rudd	20012	Ms. Gould	20017
Mrs. Stubbs	20012		
Ms. Rudd	20012	Carbon Pricing	
Mr. G�n�reux	20013	Mr. Fast	20017
Mr. Garneau	20013	Ms. McKenna	20017
Ms. Rempel	20013		
Ms. Rudd	20013	Canadian Heritage	
Ms. Rempel	20013	Ms. Dabrusin	20017
Ms. Rudd	20013	Ms. Joly	20017
Indigenous Affairs		Public Safety	
Mr. Saganash	20013	Mrs. Boucher	20018
Mr. Garneau	20013	Mr. Goodale	20018
Mr. Cullen	20013		
Ms. Rudd	20014	Indigenous Affairs	
		Mr. Angus	20018
Taxation		Mrs. Philpott	20018
Mr. Poilievre	20014		
Ms. McKenna	20014	Public Safety	
Mr. Poilievre	20014	Mr. McKay	20018
Ms. McKenna	20014	Mr. Goodale	20018
Mr. Poilievre	20014		
Ms. McKenna	20014	Ethics	
Mr. Poilievre	20014	Mr. Gourde	20018
Mr. Lightbound	20014	Mr. Lamoureux	20018
Natural Resources		Immigration, Citizenship and Refugees	
Ms. Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	20015	Mr. Fortin	20019
Ms. McKenna	20015	Mr. Garneau	20019
Mr. Davies	20015	Mr. Fortin	20019
Ms. Rudd	20015	Mr. Garneau	20019
Science		International Trade	
Mr. Mass� (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matap�dia) ..	20015	Mr. Barsalou-Duval	20019
Ms. Duncan (Etobicoke North)	20015	Mr. Garneau	20019
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship		Presence in Gallery	
Mr. Paul-Hus	20015	The Speaker	20019
Mr. Garneau	20015		
		International Trade	
		Mr. Leslie	20019
		Motion	20019
		(Motion agreed to)	20020

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Federal Sustainable Development Act

Bill C-57. Report Stage	20020
Motion No. 1 negatived	20021
Ms. McKenna	20021
Motion for concurrence	20021
Motion agreed to	20022

International Trade

Mr. Cullen	20022
Amendment	20022
Amendment agreed to	20022

Business of the House

Ms. Bergen	20022
Mr. Garneau	20022

Budget Implementation Act, 2018, No. 1

Bill C-74. Report Stage	20023
Mr. Kmiec	20023
Ms. Tassi	20023
Mr. Barlow	20024

Privilege

Standing Committee on Finance

Mr. Poilievre	20024
Mr. Lamoureux	20025

Budget Implementation Act, 2018, No. 1

Bill C-74. Report Stage	20025
Mr. Genuis	20025
Ms. Tassi	20027
Mr. Long	20027
Ms. Mathysen	20027
Mr. Carrie	20029
Mr. Boulerice	20029
Mr. Clarke	20030
Mr. Gerretsen	20031
Mr. Ste-Marie	20031
Mr. Boulerice	20032
Mr. Carrie	20033
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	20034
Ms. Gladu	20034
Mr. Barlow	20036
Ms. Benson	20036
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	20036
Mr. Schmale	20036
Mr. Stetski	20038
Mr. Ste-Marie	20038
Mrs. Boucher	20038

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Opportunity for Workers with Disabilities Act

Bill C-395. Second reading	20039
Mr. Lake	20039
Mr. Lightbound	20041
Mr. Boulerice	20042
Mrs. Vecchio	20043
Mr. Gerretsen	20045
Ms. Gladu	20046

Mr. Poilievre	20047
Division on motion deferred	20048

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Budget Implementation Act, 2018, No. 1

Bill C-74. Report Stage	20048
Mrs. Boucher	20048
Mr. Genuis	20048
Ms. Boutin-Sweet	20048
Mr. O'Toole	20049
Mr. Simms	20050
Ms. Ramsey	20050
Mr. Saroya	20051
Ms. Ramsey	20052
Mr. Genuis	20052
Mr. Waugh	20053
Mr. Fergus	20054
Ms. Boutin-Sweet	20054
Mr. Boissonnault	20054
Mr. Brassard	20054
Division on Motions Nos. 1-46 deferred	20056
Division on Motions Nos. 47 to 67 deferred	20056
Division on Motions Nos. 68, 70 to 72, 74 to 94, 96 and 98 to 119 deferred	20056
Division on Motions Nos. 69, 73, 95, and 97 deferred ..	20056
Division on Motions Nos. 120 to 185 deferred	20057
Division on Motions Nos. 186 to 198 deferred	20057
Division on Motions Nos. 199 to 201 deferred	20057
Division on Motions Nos. 202 to 213 deferred	20057
Division on Motions Nos. 214 to 219	20057
Division on Motions Nos. 220 and 221 deferred	20058
Division on Motion No. 222 deferred	20058
Division on Motions Nos. 223 and 224 deferred	20058
Division on Motions Nos. 225 to 230	20058
Division on Motions Nos. 231 to 244 deferred	20058
Division on Motions Nos. 245 and 246 deferred	20058
Division on Motions Nos. 247 to 249 deferred	20059
Division on Motions Nos. 250 to 256 deferred	20059
Division on Motions Nos. 257 to 264 deferred	20059
Division on Motions Nos. 265 to 267 deferred	20060
Division on Motions Nos. 268 to 283 deferred	20060
Division on Motions Nos. 284 to 296 deferred	20060
Division on Motions Nos. 297 to 309 deferred	20060
Division on Motions Nos. 310, 316, 317, 324, and 329 deferred	20060
Division on Motions Nos. 311, 312 to 315, 318 to 323, 325 to 328, and 330 to 358 deferred	20061
Division on Motion No. 359 deferred	20061
Division on Motion No. 360 deferred	20061
Division on Motions Nos. 361 to 402 deferred	20061
Division on Motions Nos. 403 to 409 deferred	20061

Export and Import Permits Act

Bill C-47 Report Stage	20061
Mr. Kmiec	20061
Mr. Genuis	20063
Mr. Ayoub	20063
Mr. Barlow	20064

Ms. Boutin-Sweet	20065
Ms. Gladu	20065
Mr. Eglinski	20065
Ms. Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona).....	20066
Mr. Genuis	20067
Ms. Gladu	20067
Mrs. McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo).....	20067
Mr. Viersen	20068
Mr. Saganash	20069
Ms. Gladu	20069
Mr. Lukiwski	20069
Mr. Lamoureux.....	20070
Mr. Lloyd.....	20071
Mr. Brassard.....	20071
Ms. Gladu	20071
Mr. Genuis	20073
Mr. Boulerice.....	20073

Mr. Boulerice.....	20073
Mr. Viersen	20074
Mr. Godin	20074
Mr. Genuis	20075
Mr. Viersen	20075
Mrs. Caesar-Chavannes	20076
Mr. Genuis	20077
Division on Motion No. 1 deferred.....	20077
Division on Motion No. 2 deferred.....	20077

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Foreign Affairs

Mr. Genuis	20077
Mr. Mendicino.....	20078

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>