



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 148 • NUMBER 436 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Tuesday, June 18, 2019

—

Speaker: The Honourable Geoff Regan

CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, June 18, 2019

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayer

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

•(1005)

[*English*]

INFORMATION COMMISSIONER

The Speaker: I have the honour, pursuant to section 38 of the Access to Information Act, to lay upon the table the report of the Information Commissioner for the fiscal year ended March 31, 2019.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(3)(h), this document is deemed to have been permanently referred to the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PARLIAMENTARY BUDGET OFFICER

The Speaker: Pursuant to subsection 79.2(2) of the Parliament of Canada Act, it is my duty to present to the House a report from the Parliamentary Budget Officer entitled “Federal Program Spending on Housing Affordability”.

* * *

[*English*]

COMMISSIONER OF LOBBYING

The Speaker: I have the honour, pursuant to section 11 of the Lobbying Act, to lay upon the table the report of the Commissioner of Lobbying for the fiscal year ended March 31, 2019.

[*Translation*]

I also have the honour to lay upon the table the annual reports on the Access to Information and Privacy Acts of the Commissioner of Lobbying for the year 2018-19.

[*English*]

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(3)(h), these reports are deemed to have been permanently referred to the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics.

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's responses to 123 petitions.

* * *

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

Ms. Yasmin Ratansi (Don Valley East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1), I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, three reports of the Canadian Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

The first concerns the bilateral visit to New Zealand and Samoa, held in Auckland and Wellington, New Zealand and Apia, Samoa, from March 1 to 10, 2019.

The second concerns the meeting of the International Executive Committee Working Group on Programmes, held in London, United Kingdom, from January 24 to 25, 2019.

The third concerns the International Executive Committee Meeting, held in London, United Kingdom, from November 5 to 9, 2018.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND ESTIMATES

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Moose Jaw—Lake Centre—Lanigan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the 19th report of Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates, entitled “Veterans: A Valuable Resource for the Federal Public Service”.

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

Lastly, since this will be the final time I have an opportunity to speak on committee business before this Parliament dissolves, I want to thank, once again, all of those important people who assisted our committee over the last four years. In particular I want to point out one of analysts, as they say in Ottawa, who is with us today, Raphaëlle, who has been with this committee for four years and who has done an exemplary job. Frankly, without her assistance and her guidance, at times our committee would not have been able to perform the duties that it did.

Routine Proceedings

Once again, I thank not only Raphaëlle but all those officials, translators, interpreters, clerks and others who made our committee as efficient as it was.

The Speaker: I am sure that members of all committees would have similar things to say in appreciation for those who work on committee business as clerks, interpreters, analysts and so forth.

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. John Aldag (Cloverdale—Langley City, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 21st report of the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development, entitled “The Last Straw: Turning the Tide on Plastic Pollution in Canada”.

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

I would like to thank all of our support staff for the excellent work they did during this term.

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Hon. Larry Bagnell (Yukon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 98th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, entitled “A Parallel Debating Chamber for Canada’s House of Commons”.

This may be a very historic report, because it may lead to the discussion of having a second House of Commons, a second parallel chamber similar to the ones in Britain and Australia.

As mentioned by you, Mr. Speaker, and a previous Conservative member, we would like to thank all the clerks and researchers in our committee, and in particular the clerk and researcher who have been with us since the beginning, and I think members would find are the best clerk and the best researcher in the House, maybe on division, Andrew Lauzon, the clerk, and Andre Barnes, our parliamentary researcher, for their great work.

ACCESS TO INFORMATION, PRIVACY AND ETHICS

Mr. Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 20th report of the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics, entitled “International Grand Committee on Big Data, Privacy and Democracy”. Indeed, it was an honour to host 10 countries representing over 400 million people in Ottawa. The first meeting was held in London, a co-effort with my co-chair Damian Collins from London. I want to thank everyone who pulled it together and made it such a great event and also all the witnesses who travelled such long distances to make it the International Grand Committee that it was.

I also have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 19th report of the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics, entitled “Privacy of Digital Government Services”.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for your services over the last four years and have a great summer.

• (1010)

The Speaker: I wish the same to all members.

The hon. member for Scarborough—Guildwood.

PUBLIC SAFETY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Hon. John McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table the 37th report of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security on Bill C-98, an act to amend the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act and the Canada Border Services Agency Act and to make consequential amendments to other acts.

I also want to endorse the general comments on the way in which we are so well served by those officials who are clerks and analysts. In this instance, I also want to compliment and appreciate the co-operation of my vice-chairs, the members for Beloeil—Chambly and Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, and all of the members of the committee, along with the House leadership who have moved the bill in a very expeditious fashion because it is of great importance to the Canada Border Services Agency.

I also want to generally compliment the working of the committee. We have gone through something in the order of 13 major pieces of legislation, plus numerous reports, plus numerous private members' bills and we have had a collegial atmosphere that has served us all well. I am thankful to present the bill and this report.

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Anthony Housefather (Mount Royal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 30th report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights in relation to Bill C-266, an act to amend the Criminal Code (increasing parole ineligibility). The committee has studied the bill and has decided to report the bill back to the House without amendment.

I also want to thank the support staff of the committee.

[Translation]

I especially want to thank our clerk, Marc-Olivier Girard, and our analysts, Chloé Forget and Lyne Casavant, who did terrific work for our committee.

[English]

In conclusion, I also want to salute three members of the committee who will not be running again: the member for Niagara Falls, the member for Victoria and the member for West Nova, who all served on the committee for a long period of time over the last three years. They are all great parliamentarians and I think the House will miss each and every one of them.

* * *

[Translation]

DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT ACT

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-462, An Act to amend the Department of the Environment Act (greenhouse gas reduction action plan).

Routine Proceedings

He said: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Kootenay—Columbia for seconding this important bill.

The environment and climate change are the biggest issues of the day. We have a challenge to confront, but sadly, the process has become either a war of words with plenty of slogans but little action, or a deeply partisan issue, depending on how we look at it.

This bill will depoliticize the issue and force the government to meet its greenhouse gas reduction objectives by legislating a plan setting out GHG reduction targets. The government would be required to table an independent review in the House of Commons each year to be debated by parliamentarians.

This bill is inspired by the late, great Jack Layton, and I hope a majority of members will vote for it.

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

* * *

●(1015)

[English]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

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

That, notwithstanding any Special or Standing Order or usual practice of the House, on Tuesday, June 18, 2019, the question shall be put on the opposition motion at 5:30 pm after which all questions necessary to dispose of the business of supply shall be put forthwith and successively, without debate or amendment.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

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

That, notwithstanding any Standing Order or usual practice of the House, the Prime Minister be permitted to make a statement pursuant to Standing Order 31 on Wednesday, June 19, 2019.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

PETITIONS**FIREARMS**

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition signed by Canadians from the ridings of Kanata—Carleton, Ottawa—Vanier, Nepean, Elgin—Middlesex—London and London—Fanshawe. They call on the House of Commons to respect the rights of law-abiding firearms owners and reject the Prime Minister's plan to waste taxpayers' money on a ban on guns that are already banned.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition from hundreds of Canadians, who point out that over 30,000 Canadians die annually from medical errors; the third leading cause of death in this country. The only resort they have for compensation is tort law, which ties up our courts and is financially and emotionally devastating.

All provincial governments transfer millions of taxpayer dollars to the Canadian Medical Protective Association to finance lawyers to fight these claims from patients. Because of this unfair advantage, only 2% of patient lawsuits are successful. Seven countries use no-fault health care compensation for medical errors.

These citizens call on the government to establish a mandatory error reporting system to facilitate learning from our mistakes, mandate courses on empathy and compassion for all health care workers, and establish a public inquiry to determine fair methods of compensation for medical errors, including arbitration, mediation and a no-fault health care compensation board, using the funds now transferred to the CMPA.

FIREARMS

Ms. Julie Dabrusin (Toronto—Danforth, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of presenting a petition that was started by Joan Howard, a member of my community who lost her son, Kempton Howard, to gun violence over 15 years ago.

She seeks this petition to create and support a national program for helping loved ones of murder victims, fund and promote programming that diverts young people away from gangs and crime, and that takes steps to ensure equal access to opportunities for young people across Canada and to strengthen and enhance the Canada Border Services Agency's ability to stop gun smuggling.

I stand with my community in fighting gun violence and making sure we have a safe community.

Routine Proceedings

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I am presenting a petition today that is timely, given the resolution last night that Canada is in a climate emergency. Youth petitioners and those who describe themselves as caring deeply about youth are calling on the Government of Canada to take meaningful actions to hit the obligations under the Paris Agreement, which are not the current 30% below 2005 by 2030 target, but in fact, a target designed to hit 1.5°C global average temperature increase and well below 2°C.

Petitioners call on the government to eliminate fossil fuel subsidies, place a comprehensive and steadily rising national carbon price, and redirect investments into renewable energy, energy efficiency, low-carbon transportation and job training.

HUMAN ORGAN TRAFFICKING

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition in support of Bill S-240, on organ harvesting.

• (1020)

AFGHAN MINORITY COMMUNITIES

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is in support of vulnerable minorities in Afghanistan. It calls on the government to offer them support.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): The third petition, Mr. Speaker, raises the issue of the plight of Pakistani Christians, many of whom are stuck in Thailand. The petitioners call on the government to allow private sponsorships to help them respond to that situation.

FALUN GONG

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

[*Translation*]

LAC-MÉGANTIC

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have another 50 or so signatures to add to the 3,792 signatures on last week's petition calling for a public inquiry into the Lac-Mégantic tragedy.

This petition is not just about the Lac-Mégantic tragedy. It is about all aspects of rail safety. Decades of deregulation and privatization have jeopardized rail safety across the country.

Petitions are a way for citizens to make their voices heard. There are other ways. A documentary series about the Lac-Mégantic tragedy is in production. We will not give up.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I can see that many members want to present petitions, so I would ask members to present their petitions as briefly as possible.

The hon. member for Kootenay—Columbia.

[*English*]

CHILD CARE

Mr. Wayne Stetski (Kootenay—Columbia, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to present e-petition 2176 with 706 signatures. This is one of the most pervasive and long-lasting issues, both in my riding of Kootenay—Columbia and across Canada, and that is the lack of affordable child care. As we all know, lack of affordable child care keeps a lot of people, particularly women, out of the workforce. We also need to make sure we are paying our child care workers appropriately.

The petitioners call upon the Government of Canada to establish an adequately funded framework to ensure that affordable, licensed child care is universally available throughout Canada, not just in Quebec and the pilot project in British Columbia, and that child care workers are appropriately compensated.

HEALTH

Hon. John McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this might be an appropriate moment to remind colleagues that it is an ancient right of citizens to present petitions to the Crown, notwithstanding what the member might think.

These petitioners are concerned about devices that have been planted in their brains without their knowledge and consent, affecting a variety of health issues. The petition is signed by hundreds of people from across Canada.

BOIL WATER ADVISORIES

Mr. Paul Manly (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, GP): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions to present.

The first one brings attention to the 20 years that the community of Shoal Lake 40 First Nation has had a boil water advisory. This is the very same community that supplies water to Winnipeg. The petitioners bring attention to boil water advisories for 100 other communities in the area.

The petitioners call upon the federal government, in collaboration with our local and provincial governments, in an act of reconciliation with indigenous people, to begin construction of the necessary water treatment plant at Shoal Lake 40 First Nation. They call for complete transparency in the planning process, including timelines, with the people of Shoal Lake 40. Now that the construction of Freedom Road has begun, they believe the time is right to implement the construction plans for the water treatment plant.

Routine Proceedings

STATUS OF WOMEN

Mr. Paul Manly (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, GP): Mr. Speaker, the second petition calls upon the House of Commons to recognize that violence against women remains a critical problem in Canada and that it disproportionately impacts indigenous women, as reflected in the crisis of missing and murdered aboriginal women and children; that striving for pay equity and equal participation for women in leadership roles must be a political priority for all members of Parliament; and that shifting cultural attitudes toward women and gender minorities in our society requires structural changes to education and socialization.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I want to remind hon. members to keep it as brief as possible. I notice there are still quite a number of petitions.

The hon. member for Portage—Lisgar.

PHYSICIAN-ASSISTED DYING

Hon. Candice Bergen (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to present petitions from people who live in my riding of Portage—Lisgar. These petitioners are asking that medical practitioners, nurse practitioners, pharmacists, etc., would have protection of freedom of conscience when they are administering health services.

• (1025)

[*Translation*]

CHILDREN'S RIGHTS

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet (Hochelaga, NDP): Mr. Speaker, children of parents in irregular situations are not entitled to the same benefits as all other children. That is unfair.

That includes children of parents who are homeless for a number of reasons, including the housing first policy. The Elizabeth Fry Society would like to right this wrong, and that is exactly what these petitioners want.

[*English*]

EQUALIZATION

Hon. Michelle Rempel (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the hundreds of people who have signed this petition and are so frustrated with the government's policy to destroy Canada's energy sector through bills like Bill C-69 and Bill C-48. The petitioners are calling on the government to review the equalization formula, given the punitive policies against the Alberta energy sector. This is a petition that I support. They are also calling on the government to scrap Bill C-69. It is crazy.

[*Translation*]

CHILDREN'S RIGHTS

Ms. Karine Trudel (Jonquière, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table in the House a petition from the Elizabeth Fry Society on children in irregular situations, such as children who have parents in prison or the children of single mothers.

On behalf of all Canadians, I am pleased to table this petition calling on the government to show greater flexibility toward children in vulnerable situations.

[*English*]

WILD SALMON

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to present two petitions today from residents of Union Bay, Royston, Cumberland and Courtenay.

The first petition is titled "Save Wild Salmon". It states that Canada's scientists have proven that diseased Atlantic farmed salmon in open-net pens in the Pacific Ocean are threatening the health of wild salmon. British Columbia, in particular, is well positioned to become a world leader in closed containment salmon aquaculture. The petitioners are calling on Canada to invest in a safe, sustainable industry that protects Pacific wild salmon, maintains employment and develops new technologies, jobs and export opportunities.

TRANS MOUNTAIN PIPELINE

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is titled "Let's Save Our Coast...Again". The petitioners are calling on the government not to expand the Trans Mountain pipeline as it will increase the risk of bitumen oil spills, endangering Canada's environment and wildlife and putting thousands of marine and tourism jobs at risk, and as it disregards the right of indigenous peoples to say no to projects affecting their territories and resources. The petitioners state that the Trans Mountain pipeline will increase greenhouse gas emissions and make it impossible for Canada to meet its global climate targets.

CHILDREN'S RIGHTS

Ms. Georgina Jolibois (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to present a petition led by the Elizabeth Fry Society about children in irregular situations.

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, thousands of people continue to sign a petition, originated by the Elizabeth Fry Society, that simply points out that some of Canada's most vulnerable children, because of various flaws in the policy and design of programs, are not able to access funding through several federal programs, including the Canada child benefit and children's special allowances. The petitioners are calling on the government to pay attention to this issue and fix the flaws so that Canada's most vulnerable and needy children get access to the support they so desperately need.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House to table a petition from the Elizabeth Fry Society. This organization is very concerned about the situation of many children in Canada whose parents are in vulnerable situations, for example, parents who are in prison or homeless.

Business of Supply

Under the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, these children are entitled to the same social benefits as every other child in our society.

• (1030)

[*English*]

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present hundreds of additional names to the tens of thousands of Canadians who have petitioned the government over the last few months. This petition has been sponsored by activists from the Elizabeth Fry Society, and we thank them for their activism.

What the petitioners are asking for is very simple. Irregular situations mean that so many children in Canada do not have access to the programs and services that other children have access to. The Canadian government has a responsibility, under the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, to make sure that discrimination is eliminated.

To this point, the government has not provided an adequate response to this petition and to the requests from activists across the country that all children be treated equally and have a right to the same benefits in Canada.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

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

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—THE ENVIRONMENT

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Today being the last allotted day for the supply period ending June 23, the House will proceed as usual to the consideration and passage of the appropriation bill. In view of recent practices, do hon. members agree that the bill be distributed now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*English*]

Hon. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC) moved:

That, given that the carbon tax will not reduce emissions at its current rate and it is already making life more expensive for Canadians, the House call on the government to repeal the carbon tax and replace it with a real environment plan.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with my colleague, the hon. member for Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, a beautiful riding in British Columbia.

The motion before us says that the Liberal climate plan, which is effectively a tax plan, should be replaced by a real plan that will move Canada forward to address its emission challenges, addresses the global challenge of green gas emissions and climate change and does it in a way that is respectful to Canadian taxpayers.

The reality is this. Right now the Liberals have brought forward something they call a climate plan. However, it is not a climate plan; it is a tax plan. How do we know it is a tax plan? If members remember back to when they rolled out this plan, a briefing was held by departmental officials from Environment Canada. The minister's own officials said that the foundational element of the government's so-called climate change plan was the carbon tax. Therefore, they admitted right off the bat that this was a tax plan. Of course, today the Liberals are denying that. I think Canadians understand that this is all about taxes.

There is another reason why Canadians have good reason to believe that this is nothing more than a craven tax plan to raise revenues for the government. The minister often gets up in the House and talks about the 50 different elements within her tool kit that the government is deploying to address climate change in Canada. It has a program of 50 different elements and it will let the provinces pick whatever elements they choose to meet their own targets, except for one tool. What is that tool? It is the carbon tax. Out of 50 tools, the one tool that the Liberals are going to ram down the throats of the provinces and territories, ram it down the throats of consumers and taxpayers across the country is the carbon tax.

We have to ask ourselves why this is the only tool the Liberals have made mandatory across the country. The only conclusion Canadians can draw is that this tax is an essential element in the Liberal government raising more revenues, tax revenues, in the future to spend on its own political priorities rather than on the priorities of Canadians. This is what we are left with. It is one of the reasons why we brought forward this motion, clarifying for Canadians that the Liberal climate change plan is nothing but a craven tax plan. Today, Canadians are already paying the price for that plan.

This is a cash grab from Canadians and they understand that this is on top of all the other tax increases they pay because of the Liberal government.

Members may recall that under the previous Conservative government, taxes on Canadians reached an all-time low, the lowest tax burden on Canadians for over 50 years. Today, Canadians pay, on average, \$800 more in taxes than they did back in 2015. On top of that, the carbon tax is being layered on families. Fifty per cent of those families are within \$200 of being insolvent. Along with the challenges Canadians have to face, where they struggle day to day to meet their mortgage payments, take care of their kids' educations, buy groceries and put gas in their cars, the Liberals are laying a carbon tax on top of that.

What is worse, and what the Liberals did not come out and confess, is the fact that there is GST layered on top of that carbon tax. Therefore, Canadians are paying a tax on tax. I think a lot of Canadians watching right now are wondering whether I am serious about this.

Business of Supply

●(1035)

The price at the pump has gone up dramatically already and the government is charging GST on top of that. The Liberals claim that all this money will go back to the taxpayer, which is not true of course. It is a tax on everything. It will cost Canadians more when they fill up their cars with gas, heat their homes and buy their groceries.

The plan right now calls for this tax to move from today's \$20 per tonne of greenhouse gas emissions to \$50 per tonne by 2022. Last week, the Parliamentary Budget Officer came out with a report that said that in order for the Liberals to reach their Paris agreement targets, they would have to jack up that tax to over \$100 per tonne of emissions, more than doubling what it would be in 2022 and more than five times greater than what that carbon tax is today. This is a craven tax plan.

The Prime Minister has said that when it came to gas prices, higher gas prices was exactly what he wants. That is a statement from our own Prime Minister. He said that this extra tax burden on already overtaxed Canadians was exactly what he wanted.

Let me talk a bit about the Paris targets.

We must remember that this carbon tax is a foundational element of a plan to meet the Paris emissions targets that Canada signed onto. Is the government actually meeting its Paris targets? The answer is, no it is not. The government is far off.

We know from internal environment ministry reports that in 2016, the government had already fallen 44 megatons short of its Paris agreement targets. In 2017, it had fallen 66 megatons short of its targets. In 2018, it fell 79 megatons short of its targets. However, it gets worse.

Last year, when the government calculated that 79 megaton shortfall, it had already created something out of thin air called the land use and land use change in forestry component. The acronym is LULUCF. It essentially says that Canada sequesters carbon in its natural landscape, forests, grasslands, wetlands and farmlands. We are sequestering this carbon. The reality is that the government has not done the science to prove that, in fact, a net sequestration is taking place.

Available science, which is spotty at best, indicates that since about 2000-01, Canada has been a net contributor toward emissions from our natural landscape. The government has said that the science may not be there, that the Paris agreement does not allow Canada to account for this 24 extra megatons of emission reductions, but it will take it anyway. It says that Canada is only 79 megatons short. If we factor in this unsubstantiated claim that the government will reduce emissions through natural landscape, it is actually 103 megatons short.

Is the government meeting its Paris targets, which was the goal of the carbon tax, the foundational element of the Liberal climate change plan? The Liberals are not even meeting those targets and they are falling further behind every year.

Is the Liberal plan a failure? Absolutely, and members will have to agree with me. If we look at what is being measured and

accountability for what we are delivering for the plan, the Liberals are way off the mark.

●(1040)

Very briefly, we are going to be rolling out our own environment plan tomorrow. It is going to give Canada a better chance, the best chance, to meet its Paris targets.

Therefore, I strongly support the motion before us, replacing the Liberal carbon tax plan with a real plan to address climate change.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a great amount of respect for the member. We sat on the environment committee together, and I know he cares. However, what I find deeply troubling about the motion before us and the member's statements is that he is playing with the lives of future generations when he is making those claims in the House, particularly about putting a price on pollution and how ineffective it will be.

We have a Nobel Prize-winning economist who has said that this is the way to fight climate change. In 2008, Stephen Harper, the former prime minister of Canada, said that putting a price on pollution was a way to fight climate change. We had the Pope last weekend endorse putting a price on pollution.

Now I hear the Conservatives heckling about the fact that I am invoking the Pope. How ironic is that?

It is a basic economic principle that when we want to reduce something, we put a price on it. How can the member stand here today and go against what a Nobel Prize-winning economist and what Stephen Harper, his former leader and the former prime minister of Canada, would say and endorse?

●(1045)

Hon. Ed Fast: Mr. Speaker, actually, Mr. Harper does not support a carbon tax and I can tell the member why.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: I will send you the link. There's a video.

Hon. Ed Fast: Mr. Speaker, we have a perfect example in Canada of a failed carbon tax policy, which is in my home province of British Columbia. It introduced a carbon tax back in 2008 with three promises.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Like you did.

Hon. Ed Fast: Mr. Speaker, he is heckling me.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): There was heckling on both sides. I would appreciate it if we respect the person who is speaking, whether he or she is asking the question or answering the question.

The hon. member for Abbotsford.

Hon. Ed Fast: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for that admonishment.

In 2008, the British Columbia government of the day, which was a Liberal government by the way, made three promises about the carbon tax in B.C.

Business of Supply

First, it would be revenue neutral. In other words, we would take one dollar out of one pocket and put it back in the other pocket of the taxpayer. For a law that was in place, what is to date? Is the tax revenue neutral? No, it was eliminated, and it is now a cash cow for the government.

The second promise that was broken was that it would be capped at \$30 per tonne of emissions. That promise was broken. Today that tax is \$40 per tonne and going up every year.

The third promise was that it would reduce overall carbon emissions in B.C., but today those emissions continue to go up and up.

These three broken promises prove the point that carbon taxation does not work.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech.

One thing is certain: Once the Conservatives sink their teeth into something, they hold on tight and do not let go. Unfortunately, they do not have an alternative plan.

The Liberal government is being hypocritical. It says one thing and then buys a pipeline. Meanwhile, the Conservatives have been criticizing the price on pollution and acting as though we can continue to pollute without any consequences for future generations. They have no plan.

I would like my colleague to tell me what he will do to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

[*English*]

Hon. Ed Fast: Mr. Speaker, one more sleep and the member will be able to see our climate change plan, our environment plan, writ large. We believe it will give Canada the best chance of meeting the Paris targets. Am I going to scoop our leader with that announcement? Of course, I am not.

However, I believe the member is genuine in wanting to make progress in addressing our emissions. They are global emissions, by the way, because this is a global challenge that requires a global response. Canada is perfectly positioned to deliver on that response.

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for Abbotsford for his contribution to our country and to our debate today by putting forward his motion, one I am happy to speak to and support. To me, this is an important subject, and I will explain why.

Climate change has had a serious impact on my riding and on British Columbia in general. I would like to give an example. The science shows us that our winters are not as cold as they once were. Because our winters are not as cold, the mountain pine beetle has managed to survive through the winter months and not be killed off. This, in turn, has allowed the pine beetle to thrive, and in turn, it has devastated our forests. That has created two problems. One is an economic problem. Throughout B.C. and my riding, we have had a number of lumber mill closures. This can have a devastating impact on small rural communities. It is simply devastating. One of the reasons for these mill closures is a lack of fibre. Because too much

forest has been killed off by the pine beetle, there is not enough supply for timber. That is one major problem.

The second major problem is that all this dead timber, combined with our hot summers, has basically created a powder keg of fuel for a wildfire. Make no mistake. Be the cause lightning or humans, when there is a forest fire, this dead beetle wood is producing wildfire activity the likes of which British Columbia has never seen. This not only hurts tourism but can also harm human health. Those with respiratory issues have serious problems dealing with all the smoke and ash. There is also a loss of homes and small businesses and a massive cost for fighting those fires. It is all part of a serious problem.

However, here is the thing: the carbon tax does not stop this. It does nothing to help relieve the situation. The Liberals like to pretend otherwise, but after 10 years of having the carbon tax in British Columbia, our forest fire situation only looks more dire.

Let us overlook that fact for a moment and see if the carbon tax is working otherwise in British Columbia. Total greenhouse gas emissions in B.C. fell in the period between 2004 and 2008. Much of this paralleled what happened nationally with greenhouse gas emissions, and this was mainly attributed to the worldwide economic meltdown that occurred during the later part of that time frame.

In the summer of 2008, former premier Gordon Campbell introduced Canada's first carbon tax in the run-up to the 2009 B.C. general election. The B.C. NDP opposed the carbon tax at that time.

What has happened in B.C. since the carbon tax was introduced in late 2008? It is a great question. I hate to break this fact to the Liberal government, but total greenhouse emissions in British Columbia have gone up. Yes, they have gone up. In fact, there has been a 1.5% increase in emissions in B.C. since 2015 alone. Let me repeat that for the benefit of the Minister of Environment. Since 2015, there has been a 1.5% increase in emissions in British Columbia, despite its having a carbon tax. In other words, the carbon tax is not working.

We have also discovered something else. It is called carbon leakage. What is carbon leakage? Let me give members an example. In 2008, when the carbon tax was first introduced in British Columbia, basically 100% of all cement used in British Columbia was manufactured in British Columbia. Well, why not? Concrete is not exactly a lightweight, inexpensive product to import and then transport to other jurisdictions. What happened when B.C.-produced concrete became subject to a carbon tax in 2008? Naturally, it became more expensive. By 2014, B.C.-produced concrete accounted for roughly 65% of all concrete used in British Columbia, because cheaper concrete was being imported from jurisdictions with no carbon tax. That is a 35% loss of market share in B.C.'s own market.

Of course, our federal Liberal government knows all about this. That is why, quietly last summer, the Liberals started giving carbon tax exemptions to some of Canada's biggest polluters. However, there is no exemption for small business in their plan, or in my home province, for the average middle-class family. In fact, in B.C., the NDP has now turned the carbon tax into a billion-dollar tax grab that hits families and small business owners hard.

Business of Supply

•(1050)

Ironically, the B.C. government is intervening in the carbon tax jurisdictional litigation, arguing that if other provinces do not have a carbon tax, B.C.'s competitiveness will be harmed. Of course, the same principle applies to Canada, where we try to compete with some of our major trading partners that do not have a carbon tax.

This is how carbon leakage is defined in British Columbia:

industries that compete with industry in countries that may have low or no carbon price. If BC industry loses market share to more polluting competitors, known as carbon leakage, it affects our economy and does not reduce global greenhouse gas emissions.

To recap what we know from the British Columbia example, after 10 years of having a carbon tax, it has done nothing to prevent the serious climate-change-related problems we are facing in British Columbia. Worse yet, the evidence also shows that it has done nothing to reduce total greenhouse gas emissions. They have actually increased since the B.C. carbon tax was created. It makes British Columbia less competitive, all the while letting major polluters off the hook. Basically, all the carbon tax has done in British Columbia is act as a giant tax grab for the NDP government.

Here is another fact I will share on this point. The B.C. LNG project we often hear the Liberal government boast about, which, by the way, was first approved by the previous government, has been totally exempted from carbon tax increases. The only way this went forward was that it was totally exempted from future carbon tax increases, and it will be a major contributor to increasing B.C. greenhouse gas emissions. Honestly, none of this reconciles, and the facts clearly show that.

If members doubt the facts and evidence from British Columbia, look no further than our very own Parliamentary Budget Officer, who last week made it very clear that the present course of the Liberal government will completely and totally fail to meet the greenhouse gas reduction targets it has set, unless, of course, the Liberal government desires to massively increase the carbon tax load for everyday citizens. That point could not have been made any clearer.

We are seeing mixed messages from the Liberal government on this. Will the Liberals or will they not massively raise the carbon tax if re-elected? We do not get clear answers.

Where does that leave us? It leaves us here with this motion, because it states the obvious. The carbon tax is not working. It continues to fail, so let us do away with this carbon tax so that we can focus on and find other ways to reduce our emissions. We have a collective responsibility to reduce our carbon footprint. We cannot sit back, watch this carbon tax continue to fail and try to pretend that we are taking action on reducing emissions, when in reality, we are not. If anything, we are taking action to provide more carbon tax exemptions to major polluters, and much like the B.C. LNG project, to major projects.

We can pretend that this is not occurring, but it is. Why did the Liberal government provide a 95.5% carbon-tax discount on dirty coal power in the province of New Brunswick? Does anyone seriously believe that making coal power cheaper is any way to

reduce our greenhouse gas emissions? It is a total farce, and we sell ourselves and our future short if we continue to play that charade.

I care about our children's future as much as the members opposite, so let us stop the charade today. Let us admit that the carbon tax has failed. Not only has it failed, but it continues to fail. Yes, it may work in theory if everyone were on the same page, but carbon leakage is proof that we are not. Let us do away with the carbon tax and instead let us work together and focus on real, tangible ways to reduce our emissions and lower our carbon footprint.

That is why I am going to be voting in support of this motion today. Again, I thank the member for Abbotsford for his leadership on this file.

•(1055)

Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member across the way for a stimulating discussion on this today. I was thinking of my middle daughter when he was talking. When she was small and we were living in Winnipeg, she hated putting on her coat in the wintertime. When we would get her coat on, she would struggle and struggle. The last thing she wanted was to wear her coat in the wintertime.

It seems that it is the same with the Conservative Party members. The last thing they want to do is work on climate change. Every time we bring up climate change, they struggle, scream and get upset about climate change, but part of the program is putting a price on pollution. It is part of a 50-point program that also includes incentivizing businesses, municipalities, hospitals and universities to save on their use of energy.

Could the member comment on the rest of our program? We have a plan. We are still waiting for their plan. Maybe he could give us a hint of what part of their plan might also contribute to fighting climate change.

Mr. Dan Albas: Mr. Speaker, many of us here have had the experience of raising children. It is a difficult situation. It is best left to individual parents to raise their children. That is something Conservatives believe parents can do best.

However, when we come to this place, we should be prepared to talk about what works and what does not. We have a Parliamentary Budget Officer who has said that with the tools that have been presented so far by the current government, particularly the so-called price on carbon the Liberals continue to talk about, we will not meet the Paris targets by 79 million megatonnes. That is a failure of the government.

Business of Supply

We will be presenting our full plan. I am mindful that the member in his “Real Change” platform had a single paragraph about working with provinces to deal with an international problem. We have provinces that are taking the government to court. We have provinces that are pushing back. The current government has done nothing to work with the provinces. We cannot afford to simply continue to say that father knows best and push on the provinces and not find ways to work together to deal with this issue. The provinces have the majority of the policy levers when it comes to energy, transportation and housing. This member should realize that.

● (1100)

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to challenge a statement my hon. colleague from British Columbia made about the efficacy of the carbon tax.

In preparation for this debate on this major issue, I requested that the Library of Parliament provide my office with the impact of the British Columbia carbon tax on emissions. Since it was introduced in 2008, there has been a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions in British Columbia of 2.2%. The number in 2008 was 63,737 kilotonnes, and the number in 2016, the most recent year we have numbers for, was 62,264 kilotonnes. I believe the kilotonne is the measurement being used. That is a 2.2% reduction.

The member said that he did not think the carbon tax had an impact. That is clearly wrong. It has had an impact. By the way, one would expect carbon emissions to have gone up significantly in that time period, so the fact that there is actually an overall reduction shows that the carbon tax does work.

However, I agree with the member that the carbon tax on its own is not going to be sufficient. I personally believe that we are facing a climate crisis. We have to use every single policy tool we can to deal with this. That is carbon sequestration, a carbon tax, a cap and trade system and retrofitting. We need conservation efforts. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has sent out alarm bells that should have every single legislator in every chamber like this in the world absolutely riveted, because we have 11 years to have reductions of 45% over 2010. The member is right. We are not meeting these targets. The previous Conservative government did not meet the targets, nor has the current Liberal government.

Is the member's plan going to meet the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change targets and reduce greenhouse gas emissions in Canada by 45% over 2010 levels? Yes or no.

Mr. Dan Albas: Mr. Speaker, when one of the NDP members rose on this debate a few weeks ago, I quoted specifically from the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change in British Columbia. It actually said that the last year of data we had indicated a 1.5% increase in emissions. It is on the B.C. government website. I suggest that the member look at it and he can inform himself. Obviously, during the economic recession post-2008, we saw a decline in industrial activity. The member might want to familiarize himself with the latest part of the cycle we are in.

When it comes to the plan, the Parliamentary Budget Officer evaluated the current government's plan and found it wanting. That is where we need to have the starting point. We will be presenting our plan, and the member can choose which plan he thinks is best.

Mr. Sean Fraser (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as always it is an honour to rise in this House and speak about the topic of climate change, which is near and dear to my heart and something I consistently hear about from my constituents.

I am particularly inspired by the voices of the young Canadians I represent in Central Nova, who have brought this issue to the fore and insist that legislators at the municipal, provincial and federal levels take collective action to combat the existential threat that climate change represents.

For me, the starting point in this conversation is that climate change is not only real but primarily driven by humans' industrial activity. Sometimes, when we talk about climate change, we are guilty of causing apocalypse fatigue, which causes people to feel they cannot do anything meaningful about it. At other times, we dig into the technical details about CO₂ concentration being at 415 parts per million, and we lose people's attention.

These are all important things to be addressing, but it is important to explain to Canadians that the consequences of climate change are very real. We are feeling them today, but we have an opportunity and, in my mind, an obligation to do something about it. We simply need to implement the solutions we already know exist, which can make a difference by bringing our emissions down and preventing the worst consequences of climate change from impacting our communities.

We are all familiar, of course, with the consequences of climate change. We see them in our own communities. On the east coast we have experienced more frequent and more severe storm surges and hurricanes. Recently my colleagues from New Brunswick have shown me pictures of their communities, which were literally under water. We can see the forest fires ravaging communities in western Canada, the heat waves in Quebec and Ontario that are taking the lives of Canadians, and the melting ice sheets in Canada's north. There is not a corner of this country that has not been impacted by the environmental effects of climate change.

I mentioned this during the debate yesterday as well, but the consequences are not purely environmental; they are social and economic as well. We see entire communities that have been displaced because we continue to build them in flood zones. Floods that used to take place every few hundred years are now taking place every few years.

We see indigenous communities that have traditionally practised a way of life that involved hunting caribou, for example. That may no longer be an option because of the combined impacts of human activity and climate change on the species they have traditionally relied on to practise their way of life.

I do not have to look all across the country; I can see the economic impacts of climate change in my own backyard. We rely heavily on the lobster fishery in Nova Scotia. I represent both the eastern shore and the Northumberland Strait, which have vibrant lobster fisheries today that represent nearly \$2 billion in exports for our provincial economy.

Business of Supply

However, when we look a little south, to the state of Maine, we have seen a decrease of 22 million pounds in their catch over the past few years due to a combination of things like rising ocean temperatures, deoxygenation of the gulf region, and other environmental factors that are having a very real impact.

We are seeing a drop in industrial production and manufacturing in places that have been impacted by forest fires, and when we go for lengthy periods with droughts, we know that our agricultural sector suffers. There is a very real consequence to inaction on climate change in the prevention of economic activity. We know there are solutions. We have an obligation to implement the most effective ones that we know exist.

This brings me to the current motion, which attacks both the efficacy and affordability of our plan to put a price on pollution. I have good news for the members opposite. In fact, we know that putting a price on pollution is the most effective thing we can do to help reduce our emissions. We have identified a path forward on the advice of science, facts and evidence, including world-leading expertise, to ensure that as we put forward a plan that brings our emissions down, the affordability of life is not only not impacted but in fact made a little better for Canadian families.

Over the course of my remarks, I want to touch on the efficacy of carbon pricing. I will talk about some of its benefits and address the affordability, but also highlight some other measures we are implementing. We know that pricing alone is likely insufficient to get us where we need to be, but the attack built into the motion, that our government does not have a real plan, rings hollow from a party that has yet to produce a plan of its own.

● (1105)

I will take a step back and explain in broad strokes what carbon pricing really involves. There are more or less two different ways one can put a market mechanism to price pollution. One is a cap-and-trade system, where one sets an overall cap and industrial players that exceed their credits can buy credits from those that have reduced emissions, in order to bring emissions down across society over time. The other, perhaps simpler, way is to put a price on the thing one does not want, which is pollution, so that people buy less of it. If one puts a price on pollution and people buy less of it but the revenues are returned to households, life can be made more affordable for a majority of families. In a nutshell, that is how it works.

We know it works. We have seen other jurisdictions implement these solutions and have monumental successes. In the United Kingdom, which imposed a price on pollution over and above the European Union's cap-and-trade system, there was a rapid transition from coal-fired power plants to other, less-emitting sources. The United Kingdom has achieved magnificent reductions in recent history, in part because of the way it used a market-based mechanism with a price on pollution.

The example of British Columbia came up previously. One of the members who spoke earlier indicated that emissions have gone up to 1.5% and dismissed it as not possibly working. I commend my NDP colleague, who noted that one should not be cherry-picking data the way that member did. In fact, there has been a 2.2% reduction since the price on pollution came into place. More importantly, when we

look at the example of British Columbia, despite population growth and serious economic development we can see that the per capita rate of consumption of greenhouse gases has actually come down significantly.

The report of the Ecofiscal Commission, which studied this in depth, estimates that emissions in British Columbia are 5% to 15% lower than they would have been had no price been put on pollution in the first place. Five per cent to 15% is a serious reduction from one policy tool alone, and we know we can do better by doing more.

However, it is not just the practical examples of which we have empirical evidence that show that this in fact works. We have seen support from folks who really know what they are talking about. Last year's Nobel Prize for economics went to Professor William Nordhaus for his development of the kind of approach we are now seeking to implement in Canada. In fact, he pointed specifically to the example in British Columbia of the kind of model that could work best.

Professor Nordhaus has identified a way to ensure a price is put on pollution, so that what we do not want becomes more expensive and people buy less of it, but affordability is maintained by returning the revenues to households. It is common sense when one thinks about it. It is quite straightforward, and it works.

Mark Cameron, Stephen Harper's former director of policy, has pointed to the fact that this is the right path forward. Even Doug Ford's chief budget adviser testified before the Senate, in 2016 I believe, saying something to the effect that the single most effective thing we can do to transition to a low-carbon economy is to put a price on pollution. Preston Manning has been arguing for this kind of approach for years.

When the partisan lens is removed, we see folks on different sides of the aisle who have a strong history with the Liberals, the Conservatives and the NDP, who all support this approach because they know it is the most effective thing we can do. In particular, I point to the recent Saskatchewan Court of Appeal decision that upheld the federal government's constitutional power to implement a price on pollution across Canada in provinces that would not come to the table with a serious plan. The court said that it was undisputed, based on the factual record before the court, that GHG pricing is not just part and parcel of an effective plan to combat climate change but also an essential aspect of the global effort to curb emissions.

This is why the court found it to be a national concern that some provinces would not have pricing, which gave rise to the federal government's authority to implement a plan. It is an essential aspect of the global effort to reduce emissions. That part was even put in italics, specifically so legislators would see that this is so important. We have to move forward with it if we are going to take our responsibilities seriously.

Business of Supply

However, these are not the only voices; I can point to a number of others. The Parliamentary Budget Officer, whom the opposition members have quoted ad nauseam in this House, has said that putting a price on pollution is the most effective way to reduce our emissions. He also pointed out something I hope we will get into during questions and comments, which is that eight out of 10 families will be better off in jurisdictions in which the federal backstop applies. This is because we are returning the revenues directly to households. The only families who will pay more than they get back in the form of a rebate are the 20% in the highest-earning households in Canada. I believe it maxes out at \$50 a year for the wealthiest families in Saskatchewan.

• (1110)

Meanwhile, in various provinces there will be rebates of between \$250 and \$609, depending on how much pollution is generated in those provinces. The bottom line is that eight out of 10 families, no matter which province they live in where the federal system applies, will receive more in the form of a rebate than their cost of living will go up. Therefore, the argument that this is about affordability rings hollow.

I point out in particular the comments this past weekend by Pope Francis, who has no political agenda. He is not a Liberal or Conservative when it comes to Canadian politics, but he has explained that carbon pricing is essential to combat climate change. He pointed to the fact that the world's poor and the next generations are going to be disproportionately impacted. There is a sense of injustice about it, that we are shoving this burden onto future generations, onto the world's poor and onto the world's developing nations. It is not right. Canada has an obligation to play a leadership role and take care of things at home as we help the world transition to a low-carbon economy.

If we move forward with a plan to put a price on pollution, there are also economic benefits. Again, citing the example of British Columbia, there has been a net job gain in that province as a result of its aggressive plan to tackle climate change. The Government of Saskatchewan, in an attempt to gain political support for its fight against the plan, commissioned a report that showed there would be a very limited economic impact. It then tried to bury the report; it did not want the evidence to get out because it conflicted with its ideological narrative that carbon pricing would somehow damage the economy. The reverse is true. It can help spur innovation and take advantage of the new green economy, which Mark Carney has flagged as representing a \$26-trillion opportunity globally. If Canada is on the front end of that wave, we can expect to have more jobs in our communities as the world transitions to a global low-carbon economy.

I want to touch on affordability in particular, because this is front of mind for me. In my constituency office, the power company is on speed dial, because so many constituents come to my office not knowing where to turn. We know the cost of living has gone up over time. That is why we are trying to tackle those measures. Poverty has come down by 20%, which means 825,000 Canadians are not living in poverty today who were when we took office in 2015. The allegation that we are somehow seeking to make life more expensive is not true.

We understand the struggles of Canadian families who live in Pictou County, or Antigonish or on the eastern shore, places I represent. These are important issues that we need to tackle. That is why we are moving forward, not just with a plan to address climate change that can make life more affordable, but also by introducing measures like the Canada child benefit, which puts more money in the pockets of nine out of 10 Canadian families and stops sending child care cheques to millionaire families that, frankly, did not need it.

We have moved forward with a boost to the guaranteed income supplement, which puts more money in the pockets of low-income single seniors, some of the most vulnerable folk in the communities I represent, with up to \$947 extra a year. That is why we moved forward with a tax cut for nine million middle-class Canadians and raised taxes on the wealthiest 1%.

Each of these measures was opposed by the official opposition. To hear them now criticize a plan based on the fact that it will make life more expensive creates some serious cognitive dissonance considering that they voted against all the measures that were making life more affordable.

In particular, this plan, as I have explained a number of times during these remarks, will also put more money in the pockets of eight out of 10 families in systems in which it applies. We worked with provinces for years leading up to the implementation of this system. In provinces like mine, Nova Scotia, there is in fact no federal price on carbon. It has come up with a cap-and-trade system that impacts about 20 major industrial polluters and places a modest surcharge on fuel. Nova Scotia's plan was accepted because it showed that it was taking seriously the threat that climate change constitutes.

It is only in provinces that would not come to the table with a serious plan that we are moving forward with it. We do not believe it should be free to pollute the atmosphere anywhere in Canada. The atmosphere belongs to all of us. When people operate industrial facilities that degrade that atmosphere, they should be liable to every Canadian for the damage they have done. That is why they are paying a price on pollution, and that is why citizens deserve the rebate that is paid out of these revenues.

None of this money is being kept by the federal government, contrary to what some of the Conservative members have suggested. If they have problems with the tax being kept by governments on the price of gas, I suggest they speak to some of the Conservative premiers who are currently railing against our plan to put a price on pollution. Those premiers have the ability to take the tax off gas and allow families to keep their hard-earned money. We are making polluters pay and giving that money directly to families.

Business of Supply

●(1115)

The great thing is that we can see job growth when we move forward with an ambitious plan to fight climate change. In my community, there are examples like the Trinity group of companies, which is doing incredible work in energy efficiency. It started out with a couple of guys who were really good contractors. They realized an incentive was put in place by different governments, which we have since bolstered at the federal level over the past few years, to help homeowners reduce the costs of energy efficient products, whether smart thermostats, better doors and windows or more efficient heating systems. They use the products that have come down as a result of publicly funded rebates, which are helping homeowners bring their costs of living down by reducing their power bill each month. They have added dozens of positions to their organization.

In the community of Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, companies like CarbonCure have developed carbon sequestration technologies that pull carbon out of the atmosphere to inject into concrete products to strengthen them for use in construction.

Speaking of construction, Canada's Building Trades Union has pointed out that as we upgrade our buildings and infrastructure, there is a potential opportunity to create four million new green jobs by embracing the green economy and fighting climate change. Those are serious numbers that will have a real impact on the GDP of Canadians. More important, for families, it is a job that people maybe could not get in the community they came from, so they may not have to move.

These are real, meaningful, human examples that are making a difference, not just for our economy but for families.

The motion on the floor suggests that we repeal our price on pollution and implement a real plan. I would like to draw to the attention of the House to the fact that there is so much more to our plan than this one policy onto which the Conservatives have latched. In fact, there are over 50 measures. I am happy to lay a few of them out for the House.

By 2030, and not many Canadians appreciate this, we are on track to have 90% of our electricity in the country generated from non-emitting resources. That is remarkable. We have made the single largest investment in public transit in the history of our country. This will encourage more Canadians to take public transit rather than drive their cars, so we can become more efficient and life can be made more convenient at the same time. We are phasing out coal. We are investing in energy efficiency. We are investing in green technology.

At St. Francis Xavier University, of which I am a proud alumnus, the flux lab, with Dr. David Risk, is developing instrumentation that is putting researchers to work. It has been commercialized because the oil and gas sector has realized that by using this instrumentation, it can detect gas leaks at a distance and increase its production without increasing its emissions. It is capturing gas that is currently leaking out of its infrastructure.

We are moving forward with these serious things.

In addition, we are implementing new regulations on methane to help reduce the fastest-growing contributor to global GHG emissions.

On the same piece, pursuant to the Montreal protocol, in Kigali, we have adopted a single new measure that will result in a reduction of methane emissions which will have the equivalent of a 0.5° reduction in emissions on its own. We are also adopting a clean fuel standard and vehicle emissions standards.

We are moving forward with the most ambitious plan in Canadian history to protect nature in Canada. This is serious. We need to take the opportunity before us to do something to protect our threatened ecosystems. With over \$1.3 billion invested in protecting nature, we will more than double the protected spaces across our country.

Of course, we recently announced we would be moving forward with a ban on our harmful single-use plastics. At the same time, we are putting the responsibility of managing the life cycle of those products on manufacturers.

Most of these policies have a few things in common. They will help reduce our emissions and protect our environment, yet the Conservatives oppose them every step of the way. I have taken hundreds of questions in question period about our plan for the environment. Not once have I received a question from the Conservatives about what more we could do for the environment. It is always an attempt to do a less.

The fact is that we cannot turn back the clock. I look forward to seeing the Conservative plan tomorrow. When I hear the kind of commentary from members of Parliament on their side, it gives me great cause for concern. I doubt whether we can even start the conversation about what solutions are most appropriate when I hear comments that deny climate change is primarily due to human activity. This is not a time to be debating the reality of climate change; it is a time to be debating solutions and, more important, implementing solutions.

I want to encourage everyone at home to start pulling in the same direction. If people have children, they should talk to them at the dinner table. It is the most effective thing they can do to help change their minds about the importance of climate change. The kids are all right. They know what is going on and they want us to take action.

●(1120)

If people have the opportunity to take part in a community cleanup, to take part in a solo or co-operative cleanup, to take part in whatever is going on in their community, I urge them to embrace it. We are running out of time. We want to implement a solution to avoid the worst consequences of climate change. I only hope the Conservatives get on board.

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government in its first two years before introducing its so-called price on carbon, gave places like Nova Scotia large exemptions from their coal-fired facilities so they could go much longer than was originally brought into place by the previous government.

Business of Supply

The second thing that group has done, with its so-called price on carbon, is to exempt 95.5% for coal-fired production, dirty coal, in New Brunswick.

The member says that somehow the Liberals are the white knights who will deal with these issues. They are actually the government that is giving massive exemptions to large emitters. How do they square that?

• (1125)

Mr. Sean Fraser: Mr. Speaker, this is a very important issue. A myth has been peddled by both the Conservatives and the NDP about supposed exemptions for large emitters under our system. Let me be crystal clear. There are no exemptions for large emitters under our system. They pay into a system that is called an output-based pricing system which requires them to pay a price—

An hon. member: You're playing with words.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): We were doing so well. I want to remind hon. members that a question was asked. When the presentation was being done, it was perfect. Nobody said a word, maybe a couple of chirps here and there, and now we have started up again.

I want to remind hon. members that whoever is speaking, whether it is a member on the opposition side or the government side, to try to give that member the respect he or she deserves, just as all members would expect.

Mr. Sean Fraser: Mr. Speaker, I enjoy good conversation with my friends and colleagues.

To be crystal clear, there is no exemption for big emitters under our system. They pay at the exact same price that everyone else does under what is called the output-based pricing system. We have established a system that allows us to move forward with a price for big emitters that does not jeopardize their competitiveness.

One of the points of differentiation between our plan and the NDP's plan is that without this kind of system, as the Ecofiscal Commission has pointed out, the NDP will hurt the Canadian economy by causing carbon leakage and also increase global emissions because big polluters will be incentivized to leave Canada.

With respect to the example in New Brunswick, it is because that province is dealing with an industry that is operating better than the industry standard. In Nova Scotia, the member is right that we do have an equivalency agreement with that province to help it transition off coal, still 28 years faster than the Conservatives would have it transition. It is because we are trying to reflect the realities after we have had discussions with the different provincial governments.

I have a meeting later today. We are going to discuss how we can accelerate the phase out of coal in Nova Scotia, because it is the right thing to do.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the parliamentary secretary's speech and his endless litany of ineffective half-measures. I am not impressed.

After four years in power, the Liberal record on the environment is absolutely abysmal, especially when it comes to reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Here are some figures from Environment Canada. In December 2017, officials forecasted that the Liberals would miss the Conservatives' targets by 66 megatonnes. A year later, no progress had been made. In fact, it was then estimated that they would miss the targets by 79 megatonnes.

The Liberals can pat themselves on the back and adopt emergency motions in the House of Commons all they like, but the fact remains that they are going to miss the Conservative targets set by Stephen Harper. Furthermore, they want to expand the Trans Mountain pipeline, which they bought with our money. In terms of pollution, it would be like putting 3 million more cars on our roads every year. That is the Liberal record.

I doubt that voters will be fooled in the upcoming election.

[*English*]

Mr. Sean Fraser: Mr. Speaker, there were a number of different issues built into that question. I will do my best to address them.

The starting point with the use of 2017 is a good example of cherry picking data that misrepresents the facts on the ground. Due to the forest fires in western Canada in 2016, an artificial suppression of the emissions in Canada led to a low that did not necessarily fit the trend. If we look at a longer time horizon, we are trending in the right direction.

With respect to the target to which my hon. colleague has referred, we will hit that target, and this is important. To the extent there is a gap, it does not factor in certain measures that have not been modelled, measures like the single largest investment in public transit in the history of Canada, measures such as the adoption of zero emission vehicles with the subsidies that we have just put in place to bring their cost down and measures like investments in carbon sequestration technologies that will continue to have uptake over the next while.

It also presumes that we will take absolutely no action over the next 11 years, which is patently false on its face.

The member said that some of our measures would be ineffective, and I forget the precise word, and I am curious. The NDP is now campaigning on the ideas that we started implementing several years ago.

I do not know how he squares that circle. On the one hand, he says they are ineffective. On the other, he says the NDP will implement about half of them should it form government.

• (1130)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the parliamentary secretary can comment on how it is possible that the Conservative Party of Canada will come forward with a real plan tomorrow to address the environmental challenges. Yesterday the Conservatives voted against declaring a climate emergency.

Business of Supply

Only a couple of weeks ago, the member for Milton, the deputy leader of the Conservative Party of Canada, said that the bottom line was there was no connection between climate change and major indicators of extreme weather, that the continual claim of such a link was just misinformation employed for political or rhetorical purposes.

How are we ever to take seriously a Conservative plan when comments like these are being made by the the deputy leader of the Conservative Party of Canada?

Mr. Sean Fraser: Mr. Speaker, my ordinary disposition is one of optimism and hope, but I do not have much cause for hope when it comes to the plan we will see later this week. I note that the Conservatives are tabling it in the very last week of Parliament when it will not be subject to scrutiny by the parties in the House during question period.

With respect to the recent tweet put out by the deputy leader of the opposition, I found it unfortunate. I know her to be a reasonable person. I believe she thinks we should take action on climate change. However, to put these harmful messages out there for political gain when it does a disservice to the debate and discourse around climate change in Canada is disheartening. I note in particular that the Conservative leader was recently confronted about his desire to avoid tackling the question of whether there was a connection between climate change and severe weather. This has just become the norm.

I look at comments from different Conservative MPs over the past few years. One member visited school children in Alberta and told them that CO₂ was just plant food, not pollution, saying there was no consensus on this. Some members want to pull out of the Paris agreement. I was in a debate on social media with one of the Conservative members, who cited a pile of snow in Saskatchewan in February as evidence that climate change was not real.

It is unfortunate, but this is the tenor of the debate. Members from British Columbia have suggested that climate change and the rising temperature is similar to more people just being in a room giving up body heat. If they cannot acknowledge that a primary cause of climate change is human industrial activity, then they are not taking part in the debate at all. I do not anticipate the Conservative plan will be worth the paper it is written on.

Mr. Erin Weir (Regina—Lewvan, CCF): Mr. Speaker, one of the main concerns the Conservatives have raised is that if we have a carbon price, it could prompt a carbon-intensive industry to move to jurisdictions with weaker environmental standards, eliminating Canadian jobs and potentially increasing global emissions. The government is trying to address this problem of carbon leakage with output-based rebates to industry that keeps its production here. Another approach to this problem would be carbon border adjustments, extending the carbon price to the carbon content of imports and rebating it on Canadian-made exports.

I would like to invite the parliamentary secretary to comment a bit further on the importance of maintaining a level playing field between Canada and countries that do not price emissions.

Mr. Sean Fraser: Mr. Speaker, as always, I thank the hon. member for his thoughtful approach to politics. Perhaps the CCF

does not suffer from the same defect of partisanship that the rest of us do at times in the House.

He is absolutely right. The phenomenon of carbon leakage is real. If a system is created that does not protect against trade-exposed industries potentially fleeing Canada, we will have the exact kind of consequence that the Ecofiscal Commission warned would result if we implemented the NDP's approach, which does not adequately take this into effect. I read with interest the editorial the hon. member put forward just last week on this subject.

We established a price on pollution for large emitters, which they would have to pay. Then industry by industry identified a threshold of the rebate that they would get back, should they perform above the industry average with respect to reducing their emissions. To the extent that someone can actually significantly beat the industry average, they can receive a credit. To the extent some just continue on with business as usual, they will pay a significant price. We have used the market to create an incentive for large emitters to reduce their emissions over time, without putting them at risk of having jobs leave the country.

I would be happy to carry the conversation on with the member after.

• (1135)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP):

Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with my fantastic colleague from Courtenay—Alberni. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate him on all the work he does to promote cycling in this country and help reduce plastic pollution. My colleague from British Columbia is doing an outstanding job.

I listened carefully to the parliamentary secretary's speech, and I want to come back to the final point he raised when responding to our Conservative colleague's question. Indeed, contrary to what the parliamentary secretary said, certain industrial sectors in Canada are getting free passes and handouts in terms of the price they will have to pay for their huge contribution to greenhouse gas emissions. This is all being given to them because of fears that businesses in certain highly competitive industrial sectors will want to move away or shut down their operations in Canada.

In his argument, the parliamentary secretary used the market argument to justify giving these companies a free pass allowing them to emit 10% more greenhouse gases before having to pay. What he fails to mention is that there is absolutely no verifiable objective criterion to justify this exemption, this gift being given to certain industrial sectors. In theory, the underlying logic to this exemption could be justified, but it is impossible to know what objective, rational, and independent criteria the Liberal government is basing its reasoning on. Several environmental activists have already asked this question. This approach lacks credibility. Again, it looks like the Liberals are handing out gifts to their corporate industry friends.

Business of Supply

I find it interesting that we are having this discussion on the price of pollution. I have to hand it to the Conservatives, they are certainly consistent. When they sink their teeth into something, they do not let go. They do not like the idea of putting a price on pollution, and they are moving the same opposition motion that they presented a month or two ago, as though nothing else were going on in our society or our country. It seems to be the only thing they want to talk about until the election. Suits me. Let's talk about it.

I am the NDP environment critic. I am pleased to speak about our extraordinary platform called "The Courage to Do What's Right", which the NDP leader recently presented in Montreal. It is an extraordinary and comprehensive document that includes a multitude of measures to address the challenges of tackling climate change. I will come back to that in a few minutes.

If there is one thing we can fault the Liberals for it is their lack of coherence. The government sheds crocodile tears and plays the violin while talking to us about future generations, the importance of the planet, nature, frogs and little birds, but it does nothing. It has been dragging its feet for years. The Liberals' environmental record does not live up to its promises of 2015 or the speeches it continues to give. What happened last night is proof of that. The Liberal government made us vote on a motion declaring a climate emergency. That is important. Canada is a G7 country. The government took the initiative to declare a climate emergency and to say that we must roll up our sleeves and take action. However, the Liberals had us vote on this motion the day before the announcement about the Trans Mountain expansion. That took some nerve. It does not make sense.

The Trans Mountain expansion will triple oil sands production, which will rise from 300,000 to 900,000 barrels a day. This project poses an extremely serious threat to British Columbia's coastline and has no social licence. Many indigenous communities oppose it, as does the Government of British Columbia. It is completely incompatible with the Liberal government's ambition to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions by 2030. To increase oil production from 300,000 to 900,000 barrels a day is equivalent to putting another three million cars on the road.

● (1140)

The government's climate change plan involves putting three million more gas-guzzling vehicles on our roads. Someone pinch me; I must be imagining things. This is a nonsensical and wrong-headed plan.

It is no wonder that groups like ENvironnement JEUnesse are suing the Liberal government over its reckless disregard for future generations. Young people are concerned, they are protesting, they are organizing and they are taking the government to court because it is not fulfilling its responsibilities. It is not taking the courageous decisions needed to do our part to combat climate change, the greatest challenge of our generation. If we do not get greenhouse gas emissions under control and limit global warming to 1.5°C to 2°C, the consequences will be extremely costly. There will be social, human, financial and economic consequences. We cannot wash our hands of this. We cannot stand by. Unfortunately, the Liberal government is all talk and no action.

By contrast, the NDP, with our leader, the member for Burnaby South, has proposed an extremely ambitious and comprehensive plan. I am pleased to have the opportunity to talk about this plan today, because we are going after the biggest greenhouse gas emitters.

The government's mistake is thinking that taxing carbon or pricing pollution is a magic wand that will fix all problems. This is not the case. It is a necessary tool, sure, but it is not enough. I think this is very important to point out. This is why the NDP has proposed other measures to ensure that we take serious, responsible action. Our commitment is to cut emissions by 450 megatonnes by 2030. This is achievable and is consistent with scientific findings and the IPCC report.

First, we want to take action on housing. We want to complete energy efficiency retrofits on all existing buildings and homes in Canada by 2050. That will save Canadians money and also reduce our carbon footprint. We want to change the building code so that all new buildings are carbon neutral by 2030, meaning they produce no greenhouse gas emissions. This would be a regulatory requirement that would apply across the board. The government has not had the courage to do this, and it does not even seem to be interested in moving in this direction.

Second, there is transportation. The transportation sector is a major GHG emitter. There are two things we need to achieve. First, we want to electrify personal and freight transportation, and we want to make sure we do both, not just personal transportation. Second, we want to electrify transit.

Electrification of transportation is crucial. We are going much further than the current Liberal government. We pledge to waive the GST on all models of electric or zero-emissions vehicles made in Canada. Not only will this make it easier for consumers to own a zero-emissions electric or hydrogen fuel cell vehicle, but it will also provide an important boost to help the automotive sector make this transition.

Our plan includes major investments in public transit totalling \$6.5 billion over the course of the NDP's first term in office. We will work with municipalities to reduce the cost of using public transit. Ultimately, we want public transit to be free, as it is in other places around the world, because we want to encourage people to use public transit more as well as active transit, such as walking and cycling.

Third is renewable energy. This government continues to subsidize oil and gas companies to the tune of billions of dollars a year. That needs to stop. We will divert that money to the renewable energy sector, which is already creating far more jobs in Canada than the fossil fuel sector.

We will make that happen by setting up a climate bank that can issue loans and provide loan guarantees to businesses, investors and people who are building green energy projects and renewable energy developments.

Business of Supply

That is the NDP's game plan. I think it is much more ambitious than what any other party in the House has to offer.

Canadians and Quebecers will judge its merits on October 21.
[*English*]

Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was into the speech right up until the end, when the member mentioned the fossil fuel phase-out. The fossil fuel phase-out also includes fossil fuel subsidies for remote communities that need to use diesel until we are able to get them other fuels to generate electricity.

Five out of the seven subsidies that are currently in place have been negotiated out, but a few still remain, such as the one I just mentioned. Could the member talk about the nuances of the fossil fuel phase-out in relation to the types of fossil fuel subsidies we have in place and how critical it is to remove them in a way that does not jeopardize people in remote locations?

• (1145)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question and for giving me an opportunity to speak to that issue.

Unfortunately, the Liberals often use that argument to attack the NDP's plan. It is not quite accurate. I want to clarify and set the record straight.

Obviously, we are talking about subsidies for big industry and for large oil and gas corporations. We are also talking about changing the mandate of Export Development Canada and using that money to make a public investment in renewable energy. Obviously, the indigenous communities in northern Canada that need diesel to produce electricity would never be negatively impacted by the NDP's plan.

I thank the member for that question.

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie for his remarks.

Obviously, we disagree with about 95% of what he said, but we do agree with the remaining 5%, specifically, when he so rightly pointed out that the Conservatives are logical and consistent, and they are too.

The question I have for my colleague is very simple. We do not believe that putting a price on pollution reduces emissions. That is why we are opposed to the Liberal carbon tax, which has been imposed right across the country, regardless of what the provinces want. That is not right, and at the very least, it shows the government's outrageous disregard for jurisdictional boundaries.

On November 29, the Premier of Quebec tabled in the Quebec National Assembly a document prepared by the Quebec ministry of the environment on greenhouse gas emissions from 1990 to 2016. That document indicates that, even though the carbon exchange was in place, and I know what I am talking about since I voted on it when I was a member of the National Assembly, GHG emissions did not drop in 2014, 2015 or 2016. In fact, they actually increased.

I would like the hon. member to explain to us why he thinks the carbon tax, the tax on pollution, does not lower greenhouse gas

emissions, as proven by science and the real and tangible experience of Quebec.

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Louis-Saint-Laurent for his highly relevant question. That was not the first time he asked it and I feel as though I will be hearing it a lot over the coming months.

The hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent demonstrated what the NDP has been saying, that the carbon tax alone is not going to have a major impact. A host of factors need to be taken into account and all sorts of efforts need to be made to tackle this. I think there are no two ways about it, and I think it is a shame that the Conservatives oppose putting a price on pollution. I also find it odd that the Conservatives are against using market mechanisms to put pressure on companies or consumers to change their behaviours.

Since the hon. member is Conservative, I imagine he wants to preserve things. Through our plan, we want to protect 30% of all of Canada's land and sea area and convert them into parks and reserves. That is what environmental groups are asking for.

I hope the Conservatives' announcement tomorrow will include a commitment to protect nature here in Canada.

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet (Hochelaga, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the NDP plan, which is extremely comprehensive.

The member has yet to speak about the part of the plan that deals with employment insurance and training. I wonder if he could talk a bit about that, since I am very proud of that part too.

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Hochelaga. It was in my notes, but I did not have time to get to it.

Indeed, we are the only party that respects workers in the energy transition, which is unavoidable. We have an plan for EI that involves providing labour force training so that people can qualify for the jobs of the future before the changes are complete.

People will be able to train for a new job in renewable energy, for example, while they are still on the job. We are very proud of that.

• (1150)

[*English*]

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise today as we talk about the most important issue that is facing our planet and humanity. The Conservative motion today is:

That, given that the carbon tax will not reduce emissions at its current rate and it is already making life more expensive for Canadians, the House call on the government to repeal the carbon tax and replace it with a real environment plan.

Business of Supply

I am going to speak about an environmental plan and how we can get to that conversation. However, before I do that, I want to read an important quote from Greta Thunberg. We all know that she is a leading climate activist globally. She says, “You say you love your children above all else, and yet you are stealing their future in front of their very eyes.”

I am going to target my speech to this motion and around the fiscal responsibilities of what is happening today. We know that the PBO did a report in 2014 and guesstimated that the cost of climate emergencies would be about \$900 million a year to the Canadian economy. That has actually turned into \$1.8 billion, so at the time he very much under-calculated the true cost of climate emergencies and how quickly we were going to see climate change happen. He also predicted that by 2050 we would see the cost escalate to \$40 billion to \$50 billion. When I think about Greta Thunberg, I think about my children and the children of our country. I think about ensuring that we do not leave them with a huge deficit and that we pay for pollution now instead of expecting Greta and other children around the world to inherit this huge economic deficit.

In our country, we are seeing skyrocketing temperatures that have never been seen before. Canada is the fastest-warming country in the world, now at 1.7° above 1948 temperatures, which is our baseline. We are looking at 2.3°C in the far north, where it is the fastest warming in the world. As I have raised here in the House, we are seeing changing weather patterns. We had the biggest windstorm in Vancouver Island's history in December. In February, we had the biggest snowstorm. In March, we had the biggest drought. We had forest fires that started in May and right now most communities in coastal British Columbia and certainly all over Vancouver Island are on water conservation orders. It is affecting our salmon, our economy, our food security and our way of life.

I will go to the motion. The Conservatives have been opposing the carbon tax. They have raised the carbon tax issue. I did a Library of Parliament research question. About two months ago, the Conservatives had asked 762 questions in question period opposing the carbon tax. Those are lost opportunities to bring solutions to the government and to call on the government to take action on a list of items that the Conservatives could be bringing forward. They are perhaps talking about some of that tomorrow. I am extremely disappointed that the Conservative Party of Canada did not roll out its platform yesterday so that today we could be debating its proposal. It would have been good for a healthy debate. We need to put partisan politics aside and have a healthy debate about this most important crisis that is happening in all of our planet's history.

I am extremely disappointed. The Conservatives point to the government, saying that the Liberals have no real plan, but we still have not heard the Conservatives' plan. This really affects the credibility of today's motion, which is just in opposition.

The Progressive Conservative Party of the past was willing to take action on climate leadership like with acid rain, putting a cost on polluters and ensuring that they paid the price. The Conservatives are not listening to some of their own leaders. Preston Manning is very much in support of a carbon tax, putting a price on pollution and ensuring it is carbon neutral. Therefore, when we look at the changes and evolution of the Conservative Party, I am concerned to see this

motion come forward without the Conservatives' plan being presented to us.

We have heard from the Liberal Party about the importance of balancing the environment and the economy. We could not agree more.

• (1155)

However, we hear about the government purchasing a pipeline for \$4.5 billion, and now, today, the Liberals are going to consider making a decision. If that decision has not already been announced while I am rising right now, it is to twin the Trans Mountain pipeline and invest \$15 billion, which would be the largest purchase by the public in Canadian history in fossil fuel infrastructure, and at a time when we need to go in the other direction and invest in clean energy and renewal. Therefore, I am extremely disappointed to hear the government talk about balancing the environment and the economy when it could invest \$15 billion into clean energy right now and into electrifying our country. There are so many opportunities and tools that the government has to bring our emissions down and take real climate action.

When I look at jurisdictions around the world, they certainly differ from the beliefs of my friend for Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola. He believes that the carbon tax in British Columbia and Quebec has not worked when, in fact, they have had the fastest growing economies in our country. In British Columbia, it has been an enormous success. When the member attacks the B.C. Liberal government of the past that brought it in and the B.C. NDP government that is carrying forward an important policy that is supported by the B.C. Green Party, he is taking a shot at all political parties in British Columbia that are united on one thing: knowing that we have to put a price on pollution and that polluters need to pay their fair share. That is just the reality.

We cannot leave it for Greta and other young people in our communities who we are hearing from. The youth climate action, as we have heard, is doing Friday walkouts, joining children from around the world demanding that we take action. By “we”, they mean right here in the House of Commons and leaders from across political parties standing united to take action. They are demanding it. I have children in my riding from G.P. Vanier and Mark R. Isfeld secondary schools in Courtenay who have walked out of school and called on us to bring their important message to Ottawa to be heard here in the House, and I am doing that today. Children in Port Alberni at Wood Elementary School are walking out of school, demanding we take action.

I have been privileged to sit on the climate caucus here in Ottawa, which is an all-party, multi-party caucus, with my good friend for Drummond from the NDP, my friend for Saanich—Gulf Islands from the Green Party, my friend for Repentigny from the Bloc Québécois and my friend for Wellington—Halton Hills from the Conservative Party. It is one opportunity where we actually put our partisan politics aside and become united on an important issue. Sadly, only about 10 or 12 of us show up on a regular basis, and we need more. We need to make it a party so that climate caucuses meet right here in the House of Commons and have a healthy debate about how we move forward and not go backward.

Business of Supply

Today, I look at models around the world. California is an excellent model that has taken real action, such as curbing climate emissions on vehicles. Californians have taken a multi-tasked approach where they work with people who are facing real challenges in communities, who are facing huge economic hardship, and shifted that through cap and trade. They have improved their GDP by 37% since 2000 and have reduced emissions by 35%, and that is per capita. This is just another example of a jurisdiction that has taken leadership. Norway has invested in \$1 trillion in oil and gas, while our country put \$11 billion aside. In Norway, they are earning \$50 billion in interest alone and investing in clean energy and strategies that will lower emissions. In fact, 53% of their vehicles are electrified in Norway. Therefore, it can be done. There are 45 countries around the world that have a price on pollution and a carbon tax, as well as an additional 25 jurisdictions, provincial or state, in various countries around the world.

We have heard from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, or the IPCC, that we need to reduce emissions by 45% from 2005 levels, and our commitment in Paris, by 2030. We have to take drastic action.

I could speak all day about solutions and creating jobs, clean energy and investing in electrification, and ending subsidies to big oil and gas, which, again, could finance so many opportunities and solutions, such as retrofitting buildings. The number of things that we could do is endless. We could have a full debate about that, and I wish we were.

We are in a climate crisis, and I want to close on what Greta Thunberg had said, "I don't want your hope. I don't want you to be hopeful. I want you to panic [and] act as if the house was on fire."

We are in the House. Let us act like it is on fire.

• (1200)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to go back to one thing the member said just a few moments ago. He really hit the nail on the head when he said that this should not be an issue that is overly politicized and partisan. Climate change is not a Liberal issue, or an NDP issue or a Conservative Party issue. This is an issue that we face today, and we will not be judged in the future based on which political party we were part of when all these decisions needed to be made. We will be judged on what action we took collectively, as a whole.

Could he comment as to what he sees the need for in the future, and in particular, when we talk about future generations? How will they judge us collectively rather than based on an individual political party that we belong to?

Mr. Gord Johns: Mr. Speaker, this excellent question draws me back to the all-party climate caucus. Even though a handful of people would show up for it, I know that most members in this House care deeply about this very important issue. I wish we were talking and debating motions about proposals, and how we were going to be moving forward and focusing and drilling down on this specific issue. I am very disappointed that is not where we are spending our time and energy.

Instead of putting partisan politics on whether we support each other's motions or not, we need to find a way to collectively work

together and support each other's amendments that are going to move us forward. That is what our children are going to look back on. They are going to look at what we did and whether we took that paradigm shift when it was necessary and were told this by 97% of the scientists around the world. They are going to look at whether we took the action necessary. They are going to find out, we know that, and they are going to hold us to account. Let us hope we do the right thing by moving quickly on this very important issue.

Mr. Robert Sopuck (Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed working with my friend on biosphere reserve issues, but I disagree with pretty much everything he says. I find the NDP strangely hilarious. On one hand, it tries to defend the steel industry in Hamilton and talks about how important those jobs are, yet it works like crazy to stop pipelines that are made of steel.

I used to have a lot of time for the old NDP and members like Ed Schreyer, the party of the working person and so on. This new NDP is finished when it comes to dealing with the working person. The only party that cares about working people in this country is the Conservative Party.

Today's poll showed what working people have to say. They do not want to pay a carbon tax. The Conservative environmental plan to be released tomorrow will be a groundbreaking plan.

The member talked about electrifying this country. This country will be electrified when that man in that chair is the Prime Minister of this country.

I have two questions for my friend. One, how high does he want the carbon tax to go? I notice that he did not give a number. Two, given that the NDP rails away against the oil and gas industry all the time, will he put his money where his mouth is and recommend every union pension fund and the Canada pension plan divest themselves completely of every single oil and gas investment?

Mr. Gord Johns: Mr. Speaker, I could speak for a long time to answer that very long question. First of all, when it comes to standing up for workers, I will tell the House what it looks like in my riding. We had the B.C. Liberals in government and raw log exports went up tenfold in 10 years. They shipped jobs out of our province. Now they want to raw ship oil, raw bitumen, instead of refining it in our country and creating Canada's energy security here. They want to ship it out of our country.

Who is standing up for jobs? The only time British Columbians have had jobs stood up for is from New Democrats, who have always been there for labour and ensuring we have job security in our country.

When it comes to a carbon tax, again, this is when partisan politics get in the way. We are not listening to the experts or bureaucrats who know what we need to do. We need to listen to them and do what we need to do to ensure our children are not picking up the tab. There is nothing fiscally Conservative about this.

Business of Supply

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, since the NDP purports to be for the working man, there are a number of people in Skeena—Bulkley Valley who want to know where the NDP stands on the B.C. LNG, which would not have gone forward if the B.C. NDP government had not lowered the taxes on the previous regime established by the B.C. Liberals he purports to dislike so much.

Second, in addition to that tax relief, his party has been completely off the radar on whether it supports it. I can look Greta in the eyes and say that we are reducing global emissions with clean LNG to replace dirty coal. I would hope that she would support that on the science.

● (1205)

Mr. Gord Johns: Mr. Speaker, there were a lot of questions again. New Democrats do not support oil and gas subsidies, full stop. That is clear. I have no problem saying that right now. The federal NDP has made it very clear.

When it comes to a previous question about the Canada pension plan, no, we should not be investing Canadian pension funds in oil and gas infrastructure. My colleague from Cowichan—Malahat—Langford has a bill that he will hopefully be speaking to this week and the member will have an opportunity to speak to that.

I could talk a lot about how we need a bigger debate about this very important issue. This is not enough. With the Conservatives not rolling out their plan and having this discussion now, they totally lack credibility.

Hon. Michelle Rempel (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today we are debating the following motion that Conservatives have put forward:

That, given that the carbon tax will not reduce emissions at its current rate and it is already making life more expensive for Canadians, the House call on the government to repeal the carbon tax and replace it with a real environment plan.

As part of debate on this motion today, I would like to break down what climate change is, what causes it, and then show why the Liberals' carbon tax scheme, which is currently at \$40 a tonne, will not reduce emissions in Canada, why it exacerbates global climate change and why it is harmful to our economy, but I will do so in the following context.

Earlier in debate today, the member for Kingston and the Islands said that by raising this motion, the Conservatives were “playing with the lives of future generations”. Recently, something awesome happened to me. I became a stepmom and a step-grandmother. To one tiny, very sticky human being, I am known as nana. My stepson Kepi is watching the debate today and my stepdaughter Tori really cares about this issue because she has a son. This one is for them, not for the member for Kingston and the Islands.

What is climate change and what causes it? Climate change can be broadly described by global or regional climate patterns, in particular a change apparent from the mid- to late 20th century onward and attributed largely to the increased levels of atmospheric carbon dioxide produced by the use of fossil fuels. Climate change is caused by changes in greenhouse gas concentrations, for example industrial emissions, cars, volcanoes, forest fires; deforestation and land use

changes; sulfate aerosols; and soot particles or black carbon. If that is what it is and what it is caused by, then how do we reduce it?

Let us start with the Liberal plan, which is the subject of the motion today. To the member for Kingston and the Islands and everyone who has mentioned children as the reason for debate on this issue, Liberals have staked their children's future on a \$40-a-tonne price on carbon. If we know what the causes of climate change are, as I read them out, then the policy objective should be to put in place a policy instrument that reduces greenhouse gas emissions. That is what we are managing to, to save the planet for our children. Therefore, it is incumbent upon us as legislators to ask, given the severity and gravity of this, if the Liberals' purported plan would work.

Those who have a background in economics will know that there is a concept called price elasticity. I am oversimplifying this, but it means that if a price changes on a good, people will buy more or less of it. When the price changes on goods and people buy more or less of them, those are highly price-elastic goods. When the price of goods increases but people still have to buy them and their consumption does not change, those goods are called price-inelastic.

I am raising this because this concept is super important when we talk about whether a carbon tax would reduce greenhouse gas emissions. If an additional price is put on carbon, and I mean things like gas in our tanks, what we use to heat our homes or electricity, if it is produced by fossil fuels, if the government is going to put a price on that and that is its purported way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, in theory, Liberals are hoping and praying that people will buy less carbon because the price has increased.

The government has refused to table or make public any sort of data that it has from modelling the price elasticity of carbon. That is really unfortunate, because it does not allow us as legislators, given what is at stake for our kids, to look at whether this is actually going to work.

● (1210)

The reality is that, in Canada, where it is very cold and we have to use fossil fuels to heat our homes and to drive around, as we do not have the same sort of transit infrastructure that a small European country would have, there really is not a substitute good for carbon. In Canada, carbon is price-inelastic, which means that putting a price of \$40 a tonne on carbon, as the Liberals have done, is not actually going to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in Canada.

Business of Supply

The reason this motion is before the House today is that this is an important issue, but if we want to save the planet for our kids and we know that it is not going to work, then we have to talk about other solutions, not just cling to it out of political expediency.

Members do not have to take my word for it. This year, the Parliamentary Budget Officer, a non-partisan agent of Parliament whose job it is to do this type of modelling, said that the Liberals' carbon tax would need to be \$102 per tonne in every province and territory in order to meet the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets set by the government, which it is purportedly managing to.

When asked if she would raise the tax to this level, the environment minister said no. Praise the Lord the answer was no. Essentially, the Liberals have said that they are setting a \$40-per-tonne price on carbon. They know it is not going to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and they are not going to raise it to a higher level.

What have we done in four years? The Liberals' own released report this year shows that Canada is actually further from the Paris target than last year. New numbers released by Environment Canada show that Canada is on track to fall 79 megatonnes short of its 2030 greenhouse gas emissions target, and that is up from 66 megatonnes last year.

These guys are standing here doing something that I like to call apocalypse porn. It is where people stand and talk about all the terrible things that are happening and focus on that to deflect any sort of legislative inquiry into the efficacy of their policies. We know it is not going to work. That is why the motion is in front of us today. Liberals shut down debate when any of their climate plans are questioned. If they know that their plan will not reduce greenhouse gas emissions and they will not raise the tax, then why have they put this forward?

I could speculate at length about that. I think this is a cash grab for the Liberals' out-of-control spending. This is a way for some of the senior cabinet ministers to get on speaking tours and perhaps position themselves for jobs in the industry of people who do not really have plans to reduce greenhouse gas emissions but make a lot as environmental consultants.

I think that is what they are managing to, and that is really unfortunate, given that the member for Kingston and the Islands appealed to the children. I do not want my kids to see a Liberal carbon plan where what the Liberals are managing to, instead of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, is jobs after politics, because they have said the right things but have done nothing.

I want to debunk some of the talking points that the Liberals have been throwing out today in opposition to the motion. First of all, they are citing the Nobel Prize-winning economist who said that this is the way to fight climate change. Let us go through some of the work that Dr. Nordhaus actually did. He acknowledges that the carbon tax raises many practical design and implementation questions. There are issues with cross-border taxes on carbon emissions and issues with administrative inefficiencies.

In fact, the Parliamentary Budget Officer said that the cost of administering the carbon tax in Canada, which, as I have shown, is ineffective and does not reduce greenhouse gas emissions, is \$174

million, outside of the cost to Canadians in their pocketbooks. There is no price elasticity data by the Liberals to show that the \$40 per tonne would actually reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

For comparison, the United Nations report the Liberals often cite actually estimates that the government would need to impose effective carbon prices of \$135 to \$5,500 per tonne of carbon dioxide by 2030. This does not take into account any sort of economic growth modelling or what would happen to the growth of the Canadian or global economy at this point in time.

There are other things that this professor talks about in terms of some of the inefficiencies and uncertainties that could be applied to the Liberals' ineffective plan.

● (1215)

In one of his books, he writes, "The exact pace and extent of future CO₂-induced warming are highly uncertain, particularly beyond the next few decades." Yes, there might be a consensus view, but he notes, "Science does not proceed by majority vote."

He notes that costs are key:

People want to be assured...that [carbon emissions] targets are not simply the result of overly concerned environmentalists who are intent on saving their ecosystems at the expense of humans.... People want to compare costs and benefits.... It will not be sufficient to say: "Ecosystems are priceless", or "We must pay any cost to save the polar bears."

He also notes that modelling is hard. The Financial Post said:

Of his own computer exercises looking into the implications of climate tipping points, he emphasizes that the assumptions he makes "are at the outer limit of what seems plausible and have no solid basis in empirical estimates of damages".

This is a complex issue with complex economic modelling, which the Liberals have not explained to Canadians. They have not talked about the fact that the \$40-a-tonne price on carbon will not reduce greenhouse gas emissions, yet they are asking Canadians to pay a very high cost for that. It is morally bankrupt and it is wrong.

Nordhaus also notes that all countries, the poorest countries included, need to be included in globally binding emissions structures in order for this to have any effect. However, the Liberals are not doing any of the things cited by this economist, absolutely zero.

A few other things have been raised in debate today. The member for Vancouver Kingsway cited B.C.'s carbon tax. He cited this 2.2% emissions reduction as if it were a victory. However, he is looking at data in the context of the Lower Mainland, B.C. It is warmer there, and there is more public transit. The price elasticity for carbon there might be different from that in rural Saskatchewan. If we are looking for a solution to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in Canada, it has to be a solution that applies to the entire country without harming our economy.

Business of Supply

Members opposite brought up Preston Manning. I think Preston Manning's approach on this is absolutely wrong. I question why Preston Manning is doing this. I would even go as far as to speculate that he is doing this to raise funds for his think tank, not to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. I would be happy to debate Preston Manning, on any stage, on the same data I have put forward, because this is not right and it will not reduce greenhouse gas emissions in Canada.

Members opposite have also cited the Pope. Members cannot stand in the House of Commons and say that we need a science-based, empirical response to climate change, not produce their own data and then cite religion, from a man who would not even meet the litmus test to run as a Liberal candidate.

Members opposite have talked about revenue neutrality. I will explain this concept for those listening and for my stepson, Kepi. According to the government, and only a Liberal would say that, revenue neutrality means paying a tax and getting an equal amount of money for it. That is crazy, because, as members know, it costs money to take money away. People are paid from the \$174-million administrative cost. People will not get the same amount of money back in a cascading tax that affects every single level of production. This has been borne out by data reports in British Columbia, which have shown that the tax has become regressive. It is not revenue-neutral anymore.

Furthermore, with respect to the purported rebate that is going to Canadians, which the government said was factually correct, the Parliamentary Budget Officer, in an announcement, showed that the average carbon tax rebate Canadians received in 2018 was significantly lower than the amount the Liberals claimed Canadians would receive.

If it is not reducing greenhouse gas emissions, people are paying more and it is not revenue-neutral, why would we accept this as the status quo when talking about what we are doing for the children? It is just crazy.

In addition, the Liberals, the NDP and the Greens all say that this will not affect the economy. That is bunk. I will tie this into the concept that the Liberal carbon tax actually exacerbates climate change globally, because when we tax goods that are produced under high environmental standards, such as we have in Canada, we actually displace them with goods coming from higher-carbon jurisdictions. A perfect example of this is steel production in Canada.

• (1220)

When our steel producers in Ontario were subject to a carbon tax and Chinese steel was not, and the Chinese government was able to dump steel in Canada at lower prices, that was actually displacing goods in Canada that were produced under lower emissions standards.

We, as a country, can put a carbon tax on greenhouse gas emissions until the cows come home, but as long as we are buying goods from China, India, Brazil and the United States, we are not going to tackle the issue of greenhouse gas emissions. There needs to be a globally binding system that reduces greenhouse gas emissions, with binding targets, for this to work.

What should we do? Tomorrow, my leader is going to announce a very comprehensive plan that addresses many of these issues. Again, I do not want to scoop him. We need a made-in-Canada solution that addresses the fact that we have a regionalized economy. It is cold here. There are not a lot of substitutes for our products. We have a wealth of technology that needs the right incentives to be adopted. We need energy efficiency standards. This is just me thinking up things.

Our global climate action cannot be the Minister of Environment going on a photo op tour where the most environmentally friendly thing she did was sit at a table covered in grass and drink cocktails. That was not Canada using its role on the world stage to incent climate action.

I want to speak to the Conservative record. The Liberals can say that the Conservatives do not have a plan until the cows come home, but there is one inconvenient truth: there is only one time in Canada's history when we saw a reduction of greenhouse gas emissions while the economy grew. It was under Stephen Harper's government, when we imposed regulations on passenger vehicles. I would also argue with the member for Vancouver Kingsway about any reductions they saw in B.C. What about the passenger vehicle reductions we put in place?

The coal-fired regulations on Canada's coal-fired sector came in under a Conservative government, because we believe, and here is the underlying point, that we need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions without undermining the Canadian economy. I am standing here as an Alberta MP, because these guys have used their apocalypse porn to put my riding out of work. The Liberals have done nothing to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. They have stood here and railed, "What about the children?" The Liberals have done nothing to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and they have put my riding out of work. That is morally bankrupt. That is crass politics.

Members should be concerned about what political party they stand for after this debate. It is partisan. The Liberals stand here, apocalypse porn and all, behind policy instruments that do not work, and then they want me to look at my children and my grandchild and say, "Yeah, it was great. It was non-partisan. We did nothing." That is wrong.

I was actually at an event with Al Gore, and I debated Al Gore. I wish that event had been public, because it was a lot of fun. There is a lot of inconvenient truth about the buzzwords that come out of these communities that do nothing to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

We have a responsibility to take action in Canada. Conservatives have done that. In fact, the last Liberal government saw greenhouse gas emissions rise by 30% when it was in government. The Liberals are probably on track to do the same here.

This should be partisan, because these guys have made this all about falsehoods, all about policy, and have done nothing to materially reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Business of Supply

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change said that it is time to be debating solutions and implementing those solutions. The kids are all right. They want us to take action. They do. However, a price on carbon that does nothing to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and puts people out of work in this country, and allows countries like China to get away with producing goods in a high-carbon jurisdiction while we buy them, is not action. That is politics. That is morally bankrupt.

Since this might be one of the last times I speak in this House in this Parliament, I want to thank all my constituents in Calgary Nose Hill for giving me the opportunity to fight for them. It is important. I would just say to them that we fought hard. We fought the Liberal government at every turn, and we have had great success in holding it to account and making it step back on some of the policies.

Now the time to fight goes to my constituents, so I ask them to join us.

● (1225)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the member for Calgary Nose Hill on her recent marriage and the introduction of children into her family. The first child I became a parent to was also a stepson of mine. I think there is nothing more rewarding in life than the feeling of knowing this new-found love for another human being, in particular one we are so responsible for.

I also thank her for bringing up her economics background. I have a background in economics as well. The problem with her discussion on elasticity is that she is assuming that elasticity will not change over time. The elasticity of a good can change, in particular when substitutes become available for the good. Before the industrial revolution, elasticity was extremely tight on whale oil, because that was the only form of oil being used to create light. If people wanted light, they had to buy that particular type of oil. However, when substitutes and new technology came along, the elasticity changed, and nobody required whale oil anymore. Therefore, I find a great problem with her discussion when she has only presented one side of the economic model. We have to respect the fact that changes will occur as new substitutes come onto the market. When we put a price on something, we have the ability to impact that good in the market, and hence, will see its elasticity change.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Mr. Speaker, a price on carbon at \$40 a tonne does not magically change the fact that the most efficient way of getting energy is from a carbon molecule. When we look at Canada, what the member is trying to spin here is that there is a substitute good for gas in a combine or for driving to work in a city that does not have public transit.

Let us talk about what a carbon tax will do to incent substitute goods and the adoption of clean tech. What that \$40 a tonne would do is chase investment capital away from Canada in areas where we could be developing receptor capacity for these types of initiatives. For example, in the energy sector, we are seeing capital leave the country, when we should be putting regulations in place to ensure that there is adoption of that technology without pricing us out of competitiveness with the United States.

The member talks about this magical structure, which his own policy upends and uproots and makes impossible to achieve. That is

why this is so damaging. That \$40 a tonne puts Canada out of the game with respect to adopting clean tech and the development and adoption of substitute goods.

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for fighting so hard for her riding. Clearly, the people in her community, like all of us in this House, are important to her.

I have huge concerns. I see B.C. Liberals, who are predominantly conservative, on one side of the Rockies, patting themselves on the back and talking about what a great job they have done implementing a carbon tax, with the fastest-growing economy in the country. They pat themselves on the back for lowering carbon emissions. They have even run elections while they were patting themselves on the back. Then they come to Ottawa, like our former colleague Dianne Watts, who sat in this House as a Conservative and ran for the provincial leadership of the B.C. Liberal Party, and pat themselves on the back for their important work implementing a \$40-a-tonne carbon tax in British Columbia, which was supported by all three political parties in B.C.

I am concerned when I hear about this “job-killing carbon tax”, which is the message the Conservatives are putting out, when we know that it has worked in B.C.

The member talked about Scandinavia, but she did not bring forward any solutions or any proposals in her speech. I want to hear some ideas on how we are going to work together on this.

● (1230)

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Mr. Speaker, this is the member who just stood up and said that it was a non-partisan issue, and now he is bringing up partisan politics.

I spent an entire component of my speech talking about the fact that B.C.'s carbon tax has been shown to be regressive. It is not revenue neutral. His own colleague cited that it only had a 2.2% impact.

I also went through the fact that Vancouver is not as cold as the rest of the country. It has trains that take people everywhere. That is not the same as rural Saskatchewan. That is why we need to look at a national policy that recognizes that we are a natural resources-based, agriculture-based, very large, cold country.

With respect to solutions, I literally spent the last half of my speech talking about that in very detailed terms. If my colleague wants some further reading to edify himself, I wrote a detailed article in the National Post in 2016 outlining this, which has been shared and re-tweeted many times.

Business of Supply

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I find it somewhat interesting that the Conservative Party opposes a price on pollution. I too, like millions of other Canadians, am waiting for Doug Ford's announcement tomorrow with respect to the national Conservative plan on the environment.

Provinces of different political stripes have adopted a price on pollution. The national plan fills in for those provinces that do not have a plan, or for individuals like Doug Ford, who withdrew from a plan, to ensure that there is a national standard across the country.

Would the member not agree that it is a good thing to have a national plan when it comes to environmental issues? This is the essence of what is taking place: a price on pollution across the country.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Mr. Speaker, that guy treats this like a joke, and it is not. He is building his argument on a premise, which I completely debunked for over 20 minutes. A \$40-a-tonne price on carbon is not going to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Former premier Clark, in 2016, talked about the fact that B.C. might be paying the carbon tax twice under the Liberal government's scheme. That is inappropriate. The fact that so many premiers in this country won mandates to scrap carbon taxes underscores that a punitive tax like this is going to have disproportional effects in different regions of the country, because we have regional economies that have different needs in terms of energy use and energy profiles. That is why we need to move away from a unilateral tax that harms our economy and does not reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Notice how many times that man mentioned the names of different premiers. That is because we are going into a federal election, and the Liberals are desperately doing everything they can to try to get away from the fact that Canadians are calling them on their lies on this stuff.

Canadians are concerned about climate change. We have had enough. Canadians have had enough. I am more than proud to stand against a failed, do-nothing, empty, virtue-signalling, paper water-box sort of policy that will not reduce climate change in this country.

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciated hearing my colleague's perspective on the answer given to me by the minister to a question I posed on behalf of an energy-efficient home builder in my riding who is concerned about the increased cost of his products as a result of the carbon tax.

Her response to me was about a company named VeriForm that is doing remarkable things. It reduced its greenhouse gases by 80% and increased its bottom line by \$1 million. What she failed to mention was that this happened in 2014, under the Harper government.

• (1235)

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Mr. Speaker, I am so glad that my colleague brought this up. We need to have an economic environment in which we are incenting the adoption and development of clean alternatives. When we have a high-price jurisdiction, where intellectual capital and actual fiscal capital leaves because of punitive policies that do not reduce greenhouse gas emissions, we are not going to see that sort of thing happen. The member is spot on.

I just want to build on the point of empty virtue signalling. The Liberal government dumped millions of litres of raw sewage into the St. Lawrence River. It has cut funding for lake cleanup.

My friend Sarah Fischer made a nine-second video last week mocking the Prime Minister's paper box water bottle thing. He could not even name what he was doing to reduce plastic waste in the country. I wonder when he last pumped a tank of gas or went grocery shopping. He is so out of touch. Her video closed with "doesn't work". To me, there could not have been a more concise, accurate summary of the empty virtue-signalling, do-nothing, environmentally damaging, self-aggrandizing, self-promoting hogwash that we have seen from the Liberal government when it comes to the environment and the economy.

I am so proud to stand up to fight this and fight for better.

Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am going to be sharing my time with the hon. member for Winnipeg North, and I look forward to his comments after I have had a chance to speak.

Our government is taking climate change seriously. We know that climate change is real and that we have a plan to tackle it. After the Paris Agreement negotiations in 2015, Canada set out a plan to tackle emissions to do its part to limit the global temperature increase to 1.5°C. We spent a year working with provinces and territories, engaging indigenous peoples and listening to Canadians from across the country. Two and a half years ago, we released our national climate plan, the pan-Canadian framework on clean growth and climate change. I went through that plan last week. It is an 86-page document that says what we are going to do and how we are going to do it.

The plan is designed to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions by 30% below 2005 levels by 2030. It is going to help us to adapt to a changing climate and spur clean technology and innovation. Our plan includes putting a price on carbon pollution across Canada, something we are talking about today, because we know it is effective and puts money back in the pockets of Canadians. As part of an overall plan, 90% of the revenues that are collected are going straight back to families through their tax returns in provinces where pollution pricing does not exist, such as in Ontario.

The other 10% is going back to businesses to help them reduce their carbon footprints with the climate action incentive fund, which supports these types of projects and measures that are undertaken by SMEs, municipalities, universities, schools and hospitals as well as not-for-profit organizations. The recipients of these funds will benefit from funding projects to decrease their energy usage, save money and reduce carbon pollution. It is also an economic plan for these types of organizations.

Putting a price on carbon is going to reduce emissions by 50 million to 60 million tonnes by 2022. It will also promote innovation, providing incentives to reduce energy use through conservation and efficiency measures.

However, our plan is much more than pricing carbon pollution. Our plan includes over 50 concrete measures in policies, regulations, standards and investments to reduce Canada's emissions, drive clean growth and help Canadians adapt to the impacts of climate change.

The Government of Canada has also invested \$28.7 billion to support improvements in public transit. Through this investment, we are making it easier for Canadians to choose lower-emission transit options. The Ontario government has put a freeze on some of these projects, but we are hopeful to see further investments in Guelph, including alternate-fuelled buses through the municipality, greening its fleet, and the incentives in place by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities to create charging stations. We invested in 26 new buses a few years ago. Those buses were purchased in a way that is going to help our community to have more people on the bus.

Outside our community, we are looking at the ongoing concern of establishing an all-day, two-way GO train service to and from the GTA. We have a lot of commuters who are getting through traffic on the 401 to get to work and then facing delays getting home to their families. However, the multi-billion-dollar project to expand Ontario's GO Transit network has taken two major steps forward, on May 30 of this year, with the Canada Infrastructure Bank's announcing an investment of up to \$2 billion and the province's short-listing four consortia to advance to the next stage of procurement on this project. That project is attracting international investment; it is not all being funded by Canadians through the infrastructure bank, which is one of the measures that our government has brought forward.

The rail expansion that we are talking about is officially known as the GO regional express rail on-corridor project. It involves significant construction work along the greater Toronto and Hamilton area rail corridor, as well as a new train maintenance facility and upgrades at Toronto's Union Station. The wide-reaching project also incorporates rail electrification, refurbishment and maintenance on trains, and oversight of train control and dispatch operations, among many other aspects, and introducing data as a way to help us move trains from point A to point B.

● (1240)

The overall approach that we are taking is strategic. It is something along the lines of what Guelph has developed, a community energy initiative. Now we are looking at the same types of principles nationally to see where the main contributors to climate change are. Industry is the largest, including oil and gas, but it is all industry, amounting to 37% of greenhouse gas emissions in Canada or 269 megatonnes.

We are looking at small business retrofits across the board. In Guelph, we have Canadian Solar that is doing great work on providing solar panels across Canada. Linamar in Guelph is developing the car of the future.

We are looking at new processes within our manufacturing industry. One of the members across the way mentioned VeriForm,

Business of Supply

which is just in Cambridge, southwest of Guelph, that is looking at how to reduce the climate change impact on businesses.

We have introduced an accelerated capital cost allowance to write down costs in the first year. Instead of paying taxes, people will pay for greening their businesses to reduce the cost of operations.

We have also looked at transportation. Twenty-three percent of greenhouse gases, 171 megatonnes, are emitted through transportation. We are looking at how we can reduce those through EV incentives that we have now introduced. We are also promoting EV within our communities through a not-for-profit organization called eMERGE that has held a couple of car shows to show the community how we can transition to electric vehicles. In fact, we have had many owners displaying their cars and saying what their challenges have been and how they are overcoming challenges to show that it really is not that hard to get into an EV.

We are looking at active transportation, increasing bike lanes, and as I mentioned, increasing the number of buses in our fleet, getting new buses in our fleet, providing fare boxes at bus stops and four special transit vehicles, all of which are funded through the federal government's support.

We are looking at our built environment, the buildings and the 12% of greenhouse gas emissions, or 87 megatonnes, that are emitted through building heating and cooling. FCM now has a green fund that we have doubled so that we can put climate action incentives in place to help people save money on the operation of their building and, at the same time, reduce their greenhouse gas emissions.

As well, 11% is coming from electricity. How do we provide a better way of getting electricity other than using fossil fuels? We are looking at research into cold-water aquifer development so that we can get geothermal working on our side to provide heating and cooling in urban buildings.

Forestry, agriculture and waste draw a lot of attention with 17% of greenhouse gas emissions, or 127 megatonnes. I am proud to say that Guelph and Wellington County were the recipients of a \$10-million fund through the smart cities challenge to reduce food waste and promote clean technology companies that are focused on providing sustainable food and reducing food waste. We are looking at that developing and going into the future.

Beyond all of these, looking at the different areas of greenhouse gas emission opportunities, we are also looking at adaptation and climate resilience. We are looking at the floods and forest fires that are happening and how we can reduce greenhouse gas emissions through adaptation programs.

Business of Supply

I was a member of the Rotary Club in Guelph. It just completed a 10-year program of planting 60,000 trees in our area. It is looking at how to sequester carbon and promote more oxygen into the atmosphere. Even though the Ontario government is cutting tree-planting programs, Guelph is looking at ways to increase its tree canopy to a 40% target within the municipality.

Flood resilience is another area. We all experience floods. Even though Guelph is not on a major river like the Ottawa River, we still get floods. The federal government has provided support for sewer upgrades and snow storage areas and flood resilience programs, all helped by federal funding.

Clean technology, innovation and jobs is where we are all heading. It is a new economy. We are looking at the opportunities that climate change provides for us to develop the technology of the future. I co-founded an organization I am so proud of, Innovation Guelph, that is working with Bioenterprise in Guelph. It received \$5.6 million and is helping 135 new start-up companies to develop solutions around clean technologies.

• (1245)

Looking at this nationally, Sustainable Development Technology Canada is providing funding support for companies across Canada to develop these types of solutions. It has also launched joint funding opportunities in collaboration with Emissions Reduction Alberta and Alberta Innovates, which I also visited during my term here. It has partnered with the Ontario Centres of Excellence to enhance Ontario's greenhouse gas innovation initiative. SDTC estimates that its projects have reduced annual emissions by 6.3 megatonnes of CO₂ equivalent, generated \$1.4 billion in annual revenue and supported growth of more than 9,200 direct and indirect jobs since 2015.

We have also funded the upgrade of the community energy initiative in Guelph with \$175,000, which is going into projects in Guelph to try to help us move forward into the future.

However, our work is not done. The transition to a low-carbon economy does not occur overnight. We recognize that evidence-informed policy requires ongoing support, so we established a new independent climate change and clean growth institute to provide trusted information and advice for years to come. We are going to review these findings to help us contribute to take strong action on climate change, which includes the price on carbon but does not exclude all these other things we are doing.

I am thankful for the time I had to talk about climate change as it relates to Guelph.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, Guelph is a very green community, as evidenced by its MPP Mike Schreiner, the leader of the Green Party of Ontario. The local initiatives are fantastic, as they are right across Canada.

The problem we have here is that last night we declared a climate emergency and today we are apparently going to buy a pipeline with public dollars. This goes right against the goal of achieving the Paris Agreement target, which is not the one cited by my hon. friend from Guelph. The target of 30% below 2005 by 2030 is the target tabled with the United Nations by former environment minister Leona Aglukkaq in May 2015, well before Paris was negotiated.

It is inexplicable to me that the Liberal government has held that target, but particularly, it is unconscionable since the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report of October 8 of last year told us clearly that we have one opportunity to preserve human civilization, the window on that opportunity will close soon and 30% below 2005 levels by 2030 is a path to catastrophe.

Recognizing it is a climate emergency, when will the government, if the hon. member for Guelph is in a position to tell us, increase Canada's target and commitment with the United Nations to be consistent with the goal of 1.5°C?

Mr. Lloyd Longfield: Mr. Speaker, I enjoy working with Mike Schreiner, who is the MPP in our area. What it shows is that all orders of government need to work together, including the municipality, on something that is not a partisan issue as we go forward. We should not be fighting each other, we should be fighting climate change.

The goals we have signed on to, through the Paris accord, are goals that will be reviewed as we go forward. However, they are goals that align with the international goals that 192 countries have all signed on to together. We have worked across Canada with provinces and territories. We know what the target is. We are going to exceed our targets by the aggressive programs we have launched and are going to be following through on, working with our provincial and municipal counterparts.

• (1250)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I listened closely to my colleague's speech.

I feel that the Liberals are taking action at the last minute. Last night, they made us vote on a motion recognizing the climate emergency, but they have done practically nothing over the past four years when they were in power.

The vote on this motion was held on the eve of the announcement concerning the expansion of the Trans Mountain pipeline, which they bought with our money.

The Trans Mountain expansion will increase pollution and oil sands production. It will be equivalent to putting another three million cars on the road.

How can my Liberal colleague say that it makes sense to vote on a climate emergency motion one day and then authorize the increased production of the most polluting oil in the world the next day?

Business of Supply

[English]

Mr. Lloyd Longfield: Mr. Speaker, that was also part of the question from the hon. member for the Green Party across the way, which was how do we have sustainable development in terms of pipelines and getting oil to export markets? That is really the purpose of Bill C-69 and Bill C-48 working together. How do we measure greenhouse gas emissions upstream and downstream, working with indigenous people to make sure we also have the social licence to do what we need to do?

The pipeline we are going to be talking about later this week has 200 conditions against it. This is not a matter of creating a corridor and plowing through with no environmental or social review. We are following the new review processes, which take into account climate change and our impact on the world, hopefully getting our oil to market to take off dirty coal or other emitters that are worse than what we would be providing through our resources in Canada.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not quite understand how we got here. We are at a place where the majority of the world, the vast majority of scientists, former Conservative politicians, religious leaders are saying that the path forward is through a price on pollution.

However, only two weeks ago, the deputy leader from the Conservative Party said, “The bottom line is there’s no solid connection between climate change and the major indicators of extreme weather...The continual claim of such a link is misinformation employed for political and rhetorical purposes.”

How did we get to this point where we have a Conservative Party that is just hell-bent against the idea of climate change and doing something about it?

Mr. Lloyd Longfield: Mr. Speaker, the quote was actually referring to a quote from a Guelph economist, Ross McKittrick, who was looking at the connection between climate change and the economy.

It is inflamed rhetoric from the other side. We heard the member for Calgary Nose Hill. Some of the words she was using were intended to inflame the argument and divide, versus working together, working across party lines, working with provinces, territories and municipalities.

We should not be fighting each other. We should be fighting climate change.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when I think of our environment, virtually from day one, this government has had a developing climate action plan that is healthy for the environment and the economy at the same time. We often talk about Canada's middle class, those aspiring to be a part of it and helping them through different measures. We recognize that we can do both at the same time. We can continue to develop the economy and ensure we have a healthier planet for future generations.

I want to highlight a few thoughts and then provide a little more detail on some of the politics.

When we look at the budgets and legislative measures, it is fairly impressive. We have committed hundreds of millions of dollars through budgetary measures over the last few years, such as over \$2.3 billion in funding to support clean technology in one form or another; \$21.9 billion in green infrastructure funding, which will support things like electricity infrastructure, renewable energy and so forth; and \$2 billion for disaster mitigation and adaptation funding.

Along with these budgetary measures, we have legislative measures, such Bill C-48, the oil tanker ban; Bill C-69, the environmental assessment legislation; our fisheries in Bill C-68.

From day one, this government has been on track to bring forward positive legislation and budgetary measures. This demonstrates very clearly that we understand how important the environment is not only to Canadians but to the world. These types of actions put Canada in a good place with respect to strong international leadership on this very important file. I believe Canadians want us to do this as a government.

We can look at some of the initiatives that government can take, and we hear a great deal about the price on pollution. For years now, the Conservative Party has been a lone voice in the House of Commons. The New Democrats, the Greens and, to the best of my knowledge, the Bloc understand that a price on pollution is the best way to go. It is not only the parties in the chamber, but it is very well received in many provincial and territorial jurisdictions. In fact, the majority of them already had some form of a price on pollution in place.

When we are talking about the national price on pollution, we are talking about areas where there is no plan in place, where there is no price on pollution and the federal government is imposing one. The good news is that 80%-plus of constituents I represent as the member of Parliament for Winnipeg North will be better off financially as a direct result of the price on pollution. However, the Conservatives in their spin and misinformation that they funnel out of their Conservative war room virtually on a daily basis are telling Canadians something that is vastly different from reality and truth. This is not a cash grab.

● (1255)

The Conservatives ask about the GST on fuel at the pumps. I remind them that they put the cascading tax on the pump price. I remind the Conservatives that their Party ignored the environment to the degree that it now demands the type of attention it has been given over the last few years. We just voted last night on the emergency facing our environment. Once again, the Liberals, the Greens, the Bloc and the CCF all voted yes that we did need to take the environment far more seriously. They recognized that it as an emergency. Only the Conservative Party voted against that motion.

The Conservatives say they have a plan. They have been saying that for a long time now. For the last 400-plus days, all they have been doing is criticizing the price on pollution, even though it is widely respected and acknowledged as the best way to deal the reduction of emissions.

Business of Supply

However, now Doug Ford has apparently met with the federal Conservative leader and hammered out a plan. Tomorrow, Mr. Ford will share his plan with the rest of Canada. He took Ontario out of the old plan. Now he will present a national plan, worked on with the federal Conservative Party. I look forward to seeing that plan. A little more transparency on the environment is long overdue when it comes to the Conservative Party of Canada.

It would be nice to compare our plan with the Conservative plan. Our plan talks about hundreds of millions of dollars of investment in clean energy and working with the different stakeholders. I will provide some tangible examples. In the last budget, there was an incentive for individuals to buy electric vehicles. Other provinces, like the beautiful province of Quebec, had a complementary program that would give the residents of Quebec a more substantial discount. Tesla reduced the price on a vehicle in order to get under the threshold. The biggest winner in this is the consumer, followed by the environment.

Governments can make a difference. To get a better appreciation of that, look at what happened in the taxi industry in the province of Manitoba with the Prius car. It was through government action. Government actions can make a difference. We came in with a plan after working with indigenous communities, provincial governments, municipalities, school boards and the private sector in developing ways to reduce emissions in every region of our country.

Through this debate, I have learned that the Conservative Party opposes supporting private sector initiatives with public dollars. That became very clear in the last number of weeks. I am anxious to see how the Conservatives might spin on that dime as they try to convince Canadians they care about the environment. In reality, there has been no indication that is the case.

● (1300)

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I think the member opposite is following the advice of the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, “if you say it louder...people will totally believe it.”

He should know that over the past year and a half, every single provincial government that has pushed headlong into this consumer-directed carbon tax has been defeated at the polls. Canadians are repeatedly saying that enough is enough. They are tired of being nickel-and-dimed.

The parliamentary secretary will know that the Alberta government got rid of its carbon tax, but it does have a price on the largest emitters in the province. The member just said that basically the federal backstop is only meant to impose a carbon tax on those jurisdictions that are not pricing it. Alberta is, and we have been told by the Minister of Environment and Climate Change that, as of January 1, we will be paying two taxes, one for the largest emitters based in Alberta, which is our jurisdiction, in our province, and now this revenue-generating carbon tax that Albertans have said they do not want.

What does the parliamentary secretary have to say to that?

Let us say goodbye to the member for Edmonton Centre, too.

● (1305)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party is very good at misleading Canadians. At the end of the day, the residents in Edmonton and the residents in Calgary, a vast majority of them, will actually be financially better off with a price on pollution, with the way the Liberal government is administering it.

Canadians would never think that if they listened to a Conservative. Canadians would think it is cash grab from Ottawa, which is absolutely crap. That is not the case. The members across the way know that, but do members think that would change the propaganda that they send out? Absolutely not.

The Conservative Party is not being honest with the people of Alberta; it is trying to give a false impression. A majority of the residents in Alberta will be financially better off with the price on pollution that would be put in by the federal government come January 1.

[Translation]

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I completely agree with the parliamentary secretary, who said that a price on pollution improves economic competitiveness. That is what OECD researchers are saying. That is a message for my Conservative colleagues.

However, I do not agree with the Liberals, who keep repeating that the economy and the environment go hand in hand. That is not the case for Trans Mountain.

The more we increase oil sands development, the more we increase greenhouse gas emissions. Here are a few statistics. Since 2005, the oil sands have grown by 158%. Alberta is the largest emitter of greenhouse gases, which rose by 28.7% between 2009 and 2016.

The economy and the environment do not always go hand in hand, when it comes to the extraction of dirty oil from the oil sands.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, on that particular point, we would have to agree to disagree. I believe an economy can in fact be managed while respecting the environment. We have seen that over the last three and a half years.

We have seen very progressive policies developed and implemented on the environment, while at the same time we have been able to generate, by working with Canadians, over one million jobs here in Canada. The economy does matter.

When we look at LNG, which is the largest single government-private working investment in Canadian history, we see it is going to provide cleaner energy. Parties will fall where they may. I know the NDP is having a very difficult time with that issue. The current leader at one time supported it, but now we do not know exactly where the NDP will fall on that particular issue.

Business of Supply

If we look at it and just listen, the Conservatives will say that we are not building the pipelines fast enough. If we listen to the Green Party, it would be that we should not build any pipelines. If we listen to the NDP, it would depend on the day and how threatened it is by the Greens. That would determine their policy. In terms of the Liberals, I can say that we appreciate the fact that we can do it in such a fashion that it is still good for Canada's environment and good for Canada's economy.

That is why we would argue that at times it is important for us to recognize that the economy and the environment can in fact go hand in hand, if they are administered properly. That is something we have done in the last three and a half years. Hopefully, we will get a renewed mandate a little later this year.

Mr. Larry Maguire (Brandon—Souris, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thought all along that the member for Winnipeg North just liked to debate so he could hear himself. However, I digress.

I am pleased to speak today to the Conservative Party of Canada's opposition motion on the topic of climate change and the environment. I will be sharing my time with the member for Perth—Wellington.

I want to say that only the Liberal government could talk about the environment for four years, break its promise to meet the Paris accord on climate change and end up taxing Canadians to cover up its incompetence, overspending and environmental management.

As I get into my presentation, for those who know me and my background, I have always strived to put forward ideas and solutions to the many issues facing my constituency and our nation. While I am not as good as giving one-liners or the pithy comments of social media that seem to attract the most attention, in my own way I have tried to reach out and build consensus to get things done.

Today, I want to apply that attitude to the larger issue of the environment, conservation and climate change. Like many members in the chamber, I represent a constituency that is geographically large. All across Westman, farms and communities dot the prairie landscape, as they have for many generations. Almost half of the people I represent live outside the city of Brandon in the 20-plus municipalities located in the riding.

These are some of the most hard-working, down to earth and determined people we will meet anywhere in this great country of ours. Living in rural Canada has its unique challenges. With those challenges also comes a way of life like none other. Our connection to the land, air and water is strong, because our livelihoods quite literally depend on it.

As someone who farmed for most of my life, I firmly believe that if we take care of the land, it will take care of us. My father raised my brother and me on those words, and I have lived by them. I want to immediately dispel any notion that farmers or rural folks who oppose the carbon tax do not care about the environment. They do care. They care about it immensely. They just have a serious issue about being forced to pay a new tax imposed on provinces that will disproportionately impact rural people.

Let us put ourselves in their boots for a moment. Many families must drive long distances to get to work. Many seniors have to drive

into Brandon to go to either the doctor or the optician. Parents have to drive their kids to various towns for sports or choir practice.

Let us never forget students at Brandon University and Assiniboine Community College who still live on the farm or in their rural community and make the daily commute to the city to attend classes. These are not optional things that people can just decide not to do or do less. There are no subways or bus routes for their purposes. Trust me; if people did not have to drive in our blustery winters, they would not.

From the very beginning, I believe the government has mishandled the rollout of the carbon tax.

First and foremost, many Canadians, particularly many of the people I represent, have trepidations about the federal government's priorities at the best of times. Saying the federal government is about to impose a new tax but not to worry because people will not feel the pinch, while at the same time it will combat climate change, is not the best way to get buy-in from those who have skepticism.

Second, when we tried in vain to get the financial data out of the Minister of Finance, it was so heavily blacked out that it was meaningless.

Third, when the Province of Manitoba put forward a plan that would have reduced carbon emissions, the federal government rejected it. Officials were told that no matter how many tonnes of CO₂ their plan would reduce, it had to include a \$50 a tonne carbon tax.

My province tried to work in good faith with the federal government and was told to go pound sand. No wonder it has decided to launch its own court case. If that is the way federalism now works in this country, it is not hard to understand why premiers are concerned about the Liberal government's other initiatives, such as Bill C-48 and Bill C-69.

It also troubles me that, in Canadian politics, the litmus test on one's commitment to the environment is now centred on supporting a \$50 a tonne carbon tax. While that may be the case in some circles, I can assure MPs that everyday Canadians do not use this lens when talking with their family and friends. It is not that my Conservative colleagues or people who oppose the carbon tax do not care about the changing climate; it is that we do not believe the carbon tax is the best way of addressing it.

Business of Supply

●(1310)

Tomorrow, our leader will outline the vision and present an alternative to what is being imposed by the current federal government. Due to the already challenging political discourse on this issue, I can only imagine the over-the-top language being drafted now in response. I want to urge the Liberals to hold off on issuing their canned response before the speech has even been given. The Liberals have been waiting ever so patiently, so I fully expect that they will be paying close attention. I want the government to recognize that there are more ways to deal with climate change than applying a tax on the fuel that families put in their minivans.

I want the Liberals to recognize that applying a carbon tax on the energy used to drive farmers' grain only adds further cost to the industry that is already facing challenging commodity prices and markets that slam shut. I want them to start listening to farmers who have ideas that can reduce and sequester carbon without applying a new tax. The agricultural industry has made great strides in environmental management that benefit society, virtually by its own innovation at its own cost. There are proven models out there that have had tangible and meaningful results.

I have always been a proponent, as examples, of implementing an alternative land use services program and the expansion of wetland restoration programs. For those who have not listened to the member for Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa, I can assure them his message about eating more beef and how it is good for the environment is grounded in empirical science.

Over the years as a farm leader, an MLA and now an MP, I have dealt with many issues that impact our environment. Back home, people do not apply a litmus test to determine our commitment to an issue. We focus on bringing people together to work on solutions. Perhaps one day those values will rub off on all of us in this chamber when we must wade through our differences.

I want to give just one example from which we can learn. Manitoba has been prone to floods for as long as history has been recorded. Being at the bottom of the basin, we have had to deal with spring runoff and localized flooding that has impacted communities for generations. It was a Progressive Conservative premier, Duff Roblin, who implemented a series of public works projects that protected communities in the Assiniboine and Red River basins, and particularly impacted the flooding that would have occurred in the city of Winnipeg in 1997. Since then, there have been significant enhancements to flood protection up and down the Souris, Red and Assiniboine rivers. I want to say that this issue in Manitoba is non-partisan.

Our previous federal Conservative and provincial NDP governments both invested in projects that protected the city of Brandon and the towns of Melita, Reston, Souris, Deloraine, Elkhorn and Wawanesa. We also expanded the Red River Floodway, which was completed under budget.

It was after the most recent flood that many people in the Assiniboine River basin decided that we needed to work together. Under the leadership of Allan Preston and Wanda McFadyen, they spearheaded an initiative that brought the governments of Saskatchewan, Manitoba and North Dakota under one organization, alongside

municipalities, farmers and conservation districts. We all live within the same watershed, and we had to stop working in silos.

We know a one-size-fits-all approach to water management does not work, and that is why a one-size-fits-all approach will not work with a carbon tax. That is why it was so frustrating to see how the federal government tossed aside the climate change plan put forward by Manitoba. Without a change in attitude, more and more Canadians will look at the rigid position taken by some in the government and tune out. We also know that climate change is a global problem that requires global solutions. The current approach does not reflect that reality.

I firmly believe that Canada is well positioned to provide these solutions. Tomorrow we will start outlining our alternative to the carbon tax and begin the conversation on what will replace it. I encourage my Liberal colleagues, particularly those who represent rural areas, to join me in supporting this motion. I ask them to please stand up for their constituents, repeal the carbon tax and replace it with a real environmental plan.

●(1315)

The Deputy Speaker: Before we go to questions and comments, I want to thank the hon. member for Burnaby North—Seymour for stopping that inadvertent sound from a device near him. It was not his, but I appreciate his efforts in that respect.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Toronto—Danforth.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin (Toronto—Danforth, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was listening with interest to my colleague's presentation, but there were a few parts that were missing, on which I would like his comments.

The first part is that he talked about the climate action incentive, with which I understand an average family of four in Manitoba would be receiving \$339. Not only that, in rural areas, where there are those extended drives for people who live farther away from cities, there is in fact a top-up as well, so there can be some additional support for those families. The Parliamentary Budget Officer did a study, which found that eight out of 10 families would be receiving more through this plan than they would be spending. Could I hear some comments on that?

The other missing piece is that the price on pollution is not the entire climate action plan. There is a lot more being done. There are many investments. I am sure that the member is aware of them. Perhaps he could comment about the great work that is being done on those programs, including phasing away coal and creating jobs in the meantime.

●(1320)

Mr. Larry Maguire: Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for her very pertinent question. However, coming from a government that has missed its Paris target by 79 megatonnes, it is not sound management.

Business of Supply

We also know the tax package the Liberal government has come up with has fallen very short. The Parliamentary Budget Officer was very clear about the decrease that would be required in greenhouse gas emissions in order for Canada to meet the Paris climate target. He also said we would need a tax of about \$102 a tonne to meet that target, versus the \$50 a tonne the government is talking about today.

Therefore, the current government does not have a real plan for environmental management; rather, it has a tax plan, and that tax plan has failed, which I thank my colleague for pointing out. It has failed in all the provinces in which the government said people would be better off with the tax than without it. The best thing to do is leave the money in people's pockets, so they can make environmental management changes in their own operations, as the agricultural industry has done over the past 50 or 100 years.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I also tried to rise to speak to another Manitoba member, the Liberal member for Winnipeg North.

I agree with the claim referenced by both members, that Canada is in a good position to exert world leadership. Canada has a tradition of punching above its weight. However, right now, the horrible reality is that we are the worst polluter of the G20 countries. Per capita, we pollute 22 tonnes of carbon per person, compared to Sweden at about four tonnes and Norway at about six tonnes. Those are also cold, Nordic countries. It is not a question of temperature, as was offered by other members; rather, it has to do with the ambition of a target.

Both members who recently spoke referred to the Paris target as if it were the same as the current target put in place under the previous government, of 30% below 2005 levels by 2030. That is not a target that is consistent with our Paris goals. Our Paris goals require that we roughly double that effort, so we can hold to 1.5°C globally.

We have a global framework, which is the Paris Agreement. Countries around the world are doing better than we are. I wonder if the hon. member for Brandon—Souris knows whether the plan that will be revealed tomorrow by the Conservative Party leader will be framed around the wrong target or adopt a target that is consistent with the Paris Agreement.

Mr. Larry Maguire: Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge the fact that we have the ability to be a leader in the world with respect to the management of our climate. As a Conservative member who is sitting on the Arctic climate change committee, I am very aware of the changes that are taking place in that part of the world, and in all areas. The member mentioned Sweden and Norway. From my experience in those two countries, I know that because the Gulf Stream goes right up the coast of Norway, its average temperatures in the winter are 0°C to -6°C. This winter, we hit -50°C six times in Manitoba. There is a difference in the temperatures and in the climates we have to deal with in these areas.

The whole process of the Paris accord is something the government has adopted. We voted in favour of it. The levels the present government is targeting are those the Conservative government brought forward. Certainly, at the time we brought them in, they were obtainable targets. However, the government has missed the mark by a mile, and is still adding a tax on people that is not going to benefit them.

Mr. John Nater (Perth—Wellington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise today to speak to this motion. Canadians do care about the environment. Canadians care about the environment, and they care about climate change. Constituents in my riding of Perth—Wellington care about the environment and climate change. They tell me that. Small businesses, families and the agricultural community care about the environment. After all, farmers are the original conservationists. They are closest to the ground, closest to the natural resources and closest to the natural environment that they depend on for their livelihoods and way of life, so they care about this. They care about what we as a country and we as a Parliament are doing for the environment and to combat climate change.

I also hear from my constituents about the negative impact the policies of the Liberal government are having on their families, their communities and small businesses in Perth—Wellington. They tell me on their doorsteps, write to my office and send emails, and I see it on social media. They are concerned about the rising cost of living. They are concerned about the impact and effect the carbon tax is having on the cost of taking their kids to soccer practice, driving to a part-time job, running their businesses and caring for their families. They are concerned about this. They are concerned that they are being taxed and taxed again, and seeing no tangible impact of those changes.

Today's motion is very simple. It calls on the House to express its opinion that we should repeal the carbon tax, which it has been shown will not meet the Paris targets. In fact, it will fall far short of meeting those targets. The motion calls on the House to endorse a real environment plan. I am proud to say that tomorrow Canadians will see what a real environment plan looks like.

The government fails to understand that people in my riding and Canadians across the country are not wasteful people. They care about the environment, and they care about their communities. They do not waste. They are already making changes where they can. They have made their best efforts and are continuing to make their best efforts, because they care.

I recently came across a comment by a small business owner just outside of St. Marys, Ontario. She wrote that as she listened to our Prime Minister stumble over the question regarding how his family were changing their lifestyle to help the environment, she thought of her husband, whom she called the unintentional environmentalist. He has flown on an airplane once in his life, in 1991, to attend a friend's wedding in B.C. His idea of a holiday is a day trip to a local museum or pioneer village, or a train ride to Toronto to watch a ball game. A fun Saturday night is staying home watching the game on TV. He has never used a fast-food drive-through. He does not even drink coffee.

Business of Supply

On the rare occasion that he goes out for something to eat, he always goes into the restaurant to dine. When he goes to work, he packs a lunch in a reusable container and fills his water jug from the tap. His favourite drink, milk, is purchased from the local variety store in recyclable jugs. He shops locally, and the limited clothing in his closet comes from work, the township or sports team sources. His little Honda only leaves the driveway when there is a purpose, and he does multiple errands where possible. Christmas and birthday gifts are books, given and received, not trinkets from offshore. One can see his footprint is quite small.

That is reflective of so many Canadians, so many of my constituents and so many Canadians across the country who are making an effort. Then they see the Liberal government taxing them more, and they see a Prime Minister who, when asked the very simple question of what he personally and his family are doing, stumbled over his own words and made some incoherent comment about a “drink box-water bottle-sort of thing”. That is not good enough for Canadians. It is not good enough for Canadians who are making a real effort to reduce their carbon footprint. It is not good enough for Canadians who are struggling to get by because of the cost of having the Liberals in office.

Rural communities like mine are struggling because of these costs. They do not have the benefit of mass transit systems that our urban cousins have. Someone who works in Atwood but lives in Listowel cannot take a bus to work; someone who lives in Stratford cannot take a subway to St. Marys to visit family, and a person in Arthur cannot take a transit bus to Mount Forest for appointments. It is not possible, yet this carbon tax is putting an added burden on these Canadians.

●(1325)

I often hear about the cost of heating people's homes, and of course the carbon tax is increasing the cost of heating homes. Luckily, the Conservative Party has proposed to lower the cost of heating homes by removing the GST portion of the HST from home heating to help families get ahead.

The problem we see is that the Liberals are not talking about an environment plan. It is a tax plan. It is a tax plan that they claim takes with one hand and gives back with the other hand, but we see them reaching into both pockets. Their rebate plan was clearly not as advertised: We saw Canadians in Ontario being told they would receive \$307 back, yet the vast majority received far less than promised.

We see the Liberals, at every opportunity they get, fearmongering. They say that anyone who is opposed to the carbon tax is somehow a climate change denier. They use strong-man arguments to try to paint hard-working Canadians and the opposition as climate change deniers. However, at the end of the day, we know that the Liberals are just using empty, symbolic gestures rather than taking real action. Real action is what Conservatives take.

Real action is what Conservatives will take once again in October when we are given the honour, hopefully, of serving this great country. It was a Conservative government, under Brian Mulroney, that introduced, signed and ratified the acid rain treaty. Contrast that with the Liberal government, which signed the Kyoto protocol and then did nothing. I am proud to be a member of the Conservative

government that, during its time in office, actually saw emissions decrease.

We often talk about coal-fired power plants. In fact, it was a Conservative government in 2001 in Ontario that began the process of phasing out coal in Ontario, having a meaningful and real impact on emissions in Perth—Wellington and across Canada. In my riding, many people heat their homes with natural gas. It is fascinating that the Liberal carbon tax gives a more favourable rate to coal than it does to natural gas, which is a far cleaner use of electricity and energy. Once again, the Liberals do not care about that. They care about revenues and money, and that is exactly what the Liberal plan is: a tax plan.

Yesterday we saw the Liberals vote in favour of declaring a climate change emergency, which is a symbolic gesture but has no meaningful or tangible impact. The NDP member for New Westminster—Burnaby said, “I have to comment on what just transpired. The Liberals are slapping each other on the back because they passed a motion that is meaningless.”

That is exactly what we are seeing with the Liberals: meaningless gestures rather than taking real action. Real action is what we will see tomorrow, when the Conservatives unveil our plan.

I realize that my time is running short, but I want to make a few final comments. The carbon tax is not benefiting our environment. In fact, in 2016 Canada was 44 megatonnes over its Paris target. In 2017, that number rose to 66 megatonnes. Last year, it was 103 megatonnes above the Paris commitment.

Then we find out from the Parliamentary Budget Officer that the only way the Liberals will even come close to hitting their Paris targets is if they increase by five times the cost of the carbon tax, from \$20 today to \$102. That means people in ridings across Ontario and Canada could be paying as much as 23¢ per litre of gasoline more into the coffers of the Liberal government.

Under the Conservative plan, we will have the best chance of meeting our Paris targets. Under the Conservative plan, we will have a meaningful commitment to the environment, a meaningful plan to combat climate change and a meaningful plan that will benefit all Canadians, rather than the tax plan that we see from the Liberals.

●(1330)

Mr. Terry Beech (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would specifically like to talk about the national price on pollution. It was implemented on April 1. I am glad that the Conservative Party gave it a full 78 days so that they could gather the evidence they need to tell us whether it was successful or not.

I would refer the member to British Columbia, where this was first implemented 11 years ago. If we look at the data there, of course, we had reductions in per capita emissions, and at the same time, we had the fastest-growing economy in the country.

Business of Supply

The member talked in his speech about emissions going down during the Conservatives' time. The only time that happened was during recessions, a climate plan so nice that the Conservatives did it twice the last time they were in government. That is not a way to actually protect the environment. Maybe the member is going to point to Doug Ford's plan in Ontario, one that is twice as expensive and is not getting the job done.

This is why the Conservatives voted against the climate change emergency. The Conservatives' number one promise is to repeal the national price on carbon. They are looking at the people of British Columbia, people who have done this for 11 years, and are saying, "Guess what, you have been doing it for 11 years, and finally the rest of the country came onside on April 1, but we are going to take that away. You guys in B.C. keep paying, but we are not paying anymore." How does the member think that is fair?

• (1335)

Mr. John Nater: Mr. Speaker, first of all, yesterday the Liberals voted in favour of a motion declaring a climate emergency, but the real emergency is a political emergency. The Liberals saw their votes seeping to other parties. They saw a Green seepage and an NDP seepage, so they used a political emergency to have a debate. The Liberals introduced that motion and let it sit for nearly a month.

Let us talk about British Columbia. The member says that there was a per capita emissions reduction, but what we see is that emissions have steadily risen in jurisdictions where there was a carbon tax. It did not reduce emissions.

Today we hear from the Parliamentary Budget Officer that for Canada to even come close to meeting its Paris targets, it has to increase fivefold from what it is today.

Let us talk about the provinces. We have provinces across Canada where the federal government has said that Ottawa knows best. The provincial plans are not good enough, in its opinion. Even if they reduce emissions, it is not good enough in the Liberal government's opinion. The government will only accept a tax.

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, first, my concern today is that what we have heard from Conservatives is an attack on every jurisdiction that has had success implementing a carbon tax.

Conservatives say that British Columbia is too warm. That is what I heard from my colleague from Calgary Nose Hill. This member talked about Scandinavia and that it is too cold there and it would be too hard for us to model ourselves on that. However, 83% of Canadians are in urban areas. The difference between Stockholm and Toronto, in median temperature, is one degree Celsius.

Canadians need bold and courageous action and to actually be committed to a clear plan with clear targets. The Conservatives are debating this motion the day before they put their plan on the table. One would think they would put their plan on the table the day before and then have this debate today. Instead, the Conservatives decided not to do that, because they do not want to talk about it. They do not want to have a real conversation so that we can talk about how we are going to move forward.

The Conservatives talk about being fiscally responsible. They know that the Parliamentary Budget Officer says that it is going to

cost \$40 billion to \$50 billion for climate emergencies by 2050. Does the member think it is right that we put these economic deficits on future generations to shoulder, or does the member think we should pay a price on pollution right now? That would be the fiscally responsible thing to do for future generations right now.

Mr. John Nater: Mr. Speaker, the right thing is to take real action in support of the environment, rather than introducing more taxes on Canadians who are already struggling to get by.

The member talked about urban centres. Let us talk about rural communities, which I am proud to represent. Our rural communities are going to be the hardest hit by the carbon tax, and they are going to see the least amount of benefit from the carbon tax. What is going to happen is that businesses are going to be impacted, families are going to be impacted, and we are not going to see the benefit for the environment.

The member mentioned that tomorrow we will be unveiling our Conservative plan for the environment. It is going to acknowledge and recognize that this is a global challenge and that it is going to take global action to address the concerns of climate change here in Canada and around the world. We need to take action in Canada, but we also need to be a leader in the world when it comes to this. That is why I am proud of our plan. I will be proud to see it unveiled tomorrow.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I will be sharing my time with the member for Rivière-des-Mille-Îles.

I would like to pick up on a point the member for Perth—Wellington discussed in his speech a few moments ago. He talked about his constituent, the unintentional environmentalist, who had only taken one flight and is continuing to do a number of things that are environmentally friendly to protect our world.

The irony is that the member did not bother to tell his constituent the full story. The fact is that although there is a price on pollution, there is also the climate action incentive rebate. The fact is that because the member's constituent lives in a rural riding, he will even get a top-up to the normal rebate. As a result of being so environmentally conscious, the member's constituent is going to be further ahead than the vast majority of Canadians. Of course, the member did not bother to inform his constituent of that very important information.

The Conservatives will stand here and accuse this side of the House of playing politics. This is fascinating to me, because over the last three and a half years, I have listened to Conservatives talk about CO₂ being plant food. I have heard Conservatives talk about how we are demonizing CO₂. I have never heard them reference anything about climate change, yet suddenly, within the last month, we have started to hear Conservatives utter the words "climate change."

Business of Supply

I would love to ask the Library of Parliament to do a summary of the number of times the Conservatives said “climate change” during the last month versus the preceding three and a half years. I bet they have said it more in the last month. Do members know why? It is because they have started to do the polling, and they are starting to think they might have had it wrong on this one and had better start talking about climate change now.

What are they relying on? I will tell the House what they are doing. Tomorrow they will make their big announcement. They know that they have to thread the needle very tightly, because they also know that they represent Canadians who do not believe in climate change. They need to be careful. They need to make sure that they bring forward a plan that does not offend those people either.

What we are going to hear tomorrow is a whole bunch of rhetoric from the Conservatives about how we have to do more for our environment and that the Liberal plan is a horrible plan and at the same time, we are hoping that they bring forward something that is meaningful that we can have a real and honest debate about.

At the same time as they are starting to change this messaging, someone forgot to tell the member for Milton, the deputy leader of the Conservative Party. In a tweet, she said:

Bottom line is there's no solid connection between climate change and the major indicators of extreme weather. The continual claim of such a link is misinformation employed for political and rhetorical purposes.

She must have received the message right after she tweeted that out, because it did not take long for them to pull that message off the Internet, because it did not fit the new narrative the Conservatives have suddenly adopted.

Tomorrow we will see this “plan” that will somehow try to appease those who do not believe in climate change, because that is their base. We will also see them try to put it just enough over the fence so they can pull in some of those people who do not quite know where they stand. How am I doing? How is that for the war room? I am pretty sure that is bang on with how the Conservatives are trying to play this one out.

Of course, they will scare people by claiming that this is a tax and will not tell them the full story, which is that there is a rebate back-ended on this. All the money that is collected through the price on pollution goes right back into the pockets of Canadians. The Conservatives do not want to tell Canadians that part.

This is not a tax. This is a market incentive tool, a tool used to change market behaviour. That came out in the conversation and the questions I had earlier with the member for Calgary Nose Hill when she proceeded to educate us on economic models and price elasticity. She said that fuel is an inelastic demand, and therefore, it is impossible to change the price elasticity of it or to change demand for it. The reality of the situation is that after time, the price elasticity will change as new options come into the marketplace.

● (1340)

That is why, while putting a price on pollution, this government has also been doing a number of things to help change that price elasticity, such as putting in a rebate for electric vehicles, investing in green technology to change the way business looks at things and making large emitters pay more.

Did members know that globally, money is gushing into any kind of fund that has a green infrastructure or green asset attached to it? There is \$31 trillion currently available in anything that is labelled green, because even the marketplace knows this. Even economists know this. We are seeing world-renowned, Nobel Prize-winning economists saying that this is the solution. We are seeing religious leaders saying that this is the solution. Former Conservative prime minister Stephen Harper said, in 2008, that a price on pollution is the way to go. It is what is going to make changes and make us make different choices in the marketplace. Preston Manning, another famous Conservative, said the same thing.

The bottom line is that while we continue to listen to the rhetoric from the other side of the House, we know that having a plan that incentivizes our market to make people make different choices is the right way to go. It is a fundamental principle of any economic model. The Conservative Party of Canada, which says that it is the saviour and the only party that understands how the economy works, is somehow the only party in this House that is fighting against putting a price on pollution. Every single other party in this House recognizes and knows that putting a price on pollution is the way to go.

I stand by this decision. I stand by this policy. I know it is the only way to go. I know it is the right way to go. I know that Canada and the world will be better off when we listen to these renowned individuals, as opposed to the Conservative Party of Canada.

● (1345)

Mr. Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes, CPC): Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to acknowledge today that Bombardier Patrick Labrie of the 2nd Regiment, Royal Canadian Horse Artillery, was killed in an operation in Bulgaria. As a veteran, as the member for Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes, and as a Canadian, my thoughts and prayers are with Bombardier Patrick Labrie's family, his regimental family and his Canadian Armed Forces family.

I would ask my colleague across the way, if he could comment on how much per litre he thinks the market is willing to bear. How much can Canadians afford in terms of the carbon tax increase on the price at the pump?

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes for his question and for recognizing the hurt that is inflicted upon our military community today. Being from a riding that has a military community in it, I know that these are events that impact the entire community and not just individual family members. Our hearts go out to them.

I believe that the scheduled price on pollution that has been implemented by this government is the correct way to go forward. We do not want to create a scenario where people are bombarded with a price on pollution all at once. It has to be ramped up over time. It has to be done in a way that can effectively get towards the targets we need to get to. I believe that the schedule that has been put in place is the right one.

Business of Supply

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my hon. colleague on a very passionate speech, much of which I agreed with.

I will repeat again that the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has come out with some stark numbers that ought to terrify every legislator in the world. If we do not hit a 45% reduction over 2010 by 2030, we risk elevating our global temperature by more than 2° above pre-industrial times, which will melt both polar caps. We can lose 99% of the world's coral reefs and face the extinction of one million species. What I am concerned about is that while we, and I in particular, support the idea of a carbon tax, we have to obtain significant reductions quickly. We have 11 years.

First, given that his government has capped the carbon tax at \$50, does he think that is enough to start influencing the market to bring down our emissions quickly enough?

Second, I find it ironic that we have this passionate speech on a day that his government is going to approve, in all likelihood, the Trans Mountain pipeline. Can he tell me of a single economist or climate change leader who says that tripling bitumen exports out of Canada will have a positive effect on climate change in this world?

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, the member and I probably are closer on this matter than we would both think. In fact, I voted for the motion his party put forward a year ago that defined climate change. When he talks about the amount, if we just talk about the price on pollution, we will lose sight of some of the other things that have to happen at the same time, such as investing in new technologies and moving toward encouraging people to drive electric vehicles. It is a holistic approach.

I do not think having just a price on pollution is the only way. We have to move forward in a way that advances a number of different factors and variables that contribute to the equation.

• (1350)

Mr. Robert Kitchen (Souris—Moose Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member talked about how he did not want to call it a tax. However, what we do know is the government put a GST on the carbon tax.

In 2017, 43.6 billion litres of gasoline were used in Canada and \$2.6 billion were collected in GST. The Liberals said that they would give 100% of this money back. Surprisingly, the GST money will not be given back. We found after the fact that actually only 90% would go be given back. Therefore, any way we look at it, this is a tax.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, that is such a red herring. The member is talking about an incredible fraction of the percentage on this. The reality is that we are dealing with a party that will not even say it believes in climate change, or at least it would not until a couple of weeks ago. This continual narrative will not help advance the objective of genuinely having a meaningful impact on our environment.

We have stated, and it has been proven by the fact that all the money is being rebated, that this is an incentive tool to incentivize the marketplace so people will make better and different decisions than they currently make when it comes the use of fossil fuels.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Rivière-des-Mille-Îles has about eight minutes until we begin statements by members. I will let her know when her time is up.

Ms. Linda Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to the speech by my colleague from Kingston and the Islands.

[*English*]

It was very interesting.

[*Translation*]

I would like to talk about Canada's "Changing Climate Report".

Science is the foundation of the Government of Canada's action on climate change, and our scientists provide the information we need to make strategic decisions.

Canada's "Changing Climate Report", which was drafted by world-renowned scientists from Environment and Climate Change Canada, Fisheries and Oceans Canada and Natural Resources Canada and by Canadian university experts, is one of the scientific contributions that provide the evidence we need to make sound policy decisions and to protect our environment, our communities and our economy.

The report was released in 2014 and is the first comprehensive, autonomous assessment of why and how Canada's climate is evolving and of how it is projected to change in the future. Some of Canada's best scientists conducted this peer-reviewed assessment, which was based on already published research. The report represents the work carried out by the international climatologist community. It will help inform decisions regarding adaptation and will help the public gain a better understanding of Canada's evolution.

We rely on scientists to give us the evidence. During the 10 years under the Harper government, scientists were muzzled.

We, on the other hand, prefer to rely on evidence and scientific consensus when making decisions. The science is clear: Canada's climate is warming more rapidly than the global average.

This will continue, and global carbon dioxide emissions from human activity will largely determine how much more warming Canada and the world will experience in the future.

Reducing human emissions of carbon dioxide will reduce how much additional future warming occurs. However, no matter how much warming occurs, this warming is here to stay. It is effectively irreversible on timescales of centuries to millennia.

Statements by Members

Canada's "Changing Climate Report" is a comprehensive scientific assessment that will inform the development of sound policies designed to protect the environment, our communities and the economy.

The people of Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, located along the Mille-Îles River in the Montreal area, believe in having sound evidence. Unfortunately, we have had 100-year floods in 2017 and in 2019. There can be no doubt that climate change is real, and my constituents take their environment to heart.

The report will also help raise public awareness and understanding of the changing climate and enable strong adaptation to reduce our vulnerability and strengthen our resilience to climate change. It tells us strong mitigation action is required to limit warming.

In the development of the report, key stakeholders were engaged to ensure this information is presented to serve a broad range of public and private sector adaptation decision-makers.

This key reference document is relevant across many sectors and informs Canadian planning and investment decisions that will last decades.

When the time comes for the provinces and territories to prepare development plans, they need data to show where the flood plains are, whether climate change will affect those areas and what is going to happen.

The assessment confirms that Canada's climate has warmed mainly in response to emissions of carbon dioxide from human activity. The effects of widespread warming are already evident in many parts of Canada and are projected to intensify in the next five years. The report covers changes across Canada in temperature and precipitation, including extremes, snow, ice and permafrost, freshwater availability and changes in oceans surrounding Canada.

• (1355)

The report provides a riveting account of climate change in Canada. Canada's climate has warmed and will warm further in the future as a result of human influence, and this phenomenon is irreversible. In Canada, the rate of past and future warming is, on average, about double the global average. The climate in Canada is warming at twice the rate of the rest of the world. The annual mean temperature in Canada increased by 1.7°C over the past 70 years. The temperature in winter increased by 3.3°C over the same period. The increase in annual mean temperature is even more marked in the Canadian Arctic, where it rose by 2.3°C. To sum up, Canada is warming twice as fast as the rest of the world and the Arctic is warming three times as fast. It is quite worrisome. We must do something about this.

Canada's oceans have warmed and the acidification process has begun. They are now less oxygenated, which is consistent with the trend observed around the world over the past century.

The effects of widespread warming are evident in many parts of Canada and are projected to intensify in the future. These effects such as thawing permafrost, shorter snow and ice cover seasons, longer growing seasons, more extreme heat and earlier spring peak stream flow will continue because some further warming is

unavoidable. Precipitation is projected to increase for most of Canada, although summer rainfall may decrease in some areas. Changing temperatures and precipitation, and also changes in snow and ice, have important implications for freshwater supply. The seasonal availability of freshwater is changing with an increased risk of water supply shortages in summer.

A warmer climate will intensify weather extremes in the future. Extreme hot temperatures will become more frequent and more intense. This will increase the severity of heat waves. That is why a report written by scientists is so important to both private enterprise and the public sector. It will help us make the right decisions in order to take climate action.

Since I am out of time, I will continue to explain why this report is so important after question period.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

• (1400)

[*Translation*]

TAXATION

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, according to the Canada Revenue Agency, tax evasion costs us \$26 billion and banks and oil companies reap the rewards.

That is \$26 billion that is not being taxed and used to pay for our nurses or to renovate our schools and that is just the tip of the iceberg.

The Canada Revenue Agency calculates how much money people are hiding, but not how much money people keep in tax havens with the CRA's permission. Corporations and banks are allowed to engage in tax avoidance. That is what the Liberals are hiding when they talk about tax fairness.

The CRA will put a citizen who owes \$100 through hell to get that money, but Ottawa allows banks to hide billions of dollars in Barbados.

The Liberals even legalized three new tax havens during their term. They say that the net is tightening on tax cheats, but it is more like a window that is opening.

Statements by Members

[English]

SUDAN

Mr. Chris Bittle (St. Catharines, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week, members of Niagara's Sudanese community marched to St. Catharines city hall to honour those killed in Sudan during increased violence and protests in the country. Many residents still have friends, family and loved ones in the midst of a brutal crackdown on political protesters bravely calling for change following decades of oppression from their government. They want what we have: a civilian-led government and a voice in their own future. They seek the basic human rights we all take for granted. The response from their government has been horrific violence, including killings and sexual assault. All of this was for doing what we are doing right now: making our voices heard.

My thoughts are with their loved ones and the people of Sudan. The perpetrators must be held to account for these atrocities. The Government of Canada stands with the people of Sudan. We are prepared to do whatever we can to support a civilian-led transition to a democratically elected government in Sudan.

We hear the Niagara Sudanese community, we stand with it and we stand with the people of Sudan.

* * *

ALBERTA

Mr. Matt Jeneroux (Edmonton Riverbend, CPC): Mr. Speaker, two years ago, the Prime Minister forgot to mention Alberta in his Canada 150 speech. We were of course offended but did not think it was more than an innocent omission. However, the Prime Minister's actions have lived up to this omission, as it appears he wishes he could forget Alberta altogether.

His policies, like Bill C-69 and Bill C-48, are deliberate attempts to destroy our energy sector. Bill C-69 would impose onerous new regulations around pipeline construction. Bill C-48 would ban tankers from parts of B.C.'s coast. As a result of these bills, thousands of hard-working Canadians will continue to lose jobs in our province. The government also wants to impose a new carbon tax on Alberta on January 1. Talk about kicking us while we are down.

Approving the Trans Mountain expansion project is not enough. The Liberals must put forward a concrete plan to get the project built and tell Canadians when construction will start in Burnaby.

A Conservative government will stand up for Alberta, as a strong Alberta is a strong Canada.

* * *

LIBERAL PARTY OF CANADA

Ms. Pam Damoff (Oakville North—Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to reflect on our accomplishments of the last four years: the lowest unemployment rate in 40 years, one million jobs created by Canadians and 300,000 kids lifted out of poverty.

I am proud of my work on the status of women committee to help shape a national gender-based violence strategy and my work on the public safety committee on legislation that will transform our

national security landscape, eliminate administrative segregation from prisons and introduce a common-sense approach to firearms.

My office's young women in leadership program has connected over 150 young women with career mentors. Our government supported the Terry Fox Research Institute with a \$150-million commitment toward cancer research. As Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, I note we are moving forward on pharmacare and healthy active living.

I am immensely privileged to represent Oakville North—Burlington. Here is to another four years of good work on behalf of all Canadians.

* * *

[Translation]

ABITIBI-TÉMISCAMINGUE

Ms. Christine Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, NDP): Mr. Speaker,

I first came to this world in a town called La Reine.
It captures my heart, again and again.
At the edge of the world, where the air is so clear,
The Abitibiwinni have lived for thousands of years.

To the sound of their drums is how my heart beats,
To the rhythm of their oars, the cadence repeats.
Bright, starry nights envelop, surround me,
I am Témis. I am Abitibi.

I was born in the autumn with colours ablaze,
But each season brings some beauty to praise.
An idyllic place to learn and to grow,
Where the Okiko River steady does flow.

A place of peace, rest and tranquillity,
I am Témis. I am Abitibi.
In this part of the land, mother earth gives her wealth,
And my little treasures were born in good health.

With all that they need to grow and to flourish,
They are raised in love, they are cherished and nourished.
Precious new life in need of nurture and caring,
We are mothers both, into eternity staring.

Here fertile soil helps to feed,
Nurturing every little seed.
Ancient forests embrace, enclose
All those in need of some repose.

My feet have travelled your breadth and length.
In you my heart has found its strength.
I am Témis. I am Abitibi.
I am Témis. I am Abitibi.

Statements by Members

● (1405)

[English]

VETERANS

Mr. Anthony Housefather (Mount Royal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 75th anniversary of D-Day and we share a sacred responsibility to keep veterans' stories alive. It is with that in mind that I wish to highlight the contribution of Jewish Canadian war veterans who have served in all of Canada's wars.

In World War II, for example, Canadian Jews served in Canada's armed forces at a rate 10% higher than the national average. One such individual was Nathan Dlusy. Nathan fled Germany in 1938 to come to Montreal. In 1942, despite not yet having his citizenship, Nathan enlisted with the Royal Canadian Air Force to fight against tyranny and oppression overseas. In 1944, he gave his life for our country. He was only 23 years old. Today, his brother John Dlusy has kept his story alive.

I wish to thank John for sharing his brother's courageous story and I want to thank all of our veterans who have served and sacrificed so that we may live in freedom.

* * *

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last summer, the Liberals defended funding anti-oil and gas groups because of "free speech" while they shut down church-run summer camps because of their "values" test. The Liberals showed their values this year, once again using taxpayer dollars to fund groups that want to block the Trans Mountain expansion and shut down Canadian oil and gas.

The list includes Tides Canada running a decade-long, foreign-funded smear campaign against the oil sands; the Pembina Institute working with American groups to "landlock" Canadian oil; the Dogwood Initiative campaigning against politicians who support Canadian oil and gas, specifically against the Trans Mountain expansion; the Sierra Club running a campaign right now against the Senate amendments to Bill C-69 that indigenous communities and nine provinces and all territories want; and the West Coast Environmental Law Association that took foreign money to push the oil shipping ban in 2015 that led to Bill C-48 and has already promised new legal challenges to the Trans Mountain expansion.

MPs review and approve the funding. It is all in Liberal and NDP ridings. When it comes to Liberals' claims to support oil and gas workers, the Prime Minister is not as advertised.

* * *

WEST ISLAND CANCER WELLNESS CENTRE

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the West Island Cancer Wellness Centre, under the leadership of its founder Debbie Magwood and with the unflagging support of its dedicated staff, volunteers and donors, is the model for a new kind of cancer care. The centre is a pioneer in a whole-person integrated approach that goes beyond traditional medical treatment to focus on the psychosocial needs of those living with the disease.

[Translation]

The centre supports participants through a variety of programs including fitness, meditation, reflexology and yoga.

[English]

Debbie and her team are passionate about sharing their vision. That is why, with the support of Health Canada, they have launched National Cancer Wellness Awareness Day, to be marked for the first time this June 26.

[Translation]

I would like to congratulate Debbie and her team and the incredible community that supports the centre and its mission to make Canada an even more compassionate society.

* * *

[English]

LONG RANGE MOUNTAINS

Ms. Gudie Hutchings (Long Range Mountains, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it has been my honour to represent my riding of Long Range Mountains in this 42nd Parliament. Our government has accomplished a great deal, however, I know that, working together, there is much more we will deliver in our next mandate.

With summer coming, I must take this opportunity to talk about the tourism industry. It is growing leaps and bounds and there is an economic boost especially in rural areas. The invitation is extended to all my colleagues, if they are looking for something to do this summer, to visit my riding. We have stunning campgrounds, cozy B and Bs, unique inns and hotels. Surrounded by majestic scenery, people can enjoy hiking, boat tours, icebergs and whales, kayaking, fishing, hunting, challenging golf, incredible theatre, museums, delicious culinary experiences and so many local shops to explore.

From our national parks and historic sites, people will see some incredible sunsets and if they are lucky, the northern lights. Visitors will always find the locals just waiting to share their stories in our unique lingo. I can promise that there is music everywhere.

I will be travelling about my riding all summer and I hope to see everyone there.

*Statements by Members***CANADA—U.S. RELATIONS**

Ms. Leona Alleslev (Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it has become obvious the Prime Minister is not taken seriously on the world stage. While the Liberals try to justify his disastrous foreign diplomacy, the Prime Minister inevitably makes another misstep that further erodes Canada's reputation. The result is that Canada has never been more alone.

Canada's economy and prosperity depend on trade and trade is all about relationships. Failed diplomacy is failed trade. That is why this meeting with the U.S. President this week is important. It is an opportunity for the Prime Minister to repair a strained relationship and advance Canada's interests.

Canadians imprisoned in China, softwood lumber, a guarantee of no new U.S. national security tariffs, improved defence and security, and Canada's Arctic sovereignty must all be addressed. Canada and the United States must resolve our differences and unite to face the common threats to our freedom and democracy.

Canada needs a Prime Minister who will rise to the challenge in Washington. There is much at stake.

* * *

• (1410)

MEMBER FOR BRAMPTON NORTH

Ms. Ruby Sahota (Brampton North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is my last member's statement in this 42nd Parliament. I would like to take a moment to reflect on what a wonderful journey it has been. I want to take a moment to congratulate all members in this House and thank them for their friendship, their guidance and lessons learned.

However, none of this would be possible without the support of some very important people back home. I would like to thank my husband, Tejinder Sahota, and our son, Nihal. I would like to thank my parents, Harbans Singh, Surinder Kaur, Kuldip Sahota and Pam Sahota, and my siblings, Simmi, Raj, Shub and Mandeeep. Of course, I cannot forget my assistant, Karen Gill, who has become one of my most trusted friends. We have taken this journey together and boy, has it been sweet.

Lastly, I want to thank the good people of Brampton North. They have encouraged me and challenged me every step of the way. Over these last few years, I have tried my best to serve them with passion and integrity. I thank them for the opportunity of a lifetime, I have nothing but love and gratitude for them.

* * *

LIBERAL PARTY OF CANADA

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, every day, Canada's middle class has been priority number one. Whether it is the Minister of Finance, the Prime Minister or the entire Liberal caucus, we recognize the value of having a middle-class tax break that gave hundreds of millions of dollars to Canadians in every region of our country.

We recognize the value of decreasing the small business tax. We recognize the value of increasing taxes for Canada's 1% wealthiest. We realize the value in terms of increasing the Canada child benefit for Canadians, with \$9 million a month going into Winnipeg North

alone. We recognize the value of supporting our seniors, lifting hundreds of seniors out of poverty in Winnipeg North alone and seniors across our country. We realize the value of investing in Canada's infrastructure.

We know, understand and appreciate that the way to make our economy work is to invest in Canada.

* * *

CARBON PRICING

Mrs. Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, while the Prime Minister enjoys the life of being in the world's top 1%, and the use of taxpayer-funded carbon-spewing government jets, most Canadians have to budget to get by. It is no wonder there is a disconnect between the current Prime Minister's policies and the impacts they will have on middle-class Canadians.

A carbon tax raises the price of everything. Food, flights, gas and all household items are more expensive because of it. This week we learned that the Liberal carbon tax will fail in its alleged purpose of helping Canada reach its Paris Agreement targets. This is further evidence that the Liberal carbon tax is a tax plan, not an environmental plan. Canadians cannot afford this tax.

When something does not work, we replace it with something else that does. On October 21, Canadians will have the opportunity to exchange the current defective Liberal government for a Conservative government that will work for them.

* * *

• (1415)

MEMBER FOR WEST NOVA

Mr. Colin Fraser (West Nova, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is the honour of a lifetime to be a member of Parliament. Since I will not be running again in the next election, this will be my last time addressing the House.

I have so many people to thank for allowing me this incredible opportunity to serve Canada. I owe a huge debt of gratitude to my amazing team here on the Hill, and back at home. I thank Melanie, Sjanna, Norma and Jason for a job very well done.

I thank the many Liberal Party volunteers and supporters in West Nova. I cannot begin to tell them how much their dedication has meant to me.

As we all know, none of us could do this job without the support of our family and friends, and to mine I say that I love them, I look forward to seeing them more often, and I hope the feeling is mutual.

Last but not least, I thank the kind and decent people of western Nova Scotia. I hope the contribution I have made on their behalf is worthy of them. It is a privilege to be their representative, one that I will treasure for the rest of my life.

Canada is good and just. As we continue on our journey, let us always have the wisdom to strive for an even better country.

*Oral Questions***OIL TANKER MORATORIUM**

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, 15 years ago, I first rose in this place to pay tribute to an environmental and peace activist named Alice Coppard, who had just passed away. In 1971, she hitchhiked across Canada, gathering signatures for a north coast oil moratorium. One year later in this place, in 1972, Frank Howard, the MP for Skeena, passed a unanimous motion to the same effect.

For those of us watching the devastating impacts of climate change in our communities and watching governments unwilling or unable to act, it is tempting to lose faith. However, hope springs eternal, for after almost 50 years of a campaign to unite indigenous and non-indigenous, environmentalists and conservationists, rural and urban, tonight we will vote to finally pass the north coast oil tanker moratorium into law.

In my final statement to Parliament, I thank all those who fought and campaigned to protect the northwest and who believe firmly in their hearts and minds that it is never too late to build a better world.

* * *

GOVERNMENT POLICIES

Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let us look back to 2015 and some of the promises that were made by the Prime Minister.

There would be modest deficits and the budget would balance itself in 2019. That was false. The deficit is at \$22 billion this year and mounting. Then there was the reinstatement of life-long pensions for veterans. That was false again. We have seen multiple ethics scandals, a disastrous India trip, the payment to Omar Khadr, the SNC-Lavalin scandal, the Mark Norman affair, and threats to our security and sovereignty. The 2015 election was going to be the last election under first past the post.

Shall I dispense? Members obviously agree.

The Prime Minister said that Canada was back, but Canada was not back. The Liberals were back to their scandal-plagued days of backroom deals and backroom operatives, looking after their well-connected and well-heeled friends and working on two sets of rules: one for the Liberals and one for the rest of us.

The number of first-time Liberal MPs not reoffering this October is the most since 1997. For all the reasons I have stated, and much more, these members have come to realize, like many who voted for them in 2015, that the current Prime Minister is not as advertised.

* * *

GOVERNMENT POLICIES

Mr. Mike Bossio (Hastings—Lennox and Addington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government believes that investing in Canadians is not only the right thing to do; it is the smart thing to do. Over one million jobs have been created since we came to government. Unemployment rates are the lowest on record. Over 825,000 Canadians have been lifted out of poverty through measures like our increase to the guaranteed income supplement, sending \$1.7 million per year to low-income single seniors in my riding.

Low- and middle-income families, like Lacy's in Tweed and Krysta-Lee's in Tamworth, are benefiting from the Canada child benefit, which in April alone helped over 16,000 children in my riding, for a total of \$5.5 million. That is \$66 million per year for families in Hastings—Lennox and Addington.

We ran on a plan to invest, and the result is the best balance sheet and one of the highest growth rates in the G7. Not only is our plan working; it is better than advertised.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[English]

NATURAL RESOURCES

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we know that the Prime Minister and his cabinet are going to approve the TMX pipeline project today. This is not a big surprise. However, what is very unclear is whether or not this pipeline will ever get built.

I have a very simple question for the Prime Minister. When will construction of the TMX pipeline commence in Burnaby this summer?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have been steadfast in our commitment to getting this right by following the Federal Court of Appeal's guidance. Over the last number of months, the Minister of Natural Resources has met with communities from all four regions of the proposed project, and our Crown consultation teams have been on the ground engaging in meaningful two-way dialogue. We have committed to delivering this process in the right way for all Canadians, and we will have more to say shortly.

● (1420)

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there is no comfort there. I spent this weekend in Milton talking to people on Main Street. I spent the last two days in Toronto talking to senior bankers and business people. The one thing they all have in common is that not a single one of them believes that the Prime Minister will get this pipeline built, and we will not believe it until we see shovels in the ground.

I ask again, what day will this pipeline commence construction in Burnaby, British Columbia?

Oral Questions

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for 10 years, the previous government cut corners with its blatant disregard for the courts, no plans to protect the environment and coastal communities, and failure to respect the rights of indigenous communities. In the process, all the Conservatives managed to do was divide Canadians. We will take no lessons from the Conservatives. We committed to getting this process right for all Canadians, and we will have more to say shortly.

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, one would think that a government that is seeking to be re-elected by the Canadian public would actually care about the fact that nobody believes it will build this pipeline. The Liberals can dredge up past stories of their own narratives, but the reality is that they have to live with their actions now. Nobody believes they will build the pipeline.

However, here is the thing. They can tell us now exactly when they are going to commence construction. When will they commence construction in Burnaby this summer?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the Conservatives continue to double down on their failed approach, with their disregard for the courts, with no plan to protect the environment, no plan to protect the coastal communities and no respect for consultation with indigenous communities. The only thing they ever achieved in their decade was to divide Canadians. They even voted to de-fund the TMX reconsideration process. We committed to getting this done right, and that is exactly what we are doing.

The Speaker: Order, please. I remind the hon. member for Abbotsford and others to wait until it is their turn to speak before doing so.

The hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have some nerve talking about lack of respect. The Liberal Party and the Liberal leader have little respect for Canadian energy and none at all for oil industry workers.

The Prime Minister has no respect for people who work on pipelines. He wants to eliminate oil and he wants it to be expensive, as well. That is what the Liberals want. We know that the government will be giving the Trans Mountain expansion the green light a few hours from now.

The question is, when will the shovels actually be in the ground?

[*English*]

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that the party opposite would talk about respect for workers. For over a decade, it had a process that resulted in no pipeline getting built. In fact, we respect workers. We have respected workers through the legislation we introduced to strengthen workers' rights in this country, to protect workers' rights and to create good jobs. In fact, we have supported the creation of over a million jobs in this country since we were elected. That is standing up for workers. This

government will always stand up for workers, always stand up for jobs, and that is exactly what we are doing today.

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to the member to be patient: four months and it will be done.

[*Translation*]

As everyone knows, the government has not done a single thing since announcing Trans Mountain. Not one spadeful of soil has been turned, not one inch of pipeline has been built. The government has not built a thing, but it has taken a 2,500 kilometre detour by sending Canadians' money to Houston, which is 2,500 kilometres away from here. That is the only thing the Liberals have done.

In a couple of hours, they will announce that Trans Mountain is going ahead. When will shovels be in the ground?

[*English*]

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, the Conservatives had a decade to create things like pipelines and it did not result in any action. Why? Because they blatantly disregarded the courts. They blatantly disregarded the rights of Canadians. They blatantly disregarded the rights of communities to have input, to have consultation on these projects that affected all of us.

We continue to support the process of consultation. The minister has held numerous consultations with indigenous communities and with coastal communities. We continue to listen. We will have more to say shortly.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister presents a symbolic motion on the environment one day and approves a pipeline expansion the next. This pipeline will only make climate change worse. This decision shows that the Liberals are not taking the emergency seriously and do not respect the rights of indigenous peoples.

What will the Prime Minister say to the young people who want to defend the environment and have sustainable employment in the future?

● (1425)

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am always pleased to stand and say how hard we are working to protect the environment and tackle climate change.

Yes, yesterday, we had a vote on the climate emergency motion. The Conservatives voted against it. I am pleased that the NDP voted for it, but why are they not in favour of the project supported by B.C. NDP? I am speaking of the LNG project, which creates thousands of jobs and is growing our economy. We are—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Burnaby South.

*Oral Questions**[English]*

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are facing soaring temperatures, forest fires and flooding. Canada should be a leader on climate innovation. Canada should be ending our subsidies to fossil fuels. Instead, the Liberals are purchasing pipelines. They are continuing to maintain Harper's targets. They are continuing to subsidize fossil fuel sectors.

We believe there is a better way. The Liberals believe there is better symbolism. When will the Prime Minister finally respect indigenous communities, coastal communities and defend our environment?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we do not believe in symbolism; we believe in action.

That is why we have phased out coal and we are ensuring a just transition for communities. That is why we are making historic investments in public transportation, so people can get around faster, greener, cheaper. That is why we are investing in innovation and companies across the country that are providing the solutions we need and the world desperately needs. That is why we brought in Bill C-69, better rules to protect the environment.

Unfortunately, we have a Conservative Party that does not believe that we need to protect the environment, that we need to—

The Speaker: Order, please. I urge members to show other members the respect they would like to be shown.

* * *

HOUSING

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, continuing on the theme of symbolism, the Prime Minister is great at grand symbolic gestures, but always fails when it comes to helping people when it counts.

Millions of Canadians do not have an affordable place to live and they make difficult choices every day, between buying their groceries or paying their rent. Now the PBO confirms what Canadians have known all along, that instead of increasing the amount of funding for housing, the Liberal government has cut it by one-fifth.

When will the Prime Minister stop making excuses and actually build, which is our plan, half a million new affordable homes for Canadians?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government proudly introduced Canada's first-ever national housing strategy. We recognize that every Canadian deserves a safe, affordable place to call home.

The new report on housing from the Parliamentary Budget Officer highlights that without the national housing strategy, housing investments in the country would have been cut by more than 75% over this next decade. We are maintaining the momentum and the growth to ensure Canadians have the housing they need, deserve and can afford.

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it contains nothing. The PBO points out that the Liberal government is cutting funding to housing. Do not make up stuff.

[Translation]

The Parliamentary Budget Officer's reports are clear—

[English]

The Speaker: I would remind the hon. member for Burnaby South to direct his comments to the Chair.

[Translation]

Mr. Jagmeet Singh: Mr. Speaker, the PBO's reports are clear and prove what we have been saying for months: the Liberals are not creating the housing that people need. This Prime Minister is very good at making symbolic gestures, but he is not there for the people when it counts. Canada is in the midst of a housing crisis that affects all regions of the country.

When will the Liberals get serious and help people secure the affordable housing they need?

[English]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, thanks to our unprecedented investments in housing since taking office in 2015, we have helped more than a million Canadians find a place to call home. The national housing strategy ensures that we will continue to be a full and active partner in Canada's housing sector for the decade to come.

I have had the honour in my constituency to help dig the foundations and open the new buildings that new citizens in my riding are able to enjoy.

* * *

● (1430)

*[Translation]***CARBON PRICING**

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Budget Officer sent a clear message last week.

The Liberal government's carbon tax will cost Canadians even more. The Prime Minister does not want to tell us that, in addition to being twice as high as was originally announced, the carbon tax will go up. The Prime Minister will raise the price of gas by 23¢ per litre.

I have a simple question for the Prime Minister. Why does he want to raise the price of gas by another 23¢? That will have an impact on people's grocery bills, heating costs and everything they consume.

[English]

The Speaker: If the hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby and the hon. member for Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Social Development wish to have a conversation, they might want to do that outside.

The hon. Minister of Environment.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the opposition party knows, we put a price on pollution because pollution can no longer be free. We are giving that money back to families. Eighty per cent of families, low-income and middle-class families, will have more money in their pockets.

Maybe the member noticed that the pope met with oil companies last week. They agreed that we need to put a price on pollution.

Why do we need to put a price on pollution? Because it works.

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have an abysmal record when it comes to the environment and their past four budgets. They have managed Canadians' finances irresponsibly and ineffectively, which led to four years of deficits.

Who will pay for that? Our children, our grandchildren and Canadians who work hard for their money, that's who.

What is this government trying to do? Clearly, to make life even more expensive for Canadians.

Why do this government and this Prime Minister want to increase the price of gas yet again—

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Environment and Climate Change.

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy with what we are doing as a government. We have created one million jobs for Canadians. We have lifted 875,000 people out of poverty. We lowered taxes on small businesses.

What are we doing, on top of all that? We are taking climate action.

I was embarrassed yesterday to hear the Conservative Party say that there was no climate emergency and that we did not need to meet our targets and work with others.

What are we leaving our children and grandchildren? A climate emergency—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: The hon. member for Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier will come to order.

The hon. member for Carleton.

* * *

[English]

SMALL BUSINESS

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, two years ago, almost to the day, the finance minister unleashed an attack on small businesses. He tried to raise taxes on their investment up to 73% and double the tax on parents selling their businesses to their children. He backed down, partially and temporarily, after a massive uprising.

I have two questions. First, will he admit that this attack on small businesses was wrong? Second, will he promise never to try it again?

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know that results count. We are in a position where our economy is doing better than anyone expected at this stage. We have the lowest rate of unemployment we have seen in 40 years. We have the highest rate of working-age population at work than we have ever seen in history in the country.

One of the big reasons for that is small and medium-sized businesses are doing well. We lowered their tax rates. They are now experiencing the lowest tax rates among G7 countries.

We have continued to support businesses in the country and what they have done. They have created jobs so Canadians are working. It is good news all around.

• (1435)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we just heard it right there. Small businesses across the land will notice that the minister had an opportunity to rule out bringing back his original tax increases that he proposed in the summer of 2017 and he refused to rule it out.

We know what is coming after the election, just like the carbon tax. We have found out from the Parliamentary Budget Officer that the government will raise gas prices 23¢ a litre.

Why does the government not honestly admit that now, before the election?

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we did take on the additional \$150 billion of debt left us by the previous Harper government. What we did was decided that with that we would actually focus on the middle class. We knew it would be the engine of growth for our country. We focused on it and we increased the amount of money going to people who were struggling to get by. Lo and behold, our economy rebounded and lo and behold, the lowest unemployment rate in four years.

That was good news, but we will keep on working for the middle class. We are going to keep making sure that businesses are successful. Our approach is working.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have just given two opportunities for the minister to admit that his original attack on small business people in the summer of 2017 was wrong and that he would never try it again. We know he is running out of other people's money and he will be looking for more of it if he is re-elected.

Now we find out that he is open to reintroducing his 73% tax on small business investment and he is open to doubling the tax on families selling from parent to child.

Why does he not just admit that is exactly what he will do if re-elected?

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know that confidence among small and medium-sized businesses and confidence among large businesses is critically important. That is why we never resort to scare tactics like this.

Oral Questions

We focus on how we can actually make a difference. The good news is that the things we have done have actually made a difference. The fact that Canadians have more money in their pockets means they are putting it back into the economy, means they are actually buying goods from small and medium-sized businesses. The good news is it is working. Canadians are doing well and we are going to keep on it.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, scare tactics? The Prime Minister said that our small businesses were nothing more than tax cheats. The finance minister tried to impose a 73% tax on small business investment. This is a government that attempted to double the tax on parents selling their businesses to children, so it would have a tax advantage in selling it to foreign multinationals. Scare tactics? The government scared the hell out of small business right across the country.

The Liberals could put some of those fears to rest if they would promise now that they will never do it again.

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is very important that we listen to people in the business community to figure out what we should do to make sure our economy keeps doing well.

They have told us, first and foremost, that skills matter. What did we do? We ensured that people could have access to university by lowering the cost of university for low and middle-income Canadians. We put in place an approach to ensure that people could get the training they needed over the long term. They also told us that taxes mattered, so we lowered the taxes on small and medium-sized businesses.

We know our approach is working. We will continue to focus on what really matters to business to keep our economy—

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

* * *

[Translation]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we already know that saying one thing and doing the opposite is the hallmark of the Liberal Party. However, declaring a climate emergency one day and approving the expansion of a pipeline that will emit as much pollution as three million cars the next day goes beyond mere hypocrisy. They just do not give a damn what Canadians want.

How can this government claim to be for the environment while betraying future generations with its fake green policies?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are working very hard to fight climate change. We put a price on pollution across the country, we are phasing out coal, and we are investing in a just transition. We are investing in clean technology to create jobs across Canada. We are investing in public transit and green infrastructure. We are fighting plastic pollution.

I could say more, but what Canadians and I find really disappointing is the Conservative Party. The Conservatives refuse

to join all members of the House in declaring a climate emergency and saying that we must take action.

[English]

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are disappointed in the Liberals, because with this irresponsible rubber stamp, Liberals are trashing the Paris agreement forever and vandalizing our coastal environment and marine life.

Climate leaders do not try to ram through raw bitumen pipelines, and they do not run roughshod over indigenous rights. Just one spill will wipe out thousands of jobs in the fisheries and in tourism for a generation.

Liberals are throwing away \$17 billion from taxpayers to threaten jobs in the environment in B.C. Why did they not say no to oil lobbyists? Why did they not say yes to future generations?

• (1440)

Mr. Paul Lefebvre (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians elected our government on a plan to grow the economy and protect the environment. That is exactly what we are delivering.

We have invested over \$1.5 billion in the oceans protection plan. We have a national climate plan with more than 50 measures, investing over \$50 billion in the green economy. We are also putting in place a process to make sure resource projects move forward in the right way.

If it were up to the NDP, there would be no new investments in any new natural resource sector. Let us look at LNG Canada. We are not sure where the NDP stands.

We are focused on getting the energy sector process to move forward in the right way.

* * *

[Translation]

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, CPC): Mr. Speaker, under Bill C-69, all natural resource development in this country will grind to a halt. Even Quebec opposes this legislation. The Quebec environment minister has said the bill “perpetuates the duplication of environmental procedures” and “expands federal government control”.

Bill C-69 will put the brakes on electricity exports, which are an essential opportunity for Quebec's economy.

Why are the Liberals undermining Quebec's economic development?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when we were elected, we said we would bring in better rules for reviewing major projects.

Oral Questions

The Conservatives' plan under Stephen Harper was a disaster. The Conservatives did not listen to indigenous peoples and did not want any environmental protections. They did not even want to listen to people who expressed concerns about projects.

That is not how good projects move forward. We must protect the environment and listen to indigenous peoples—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock.

[*English*]

Mr. Jamie Schmale (Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, nine provinces are opposed to the Prime Minister's attack on resource development in Canada. The Liberals stifled debate and rammed through bills that would block oil exports and kill energy projects. Twenty-one industry leaders announced that this is the end of future growth, and those investors have abandoned this important sector.

When will the Prime Minister finally admit that his no more pipelines bill and oil export ban bill are part of his plan to phase out Canada's energy sector?

Mr. Paul Lefebvre (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians expect a transparent assessment of major projects that they can trust, and businesses need assessments to be done in a timely and efficient way. The Harper Conservatives gutted this process. They made Canadians lose trust, and they hurt our economy and energy sector at the same time.

Our better rules will ensure that resource development is done in a way that protects the environment, grows our economy, properly consults indigenous peoples and creates good, middle-class jobs. That is what Canadians expect. That is what we will continue to deliver.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister dismissed six premiers' calls for changes to Bill C-69 as partisan, but he also rejected requests from the Liberal premiers of Nova Scotia and Newfoundland and Labrador for offshore oil and gas. The Liberals have already killed over \$100 billion in major projects, and the Bank of Canada predicts no new energy investment after 2019.

The Liberals' shipping ban bill, Bill C-48, blocks the west coast. Their poison pill in Bill C-86 would allow the same thing on every other coast. Bill C-69 would harm the whole country.

Will the Liberals kill these anti-energy bills before it is too late?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Stephen Harper's failed system gutted environmental assessments. He rammed through a new process, without any consultation, through an omnibus budget bill.

What did that get us? It got us more polarization. It got us fights across the country. What did it not get us? Good projects were not able to go ahead in a timely way.

We built better rules that will ensure that we listen to indigenous peoples, that we protect the environment, that we listen to the concerns of Canadians. Yes, they will ensure that good projects are

built in a timely way, because we have \$500 billion of economic opportunity—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeland.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, businesses, municipalities and indigenous communities say the Liberals' anti-pipeline, anti-rail, anti-hydro, anti-business bill, Bill C-69, would hurt all of Canada.

Canadian Manufacturers & Exporters said it will make it “in some cases, impossible...[for]...nationally significant natural resource development”. The Canadian Chamber of Commerce said “the impacts will be severe across Canada”. Nine provinces and all territories want major changes to Bill C-69. Quebec calls it a “veto” over economic development.

Will the Liberals stop Bill C-69?

● (1445)

Mr. Paul Lefebvre (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are putting in place better rules to protect the environment, respect indigenous rights, attract investment and create good, middle-class jobs. Hundreds of major resource projects worth over \$500 billion in investments are planned across Canada over the next 10 years. A robust project list will ensure good projects can move forward in a timely, transparent way that protects the environment, rebuilds public trust and strengthens our economy.

* * *

HOUSING

Ms. Sheri Benson (Saskatoon West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we have a housing crisis in Canada, and the Liberals are failing to address it. The PBO report shows that the Liberals are inflating their own figures while families in our communities are facing constant stress to find a place to call home. The report says the Liberals are doing even less to help people with immediate housing needs than the Harper government did. I find this shameful. Enough with the empty promises. Will the government act now to end homelessness and ensure families in Canada have a place to call home?

Mr. Adam Vaughan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development (Housing and Urban Affairs), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the national housing strategy. As the PBO correctly identifies, the 62% increase in front-line services to fight homelessness will help us reduce chronic homelessness by 50%. As well, we are targeted on lifting 500,000 Canadians out of core housing need.

Oral Questions

What the PBO does not count is the Canada housing benefit, an \$8.4 billion program. The report also does not take into account the federal-provincial-territorial agreements that we have locked in, which guarantee a 15% increase in housing supply. It also does not properly qualify the loans and financing that are building thousands of housing units across the country.

The national housing strategy is working, building real housing for real people.

* * *

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, a Powell River judge sentenced a crab poacher recently. In her decision, she noted that Fisheries and Oceans Canada is woefully understaffed. Law-abiding fishers struggle to make ends meet because of climate change, habitat destruction and tighter restrictions while they have no choice but to watch as poachers and over-harvesting destroy local ecosystems.

Will the minister listen to this judge and to my constituents and get more DFO staff on the water doing the work they need to do?

Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this government has done an enormous amount of work to restore the capacity of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans after it was gutted by the previous Harper government. There were \$100 million in operating cost reductions and the gutting of the Fisheries Act in 2012.

We have just restored the protections in the Fisheries Act. We made significant investments in science. We made significant investments in enforcement and protection. We will continue to do so, so that the fisheries are managed in a sustainable way, going forward.

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Mr. Robert-Falcon Ouellette (Winnipeg Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wear this beaded jacket that has the image of indigenous women so we may never forget that we all have a role in giving a voice to those who have been ignored for far too long.

In 2017, Bill S-3 was finally passed with a delay concerning the 1951 cut-off criteria. The government said it needed time to consult on an implementation plan. The minister's special representative has completed her consultations and report, which was just tabled in Parliament. Indigenous women and their descendants want to know. When will they finally have their human rights restored?

Hon. Carolyn Bennett (Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Winnipeg Centre for his ongoing advocacy on this. Gender equality is a fundamental human right, and Bill S-3 does eliminate the sex-based discrimination from the Indian Act.

With the ministerial special representative's consultations concluded and her report tabled, we now know what our partners need in a successful implementation plan. Work on that implementation plan is well under way, and I can confirm that we will be bringing these provisions into force within the current mandate. We are committed to working with our partners to remedy all remaining registration

issues, but also to accelerate the progress to self-determination by which nations—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier.

* * *

[Translation]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Joël Godin (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government has no credibility on environmental matters. It says its plan will enable Canada to uphold its commitment to the Paris Agreement targets.

Experts, scientists, environmental groups and government officials unanimously agree that Canada is not going to meet its targets. Only the Liberals think they know better, and their refusal to tell Canadians the truth is hypocritical. The Liberals need to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

Why is this Liberal government not telling the truth?

● (1450)

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, why did the Conservatives vote against the motion on the climate emergency? Is it because they refuse to listen to the science on climate change? Do they not realize that we are already paying the price? Are they not aware that even Quebec, the province that the member represents, has a carbon exchange that is working?

Quebec is lowering its emissions, it has a clean technology sector, and Quebecers are happy. Maybe the member should try talking to Quebecers.

[English]

The Speaker: Order. I have heard from the hon. member for Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies many times today, and normally I enjoy that, but he has not had the floor. I would ask him to wait until he has the floor before interjecting.

Hon. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have fallen far short of their Paris targets, and that should come as no surprise. They do not have a climate plan. They have a tax plan. Whether pretending that they will not raise the carbon tax past \$50 per tonne or trotting out ministers to criticize a climate plan they have not even seen yet, the Liberals are increasingly desperate to distract from their own climate failures.

When will the minister tell the truth and finally admit that they will not meet their Paris targets?

Oral Questions

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to go back to 2015. The member opposite came to Paris. He came when we negotiated the Paris agreement. He came when Canada said that we are back, that we are serious, that we are taking climate action. We negotiated for one year a climate plan with more than 50 measures.

Yesterday, we saw the hypocrisy of the Conservative Party. Those members voted against a climate emergency motion. They voted against taking action to meet our Paris agreement targets. They voted against a safe and cleaner future for our kids. They voted against a \$26 trillion opportunity—

The Speaker: Order. We could always have a shorter question period if members want that. If they cannot hear the questions and the answers, we might have to.

* * *

[Translation]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the China crisis is going from bad to worse. Canada's international reputation is in tatters because of this Prime Minister. China is not even taking his calls.

Like China, it is time the Liberal leader stopped making excuses. First it was canola and soy, and now China is targeting the pork sector even though it desperately needs Canadian pork. Standing up for photo ops is one thing, but standing up for our producers is quite another.

Why is the Prime Minister incapable of standing up to China?

Hon. Marie-Claude Bibeau (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): It is quite the contrary, Mr. Speaker. I can assure the House that we are standing up for Canada and have been since this all started. Our Canadian pork producers provide very high-quality products.

It is true that China informed us that it had suspended a pork producer after detecting the presence of a feed additive that is permitted under international standards but prohibited in China. I can assure the House that the Canadian Food Inspection Agency is monitoring this matter closely. We are taking this very seriously.

* * *

[English]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Ms. Leona Alleslev (Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, for months the government has defended its lack of progress with China by claiming that it has built a coalition of countries who support freeing two Canadians from a Chinese prison. While a consensus among friends is helpful, the Prime Minister has yet to translate this global support into action. It rests with the Prime Minister to step up himself and demonstrate we are serious when dealing with China.

When will the Prime Minister act to break this deadlock with China and free our wrongfully imprisoned Canadians?

Mr. Robert Oliphant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as with every issue, our

priority is the best interests of Canada and Canadians. We have ensured that China is well aware of every one of our positions. We have indeed rallied an unprecedented number of countries who are speaking out in support of Canadians.

This should not be about grandstanding. It should not be about scoring political points. This is about working persistently, carefully and resolutely to get brave Canadians home and to ensure that our farmers have access to markets.

* * *

● (1455)

GOVERNMENT PRIORITIES

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canadians depend on services like health care, education and supports for children with autism. Instead of properly funding them, Liberal and Conservative governments across this country keep telling Canadians to expect less and slashing services. Meanwhile, rich corporations have avoided paying \$26 billion in taxes. Why are they getting away with it? Imagine the services Canadians could receive with that money.

Will the Liberals ever have the courage to stand up to rich corporations, or will they continue to watch and do nothing as Canadians struggle?

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government recognizes the unique challenges that Canadians face when they are dealing with autism. That is why we are taking action to support them through community-based projects, a national research and exchange network program to help them find work and groundbreaking new research.

We will continue to work with community groups, caregivers and others to ensure that all Canadians with autism get the support and the help they need.

* * *

[Translation]

TAXATION

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as a result of inaction on the part of successive Liberal and Conservative governments, we are losing out on \$26 billion in taxes every year, and the minister refuses to go after it.

To put that number into context, it is enough to build eight superhospitals like Montreal's CHUM hospital, six Champlain Bridges or 650,000 affordable housing units.

When will the government and the Minister of National Revenue find an ounce of courage to finally reform our outdated tax laws, which favour the wealthiest Canadians?

Oral Questions

Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleague obviously has not read the five CRA reports on this topic. He is talking about tax gap estimates from 2014. That was before our government began tackling the problem, following 10 years of Conservative inaction.

Those estimates confirm that tax evasion is a problem. We are on the right track, having made historic investments of over \$1 billion in the Canada Revenue Agency. Unlike the Conservatives and the NDP, we believe in making decisions based on facts.

* * *

CANADA SUMMER JOBS PROGRAM

Hon. Steven Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Canada summer jobs program is supposed to get young people working, but we learned that the Liberals are using it to fund organizations that are linked with terrorist entities.

The Islamic Society of North America, in the riding of Mississauga—Lakeshore, has been banned by the Canada Revenue Agency for its ties to certain organizations. It cannot even take a cheque, yet the Liberals are giving it money.

Do they take the threat of terrorism seriously? If so, when will the minister revoke the grant?

[English]

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, obviously, this government stands against terrorism. I understand the member's concerns. My officials are looking into this.

As I said, we expect all organizations that receive funding for Canada summer jobs to abide by the terms and conditions of the program. I have asked the department to examine the organization in question. If in fact the organization is using the money in a way that violates anybody's charter rights or places that student in an unsafe position, then it will not be eligible for reimbursement for that position.

Ms. Rachael Harder (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the problem is that charter rights are granted to those who call Canada home. We are talking about terrorist activities that are taking place in Pakistan.

The question is simple. The number one responsibility of any government is to uphold the rule of law. It is particularly problematic then that the money in this case went to where it did.

Here is the thing. To receive Canada jobs funding, organizations have to pass the Liberals' autocratic values test. Did this organization in fact pass the Liberals' test on this?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite should put the whistle down. It is disappointing, but not surprising, that the member would spread such dishonest rhetoric. What can we expect from the party that reads the words of an Islamophobic terrorist into committee record or the party that associates with Faith Goldy or Rebel Media and their hateful conspiracy theories? Of course, that is the party that has shared a stage with those who have been removed from Facebook for their white nationalist views. We will not take lessons from that party.

The Speaker: Order, please. Members naturally are going to hear things they do not like during question period and perhaps other times, too. I do not understand why members do not think it is important to listen whether they agree or not.

I would urge members to be judicious in their comments. I also ask the hon. member for Wellington—Halton Hills not to be yelling when someone else has the floor.

The hon. member for Chilliwack—Hope.

● (1500)

Mr. Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC): Mr. Speaker, clearly, the minister is scared to answer the actual question.

The Liberals have given \$26,000 in Canada summer jobs funding to a group linked to terrorism. The activities of that group, the Islamic Society of North America-Canada, are known to the government because the Canada Revenue Agency already suspended its charitable status because of its connection to militant extremists. That did not stop the Liberal MP for Mississauga—Lakeshore from signing off on the funding.

The minister has had this file on her desk for a week. It should have taken her five minutes. Why does she not cancel the funding today?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is heartwarming to hear the member opposite cares so much now about jobs for kids. In fact, if the Conservatives were so concerned about jobs for Canadian youth, why did they oppose critical funding for things like the youth employment skills strategy, or the work-integrated early learning program or apprenticeship grants? Why did they let the youth unemployment rate reach the highest rates since the nineties under their watch?

Our government had doubled the program. In fact, since we have been elected, over 70,000 students each summer have received quality student jobs, which has led to the lowest youth unemployment record—

The Speaker: Order, please. There is no need for this constant cacophony when others are speaking.

The hon. member for Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley.

*Oral Questions***HEALTH**

Mr. Doug Eyolfson (Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, both as a member of Parliament and a physician, I have heard from constituents, patients and many others about the high cost of prescription drugs. Canadians are proud of their universal public health care system, but we know that nearly one million Canadians have to give up essentials like food to pay for their medication. That is why I am heartened to see our government taking action on this critical issue.

Could the Minister of Health update the House on our work to make prescription drugs affordable for more Canadians?

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank my colleague from Manitoba for his important work on the health committee and also his advocacy for pharmacare.

No Canadian should have to choose between putting food on their table and paying for prescription medication. That is why our government is committed to ensuring that all Canadians have access to a national pharmacare program, and the work is under way. In budget 2019, there are \$35 million to create the Canadian drug agency and also \$1 billion to address the high cost of rare diseases.

We will not rest until every Canadian has access to a national pharmacare program.

* * *

ETHICS

Hon. Peter Kent (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last week, the Prime Minister claimed the Liberal MP for Steveston—Richmond East had addressed allegations of his law firm's handling of a Chinese drug boss's real estate deal. This week, faced by details of another suspicious deal, revealed by B.C.'s money laundering inquiry, the Minister of Border Security and Organized Crime Reduction would not address unproven allegations.

The Prime Minister attacks small business owners as tax cheats without evidence, but in this latest emerging Liberal scandal, no action. Why is there one set of rules for Liberals and another for everyone else?

Hon. Bill Blair (Minister of Border Security and Organized Crime Reduction, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member for Thornhill may wish to test the veracity of his speculations outside the protection of the House.

However, let us talk about money laundering. Our government has demonstrated that we will take all measures available to us to stop organized crime. That includes an investment of \$172 million to the RCMP for FINTRAC and CRA to establish an enforcement team, as well as making Criminal Code amendments.

That is the same government that in the last four years of the Harper government took \$500 million from the RCMP and closed all 12 of the—

The Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Beloeil—Chambly.

[Translation]

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Matthew Dubé (Beloeil—Chambly, NDP): Mr. Speaker, people from my riding are here in Ottawa to protest against the Telus tower that is being forced on Otterburn Park. Students Romane, Laurence and Emma-Rose from École Notre-Dame launched a petition signed by about 100 students to protect their magnificent woodland.

If the minister will not listen to the citizen movement or to the municipality, will he listen to the young people who want to protect the environment from the Telus tower? Will he block the tower in Otterburn Park?

Mr. Rémi Massé (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have said many times, our government believes that communities should have a say in where cell towers are installed in their area.

Telecommunications companies also need to consult communities in an open and transparent manner. However, this matter is before the courts. It would be inappropriate for me to comment further.

* * *

● (1505)

[English]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a 2004 RCMP report concluded that the RCMP 911 call centre should be “outside of HRM given the risks of placing the two largest police communications centres in close proximity to each other”. The risks given were a risk of environmental disasters and threats to our communications system. Strangely, a new RCMP report says that the 2004 concerns were reassessed and they were no longer a risk.

Would the minister ask the RCMP to make available the study that explains why environmental disasters and communications threats were a risk in 2004—

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Public Safety.

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has been in touch with me many times about this matter. The safety of Nova Scotians is the top priority for the RCMP's H Division, which functions as Nova Scotia's provincial police force. In that capacity, it makes the necessary decisions about the most effective deployment of provincial assets and facilities, including the provincial operations and communications centre.

Government Orders

It is obtaining the counsel of an independent assessor to ensure that its provincial responsibilities are safely and properly discharged in the best interest of Nova Scotians.

* * *

SOFTWOOD LUMBER

Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in March 2016, the Prime Minister promised to resolve the softwood lumber dispute. He said, “I’m confident that we are on a track towards resolving this irritant in the coming weeks and month.” That was three years ago. Yesterday, the third mill in my riding in two weeks closed its doors.

The Liberals have lots of time for their millionaire friends, but when it comes to B.C. workers, they cannot lift a finger.

Will the Prime Minister finally make good on his promise to resolve the softwood lumber dispute and save jobs?

Mr. Robert Oliphant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, the Conservatives simply do not know what they are talking about on this issue. Our government saw the consequences of the wretched quota deal the Conservatives accepted on softwood lumber, which is why we refused to accept the tariffs imposed on steel and aluminum.

We are continuing our legal challenges against the U.S. softwood duties through NAFTA, through the WTO, where Canadian softwood has always won in the past.

Our government will always defend Canadian workers and Canadian industry.

* * *

[Translation]

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mrs. Marilène Gill (Manicouagan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice said yesterday that Bill 21 violates fundamental rights and individual freedoms and that he would always defend the charter. He was basically saying that he intends to challenge the Government of Quebec's secularism law.

My question is simple. Is the minister going to wait until after the election to challenge Bill 21, for fear of alienating Quebecers?

Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our position has always been clear. It is not up to the government or to politicians to tell people what to wear or not to wear.

Canada is already a secular country, and that is reflected in our institutions. We believe that this new law violates fundamental rights and individual freedoms. We will always defend the charter.

Mrs. Marilène Gill (Manicouagan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the government already dictates what people can and cannot wear. Soldiers, RCMP officers and prison guards all wear uniforms. Male MPs have to wear a tie in order to be recognized in the House of Commons. I do not hear the Minister of Justice objecting to those rules.

What is the real reason that the Minister of Justice wants to challenge a state secularism law that is supported by the people of Quebec?

Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are the party of the charter. We have always defended the rights and freedoms it guarantees, as well as other fundamental rights of society. It is not up to the government or to a political party to tell people what to wear or not to wear. It is as simple as that.

* * *

[English]

JUSTICE

Hon. Maxime Bernier (Beauce, PPC): Mr. Speaker, free speech is the foundation of a free society, yet after erasing the statement of the member for St. Albert—Edmonton from the record, the justice committee proposed several measures to censure free speech on the Internet.

Does the government understand that the novel *1984* was meant to be a warning against the dangers of a totalitarian society and not an instruction manual?

● (1510)

Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member well knows, free expression is something that we value in the country. He should also know that in the current context with online platforms, the limits of free speech, justifiable limits of free speech, is something that any government should be looking into, as the Prime Minister did when he was in Paris and looked at the Christchurch declaration.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

ACCESS TO INFORMATION ACT

The House resumed from June 17 consideration of the motion in relation to the amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-58, An Act to amend the Access to Information Act and the Privacy Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts.

The Speaker: It being 3:10 p.m., pursuant to order made on Tuesday, May 28, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion to concur in the Senate amendments to Bill C-58.

Call in the members.

● (1515)

[English]

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

(Division No. 1367)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra

Aldag

Government Orders

Amos
Arya
Badawey
Baylis
Bendayan
Bibeau
Blair
Bossio
Breton
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duguid
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Garneau
Goldsmith-Jones
Graham
Hardie
Hogg
Housefather
Hutchings
Joly
Jordan
Kang
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lighthound
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
May (Cambridge)
McDonald
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)
Monsef
Morneau
Murray
Ng
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Ratansi
Robillard
Romanado
Rudd
Rusnak
Saini
Samson
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Simms
Spengemann
Tan
Tootoo
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wilkinson
Wzesneskyj
Young

Anandasangaree
Ayoub
Bagnell
Beech
Bennett
Bittle
Boissonnault
Bratina
Carr
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCoursey
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Goodale
Hajdu
Hébert
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Jones
Jowhari
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Morrissey
Nassif
O'Connell
Oliver
Ouellette
Pescholido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rogers
Rota
Ruimy
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sorbara
Tabbara
Tassi
Vandal
Vaughan
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip
Zahid — 164

Aboultouf
Albrecht
Allison
Arnold
Barrett
Beaulieu
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Block
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Brosseau
Caron
Chong
Christopherson
Cooper
Davidson
Deltell
Doherty
Dubé
Dusseault
Eglinski
Finley
Gallant
Genius
Gladu
Gourde
Hardcastle
Hoback
Jeneroux
Jolibois
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lake
Laverdière
Lloyd
MacGregor
Maguire
Martel
Mathysen
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Moore
Nantel
Nicholson
Paul-Hus
Plamondon
Quach
Ramsey
Rayes
Rempel
Saroya
Shields
Singh
Stanton
Stetski
Stubbs
Thériault
Trost
Van Kesteren
Wagantall
Waugh
Weir
Yurdiga

NAYS

Members

Albas
Alleslev
Anderson
Aubin
Barsalou-Duval
Benson
Bergen
Berthold
Blaikie
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boucher
Boulé
Boulerice
Brassard
Cannings
Carrie
Choquette
Clarke
Cullen
Davies
Diotte
Dreesen
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Duvall
Fast
Fortin
Garrison
Gill
Godin
Grewal
Harder
Hughes
Johns
Julian
Kent
Kmieć
Kwan
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Liepert
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
Manly
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Saenich—Gulf Islands)
McColeman
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Motz
Nater
Nuttall
Pauzé
Poilievre
Raitt
Rankin
Reid
Sansoucy
Schmale
Shipley
Sorenson
Ste-Marie
Strahl
Sweet
Tilson
Trudel
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Wong
Zimmer — 134

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu
LeBlanc — 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Business of Supply

● (1520)

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—THE ENVIRONMENT

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Cariboo—Prince George, and what a debate it will be. After all, the cat is out of the bag.

Earlier today, I asked the finance minister if he would rule out bringing back his small business tax increases. Members will remember them, the ones he ruled out in the summer of 2017, after the Prime Minister had said that small businesses are typically just wealthy tax cheats. The minister went out and tried to impose tax increases that would cost 73% on the dollar for every small business investment, and then he increased taxes on income and work shared among members of a family business.

We remember when the Liberals tried to double the tax paid when a parent sells a business to a child. We remember when they put forward a proposal that would allow foreign multinationals to pay half the tax if they bought a Canadian family business, and then the kids of that family business would pay. We remember how our farmers feared that this would mean that within a generation we would have nothing but foreign-owned farms where farm kids would be turned into tenants to foreign landlords on their own ancestral lands. That was the shock and dismay that Canadian entrepreneurs felt when the finance minister struck out and attacked them in the summer of 2017.

Then Canadians fought back. Local chambers of commerce, shopkeepers, pizza shop owners, plumbers, farmers, people who had never met all locked arms and said that was enough. For far too long, the government had been picking their pockets and they just quietly went on their way, showing the typical Canadian culture of deference.

However, when this tax increase struck, it went too far, and entrepreneurs decided that they were going to unite and defeat these tax changes. They were only partially successful. The minister then agreed to put some of the most egregious parts of his original proposal on hold. There was a great sigh of relief, but I think people were under a misconception that the government had backed down. In fact, headlines screamed out that the finance minister had backed down from small business tax changes.

The truth is that he never backed down. He simply put those changes on hold, leaving open the possibility that they might one day come back. He never once admitted that the proposals were flawed or wrong. He simply said they were politically impossible so close to an election. He made the pragmatic calculation to put them on hold. On hold until when, one might ask. The answer is quite simple: until after the election, when the Liberals no longer need voters but still need their money.

Of course, the Liberals are running out of other people's money. The deficit is \$20 billion. The budget has not balanced itself. In fact, the deficit is growing year after year, and the government needs a way to pay for its insatiable spending habit. What Liberals hope now is that Canadians will not ask them how they will pay for it until after

the election is over, when voters cannot do anything about it because it will be four more years until the subsequent election—

● (1525)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I want to interrupt the hon. member for Carleton. He is trying to give a speech and there is a murmur going on in the background. I just want to remind hon. members, and if there is anything going on in the corridor, maybe we can check to make sure it is quieter over there.

I will let the hon. member for Carleton continue.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, the government hopes that people will not ask any questions about where all the money will come from. The Prime Minister will just take out a fire hose and spray cash in all directions in the hopes that a grateful population will re-elect him and put him back in the Prime Minister's Office. Only days later, he will spring upon them a whole series of tax increases that they did not anticipate and that he did not mention.

That is why I rose to my feet today to ask the finance minister if he would simply commit that his original tax increases on small businesses were flawed and that they will never be introduced again. He could have just stood up and said that it was a mistake and he would not do it again; that we have his word that if they are re-elected there would be no new tax increases on small businesses. He could have just said that and sat down. Frankly, I would have been quite deflated. I do not know what else I could have asked at that point. Instead, when he stood up, he refused to answer the question at all. He rattled off a bunch of governmental talking points that had been handed to him by junior staffers in the Prime Minister's Office, but he did not rule out bringing back those tax increases. Therefore, the message for small business owners is not to tell us they were not warned. It is clear what the current government will do.

In fact, the original small business tax increases that small business owners fought in town halls and in street protests and in thousands of letters will probably be law by Christmas Day if this Prime Minister is re-elected.

The election is in late October. There will be a short session before Christmas. A Liberal government will want to do its most unpopular decisions between its return and Christmas so that it can hope everyone will forget about it four years later when they go back to the polls in 2023. Therefore, we know that is the window when this will happen. For small business persons out there somewhere working away, the warning goes out now that they have only four months to help stop the reintroduction of those tax increases that were devastating and even existential to their businesses.

Business of Supply

This is consistent with everything the government has done. Already the average Canadian family is paying about \$800 more in income tax alone. In fairness, people who are very wealthy are paying less. Wealthy taxpayers paid about \$4.5 billion less in taxes in the year after the Prime Minister introduced his income tax changes, but everyone else is paying more. They lost their children's fitness tax credit, their public transit tax credit and their education and textbook tax credits. Small business owners now pay new penalties for saving within the companies, for sharing work and earnings with family members. They pay a carbon tax, for which there is no small business rebate. Payroll taxes are now on the rise.

Despite all of these Liberal tax increases on the middle class and on small businesses, there is still a shortfall. This is in an environment where real estate has boomed and the world economy has been on fire, all of which has caused a flood of unexpected revenues into government coffers. The Prime Minister blew every penny of those additional revenues and billions of dollars more.

Here we are in 2019, the year in which the budget was going to balance itself, and we have another \$20-billion deficit. He put his hand on his heart and said he was looking Canadians in the eye and speaking truthfully to them as he always has, and that they would balance the budget in 2019. Those were the words of the Prime Minister at the Maclean's debate in the last election. He smashed that promise to smithereens. Thereafter, we cannot believe a single thing he says about money.

• (1530)

As the pressure mounts, the Liberals will start to deny it. They will deny it until they are red in the face, but the reality is that if the government is re-elected, there will be massive and crippling tax increases targeted on the working class and small businesses to fund ongoing, out-of-control spending. By contrast, Conservatives will put forward a plan that requires that the government live within its means, leave more in people's pockets and let them get ahead, and a free market economy that rewards merit rather than political connections and that puts people before government.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara (Vaughan—Woodbridge, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened to my colleague intently, who I have the pleasure of sitting on the finance committee with, to see if he would offer up some new ideas or policies instead of regurgitating talking points that I constantly hear.

He did speak about small businesses, so I will comment on that. He did not mention the small business tax rate that we reduced from 11% to 9% that benefits over 11,000 businesses in the city of Vaughan. He did not talk about the accelerated investment incentive that allows businesses across Canada, from coast to coast to coast, to fully write off their investments in a full year. He did not speak to the EI rates that are now the lowest in a generation that are benefiting businesses across the country. He did not talk about the Canada pension plan that is going to benefit hard-working Canadians, who go to work every day and save for their futures, which is portable, indexed and the model for the entire world. He did not reference those things. Then, when he should have been speaking about climate change, he did not even speak about whether he believes in climate change or we should act.

I would ask the member across the aisle what he thinks we should do about climate change and how we should reduce emissions going forward. We have a plan. Where is your plan?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I would remind hon. members to place their questions through the Chair.

The hon. member for Carleton.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: One more sleep, Mr. Speaker, and we will have a plan that lowers emissions and taxes, just like we did last time, unlike the Liberal government, which has raised emissions and taxes.

Let us go through the tax policy issues for small businesses that he mentioned. One is the small business tax rate. The previous Conservative government reduced the small business tax rate from 13% down to 11% and then 11% down to 9%. One of the first things the Liberal finance minister did is raise it back to 11% from 9%. Then, in the midst of a tax revolt, while he and the Prime Minister were running away with their tails between their legs in full retreat, they reinstated the tax increase that they had repealed when they first took office. That is the reality of the small business tax reduction.

As for the carbon tax, there is no rebate for small businesses. They bear the full brunt of the extra heating, transportation, cooling and other energy costs that they must bear. Only those businesses that can pump 50,000 tonnes of greenhouse gases through their chimneys are able to get an exemption from the carbon tax, but normal mom-and-pop shops, small construction companies and pizza shops pay the full tax, with no rebate and no support whatsoever. That is not a climate plan; it is a tax plan.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, we should be talking about climate science, what target is appropriate in order to hold to 1.5°C and why it is essential for the survival of not only our economy but our civilization that we make the transitions that are required. At this point, we are still having political battles over a carbon tax, which is a very small part of the overall plan.

I know we are waiting for the big unveil tomorrow, but I want to remind the member, because I have a good memory, that we were supposed to see a complete plan from former environment minister John Baird in April 2007. It was called the "Turning the Corner" plan, but it was never completed. It had some good elements, but it never happened. His successor, whom we all miss, anyone who had the great honour of meeting him, former environment minister Jim Prentice, also tried in that era to put in place something that would look like a plan.

Business of Supply

I have not seen a reasonable carbon plan from any party or government at the federal level since the spring of 2005 when former prime minister Paul Martin brought one forward. I wonder if the member could give us any sense of why we would have confidence that whatever the leader of the official opposition announces tomorrow is going to actually turn into the plan he initially announces.

• (1535)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, under the previous Conservative government, we did introduce sector-by-sector rules to reduce emissions at an industrial level. We also brought in improved standards for tailpipe emissions. Along with other measures that I do not have time to mention because of the time limit, we actually saw, for the first time in measured history in Canada, a reduction in overall greenhouse gases in absolute terms.

All of that proves that taxes are not the best way to reduce emissions, technology is. We need to increase the technology and the advancement of our economy, so we can deliver an improved quality of life with lower energy consumption at the same time.

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our hon. colleague from Carleton. As a new father, I know that he considers this a very important debate. I know he takes this matter very seriously.

It is all about a better future for our children. The Minister of Environment has said that lots of times in this House, very loudly and very passionately. We all strive to leave our country better off for those who will come after us. This debate is about the future. It is about ensuring our children have a better future.

It has been interesting over the last three and a half years and indeed over the last couple weeks as we debate Bill C-48, Bill C-68, Bill C-69 and Bill C-88. Again, on the virtue-signalling motion that we had last night, Motion No. 29, everybody wants to know how everybody voted. I was travelling, I landed and all of a sudden the media wanted to know how we voted on it. Motion No. 29 does nothing. It declares that we all agree there is a climate emergency, but there is nothing behind it. There are no critical steps behind it to actually make things better. We have a carbon tax that the Liberal government implemented that does nothing but punish Canadians who live in rural communities.

I want to read something into the record:

“...to constrain the growth of...production by increasing the perception of financial risks by potential investors and by choking off the necessary infrastructure (inputs and outputs)...[the campaign’s original strategy states]. We will accomplish this by raising the visibility of the negatives associated with...[the production]; initiating legal challenges in order to force government and corporate decision-makers to take steps that raise the costs of production and block delivery infrastructure; and by generating support for federal and state legislation that pre-empt future demand for tar sands oil.

It also says this: How are we going to do that? Demarketing, raise the negatives, raise the costs, slow down and stop the infrastructure, enrol key decision-makers, goals, we want to influence debate, a moratorium, strategy, stop or limit pipelines, refineries, significantly reduce future demand for Canadian oil, leverage debate for policy victories in the U.S. and Canada, resources required, first nations and other legal challenges, public mobilization in Ontario and Quebec.

Members would be forgiven if they thought that was the mandate letter for the Minister of Environment. That is exactly what we are up against, the dogma that we hear, that is spread, the language that we hear time and again.

Bill C-68, Bill C-69, Bill C-48, Bill C-88, and Motion No. 29 are all aimed at our natural resources, and somehow Canada produces dirty products and our producers are going the way of just polluting our world.

It is interesting that the carbon tax targets soccer moms and small businesses, but does not go up against the very same polluters of the campaigns, Greenpeace, TIDES, the World Wildlife Fund and all these groups that now have executives or members who are former executives in the highest offices of the Liberal government. It does nothing. It gives those very same polluters a pass.

There is no denying that climate change is real. Humans contribute to the problem. We all must do our part to address the problem, but a carbon tax is not a climate plan. The Prime Minister does not have a climate plan, he has a tax plan.

Time and again it has been said that my province of British Columbia is seen as a success, yet we have had a carbon tax for over 10 years. When it was first introduced, it was supposed to be revenue-neutral, and now it is not. It goes in one hand and stays in the government coffers. It was supposed to lower emissions, and we know that that is not the case.

Over the last two summers, we have had some of the worst wildfires in our province's history. In my riding alone, we have had the worst fire season, the largest mass evacuation in our province's history.

• (1540)

I have stood in this House and asked how high the carbon tax has to be before we start to see those wildfires and natural disasters mitigated and lessened. I cannot seem to get an answer. As a matter of fact, I was laughed at when I asked that question.

The Liberals have pandered to the environmental lobbyists for the last four years. As a matter of fact, what we are seeing today with the legislation and all this virtue signalling they are doing with their hands on their hearts is payback for the 2015 election. Leading into this next election, they want to make sure that they are solidly behind them.

They have had four years to come out with a real plan, and the best they can do is a carbon tax. The Minister of Environment stands up here and shouts loudly so that we will all believe her, yet time and again, she has approved the dumping of millions of litres of raw sewage into our waterways.

Business of Supply

A great Senate amendment came forward regarding third-party habitat banking, and I will go back to Bill C-68, where we talked about that. Where there is displacement of fish or fish habitat because of a project, it would allow the government to enlist people who are experts to create fish habitat. However, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and his department turned that down, and we heard testimony that they were the only people around the table who did not seem interested in creating fish habitat.

The Liberals like to stand up there, with all their environmental credits and their peeps behind them, saying that what they are doing is for the good of the country. We know that all they are doing is making things less affordable for those of us who live in rural communities.

I do not know if there is a fuel available that can power a logging truck or a freight truck. Our forestry sector has taken a massive hit since the current government has been in power, because we do not have a softwood lumber agreement. I will not put all the forestry downturn on the current government. However, it could have taken some major steps forward in assisting our forestry industry by securing a softwood lumber agreement.

We live in rural areas. Many of our first nations live off-grid. They have to power their communities with diesel. What has the government done to lift any of those first nations off their dependency on diesel and fossil fuels?

What about rural communities? At one point, we were a resource-driven economy. However, we know from the Prime Minister's very first speech that, under his government, our country has become known more for our resourcefulness than our natural resources. I guess that was a promise he has kept, because we have seen the government attack our natural resources sector time and again.

As we speak, there are forestry families who are receiving more layoff notices in my riding and in my home province of British Columbia. They do not have other projects or other opportunities to go to. What will they do? What is it that our Minister of Environment said? There is \$500 million worth of opportunity. Where is it? It is not in our rural communities. In some of our northern climates, we cannot plug any of our school buses in. We cannot plug logging trucks or freight trucks in. We need them to get our goods to market.

Everything this carbon tax does makes the way of life in rural communities more expensive. This is not an environmental plan. It is a revenue plan, and it is on the backs of rural communities and rural Canadians. That is shameful.

• (1545)

Mr. Terry Beech (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have had a price on pollution nationally for 78 days. However, I want to speak specifically about our home province of British Columbia.

This member knows that the Conservatives' number one promise is that if they are able to form government, the first day they are elected they will remove the revenue-neutral federal backstop. This will do absolutely zero to change the price on pollution in British Columbia, because that price on pollution was implemented by the B.C. Liberals and has continued to be supported by the NDP. Both

sides of the B.C. government support carbon prices in British Columbia. Why? It is because it has been effective. Per capita emissions have gone down, while we have had one of the fastest-growing economies in the country.

Basically, what this member is promising his constituents back home is that we will continue to pay carbon taxes in B.C., but he will get rid of them for the rest of the country. How does he think that is fair?

Mr. Todd Doherty: Mr. Speaker, our hon. colleague is being disingenuous. British Columbia has the highest fuel prices in all of North America. We know that under the Liberal government, if the Liberals are re-elected in October, those gas prices are going to have to go up at least another 23¢ a litre. That is punishing those in our province who live in rural communities, and in particular, those in my riding of Cariboo—Prince George.

Mr. Scott Duvall (Hamilton Mountain, NDP): Mr. Speaker, there was a recent poll reported in the Toronto Star, on May 15, 2019, with the headline, "Majority of Conservatives favour pollution pricing: poll". It shows that 60% of self-identified Conservatives said that there either "must" or "should ideally" be a price on pollution.

If the member wants us to support the motion, which says that the Conservatives want to replace this with a real environmental plan, I would ask him what he thinks of the poll and what the plan is the Conservatives want to bring forward that we could look at and maybe support.

Mr. Todd Doherty: Mr. Speaker, I should turn the tables on our hon. NDP colleague and ask him what he thinks of the poll that came out today that says that the Green Party is ahead of the NDP. Polls are polls.

I would say that as much as the Liberals and the NDP want to say that the Conservatives are not for the environment but are against the environment, we are first and foremost ranchers, farmers, hunters and anglers. We are for the environment. We are conservationists at heart. I cannot wait until our colleagues, and indeed Canadians, see the environmental plan our leader is unveiling tomorrow.

• (1550)

Mr. Paul Manly (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, GP): Mr. Speaker, carbon taxes are part of a solution. They are not the whole solution. I know that has been hammered on by the hon. member and his Conservative colleagues. We need a whole spectrum of things to deal with climate change.

We live in a climate emergency. If members visit my riding, they will see that the forests are dying. We were already in drought stages in early March, when rivers and lakes were at August levels. The cedars and firs are dying. We had a horrific windstorm in the winter. We have material all over the forest floor, and we are worried about the fire season.

Business of Supply

We need climate action, and part of climate action is to disincentivize the use of fossil fuels by using a carbon tax. We need incentives in place to help consumers, landlords and businesses make the transition away from using fossil fuels to deal with this climate emergency, because we have to get to zero emissions by 2050. We do not have a choice. This is not something that we can delay any longer. The scientists are telling us that we are out of time and that we need to deal with it. Carbon taxes are one of the tools we need to use.

Mr. Todd Doherty: Mr. Speaker, I want to welcome our hon. colleague to the House. This is the first time I have had a chance to address him. However, I believe he flew here. I do not think he walked here. Therefore, my challenge is that as we move away from fossil fuels, what are we going to go to? The reality is that we have to drive to work in rural communities. In my community, we have to drive for services. We have to fly. We have to ship our goods. How do we do that? Until we have a viable option for fossil fuels, it is not possible.

I would agree with my hon. colleague that we have to have a whole host of programs to fix the environment, but a carbon tax is not one of them, because it does nothing. It is a revenue plan for the government.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Alexandra Mendès (Brossard—Saint-Lambert, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, most of my speech will be in English, but I want to start by talking about the price on pollution.

I agree with my hon. colleague from Nanaimo—Ladysmith that this is not the one and only solution. There are many others.

As for the use of our vehicles—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Order. It seems we can no longer hear the interpreters.

The problem seems to be fixed.

The hon. member for Brossard—Saint-Lambert.

Mrs. Alexandra Mendès: Mr. Speaker, we will obviously need to use cars, planes and other modes of transportation that run on fuel, which we want to phase out over the coming years. This transition will take time. However, we must make choices.

My colleague complained that gas in British Columbia is very expensive. This is true. I noticed the price when I was there recently. People need to choose cars that consume less fuel. These types of cars exist. That is one way to reduce our dependence on gas.

[*English*]

An hon. member: That's why you are not saying it in English.

Mrs. Alexandra Mendès: Mr. Speaker, why should I not say it in English? I can say it in English. We should choose cars that consume less. It is doable. They exist. I did not invent them. They are there.

An hon. member: That is perfect. Thank you.

Mrs. Alexandra Mendès: Mr. Speaker, the fact is that this is what we need to do. We need to choose—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I just want to remind the hon. members that shouting or even talking across the

aisle is not conducive to debate. I encourage them to put their comments through the Speaker. Also, while the Speaker is speaking, I would appreciate it if members did not talk to him.

The hon. member for Brossard—Saint-Lambert.

• (1555)

Mrs. Alexandra Mendès: Mr. Speaker, Canada and the world are facing a real climate emergency. This was made very clear with the release of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's special report on global warming.

Climate-related risks to our health, livelihoods, food security, water supply, safety and security and economic growth are projected to increase with global warming of 1.5° and increase further if we surpass 1.5° Celsius.

Here at home, Canadians are already feeling the impacts of climate change. Communities in Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick have once again suffered record-breaking flooding in the spring. Thousands of residents in northern Alberta were evacuated because of out-of-control wildfires. Last summer, in the province of Quebec, the deaths of more than 90 people were linked to the heat wave.

Extreme events are becoming more frequent, more devastating for Canadians and more expensive in terms of both disaster response and recovery.

My children and grandchildren have now lived through two severe floods and two tornadoes in the Ottawa region in the past four years. We now have to constantly worry about ticks that carry Lyme disease. These impacts have now become their normal, and it is not right.

The Government of Canada recognizes that the impacts of climate change will only continue to be more devastating if no action is taken.

We also recognize that Canada is one of the highest per capita emitters in the world and consistently ranks in the top 10 of the world's highest absolute GHG emitters. How could we expect other countries to reduce their emissions if we do not do the same?

In 2015, this government was involved in the negotiation of the Paris agreement with a delegation that included representatives from the three political parties as well as indigenous leaders. We all came together with the rest of the world, and for the first time ever, every country's representative said that they were going to act on climate change.

Canada pushed countries to limit temperature increases to 1.5°, because this is the only way to avoid catastrophic climate change impacts, such as increases in average temperature, heavy precipitation and severe droughts devastating local ecosystems and the Canadian way of life.

I will be splitting my time with the member for Kitchener Centre.

Business of Supply

In 2016, we came together again to develop a national climate plan with concrete measures to reduce emissions, build resilience and grow the economy. Our plan includes more than 50 concrete measures, regulations, standards, programs and investments to achieve our goal, and pricing carbon pollution is an important and effective part of that.

Our plan includes putting a price on carbon pollution, because it is the most effective way to reduce emissions. It sends an important signal to the markets and provides an incentive for businesses to reduce energy use through conservation and efficiency measures. Hence, my mention of cars that consume less. We know it works.

Last year, the three provinces that already put in place their own carbon pollution pricing, British Columbia, Quebec and Alberta, were also among the top performers in GDP growth across Canada.

This climate action is so effective that more than 74 jurisdictions around the world, representing about half of the world economy, have adopted it as part of their plans to reach the Paris agreement targets. Doctors, industry leaders and Nobel Prize-winning experts have all agreed that putting a price on pollution is effective and have demanded that governments take this action.

Pollution should not be free anywhere across this country. Based on analysis conducted by Environment and Climate Change Canada, putting a price on carbon pollution would reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 50 million to 60 million tonnes in 2022. This is equivalent to shutting down about 30 to 35 coal-fired electricity-generating units for a year.

It is also important to note that all direct proceeds from the federal carbon pollution pricing system will be returned to the jurisdictions in which they were collected. Households receive a climate action incentive, which gives most families more than what they pay and creates incentives for cleaner choices. Funds will also be given to the province's schools, hospitals, businesses and indigenous communities to, for example, help them become more energy efficient and reduce emissions, helping Canadians save even more money and improve our local economies.

•(1600)

Again, putting a price on pollution is not the only action this government is taking to address climate change. As part of our climate plan, we are also regulating the oil and gas sector to reduce methane emissions by 40% to 45% by 2025, which will encourage companies to find cleaner, more efficient ways to run their operations.

We are phasing out the use of coal-fired electricity by 2030, as part of Canada's efforts to have 90% of electricity from non-emitting sources by 2030, while working with the affected families, communities and businesses to help them with the transition to a cleaner economy.

We are making a historic investment of \$3 billion to spur innovation and bring clean technologies to market, such as funding to support technology to scrub carbon dioxide directly from the air, as well as \$75 million to tackle challenges in clean technology.

We are developing net-zero energy ready building codes to be adopted by 2030 for new buildings, developing a model code to

guide efficiency improvements for retrofitting existing buildings and establishing mandatory labelling to provide businesses and consumers with information on energy performance.

As we work to fight climate change, we know that Canadians are feeling the impacts of a changing climate. That is why we are taking action to help our communities adapt and prepare for the challenges that lie ahead.

I have only a few seconds left, so I will be happy to take questions.

Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I think it is unanimous in the House that we all care about climate change. The challenge is the way that the current government is implementing things. It is causing challenges that no one foresaw. For example, the hospital in my community is Lakeridge in Oshawa. The estimate for the carbon tax, because there will be an increase in costs to heat its facilities, is going to be \$278,000 in 2019-20. By 2022-23, it is going to be \$700,000. Hospitals that are on a strict budget are going to see increased costs. It is the same with our schools. Educational facilities, municipal governments with municipal buildings, sports facilities and bus and transportation systems are going to be seeing increased costs, and there are no details on how that is going to be compensated for through the carbon tax program that the Liberals have instituted.

What does the member say to hospitals that are going to be faced with these unexpected increased budgetary costs in regard to the carbon tax?

Mrs. Alexandra Mendès: Mr. Speaker, the first observation I would make is that increased pollution will cause more people to use the hospitals, so the costs will go up anyway. However, there are many programs that the government is putting in place to help institutions transition into a cleaner economy and make that transition by changing the way they heat the hospitals, or by changing the way energy is used in hospitals, schools or businesses. That is part of the plan. It is not just a price on pollution; it is also all the other measures we are putting in place to help businesses transition into a greener economy.

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I know the Liberal government likes to see itself as a climate leader. However, we should all acknowledge the fact that climate leaders do not continue to subsidize big oil.

When will the government fully eliminate subsidies to the fossil fuel industry?

Mrs. Alexandra Mendès: Mr. Speaker, I am really sorry but I missed the last part of the question. I wish I could answer her, but I just did not hear the question. Could she ask it again?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Can the hon. member for Vancouver East repeat the last part of the question?

Business of Supply

Ms. Jenny Kwan: Mr. Speaker, I would be very happy to. I know the member was busy talking to the government House leader.

My question for the member is this. When will the Liberal government fully eliminate fossil fuel subsidies?

Mrs. Alexandra Mendès: Mr. Speaker, it is part of the plan. It is definitely part of the transition we have been talking about. I do not have a date, but I absolutely can tell members it is part of the plan. It will eventually be something that we hope we will end in Canada.

• (1605)

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was speaking with the hon. member because I was commending her on her excellent speech and the work she has done. An area I feel she has not been able to share is about the programs we have when it comes to transitioning to a cleaner, greener economy. I am wondering if she could expand on some of the additional programs that will be available? We have quite an impressive comprehensive plan that we have put forward, because it is so important that the economy and the environment go together and that we ensure that future generations have a cleaner, greener economy they can count on.

Mrs. Alexandra Mendès: Mr. Speaker, yes, I would like to expand on the many and various ways the government is preparing Canadians to transition from the current dependence on fossil fuels.

Beyond what I just mentioned is the supporting of alternatives. To go to my colleague's question about the hospital, there are alternatives to traditional ways of heating and powering homes and buildings, such as solar, wind, biomass and geothermal technologies, as well as innovative ways to connect and transmit these sources of energy to help businesses save money on their energy needs.

There is the setting of new standards to improve energy efficiency of appliances and equipment, like clothes washers, refrigerators and dishwashers, to encourage innovation and save Canadians money. We are providing \$1.1 billion in funding for energy efficiency in residential, commercial and multi-unit buildings, including support to improve efficiency in affordable housing developments.

These are part of the many measures, and there are more, that the government is putting in place to facilitate the transition to a better and greener economy.

Mr. Raj Saini (Kitchener Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pride to rise and speak to this motion, and I thank my hon. colleagues for their comments. I look forward to seeing the Conservative Party's environmental platform tomorrow, as I hope it will show that they have finally become serious about climate change. Given that members of that caucus still share the musings of climate change deniers on social media and howl for us to give up fighting for a better future because it is difficult, I will admit I am skeptical.

Conservatives have consistently ignored the science and the economics behind climate change, and I have seen nothing to indicate that they have changed their thinking. In 2006, the first year of the previous government's mandate, a report on the economics of climate change commissioned by the British government was

released. It was led by the former chief economist of the World Bank, Nicholas Stern.

The Stern review concluded that inaction on climate change “could create risks of major disruption to economic and social activity, on a scale similar to those associated with the great wars and the economic depression of the first half of the 20th century.”

Stern stressed that governments needed to take action then, saying that the next 10 to 20 years would be critical in laying the foundations for combatting climate change. He also concluded that tackling climate change is the pro-growth strategy for the long term. The U.K. listened and cut its emissions. Europe listened and cut its emissions. Both regions became leaders in combatting climate change.

What did the members opposite do? Did they retrofit our buildings and infrastructure? No. Did they commit to diversifying our economy to reduce our reliance on finite and environmentally unsustainable resources? No. Did they work with heavy industry to meaningfully reduce its emissions? No. Did they invest in new infrastructure, grow the green tech industry or expand protections for natural areas? No. Did they discuss climate change abroad? No. The members opposite ignored the data, ignored the science and stuck to a business-as-usual approach. They ignored the science and economics.

They ignored the economic growth and energy security that come from investing in green energy and technology. They ignored the massive costs that climate change would have, from disrupting trade and transportation to mass displacements and a global refugee crisis.

From 1983 to 2008, Canadian insurance companies paid out an average of \$400 million per year for climate-related claims. The floods and fires this year alone will cost \$1.8 billion. According to the Stern review, damages are projected to force 20% of global annual GDP to be spent on repairing, strengthening and replacing infrastructure. Notably, severe weather events like the floods, fires, and heat waves we have experienced in the past few years are only among the earliest symptoms; it will get worse.

Many of my colleagues opposite are quick to criticize any government investment made to make Canadians' lives better, insisting that it is an “unacceptable” debt to leave to our children. Neglecting our responsibility to take action on climate change is the unacceptable debt we leave to our children.

I have received many letters from men and women, parents and grandparents, adults and children. The text may vary, but the message is the same: to recognize the situation we are in, look at the extreme weather events we are experiencing and see the link between the two, study the science behind greenhouse gas emissions that cause our climate to change, and listen to our first nations, which have been saying for centuries that our planet's resources are not there to be recklessly exploited but must be used responsibly and sustainably. They implored me to act now, before it was too late, and I am proud of the fact that our government is doing just that.

Our government has committed to phasing out coal by 2030. We have invested over \$2.3 billion to support clean technology. We have helped schools, hospitals, businesses and homes become more energy-efficient, and we are providing enhanced disaster mitigation and adaptation funding to help the victims of these natural disasters.

When we discuss these topics, many like to point to House Resolution 109, the recognition of a need for a green new deal proposed in the United States House of Representatives this February. It calls for building resiliency against climate change and reducing the risks posed by climate impacts. It insists upon the necessity of upgrading infrastructure, transportation and buildings to lower carbon emissions.

•(1610)

It calls for growing the green economy and putting in place a transition process that leaves no one behind, including those working in the fossil fuel sector; restoring natural ecosystems by protecting agricultural and rural lands; and supporting the clean tech industry here, and exporting our expertise abroad.

It is a pleasure for me to point out that many of the components of the green new deal have already been put in place by our government. We are continuing to invest in developing transition centres for workers in carbon-intensive industries, and we are working to diversify our economy across the country by creating good green jobs. This also means helping carbon-intensive industries like the oil and gas sector become more efficient and substantially reduce their emissions.

Our 10-year infrastructure plan is an unprecedented investment in public transit and green infrastructure, to which we have committed over \$21 billion so far. We are making electric vehicles more affordable and more accessible, and we are committed to ensuring that all new vehicles are zero-emission by 2040.

We are going to get the rest of the way there, and we are committed to taking even stronger action to reduce pollution and invest in a cleaner future.

Pointedly, I have had the honour of being a seconder to the bill by my colleague from Beaches—East York, which would commit Canada to reach net-zero emissions by 2050. I believe that, as a nation, we can do it, while joining other nations, like Norway, New Zealand and the U.K., which are already taking this path. I also know that we need to do it.

Change cannot happen overnight. There is more to do, but we must do it responsibly and we must keep at it. We will not give up. Recognizing a national climate emergency affirms how seriously we are taking these issues.

Business of Supply

One of the most important steps we are taking to lower our emissions in a responsible manner is the price on pollution. The PBO recognizes that the price on pollution not only puts more money in the pockets of Canadians, but it is the least expensive and most effective way to substantially lower our emissions.

We are not deaf to the very real concerns from Canadians regarding their future without action on climate. In Kitchener Centre, I watched with pride as young Canadians stood up to implore us to take action on these issues to ensure our collective future. Climate change affects every single Canadian: rich or poor, man or woman, adult or child. It affects us all. This is why we will not give up. Business as usual is not an option. The longer we wait, the steeper the cost will be.

I will continue to support policies to implement the changes that need to happen. We must protect our environment and end our reliance on fossil fuels so that we can grow the green economy of the future. We are stepping up now to ensure that it is not too late and that Canada can once again be a leader on this issue.

I encourage all my colleagues to have foresight on this issue and not just think until the next year or the next election. We must treat this issue not as a partisan issue to be won or lost, but as a human issue that we must work together to solve. We have to look beyond that.

The 26th president of the United States, Teddy Roosevelt, recognized that we need to think about our planet in the long term. After viewing the natural beauty of Yellowstone National Park, he said, “We are not building this country of ours for a day. It is to last through the ages.”

Let us strive to ensure that our country and our planet not only last but thrive through the ages.

•(1615)

Mr. Robert Kitchen (Souris—Moose Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member talked about helping the oil and gas industry reduce its emissions. Putting a carbon tax on small businesses is not going to help those people, but there is something that is. The member is probably well aware that in the Paris accord, three of the four recommendations on progressing were about using carbon capture and sequestration, which were talked about and signed off on. This innovation already exists in Canada. Not only does it exist in Canada, but it takes the emissions captured and puts them underground, which helps the enhanced oil recovery.

In fact, just the other week, Mr. Michal Kurtyka, from the Ministry of the Environment for Poland, stated, “Carbon capture and sequestration will be important to make an advance to carbon neutrality”. Mr. Pawel Leszczynski, the COP24 presidency bureau chief, was also there.

Business of Supply

My question is very simple. Why are you not championing this?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I want to remind the hon. members to place their questions through the Chair.

The hon. member for Kitchener Centre.

Mr. Raj Saini: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member had listened to my speech, what I said is that the price on carbon and other approaches that we need to take have to be holistic. It cannot be one or the other, or one at the expense of the other. What we should be doing, as a society, is working together to try to manage a non-partisan way forward, but do it in such a way that, by 2050, at least, we will have a zero-emission, low-carbon economy in this country.

More importantly, I do not think that this should be a partisan issue. I do not think that this should be an issue where one is better than the other. I think there should be a collective approach, and this is what we have decided to do on this side of the House.

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we are waiting momentarily for the final decision from the government on the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion project. Of course, we have been hearing from the community over and over again that climate leaders do not buy pipelines and that it should not be part of our climate emergency plan.

My question for the member is this. How does he reconcile the contradiction of buying a 65-year-old pipeline in the face of a climate emergency?

Mr. Raj Saini: Mr. Speaker, there is no contradiction. It is very simple. The economy and the environment must go hand in hand. Both are important for the progress of our country. Both are important for the advancement of our society. To take one over the other is not a principled approach. The principled approach is to take both together, to make sure that the economy is functioning, not at the expense of the environment, and that the environment is respected, as it should be. There is no contradiction.

Mr. Marwan Tabbara (Kitchener South—Hespeler, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member mentioned that there will be zero emissions in 2050. I know that the Waterloo region has taken some steps in order to get to zero emissions. We have had the construction of a building.

Can the member elaborate on what our region is doing? We are an innovative region and we are committed to zero emissions as well. Can he comment on that?

Mr. Raj Saini: Mr. Speaker, we have been doing many things. We have been investing in public transit. We have a light rail system that will be inaugurated on June 21. We have been doing a lot of wastewater management work, making sure that our pipes are functioning properly. Two or three weeks ago, we made a \$50-million announcement on adaptation. We are encouraging businesses and companies in the region to invest in more climate-resilient infrastructure.

The cities in the region are also working toward their own environmental plan. They also have support from the government through the low-carbon economy fund and the green municipal fund.

I am very proud that I come from a region that understands the issues behind the climate, understands how important it is to get the

solution right and how important it is to make sure that our economy is also functioning. I am very proud to say that our region is very advanced in this way.

• (1620)

Mr. Dane Lloyd (Sturgeon River—Parkland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with my colleague, the member for Red Deer—Mountain View.

Before I launch into debate today, I just want to recognize Bombardier Patrick Labrie, who died tragically this week while serving his country in Bulgaria. As a serving soldier in Canada's armed forces reserves and as a parliamentarian, I know that the thoughts and prayers of this House go out to the Labrie family. We thank Patrick for his service. I appreciate that we can all come together in this House to support the men and women of our armed forces. It is very important. It is not a partisan issue.

Getting into the debate, it is my pleasure to rise and talk about this opposition day motion on carbon taxes and the environment. It is not an issue that we as Conservatives are afraid to talk about, because we have a very strong record on this issue. At the beginning of the previous Conservative mandate in 2007, greenhouse gas emissions in this country were 744 million megatonnes. By the end of our mandate in 2015, we had brought that number down significantly, below the 744 million megatonnes, while also growing our economy. That is a significant feat that we should be very proud of.

It is all very clear that this was done without the imposition of a carbon tax on Canadians. The government has a clear framework, an example given to it by previous governments, of what can be done to lower greenhouse gas emissions while not putting taxes on hard-working families when they fill up at the pump, when they are heating homes in these cold Canadian winters and when they go to buy groceries or anything that gets trucked in.

I rose today because this debate is important for our country and for the world, but it is also very important for my constituency. The reason is that my constituency, along with the constituency of the member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, is the home of Alberta's industrial heartland region. This is a hub in Canada for carbon capture and sequestration technology.

Under the previous government, significant investments were made to partner with industry to find ways to tangibly reduce our greenhouse gas emissions. This technology has been recognized by the International Energy Agency as one of the key pillars in ensuring sustainable and meaningful reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.

Business of Supply

On the other side of my riding, it is an important issue because Parkland County is home to a significant number, I believe over one-third, of Canada's remaining coal-fired generation plants. Decisions by the federal Liberals and the previous provincial NDP government in Alberta on carbon taxes and red tape have had serious consequences in my community, including job losses in the thousands and the loss of tens of millions of dollars in assessed tax revenues for municipal and county governments.

My remarks today are going to highlight the consequences of these policies, but I also want to highlight the opportunities and tangible things we can do to bring down greenhouse gas emissions and support our industries.

Going over the history of this, in 2015 the NDP government came to power in Alberta, and subsequently there was a federal government decision to unilaterally end coal power by 2030. These events presented significant challenges to my community, as well as undermining the livelihoods of my constituents and putting into doubt our ability to supply affordable power.

Under the previous Conservative government, Canada took a responsible, continent-wide approach with our closest ally and neighbour, the United States, to begin phasing out coal power. I recognize that coal has high CO₂ emissions and that we need significant action in order to meet our Paris climate change targets. However, I could not disagree more with the path the government has taken on this issue.

Going back to the previous Conservative policy, we would have phased out most coal-fired power plants in this country before 2030. Now, not a lot of that is different from the current government's policies, but this is where the bulk of greenhouse gas emission reductions are going to take place, mostly from plants that were already ending their life cycle before 2030 anyway. There would have been no major cost to taxpayers, no unexpected job losses, and no unexpected revenue losses for communities.

• (1625)

We also allowed for some of the newest and latest coal facilities, one of which was built as recently as 2012, to run through their life cycles, up until 2045. This would have resulted in significant greenhouse gas emissions reductions, while ensuring that taxpayers would not be put on the line for billions of dollars to bail out companies for transitioning from coal to natural gas, which is what many were doing anyways. I will talk about the specific penalties later.

I am proud of the investments of the previous Conservative government, to the tune of billions of dollars, to support industries in reducing greenhouse gas emissions through carbon capture and sequestration. I want to highlight a couple of projects in this country.

We have Shell's Quest refinery, which has just celebrated its fourth megatonne. Four million tonnes of CO₂ have been sequestered at its facility and put into deep saline aquifers. That is four million tonnes of CO₂ that is not in our atmosphere today because of an investment by the previous, Conservative government. We also have the North West Redwater refinery project, which is in my riding of Sturgeon River—Parkland. When this, the newest refinery in Canada,

becomes fully operational, it will sequester an estimated 1.2 million tonnes of CO₂ a year. These are tangible emissions levels.

As the government is falling short of its Paris climate change agreement by 79 million tonnes, facilities in my riding are, on their own, processing over a million tonnes, with facilities next to my riding already achieving four million tonnes. These are not just chump change numbers. These are significant numbers that, if replicated across the country and across industries, can have a massive effect on reducing greenhouse gas emissions. This can be done with very little support from the government and without imposing a carbon tax on hard-working families.

These projects were the result of partnerships with the federal government. They were expensive when they were first implemented, but we have to remember that with technology there are often high barriers to entry. We certainly saw this with a lot of our renewable industries, including with solar and wind power. We know that the consequences of government decisions have raised the cost of power for everyone in the province of Ontario.

There are high costs to doing this, but we know that once this technology is put in place and we learn from it, it will come down significantly in price. Comments from Shell have indicated that it could replicate the Quest refinery project for 30% less than Quest cost. It was about a \$700-million project, and Shell could do it for 30% cheaper. This is an investment that we should be replicating in this country moving forward.

That is why I find it disappointing that with respect to CCS in this country, we have not really seen a lot of progress over the last four years. I just checked out the National Energy Board website today. It indicated that there are four major projects in this country. We have the Redwater refinery; Shell's Quest project, which I mentioned; the Alberta Carbon Trunk Line, which is also in my riding; and a project in Fort Nelson, northern B.C., which, at full capacity, could sequester an estimated 2.2 million tonnes of CO₂. However, since 2015, we have heard nothing about this project. There was previous government support of about \$30 million from the B.C. government and the federal Conservative government, but the current government has taken no action.

How can the government be leaving a project like this on the shelf? We are talking about 2.2 million tonnes of CO₂. That is over 2% of what we need in this country to achieve our climate change goals, yet the government, which I believe is ideologically opposed to carbon capture and sequestration, has refused to support projects like this.

I am going to be pushing for the next Conservative government to take up these opportunities and increase Canada's investment in carbon capture and sequestration so we can come up with tangible results on greenhouse gas emissions. I feel very strongly that this will be the case.

Business of Supply

I also want to quickly talk about carbon pricing. The government has talked about increasing gas by 23¢ a litre after the election, but Canadians already pay. Up to 30% of the price of a litre of gas is federal levy, provincial levy, the GST and, in some provinces, the HST. We are already paying carbon taxes, and we are talking about 23¢ more per litre. That is going to be nearly 50% of the cost of a litre of fuel. It is just a tax plan; it is not an environment plan, plain and simple.

• (1630)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleague mentioned Shell and talked about some of the work that Shell was doing as it relates to its carbon footprint. I am wondering if he is aware that there was a CBC report on April 3 of this year that talked about Shell and said, in particular, “Global energy giant Royal Dutch Shell is urging Canada’s largest oil and gas organization to get off the fence and support both the Paris climate accord and the pricing of carbon to encourage greenhouse gas emission reductions.” Even the oil producers are talking about putting a price on pollution.

I will ask the member a much simpler question, a really direct one. The member for Milton, the deputy leader of the Conservative Party of Canada, said, “Bottom line is there’s no solid connection between climate change and the major indicators of extreme weather...The continual claim of such a link is misinformation employed for political and rhetorical purposes.” The member for Milton clearly does not believe in climate change. Does the member believe in climate change?

Mr. Dane Lloyd: That is an extremely easy question to answer, Mr. Speaker. I do believe in climate change; it is obvious. However, it is quite funny to hear the member across the way talking about political and rhetorical ways, because his question was completely political and rhetorical. However, I will try to get to one of the most substantial answers.

Of course large oil companies are looking into these things, because when taxes get put on all businesses, it is often the large companies that are the most capable of absorbing the taxes and the small companies that suffer. We saw this in Alberta. When the NDP government imposed carbon taxes, it was the small and medium-sized enterprises that went out of business, and it was the large companies that bought those companies for pennies on the dollar.

When we talk about these carbon taxes, they are going after small and medium-sized enterprises. Some of these large multinational organizations that do not pay carbon taxes in their home countries are more than happy to let these companies suffer and reap the benefits.

[Translation]

Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach (Salaberry—Suroît, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for saying that he believes in climate change. We can no longer deny this phenomenon.

Young people from across Canada have taken to the streets to demand that the federal government take much stronger action than what the Liberals are doing. However, in their motion today, the Conservatives are not proposing any sort of plan to combat climate change. They will be presenting their plan tomorrow, but they are not proposing anything right now.

That is not very constructive, particularly since we know that the Conservatives were unable to meet their own targets during the 10 years they were in office. They regulated the sectors, one by one, to try to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, but they never regulated the largest polluter, the oil and gas industry.

What is more, they never dared to eliminate the fossil fuel subsidies. It is therefore somewhat hard to believe that the Conservatives have a credible plan, and it is even harder to believe their criticisms of the Liberal government, because they are not bringing any alternative solutions to the table to debate today.

What does the Conservative Party have to offer on climate change? We know that there is a climate emergency. We are working to make sure future generations have a planet worthy of the name, where they can breathe, drink water, go swimming and continue to work the land.

[English]

Mr. Dane Lloyd: Mr. Speaker, the member obviously has a very strong viewpoint on this matter, and we disagree on the approach we need to take, but in the end we want to achieve the same goal.

In terms of our positive Conservative vision, I just need to point to our previous 10 years in government, when we implemented significant reforms for tailpipe emissions for automobiles. This meant that all new vehicles used in Canada had to be cleaner and have lower emissions, and this has had a significant impact on reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

It is ironic, because the NDP would probably, and I think has, called the government’s investments in carbon capture and sequestration a subsidy for fossil fuel industries. When money is given to fossil fuel industries to lower their greenhouse gas emissions, there is a really big benefit to the economy and the environment. When we talk about investing in CCS, we should not be labelling it as a bad thing. We should be labelling it as an opportunity to grow our economy and significantly reduce our greenhouse gas emissions.

• (1635)

[Translation]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Kootenay—Columbia, Post-Secondary Education; the hon. member for Beauport—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île d’Orléans—Charlevoix, Justice.

The hon. member for Red Deer—Mountain View.

[English]

Mr. Earl Dreeshen (Red Deer—Mountain View, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the debate on behalf of my constituents of Red Deer—Mountain View.

The motion before us today states:

That, given that the carbon tax will not reduce emissions at its current rate and it is already making life more expensive for Canadians, the House call on the government to repeal the carbon tax and replace it with a real environment plan.

Business of Supply

How do we know that the carbon tax is not reducing emissions at its current rate? That information comes from the most recent report of the Parliamentary Budget Officer. The PBO chose a figure of \$102 per tonne, which is five times the current rate. If one is to believe the numbers being thrown around by the government, the projections are that the figure would need to be even higher. Apparently, this does not matter to the Liberal government. Nor does it matter to the Liberals that Australia has realized that introducing a carbon tax is a failed plan and has repealed its tax.

If we are going to be competitive in the North American market, we should be working in harmony with the U.S. on environmental policies, not saddling ourselves with yet another barrier to our economic well-being. This is not what is happening today.

The U.S. has no such plan and has lowered its taxes for businesses, and their total emissions have fallen. In Canada, the Liberal government is forging ahead with its ill-conceived tax increases, while emissions are continuing to rise.

This leads me to the next point, which speaks to making life more expensive for Canadians.

The shell game the Liberal government is playing with carbon tax dollars and refunds is simply not logical. For starters, the plan itself is certainly not revenue neutral. Those numbers have been widely discredited as well. However, that is just part of the story.

Canadian farmers will be especially hard hit with this plan. Statistics Canada estimates that the average costs per farm will be in the tens of thousands of dollars as the tax goes from \$10 to \$50 per tonne. The worst part is that farmers do not have the chance to pass those costs on to their customers.

The second part of the motion before us asks all Canadians to look ahead. We need to look ahead to a brighter future, a future without the Liberal government's carbon tax grab. We need to look ahead to a future with a real plan for the environment, one based on Canadian know-how and Canadian expertise.

We are already moving in the right direction. Look at the dairy sector as one case in point. Today in Canada it takes 65% fewer dairy cows to produce the same volume of milk as it did 50 years ago. Improvements to cow comfort and feed efficiency have also helped to make our dairy industry more sustainable.

By embracing innovation and new ideas, furthering research and infusing old wisdom into modern practices, Canada's agricultural sector is continually reducing its environmental impact, while looking for ways to improve its practices on a national scale.

There is a lot of work to do to set the record straight about the cattle industry and about farming in general. We have all heard the story that cattle farming is a major source of greenhouse gases. However, at the Alberta Beef Conference in my home town of Red Deer, we heard from experts such as Dr. Frank Mitloehner who debunked this myth and noted that new processes, new efficiencies and proper management meant that beef cattle methane emissions were effectively zero.

On this and many other issues, it is our challenge to ensure that Canadians have science-based information and science-based facts about cattle farming and about farming in general.

We need to continue to use our Canadian expertise to ensure that all our products get to the global market in the safest and most environmentally responsible way possible. We need a government that will enable industry to do more to help the environment, not a government that will hobble businesses and burden Canadians with huge tax increases.

Canadians have so many things of which to be proud. We are proud of our amazing Olympic athletes, our talented artists and the NBA trophy coming home to basketball's birthplace. These are a few highlights, but there are so many others.

● (1640)

We can be proud of Canada's world-class oil and gas industry, which is the best regulated and the most environmentally friendly in the world. Canadians can be proud of our dynamic forestry industry, which has state-of-the-art rejuvenation projects. How about our farmers and our ranchers? Canadian agriculture produces the safest, most environmentally friendly products in the world. However, even in this case, vested interests are doing their very best to knock us down.

However, a true environmental plan will do the opposite. It will build us up and it will enhance our efforts to protect and preserve the environment.

Let us look at this as far as the Liberal track record is concerned.

In 2016, Canada was 44 megatonnes of CO₂ over its Paris target. In 2017, that number rose to 66. Last year, it was 103 megatonnes. The Liberal approach just is not getting the results as advertised.

The same is true for the Liberals' arguments about social license. Three pipeline projects, northern gateway, the west to east pipeline and Kinder Morgan, all to be built by the private sector, never got a fair hearing from the Liberal government. We all paid the bill, but got nothing in return.

However, enough about the failures of the Liberal government.

When we talk about an environmental plan, the Conservatives want to talk about things that matter, things like the amazing carbon sequestration projects that have been developed, whether it be in coal technology, oil and gas development or natural gas processing. These are major breakthroughs that Canada's business leaders and their research teams are gearing up to export around the world. Would members not say that championing our expertise on the world stage is better than wringing our hands and apologizing for the fact that Canada has abundant resources in order to score points with the environmental elites?

Business of Supply

Of course we will develop our resources and we will do it in a manner that investors will see as the new global industry environmental standard. It will be our energy that will replace foreign tankers coming to our shores. If we proudly embrace our innovations, it will be our oil demanded by climate-conscious nations around the world.

We will also be championing our other major resource sector, agriculture. As I said before, Canadian beef and dairy producers are the most efficient managers of greenhouse gases in the world. By using technologies developed by amazing Canadian minds, we will not only be helping our soil and producing world-class products, but we will be managing greenhouse emissions in a way well above the global standard.

For the last four years, Canada has had a leader who grandstands around the world and uses every opportunity to apologize for what Canada is and for what we do. Under a Conservative government, we will have a leader who is proud not just to be a Canadian, but also proud to stand up for all of us and to champion our successes.

The incompetence of the Liberal government was plain for all of us to see last week. Just a few nights ago, Canadians witnessed the spectacle of their own government choosing to support the interest of competing oil-producing nations over the interests of Canadians. As many editorials noted, the Liberal government is the only one in the world trying to shut down its own resource sector.

The government ignored the pleas of nine provincial premiers, first nation leaders, territorial governments as well as millions of Canadians by shutting down debate on Bill C-69, the no more pipelines bill. Now, by ignoring further pleas to not move forward with Bill C-48, the Liberal government is creating even more uncertainty in the energy sector. It is a shame when the government's only fallback plan, the TMX pipeline expansion project, is only going forward thanks to billions of taxpayer dollars transferred to pipeline builders in the United States.

With the Liberal government, we know that the whole process is a crass political one, not a responsible financial one. How many hospitals will be built in Canada through our purchase of Saudi oil? How many social programs will be financed from our friends in Nigeria? How many environmental causes and human rights efforts that Canadians hold dear will be jeopardized by the Liberals shutting in the resource expertise of the world's most responsible energy producers?

By following the misguided dogma of the Prime Minister, the Liberals will be following him into the political abyss. The only way to truly protect our environment, to give certainty to job creators and to ensure Canadians' strong social fabric is to make the divisive Liberal leader is a single-use prime minister.

• (1645)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I honestly feel like I am in the twilight zone. I do not understand what is going on. Somebody needs to wake me up, because now I am hearing this from the other side of the House. This member just said that we needed science-based information and science-based facts. He also said that we needed to protect and preserve the environment. Where have these people been for the last three and a half years? All of a sudden, within the last two weeks,

there is this gigantic charade that is developing because the Conservatives have this "plan" that they are going to reveal to the Canadian people tomorrow.

I find it absolutely ridiculous that a party that now, today, somehow purports itself to be the environmental champion of Canada would not have voted in favour of a climate emergency a mere day ago. How is this possible?

Mr. Earl Dreeshen: Mr. Speaker, I think everybody understands that the climate emergency was a political emergency for the Liberal government, which is obvious when we look at what is happening around the country right now.

Let us talk about some of the things the Liberals talk about, such as subsidies for Tesla cars—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Order, please. The hon. member for Red Deer—Mountain View is trying to answer a question and we have shouting going back and forth like we are at a soccer match. I want to remind hon. members that we are in the House of Commons and there is a certain protocol here. I am sure everyone will let the hon. member for Red Deer—Mountain View answer the question.

The hon. member for Red Deer—Mountain View.

Mr. Earl Dreeshen: Mr. Speaker, let me go back to a different point.

I remember a number of years ago when the neighbouring kids came to the farm. They said they were selling compact florescent light bulbs on behalf of the school to replace the incandescent ones. These were projects that helped the school. The kids were advocating for this because the environmental activists promoted this green energy product, something for which we should be so happy. We did our thing and bought a whole bunch of them. Then we realized there were five milligrams of mercury in every one of them, and about 15 million of them were sold. Therefore, we now have an environmental crisis because of those types of activities.

When the member talked about science-based ideas and the like, sometimes the science and the arguments are more related to money in somebody else's pocket than they are about really doing something to help the environment.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the member for Red Deer—Mountain View and I served on the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food.

One of the big challenges we have is to not only reduce our emissions to get to net zero, but to also do something about the carbon that is currently in our atmosphere. The member will know, as do I, that I do not think we have given due recognition to the work that farming does to sequester carbon in our soil. We are both aware of some amazing research that shows that well-managed agriculture practices can sequester up to 50 tonnes of carbon per year in a hectare of well-managed soil.

Business of Supply

Therefore, in an effort to maybe turn the temperature down, because we both have such great respect for our agricultural community, I invite the member to talk about the hard work our farmers are doing and the ways in which we can encourage them to do an amazing job in sequestering carbon. I think that will be a big part of the puzzle going forward into the future.

● (1650)

Mr. Earl Dreeshen: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from B.C. and I have had some great conversations. Although we look at things sometimes from a different perspective, nevertheless we have learned a lot from each other, and for that I am thankful.

When I look at the situation as far as agriculture is concerned, there are amazing new technologies there. We have amazing tools that can make Canadian farmers and world farmers do a much better job. The key thing for us in the future is to ensure we do not allow outside forces to take those tools away from our farmers so they can do an amazing job with respect to the environment.

[Translation]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons is rising on a point of order.

* * *

[English]

WAYS AND MEANS

MOTION NO. 34

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

That, notwithstanding any Standing Order or usual practice of the House, the Order for consideration of Ways and Means motion No. 34 be deemed read, the motion deemed moved and seconded, and the question put immediately before the deferred recorded division on the motion for second reading of Bill C-331, An Act to amend the Federal Courts Act (international promotion and protection of human rights) on Wednesday, June 19, 2019, and, if a recorded division is requested on the Ways and Means motion, that the vote shall be taken up immediately.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the House to move the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—THE ENVIRONMENT

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House in this final week of the 42nd Parliament on behalf of the constituents in Cowichan—Malahat—Langford to speak to the Conservatives' final opposition day motion which reads as follows:

That, given that the carbon tax will not reduce emissions at its current rate and it is already making life more expensive for Canadians, the House call on the government to repeal the carbon tax and replace it with a real environment plan.

I have some problems with the way the motion is worded and I will go over them. Number one, the motion asks us to basically take a major step of repealing a carbon tax and then putting our faith in a so-called real environment plan. With respect to my Conservative colleagues, if they had wanted us to put more substantive thought into the motion, perhaps they could have timed the release of their environment plan for today so that instead of waiting until tomorrow when debate on the motion will be well and truly finished, we would actually have something substantive to compare a carbon tax to and to see if it is actually going to achieve our goal of reducing Canada's emissions.

That is my first main criticism. If we are going to make the House debate a motion where something is going to be repealed that is already in existence and replace it with something else, it would be nice to know what that something else is.

A large amount of debate on the carbon tax has to do with the price and there are a few things I would like to say to address that. First of all, with respect to my Conservative colleagues, I think they are having a fairly visceral reaction to a carbon tax because it seems to be a policy that was introduced by a Liberal government and that is a problem. There seems to be sometimes a knee-jerk reaction from the official opposition to anything that the Liberals do. We want to examine these policies for the merits to see if they are actually going to do things. I think the basic premise of the argument over the costs of the carbon tax is based on an assumption that we can fight climate change without incurring costs.

Any politician who tells us that they can address this problem without costs to ourselves, to the government, to society as a whole, I am sorry, but they are simply not being truthful. This is going to require a major effort on all fronts. Furthermore, when we look at the proposed costs of a carbon tax, we know at \$20 per tonne it is going to equal 4¢ per litre. By the time it goes up to \$50 per tonne, which I believe is in three years, it would cost up to 11¢ per litre, so to put that in perspective, that means in three years we will be adding about \$7 in cost to fill up of our gas tank. That is what we are arguing over and that is not even in effect now. That is in three years' time.

The reason why I want to underline the cost part of it is this. While we are quibbling about the cost of a carbon tax now, which most experts around the world acknowledge is far too low to have any meaningful action, I want to put that in the context of just what the costs of unmitigated climate change are going to be and how those are going to affect future tax revenues.

If we think that the climate change now is costly, just look what the costs will be when we hit 2°C, 3°C or 4°C of warming and we are already seeing the effects. In my home province of British Columbia, our budget for forest fire fighting is going to be completely blown out of the water. That is the long-term trend.

Business of Supply

In my community of Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, I live in a rainforest and in March we had 30% of our normal rainfall. The lakes and rivers were at 30% of where they should have been. In future years that is going to require is a hefty dose of infrastructure money to build a new weir so we can hold more lake supply back to make sure that the river flows at an adequate rate. These have very real costs.

This is not even speaking about the extension of the droughts we are going to have in many different parts of Canada, the flooding, the mitigation and adaptation measures we are going to have to employ.

● (1655)

Some of the most expensive real estate in the country is located in Vancouver, which is a flood plain.

Before I continue, Mr. Speaker, I am splitting my time with the hon. member for Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke.

The Vancouver International Airport is located on the flood plain of the Fraser River. What happens in future years when we have a flooding Fraser River meeting increased sea levels and we have to suddenly build all of that dike infrastructure to keep the waters at bay?

This is going to be a pattern that repeats itself again and again and again. I just really want to underline that fact that while we are quibbling about the costs in the present day, we are actually not doing justice to the issue for future generations and future Parliaments and the costs that those governments are going to have to deal with.

Furthermore, this effort that we are going to have to mount to properly address climate change is going to have to be on a scale of what our country did to fight the Great Depression and World War II. Let us use World War II as an example, because I keep on hearing the argument that Canada's efforts are not really going to amount to much. It has to be sort of a worldwide solution. There is some truth to that.

The fact of the matter is that in World War II, our relative contributions to the wartime effort were quite small vis-à-vis other countries, but did Canada shirk its duties? Did we say that by ourselves we are not going to win the war so we may as well pull back our effort? No, we did not. We mobilized a wartime economy. We put people to work. We got our factories up and running. We increased our armed forces and we sent people off to make sure that the effort was won. We did not shirk our duties. That is precisely the type of mobilization that we as a country are going to need to employ to properly address this problem. I want to use that as a historical context. We as a country have been able to punch above our weight and we have the ability to do so again.

The other thing is that I want to touch on Trans Mountain and the climate emergency motion that was debated yesterday. We just received news that the Liberal government has approved the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion and that absolutely undercuts anything they said yesterday with regard to their support for a climate emergency because climate leaders do not build pipelines. The expansion of that pipeline means that the proponents, namely the Government of Canada because it owns the pipeline, are planning for it to be in operation for another 10, 20 or 30 years. Does that

mean by the year 2050, with all of the evidence of climate change, we still want to be exporting diluted bitumen at three times the amount we currently are? Is that where we really want to invest our billions of dollars? No, we do not want to do that.

Think of what we could be kick-starting in the renewable energy economy in the future with that kind of money, if we made those kinds of investments and got rid of the oil and gas subsidies that we shamefully still continue to pay out year after year. The government can say all the right words but, looking at the details, it is sadly lacking.

I am very proud of the work that my party has done over the years. Going back to 2006 when Jack Layton brought in his Climate Change Accountability Act, we had Megan Leslie in 2009 talking about a green new deal and, of course the member for Edmonton Strathcona, who has been an environmental lawyer for decades, has brought in a bill to enshrine environmental rights into law. This is the legacy of our party.

We are a party that has proposed an oil and gas ombudsman to look at the price of gas at the pump so that consumers can actually know when oil and gas companies are gouging them. These price fluctuations are not the result of a carbon tax. They are the result of oil companies controlling the supply from the refinery to the pump and they are making billions of dollars of profit off our backs. If we had an ombudsman, we could have Canadian consumers looking up those prices and getting the certainty that they deserve.

Finally, I will just end on this. I am extremely proud of the proposal that we have put forward in our “Power to Change” document because we are not going to tackle this problem with a carbon tax alone. It is going to make a multi-faceted effort where we retrofit homes, and where we help that transition for people who are employed in oil and gas to get those skills so they can so they can transfer to the new renewable energy economy of the future.

● (1700)

It is going to take a Herculean effort, where everyone works together, puts aside partisanship and realizes that this problem is far above us all. We all need to work together to properly address it.

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will work to make more frequent interventions in the future. There is no doubt there.

I want to ask my colleague about questions of social justice, in particular for low-income people, in the context of a climate plan. When we have a carbon tax that imposes particular costs on those who do not have a choice, who do not have the capital necessary to adapt, they end up paying the cost without being able to adapt their lifestyles in any way. Meanwhile, there are large emitters that get a break from this.

Of course, there are a range of different programs to provide direct government support to people in these situations, but it remains the case that the way the carbon tax applies, it imposes a particular burden on those who do not have the capital or the ability or the circumstances that would allow them to adapt.

Business of Supply

Would the member agree, in principle at least, that a better alternative, a more just alternative, is one that provides the support and the mechanisms for people who want to do things like retrofits to ensure that they have the capital and resources, rather than punishing them for what may be their inability to make the kinds of changes that ostensibly this is supposed to incentivize?

Mr. Alistair MacGregor: Mr. Speaker, the first thing I would say in response to the member's question is that I think his argument is based on a premise that people are not going to change, that we are going to be reliant on gas and oil for heating our homes and driving our vehicles well into the foreseeable future.

If we help people make a transition to lower carbon forms of energy, we are going to help them reduce costs. Absolutely, there are some people who are struggling to make ends meet. However, if we look at the last 20 and 30 years of successive Conservative and Liberal governments, they have not exactly helped the issue, when we have waited all this time to put in place programs like a national pharmacare program and helping families with child care. These are real, tangible benefits that would save people money in their day-to-day costs.

If we want to talk about effective mechanisms to help the least fortunate in our society, we have had many opportunities to do that over the previous decades. I am sad to say it, but we are probably going to have to wait for our New Democratic government to do that, because relying on the Conservatives and the Liberals has not produced those results yet.

• (1705)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Linda Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened very closely to my colleague. There are parts of my speech yesterday on the climate emergency motion that address his concerns about adapting to climate change.

As I said then, we are also investing \$22 billion in green and resilient infrastructure to both boost economic growth. I would like to know how his riding in British Columbia will use this investment, which includes funding for agreements with the provinces, as well as \$2 billion for a disaster mitigation and adaptation fund for large-scale infrastructure projects.

I would like to know how useful this investment could be for preventing natural disasters in his riding.

[*English*]

Mr. Alistair MacGregor: Mr. Speaker, I have identified that fund to successive ministers of fisheries and oceans over the last three years. I am still waiting.

Absolutely, I would love it if that money started flowing to my riding, because we have an actual real and tangible need for it. I raised it with the former minister of fisheries and oceans and with the current Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard. Their departmental officials and everyone on the ground agrees that this money is needed.

However, three years later, my community is still waiting. I hope I can employ the hon. member's assistance in maybe speaking with the

current minister to get that money flowing, because my community has a dire need for it.

Mr. Randall Garrison (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise today to speak against this Conservative motion. I will give Conservatives credit for one thing, though: they have made their position on climate change clear. We know with this motion that they are going to oppose one of the most effective ways of dealing with climate change, and that is by putting a price on carbon.

We also know, because we saw them do it, that they voted twice against motions to declare a climate emergency. That makes their position even clearer. They voted against the NDP motion and the government motion on climate change. They simply do not accept the urgency of the situation we are in. The fact that they have yet to announce any climate plans of their own really illustrates their failure to grasp the urgency of our situation.

This is surprising, as well as disappointing, because even business groups are now acknowledging that the costs of failing to act on climate change will be enormous. Earlier this year, the Insurance Bureau of Canada cited climate change as the primary factor in increasing insurance costs and noted that in 2018, severe weather caused \$1.9 billion in insured damages in Canada.

Today a working group, chaired by the Insurance Bureau of Canada and Public Safety Canada, put out a report on how we might deal with the financial risks of the more frequent and severe flooding we are now seeing. It is not about how we can avoid those costs; it is about who is going to pay those costs. How are we going to take the risks off ordinary Canadians for things that are far out of their control?

For me personally, climate change is an issue that I have been engaged in for more than 30 years. In 1989, I was working for a small indigenous-led NGO based in Victoria, at that time called the South Pacific Peoples' Foundation and now called Pacific Peoples' Partnership. At the urging of our Pacific Island partners, we organized a public education program, including a tour of B.C. high schools, warning of the threat of global warming to coral reefs and the habitability of the Pacific Islands. Unfortunately, that warning is now becoming a reality with the sad news that in just two years, between 2016 and 2018, one-half of the coral that makes up Australia's Great Barrier Reef died. Coral reefs are dying all across the Pacific Ocean.

It is not the stereotype that Pacific Islanders will have to learn how to swim. What is happening is that the coral reefs, which are a main source of food supply, the main protection of the coasts against storm surges and a main protector of the freshwater lenses that human habitation depends on in the islands, are being destroyed by climate change here and now.

Business of Supply

A second warning on climate change came from Australia this week with the release of a policy paper from an independent think tank called Breakthrough National Centre for Climate Restoration, in Melbourne. This report is entitled “Existential Climate-Related Security Risk”. The report concludes that “Climate change now represents a near to mid-term existential threat to human civilization.” The authors note that current Paris Agreement targets are insufficient, and as they stand, would lock in global warming of at least 3°C if we achieve the Paris targets. The authors cite the conclusions of numerous reports that at a 3°C increase in temperatures around the world, governments will be overwhelmed by the scale of the changes and challenges they will have to face. These include the spread of new pandemic diseases, heat beyond human survivability in many regions, massive disruption of agriculture and food systems, flooding of coastal areas, where literally hundreds of millions of people live, and the disappearance of freshwater resources, all resulting in enormous human migrations.

There is a danger that focusing on these doomsday scenarios will cause many to reject them as far-fetched, despite the fact that these are no longer probabilities. They represent the real risk of the catastrophe we are facing. There is also the danger that the sheer scope of the challenge will cause many to despair of any action at all. To me, this motion in front of us today actually falls into one, if not both, of those categories.

Therefore, I will be voting against this motion, because it is really a head-in-the-sand reaction to the very real challenges we face and because focusing on the costs of carbon pricing ignores the far larger costs of failing to act. Those costs are here, and those costs are now.

• (1710)

New Democrats are voting against this motion because we do support putting a price on carbon. We say yes to a carbon tax, not one paid by individuals alone, as the Liberals have designed, but a carbon price that also applies to the big polluters. We would like to see an end to the Liberal carbon tax exemptions for their corporate friends.

Putting a price on carbon is of course an important tool in the fight against climate change, but it is only one tool in what needs to be a comprehensive package of measures. There is no question that no single measure will be sufficient to meet the scale of the challenges of this climate emergency. That is why New Democrats put forward our plan, a plan called Power to Change—A New Deal for Climate Action and Good Jobs.

The Liberals and their policy depend almost exclusively on one tool, just the carbon tax. This will not get us anywhere near where we need to be. The NDP has a comprehensive plan that recognizes that we are all in this together and that success in meeting the challenge of climate change will only be achieved if we leave no one behind. If we ignore the question of workers and their jobs, if we ignore the circumstances of seniors, we will not get the buy-in we need to succeed.

The goal of our plan is clear: to do what we must to keep global temperature rise below 1.5°. In other words, we will have science-based targets, not just arbitrary percentages of reductions. This is the same approach I put forward when Esquimalt council adopted my motion for science-based targets in 2010: measure our progress and

adjust our target reductions as necessary to achieve the results we need.

We know now that this means a reduction of greenhouse gas emissions to 38% below 2005 levels by 2030. We know it means a reduction of at least 50% by 2050 if we are to reach a net-zero carbon economy, the one that is necessary to halt further rises in temperature.

Some have criticized our plan for being vague on targets for 2050, but I would say that the key to our plan is that our targets for 2050 are at least 40% to 50%. We are committed to whatever reductions science decrees are necessary to avoid catastrophe.

The NDP plan also calls for an independent climate accountability office, much like an auditor general in terms of our finance matters. This office would measure our progress and advise on the targets we need to meet to avoid the catastrophe that we really do face.

Unfortunately, the Liberals have kept the greenhouse gas reduction targets set by Harper, calling for a 30% reduction by 2030, targets that are clearly now inadequate. Even worse, the measures put in place by the Liberals will miss the reduction target for 2030 by 79 million tonnes, and if not adjusted, would only get us to the goal of a 30% reduction in another 100 years, yet the Liberals voted against our climate emergency motion, which called for a legislated requirement to act and a series of specific measures to adopt. Instead, yesterday we voted on their motion, which mandates little but hand-wringing. It says that we have an emergency; it mandates no action.

We have choices before us. We can put our heads in the sand. We can wait for someone else to act, arguing that Canada's share of emissions is too small for our efforts to make a difference, ignoring that we are among the world's highest per capita emitters of greenhouse gases, or we can make different choices.

We can end subsidies to fossil fuel industries right now, amounting to about \$3 billion annually. We can avoid wasting money on buying and building projects like the Trans Mountain pipeline, which the Liberal government announced, just before I started speaking, it has approved once again.

The NDP has a real plan to create jobs in all communities across the country, jobs in renewable energy, in home retrofits and in restoration of what we would call the great environmental negative legacies left behind by the oil industry. Many of those jobs will use the same skills that workers in the oil industry already use. They will be good jobs, good family-supporting jobs, in every community.

Business of Supply

It is time for the Conservatives to get on board and present their plan. It is time to stop pretending that climate change does not already come with a large price tag, which will only increase as time goes on. It is time to tell us what choices they would make about how we meet the challenge of mitigating climate change and avoiding climate disaster.

The Liberal action is both feeble and contradictory. Only New Democrats have put forward a clear plan to move forward together to meet the challenge of climate change.

• (1715)

Mr. Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am surrounded by skeptics here. The Prime Minister just announced that TMX is going to be built this summer, or at least shovels will be in the ground. That is what he is saying, and none of my colleagues seem to believe that.

What does my hon. colleague think about the approval of the Trans Mountain pipeline?

Mr. Randall Garrison: Mr. Speaker, I was the first elected official anywhere in the country to move a motion against what was then the Kinder Morgan pipeline. I remain firmly opposed to it. There is no economic argument for this project, it has no consent from indigenous people and it puts under threat most of the local economy in my riding, which is based on ecotourism, fishing and the very clean shores we have that are a mecca for tourism.

This project would be nothing but a disaster were it to be built. However, the Prime Minister, in the short time I was able to see of his statement, said nothing other than a vague promise that there would be shovels in the ground. I do not know how he is going to build this pipeline with massive local opposition and without the consent of first nations.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to challenge the member to make those sorts of statements to the steelworkers, the trades, the general individual contractors and to the indigenous groups that are behind the project.

The NDP needs to be a whole lot more transparent and honest with Canadians with respect to what its true intentions are. LNG is one of the largest, if not the largest, investment by both the private sector and the government jointly. Even the NDP government in B. C. is behind it 100%. The leader of the New Democratic Party used to be in favour and now he is waffling.

First, can the member give clear indication as to what the NDP position is on LNG? Second, the NDP consistently says that it does not support any form of subsidy for fossil fuel. That has a very significant impact on many rural communities and indigenous communities in the north. Is the NDP policy tough luck to those indigenous communities in regard to subsidy for fuel?

• (1720)

Mr. Randall Garrison: Mr. Speaker, once again the member for Winnipeg North has proven himself the king of specious arguments. When we said no subsidies to the fossil fuel industries, that is not about cutting off northern communities. It is about helping them make the transition to renewable energy, which will cut down their

costs, make life affordable for them and take a major polluter out of their local economy. It is a totally specious argument.

He asks if I would say these things to unions. I will tell the House what steelworkers said about our climate plan. They said it is the only plan that puts workers at the heart of the struggle against climate change. That is what the steelworkers said.

He asks me about LNG. I will tell him what we said. The B.C. government has approved a project. There is nothing federal about that project at this point. What we have said is that it is not the future. We will not support future projects. We will not support building a future on fossil fuels. If that is too complicated for the member, I am sorry.

Ms. Irene Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in 1934, a fellow by the name of Simon Kuznets invented GDP as a measure of wealth, because nobody could figure out wealth.

Recently, there has been a great deal of discussion about a different measurement, other than GDP, because GDP just makes the rich richer and the poor poorer. What does my colleague think about an alternative measure that takes into account people's health, their safety and our environment and is something that will pull people together rather than divide them into rich and poor?

Mr. Randall Garrison: Mr. Speaker, I look to the example of the T'Sou-ke First Nation in my riding, which held a visioning exercise about where it wanted to go as a community in the future, which was led by its elders. It is now self-sufficient in renewable energy. It now has an oyster lease that produces a million oysters for food security. Members sat down and worked together as a community. They have created more jobs now in my riding than they have members of their first nation. With vision and working together, we can achieve an economy and an environment that work for all of us.

Mr. Robert Kitchen (Souris—Moose Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to leave the House and the 42nd Parliament for the summer, I am happy to have a chance to speak to today's motion, which reads as follows:

That, given that the carbon tax will not reduce emissions at its current rate and it is already making life more expensive for Canadians, the House call on the government to repeal the carbon tax and replace it with a real environment plan.

This is an initiative that I am passionate about, which I have spoken about here many times. In fact, when I am back in the riding, my constituents continually talk to me about the carbon tax, how we are going to get rid of it and how quickly can we get rid of it. The carbon tax is something that has resonated particularly strongly with the people in my riding, and not in a positive way.

Business of Supply

I have been privileged to serve the people of Souris—Moose Mountain for the last four years, and part of why I am speaking to today's motion is due to the commitment I made upon becoming an MP. I promised that I would represent the interests of all my constituents at every possible opportunity, and I am proud to stand here today to denounce the ineffective Liberal carbon tax and the negative impact it is having on Canadians across the country.

The fact of the matter, as stated in today's motion, is that the Liberals' carbon tax is not effective in reducing emissions, and it makes life more expensive for hard-working Canadians. The Liberals seem to think that all of Canada is urban. I say this because the majority of their policies, and especially those tied to reducing emissions, are targeted toward urban areas, with almost nothing for those living in rural Canada. When a major city gets new environmentally friendly buses, how does that benefit the people in my riding? Guess what: it does not.

Furthermore, Canadians living in rural areas are going to be hit hard by the carbon tax and in some ways more so than those who are living in urban areas. It is a normal and acceptable thing for people in southeast Saskatchewan to drive 30-plus miles just to get groceries. Driving 50 miles or more to see a doctor is the status quo, and nobody complains about it, because that is just the way it has always been done. Small businesses have no avenue to rebate the carbon tax. They end up eating it or increasing their overhead or passing it on to their customers, and risk losing their customers.

What does make people frustrated and angry is when a government swoops in and unilaterally decides that Canadians now have to pay more to go about their usual day-to-day lives, and with none of the benefits that those living in urban areas receive. The Liberal carbon tax is not helping the environment, but rather it is hurting Canadians through the increased price on things like gasoline, groceries and home heating.

I would like to share the experiences of some of my constituents that touch on how ill thought out and ineffective the carbon tax really is.

As members know, under the carbon tax, fuel used for farm purposes is meant to be exempt, but this is not the case here. Due to the Liberals leaving a loophole in their legislation, farmers who obtain their fuel at pump locations and not designated cardlocks are paying the carbon tax when they should not be. There is no mechanism to rectify this, and it is creating some big issues for farmers. While I have written letters to the minister, I have not heard one response.

Many farmers are not able to have fuel delivered directly to their farms, because they do not have the ability to store it, and so pump locations are necessary for them to do their jobs. There are huge increases in cost to secure storage areas and to protect storage areas from environmental issues, not to mention the security and protection of this resource. Furthermore, there is no cardlock station within a reasonable distance of these farmers, and a pump location is their only option.

For example, farmers on acreages that are 20 miles east of a pump location have to travel to fill up their vehicles and their equipment, and they are not even getting the promised exemption. They may

farm acreages another 30 kilometres in the other direction or west of where they are coming from. We are now at the end of the spring seeding season, and farmers are still having to fight for their government to make good on the commitments it made to not charge farmers a carbon tax. It is yet another example of how the Liberal carbon tax continues to fail Canadians time and time again.

Unfortunately, Canadians have become accustomed to the Liberals misleading them and providing them with misinformation, especially when it comes to the carbon tax. When it was introduced, the minister said that 100% of the revenues from the carbon tax would go back to Canadians and that it would end up being revenue neutral. When asked specifically if that figure included the GST, the Liberals said no, that the GST would stay in our pockets. We have now found out that this is patently untrue and that the GST is being charged on top of the carbon tax, essentially a tax on a tax.

● (1725)

Here are some simple figures when it comes to the carbon tax and the GST on that. In 2017, the number of litres of gasoline used in Canada was 43.6 billion litres. The carbon tax at 4¢ per litre amounts to \$1.7 billion that is collected. The Liberals are refusing to tell Canadians how high this tax will go as we move forward. This means that people living in this country are unable to make concrete plans for their future.

According to the Parliamentary Budget Officer, the Liberals would need to hike the carbon tax up to at least \$100 per tonne to meet the Paris targets that they committed to. The PBO has also stated that in order to meet the Paris targets, gasoline prices would need to increase by 23¢ per litre. Despite their claims that they are on track to meet these targets, there is clear evidence to the contrary. It is yet another example of the Liberals attempting to mislead Canadians so that they can save face when it comes to their failed and ineffective carbon tax that has done nothing to reduce emissions.

I would like to highlight some of the innovative work that is happening right here in Canada with respect to reducing emissions. That is the utilization of CCS, carbon capture and storage, technology. The CCS technology is installed on unit 3 of Boundary Dam, the power station in my riding. CCS allows for the CO₂ emissions of that unit to be captured and stored three to four kilometres underground, preventing these emissions from being released into the atmosphere. The stored CO₂ is then used by the oil industry for things like EOR, which is enhanced oil recovery. The by-product of this process is also fly ash, which is a saleable product that is used in the production of cement. The EOR helps the oil industry reduce its emissions, and the fly ash helps the cement-production companies in reducing their carbon emissions.

While retrofitting power plants with CCS can be expensive, a recent study done by the International CCS Knowledge Centre found that the cost of retrofitting the Shand Power Station would be 67% cheaper per tonne of CO₂ captured, compared to the Boundary Dam that is built today.

According to the Paris agreement, CCS is mentioned in three or four potential pathways to reducing emissions. In fact, the secretary of state in the ministry of the environment of Poland, Mr. Michal Kurtyka, and the COP24 presidency bureau director, Mr. Pawel Leszczynski, were visiting the Boundary Dam and they basically said that carbon capture and sequestration will be important and make an advance to carbon neutrality.

• (1730)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): It being 5:30 p.m., pursuant to order made Tuesday, May 28, and this being the final supply day in the period ending June 23, 2019, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the opposition motion.

[Translation]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

• (1800)

[English]

And the bells having rung:

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[Chair read text of motion to House]

• (1810)

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

(Division No. 1368)

YEAS

Members

Abouttaif
Albrecht
Allison
Arnold
Benzen
Bernier

Albas
Alleslev
Anderson
Barrett
Bergen
Berthold

Bezan
Block
Brassard
Chong
Davidson
Diotte
Dreeschen
Fast
Gallant
Gladu
Gourde
Hoback
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Liepert
Lobb
MacKenzie
Martel
McColeman
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Nater
Nuttall
Poilievre
Rayes
Rempel
Schmale
Shipley
Sorenson
Strahl
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Wagantall
Waugh
Wong
Zimmer — 83

Business of Supply

Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boucher
Carrie
Clarke
Deltell
Doherty
Eglinski
Finley
Genius
Godin
Harder
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Lloyd
Lukiwski
Maguire
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Motz
Nicholson
Paul-Hus
Raitt
Reid
Saroya
Shields
Sopuck
Stanton
Sweet
Trost
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Anandasangaree
Ashton
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Beech
Bennett
Bittle
Blair
Bossio
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Cannings
Carr
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Choquette
Cullen
Dabrusin
DeCoursey
Dhillon
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dusseault
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Gill
Goodale
Grewal
Hardcastle
Hébert
Holland
Alghabra
Arya
Aubin
Badawey
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bendayan
Benson
Blaikie
Boissonnault
Boudrias
Bratina
Brosseau
Caron
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Cormier
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Duvall
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones
Graham
Hajdu
Hardie
Hogg
Housefather

Business of Supply

Hughes	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Johns	Jolibois
Joly	Jones
Jordan	Jowhari
Kang	Khalid
Khera	Kwan
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Laverdière
Lebouthillier	Lefebvre
Leslie	Levitt
Lightbound	Lockhart
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Manly	Masse (Windsor West)
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Mathysen	
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McCrimmon	McDonald
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Medicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)	
Monsef	
Moore	Morrissey
Murray	Nantel
Nassif	Ng
O'Connell	Oliphant
Oliver	O'Regan
Ouellette	Paradis
Paupé	Peschisolido
Peterson	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Picard
Plamondon	Poissant
Quach	Qualtrough
Ramsey	Rankin
Ratansi	Rioux
Robillard	Rogers
Romanado	Rota
Rudd	Ruimy
Rusnak	Sahota
Saini	Sajjan
Samson	Sangha
Sansoucy	Sarai
Scarpateggia	Schiefke
Shulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simms
Sorbara	Spengemann
Ste-Marie	Stetski
Tabbara	Tan
Tassi	Thériault
Trudel	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Virani	Weir
Whalen	Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewskyj	Yip
Young	Zahid — 206

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu LeBlanc — 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

* * *

[Translation]

MAIN ESTIMATES, 2019-20

The Speaker: Pursuant to the order adopted earlier today, it is my duty to put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the business of supply.

I wish to inform the House that Motions Nos. 1 to 382 that were listed in today's Notice Paper will not be moved because the motions

on notice under opposed votes were withdrawn by the member for Portage—Lisgar.

[English]

Hon. Joyce Murray (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2020, less the amounts voted in the Interim Estimates, be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The 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:

• (1820)

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

(Division No. 1369)

YEAS

Members

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

Business of Supply

Khera	Lambropoulos	Kitchen	Kmiec
Lametti	Lamoureux	Kusie	Kwan
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Lake	Laverdière
Lebouthillier	Lefebvre	Liepert	Lloyd
Leslie	Levitt	Lobb	Lukiwski
Lightbound	Lockhart	MacGregor	MacKenzie
Long	Longfield	Maguire	Martel
Ludwig	MacAulay (Cardigan)	Masse (Windsor West)	Mathysen
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Manly	McCauley (Edmonton West)	McColeman
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)		McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
May (Cambridge)		Moore	Motz
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	McCrimmon	Nantel	Nater
McDonald	McGuinty	Nicholson	Nuttall
McKay	McKenna	Paul-Hus	Plamondon
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Poilievre	Quach
Mendès	Medicino	Raitt	Ramsey
Mihychuk (Soeurs)	Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)	Rankin	Rayes
Monsef	Morrissey	Reid	Rempel
Murray	Nassif	Sansoucy	Saroya
Ng	O'Connell	Schmale	Shields
Oliphant	Oliver	Shiple	Sopuck
O'Regan	Ouellette	Sorenson	Stanton
Paradis	Peschisolido	Ste-Marie	Stetski
Peterson	Petitpas Taylor	Strahl	Sweet
Philpott	Picard	Thériault	Tilson
Poissant	Qualtrough	Trost	Trudel
Ratansi	Rioux	Van Kesteren	Viersen
Robillard	Rogers	Wagantall	Warkentin
Romanado	Rota	Waugh	Webber
Rudd	Ruimy	Wong	Yurdiga
Rusnak	Sahota	Zimmer — 123	
Saini	Sajjan		
Samson	Sangha		
Sarai	Scarpaleggia		
Schiefke	Schulte		
Serré	Sgro		
Shanahan	Sheehan		
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)		
Simms	Sorbara		
Spengemann	Tabbara		
Tan	Tassi		
Vandal	Vandenbeld		
Vaughan	Virani		
Weir	Whalen		
Wilson-Raybould	Wrzesnewskyj		
Yip	Young		
Zahid — 167			

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu LeBlanc — 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[Translation]

Hon. Joyce Murray moved that Bill C-102, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the federal public administration for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2020, be read the first time.

(Motion deemed adopted and bill read the first time)

Hon. Joyce Murray moved that the bill be read the second time and referred to a committee of the whole.

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:*

[English]

Hon. Mark Holland: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it, you will find consent to apply the result of the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting in favour.

NAYS

Members

Aboultouf	Albas
Albrecht	Alleslev
Allison	Anderson
Arnold	Ashton
Aubin	Barrett
Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Benson	Benzen
Bergen	Bernier
Berthold	Bezan
Blaikie	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Block	Boucher
Boudrias	Boutin-Sweet
Brassard	Brosseau
Cannings	Caron
Carrie	Chong
Choquette	Clarke
Cullen	Davidson
Deltell	Diotte
Doherty	Dreeshen
Dubé	Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dusseau	Duvall
Eglinski	Fast
Finley	Fortin
Gallant	Garrison
Genuis	Gill
Gladu	Godin
Gourde	Harcastle
Harder	Hoback
Hughes	Jeneroux
Johns	Jolibois
Kelly	Kent

Business of Supply

Mr. Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, we will agree to apply, and Conservatives will be voting no.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply and will be voting no.

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply and will be voting against the motion.

Hon. Maxime Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply, and I will be voting against the motion.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply and votes yes.

[*English*]

Hon. Jane Philpott: Mr. Speaker, I vote yes.

Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting yes.

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting yes.

Mr. Darshan Singh Kang: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting yes.

Mr. Erin Weir: Mr. Speaker, the CCF agrees to apply and, like the rest of the independent caucus, will be voting yes.

Mr. Raj Grewal: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and I will be voting yes.

[*Translation*]

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

(Division No. 1370)

YEAS

Members

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

Hutchings	Iacono
Joly	Jones
Jordan	Jowhari
Kang	Khalid
Khera	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier	Lefebvre
Leslie	Levitt
Lightbound	Lockhart
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Manly
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
May (Cambridge)	
May (Saarich—Gulf Islands)	McCrimmon
McDonald	McGuinty
McKay	McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendès	Mendicino
Mihychuk	Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Socurs)
Monsef	Morrissey
Murray	Nassif
Ng	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
O'Regan	Ouellette
Paradis	Peschisolido
Peterson	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Picard
Poissant	Qualtrough
Ratansi	Rioux
Robillard	Rogers
Romanado	Rota
Rudd	Ruimy
Rusnak	Sahota
Saini	Sajjan
Samson	Sangha
Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Schulte
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms	Sorbara
Spengemann	Tabbara
Tan	Tassi
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Virani
Weir	Whalen
Wilson-Raybould	Wrzesnewsjy
Yip	Young
Zahid — 167	

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Alleslev
Allison	Anderson
Arnold	Ashton
Aubin	Barrett
Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Benson	Benzen
Bergen	Bernier
Berthold	Bezan
Blaikie	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Block	Boucher
Boudrias	Boutin-Sweet
Brassard	Brosseau
Cannings	Caron
Carrie	Chong
Choquette	Clarke
Cullen	Davidson
Deltell	Diotte
Doherty	Dreeschen
Dubé	Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dusseault	Duvall
Eglinski	Fast
Finley	Fortin
Gallant	Garrison
Genuis	Gill
Gladu	Godin
Gourde	Hardcastle

Harder	Hoback
Hughes	Jeneroux
Johns	Jolibois
Kelly	Kent
Kitchen	Kmiec
Kusie	Kwan
Lake	Laverdière
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	Lukiwski
MacGregor	MacKenzie
Maguire	Martel
Masse (Windsor West)	Mathysen
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McColeman
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Moore	Motz
Nantel	Nater
Nicholson	Nuttall
Paul-Hus	Plamondon
Poillievre	Quach
Raitt	Ramsey
Rankin	Rayes
Reid	Rempel
Sansoucy	Saroya
Schmale	Shields
Shipley	Sopuck
Sorenson	Stanton
Ste-Marie	Stetski
Strahl	Sweet
Thériault	Tilson
Trost	Trudel
Van Kesteren	Viersen
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Wong	Yurdiga
Zimmer — 123	

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu

LeBlanc — 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the second time and the House went into committee of the whole thereon, Mr. Bruce Stanton in the chair)

(On clause 2)

• (1825)

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Chair, my question is for the President of the Treasury Board.

Can she assure the House that the bill is definitely in its usual form?

Hon. Joyce Murray (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of Digital Government, Lib.): Mr. Chair, the presentation of this bill is identical to that used during the previous supply period.

[English]

The Chair: Shall clause 2 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 2 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall clause 3 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 3 agreed to)

[Translation]

The Chair: Shall clause 4 carry?

Business of Supply

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 4 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall clause 5 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 5 agreed to)

[English]

The Chair: Shall clause 6 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 6 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall schedule 1 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Schedule 1 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall schedule 2 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Schedule 2 agreed to)

[Translation]

The Chair: Shall clause 1, the short title, carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 1 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall the preamble carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Preamble agreed to)

[English]

The Chair: Shall the title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Title agreed to)

The Chair: Shall the bill carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Bill agreed to)

The Chair: Shall I rise and report the bill?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Business of Supply

Some hon. members: On division.

(Bill reported)

The Speaker: This gives me the opportunity to thank our superb Deputy Speaker. Lest anyone at home think that those were boos, it was a bit more like Bruins fans calling Tuukka. I should not use the name but in this case members were saying “Bruce”. I think members will allow me to explain that. I hope members might allow me in this one instance to say that.

I should mention the great work of the assistant deputy speakers as well.

Mr. Stanton from the committee of the whole reports that they have considered the bill and have directed him to report the same without amendments.

Hon. Joyce Murray moved that the bill be concurred in.

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:

[*Translation*]

Hon. Mark Holland: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it, you will find unanimous consent to apply the result of the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting in favour.

Mr. Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives agree to apply and will vote no.

Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply and will be voting no.

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply, and we will vote no.

• (1830)

[*English*]

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply. The Green caucus will be voting yes.

Hon. Jane Philpott: Mr. Speaker, this member agrees to apply and votes yes.

Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting yes.

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting yes.

Mr. Darshan Singh Kang: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting yes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Erin Weir: Mr. Speaker, the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation agrees to apply and will be voting in favour.

[*English*]

Mr. Raj Grewal: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting yes.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Maxime Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting no.

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

(*Division No. 1371*)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Amos	Anandasangaree
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Baylis	Beech
Bendayan	Bennett
Bittle	Blair
Boissonnault	Bossio
Bratina	Breton
Caesar-Chavannes	Carr
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Casey (Charlottetown)
Chagger	Champagne
Chen	Cormier
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	DeCoursey
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz
Easter	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Ellis
Erskine-Smith	Eyking
Eyolfson	Fergus
Fillmore	Finnigan
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr	Gameau
Gerretsen	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Graham
Grewal	Hajdu
Hardie	Hébert
Hogg	Holland
Housefather	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Joly	Jones
Jordan	Jowhari
Kang	Khalid
Khera	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier	Lefebvre
Leslie	Levitt
Lightbound	Lockhart
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Manly
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
May (Cambridge)	
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	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
Ng	O’Connell

Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Ratansi
Robillard
Romanado
Rudd
Rusnak
Saini
Samson
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Simms
Spengemann
Tan
Vandal
Vaughan
Weir
Wilson-Raybould
Yip
Zahid— 167

Oliver
Ouellette
Pescholido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rogers
Rota
Ruimy
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sorbara
Tabbara
Tassi
Vandenbeld
Virani
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Young

NAYS

Members

Aboultarif
Albrecht
Allison
Arnold
Aubin
Barsalou-Duval
Benson
Bergen
Berthold
Blaikie
Block
Boudrias
Brassard
Cannings
Carrie
Choquette
Cullen
Deltell
Doherty
Dubé
Dusseault
Eglinski
Finley
Gallant
Genuis
Gladu
Gourde
Harder
Hughes
Johns
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lake
Liepert
Lobb
MacGregor
Maguire
Masse (Windsor West)
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Moore
Nantel
Nicholson
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Raitt
Rankin
Reid
Sansoucy
Schmale
Shipley

Albas
Alleslev
Anderson
Ashton
Barrett
Beaulieu
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boucher
Boutin-Sweet
Brosseau
Caron
Chong
Clarke
Davidson
Diotte
Dreeschen
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Duvall
Fast
Fortin
Garrison
Gill
Godin
Hardcastle
Hoback
Jeneroux
Jolibois
Kent
Kmiec
Kwan
Laverdière
Lloyd
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
Martel
Mathysen
McColeman
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Motz
Nater
Nuttall
Plamondon
Quach
Ramsey
Rayes
Rempel
Saroya
Shields
Sopuck

Business of Supply

Sorenson
Ste-Marie
Strahl
Thériault
Trost
Van Kesteren
Wagantall
Waugh
Wong
Zimmer— 123

Stanton
Stetski
Sweet
Tilson
Trudel
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu
LeBlanc— 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Hon. Joyce Murray moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

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:

[English]

Hon. Mark Holland: Mr. Speaker, it is with cautious optimism that I rise to say that if you seek it, you will find unanimous consent to apply the result from the last vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting in favour.

Mr. Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, we agree to apply and of course we will be voting no.

[Translation]

Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau: Mr. Speaker, we agree to apply, and the NDP will vote no.

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply and will be voting no.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply and will be voting yes.

[English]

Hon. Jane Philpott: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and vote yes.

Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and vote yes.

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will vote yes.

Mr. Darshan Singh Kang: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting yes.

Mr. Erin Weir: Mr. Speaker, the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, celebrating the 75th anniversary of the election of our first government in Saskatchewan, agrees to apply and votes yes.

Business of Supply

Mr. Raj Grewal: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting yes.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Maxime Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting no.

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

(*Division No. 1372*)

YEAS

Members

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

Robillard	Rogers
Romanado	Rota
Rudd	Ruimy
Rusnak	Sahota
Saini	Sajjan
Samson	Sangha
Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Schieffe	Schulte
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms	Sorbara
Spengemann	Tabbara
Tan	Tassi
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Virani
Weir	Whalen
Weir-Raybould	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young
Zahid — 167	

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Alleslev
Allison	Anderson
Arnold	Ashton
Aubin	Barrett
Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Benson	Benzen
Bergen	Bernier
Berthold	Bezan
Blaikie	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Block	Boucher
Boudrias	Boutin-Sweet
Brassard	Brosseau
Cannings	Caron
Carrie	Chong
Choquette	Clarke
Cullen	Davidson
Deltell	Diotte
Doherty	Dreeshen
Dubé	Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dusseau	Duvall
Eglinski	Fast
Finley	Fortin
Gallant	Garrison
Genuis	Gill
Gladu	Godin
Gourde	Hardcastle
Harder	Hoback
Hughes	Jeneroux
Johns	Jolibois
Kelly	Kent
Kitchen	Kniec
Kusie	Kwan
Lake	Lavardière
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	Lukiwski
MacGregor	MacKenzie
Maguire	Martel
Masse (Windsor West)	Mathysen
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McColeman
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Moore	Motz
Nantel	Nater
Nicholson	Nuttall
Paul-Hus	Plamondon
Poilievre	Quach
Raitt	Ramsey
Rankin	Rayes
Reid	Rempel
Sansoucy	Saroya
Schmale	Shields
Shipley	Sopuck
Sorenson	Stanton
Ste-Marie	Stetski
Strahl	Sweet
Thériault	Tilson
Trost	Trudel
Van Kesteren	Viersen
Wagantall	Warkentin

Waugh
Wong
Zimmer— 123

Webber
Yurdiga

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu

LeBlanc— 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.
(Bill read the third time and passed)

* * *

[English]

OIL TANKER MORATORIUM ACT

MOTION THAT DEBATE BE NOT FURTHER ADJOURNED

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.) Mr. Speaker, in relation to the consideration of the Senate amendments to Bill C-48, An Act respecting the regulation of vessels that transport crude oil or persistent oil to or from ports or marine installations located along British Columbia's north coast, I move:

That the debate be not further adjourned.

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 that the Chair has some idea of the number of members who wish to participate in this question period.

The hon. member for Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek.

• (1835)

Mrs. Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, while I welcome the opportunity to ask these questions of the minister, it bears repeating that it is quite shameful that the government is imposing yet another closure on very important legislation.

Currently, there is a voluntary moratorium on tanker traffic in the area that would be affected by this bill. Regardless of whether one philosophically agrees with this voluntary moratorium or not, it has been working for over 30 years.

Since Bill C-48 would do nothing to change the current situation in regard to tanker traffic on B.C.'s coast, how is this bill anything more than empty symbolism?

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleague that even though there has been a voluntary exclusion zone in place since 1985, the Prime Minister made a promise in June 2015, and again in September 2015, that we would formalize that moratorium. That is precisely what we are doing. In fact, when it went through the House of Commons, it was supported by a vote of 204 to 85. In other words, all the Liberal Party, the Green Party and the Groupe parlementaire québécois at the time agreed with it except, of course, the Conservatives.

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there are approximately 1,400 inbound tankers on the west coast per year. Conversely, there are about 4,000 tankers on the east coast per year. When can Canadians expect the same type of moratorium on the east coast from the transportation minister?

S. O. 57

Hon. Marc Garneau: Mr. Speaker, there is a difference between the northern coast of British Columbia and other parts of British Columbia and the east coast, and that is important to remember.

First, on the north coast of British Columbia, there is no developed tanker export or import market, whilst that is not the case in other places. Therefore, jobs would be at stake and there would be economic implications.

Second, this is home to the last major pristine rainforest in Canada and one of the few in the world. We want to ensure we preserve it.

Third, and this is extremely important, the majority of coastal first nations peoples who live there, and have been there for centuries, and who live off fishing and tourism have told us they want the moratorium to be in place.

Finally, there is not the same level of infrastructure in place in that part of Canada as there is in other parts along the coasts.

Mr. Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. minister that Bill C-48 is opposed by many indigenous groups in British Columbia that want to benefit from the economic activity from oil and gas. Eagle Spirit, Calvin Helin and that project would see huge benefits to local indigenous groups.

What does the minister say to those indigenous groups in B.C. that are going to be left out in the cold as a result of this bill?

Hon. Marc Garneau: Mr. Speaker, I will be the first to admit that there is not unanimity among coastal first nations in that part of British Columbia. However, the majority of coastal first nations support it because they do not want the risk of having their part of the coast destroyed by a major tanker spill.

We saw what happened with the *Exxon Valdez*, which covered 2,100 kilometres of coast. That was a major oil spill back in the previous century. They do not want to take the risk of seeing that happen.

However, even among those who do not support the moratorium, there is not unanimity. For example, the Lax Kw'alaams hereditary chiefs do not agree with the elected chiefs. I recently read an article that said there was not unanimity within the Nisga'a.

There will always be differences of opinion. It is our responsibility to take the most appropriate response in this case to address very serious concerns from the majority of coastal first nations.

Mr. Erin Weir (Regina—Lewvan, CCF): Mr. Speaker, the government has approved the LNG Canada project, which of course entails a significant number of liquefied natural gas tankers on the north coast of B.C. I appreciate that the government has done its due diligence and put in place safeguards to ensure those LNG tankers can safely navigate the north coast of B.C.

Could the Minister of Transport explain why he does not have confidence that those same safeguards could not be made to enable oil tankers to safely navigate those same coastal waters?

S. O. 57

• (1840)

Hon. Marc Garneau: Madam Speaker, that is a valid question. The answer is that the moratorium applies to a specific category of oils known as persistent oils, oils that do not break up or evaporate rapidly, such as bitumen and dilbit, which have the longest-lasting effects.

There is no moratorium on non-persistent oils. That includes LNG, naphtha, gasoline, propane and other materials that are more refined and are allowed on the north coast of British Columbia.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP): Madam Speaker, when the minister was on this side of the House, he openly criticized these kinds of closure motions and time allocation motions. The Liberals have used these methods countless times now. I wonder what happened to the democratic spirit of my colleague, who used to find these parliamentary tactics shameful.

He just said that dilbit and other types of petroleum products that do not evaporate quickly are dangerous, so why did he approve the Trans Mountain expansion project today, given that it will triple the number of oil tankers on the oceans and in the bay in southern British Columbia?

Hon. Marc Garneau: Madam Speaker, I would like to reassure my colleague that my democratic spirit is in very good shape.

This bill was studied in the House of Commons. It passed third reading in May 2018. It lingered for a while in the Senate and has finally come back to the House. The only amendment proposed by the Senate has to do with the review of this bill. I believe it is time to make a decision.

As for the increased tanker traffic on B.C.'s south coast, we are putting very significant measures in place through the oceans protection plan to minimize the chances of a spill.

[*English*]

Ms. Leona Alleslev (Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill, CPC): Madam Speaker, there are two key elements we need to discuss at this moment. The first is with respect to the closure of this debate. It undermines our democracy on something of this nature of significance.

Over 10% of our GDP comes from the resource industry, of which oil and gas is critical. This debate is on how we get our oil and gas to market. Therefore, I would like to understand how we can justify limiting a debate on such a significant issue.

The second point has to do with the bill itself. We have two standards for either ends of the coasts. We have the most environmentally friendly oil practices in the world, yet the government is allowing all kinds of jurisdictions to send oil that is far less environmentally friendly by tanker to our east coast. However, the Liberals are putting a ban on how our west coast would get our environmentally friendly oil to market.

I want to understand how the Liberals are justifying shutting down the debate on something that has such a significant impact on Canada and why—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. Minister of Transport.

Hon. Marc Garneau: Madam Speaker, as I said at the beginning, this bill went through the House of Commons and received a third reading vote in May, 2018.

Right now we are looking at one amendment that was proposed by the Senate after the bill went through the Senate process. I would be glad to answer a question on that one amendment if my hon. colleague wants to ask me one about that.

• (1845)

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Madam Speaker, this debate is nothing but a blatant attack on Alberta.

My question for the transport minister is this. Transport Canada just commissioned a company to do a report to prove that the risk of oil spills in the Arctic was next to none in order for Canada to continue to oppose the ban on carrying HFO in the Arctic, which has been proposed by the IMO. Why the hypocrisy? Why is Canada paying to prove the risk of oil spills in the Arctic as low enough to oppose the IMO, but is banning tanker traffic off of B.C. and punishing Alberta?

Hon. Marc Garneau: Madam Speaker, the suggestion that we are punishing Alberta is absolutely absurd. If my colleague was watching television earlier today, he may have heard our decision to support going forward with the TMX.

[*Translation*]

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I wonder if my hon. colleague could talk about the amendment proposed by the Senate and all the work it did on this important bill. The Minister of Transport has definitely dedicated a great deal of time to this bill, which is important to Canadians.

I would like to give him an opportunity to explain the essence of this bill to the House, particularly the Senate amendment, which the other place is asking us to adopt.

Hon. Marc Garneau: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question. We certainly did think and reflect carefully on this bill for quite some time. As members know, when the bill went to the other place, the Conservative-led Senate committee tried to kill this bill. We could talk about that for a very long time.

I would like to thank the independent senators on the Senate committee and all the senators who voted to keep this bill alive, because it was one of our campaign promises in 2015. Some senators came back to us with a very thoughtful amendment in an attempt to seek a compromise. We accept a large part of the amendment, which we will send back to the Senate. We hope it will accept it. The main point is that we agree to the proposal for a parliamentary review of the bill five years after it is adopted.

S. O. 57

[English]

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, I support the bill, but I am absolutely boggled by the hypocrisy shown by the Liberals. They say that they are trying to protect the north coast, but the announcement that was made just an hour ago would absolutely destroy the south coast of British Columbia by increasing tanker traffic through the Trans Mountain boondoggle. We basically get a ship a day going through very narrow passages. The likelihood of a spill within a very short period is absolute. That threatens thousands of jobs in the fisheries and in tourism in southern British Columbia.

We have a government that on the one hand is invoking closure, saying it will protect a part of the coast, while actively working to destroy the rest of the coast. It does not even make financial sense. They want to pour in \$17 billion of taxpayer money into something that, ultimately, for British Columbia, will mean 60 full-time permanent jobs once the construction phase is finished.

The question is very simple. Why are they destroying the southern coast?

Hon. Marc Garneau: Madam Speaker, I do not accept the premise of the question. As we all know, my dear colleagues in the NDP have never understood the fact that we take an approach that is balanced between moving forward with the economy, but also taking a very responsible attitude with respect to the environment.

Having said that, I want to thank NDP members who, in May 2018, voted in favour of the moratorium of Bill C-48. I want to also point out one particular member, the member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley, who has been absolutely fantastic with respect to mobilizing all the support necessary for us to pass this bill. I thank him for that.

•(1850)

Ms. Rachael Harder (Lethbridge, CPC): Madam Speaker, Bill C-48 is a direct attack on Canada's economy. It will tie up or prevent tanker traffic from travelling in northern B.C.

The problem with this is the hypocrisy at the core, which is this. Venezuelan oil is accepted in Quebec and Saudi Arabian oil is accepted on the east coast. Both of these countries have very few, if any, environmental regulations. Both of these countries treat their citizens with absolute disrespect. Human rights barely, if at all, exist within these countries.

Meanwhile, within our own country, we have a government that wants to tie up the responsible development of the oil industry, thus harming our overall economy and our place on the world stage. Why the hypocrisy?

Hon. Marc Garneau: Madam Speaker, may I correct a couple of things there? According to a 2018 analysis by the National Bank, 44% of Quebec's oil is sourced from western Canada, with another 37% from the United States. Only 19% comes from overseas, with the largest chunk, 11%, coming from Algeria not from Saudi Arabia. In light of these facts, would the opposition member like to take this opportunity to thank Quebecers for helping sustain the oil patch in the west through this difficult period caused by a drop in world prices of crude oil?

Mr. Robert-Falcon Ouellette (Winnipeg Centre, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I was just reading about the new agreement or what the

government just approved. It was allowing the extra earnings from the TMX to fund clean energy transition. This is about striking a balance, and this bill here is about ensuring that there is a balance. I know that there are people there who have—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby will come to order. If he has other questions or comments, he should wait until I ask for those.

The hon. member for Winnipeg Centre.

Mr. Robert-Falcon Ouellette: Madam Speaker, I wish the member for New Westminster—Burnaby could be a bit more polite as I try to offer my thoughts.

Balance is truly something that we need to have. We had this opportunity to hear the minister speak a bit about that balance and how we have to ensure that indigenous peoples also have the opportunity to get jobs and provide for their families and to be part owners of this, having equity and then using those funds to transition to a cleaner and better economy. Striking that balance for each and every Canadian is important.

Hon. Marc Garneau: Madam Speaker, my colleague really has hit the centre of the bull's eye by talking about the fact that, yes, we are stewards of the environment but we also are very concerned about trying to address economic issues and economic opportunities for first nations. That is essentially the approach that we as a party have taken from the beginning. It is not an either/or issue, where we forget about the environment, like the Conservatives, or in the case of the New Democrats, where we forget about the economy. We have actually, in our opinion, hit the sweet spot by trying to address both.

[Translation]

Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, NDP): Madam Speaker, as part of this exchange, I would like to hear the Liberal government explain why it believes that tripling oil sands production will not triple pollution. It could have decided to support Alberta's economy, which I understand, by requiring the increased production to be offset by a decrease in emissions per barrel. However, there is no mention of that. This is an election ploy designed to obfuscate. The government is talking out of both sides of its mouth. I will ask a very straightforward question.

How can the Liberal government believe that tripling production will not triple pollution?

Hon. Marc Garneau: Madam Speaker, I am tempted to ask my colleague how he gets from Saint-Hubert to Ottawa every week. On foot? No, I doubt he walks all that way.

Mr. Pierre Nantel: That has nothing to do with it. I come here in an electric car.

Hon. Marc Garneau: Madam Speaker, I would really appreciate it if the member could be quiet for once. Unfortunately—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I would like to say to the minister that I am capable of determining when someone is out of order. The member recognized that he was not acting appropriately and gave the minister a chance to continue with his answer. I am giving the minister the opportunity to continue so we can move on to another question.

S. O. 57

• (1855)

Hon. Marc Garneau: I apologize, Madam Speaker.

The problem with my colleague is that the only thing that matters to him is the environment. In his eyes, the economy does not count. He talked about campaign speeches. The wealth that flows from our energy sector allows us to build hospitals and schools in Quebec, but he does not talk about that. We are striking a balance between the economy and the environment.

[*English*]

Mr. David Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC): Madam Speaker, the government's environmental plan is all show and no go. Yesterday, we saw a climate emergency declaration that is all show and no go. That is on top of the fact that today the Liberals brought in a pipeline approval that is all show and absolutely no go. Now, we are dealing with Bill C-48, which is all show and no go. That is on top of the foundation of the Liberals' climate plan, which is a tax plan and not a climate change plan; again, it is all show and no go. Does the minister realize how much of a joke Canadians realize his environmental program actually is?

Hon. Marc Garneau: Madam Speaker, talking about all show and no go, I think we are at day 420, waiting for the environmental climate change plan that is going to come from the Conservatives. Hopefully, it will come tomorrow. Tomorrow we will find out how they will magically take care of everything with absolutely no impact on anybody. That is the thing I am waiting to hear tomorrow.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault: Madam Speaker, I am a bit disappointed in the meaningless answer the minister gave to the question from my colleague from Longueuil—Saint-Hubert. He said that we need to build Trans Mountain and triple the pipeline's capacity to export our crude oil because my colleague drives to Ottawa in a car. What a pointless thing to say.

What does the fact that my colleague drives to Ottawa have to do with exporting crude oil from the oil sands, which we buy back as refined oil to fuel our gas-powered cars?

Can he explain his twisted logic?

Hon. Marc Garneau: Madam Speaker, what I meant was that some people can be naive or hypocritical when it comes to energy. It is important to recognize that we need to look after the environment and the economy at the same time.

Tens of thousands of people rely on the energy sector, and this sector contributes to our country's wealth, allowing us to build schools and hospitals in Quebec. That is the reality, but those who are constantly criticizing energy development never recognize that.

[*English*]

Mr. Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC): Madam Speaker, when the government cancelled the northern gateway pipeline project and brought in the tanker ban, the Liberals tore \$2 billion in equity away from the Aboriginal Equity Partners, \$2 billion for aboriginal communities in northern B.C. where there is not much economic development. When we asked Liberals about it, they said they did not even consult them before they brought this in.

There is another project, the Eagle Spirit pipeline, completely indigenous owned, that has been shut down by Bill C-48 and the northern tanker ban. The Nisga'a Nation has expressed interest in having a port for a future pipeline, and the government has shut it down.

Why has the government shut down and torn away so much economic opportunity from indigenous Canadians in northern British Columbia?

Hon. Marc Garneau: Madam Speaker, I disagree with that characterization of the situation, because there are still plenty of opportunities.

Let me talk about the example of the massive LNG project out of Kitimat. That will provide opportunities for first nations and others along the northern coast. I would also add, again, because people seem to be focused only on the persistent oils, that this is not a ban on non-persistent oils. I would recommend that my colleague check the schedule in Bill C-48 to find out which products are banned. He will also realize that certain products are not banned and can be exported by tanker from the north coast.

• (1900)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Robert Aubin (Trois-Rivières, NDP): Madam Speaker, the environment is the NDP's priority. We do not have a top priority. We have just one priority.

What the NDP knows, but the Liberals are slow to understand, is that in order to balance the economy and the environment, we also need to transform the economy. If we truly want to talk about a transition, we will eventually have to stop investing in fossil fuels and invest elsewhere.

Does the minister agree that it is time to transform the economy so that we can meet our environmental targets?

Hon. Marc Garneau: Madam Speaker, that is what we are doing.

Today, when the Prime Minister announced our support for TMX, he also said that all net revenue from this project will be invested in a fund to support the clean energy transition. This is a tangible example. Once everything is in place, we will be looking at hundreds of thousands of dollars a year.

[*English*]

Mrs. Kelly Block: Madam Speaker, I would suggest that the minister's reference to the products on the schedule confirms what we know about the Liberals' willingness and desire to phase out the oil sands.

The second amendment put forward by the other place to Bill C-48 would have added a new section to the end of the bill. Even though it was not very substantive, at least it was a tip of the hat to the regions that would be most affected by the bill. However, the Liberals gutted this amendment.

Could the minister explain to the House why the rules and regulations that govern the loading and off-loading of oil on Canada's east coast are not good enough for the loading and off-loading of oil on Canada's west coast? Will you simply admit that the bill—

S. O. 57

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I have to allow for another question. Also, the hon. member knows that she needs to address her questions and comments to the Chair.

The hon. Minister of Transport.

Hon. Marc Garneau: Madam Speaker, as I said previously, there are multiple reasons that make the north coast a unique case.

First, the industry there is not developed, which is because of the voluntary exclusion zone that has been in place since 1985. Second, the infrastructure in place there to deal with problematic situations is not as sturdy as it is on the east coast or on the southern coast. Third, we are dealing with one of the last pristine rainforests in Canada, which has been protected not only by the federal government but also by the provincial government. Fourth, the majority of coastal first nations that live there and have been there for millennia have very clearly said they do not want to take the risk of an oil spill.

Mr. Todd Doherty: Madam Speaker, let us be very clear. This is not a tanker ban; this is a product ban. This is geared solely toward the products that are developed and produced in Alberta.

Thirty-five first nations have signed on to share in \$2 billion of equity. What is the government's plan for those 35 first nations communities, which are basing their communities' economic hopes on this plan?

Hon. Marc Garneau: Madam Speaker, we made a promise to Canadians in June and September 2015. It is in my mandate letter. It was in the throne speech. It is a promise that we intend to keep, as members can see.

There are other opportunities for coastal first nations, but they relate to non-persistent oils. I urge my colleague to read up on the difference between the two.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): It is my duty to interrupt the proceedings at this time and put forthwith the question on 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 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 yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Call in the members.

● (1910)

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

(Division No. 1373)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Amos	Anandasangaree
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Baylis	Beech
Bendayan	Bennett
Bittle	Blair
Boissonnault	Bossio
Bratina	Breton
Carr	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Champagne	Chen
Cormier	Cuzner
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeCoursey	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Eyking	Eyolfson
Fergus	Fillmore
Finnigan	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Fuhr
Garneau	Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones	Goodale
Graham	Hajdu
Hardie	Hébert
Hogg	Holland
Housefather	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Joly	Jones
Jordan	Jowhari
Khalid	Khera
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Lebouthillier
Lefebvre	Leslie
Levitt	Lightbound
Lockhart	Long
Longfield	Ludwig
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
May (Cambridge)	
McCrimmon	McDonald
McGuinty	McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendès	Mendicino
Mihychuk	Monsef
Morrissey	Murray
Nassif	Ng
O'Connell	Oliphant
Oliver	O'Regan
Ouellette	Paradis
Peschisolido	Peterson
Petitpas Taylor	Picard
Poissant	Qualtrough
Ratansi	Rioux
Robillard	Rogers
Romanado	Rota
Rudd	Ruimy
Rusnak	Sahota
Saini	Sajjan
Samson	Sangha
Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Schulte
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)

Government Orders

Simms
Spengemann
Tan
Vandal
Vaughan
Whalen
Yip
Zahid— 157

Sorbara
Tabbara
Tassi
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wrzesnewskyj
Young

● (1915)

MOTION IN RELATION TO SENATE AMENDMENTS

The House resumed from June 17 consideration of the motion in relation to the amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-48, An Act respecting the regulation of vessels that transport crude oil or persistent oil to or from ports or marine installations located along British Columbia's north coast.

Mrs. Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to rise to continue my response to the government's motion on the Senate amendments to Bill C-48.

As I said yesterday, I, along with millions of other Canadians, would rather that Bill C-48 be consigned to the dustbin of bad ideas. I read aloud the letter from six premiers that highlights the damage Bill C-48 and Bill C-69 are doing to our national unity. I left off quoting testimony from indigenous leaders and elected representatives on this and other bills, which underscored the hypocrisy of the government's claim to consult.

I will pick up there, considering the backdrop of Liberal attacks on the Canadian oil and gas industry, and share some of the testimony, much from first nations leaders, that the transport committee heard when we studied this bill. These are not my words. These are not the words of the Leader of the Opposition or any of my colleagues. These are the words of Canadians who, day in and day out, are working hard to provide good jobs and economic growth while maintaining a healthy environment.

Ms. Nancy Bérard-Brown, manager of oil markets and transportation with the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers, said:

CAPP did not support the proposed moratorium because it is not based on facts or science. There were no science-based gaps identified in safety or environmental protection that might justify a moratorium.

Mr. Chris Bloomer, president and chief executive officer of the Canadian Energy Pipeline Association, said:

The proposed oil tanker moratorium act, Bill C-48, is yet another change that will compound uncertainty and negatively impact investor confidence in Canada...

In conclusion, the consequences of potentially drastic policy changes for future energy projects have instilled uncertainty within the regulatory system, adding additional risks, costs, and delays for a sector that the Prime Minister publicly acknowledged has built Canada's prosperity and directly employs more than 270,000 Canadians.

The approach to policy-making represented by the development of Bill C-48 contributes to this uncertainty and erodes Canada's competitiveness.

Commenting on the practical, or rather impractical, ramifications of this bill, Mr. Peter Xotta, vice-president of planning and operations for the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority, said the following on what this bill could mean for the west coast transportation corridor:

With regard to Bill C-48, the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority assumes that government understands the potential economic impact for such a moratorium, given that there are very few suitable locations, particularly on the west coast, for movement of petroleum products, as was articulated by my associate from Prince Rupert.

Notwithstanding the fact that any future proposals would be subject to government's rigorous environmental and regulatory review process, this moratorium could create pressure on the southwest coast of British Columbia to develop capacity for future energy projects.

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Allison
Arnold
Aubin
Barsalou-Duval
Bergen
Bezan
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Block
Brassard
Caesar-Chavannes
Caron
Choquette
Davidson
Diotte
Dreeshen
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Duvall
Fast
Fortin
Garrison
Gill
Godin
Hardcastle
Jeneroux
Jolibois
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lake
Lloyd
MacKenzie
Manly
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McColeman
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Motz
Nater
Nuttall
Pauzé
Poilievre
Rankin
Reid
Sansoucy
Schmale
Shipley
Stetski
Sweet
Tilson
Trudel
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Wong
Zimmer— 113

Albas
Alleslev
Anderson
Ashton
Barrett
Benson
Berthold
Blaikie
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boucher
Brosseau
Cannings
Chong
Clarke
Deltell
Doherty
Dubé
Dusseau
Eglinski
Finley
Gallant
Genuis
Gladu
Gourde
Harder
Johns
Julian
Kent
Kmiec
Kwan
Liepert
MacGregor
Maguire
Martel
Mathysen
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Moore
Nantel
Nicholson
Paul-Hus
Plamondon
Quach
Rayes
Rempel
Saroya
Shields
Sopuck
Strahl
Thériault
Trost
Van Kesteren
Wagantall
Waugh
Weir
Yurdiga

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu

LeBlanc— 2

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I declare the motion carried.

Government Orders

As I said earlier, there were many first nations representatives who gave testimony at committee. Ms. Eva Clayton, president of Nisga'a Lisims Government, said:

In the weeks that preceded the introduction of Bill C-48, we urged that the moratorium not be enforced before further consultation took place and that the moratorium should not cover our treaty area.

Much to our surprise, Bill C-48 was introduced before we had been offered an opportunity to review the detailed approach that the government decided to take, nor were we able to comment on the implications of the proposed legislation on the terms and shared objectives of our treaty even though the area subject to the moratorium includes all of Nisga'a Lands, all of the Nass area, and all coastal areas of our treaty....

We aspire to become a prosperous and self-sustaining nation that can provide meaningful economic opportunities for our people. This aspiration is reflected in our treaty, which sets out the parties' shared commitment to reduce the Nisga'a Nation's reliance on federal transfers over time. The Nisga'a Nation takes this goal very seriously. However, it stands to be undermined by Bill C-48.

● (1920)

Mr. Calvin Helin, chairman and president of Eagle Spirit Energy Holding Ltd., stated:

In that context, first nations people, particularly the 30-plus communities that have supported our project, have told us that they do not like outsiders, particularly those they view as trust-fund babies coming into the traditional territories they've governed and looked after for over 10,000 years and dictating government policy in their territory.

Mr. Dale Swampy, coordinator of Aboriginal Equity Partners, stated:

We are here to oppose the tanker ban. We have worked hard and diligently. Our 31 first nation chiefs and Métis leaders invested a lot of time and resources to negotiate with northern gateway with the prospect of being able to benefit from the project, to be able to get our communities out of poverty.

Please listen to how Mr. John Helin, mayor of the Lax Kw'alaams Band, identified those who support the oil tanker ban. He said:

What we're asking is, what is consultation? It has to be meaningful. It can't be a blanket moratorium.

If you look at our traditional territory and the Great Bear Rainforest, that was established without consultation with members from my community. The picture that was taken when they announced that, it was NGOs from America standing there trumpeting that accomplishment. We can't let people from outside our communities, NGOs and well-funded organizations that are against oil and gas or whatever they're against come in and dictate in our territories what we should and should not do.

In contrast to Mr. Helin's comments, Ms. Caitlyn Vernon, campaigns director for the Sierra Club of British Columbia, a witness who supports this bill, actually let the cat out of the bag in response to a question, when she said:

on the south coast, tankers pose a huge risk to the economy, communities, wildlife, the southern residents, and endangered orca whales that live in the Salish Sea.... Absolutely, I would support a full-coast moratorium.

Mr. Ken Veldman, director of public affairs for the Prince Rupert Port Authority put the views of Ms. Vernon, and others like her, including, I would point out, members of this House in the NDP, the Bloc, the Green Party and likely even the Liberal Party, in perspective when he said:

As you may imagine, there are a wide variety of opinions as to what's acceptable risk and what isn't. However, the reality is that risk can be quantified, and if you're looking to achieve zero risk, then you're correct that zero transportation is really the only way to achieve that.

That said, if our appetite for risk is zero, that has very broad ramifications for shipping off the coast in general.

When speaking to our committee this spring, Captain Sean Griffiths, chief executive officer of the Atlantic Pilotage Authority,

also reflected on the impact of an oil tanker moratorium on the Atlantic Canadian economy. He stated:

Twelve of our 17 ports in Atlantic Canada ship large volumes of oil and petroleum products in and out of port. I can imagine it's a way of life back in the east, and it has been for quite some time. We move a lot of oil in and out of our ports. Placentia Bay alone, for instance, has 1,000 to 1,100 tanker movements every year on average, so a moratorium would, I'm sure, devastate the region.

Bill C-48, along with Bill C-88, and the "no more pipelines" bill, Bill C-69, paint a pattern of a government and a Prime Minister obsessed with politicizing and undermining our energy resources sector at every turn. Whether it be through legislation, the carbon tax, the cancellation of the northern gateway and energy east pipelines or the continued bungling of the Trans Mountain expansion, which we heard today the Liberals have approved yet again, the current Prime Minister has proven, at every turn, that he is an opponent of our natural resources sector. If the government was serious about the environment and the economy going hand in hand, it would implement real changes.

● (1925)

Hypothetically speaking, let us look at some the changes the government might make. It could use scientific independent studies to further strengthen our world-leading tanker safety system by making changes that would not only protect our domestic waters but the waters of any country with which we trade. It could require all large crude oil tankers operating in Canadian waters to have a double hull, since a double hull has two complete watertight layers of surface and is much safer. It could even go a step further and inspect every foreign tanker on its first visit to a Canadian port and annually thereafter, holding those tankers to the same standards as Canadian-flagged vessels.

This hypothetical government could also expand the national aerial surveillance program and extend long-term funding. It could increase surveillance efforts in coastal areas, including in northern British Columbia. It could ensure that the aerial surveillance program was given access to remote sensing equipment capable of identifying potential spills from satellite images.

This theoretical government could give more power to the Canadian Coast Guard to respond to incidents and establish an incident command system. It could amend legislation to provide alternate response measures, such as the use of chemical dispersants and burning spilled oil during emergencies, and could clarify the Canadian Coast Guard's authority to use and authorize these measures when there was likely to be a net environmental benefit.

It could create an independent tanker safety expert panel to receive input from provincial governments, aboriginal groups and marine stakeholders and then implement the changes recommended by this panel. It could focus on preventing spills in the first place and cleaning them up quickly if they did occur, while making sure that polluters pay.

Government Orders

Hypothetically, the government could modernize Canada's marine navigation system and have Canada take a leadership role in implementing e-navigation in our tankers while supporting its implementation worldwide. This is doubly important, since e-navigation reduces the risk of an oil spill by providing accurate real-time information on navigation hazards, weather and ocean conditions to vessel operators and marine authorities, thereby minimizing the potential for incidents.

It could establish new response planning partnerships for regions that have or are expected to have high levels of tanker traffic, such as the southern portion of British Columbia, Saint John and the Bay of Fundy in New Brunswick, Port Hawkesbury in Nova Scotia, and the Gulf of St. Lawrence in Quebec. It could work to develop a close partnership with each of these regions, including with local aboriginal communities, to develop responses to the unique challenges facing their tanker traffic.

This theoretical government could strengthen the polluter pay regime by introducing legislative and regulatory amendments that would remove the ship-source oil pollution fund per incident liability limit and ensure that the full amount was available for any incident. It could ensure that compensation was provided to eligible claimants while recovering these costs from industry through a levy. As well, it could extend compensation so that those who lost earnings due to an oil spill would be compensated even if their property had not been directly affected.

All these changes could be done by a government that actually cared about protecting the environment and continuing to grow the economy. Wait a minute. We are not talking about a hypothetical government. Every single one of the changes I just mentioned was brought in by the previous Conservative government. Unlike the Liberal government, we listened to the experts, which empowered us to make real, practical changes that made a difference.

While Liberals vacillate between paralysis and empty, economically damaging, virtue-signalling legislation, Conservatives look for real solutions. Case in point, the Liberal government is so preoccupied with appearances that it just finished its third round of approving a pipeline supported by over 60% of British Columbia residents.

I read the quote earlier by some who support this legislation. Some would like to see a complete prohibition on oil movement.

● (1930)

This ideological oil tanker moratorium, as I have said, is not based on science. We know that. That is why, frankly, we did not propose any amendments when this bill was before the transport committee. We did not believe that this bill was redeemable, and I still do not. There was a brief moment of hope for me when the Senate committee recommended that the bill not proceed. Sadly, that hope was short-lived.

This brings us to today and the motion that is the basis of our debate. I will take a few minutes to outline my thoughts on the government's response to the Senate's amendments to the Liberals' terrible bill.

Last week, the Senate voted on three amendments to Bill C-48. One, by a Conservative senator, which would have given the

Minister of Transport the authority to adjust the northern boundary of the tanker moratorium, would have been an improvement to the bill. Regrettably, it was narrowly defeated.

The amendment in the other place that did pass cannot be called an improvement to this bill. While somewhat noble in its intent, it is a thin attempt to mask the fact that this entire bill is an affront to indigenous people's rights. The inclusion of these clauses in the bill does not change that fact.

Regarding the second part of the amendment passed by the Senate, I acknowledge that it is at least an attempt to recognize that this bill is an assault on a particular region of the country, namely, the oil-producing prairie provinces. This second part of the amendment passed by the Senate calls for a statutory review of the act as well as a review of the regional impact this act would have. The government's motion, which we are debating today, amended certain elements of this Senate amendment.

No one will guess which section of this amendment the government kept and which section it rejected. Those who guessed that it rejected the section that, at the very least, acknowledged indirectly that this bill was an attack on western Canada, would be correct.

This further demonstrates that when the Prime Minister or one of his ministers claims that others are threatening national unity with their opposition to certain pieces of legislation by the government, it is the ultimate doublespeak. Hon. senators who support this bill had the decency to propose and pass an amendment that was at least a tip of the hat to the alienation felt by western Canadians brought on by the Liberal government's actions. The motion we are debating today has stripped these sections from the bill, proving once again that this is just another step in the Prime Minister's plan to phase out the oil sands, regardless of the impact on Canada's economic well-being.

It is for these reasons that my colleagues and I oppose the government's motion on the Senate amendments to Bill C-48. We on the Conservative side will always stand up for Canada. We support Canada's natural resource sector, which contributes billions to our economy and economic growth. We support Canada's environment with practical, science-based policies that have a real and positive impact on our country's, and indeed the whole world's, environment. We support Canadians in their hope and desire for sustainable, well-paying jobs so that they can support their families, support each other and contribute to a happy and healthy Canada.

Conservatives support legislation that is based on science, research and the facts, and this bill is none of the above.

Mr. Terry Beech (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened intently to the member's comments, as I know she did when I gave my presentation yesterday. There was a particular part of the presentation I gave yesterday that had to do with growing the economy, and I heard some groans from the member opposite, so I thought I would give her an opportunity to address it.

Government Orders

During my speech, I talked about how our government is working to both protect and restore the environment and to also grow the economy. I heard those groans when I started talking about the economy. Specifically, I addressed the fact that in 152 years, the Government of Canada has accrued about \$688 billion worth of debt. Taken over 152 years, it is an average deficit of about \$4.5 billion a year. However, that does not tell the whole story, because most of that debt has been accrued since I have been alive. In fact, \$490 billion of it was accrued under the previous two Conservative prime ministers. That means that 72% of our country's entire debt happened under Stephen Harper or Brian Mulroney.

Given that, I would like to know why the member is so worried about being fiscally responsible, when she is a member of that party.

• (1935)

Mrs. Kelly Block: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what my hon. colleague's question has to do with the bill or Senate amendments before us. I absolutely reject the premise of his question.

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I always appreciate my friend and colleague from Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek for her respectful comments and the way she conducts herself in the House. However, I disagree with some of the comments she made in her speech.

She talked about indigenous rights and title and touched on the areas where the government has failed to consider this. What we see constantly from the Conservatives, which we saw in the NEB process when they supported the northern gateway project, is a tendency to pick and choose when they want to respect indigenous rights and title, and free, prior and informed consent. It is no different from the Liberals.

In the NEB process on the northern gateway project, the courts rebuked the Conservatives for not listening to indigenous communities and respecting indigenous rights and title. Does the member support indigenous rights and title even when they go against projects from the government of the day? Does she respect that, or does she think we should get to pick and choose?

Mrs. Kelly Block: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest there have been consultations along the way with first nations. Consulting with first nations is very important. We know there is considerable support among first nations on B.C.'s coast for energy development opportunities. We even heard support at committee for these opportunities. We recognize, just as the minister did earlier, that there are varying views, whether first nations support the bill or not. However, what we heard in committee is that they were not consulted.

I would suggest that the government is only consulting when it believes it will get the answer it wants. When it knows it is not going to get the answer it wants, it does not consult.

I would remind the House that this directive was put in the minister's mandate letter long before he had any opportunity to consult. I would ask the hon. member to reflect on what the current government is doing with respect to consultation.

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am curious about my friend's last comment regarding indigenous rights and title and respecting consultative obligations

with respect to the north coast specifically and the oil tankers that could potentially plow through B.C. waters. When the Conservative Party was in government, it issued the permits for the Enbridge northern gateway pipeline. In Federal Court, the former government was shown to have completely failed in the most basic obligations to consult and accommodate first nations and indigenous communities across the northwest. I was privy to some of those consultations, being the member of Parliament from the northwest.

It is passing strange to me that one of the central criticisms now coming from Conservatives is that the Liberals have inadequately consulted first nations. In the first round of the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion, the Federal Court also threw out the current Liberals' effort to adequately and properly consult. I do not understand how Conservatives now say they believe in this fundamental principle when, while in government, they practised one of the worst forms of consultation, which the court immediately threw out, totally abrogating all of the permits that had been issued for the northern gateway pipeline. Now they are lecturing anyone about what proper consultation looks like.

Is this a new evolution in their thinking? Do they have any suggestions regarding what they might eventually do in the future to make up for the many mistakes they made in the past?

• (1940)

Mrs. Kelly Block: Mr. Speaker, I would remind my hon. colleague that there were 31 first nations that were equity partners. They held a 30% financial position in the northern gateway pipeline project. I am pretty sure that there was consultation that took place in regard to that project with first nations communities that were going to be directly affected by the project.

I would also remind my hon. colleague that it was the previous Conservative government that created the Major Projects Management Office - West, which was bringing together provincial governments, federal governments and first nations leaders to talk about resource development and resource projects in their territories and in those provinces.

I would also quote the Assembly of First Nations Chief Perry Bellegarde. He said that we know that 500 of the 630 first nations across Canada are open to pipelines and petroleum development on their land. We definitely need to create partnerships to have these conversations to ensure that they have every opportunity to succeed economically as the rest of Canadians do.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: Mr. Speaker, I have a curiosity for the Conservative government, because I had worked quite closely with our dearly departed friend, Jim Prentice. One of the projects we worked on was the approval of the Great Bear Rainforest. In order for that entire tract of land, coastline and ocean to come under conservation protection, under a Conservative government, we had to abrogate and remove the drilling leases that had been acquired over many decades in the Hecate Strait. That is a body of water between Haida Gwaii and the mainland of coastal British Columbia.

Government Orders

There is no way to be able to bring in the Gwaii Haanas National Marine Reserve, which we did over successive governments and both Liberals and Conservatives joined with us and the people of the north coast in understanding that it is a particular part of the world. I am not sure if my friend has been to the north coast or to Haida Gwaii. It is beyond question for anyone who has spent time there that there is something truly unique about this place. There is something special about and it has been acknowledged not just in words, but also in law and practice, again by Conservative governments of the past.

I am wondering if she could attempt to acknowledge here today that we are not talking about just another part of the world, that it is something special that future generations are counting on us to protect.

Mrs. Kelly Block: Mr. Speaker, I have travelled throughout this entire country and recognize that there are extraordinary, beautiful places across this country that we all want to see stewarded carefully. When it comes to the environment, when it comes to this bill and when we are talking about the impact this bill will have on the environment, Bill C-48 will do nothing more to preserve the area off the northwest coast of British Columbia than is already being done.

Ships, including U.S. tankers travelling from Alaska to Washington state, will still continue to be able to travel up and down the coast just outside of the 100 kilometre limit. There already is a voluntary moratorium in place. It is being observed. It has been there for three decades. The bill is nothing but symbolism. It is not going to preserve that northwest coast any more than what is already being done through the voluntary moratorium. All it is doing is putting a moratorium on Canada's Alberta oil sands.

• (1945)

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I think the time ahead of us is somewhat short. This bill is now under a measure to allow it to proceed at a certain pace. For some, it might seem like a bit of a rush, that this is happening at some accelerated pace, but for those of us who make our homes along the north coast and the northwest of British Columbia, this has been a conversation that has gone on for more than a generation. We have been talking specifically about the transit of oil across the northwest and off the north coast to some other ports for almost 50 years. It has been 47 years.

Going back through some of the history would be important to help colleagues and people watching this debate understand how much this has been studied by Parliament, the National Energy Board, people living in the northwest and industry. I am not sure there is another transit route anywhere in North America that has been looked at so often and so often rejected as a good or potential route to pass oil products through because of some of the inherent risks that make the transit of that oil difficult to do securely.

Fifteen years ago, I started my career in federal politics. One of our objectives in running for office and ultimately achieving success at the polls was to put Skeena back on the map, to have the conversation that we were having between and within our communities as part of a national dialogue, issues about the environment and resource exploitation, about indigenous rights and title, and the obligation of the Crown of this place to do a much better job than we have historically done through our colonial past.

Fifteen years ago, when I first rose in Parliament, the issue that we talked about was this. We were talking about attempts to protect the north coast, which by anyone's estimation is deserving of our respect and protection.

In the most recent election in 2015, four of the five major federal parties campaigned on the promise to do exactly what we are doing here today. Of the people sitting in this House of Commons, representing over 12 million Canadian voters, 70% campaigned on this promise throughout that election. Making good on that promise is the least we can do for the people in the northwest, who have again been discussing this for more than a generation.

In 1970, a House of Commons committee first studied this question asking: is this a good idea or not; is there a port to the north of Vancouver that would make good sense to transit oil? That review came up negative.

In 1972, the declaration of a voluntary moratorium, an exclusion zone, was put in place. Also, in 1972, one of my predecessors, Frank Howard, the MP for Skeena, as it was known at the time, passed a unanimous motion confirming that exclusion zone. All parties in the House of Commons at that time understood the importance of this. It was multipartisan. It was not even partisan or bipartisan; it had all parties in agreement.

The federal commission was struck in 1978.

The voluntary agreement with the United States came in 1988, which has been reviewed many times since and confirmed each and every time.

In 2009, Stephen Harper decided to ignore this long-held moratorium. He simply called it a cabinet utterance, which it was. It had never been written down into law. Therefore, as the then prime minister, he said he did not need to abide by it and then opened up the conversation for a proposed project from the company known as Enbridge, which hived off to become Enbridge northern gateway, a subsidiary, which is a neat trick an oil and gas company sometimes does to protect itself. It creates a subsidiary to run a pipeline, which indemnifies it against legal action if ever there was an accident. This is the same company that spilled massive amounts of oil and diluted bitumen into the Kalamazoo River, which cost hundreds of millions of dollars. It is unable to clean up the Kalamazoo, by the way, in Michigan in the States. It is a very shallow, slow-moving, warm river. For anyone familiar with the circumstances of our rivers in British Columbia, particularly northern British Columbia, they are not shallow, slow-moving or warm. Every oil cleanup expert in the world, those based in British Columbia and throughout North America, has described a successful cleanup rate for a diluted bitumen spill on the north coast at less than 7% recovery.

• (1950)

Let me repeat that. What would be deemed as a successful, A-plus cleanup operation in the event of a spill from a pipeline or an oil tanker on the north coast in the waters that we know, is 7% recovery and 93% lost into the environment. As we know, diluted bitumen sinks and causes havoc in a place that relies on our rivers and our oceans for our very sustenance.

Government Orders

The great privilege that I have had for this decade and a half representing the people of the northwest is to come to know in some small way the ancient indigenous cultures that have resided there since time immemorial: the Tsimshian, the Haida, the Heiltsuk, the Nuxalk, the Tahltan, the Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en, all the way through and to the coast.

The privilege that has been mine is learning from that leadership that the responsibilities of leaders are not simply to care for ourselves in the moment in which we exist, but in all of our best efforts to represent people, to speak on their behalf and to leave the place better than we found it.

In Kitimat, British Columbia, which would have been the terminus for the northern gateway pipeline, it was the Haisla leadership in particular, elected and hereditary leadership together, who spoke with such firmness and declaration. They rejected the idea of bringing diluted bitumen to the north coast and sailing it down the Douglas Channel in super tankers, trying to perform three 90-degree turns before getting into the Hecate Strait near Haida Gwaii, the fourth most dangerous body in the world, in an attempt to move oil safely hundreds and thousands of times over the course of the life of a pipeline. There is no reasonable person who can offer the people I represent the assurance that an accident will not happen.

The *Exxon Valdez* spill of 1989 was just north of us. To this day, we can go on the shorelines where the *Exxon Valdez* went down and where it spilled. All we have to do is dig half a foot into the gravel banks and the water that fills back in comes with an oil sheen that is detectable as spillage from the *Exxon Valdez* so many years ago.

Most Canadians approach these questions in a relatively straightforward way: What are the risks versus the benefits, not just to us as a community but to us as a province and a nation? The risks that are entertained in trying to move diluted bitumen and any oil product off the north coast in super tankers that are not designed for our waters through very narrow and treacherous passageways so far outweigh any imagined benefits that it is a no-brainer.

I can remember a letter that was issued by the then natural resources minister. I do not know if colleagues remember. It was directed by the prime minister's office, we found out later. It said that those who are opposed to northern gateway are enemies of the state and foreign-funded radicals. That is what they called us. Not only was that an incredibly offensive and ignorant thing to say about fellow Canadians from the prime minister's office and his minister, but it ended up having the reverse effect in the place I represent.

What the former Harper government had not learned was that sometimes those people who are concerned about the environment and worried about oil spilling into our oceans and into our rivers are not all wearing Birkenstocks. They are not all fully paid members of Greenpeace. In fact, in the place I live, some of the most conservative people I know take that word "conservative" seriously, to mean they want to be able to take their kids fishing and to the out of doors. I need to respect that place in order to have that privilege and for them to have that privilege for their children. The former government accused us of being radicals, of being foreign-funded stooges to some great, grand conspiracy theory, which continues on today, unfortunately, for law-abiding, proper-thinking Canadians

who are simply saying they want a voice in this conversation and that the government has to listen to them.

It was so shameful for any government of any political persuasion to stoop to those tactics, and it had the opposite effect. People where I live, those from the right, the left, the middle and outside all of our conventional thinking said, "How dare you" to the former government. In fact, it may have in part contributed to the Conservatives' eventual downfall; that the arrogance and the bullying represented in that attitude toward citizens whom we seek to represent backfired completely and exposed that government to something else.

● (1955)

To former colleagues and current provincial premiers who are waving the national unity flag, one way to not do national unity is by threatening and bullying other Canadians. We do not bring this country together by yelling at each other. We do not represent the best interests of Canada when we talk to another province in a disrespectful and offensive way. Unfortunately, what we are seeing out of some of our provinces is to suggest to British Columbia, the place that I call home, "How dare you stand up for things you believe in? How dare you represent your views politically and socially?" We can see what is coming out of Edmonton these days, and it will not have the effect that I suppose they are hoping for.

To my friends and family in Alberta, whom I have spoken to many times over these long years, and we have been campaigning and talking about this for a long time: We absolutely understand the fear that is exhibited, particularly by those who are involved in the oil industry, because they have had a hard go. Oil went up to extremely high prices, \$140 a barrel, money was easily made through hard work and focus, and then, steadily, prices collapsed. The economy of Alberta, in particular, and of Saskatchewan as well, are very reliant on that particular economy. They fell on incredibly hard times, and things got more and more tight and desperate. It felt as if the world was lined up against them. However, no one is controlling oil prices, last I checked, effectively. Not the current government and not past governments. This is a cycle that we have seen many times.

In the face of this, we are also collectively challenged with what we are seeing in our world. The predictions and thoughts we were getting in the 1980s and 1990s about the impacts of climate change were that forest fires would become more intense and broader, that floods and storm events would no longer be single-century events but many times over many years, and that we are seeing the impacts and the weather pattern changes that are directly attributable to dangerous climate change. Albertans know this. We saw the floods in Calgary. We saw the fires in Fort McMurray, and we saw them in my region as well.

Government Orders

I sat down with a forest firefighter just last season, which was another record and devastating year. For those who have ever experienced or been in proximity to an out-of-control forest fire, it is devastating. It is so shaking to our very understanding of home and security when we see the full rage and power of Mother Nature in effect. However, I was sitting across the lunch table from a firefighter who had blackened eyes and was completely covered in soot. He had just got off the line. He has been fighting fires for 30 years. I asked, "How are you doing?" He said, "It's different". This guy is to the right of Attila the Hun and way out there in terms of his conservative views on the world and so I asked, "How is it different?" He said, "The impacts of climate. I'm watching it". I said, "You're putting me on." He replied, "Absolutely not. It's the way the fires are behaving; the way the things are conducting themselves is not the way that we know."

Now, with the bill before us, many in the oil industry are seeking certainty. It is a common refrain: "We want certainty. We just want to be able to know what the landscape is". I will offer this to those interested in certainty: We want certainty too.

For millennia, the people of the north coast have relied upon the oceans and rivers for our economy, our basic social fabric and the sustenance that builds the incredible cultures that we now celebrate and enjoy across the globe. The certainty that we require is that these moratoriums that were voluntary, that were utterances from the government, will no longer be uncertain; they will be certain, and that is what the bill would do. However, the bill would also bring certainty to the industry, because last I checked, and someone can correct me, there is no one knocking on the door to try to build a diluted bitumen pipeline to the north coast, because the risks so far outweigh the benefits. It is because the political and social environment of the northwest is so connected to the land, so connected to the oceans and the rivers, that the viability of anyone proposing to build a big old diluted bitumen pipeline and put all of that in supertankers with some faint promise to get it off to overseas markets is not a reality. So let us create that certainty.

I mentioned in a question earlier in the debate that I worked alongside Jim Prentice, who has left us, while he was environment minister for the former government. Jim had come to the north coast, unlike many people who speak with some sort of authority as to how the north coast works.

● (2000)

Jim came many times. He saw the splendour and the grandeur. He worked with us on bringing forward the Great Bear Rainforest initiative. It had started under a previous Liberal government but had never come to completion. I worked with Rona Ambrose and John Baird. It was all these folks who had not exactly hugged a tree every day, but who understood the importance of this part of the world. We funded that initiative, protecting the largest tract of temperate rainforest in the world, and protecting it in such a way that includes the people who live there. We did not draw a line on a map around people, saying that the local communities were not important. We included them in the creation of a global leading conservation effort.

We bought back some, and some companies just simply forgave the permits they had to drill for oil and gas in the Hecate Strait, a preposterous notion for anyone who has ever been across the Hecate

Strait. It is incredibly shallow, prone to storms, and has some of the strongest winds in the world. It is a place that so relies on the ocean being intact for the survival of the people there.

It was through a Conservative, and I got in a lot of trouble for it. Some people said, "How dare you work with Conservatives to get something done?" There was a headline in the Toronto Star, claiming I had sold out. People wonder sometimes why we lose faith in politics. Something good was done, and I did not care who did it. I did not care who got the credit for it. I just cared that it got done. It was something people in the region wanted. It was through the Conservative government that we did it.

This is a strange, circular moment for me. When we came into this place, we were fighting to protect the north coast. As this parliamentary session winds down and my colleagues turn their eyes toward the next election, those who are re-offering, I think sometimes life offers us a little bit of a bookend to a story, that where one starts ends up being where one finishes.

For the people I represent, who have been engaged in this battle, indigenous and non-indigenous, right and left, rural and urban, for more than 40 years, to see this bill come to pass as one of the last acts of this Parliament, in which there have been disappointments, failures and mistakes as there always are, they can look to this piece of legislation, know that it is in fact founded in science, know that it is in fact founded in deep and profound consultations that have gone on for decades, and know for a fact that what we are doing as a Parliament here today is good.

What we are doing here as colleagues, as parliamentarians, who are called to serve, and in our best ways represent the people of this great country, is something right. There will be those who think it is wrong. I would invite them to come to the place where I live. I would invite them to see this place and meet the people who rely on this place for their very survival.

Allow me to end with this. I was in Bella Coola in Bella Bella, Heiltsuk and Nuxalk territory just last week. It was in the Heiltsuk territory where the *Nathan E. Stewart* went down. It is a relatively small, segregated barge. The world-class oil spill response that this country has claimed to have for 20 years was unable to handle a relatively small spill that took place on the clam beds and areas where salmon spawned, vital to the Heiltsuk Nation.

That experience was traumatizing for people there. It was traumatizing because they had been warning the federal government for many years that the clean-up for spills was insufficient, our navigational responses were insufficient, and what they were trying to protect was so precious to them. They could not go anywhere else. This was their home, this was where their ancestors were buried.

In watching the response, the brave response from that community, and knowing the risks posed by a much larger and more devastating spill, the least we can do is listen. Politicians are not always great at that. We like to talk. I have been talking for a bit here.

We have had many failures in this place. Parliament has failed rural people and indigenous people more often than not. Every once in a while, we can do something right and we can do something good. Passing this bill, enshrining what has existed for many decades into law, will be doing something right, and I believe doing our jobs on behalf of all Canadians.

• (2005)

The Deputy Speaker: It being 8:05 p.m., pursuant to an order made earlier today, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the consideration of the Senate amendments to Bill C-48 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.

• (2045)

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

(Division No. 1374)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Amos	Anandasangaree
Arya	Aubin
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Baylis
Beech	Bendayan
Bennett	Benson
Bibeau	Bittle
Blaikie	Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Boissonnault
Bossio	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Bratina
Breton	Brosseau
Caesar-Chavannes	Cannings
Caron	Carr
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Casey (Charlottetown)
Chagger	Champagne
Chen	Choquette
Cormier	Cullen
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	DeCoursey
Dhaliwal	Dhillon

Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Goldsmith-Jones
Graham
Hardcastle
Hébert
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Johns
Jones
Jowhari
Khalid
Kwan
Lametti
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacGregor
Manly
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Mathysen
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Socurs
Monsef
Morrissey
Nantel
Ng
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Peterson
Picard
Quach
Rankin
Rioux
Rogers
Rota
Ruimy
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sorbara
Stetski
Tan
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wrzesnewskyj
Young

Government Orders

Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dusseault
Easter
El-Khoury
Eyking
Fergus
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goodale
Hajdu
Hardie
Hogg
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Joly
Jordan
Julian
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Érables)
Moore
Murray
Nassif
O'Connell
Oliver
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Poissant
Qualtrough
Ratansi
Robillard
Romanado
Rudd
Rusnak
Saini
Samson
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Simms
Spengemann
Tabbara
Tassi
Vandal
Vaughan
Whalen
Yip
Zahid— 190

NAYS

Members

Albas
Alleslev
Anderson
Barrett

Government Orders

Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Bergen	Berthold
Bezan	Block
Boucher	Boudrias
Brassard	Carrie
Chong	Clarke
Davidson	Deltell
Diotte	Doherty
Dreeshen	Eglinski
Fast	Finley
Fortin	Gallant
Genuis	Gladu
Godin	Gourde
Harder	Hoback
Jeneroux	Kelly
Kent	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kusie
Lake	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Lukiwski	MacKenzie
Maguire	Martel
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McColeman
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Motz	Nater
Nicholson	Nuttall
O'Toole	Paul-Hus
Pauzé	Plamondon
Poillievre	Rayes
Reid	Rempel
Saroya	Schmale
Shields	Shipley
Ste-Marie	Strahl
Stubbs	Sweet
Thériault	Tilson
Van Kesteren	Viersen
Wagantall	Warkentin
Wauh	Webber
Weir	Wong
Yurdiga	Zimmer — 86

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu

LeBlanc — 2

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.
(Motion agreed to)

* * *

[Translation]

**CANADA-UNITED STATES-MEXICO AGREEMENT
IMPLEMENTATION ACT**

The House resumed from June 11 consideration of the motion that Bill C-100, An Act to implement the Agreement between Canada, the United States of America and the United Mexican States, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Ms. Linda Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here once more in the House of Commons with all of my colleagues to talk about the benefits of the Canada-United States-Mexico agreement for all Canadians.

In keeping with Canada's inclusive approach to trade, we have worked very hard since the negotiations began to get results that will advance the interests of Canada's middle class, small and medium-sized enterprises, women, indigenous peoples and entrepreneurs. The cultural exemption is also particularly important to me.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Ms. Linda Lapointe: Mr. Speaker, the members are talking very loudly, and it is bothering me.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. I would ask the hon. members to continue their conversations outside the House.

The hon. member for Rivière-des-Mille-Îles.

Ms. Linda Lapointe: Mr. Speaker, thank you for making sure everyone is listening. The agreement we are discussing is very important.

We worked hard to secure a good deal that will benefit all Canadians. For example, the provisions that protect women's rights, minority rights and indigenous rights are the strongest in any Canadian trade agreement to date. This includes obligations with respect to the elimination of employment discrimination based on gender. The new NAFTA is also the first international trade agreement that recognizes gender identity and sexual orientation as grounds for discrimination in its labour chapter.

I would add that, from the very beginning of the negotiation process, we emphasized the need to protect middle-class jobs and support economic growth. The vast majority of Canadian businesses are SMEs. They employ over 10.5 million Canadians, accounting for about 90% of the private sector workforce. The new agreement will help these Canadian businesses by giving them access to the U.S. and Mexican markets and promoting collaboration between the parties to create more opportunities for trade and investment.

During the 42nd Parliament, I had the honour and privilege of being a member of the Standing Committee on International Trade for two and a half years. The agreements that we signed include CETA and the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership. However, the agreement with the United States and Mexico is very important. The committee and parliamentarians worked very hard to move forward on this file, which is of vital importance to Canada. CUSMA includes a chapter on SMEs designed to complement the other commitments made throughout the agreement. It includes requirements to make available information that is specifically tailored to SMEs, including information on entrepreneurship, education programs for youth and under-represented groups, and information on obligations in the agreement that are particularly relevant to SMEs.

CUSMA also provides SMEs with an opportunity to collaborate in addressing any issue that could impact them in the future. In my riding of Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, which includes Deux-Montagnes, Saint-Eustache, Boisbriand and Rosemère, SMEs are the main employers. The new agreement establishes a committee on SME issues and an annual trilateral SME dialogue that brings together representatives of private sector employees, non-governmental organizations and other experts to discuss issues pertaining to the agreement that are relevant to SMEs. By doing so, CUSMA will give a voice to Canadian SMEs and facilitate discussions on issues that matter to them.

Government Orders

In keeping with our commitment to adopting an inclusive approach to trade, Canada carefully considered the interests of indigenous peoples throughout the negotiations. The Government of Canada is determined to advance the process of reconciliation with indigenous peoples through a renewed nation-to-nation relationship based on the recognition of rights, respect and co-operation. Given the efforts made by Canada to renew this relationship, one of Canada's objectives is to better advocate for the commercial interests of indigenous peoples. To that end, the Government of Canada has undertaken a vast consultation with chiefs and indigenous representatives and also with businesses and experts to better understand their commercial interests and obtain their advice on the priorities for the negotiations.

For the first time in a Canadian free trade agreement, the CUSMA includes a general exception that clearly states that the government can adopt or maintain measures it deems necessary to fulfill its legal obligations towards indigenous peoples. This exception is a testament to the commitment by all three countries to ensure that the agreement's obligations do not interfere with a country's legal obligations towards indigenous peoples.

We are proud to have made indigenous peoples the focus of the NAFTA renegotiations. As National Chief Perry Bellegarde of the Assembly of First Nations said, the new NAFTA's provisions addressing indigenous peoples make this most inclusive international trade agreement for indigenous peoples to date. The provisions will uphold the ancestral, inherent and treaty rights of first nations.

• (2050)

Furthermore, we are proud to have included a chapter on the environment in lieu of the side letter to the original NAFTA.

The chapter on the environment recognizes the important role indigenous peoples play in long-term environmental and biodiversity conservation, as well as sustainable fishing and forestry. The environmental provisions also take into account the rights of indigenous peoples under the Constitution for the use and development of natural resources.

Finally, for the first time in a Canadian free trade agreement, the preamble recognizes how important it is for indigenous peoples to participate more in trade and investment decisions. In addition to achieving results for SMEs, indigenous peoples and, of course, the cultural exemption, Canada has made gender equality and women's empowerment top priorities.

For instance, the labour chapter levels the playing field when it comes to labour standards and working conditions in North America, and includes commitments to ensure that national laws and policies provide protections for fundamental principles and rights at work. This includes provisions on non-discrimination in the workplace, including gender discrimination. It also includes provisions that encourage the adoption of programs and policies to tackle barriers to the full participation of women in the workforce. The agreement supports co-operative activities dealing with questions on gender issues in the workplace, particularly gender equality.

The investment chapter includes a special provision that reaffirms the importance of encouraging businesses to uphold standards of

corporate social responsibility, including those that apply to gender equality.

The chapter on small and medium-sized enterprises encourages the parties to collaborate on activities that will maximize trade opportunities for SMEs owned by women and promote their participation in international trade. Taken together, the agreement's provisions on equality address the issue directly.

I have to say a few words about the cultural exemption. I remember the Standing Committee on International Trade's trip to Washington. When I said that Canada has over eight million French speakers, they had no idea what I was talking about. That is why the cultural exemption is so important. It affects the cultural industry and means that Canada will still be able to create and maintain programs and policies that support our thriving cultural industries. The industry represents 75,000 jobs in Quebec, and culture represents 2.7% of our GDP and 3.6% of all jobs in Canada. That was a very important gain, and I am very proud of it.

In conclusion, let me reiterate that we worked incredibly hard to make sure the new agreement benefits Canadians, and not just middle-class workers and small businesses, but traditionally under-represented groups, such as women and indigenous peoples, too.

As I said, the cultural exemption was very important, and I can proudly say that our goals were met. We made significant progress in improving standards and benefits for all Canadians.

• (2055)

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, one of the problems with the agreement has to do with its impact on supply management. Farmers from across Canada are looking at the concessions that were made to the Americans on dairy and other products.

In New Westminster, I am seeing American milk on the shelves for the first time in my life. That milk is cheap because it contains ingredients like bovine growth hormone. Generally speaking, the quality of that milk is not as good, but it puts consumers in a difficult position because it costs less.

The question I want to ask my colleague is very simple. Why did Canada and the government make so many concessions with regard to supply management? They are undermining all of our existing supply managed products.

What is more, why did they not offer dairy farmers the kind of compensation they should be able to expect from a government that supports them?

Ms. Linda Lapointe: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to answer my colleague's question about supply management. That issue is very important to me. We have heard a lot of talk about supply management in Quebec. However, from what dairy and poultry farmers are telling me, they are very satisfied.

Government Orders

It is important to remember that there are also new opportunities available. Take, for example, refined sugar and margarine. Markets are opening up. We are able to go there.

I would like my NDP colleague, who often speaks about international trade, to tell me whether there is an agreement, other than the one between Canada and Ukraine, that the NDP would have accepted. They do not think any agreement is good enough.

As for the official opposition, they were willing to accept any agreement as quickly as possible. They thought it we should just take whatever we could get without any negotiation.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, I asked a question. Mr. would have been enough to answer me, but as usual the Liberal government prefers to attack the NDP.

As far as trade agreements are concerned, the NDP has always supported trade agreements that are fair, while the Conservatives and Liberals never talk about fair trade agreements. They are more interested in agreements that leave a lot to be desired for Canada and Canadians.

I am very pleased that my colleague mentioned that the NDP is the only party that supports trade agreements that are fair. It is the only party. As usual, the old parties are prepared to sign anything at any price. We have always advocated for evaluating agreements to see what we are gaining and what we are losing, in order to have trade where everyone wins, a fair trade agreement. The Liberals have never offered a single—

• (2100)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. I apologize, but I have to give the hon. member the chance to respond to the question or make a comment.

The hon. member for Rivière-des-Mille-Îles has just under one minute.

Ms. Linda Lapointe: Madam Speaker, I find that interesting, but he still has not said what kind of agreement they would have accepted.

We have faith in our farmers and in all those who work in the agri-food sector. Furthermore, the free trade agreement that we will sign with Mexico and the United States offers plenty of opportunities. Quebec excels in producing fine cheeses. Do members know that the best Camembert in the world comes from Quebec? We can export it. We are developing markets. It is simply a matter of seeking opportunities and selling our products.

[*English*]

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is an honour for me to rise in the House today to speak to Bill C-100.

I want to start my remarks by recognizing that we are ending the session shortly and this could very well be my last speech in the 42nd Parliament. That will no doubt delight my Liberal friends, but if they stay to listen to the content of my final remarks, they will have no delight because they will outline their failures.

I want to also send special thanks to a couple of exceptional Canadians, Dr. David Stevens and Dr. Bill Plaxton in Kitchener Waterloo. I have been away the last week with my wife who had

surgery. She was in the hands of those amazing medical professionals at Grand River Hospital. I want to thank them and I want to thank her for allowing me to come and speak tonight to NAFTA. I have been trying to help at home a little this last week.

All of us in the House rely on exceptional spouses, partners and families. If these are my last remarks of this Parliament, I think all of us do not thank our families enough. I love Rebecca and I love my family. The sacrifices we make in the House lead to reflection at this time of year. It has been good for me to spend time with my wife who is my partner in this adventure. I want to thank Dr. Stevens in particular for his exceptional care.

I will now proceed to upset my Liberal friends in discussing Bill C-100, back to my normal approach.

I hope a lot of Canadians are watching. I doubt they are, but I will push this out because we have to break this narrative that the government has approached the U.S. trade relationship and NAFTA renegotiations in any form of strategic fashion, because that has not been the case.

Much like almost every foreign relations approach under the Prime Minister, Canada has suffered, our sectors have suffered, employers, job creators, employees have suffered. The Liberal Party always puts the Prime Minister's brand and their own electoral fortune ahead of the national interest. Nothing highlights that more than the famous state visit to India. However, if we look at all the strained relationships Canada has around the world right now, we have never had so many. Almost all of these diplomatic entanglements are attributable to the Prime Minister's own approach, style and obsession with his image and electoral prospects.

We saw that with photographs from the India trip, but we have also seen it in flawed trade relations with China, where we are in the biggest dispute since we have had relations with China in the 1970s, with Saudi Arabia, with the Philippines. Countries like Italy have imposed tariffs on durum wheat. We are losing track of the number of countries that have a serious problem with Canada on trade, on security or in other relations because of the Prime Minister's government.

As much as I have some admiration for the Minister of Foreign Affairs, she is presiding over probably the worst period of modern diplomatic relations of Canada. I do not think 10 more magazine covers of Maclean's will correct that record.

Nothing should concern Canadians more than the situation with NAFTA. Two-thirds of our economy relies on trade with the United States. I have said this many times. Canada became lazy for the last half century, relying on the fact that we lived just north to the largest, most voracious free market economy in the world. In the post-world cycle, Canada traded, produced, were drawers of water and hewers of wood for the largest market just south of us.

Until the Harper government, we did not look much beyond our shores to enhance free trade and develop partnerships to diversify our trade relationships. We were so reliant, but we were also pioneers in free trade.

We can go back to the Harper and Mulroney governments, even back to Pearson with the auto pact of the mid-1960s when there was free trade in automobiles for the first time between two modern industrial countries. An automobile assembled in Oshawa by people like my father and his colleagues who worked in Oshawa where I grew up, or an automobile assembled in Windsor, or Oakville or Sainte-Thérèse, Quebec was considered just the same as if it had been assembled in Michigan.

● (2105)

Over the subsequent decades, we saw a Great Lakes free trade based in auto. It was the epicentre of the global auto industry. With just-in-time manufacturing, a part could be made in Aurora, put on final assembly in Oshawa and 70% of the vehicles produced in our Ontario auto plants were for sale in the United States anyway. Therefore, our free trade with the United States was built upon the auto industry.

I say this for two reasons. The first is because representing Oshawa and that industry, the retirees and the workers there now is a priority for me. The second reason is because it should trouble Canadians that the minister did not mention the auto industry in her priority speech on NAFTA, despite the fact the Liberals' best friend, Jerry Dias, was on the NAFTA advisory committee. I was pushing for auto to be a priority, whereas Jerry Dias was applauding the Prime Minister for an agenda that did not mention the auto industry.

Let us do a recap. President Trump was elected, and before his inauguration, before he was president, the Prime Minister volunteered to renegotiate NAFTA. There have been so many mistakes between now and then, we forget that our Prime Minister inserted us into something that was likely going to be focused on modernization with Mexico. Later on, the U.S. outlined what it wanted.

In July 2017, a United States trade representative laid out a series of priorities for the U.S. It spelled them out in detail, including things related to state-owned enterprises and non-market economy-type structures, which were a surprise to people at the end. The U.S. laid it out in July 2017 in detail, rules of origin, part content and the fact it wanted to go after what it perceived to be subsidies in the agriculture sector in Canada, despite the fact the U.S. spends more on agricultural subsidies than we spend on our military. However, it laid out what it wanted to talk about.

What did the Liberal Party lay out a few months later in August 2017 at the University of Ottawa? The minister launched her vaunted progressive agenda speech. There was no response to what the U.S. had already put out on trade. That is how a negotiation is supposed to work. The U.S. talks about the priorities it wants to talk about at the table and we put forward a contrary position. We should have pushed back and said that the U.S. had to stop subsidizing its agriculture sector before it could lecture us. However, the Liberals did not do that. They proceeded to make it all about the Prime Minister again. The "progressive agenda" they called it.

I invite Canadians to look at the speech. The core objectives of the minister's speech were laid out in detail and they were failures across the board. I know the minister has a high degree of education, but if she was getting marked on her paper, her speech, she would have failed.

Government Orders

Let me take the House through the core objectives laid out by the Liberal Party at the beginning of NAFTA.

The first objective was to modernize NAFTA for the digital revolution. That did not happen. In fact, there are concerns with respect to data transfer and localized storage of digital information that Canada was not able to negotiate into the new NAFTA. Therefore, the first core objective was a failure.

The second objective was the progressive section within NAFTA, where the minister, and later on the Minister of Environment and Climate Change and others, said that the government wanted clear, new chapters on climate change, gender rights, indigenous issues regarding reconciliation, those sorts of things. At the time, I said it was hard to be critical of things that were very important social programming and policy issues, particularly reconciliation. I take that responsibility very seriously. However, I also recognize that NAFTA is a trade agreement. There is not even a constitutional alignment between first nations and indigenous peoples, between Mexico, the United States and Canada, so how could we ever negotiate a trade agreement with a chapter on indigenous issues, for example? It was impossible.

● (2110)

Why were those elements the second prong of Canada's NAFTA strategy? Because it was the Prime Minister's brand. That could have been ripped out of the 2015 Liberal election platform.

When we are putting up policies to ensure we guarantee almost two-thirds of our economic activity as a nation, we should not be doing the posturing that the Liberals do on all these relationships. It leads to bad outcomes.

The third core objective the Liberal Party outlined was harmonizing regulations. That did not happen either. In fact, the last government had regulatory co-operation in the western hemispheric travel initiative, beyond the border initiatives. We have gone way back. We are not harmonizing any regulations.

The fourth core objective was government procurement and eliminating local content and buy American provisions. The Liberals failed on that one too. There remain buy America provisions, and the trend is getting worse.

The fifth core objective was to make the movement of professionals easier with respect to allowing Canadian professionals or people transferred to work in the United States. They failed on that front too. They did not secure that. That should have been low hanging fruit.

Government Orders

The sixth core objective was supply management, which the Liberals caved on as well. What I never heard the government say was the fact that the supply management system was criticized relentlessly. We heard President Trump talk about high tariff rates. I never heard a Liberal minister push back on the United States and say that its collection of direct agriculture subsidies amounted to more subsidization of the agricultural sector in the United States than in Canada by a country mile. In fact, the Americans spend more on agricultural subsidies on average each year than we spend on our military. We should have been pushing back at this narrative.

Those were the six core objectives of the minister's speech at the University of Ottawa. I would invite Canadians to look at it. We did not achieve a single objective. If that is not failure of colossal proportions, I do not know what is.

At the same time, we had section 232 speculation about steel and aluminum tariffs. The Conservatives said at the time that we needed to talk security, that we needed to talk trade, that we needed to ensure we could use NORAD and other relationships that were unique to Canada as a way to ensure we did not have section 232 tariffs applied.

The Prime Minister did a steel town tour when the government gained a one month exemption from tariffs. A month later the tariffs applied and they hurt Canada hard for a year. If we look at the statements by Secretary Ross in the United States, we could have avoided it.

Bill C-101 that is before the House now on safeguards is what the U.S. had been asking for. Had we aligned on concerns about oversupply of steel from China, had we aligned on security provisions, we could have avoided section 232 tariffs and we could have had a better NAFTA.

At the time, the Conservatives publicly told the minister to use the North American defence relationship to distinguish Canada. Only Canada has a defence and homeland security partnership with the United States. Mexico does not. Europe does not. NAFTA does not. Only Canada does, and we have had that since the 1950s.

When we are talking trade, or security, or oversupply of commodities from China, we should have been aligned. Oversupply of Chinese steel was something the Obama administration started taking on in the early days of the Liberal government, as the administration was winding down. This was not all about it being hard to align with Trump. No attempt was made by the Liberal government.

The damage the so-called progressive agenda did allowed Mexico to negotiate an agreement before Canada. It should astound Canadians to know that in the final months of negotiations, Canada was not at the table but Mexico was. Mexico had 85 direct meetings with administration officials even though it was starting in a much worse position. The border relationship with Mexico was part of the U.S. presidential election. However, Mexico was strategic. It did not posture. It did not virtue signal. It did not try and run its next election using NAFTA negotiations as the stage.

• (2115)

I cannot stress enough that on almost every major diplomatic entanglement we have had under the current government, it has been

the result of the Liberal Party putting its own election fortunes ahead of our national interests, ahead of steelworkers, ahead auto workers and ahead of the softwood lumber industry, which was hardly even mentioned by the government. We have seen those sectors, agriculture and others, let down time after time because of the Prime Minister's particular agenda and his desire to make this all about him. In this Parliament, we should be serving Canadians and not the electoral fortunes of that party.

What has Mexico done? It has surpassed us under the Liberals. In fact, Mexico is now the largest bilateral trade partner with the United States at \$97.4 billion in the first two months of this year. That was ahead of our \$92.4 billion, even though it is caught in the trade disruption. Mexico has been smarter than the current government has, so much so that it reached an agreement, and Canada was given an option to join it. There were no further negotiations, despite the minister's frequent trips to Washington and storming into the building. The deal was done, and if members go to Washington, everyone knows that. The deal was done, and Canada was given the ability to sign on.

Now we hear the Liberals holding on to things like culture, which was exempted. Culture was never mentioned by the U.S. once. It was not a priority in the minister's speech, and the Prime Minister never mentioned it. The Liberals are now trying to cobble together things they try to say they saved. We already had chapter 19. They are saying that culture was not changed. The Americans were not trying to change it. I read through the six core objectives in the minister's speech. The Liberals failed on every single one.

We have tried to work with them. In fact, the relief from the section 232 tariffs was initiated by the Conservative caucus going down there and saying that we would work with the government on ratification, and the member for Malpeque knows that. He and many people are leaving, because they do not like the way the Prime Minister approached it. I have lost track of how many more Liberal first-timers have resigned today. They do not agree with his approach.

Government Orders

We went down and said that we would try to use the dying days of Parliament to pass a new NAFTA, even though we think it is a step back. Our leader has called it NAFTA 0.5, because we wanted those steel and aluminum tariffs off. They were hurting manufacturers in Ontario. They were hurting people in my riding, like Ranfar Steel, and steel plants in Prince Edward Island that I visited last summer. They were being hurt in Quebec. Therefore, we made an agreement to say that we would try to work with the government on ratifying a deal, which we think is a step back, just to get trade certainty. Businesses want some certainty, even if it means taking a worse deal. This will be a priority for us.

I want to end with remarks that are etched on the walls of the U.S. embassy in Canada. We can let personalities get in the way on both sides, but it will be a priority for the Conservative government to get this relationship back on track.

In 1961 in this chamber, John F. Kennedy said this:

Geography has made us neighbours. History has made us friends. Economics has made us partners. And necessity has made us allies. Those whom nature hath so joined together, let no man put asunder

He said that in this chamber, and that is a challenge to us. These are our closest allies, trade partners and familial connections going back to the origins of our country. We have to be able to fight for our interests and co-operate on security and trade. To do that, the Conservatives wanted to work with the government to get the tariffs done and work with the NAFTA agreement as we have it. We will fix the gaps after a change in government, sector by sector, including auto, softwood and agriculture. To get the certainty, we were prepared to try to work with the government, even though we would have taken a very different approach.

I look forward to questions, including from my friend, the MP for Malpeque.

● (2120)

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to rise and talk about the auto industry, coming from the auto capital of Canada, Windsor.

We have seen trade relations erode, and we have seen our current footprint shrink, most notably in the last number of years. I think it is important to recognize that it was actually 1965 when Canada got the Auto Pact in place. We had a trade deficit with the United States, despite the fact that my region was actually the birthplace of the Canadian auto sector. It actually developed with Detroit.

Fast forward from 1965 and we go from an auto deficit with the United States to actually having a significant surplus, which led to some consternation in the United States. In fact, it was the Mulroney Conservative government that killed the Auto Pact with the original NAFTA. That is the reality.

What I would like to know from the Conservatives is what the difference would be in the auto sector with regard to these new negotiations and this trade agreement, given the fact that it was the Mulroney government that actually got rid of the Auto Pact.

Hon. Erin O'Toole: Madam Speaker, I appreciate the question from the member for Windsor West. As he recognized, I mentioned the Auto Pact in my remarks as the first example of sectoral free trade between two large industrial countries.

Canada did benefit in a large way. His area of Windsor, my area of Oshawa, places like Oakville, Sainte-Thérèse, Mississauga and Aurora grew what became a Great Lakes basin of auto parts, auto supply and assembly.

There are a number of reasons we have seen Canadian competitiveness erode in the last few years. This negotiation is one of them. In fact, some of the best years, when that member was working in the auto industry, came in the early nineties, when we had record levels of assembly with the United States. I know the member was part of that at the time.

What we are seeing now is protectionism with the U.S. We should have made sure that auto was our priority from the start. The fact that our minister did not mention auto as a priority in her core objectives speech should concern Canadians. It should concern Jerry Dias, who was on the committee. Where was Jerry? That is a good question. Now the Liberals are putting him on other advisory committees, at least for the next few months.

● (2125)

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Madam Speaker, my colleague made a comment about how the tariffs have been hitting our steel industry hard.

I was looking at the PBO report, and two things stuck out. Last year, the Liberals collected \$1.1 billion more in tariffs than they actually delivered to our suffering steel companies. In the fall economic statement, the Liberals further forecast that the Liberal government would bank an additional \$3.54 billion in tariffs instead of actually using that money to help our suffering steel industry.

I wonder if my friend could comment on the duplicity of the Liberal government, saying that it stands behind our steelworkers when it is actually just taking the money and putting it right in the bank.

Hon. Erin O'Toole: Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my hon. colleague from Edmonton West for his work. In fact, he and his office knew the last budget and the errors in it better than the Minister of Finance and his entire department. I think the people of Edmonton should be very proud of the team we have there. It will be growing by two in a few months.

Government Orders

The \$3.5 billion in tariffs is part of our push-back on Bill C-101. The government promised certain things in terms of tariff relief. When it imposed the retaliatory tariffs on the U.S., it knew that it was having an adverse effect on Canadian producers and suppliers. In fact, I called some of them dumb, because the minister had promised me that she would adjust if those retaliatory tariffs were having virtually no impact in the U.S. but a huge impact in our community. We all know boat sellers across the country, like the Junkin family in my riding. They have received no relief. They now have stranded inventory.

As part of our support for the safeguard bill the Liberals are rushing through at the end, we have asked for a plan to get rid of that \$3.5 billion. That is tax they collected that is in government revenues. It should go out to the small steel fabricators. It should go out to the boat retailers. It should go out to the SMEs impacted by Liberal trade disruption.

When are the Liberals going to dispense the money these Canadian enterprises, particularly in western Canada, need so much?

Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I could not resist standing, because there was so much boom and bust and bluster from the member for Durham that it provoked me to ask a question.

There was a lot of fiction and very few facts in his remarks this evening. The fact of the matter is that we should be thanking the Prime Minister, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the negotiating team for getting a pretty darn decent agreement at the end of the day. The Conservatives, on the other hand, in the initial stages of the negotiations, were taking the position that we should just cave in and give the Americans what they wanted.

The member for Durham talked about supply management, but what did President Trump put on the table when he was speaking with the dairy farmers from Wisconsin? He said he wanted the supply management system gone in its entirety. That is not where we ended up. We saved supply management. Yes, we gave a little bit of access, but we saved the system and negotiated a good agreement for Canada.

Hon. Erin O'Toole: Madam Speaker, I am glad I provoked my friend from Malpeque to stand. We are going to miss him when he retires shortly.

I would direct him to MacDougall Steel Erectors in Borden-Carleton. They are great people. They know the member well, and they know he has been frustrated. MacDougall is a great example of a supplier that has worked with companies in Quebec that are working on buildings in Manhattan. It is amazing. They can get specialized steel products made on Prince Edward Island into a Quebec company's bid for a Manhattan high-rise. What the tariffs were doing, under the Liberals' watch, when they allowed them to happen, was pricing the Quebec steel company and the P.E.I. company out of North American supply chains. We could not have another year of companies like MacDougall stuck out of these supply chains. That is why Conservatives are working with the government to get the tariffs off, and if it means a NAFTA 0.5, we will fix it after the election.

● (2130)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ): Madam Speaker, I thank the member for Durham for his speech.

Today we are debating the new NAFTA. The government announced that it wanted to fast-track it. For the Trans-Pacific Partnership we heard more than 400 witnesses in committee. There are just three days left before the House adjourns for the summer, followed by the election.

Does the member for Durham think this is all a pre-election spectacle by the government to show Canadians that it is resolving the matter of free trade, or is the Prime Minister simply sending a message to President Trump, telling him that he is taking care of it and will see him next week?

Hon. Erin O'Toole: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

Free trade agreements like NAFTA, the TPP and CETA are very important to our future, because we need to seek out new markets around the world. Trade between Canada and the United States is currently being disrupted, especially with respect to steel and aluminum. The Conservative Party will work with the government if we have a normal agreement and if there are no tariffs going forward.

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ): Madam Speaker, the Bloc Québécois does not oppose the implementation of the new NAFTA, now known as CUSMA. We had two conditions for agreeing to consider the bill. We stated our reasons more than once, and I even wrote about them in the U.S. media. First, we wanted the issue of the steel and aluminum tariffs to be resolved. That has been done. However, there is also the issue of supply management, which has not been resolved.

The government wants to ram through the implementation bill for the agreement, and we are opposed to that. As I indicated in my previous question, more than 400 witnesses were invited to appear before the committee when it was studying the trans-Pacific partnership. However, to date, no witnesses have been invited to speak about CUSMA, the new NAFTA. We are therefore opposed to its implementation, because it puts the cart before the horse.

In Washington, Congress has barely started looking at the new agreement, and Congress has the authority to sign international agreements. The text that the Prime Minister signed in November may change. We know that the Democrats, who control the House of Representatives, disagree with the Republicans, who control the U.S. Senate, about a number of things. The Democrats may well demand changes to the agreement before they endorse it. As of now, Congress has not even drafted the bills to implement the agreement, yet here we are debating ours. This makes no sense. Implementing an agreement that has not even been finalized is nothing more than pre-election smoke and mirrors.

Government Orders

Where is the fire? NAFTA is still in force and will remain in force after the dissolution of the House. There is no rush. I understand the government wanting to cross a few things off its to-do list, but doing a sloppy job is not the right way to bolster its record. Doing things properly means waiting. Furthermore, this agreement has some very real implications, and the government has not even bothered to listen to the people it will affect. That is a major problem.

Like all agreements, this one has winners and losers. The losers will need compensation, guidance and help, and that needs to happen at the same time as ratification, not afterwards, on the 12th of never. We know that promises made before ratification are quickly forgotten. Just look at the workers in the shipbuilding industry. They were told they would be compensated, and the next day, they were forgotten. We can also think of workers in the clothing, furniture, agriculture and automotive industries. They are getting no support.

We all know that this agreement was signed at the expense of our supply-managed farmers, our regions and our agricultural model. There is nothing to help them deal with this, nothing but vague promises. There was nothing in the notice of ways and means motion tabled a few weeks ago either.

After four years, we know what this government's promises are worth. It has been two years since CETA and the TPP were signed, but our farmers have yet to see even a hint of any cheques, and they will not get one red cent before the election. Despite its lofty promises, the government has done nothing. It should be ashamed. Because of its inaction, any commitments made in the budget have become campaign promises. Canadians have been burned, so all trust is gone.

With respect to CUSMA, the programs should already be in place when the agreement comes into force. Our farmers have been fleeced twice now, but they will not be fleeced a third time.

I want to address another issue of concern to dairy farmers. With CUSMA, Donald Trump will have control over the export of milk proteins, class 7. That is an unprecedented surrender of sovereignty by this government. Our farmers can currently sell surplus milk protein on foreign markets. If the agreement comes into force too quickly, there is a good chance that Washington and President Donald Trump will completely block our exports. It is worrisome. The risk is very real. That would completely destabilize Quebec's dairy industry.

• (2135)

If we get our protein exports in order before the agreement is implemented, there is a chance that the Americans will see the matter as resolved and will let it go. That is what we want. The last three agreements were signed at the expense of our producers. If the government implements this agreement in the worst way possible, it will cause irreparable harm. I think our farmers have been punished enough by the government. Enough is enough. For this reason alone, it is worth waiting. I think we all agree on that.

As I was saying, we do not systematically oppose every free trade agreement. We support free trade in principle. Quebec needs free trade. I also want to say that CUSMA, the new NAFTA, is not all bad. If I were a Canadian, I would probably think that the Minister of

Foreign Affairs got a good deal. For example, she shielded Ontario's auto sector from potential tariffs. She also protected Canada's banking sector from American competition. That is not nothing. It is good for Ontario. She maintained access to the American market for grain from the west. This is good for the Prairies. This is a good agreement for Canada.

She also took back Canada's control over the oil trade, which Brian Mulroney abandoned in 1988. Alberta must be happy. For once, I am not being heckled too much. She did away with the infamous chapter 11 on investments and preserved the cultural exception. That is good. However, the specific gains for Quebec are less clear. I talked about supply-managed producers. I could talk about how the Government of Quebec will have to pay more for biologic drugs and will no longer be able to collect QST on packages arriving from the United States from Amazon or other web giants. Small retailers will find themselves at a disadvantage. What is more, copyright will be extended from 50 years to 70.

In short, we need to look at all of those things in order to implement measures that will help Quebecers benefit from the new opportunities that are available and put programs in place to compensate those the government abandoned during the negotiations. We need to do all that before we vote on this legislation. No party in the House deserves to be given a blank cheque.

I hope that, after the election, the Bloc Québécois will have the balance of power. That is what political analysts are saying could happen. Then, there will be no more blank cheques.

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Madam Speaker, the member for Brossard—Saint-Lambert will see. For the first time in years, Quebecers will be able to rest assured that their interests are being taken into account. In order to do that, we need to wait before voting on the NAFTA implementation bill. There is no hurry.

• (2140)

[*English*]

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Madam Speaker, one of the concerns that we have with regard to the deal that is being arranged here is important to note. The Liberals are trying to put Canada first in this agreement, but the reality is that in the United States and everywhere else in the world, it is being branded as the U.S.-Mexico-Canada agreement because Canada was the third party involved in the current state of affairs. In fact, it was a bilateral agreement with the United States and Mexico that we later got involved in because the government got out-negotiated during the process.

With regard to the extension of copyright for an additional 20 years with regard to authors and publications, do the member and his party support that? If they do, are there any concerns? I know for a fact that it will have consequences for artists with regard to materials, but I would like to hear from the member on that.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his thoughtful question.

Government Orders

Before I answer, I do not think I made myself clear in my speech, so I wanted to say again that I will be sharing my time with the member for Davenport. The microphone was off, but—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The member had already finished his speech, and I had already announced questions and comments. The member has 10 minutes for questions and comments, unless he wishes to seek the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Madam Speaker, I also said that I wanted to share my time with the member for Davenport, but you could not hear me because the microphone was off.

I therefore ask the unanimous consent of the House to share my time.

An hon. member: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): We do not have unanimous consent.

The member has enough time to quickly answer the member's question, and then we will move on to other questions.

The member has 10 minutes for questions and comments, and he has about seven and a half minutes remaining.

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Madam Speaker, I am really disappointed that the member who asked the question opposed the motion.

There are times when we do not get our requests met as we would like. It is nice when we manage to agree on how to play the parliamentary game, but when people act in bad faith, it complicates things.

Indeed, it is troubling that the copyright period has been extended from 50 years to 70 years. It is important to take the time in committee to consult experts and the people who could be affected. Extending it from 50 to 70 years will have many repercussions on radio stations that broadcast cultural programming. Let me give a bit of a silly example. Playing Elvis Presley songs did not cost anything, but what is it going to cost for another 20 years? That is problematic. That said, we need to listen to producers and broadcasters to properly evaluate it. That is why I am saying we should not rush this.

[*English*]

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz (Davenport, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Joliette.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The member for Joliette has already spoken so the hon. member is not going to be able to share her time, but she can share her time with somebody else if she would like.

The hon. member for Davenport.

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: Madam Speaker, while we are figuring that out, I will speak to the bill.

It is an absolute pleasure for me to be speaking, on behalf of the residents of my riding of Davenport, to Bill C-100, an act to implement the agreement between Canada, the United States of America and the United Mexican States. Indeed, this will be my last speech in this 42nd Parliament, and I am delighted to be speaking on such an important topic.

Before I speak to Bill C-100, I want to marvel at the accomplishments of our federal government over the last few years. We signed not one, not two, but three trade agreements since we came into office in late 2015. I am very proud that we signed the Canada-Europe trade agreement, the CPTPP and the USMCA, which we are now debating. These three agreements give Canada tariff-free access to 1.5 billion customers around the world. It is absolutely amazing. I would also like to point out that Canada is the only country to have a free trade agreement with each of the G7 countries.

I think both of these things are remarkable to note. We should be very congratulatory about the fact that we have been able to accomplish them over the last few years. I think it will truly be beneficial for Canada's economy moving forward.

As members know, we are a trading nation. Geographically, we are a massive country, but we are small in terms of people. Indeed, for our economy to be strong, both now and moving forward, we need these trade agreements.

I want to point out two other trade agreements that I follow in particular, because they have a direct impact on key groups in my riding. The first relates to the Hispanic and Brazilian communities.

In March 2018, our Minister of International Trade Diversification launched negotiations on Mercosur, which is a trading bloc that includes Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay. These are really important markets for us and are very important for many members of my particular community. I am delighted that we have embarked on this. I hope to hear about its conclusions by the end of this year or early next year.

The other agreement I want to mention, as it is important to a group I am very proud to be a part of, relates to the Turkish community. Very recently, on June 8, the JETCO was signed between the hon. Ruhsar Pekcan, Turkey's Minister of Trade, and our Minister of International Trade Diversification at the G20 summit in Japan. We signed this JETCO because we want to further trade and investment between our two countries. We want to put a specific emphasis on small and medium-sized enterprises, strategic venture initiatives and technical and scientific co-operation. I am delighted with this. I currently serve as the chair of the Canada-Turkey Friendship Group, and I know this is exciting for both countries. I think it will be a benefit for both of us as well.

In my downtown west riding of Davenport, people are very supportive of trade agreements. This is partly because over 52% of them were born outside of Canada. For them, increasing trade between countries not only is beneficial for Canada overall but is also a way for many of the diasporas in my community to build closer relationships with their home countries or the home countries of their parents or grandparents. I find this particularly endearing. They are very positive toward trade agreements and are absolutely delighted with the CUSMA.

I will provide a few facts and figures. I do not think I will say anything that members have not heard many times before, but it is important for me to reiterate them.

The North American free trade zone is the biggest economic region in the world, worth \$22 trillion U.S. in our regional market, and it encompasses more than 480 million consumers. This new updated agreement preserves Canada's market access to the United States and Mexico, securing our most important trading relationship.

I am delighted that this deal would increase trade between all three countries. I also like that it strengthens relations between Canada and the U.S. and between Canada and Mexico. Canada's preferential access to these markets is vital to the continued prosperity of Canadian workers, whose livelihoods rely on trade.

• (2145)

We did have some concerns after we signed the original agreement, which I believe was on November 30, 2018. The reason we had some concern is that the U.S. had imposed some steel and aluminum tariffs.

I am very glad to say that, after months of hard work and effort from our government, particularly our Minister of Foreign Affairs, our Minister of Finance and our Prime Minister, Canadians are now in a very different situation. We have secured a full lifting of the steel and aluminum tariffs and, despite the Conservatives' call to drop our retaliatory measures, we held firm. We have stuck to our principles and there are no longer tariffs on our steel and aluminum, about which I am absolutely delighted.

In terms of benefits, the new agreement preserves NAFTA's chapter 19, which is the binational panel that will settle disputes between our countries on any trade issues. Chapter 19 provides Canada with recourse to an independent and impartial process to challenge U.S. or Mexican anti-dumping and countervailing duties. This is particularly important for our country's softwood lumber industry, which exported product worth billions of dollars to the United States in 2017.

Another benefit is the ease of trade going across our borders. We all know what it is like to wait in a lineup to cross the Canada-U.S. border, and the new NAFTA has new customs and trade facilitation measures that will make it easier for companies to move goods across the border. It will also eliminate paper processes and provide a single portal for traders to submit documentation electronically. Then, of course, there is enhanced regulatory transparency and predictability, which will provide additional assurance for exporters that their goods will make it to new markets.

The other benefit of the agreement is that there is a new chapter on small and medium-sized enterprises, which I believe is going to foster greater co-operation among all three countries in terms of small businesses. It is also going to increase trade investment opportunities. Small businesses are the backbone of our economy here in Canada, and I think they are delighted at this particular addition.

We have talked quite a bit today about the progressive elements of the deal. In particular, I want to mention a couple of them. The first is the agreement's labour chapter. Its key aim is to level the playing field on labour standards and working conditions in North America. It also contains commitments to ensure that national laws and policies provide protections for fundamental principles and rights at work.

Government Orders

The chapter also includes unprecedented protections against gender-based discrimination that are subject to dispute settlement, and there are also specific provisions around sexual orientation, sexual harassment, gender identity, caregiving responsibilities and wage discrimination. Gender equality and women's economic empowerment are important priorities for our government. They are also important priorities in spurring economic development and in making sure that trade works for everyone.

This new agreement is also very strong on the environment. I think that is top of mind for all Canadians right now, particularly since we have now officially declared a national climate emergency. The environment will be top of mind for not only our government but for all governments right around the world. The new and comprehensive environment chapter includes ambitious environmental provisions with core obligations for countries to maintain high levels of environmental protection and robust environmental governance.

Since I have 11 minutes, I will continue with all the benefits of the new NAFTA. I am delighted to be speaking longer on this, and I will continue with the benefits to the environment.

In terms of additional benefits, the updated NAFTA, or the USMCA, also introduces its new commitments to address global environmental challenges such as illegal wildlife trade, illegal fishing and the depletion of fish stocks, species at risk, conservation of biological diversity, ozone-depleting substances and marine pollution. Canadians care about the environment and are delighted that we have these additional provisions.

I always like hearing from third parties in terms of what they think about the agreement, so I want to highlight some of the key third parties and what they have said about the benefits of this agreement. Then I am going to go on as to its benefits for the cultural industry, which is really also very important for my riding of Davenport.

• (2150)

The Business Council of Canada stated:

We applaud your government's success in negotiating a comprehensive and high-standard agreement on North American trade. The [new NAFTA] maintains our country's preferential access to the United States and Mexico—Canada's largest and third-largest trading partners respectively—while modernizing long-outdated elements of the North American Free Trade Agreement.

Also, I have a wonderful quote from one of our former prime ministers, the Right Honourable Brian Mulroney, who was the chief negotiator of the original NAFTA. He said that NAFTA got what it wanted and that it was a good deal. Therefore, he wholeheartedly endorsed this as well.

Because we talked a bit about labour provisions, I also have a wonderful quote from Hassan Yussuff, who is head of the Canadian Labour Congress, who said this new agreement, "gets it right on labour provisions, including provisions to protect workers against employment discrimination on the basis of gender."

Government Orders

Therefore, as members can tell, there is quite a bit of support for the new NAFTA, and there are a number of third-party groups who provided these wonderful quotes.

What I would like to spend a couple of minutes on now is the positive impacts of this new updated agreement on cultural industries in Canada. As members may know, Davenport is home to one of the largest communities of artists, creators and those working in the cultural industries. Therefore, whenever I see any new agreements or announcements, I am always looking to see how they are going to benefit artists not only in my community but right across this country. Indeed, there are many benefits.

The USMCA will help strengthen Canada's unique cultural identity, including the French language and the independent Canadian media. The agreement will preserve the Canadian cultural exception that was demanded by Canada, especially in the digital world. It protects our cultural industries and more than 650,000 jobs across Canada. The cultural exception is essential for preserving identity and continuing to showcase our vibrant francophone culture, which is unique in North America.

I want to point out, because I am always proud of it, that I have a really wonderful growing francophone community in my downtown west riding of Davenport. We have a wonderful group called CHOQ-FM, which promotes really wonderful radio programs and really promotes the French language and francophone culture not only across Toronto but beyond.

I want to talk about some additional benefits without a cultural exception, federal and provincial tax credits and program funds to support our newspapers and magazines.

The cultural exception also protects Canada's broadcasting system, ensuring sustained investment in content created and produced by fellow Canadians.

I have some quotes from various leaders within the cultural industry who support the new USMCA and say it is beneficial for the industry.

I will provide a quote from Eric Baptiste of SOCAN, who stated:

Today is a great day for Canadian creators. SOCAN would like to thank the Canadian government for its efforts to defend the interests of the Canadian cultural sector and to provide greater protection for our creators.

I have a great quote from the Canadian Media Producers Association, which stated:

Throughout the NAFTA negotiations, the federal government consistently identified cultural exemption as a key priority. In securing this exemption in the new agreement, [the Prime Minister, the Minister of Foreign Affairs], and the entire negotiating team have stood tall for Canada and defended our cultural sovereignty. We applaud their successful efforts, and congratulate the government on this new deal.

Then I also have a great quote from Margaret McGuffin, who is with the Canadian Music Publishers Association, who stated:

Canada's music publishers and their songwriting partners welcomed the trade agreement reached between the governments of the United States, Canada and Mexico.

Finally, I have a wonderful quote from Melanie Rutledge of Magazines Canada, who said, "Magazines Canada's nearly 400 members across the country congratulate" the Prime Minister, the

Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Minister of Canadian Heritage and all the other players within the Canadian government who played a role in negotiating this updated free trade agreement. She also said:

We are especially pleased that the cultural exemption applies in both the analogue and digital spaces. This digital inclusion will be critical to Canadian magazines and other cultural industries in the years to come.

● (2155)

As we can see, there is lots of support from artists and those in the cultural industry.

I will also mention a couple of areas where I think it will be very supportive. Canadians are very proud of our health care system and see it as part of our identity. One of the key things we have done is that this agreement continues to support our health care system.

The new agreement is a renewed understanding among Canada, the United States and Mexico on the significance of our mutual trade agreement. It preserves key elements of our trading relationship and incorporates new and updated provisions that seek to address 21st century trade issues to the benefit of all of Canada's provinces and territories.

I did not expect to speak for more than 10 minutes and I have spoken for about 17 minutes now, but it has been a pleasure. This really is a key and fundamental agreement among Canada, the U.S. and Mexico. As I mentioned, our economy greatly depends on trade. Canadians were worried for a while whether or not we would finally have an updated agreement. I think they can now set aside that worry.

We now have that updated agreement in place. We have charted a course moving forward. It gives us a wonderful foundation from which to continue to build our businesses between Canada and the U.S.; Canada, the U.S. and Mexico; and Canada and Mexico. It will serve us well as we develop closer business relations and as we all seek to improve our economies moving forward.

With that, I am going to wrap up my comments. On behalf of the residents of Davenport, I am grateful for this wonderful opportunity to speak to this very important bill. I encourage everyone in the House to support it.

● (2200)

Mr. Mel Arnold (North Okanagan—Shuswap, CPC): Madam Speaker, I thank the member for Davenport for her valiant attempt to defend something that is indefensible. She talked for 20 minutes trying to extol the virtues of this agreement, yet in that 20 minutes she never once mentioned the softwood lumber agreement.

In March 2016, her Prime Minister and her trade minister promised to have a deal framework within 100 days. We are now years past that 100 days and nothing has ever been done by the government on the softwood lumber agreement between Canada and the U.S.

Currently, in my home province, British Columbia, and in my riding of North Okanagan—Shuswap, we have mills shutting down because of the difficulties in the market, because there is no certainty created for them out of this trade deal whatsoever. The Liberals have completely abandoned the softwood lumber agreement and left those mills in limbo.

Government Orders

Could the member explain why she did not even mention that in her 20-minute intervention?

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: Madam Speaker, indeed the softwood lumber industry is absolutely important in Canada. I did slightly mention it in my over 17 minutes of speaking today. I mentioned it when I was talking about chapter 19.

As everyone in the House knows, when we were deep in negotiations, our Minister of Foreign Affairs was adamant about keeping chapter 19, which we had in the original NAFTA. It is a bi-national panel dispute settlement mechanism. Chapter 19 provides Canada with recourse to an independent and impartial process to challenge the U.S. or Mexico for anti-dumping or countervailing duties.

I did indicate that this is particularly important for our country's softwood lumber industry, which exported over four billion dollars' worth of product to the United States in 2017. I want to let the hon. member know that softwood lumber is an absolutely essential industry for Canada. It is an industry that creates many good-paying, middle-class jobs. We have absolutely preserved chapter 19, which will continue to provide us with a mechanism for any future disputes with the United States.

• (2205)

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Madam Speaker, one of the things taking place right now is that Democrats in Congress are trying to negotiate a better deal based on the principles of enforcement particular to labour and the environment. I would like the member for Davenport to expand upon the reasons why we are pushing this through now, when one of the representatives, Congresswoman Dingell from Michigan, said, "We're not ready", and Nancy Pelosi said, "No enforcement, no treaty."

Given that we have two strong voices in the U.S. calling for support to improve labour and environmental enforcement provisions, which are critical for those who are disadvantaged and for gender equality, why are the Liberals trying to undermine the negotiations right now in the U.S.?

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: Madam Speaker, I talked about the environmental benefits, as well as the labour benefits, of the new USMCA. I mentioned how we have provided some additional protections around the environment and labour, and we are very proud of those enhancements. It does not mean that moving forward, we will not continue to improve on those areas among our respective countries, or that we should not try to improve on them as we move forward. I do not think everything needs to be negotiated in just one trade agreement. There are many other opportunities for us to work together on these key and very important areas.

Mr. Ken Hardie (Fleetwood—Port Kells, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is a little difficult to hear criticism from the Conservative side on this, simply because Conservatives played such a great part in Team Canada. Rona Ambrose, John Baird and others were there, shoulder to shoulder with our negotiating team, and yet there was the spectacle of members on the benches opposite appearing on American media and undercutting the work we were trying to do. It seems that the effort put in by Team Canada on this, with the governors, congressmen, senators, even the mayors, right across the United States, has really established a firm foundation for an

ongoing relationship that will remain strong, in spite of the leadership of the United States, which loves tariffs an awful lot.

I am wondering if the member for Davenport could comment on what she sees in the future for Canada-U.S. relationships based on what we have accomplished in this round of negotiations.

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: Madam Speaker, we all know that for over a year Canada negotiated hard to modernize our free trade agreement with the United States and Mexico, because we knew how important it was to get a deal that was good for Canadian workers, Canadian businesses and communities across Canada. Finally, we have this deal, and all three parliamentary bodies in our respective countries are moving as quickly as they can to ratify it. We are doing this because the new NAFTA will protect millions of jobs, create more opportunities for hard-working Canadians and for small businesses right across this country, indeed in all three countries, and keep all of our respective economies strong.

Mr. Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes, CPC): Madam Speaker, my question for the member across the way has to do with competitiveness. I have heard from businesses in my riding and across Canada that small and medium-sized enterprises really got hammered with the tariffs and counter-tariffs. Government coffers swelled with the money collected, while these businesses suffered, not being able to fairly compete with our trading partner, the United States. The government put on retaliatory tariffs, with no pain to the United States but great pain to our SMEs. The ones that survived are looking for relief, but this comes at the same time that a punishing carbon tax has been put on these businesses, which do not get a \$300 cheque in the mail. They are the ones funding the money going back to families in this pyramid scheme that the Liberals have cooked up.

The anti-competitive Liberal government is really harming Canadians and small and medium-sized enterprises. I wonder if the member could tell us when the government will flow the money from the tariffs that it collected as relief to those businesses.

• (2210)

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: Madam Speaker, I do not quite agree with everything the hon. member mentioned, but I agree that our small businesses are the heart and soul of our economy. Our government has spent a lot of time trying to do everything it can to support our businesses.

We have reduced small business taxes from 11% to 9% in the time we have been in office over the last three and a half years. We have ensured that we have a really strong economy, which is what we have right now. We have created over a million jobs. We have the lowest unemployment rate since the 1970s, and we have made historic investments in infrastructure. Those are all good things for small businesses. Even signing these three historic trade agreements is also excellent for our small businesses, because it provides them with opportunities for growth, both today and tomorrow.

Government Orders

In terms of our price on pollution, the carbon pricing we have put on, a Nobel Prize economist has said it is the right thing to do. The Pope has said it is the right thing to do. We made a recent announcement about providing support to small businesses to help them transition to a low-carbon economy. It is something we all have to do. From sitting on the environment committee, I can tell the House that all industry groups would come and say to us that they believe in carbon pricing because it will force them to innovate and to be competitive, both nationally and internationally.

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to be able to rise today and speak to Bill C-100. I will be splitting my time with the member for Windsor—Tecumseh from our region, which I am quite glad to do. It is important. I know that this has been portrayed as a Canada-U.S.-Mexico agreement with regard to some of the discussion with the government that has been taking place. However, really this is a USMCA and that needs to be told, because this is a concession-based deal.

I was in Washington at the time of the decision-making, meeting with trade lawyers as part of the Canada-U.S. parliamentary association. Trade lawyers going through the documents from the first day to this day know that this is a concession-based deal for Canada. That is why it is a U.S.-Mexico-Canada agreement. The government got out-negotiated and out-foxed by Mexico with regard to its position on the negotiations and, more important, also with the concession-based agreement that we have to this day.

We have to live with a number of provisions in this agreement. At the same time, there are Democrats who are looking to improve the deal right now in Washington, in particular on labour and also on environmental improvements that will increase our competitiveness, not only domestically but also within our trading bloc for the future. The current government is undermining those efforts by ramming this through now and doing it in a way that is consistently undermining even the Democratic Speaker of the House, Nancy Pelosi, Congresswoman Dingell from Michigan and others who have been advocating for the improvement of those issues.

I would say that no matter what we do with regard to the situation right now, we should be focusing on the best decision for our future. Giving ourselves at least an opportunity for the Democrats to enhance our capabilities would be the smart and wise thing to do. In fact, it would fix some of the damage with this agreement.

I am going to go through a couple of things, but first and foremost we have to look at a Prime Minister here who set upon this himself, who actually initiated the fact that he wanted a new deal. The deal comes because of the Prime Minister's negotiating it. We would think that when he started with something he would want to come out better and further ahead. However, as we have heard, softwood lumber was not even part of the equation here. One of the cankerous elements with regard to our trading agreement with the United States, softwood lumber was left off the table to begin with.

We go into negotiations and we get steel tariffs that are put on our auto and other manufacturers. To this day, the government has collected a billion dollars from steelmakers across Canada. It has been an increased tax on them, and the government has not rebated it back to the actual companies. In fact, very little has gotten back when the Liberals promised it would be a dollar-for-dollar exchange.

It has made it more difficult to compete. In fact, some have given up competing because they know they could not actually carry the debt load. The government was taking their money from them and never returning it. It is over a billion dollars.

At that time when we were looking for a new deal, coming from a number of perspectives, we had lumber left off the table. We still have unresolved professions and qualifications that go back to the previous deal. With regard to this today, if this deal does not pass right now, we go back to NAFTA to a better deal. That is what happens. It is clear that our path forward, if this does not happen right now, is that nothing changes. We continue without the concessions on dairy, copyright, auto and intellectual property. That is what is going to take place.

Regarding the current steel issue, first, it did not start until this Prime Minister tried to negotiate something, so he created that himself. Second, it has so many escape holes through it that it could be easily undermined right from the get-go. It is really a Pyrrhic victory. Let us be clear. If Trump wanted to get out of the NAFTA that we have right now, we would then have to have a process that involves Congress, the Senate and legal aspects that would be involved to pull us back to the free trade agreement. Past that, we would go back to the World Trade Organization agreement.

● (2215)

We have a long, storied road to go down before we would have a series of things that would undermine our current competitiveness.

It was argued that we should do a deal with the United States because we can develop certainty, but certainty has not been created in this deal. In fact, some of the implementation processes that are in place give more conditions to cabinet to change regulations in the future. We could change those regulations unilaterally, without this Parliament and without the other House looking at it. Again, that would leave more uncertainty. It would not create the conditions that we want because the president creates uncertainty because that is what he wants. He wants to destabilize things, so that they have relocation back in the U.S. This agreement would not achieve those objectives.

What is important is that we saw some efforts taking place in the U.S. House of Representatives. We saw improvements to create more specifics, for example, on the environment and labour.

I come from the Windsor-Detroit region. Thirty-five per cent of economic trade activity in my riding crosses over the U.S. border every day. That is about \$1 billion. Thirty-five per cent of our daily trade with the United States takes place along two kilometres of border. We have been fighting for a new border crossing for some time and we are finally going to get a new one.

Interestingly enough, we are seeing the rollout of community benefits, something New Democrats proposed from the get-go. We are the only party that has consistently fought for a publicly owned border crossing, while the Conservatives often dallied with the DRTP, a private entity group from OMERS that was a complete and utter disaster.

Government Orders

At times, the Liberals backed out of the process with comments and positions proposed by former transport people and representatives like Joe Volpe and others. New Democrats have consistently been trying to get a new border crossing built. We are proud to be the ones who continue to advocate for local supports for the community that will make things better.

With regard to the auto industry, as I said earlier, the auto pact was dismantled because of Brian Mulroney's free trade agreement. The Conservatives at that time left an escape hatch open for the WTO challenge by the Japanese and other automakers, which led to us going from a revelled state to where, under the Liberals, our footprint has shrunk quite dramatically when it comes to the auto industry.

The Liberals often brag about the \$6 billion they say they have invested during their four years in office. Detroit alone is upwards of \$12 billion to \$14 billion in investment and most of it being in the innovative sector with regards to electrification and automation, so we have potential access to those markets, but the government has not worked on that plan.

The labour and environmental standards that the Democrats are successfully trying to negotiate right now are related to ensuring there are measurables. Measurables make sure Mexican wages are not going to be used to undermine. There is no enforcement on that. There is also no enforcement on the environment.

Mexican labour representatives have been here in Ottawa advocating for those enforcement measures as well, and that is important. They know that with enforcement, they will see better terms and conditions for themselves and their families.

It is important to recognize that if this agreement does not go forward in its current form right now, our trade relations remain constant and steady under our current position. We do not get concessions on labour, the environment, digital property, intellectual property and supply management. We do not get concessions on a whole host of things in this agreement. That is why we believe in giving the democrats a chance to fix some of these enforcements so we can get those benefits. That would be better in the long term.

• (2220)

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, the member for Windsor West is the foremost member of Parliament in the House in terms of border issues. He has been a long-standing leader in the House talking about both border issues and our relationship with the United States. As a result of his expertise in industry and the automobile sector, he understands the importance of Canada being strong when we negotiate agreements.

What we saw under the Conservative government and now we are seeing under the Liberal government is basically governments that do not seem well prepared. They go into negotiations without understanding the implications of what they are negotiating. We have not seen in any case under Conservatives or Liberals even an evaluation of the impacts of measures that are taken in the trade agreements.

I would like to ask the member for Windsor West if he sees this lack of preparation, this lack of due diligence, the lack of doing homework that we have seen from both Conservative and Liberal governments?

Mr. Brian Masse: Madam Speaker, I thank the member for his comments on this. Of course it has been interesting to watch.

As one of the vice-chairs for the Canada-United States Inter-Parliamentary Group, I am going to give kudos to the Liberal member for Malpeque who worked with us on that, and also Senator Mike MacDonald. We have worked in a bipartisan way, in the Canada-United States Inter-Parliamentary Group, to be lobbying in Washington on a regular basis for the 17 years I have been in Parliament.

What I saw from the government side with regard to the lead-up to negotiations and then in the actual process was rather bizarre. In fact, some of the representatives, including the Minister of Foreign Affairs went to some committees and went to some other out-of-her way events to basically poke the Americans in the eye at that time.

It was done without a full plan. We did not have some things on the table. Most importantly, it became evident, and at one point we received criticism as New Democrats for suggesting that we should be looking at a bilateral start in our work with the United States. We were criticized and attacked by the Liberals about that.

Sure enough, what happened was Mexico and the U.S. started working together, and that is why Canada is at the very end of the agreement, and even the end of the name.

• (2225)

Mr. Darrell Samson (Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook, Lib.): Madam Speaker, my colleague delivered an excellent speech. I just want to come back to a couple of points that he made.

I have to share some of what I picked up from Jerry Dias, Unifor, who said, "There are some incredible victories in this deal, things we've been arguing and fighting for the last 24 years." He went on to say, "Traditionally, trade deals have been about profit, not people."

Then of course we have the member for Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie who said, "I just want to congratulate everybody in this room for the fantastic job that you did, for the leadership of Unifor, to be sure, that we can get the best deal possible and protect workers all around this country."

Those are very important quotes and comments that I want to share with the member. How would he respond to the sharing of that precise information we received?

Mr. Brian Masse: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question. I think it is important to note that the fact is, as we have seen the deal evolve, it has shown some of its weaknesses as the analytical process went through.

We know it is concession based on a number of different things, but most importantly, right now, we see a fix to some of these problems and concerns that are important, not only just for Jerry Dias but also our party and others with regard to labour and the environment.

Why would the government want to undermine those negotiations and the strength of the capabilities to get those elements together? Right now, Nancy Pelosi and others have been working hard to actually get the enforcement aspect. I think it is understandable to see changes right now, as the deal is coming forward. It would actually make a better deal for everybody at the end of the day.

Government Orders

Ms. Cheryl Hardcastle (Windsor—Tecumseh, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to rise during this last week of the 42nd Parliament to represent my riding of Windsor—Tecumseh and voice our concerns and issues with free trade agreements in general, and specifically with Bill C-100, an act to implement the free trade agreement between Canada, the United States of America and Mexico.

New Democrats understand the importance of our trading relationship with the U.S., our largest trading partner, and we believe that a better NAFTA can improve the welfare of all North Americans. New Democrats are in favour of international trade agreements that respect human rights, the rights of workers, the environment and all of our international obligations. In fact, we supported the bill at second reading and proposed some excellent amendments that would have made for a truly progressive free trade agreement, the very sort of agreement that the current government pretends to support but never actually seems to sign.

The other parties like to take simplistic jabs at the NDP, as happened earlier tonight with the parliamentary secretary saying that the NDP has never supported a free trade agreement, ever. Well, I would ask the other parties to name just one trade agreement that actually respects human rights, the rights of workers, the environment and all of our international obligations, including to indigenous people. The other parties cannot answer that, because it has not happened yet. However, we had the opportunity to improve this key trade deal and make it about improving the lives of Canadians, forging ties for sustainable jobs and really leveraging our relationship.

In my role as vice-chair of the Subcommittee on International Human Rights, one important issue related to trade agreements is supply chain transparency, or supply chain due diligence. How exactly does a nation ensure that no product finds its way into its borders that was not made by utilizing child labour or forced labour? This issue surrounding modern slavery is complex and includes multi-faceted problems.

According to recent figures released by the International Labour Organization, 64 million girls and 88 million boys, for a total of 152 million children, are all in child labour globally, accounting for almost one in 10 of all children worldwide. Nearly half of those in child labour, 73 million children in absolute terms, are in hazardous work that directly endangers their health, safety and development. Children in employment, a broader measure comprising both child labour and permitted forms of employment involving children of legal working age, number 218 million. Widely reported instances of child labour and forced labour in the global supply chains of everyday goods, such as coffee, seafood, apparel, palm oil and the metals used in our electronics, have linked multinational companies with some of these human rights abuses.

Canadian companies are not immune from these risks. According to World Vision's research, 1,200 companies operating in Canada imported goods at risk of being produced by child labour or forced labour in 2015, worth a total of approximately \$34 billion. The majority of companies in Canada disclose very little meaningful information about the policies, practices and due diligence they have in place to prevent child labour and forced labour in their global

supply chains. Obviously, this makes it hard for our friends in civil society, not to mention consumers, investors and trade unions, to constructively engage with these companies. It is even more difficult to hold them accountable to their human rights responsibilities.

This is not for want of proposals out there that might bring an end to forced labour in these supply chains. First and foremost, we must get children into schools. As enrolment rates increase, child labour declines. Since 2000, governments have increased the number of children in school by 110 million, making it much less likely that those children will end up in the labour market.

Next, a strong legal framework must be enacted. When governments enforce child labour laws through effective inspections and penalties for employers who exploit children, child labour is less likely to flourish.

● (2230)

Without targeted legislation requiring more information on corporate supply chains, we can only guess whether abuses perpetrated by Canadian corporations overseas, as alleged in several civil lawsuits in Canadian courts, are common occurrences or isolated incidents.

Human Rights Watch calls for the beginning of a process for the adoption of new, international, legally binding standards that oblige governments to require businesses to conduct human rights due diligence in global supply chains. UNICEF has made similar recommendations.

Free trade agreements are international treaties that should put human rights at the forefront, not as side agreements. These are the issues that should be focused on first and foremost and form the basis when we are renegotiating trade agreements. NAFTA 2.0 is a perfect example of that.

The original NAFTA was negotiated by Conservatives and signed by Liberals in 1994. People were promised jobs, rising productivity and access to the largest market in the world. Instead, Canada lost over 400,000 manufacturing jobs and its textile industry. In addition, Canada paid millions of dollars in court fees and penalties when sued by corporations under investor state dispute resolution mechanisms.

The Democrats in the U.S. are working hard to achieve a better NAFTA. They want improved labour provisions that will protect jobs; they want to fight big pharma on the extension of drug patents, which will result in higher costs; they want to ensure that the environment is protected, and they want to ensure clear, meaningful enforceability.

Government Orders

Canadians expect the Liberal government to push for these progressive changes. The new NAFTA, or CUSMA, resulted in illegal tariffs on aluminum and steel for over a year and the devastation of Canadian businesses and workers. The tariffs were lifted on May 20, 2019, and the cost has been incredibly high. Canada has lost over 1,000 well-paying, community-building jobs while watching these businesses close.

In my riding of Windsor—Tecumseh and the rest of Windsor-Essex County, we know the devastating effects of poorly negotiated trade agreements like the first version of NAFTA: the race to the bottom. The Liberals scoffed at our warnings then, and now they are presenting today's version, which is CUSMA.

At its core, the new NAFTA is about giving more power to corporations, as it gives enforceable rights to investors and limits the powers of current and future governments and the citizens who elect them. For New Democrats to support this agreement, CUSMA must not set the stage for exploitation, and it must protect the poorest and most marginalized people. For that reason, I move:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "That" and substituting the following: "the House decline to give second reading to Bill C-100, An Act to implement the Agreement between Canada, the United States of America and the United Mexican States, because it:

- a) fails to improve labour provisions that are necessary to protect good jobs;
- b) allows for an extension of drug patents that will significantly increase the cost of medicine for Canadians;
- c) leaves the environment vulnerable due to the absence of clear, enforceable protection provisions;
- d) is being rushed through the legislative process, without adequate time and attention for such a crucial trade agreement;
- e) will shift the levers of power within the economy away from governments and workers, in favour of corporations, by weakening public regulations on public health and the environment; and
- f) puts the poorest and most marginalized Canadians at further risk by failing to ensure the protection of human rights, gender equality and inclusive economic growth.

• (2235)

The Speaker: Questions and comments, the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Robert Oliphant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us be very clear about this deal. Canadians asked for a good deal, and they got a good deal. Canadians recognized that it was an opportunity of a generation to make a difference and improve the old NAFTA.

This morning at the international trade committee, National Chief Perry Bellegarde said this was "the most inclusive international trade agreement for Indigenous peoples to date."

Labour leaders are also saying it has the strongest labour protections of any free trade agreement in the world. It is the most progressive trade agreement, the most inclusive for indigenous peoples, and the most impressive and important deal for labour. Why would the member not support this?

Ms. Cheryl Hardcastle: Mr. Speaker, I am glad the member has pointed out how weak our existing free trade agreements are, if what we are getting now is going to be groundbreaking.

As a matter of fact, the Democrats in the United States are pushing forward for the kinds of expectations we had for the free trade

agreement and for the rhetoric the Liberals had about this free trade agreement. These are half measures, and there are voluntary and discretionary measures and excerpts within the agreement that are going to make it vulnerable to those who want to undermine it. Indeed, we know from experience that will happen, especially in my riding, where we have seen manufacturing jobs leave.

When I discussed earlier how people called NAFTA the race to the bottom, some of those same people in the labour community predicted exactly that. It is of no satisfaction to me that certain people are now endorsing it because of these half measures. They are just better than what exists now.

• (2240)

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Windsor—Tecumseh for speaking so eloquently on trade issues, as she has throughout this Parliament. She has been very effective. Living close to the border, she understands the issues and the importance of having a strong partnership with the United States, but also the importance of having Canadian governments actually stand up for Canada.

That certainly has not happened here, as it did not happen under the Conservatives either. They were in haste to sign whatever they could, rather than actually doing the kind of hard slogging and the homework that is required to prepare the ground for negotiations and to understand what the impact analysis is and what the impacts are in every sector.

For the decade and a half I have been in the House we have not seen one single agreement that the government adequately prepared for, which is why in so many cases under both the Conservatives and the Liberals, exports from the other market increase as exports in Canada fall. Given that the homework and the due diligence are not done by governments, and the Liberals are following along the same path as Mr. Harper's government did, could the member for Windsor—Tecumseh tell us why it is so important to do the due diligence and understand, going into negotiations, what is at stake?

Ms. Cheryl Hardcastle: Mr. Speaker, my colleague's question allows me to share some very crucial examples of what happens when we do not do our due diligence and when we rush through an agreement. We cannot adequately explain what labour value content rules are and how they are going to be enforced.

Right now there is a clause about labour value content that requires a \$16 U.S. per hour average wage. How does that translate when averaging in the more expensive executive management positions? No one is explaining how that is going to be excluded yet, so that is inadequate.

Government Orders

How is this for a quote from validators of our position? “Canadians will not sit idly by and watch our Internet be conceded by politicians trading horses. These kinds of digital policies do not belong in trade agreements. Canada is in the midst of a national consultation on Canada's Copyright Act, which has just been dramatically knee-capped with this agreement...Copyright reforms in this deal may be beneficial to corporate American rights-holders, but the Canadian government does not work for them. This is a bad deal for Canada.”

Mr. Darrell Samson (Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I stand in the House tonight, as the member of Parliament for Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook, in Nova Scotia, excited to to speak to this important bill, yet saddened, as this will be my last speech in the House for the 42nd Parliament. I have mixed feelings.

In my closing speech for the 42nd Parliament, the theme I would like to speak on is CUSMA. Bill C-100 is a great example of the work our government has done throughout the four years it has been in power.

If we want a country to be strong, we have to ensure Canadians, the business community and all citizens have opportunities. This is the third trade deal we have brought forward.

A couple of years ago, we brought forward CETA, which was a very important deal with the European Union. With that deal, we potentially have access to 500 million people who can purchase our goods as well. We need to remember that under that deal, 98% of tariffs are gone. In the past, it was only 25%. We are opening the market tremendously and there is great potential for Canadians to move forward with important opportunities.

Our second deal was the CPTPP, once again providing us access to 500 million people. We now have access one billion people. It is an outstanding potential opportunity in Asia and the Pacific. We know we have great entrepreneurs who continue to innovate. They are able to sell and trade with those countries.

The third deal is CUSMA, which is extremely important. Of course, it adds access to 500 million people more. We are now have access to 1.5 billion people.

This is a continuation of what is happening in this great country right now. Our unemployment rate has changed from the time we took power. When the Conservatives left four years ago, we had a 7.2% unemployment rate. Today, as I stand before the House, the unemployment rate is 5.2%. It is outstanding.

There has been job creation. Who has created those jobs? Canadians. How many jobs have they created since 2015? Over one million jobs. How many Canadians were lifted out of poverty during that time? Over 825,000. It is very impressive.

What else have we done? We are investing in Canadians to create a strong Canada, ensuring we build a Canada that Canadians can be proud of and from which Canadians will be able to benefit. We brought forward a national housing strategy for Canadians. We brought forward the CPP. We brought forward a national early learning and child care framework. Canadians should just watch us now, though. We are bringing forward pharmacare for all Canadians. This is what we are doing.

It is important to share with members this victory. It is tremendous.

● (2245)

This is such an important victory for Canadians and I have to tell them how it turned out. President Trump was waking up in the middle of the night and tweeting about what he felt the Americans needed if a deal was to be had. He talked about three major areas.

The first one was the five-year sunset clause, or a shotgun clause, whatever we want to call it. If there was no renegotiation on that, the deal was dead. Canada said no. We cannot expect business communities, businessmen and women and business entrepreneurs to invest, upgrade and modernize when they only have five years of guaranteed potential. We know what the Conservatives were saying. From the start, they were saying we should sign any deal. It did not matter, we just had to get it done. However, that is not what we did. We got what we wanted.

The second thing Trump tweeted about in the middle of the night was that we had to end supply management. The Americans did not want that in the deal. Do we have supply management today? Absolutely. That is a very important. The Americans will not flood our markets with their cheap products. We will not have it. We are proud Canadians, and we will continue to defend supply management for all Canadians.

The third thing President Trump said was he could not sign a deal unless we changed the dispute management mechanism. It was important to the Americans that we changed that. Why? Because the Americans were losing 98% of the time when things went to the tribunal. He wanted to do away with the international tribunal and have American lawyers and judges determine what was right and what was wrong in the deal. The Tories wanted to sign. We said it would not happen and it never happened. That also is important.

I think back to when the Conservatives were criticizing us, saying “Sign Sign”, but we stayed on the path. We were successful. The former prime minister of the country, Brian Mulroney, said that Canada did very well. He said it was a great deal. He was speaking, of course, for the Conservatives.

For the NDP, there is no such thing as an NDP deal. The New Democrats are anti-trade. We could not make it good enough for them. There will always be an issue or a problem.

There is one good, solid New Democrat when it comes to trade, and that is my colleague, the member for Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie. I think he wants to be a Liberal. I believe he is more Liberal than New Democratic. This is what he said:

I just want to congratulate everybody in this room for the fantastic job that you did, for the leadership of Unifor, to be sure, that we can get the best deal possible and protect workers all around this country.

Government Orders

That was pretty impressive for a New Democratic member who really understands the importance of trade deals.

Let us talk quickly about CUSMA. There are certain aspects that we were victorious on, over and above the fact that we told Trump those three were not going to happen, and that he should get over it. I guess he did get over it. He never showed up last week. He sent Pence here. He knows he did not get the best deal for the United States. He knows that Canada got the best deal. He knows the Liberal Government of Canada got the deal done.

Another very important piece we were successful on was labour. We were able to bring a more ambitious and robust piece to the labour portion of the agreement. The new auto rule of origin that we were successful in getting for the auto industry allows auto workers guaranteed work over time. The auto industry is very proud of that.

• (2250)

The environmental changes we brought forward are very important and are incorporated in the agreement. We are talking about air quality, water and marine. They are all very important aspects.

Of course, who can forget the very important gender lens? We are a party that will work to ensure all genders have opportunities. We put in place a mechanism to protect women's rights. It is very important to recognize gender identity and sexual orientation.

We cannot forget this. The Conservatives, NDP, Bloc and the Greens asked us how we could sign a deal that did not remove steel and aluminum tariffs. We knew what we were doing. Not only were we working on ratifying and ensuring we had a the deal, but we did not ratify this deal before the tariffs were removed. The tariffs on steel and aluminum are gone. They are history. We were able to do that successfully.

I want all members in the House of Commons not to forget that Canadians have a victory with this deal. The people from Nova Scotia have a big victory with this deal. This is very important for people from Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook as well. This bill will create good middle-class jobs for all Canadians.

We have strong deals because we believe in industry. Our products, when we have a level playing field, are the best in the world. We are proving that by implementing these trade deals. Canadians have created over a million jobs. Those jobs have been created before seeing the success of these trade deals.

This is a very good deal for Canadians. I am very proud of this deal and I know all Canadians are proud of it.

• (2255)

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what to say after that speech? Winston Churchill once said that a man was about as big as the things that made him angry. Certainly, the member for Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook was quite angry tonight, trying to defend the government's record on trade, which is not a good one. It reminds me a little bit of the advice he was given by the minister for climate change when she said that if we wanted people to believe something, just keep saying it, yell it, get angry and then they would totally believe it.

I would ask the member this. He talked a lot about how the Prime Minister fought for the progressive agenda in the U.S. trade deal. Of course, in the last two months of this trade deal, which is represented in Bill C-100, Canada was not even at the negotiating table. Mexico got the deal. We had to be added to it.

The member talked about the signature of the progressive agenda and he mentioned the gender lens. I would like that member to refer me to the chapter in the agreement on gender. Here is a hint for Canadians watching: There is no chapter. None of the items the government laid out in their objectives were met.

I know the member worked a lot in education. I think he will be going back to that in the fall. Could he tell me something? In the six core objectives, when the Liberals got zero out of six, would he fail a student with that mark?

Mr. Darrell Samson: Mr. Speaker, my colleague needs to understand one thing first. I did not deliver that speech because I am angry. I delivered that speech because I am passionate. The anger is on that side of the House. We are passionate about what we are doing for Canadians. I want my colleague to remember what happened under the Conservatives. Exports hardly grew under the Harper government. It had the slowest economy post-war.

The member should remember what the Business Council of Canada said. It applauded the government's success in negotiating a comprehensive, high-standard agreement on North American trade. That is pretty impressive. He needs to read that closely because there are great things in there for Canadians.

• (2300)

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is important to recognize that Democrats in Congress, Nancy Pelosi, Debbie Dingell and others, are proposing changes on the enforcement provisions with regard to labour and the environment, which include some of the women's equality issues the member noted. The effort to fast-track this will eliminate the potential of the agreement that relates to enforcement on labour and the environment.

I would like the hon. member to reflect on the fact that the Liberals are undermining those efforts and that we could sign a deal that later on excludes the elements that have been included in the United States.

Mr. Darrell Samson: Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of things I need to correct. We are not fast-tracking. This is a process that was in place, and we are moving step by step. We will not allow the Conservatives, the NDP and others to slow us down, because Canadians need this.

The second thing I would tell my colleague is that he should look at the statistics. There are more women working in Canada today than ever before. That is extremely important, and the member should keep an eye on that.

Government Orders

I could go on, because there are lots of quotes that talk about how this deal is good for Canada. There are so many more jobs being created for Canadians. There are some in agriculture who did not get as much as they wanted. We have compensation for them and investment and innovation. That is what I call looking at the big picture and delivering for Canadians.

The Speaker: I would remind the hon. member for Barrie—Innisfil that one member at a time should be standing, so I would encourage him to take his seat.

The hon. member for Edmonton West.

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I do not know how you could have possibly heard the member for Barrie—Innisfil over that. If the good people of Winnipeg North ever come to their senses and elect a Conservative MP and the Liberals are looking for another MP to stand and rage incoherently on demand, I think we have our winner.

The member talked a lot about job growth. I want to point out that according to the Library of Parliament, the participation of women in the workforce as a percentage has actually dropped under the current government. He talked about unemployment dropping in Canada, and it is great that it has, but I want to point out again some information, again from the Library of Parliament.

There is a great bumper sticker that says, “Trigger a Liberal: use facts and logic”, so here is a trigger warning right now. Since the Liberals were elected, in Germany unemployment has dropped 27%. In England, with all the problems with Brexit, unemployment has dropped 24%. In Japan, with its massively aging workforce, unemployment has dropped 19%. In the United States, unemployment has dropped 28%, and under the Liberal government, unemployment has dropped 16%. The high tide is lifting all boats, but the Liberals are sitting on the dock while their boat is drifting away.

Why has the government so underperformed compared to the rest of the booming world in the creation of jobs and dropping unemployment?

Mr. Darrell Samson: Mr. Speaker, again, the member is getting me excited. I want to share with him that Canadians have created over one million jobs. We have the lowest unemployment rate in the history of Canada. The highest percentage of indigenous people are working in Canada today under our leadership.

I cannot close without saying that what the Conservatives did to Nova Scotia with investment was sad. For example, they invested \$530 million in nine years in Nova Scotia. We invested \$560 million in four years. Nova Scotia is prospering under our leadership.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy hearing the member, but we need a dose of reality. The reality is, of course, as members know, that average Canadian families are now struggling under the highest debt load in our history. In fact, it is not just the highest debt load in our country's history, it is the highest family debt load of any industrialized country throughout the world. Therefore, the history that has been created by the Liberal government is actually to have Canadian families struggling under the worst family debt load of any industrialized country ever. That is a fact. That is the reality.

As members know as well, we have the lowest level of labour force participation we have ever had in our country. What that means is that nearly 40% of Canadians who are of employment age are not participating at all. As the member knows, that has an impact on the unemployment figures, because it means that most people have just given up even searching for work. That, again, is a fact from Statistics Canada.

Coupled with this, and the worst affordable housing crisis in our country's history, is the fact that Canadians are struggling to pay for their medication. One in five Canadians cannot even afford to cover their medication costs. We have to have that dose of reality.

Sometimes Liberal MPs get so carried away with their own rhetoric and slapping each other on the back that they do not actually realize what is happening across the length and breadth of our country. The problem here is that the rush to sign an agreement even before it is improved, as the member for Windsor West noted so eloquently, means that we are going to see prescription drug prices soar at a time when most Canadians cannot afford it.

Will the member comment on most Canadians not being able to afford their medication?

● (2305)

Mr. Darrell Samson: Mr. Speaker, those members would like us to stop and restart. They do not realize how important this economy is to our country. There is \$2 billion per day in trade between our two nations.

We cannot stop the 825,000 lifted out of poverty and the 300,000 kids lifted out of poverty. The CCB, which is tax-free, is five times better than what the Conservatives offered. This is a great economy we are seeing. We should be proud of it. Sign up.

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure how to follow my friend from Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook. I will try to do so with facts, as opposed to volume. He knows that my family, who live in Fall River in his riding, have a great deal of respect for him, as I do. Unfortunately, the speech he was given tonight with respect to NAFTA does not reflect what really happened in the negotiations and the deal.

As a Nova Scotia MP, the member would know that the future of economic development in Nova Scotia, the success being had right now, is attributable to two things. First is the amazing potential of institutions and entrepreneurs in Atlantic Canada, and Nova Scotia in particular. Second was the strategic focus on trade and infrastructure that took place during the Harper government. Specifically, Atlantic Canada has never seen a larger investment than the awarding of the shipbuilding contract to the Halifax shipyard. The largest investment in the history of Atlantic Canada is attributable to the Conservatives.

I am very proud of that, having served on board one of the frigates bought previously by the last majority Conservative governments of Mulroney. When Conservative governments are in, they have to modernize and update the Canadian Armed Forces every generation. We see the current government buying 40-year-old used aircraft from Australia and being parodied on the world stage, but the investment at the Halifax shipyard is impressive. In fact, I will be going to see it again this summer.

Government Orders

What is interesting as well for the Halifax Regional Municipality, an area that the member for Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook should know well, as his riding abuts the Halifax airport, is that Peter MacKay made it a priority for the runways at the Robert Stanfield airport to be extended. Longer runways allowed for more cargo flights to take Atlantic Canadian exports around the world, exports like lobster to South Korea. As parliamentary secretary in the Harper government, I was proud to visit the cargo terminal at Stanfield International in Halifax to see one of the first few months' worth of flights taking Nova Scotia lobster, fished from Cape Breton right down through to the south shore and to Yarmouth, to new markets in Asia, to secure a better price for the products.

In fact, the CETA trade deal was particularly beneficial to a number of key industries in Atlantic Canada, particularly on the seafood side, as was the bilateral trade deal with South Korea, which I was involved in.

If we do the rundown, at Cape Breton, the tar ponds that were talked about for generations, when I was in law school at Dalhousie or serving at Shearwater, were finally cleaned up under the Conservatives. The trouble is that by the time we get these projects done, we have done the heavy lifting and we do not get to cut some of the ribbons that the new people do. However, I would like the member to spend a few moments researching that.

At the moment, I cannot point to one major investment by the current government. In fact, when the minister in charge of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency is based out of Mississauga, and when the Liberals tried to break with 80-year tradition to block an Atlantic Canadian jurist from the Supreme Court of Canada, defying constitutional precedent, I would suggest Atlantic Canadians have seen that there is zero priority for their needs with the government. There are lots of photo ops and selfies, but that is wearing thin on them.

I would like the member to do some research on the items I have just spoken about. I would like anyone to bring it to the floor of the House of Commons if I am wrong about the shipbuilding investment in the Halifax shipyard being the largest single public procurement infrastructure project ever in Atlantic Canadian history. As someone who lived, served and studied in Atlantic Canada, I am very proud of that track record.

● (2310)

I am now speaking on a continued debate on Bill C-100 and the amendment offered by the NDP. I might as well get to the crunch of the challenge we face here.

As Conservatives, we negotiated 98% of Canada's export access; 98% were deals negotiated by the Conservatives. That included the U.S. free trade agreement, NAFTA, CETA and the trans-Pacific partnership, which basically was agreed upon in the middle of the 2015 election, but then the U.S. pulled out and there were some changes made. There was the agreement with South Korea and a tonne of bilateral agreements. There are really only two or three free trade agreements that were not negotiated by Conservative governments: the Israel free trade agreement, which we modernized, and I think maybe the Chile agreement. However, by and large, 98% of our export access was negotiated by Conservatives. Therefore, we have been frustrated in this process, seeing a lack of attention on

trade, exports and key market sectors to be put forward in the renegotiation of NAFTA. This amendment raises a range of issues.

Core to the problems with the NAFTA negotiation were not the outcomes on labour, because the U.S. was concerned basically about labour rates in Mexico. In fact, Canada is a signatory to more ILO treaties than the U.S. is. What is interesting is that, just today, in front of Congress, the USTR, Ambassador Lighthizer, viewed it as a success that Mexico is going to have a secret ballot in the union elections, something the Liberals oppose as a democratic approach to elections for union representation. They likely oppose it because Jerry Dias appears to be a senior advisor to the Prime Minister, advising now on how to spend the \$600 million media fund. That should trouble Canadians.

However, the problem was the focus in the NAFTA negotiations, which was softwood lumber, our eternal irritant with the U.S. relationship. In fact, Canadian softwood allows home ownership in the United States to be available to more people. The only reason the tariffs on our softwood lumber, which were agreed upon by the current government, are not having as big an impact as they could is the voracious appetite in the United States right now for construction and softwood in general. Therefore, the price and demand are strong enough that they are living with the tariff that has been imposed.

Members may recall that when the Harper government came in, it made the unusual decision of asking David Emerson to switch parties to help drive toward a deal on softwood. That was the last agreement we were able to lock down with the United States. Therefore, it has been a perpetual irritant in the trade relationship with Canada, which is largely due to a few stakeholders in the U.S. who have a lot of influence in Washington holding back affordability for millions of Americans. The Liberals should have used this opportunity of opening up NAFTA to get resolution on a core irritant of trade. If we are going to modernize, let us fix something that we are always fighting with the Americans on. It was not even mentioned in the priorities of the Liberals, nor was auto.

As I said earlier, the Auto Pact of 1965 was the first free trade agreement between Canada and the U.S. We would not have NAFTA, nor the USFTA, were it not for the Auto Pact. That was not mentioned as a priority.

Government Orders

Most of the agriculture sector is not mentioned. In fairness, the minister did mention supply management but did not push back at any of President Trump's inflated rhetoric on 200% tariff quotas. The U.S. spends more on agricultural subsidies than we spend on our military. When were we pushing back on that? There is no level playing field in agriculture if the U.S. is spending billions in direct subsidies.

We ignored agriculture, auto and softwood. We literally left out most of the areas that we should have been focused on right from the start. That is what the Conservatives said. That is what our leader said. That is what I said. That is what many of our members said.

● (2315)

We also urged them to look at ballistic missile defence, modernizing NORAD as a way to remind Americans that if they are going to impose section 232 tariffs because of security grounds, they do not do that with their one partner on homeland defence and security, Canada. They did not do that. In fact they took positions antithetical to the U.S.

Canada pulled out our jets in the fight against ISIS. When France and the U.S. were asking us to do more in security, the Prime Minister in a second vote in this Parliament, whipped by the former head of our army, I would note he is retiring. He was the whip. I know how difficult that must have been to withdraw from a battle when our allies are trying to step up.

The Obama presidency, the bromance the Prime Minister brags about all the time, wanted us to stay in. We were not seen as a trusted, reliable security partner under the Prime Minister. When section 232 tariffs were being talked about on security grounds, we were not making our case.

Here is something else I recommended and I would recommend the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, who informed us how they try and fool Canadians by being persistent, yelling, being loud and then Canadians will totally believe them. The big myth we have in modernizing NAFTA was modernizing trucking and transportation in North America. We knew that President Trump had issues with Mexican trucking and some of the border rules in terms of states on the border and trucking regulations.

When the Mulroney government negotiated the U.S. Free Trade Agreement, concluded in the 1988 election, Canada still owned Air Canada. We had not liberalized passenger airline travel. It was still a Crown corporation. Fast-forward to today in 2017, 2018, 2019, we see efficiencies for more open skies. I would like to see even more. We see efficiencies in the North American railroads where Canadian companies like CP and CN have done very well with liberalized transportation rules.

We urged the government, if it wants a game-changer, to truly modernize NAFTA, modernize trucking because in many cases because of state or provincial rules, if we send goods from Quebec to California, or from Ontario to Massachusetts, those trucking resources often have to come back empty or do not have the ability to transport interstate.

What is interesting about that, and I know my friend, the leader of the Green Party is listening intently, is that, had we brought cabotage and trucking into it, it would have been the single largest reduction

in greenhouse gases in the history of North America, by modernizing trucking.

I recommended that and when David Emerson, a former transportation minister, someone very well regarded in the industry as well, appeared at transport committee, I asked him would that not have been a win on both the trade front and the environment front. He agreed it would have been the single largest way to reduce greenhouse gases.

Despite the rhetoric, the government's greenhouse gas emission reduction plan is a tax. We could have worked this into NAFTA. The timing was there. As I said, liberalizing trucking regulations was not even forecast in the eighties because there was still state ownership of airlines and so on. Today with air liberalized to a large degree to rail, to short sea shipping in many cases, we could have added trucking. Not only would it reduce greenhouse gases, it would have made businesses more efficient, would have potentially reduced costs and maximized the utility of our trucking infrastructure.

That is something we recommended for the agreement, particularly with a president who likes to tell everyone that he is a business leader. That would have been a way to say we can have a win for the customer, a win for competitiveness, fewer trucks on the road and fewer emissions. Let us modernize that in NAFTA.

● (2320)

No, we did not mention that either. We did not mention our core industries, like auto, softwood or key agriculture sectors. We did not even get modernized professional work abilities in the United States. We did not get digital modernization. We did not get security and certainty with respect to where data and data storage would be for privacy reasons. We really did not get anything in this agreement, because we did not go into the negotiations in a strategic fashion.

The Liberal government underestimated what the negotiations would amount to, and they went in with the sort of posturing image of the Prime Minister, his much vaunted progressive agenda. Liberals kind of said that they would work with Mexico, too. The Prime Minister went down to Mexico to say that we would work together. Then, what did Mexico do? It had 85 direct meetings with White House administration officials.

Government Orders

By the end, the last two months, we had negotiated ourselves away from the table, and the member for Fredericton should know, because the exporters in New Brunswick have been let down by him, remarkably, on this file, that when Canada is not present at the negotiation of a trilateral agreement, when there are only two parties present, it is a failure of the third party.

I understand why the member for Fredericton is frustrated. He might be the next first-term Liberal to announce his retirement. I am losing track of how many. Today it was the member for Pierrefonds—Dollard. We had a few others, I think. I would love to have the Library of Parliament research this fact because I am not 100% sure, but maybe the member for Fredericton could research it too. I think that a majority government has never seen more first-time MPs leave than the current government.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

• (2325)

The Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Fredericton will come to order. If he wishes to yell, he can do so—order. If the hon. member for Fredericton wants to yell, he can do so somewhere else. Order.

The hon. member for Durham has the floor.

Hon. Erin O'Toole: Mr. Speaker, if only we had seen that passion from the member for Fredericton a few years ago, we might have been able to avoid some of the disastrous results we have had on the trade front.

On nights like this, I wonder if he is reflecting on that fact and on what he is going to say when he goes back to Fredericton. He will have to say that we are rushing through bills like Bill C-100 and Bill C-101 in the final hours of Parliament because we were not able to secure good outcomes for Canada. This is despite the fact that we were able to join a deal that Mexico and the United States had signed.

As I was saying before he had his outburst, if there is a trilateral agreement being negotiated and one of the three parties is no longer at the table, we should ask how we let that happen. As I said in my remarks on Bill C-100, this year is the first year that Mexico has surpassed Canada as the number one bilateral trade partner for the first two months of this year. Mexico surpassed us, negotiating the USMCA. It had a deal on section 232 tariffs before Canada, despite the fact we are NORAD partners and we have had free trade with the U.S. for years before Mexico did.

We have to work with what the government has been able to table. We have to make sure that we do not have the tariffs come back on, because steel fabricators in Fredericton and MacDougall Steel in Prince Edward Island cannot afford another year of tariffs.

In fact, I can summarize and conclude with this. Canadians cannot afford another four years of the Liberals.

Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I hope this is parliamentary, because I would like to quote the hon. member for Fredericton, who said that the member for Durham talks all kinds of crap.

The Speaker: That is unparliamentary, and I ask the hon. member for Malpeque to apologize for using an unparliamentary word.

Hon. Wayne Easter: Mr. Speaker, I apologize. I was trying to make the point that the doom and gloom from the member for Durham and what he tries to allege as facts are not facts at all.

I would give him credit in terms of the shipbuilding deal. The Conservatives like to talk about that deal. That is because the best proposal in terms shipbuilding came from the Irving shipyard in Atlantic Canada, and I congratulate the shipyard for putting that proposal in.

What the member for Durham failed to mention was that the lowest spending in Canadian history in terms of the military in this country was under the Stephen Harper government, in which he was a member of cabinet.

The member also mentioned that the United States spends more on agriculture than Canada does on the military. That, in fact, is true. However, for farmers in this country, for primary producers in this country, who he talks about from time to time, the Harper government, under the leadership of Gerry Ritz as minister of agriculture, cut the safety net for farmers in this country by 50%. What a failure.

The member loves to talk about the section 232 tariffs. Who negotiated those tariffs away? The fact of the matter is that this Prime Minister and this Minister of Foreign Affairs negotiated those tariffs away. They protected Canadian interests so that we could move ahead with prosperity.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

• (2330)

The Speaker: Order, please.

Again, I ask members to contain their enthusiasm. The hour is late. Let us try to maintain not only our good humour but also some decorum.

The hon. member for Durham.

Hon. Erin O'Toole: Mr. Speaker, with the interventions tonight from the member for Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook, the member for Fredericton and the member for Malpeque, there must have been a really good Atlantic reception tonight in Ottawa these members were attending before late night debate.

I talked about how impressed I was when I toured the MacDougall Steel facility in Borden-Carleton. I know that the member from there is proud. He knows that they were hurting under the tariffs, which is why we are trying to work with the government.

I refer the member for Fredericton to Tek Steel, L&A Metalworks and Ocean Steel in St. John, which does work across the region. They were hurting because they were being boxed out of North American bidding opportunities. In fact, in this trade deal, we still see buy American provisions in the United States.

Government Orders

I invite that member for Fredericton to meet me this year at Tek Steel, and let us talk to them about the damage that has been done with tariffs, with trade uncertainty and with taxes. Remember, Tek Steel and MacDougall Steel are run by the people the Prime Minister thinks run small businesses to avoid paying taxes. The Liberals already had their war on small business two years ago.

Canadian businesses have had enough. On October 21, they can choose the Conservatives.

Mr. Marco Mendicino (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have had the chance to debate the member for Durham both inside this chamber and out, and I always find it regrettable when the member descends into remarks that are so partisan as to be lacking in any kind of credibility. It undermines the hard work that went into the negotiations to modernize the NAFTA agreement, negotiations that involved not only members on this side of the House but former members and alumni from his party. It is a testament to the achievements and the progress made in modernizing this agreement.

The new NAFTA will protect millions of jobs that exist today, and will likely create more as a result of making advancements in the auto sector, with favourable rules of origin for high-paying jobs in our home province of Ontario in particular, and in agriculture by protecting the supply management side, which one of his leadership contenders does not believe in. When it comes to the environment, the new NAFTA will reduce pollution. It will also protect gender and women's rights, and in particular labour, whom we invited to the table to ensure that we got the best possible trade deal and that hard-working Canadians' labour rights would be protected.

It is one thing to hear the member for Durham complain about all this progress, but when we listen to the former leader of his party, Rona Ambrose; when we listen to James Moore, a former colleague of his; when we listen to former prime minister Brian Mulroney, former prime minister Kim Campbell and now the premier of Alberta Jason Kenney speak very favourably about this deal, and when the member is very likely going to vote in favour of this new NAFTA, is it not the height of hypocrisy to hear all of the criticism laid bare?

Hon. Erin O'Toole: Mr. Speaker, if Canadians are still watching, I want them to know that we have lots of respect and friendships across the aisle, and I am friends with the member for Eglinton—Lawrence. I will try to tone down my partisanship. I would like to thank him for asking his last question in the House of Commons.

I find it interesting that a lot of members keep quoting elements of this deal that are not in the deal. We know the Liberals made really big news about the progressive agenda, but there is no chapter on gender. In the Chilean deal, in which they updated an appendix, it was non-binding provisions. They are pointing to things that are not even in the deal but are still in the brand talking points of the Prime Minister, and that is the problem with the Liberal approach to trade. It is the problem with the trip to India. It is the problem with China. It is the problem with Saudi Arabia. It is the problem with the Philippines. It is the problem with Italy, which has imposed tariffs on durum wheat.

Right now, Canada is not seen as being serious under the Liberal Prime Minister, because he puts electoral prospects in certain parts of

the country and his own brand and image in photographs ahead of our trade, ahead of our economic future and ahead of our security.

When France asked us after the Bataclan attack to step up our fight against ISIS, the Prime Minister was the only western leader to pull back, and countries noticed. As the foreign affairs critic, I meet with them, and near the end of the meeting it is clear they are wondering what has happened to Canada.

We do not need more photographs or hashtags. We need more principled Canadian leadership in the world, and that is what the world will get with a Conservative government.

• (2335)

Mr. Paul Manly (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, GP): Mr. Speaker, I have a number of concerns about this agreement, including the potential import of dairy containing bovine growth hormone, the extension of patents from eight to 10 years, and article 22, which is about state-owned enterprises and the carve-out for the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion; we are seeing now that we have this state-owned enterprise that is excluded from this deal.

I would ask the hon. member about the provisions for investor state dispute settlements. He said that we do not have enough time to debate this issue, but investor-state dispute settlements are part of the FIPA agreements that the Conservative government pushed through, including the Canada-China agreement, which allows Chinese state-owned corporations to sue Canada for laws and policies that get in the way of their profits.

I would like to hear—

The Speaker: Order.

The hon. member for Durham. I am sorry, there is very little time, 30 seconds.

Hon. Erin O'Toole: Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the member for Nanaimo—Ladysmith. It is my first time responding to his question.

I share his concern about the loss we had on data protection with respect to biologics. I have seen the impact of those drugs, personalized medicine, and I think that was one of many losses.

ISDS is one, as his leader would know. However, it is interesting that the Liberals do not seem to recognize that foreign companies operating here can already use our court system, which is the most fair in the world when they are not interfering with it like in the SNC-Lavalin affair. We need that certainty in other countries. With the FIPA with China, we were giving Canadian exporters the right to sue there.

Government Orders

Mr. Peter Fonseca (Mississauga East—Cooksville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Edmonton Centre.

When we get in that global competitive environment, which is what we do when we are in the midst of a trade negotiation, I could not ask for anybody better than people like the member for Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook in my corner. I could not ask for anybody better than the Prime Minister and our Minister of Foreign Affairs. This team on this side of the aisle stood up for Canada, stood up for Canadians, and made sure that we delivered a good deal that will deliver millions of jobs to Canadians.

Over the last three and a half years, over one million jobs were created, and a 40-year low when it comes to unemployment.

I was listening to the member for Durham, who is a revisionist. He forgets about the 10 years, the decade of failure, under the Conservative government and the failure with the economy; the lowest economic growth, anemic growth; the failure with trade and the environment; the failure with indigenous people and veterans. It goes on and on, failure, failure, failure under that Conservative government.

If we listen to the Conservatives, they have a defeatist attitude. They are weak and that weakness shows through. We are seeing it with Doug Ford.

Doug Ford and the federal Leader of the Opposition right away put up the white flag: “We give up, we give in, give them everything they want, and capitulate on this whole deal”. That is not what Canadians are asking of their government. What they are asking of their government is to hold firm, hold strong and deliver for Canadians from coast to coast to coast, but that is not what we heard from the Conservatives.

When President Trump came into office, the first thing he was talking about was ripping up the NAFTA. However, under this government, we went down to Washington, we worked with our friends in Washington and on all sides of the aisle, and made sure that we had a team Canada approach. That team Canada approach included the business council, labour groups and stakeholders right across our country. We had not just hundreds but 1,000-plus meetings with these stakeholders, which is something the Conservatives fail to do every time. They do not consult with others, they do not listen, but that is what we do. This is why we have been successful when it comes to trade deals. We have been successful when it came to the CPTPP, because we did travel this country and we did listen to Canadians. We were able to get a better deal for Canada and Canadians on the CPTPP. We got CETA past the finish line.

The Conservatives failed. They could never do it. They cannot finish anything, and that is why the Liberal government came into power and made sure that we put in progressive elements to these trade deals. We made sure that we had gender equity so that everybody had a chance at success. This was not made for what the Conservative look for, which is just for big business and not caring about the workers or people. When we look at a trade deal, we look at it as how it will help our greatest resource, which is the 36 million Canadians who call Canada home, and we are very proud of them.

That is the approach that we took, and what we are hearing right across the spectrum of stakeholders is that this has been the right approach. This has been the way to get progressive trade deals done. Today, the rest of the world is looking to Canada, seeing how this model that we were able to use in the negotiations of NAFTA worked so well and how they could incorporate this type of model globally. Therefore, it is making not only an impact here in North America, but an international impact for our country.

• (2340)

The modernizing of this agreement is good for Canadian workers and Canadian businesses. This agreement is also profoundly beneficial for our economy, Canadian families and the middle class.

When we began working to update NAFTA, we kept our focus on what really mattered. It is this new agreement that we need to preserve jobs, foster growth, expand the middle class and support people working hard to join the middle class.

CUSMA proves that the team Canada approach the government implemented was a success. It was not a time for partisan differences.

We cannot thank our Minister of Foreign Affairs enough. We also cannot thank Steve Verheul enough, as well as his negotiating team that was down in Washington. We thank all other members of the team involved in this, who sacrificed many hours and days to get us here. Even some Progressive Conservatives, such as Rona Ambrose, were part of this.

The leader of the official opposition, as I said, had a defeatist attitude, put up a white flag and wanted us to give the Americans everything they wanted. That is not the approach we wanted. It is not what Canadians were asking for. They want us to compete on this very competitive, challenging file when it comes to trade negotiations. That is what we did, and that is why we have been able to deliver.

When we were first faced with the prospect of renegotiating NAFTA, there was a lot of anxiety. We heard it from businesses and workers and from those who thought the auto sector would be decimated. However, we provided certainty and stability to them, which are the same things we were looking for in the agreement. We wanted to bring in certainty and stability and continue providing that access.

Did we deliver? We delivered in spades. With respect to the auto sector, we have increased rules of origin from 60% to our current 75%. This will mean many more new high-paying, middle-class jobs in that sector and throughout the whole supply chain.

We heard today from our parts manufacturers. They have said that, with this deal, we are looking at another \$6-billion to \$8-billion investment in Canada just in the auto sector. We also heard from the business council. It said the renegotiated deal was very good, and it gave us kudos for the approach we took. It noted that by our providing certainty and stability, there will be a great lift in our economy.

Government Orders

We asked various sectors about this. Some sectors were holding off on making equipment purchases or adding new workers. However, what we have heard is that, with the new NAFTA, they are ready to go. Therefore, not only is our economy doing well now, but it will be doing so much better with the new NAFTA.

I have been asked many questions in my riding by constituents. They wondered if we were going to get the deal done, and they were anxious. We gave them the reassurance that we had a great team, which was working together to deliver for them in every sector, whether agriculture, auto or the arts. Right across the board, Canadians understood how important this was, and they understand how important it is now. That is why we had broad consultation and why we made sure that everybody understood the importance of the deal and what was getting done.

This government undertook many consultations with stakeholders, and many hours were spent hearing from witnesses on the international trade committee, of which I am a member. We also travelled to the U.S. to make our southern friends aware of how important this relationship is not just for our country but also for theirs. As we have heard, there is two billion dollars' worth of trade every single day.

I am so happy that we took on this challenge. It was the largest challenge in U.S.-Canada relations in decades. Through negotiation, we have achieved all the outcomes and benefits for now and well into the future. CUSMA is a great deal for Canada.

• (2345)

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I know the member served in the Ontario legislature with my father, and my father had good things to say about him. He got off the HMCS *Titanic* before the Wynne government took down the Liberals in Ontario, in many ways because they made the Ontario economy less competitive. A high-tax, high regulatory environment was driving investment to the U.S. and other jurisdictions.

Added to that competitiveness challenge that our PC cousins in Ontario inherited after 15 years of the Liberals, we now see trade uncertainty, tariffs and potentially reduced market access around the world, further complicating Ontario, Mississauga and the GTA as a place for investment.

It is not lost on many people that the retreat of the auto industry, hitting the auto parts industry in Durham, is the culmination of the three Ts, high taxes, tariffs and trade uncertainty, all things brought in by Liberal governments provincially and federally.

Does he see the threat of the reimposition of steel and aluminum tariffs as a serious competitive threat for Ontario?

• (2350)

Mr. Peter Fonseca: Mr. Speaker, I did have the opportunity to serve with the member's father, a good man, John O'Toole from Durham. One thing I can tell the member is that his dad would not like what he sees right now under Doug Ford as Premier of Ontario, with the cuts to our competitiveness, cuts to education and cuts to health care. He would not stand for that. He would stand up on principle. He made cuts to children with autism and their parents. It is horrible.

The member has to know that there was complete anemic growth under the Conservative government. It is this government, with the approach we have taken, that has worked together as a team to lift the section 232 tariffs. We heard from the steel and aluminum industry, as well as the supply chain, that we did everything right to make that happen. Section 232 tariffs are off the table and we are delighted.

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, continuing with the auto industry, the government often advocates, quite falsely, though it likes to take that position, that it has made \$60 billion in auto investment in its four years in office. That pales in comparison to Detroit alone that has around \$12 billion. In fact, since signing this agreement, Oshawa has been closed and a shift has been lost in Windsor, whereas General Motors is investing billions in Detroit in autonomous new vehicles with electrification. Chrysler and Fiat investments in Detroit are upward of \$6 billion to \$8 billion. Others have invested, Ford included, in just one city alone. In fact, Brazil and other countries have received more than Canada.

Dennis DesRosiers has shown that the Liberals' plan for auto has decreased our overall footprint to the United States. Given the fact that there is more investment and there are restrictions on it in Canada, how can he claim this deal will be good for auto when there are more taxes as production increases?

Mr. Peter Fonseca: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take what the member has to say, I am going to listen to the stakeholders and experts in the field. At the international trade committee, the parts manufacturers said they were going to look at a \$6-billion to \$8-billion investment in auto. I heard from Jerry Dias and Unifor. Jerry Dias said that this was a great deal for auto. This is a deal that was not done 24 years ago and he is so delighted that today, 24 years later, we are getting the NAFTA that we need when it comes to auto.

The member may know, or ought to know, that we have increased the parts of origin in North America 75%. That means great growth, more jobs, high-paying jobs, middle-class jobs.

Government Orders

Mr. Randy Boissonnault (Edmonton Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a great honour to speak at this late hour. With the few minutes I have at my disposal, I want to share a story about the most comprehensive and important trade deal that Canada has negotiated in modern times. Let us talk about the evolution of a trade deal that transformed how our economy and those of the United States and Mexico have become intertwined to the benefit of Mexicans, Americans and all Canadians. Let us talk about a failed Conservative administration that poisoned the well with the Obama administration and had no chance whatsoever to negotiate a new deal with an administration that had no time for the then Canadian government because Prime Minister Harper went on national TV to tell President Obama how to do his job. It is an odd strategy when one is trying to build bridges, not fences or walls.

When it was clear that our government would be working with President Trump and his administration on negotiating a new NAFTA, our government got to work. We assembled a true Team Canada, not one geared to narrow partisan interests, as the other side had done, but one that was putting the interests of Canadians first. We reached out to former interim leader, the Hon. Rona Ambrose. We reached out to former prime minister Brian Mulroney, even to then premier Brad Wall and then premier Rachel Notley, individuals at the polar ends of the political spectrum in Canada working on behalf of Canadians in the face of a deal that was essential to our survival.

Our Minister of Foreign Affairs, the MP for University—Rosedale, took charge and got busy to develop an approach that would reach out to decision-makers across the U.S., to leaders in the Mexican government and industry associations across both countries.

When I was knocking on doors during the negotiations, Canadians were understandably concerned. They had had 10 years of failure from the Conservatives, and \$2 billion of cross-border trade daily was at stake. They told me, and I agree, that it was no laughing matter. In fact, access to and integration with the U.S. and Mexican markets are the fabric of small and big businesses here in Canada.

At the height of concerns for people in my riding of Edmonton Centre, at the height of that anxiety over a trade deal that for many seemed to be an existential issue for our country, that is when the Conservatives showed their true nature. At the point when the Trump administration was trying to wear us down, that was the moment when the Conservatives could not handle the heat.

• (2355)

The Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Barrie—Innisfil and others will come to order. They do not need to be heckling and interrupting. We should have one person speaking at a time. We do not need this nonsense.

The hon. member for Edmonton Centre.

Mr. Randy Boissonnault: Mr. Speaker, I understand that my remarks may be getting under the skin of the Conservative opposition. That is the nature of this place. That is the moment when the Conservatives threw up their hands and said to capitulate, cave in, give in on culture, give in on supply management. Forget labour, throw out the dispute resolution mechanism, forget women and indigenous and LGBTQ2 people. They really do not count in

trade. Just take any deal, even a bad deal. It is shocking and shameful. I am glad that they were not in the kitchen cooking the deal, because it would have been a colossal flop.

Instead of taking the advice of the Conservatives to capitulate, our Minister of Foreign Affairs held fast. Our government stayed strong. We let the Americans and the Mexicans iron out their differences and then we came back to the table. The new NAFTA was always going to be about three economies. We committed to that, as did our Mexican partners, and ultimately so did the United States.

Now we are debating the passing of a deal that is central to our economy and to our modern self-identity. I understand the sour grapes from the Conservatives over trade deals like the Canada-European trade agreement because they simply could not close the deal. They did not have the mettle of our Minister of Foreign Affairs, who knew that the German Social Democratic Party would not be able to deal with a new modern trade deal with Canada. What did she do? She did not take advice from the Conservatives. She did not sit here and sulk. She did not yell at them from across the Atlantic. What did she do? The Minister of Foreign Affairs went to the convention of the German Social Democratic Party, spoke at it and convinced the Social Democrats. Germany signed on to a historic deal.

That is exactly the same kind of mettle that the leader of our NAFTA negotiations put toward this historic deal. That is leadership. That turned the tide. That is exactly what makes them so mad on the other side. The opposition cannot handle innovative trade deal-making because they think that they know how to run an economy when, in fact, what they know how to do is add \$150 billion to our debt and have nothing to show for it.

What did we get? Since day one of the NAFTA negotiations, our objective was to get a good deal for Canada and for all Canadians. We wanted to safeguard more than \$2 billion a day in cross-border trade, 70% of Canadian exports.

What is in the new NAFTA? Let us talk about energy, because that is important to my province and to the whole country. The new NAFTA deals with energy issues through the modernized agreement.

On this day when we approved TMX and when we are no longer going to rely on one U.S. market for 99% of our exports, when we are going to see shovels in the ground, and when we are going to see \$15 billion of trade repatriated to this country because we will be able to have world prices, this is when we want to make sure that there is no more proportionality clause so that we do not have to sell the Americans more oil than we want to.

On autos, we have heard exactly from my colleague from Mississauga that the CUSMA deal and Canadians working in the auto sector are better off than ever before. That is the new NAFTA. That is what we promised. That is what we got.

Government Orders

• (2400)

(The House adjourned at 12 a.m.)

The Speaker: It being 12 a.m., pursuant to order made on Tuesday, May 28 and pursuant to Standing Order 24(1) the House stands adjourned until later this day at 2 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 18, 2019

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Information Commissioner	
The Speaker	29305
Parliamentary Budget Officer	
The Speaker	29305
Commissioner of Lobbying	
The Speaker	29305
Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Lamoureux	29305
Interparliamentary Delegations	
Ms. Ratansi	29305
Committees of the House	
Government Operations and Estimates	
Mr. Lukiwski	29305
Environment and Sustainable Development	
Mr. Aldag	29306
Procedure and House Affairs	
Mr. Bagnell	29306
Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics	
Mr. Zimmer	29306
Public Safety and National Security	
Mr. McKay	29306
Justice and Human Rights	
Mr. Housefather	29306
Department of the Environment Act	
Mr. Boulerice	29306
Bill C-462. Introduction and first reading	29306
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	29307
Business of Supply	
Mr. Lamoureux	29307
Motion	29307
(Motion agreed to)	29307
Statements by Members	
Mr. Lamoureux	29307
Motion	29307
(Motion agreed to)	29307
Petitions	
Firearms	
Mrs. Gallant	29307
Health Care	
Mr. Cannings	29307
Firearms	
Ms. Dabrusin	29307
The Environment	
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	29308
Human Organ Trafficking	
Mr. Genuis	29308

Afghan Minority Communities	
Mr. Genuis	29308
Human Rights	
Mr. Genuis	29308
Falun Gong	
Mr. Genuis	29308
Lac-Mégantic	
Ms. Pauzé	29308
Child Care	
Mr. Stetski	29308
Health	
Mr. McKay	29308
Boil Water Advisories	
Mr. Manly	29308
Status of Women	
Mr. Manly	29309
Physician-Assisted Dying	
Ms. Bergen	29309
Children's Rights	
Ms. Boutin-Sweet	29309
Equalization	
Ms. Rempel	29309
Children's Rights	
Ms. Trudel	29309
Wild Salmon	
Mr. Johns	29309
Trans Mountain Pipeline	
Mr. Johns	29309
Children's Rights	
Ms. Jolibois	29309
Mr. Davies	29309
Mr. Boulerice	29309
Mr. Julian	29310
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Lamoureux	29310

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Business of Supply	
Opposition Motion—The Environment	
Mr. Fast	29310
Motion	29310
Mr. Gerretsen	29311
Mr. Boulerice	29312
Mr. Albas	29312
Mr. Longfield	29313
Mr. Davies	29314
Mr. Fraser (Central Nova)	29314
Mr. Albas	29317
Mr. Boulerice	29318
Mr. Gerretsen	29318
Mr. Weir	29319
Mr. Boulerice	29319

Mr. Longfield.....	29321
Mr. Deltell.....	29321
Ms. Boutin-Sweet.....	29321
Mr. Johns.....	29321
Mr. Gerretsen.....	29323
Mr. Sopuck.....	29323
Mr. Albas.....	29324
Ms. Rempel.....	29324
Mr. Gerretsen.....	29327
Mr. Johns.....	29327
Mr. Lamoureux.....	29328
Mrs. Wagantall.....	29328
Mr. Longfield.....	29328
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands).....	29330
Mr. Boulерice.....	29330
Mr. Gerretsen.....	29331
Mr. Lamoureux.....	29331
Mr. Kmiec.....	29332
Ms. Pauzé.....	29332
Mr. Maguire.....	29333
Ms. Dabrusin.....	29334
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands).....	29335
Mr. Nater.....	29335
Mr. Beech.....	29336
Mr. Johns.....	29337
Mr. Gerretsen.....	29337
Mr. Barrett.....	29338
Mr. Davies.....	29339
Mr. Kitchen.....	29339
Ms. Lapointe.....	29339

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Taxation

Mr. Ste-Marie.....	29340
--------------------	-------

Sudan

Mr. Bittle.....	29341
-----------------	-------

Alberta

Mr. Jeneroux.....	29341
-------------------	-------

Liberal Party of Canada

Ms. Damoff.....	29341
-----------------	-------

Abitibi-Témiscamingue

Ms. Moore.....	29341
----------------	-------

Veterans

Mr. Housefather.....	29342
----------------------	-------

Natural Resources

Mrs. Stubbs.....	29342
------------------	-------

West Island Cancer Wellness Centre

Mr. Scarpaleggia.....	29342
-----------------------	-------

Long Range Mountains

Ms. Hutchings.....	29342
--------------------	-------

Canada–U.S. Relations

Ms. Alleslev.....	29343
-------------------	-------

Member for Brampton North

Ms. Sahota.....	29343
-----------------	-------

Liberal Party of Canada

Mr. Lamoureux.....	29343
--------------------	-------

Carbon Pricing

Mrs. Block.....	29343
-----------------	-------

Member for West Nova

Mr. Fraser (West Nova).....	29343
-----------------------------	-------

Oil Tanker Moratorium

Mr. Cullen.....	29344
-----------------	-------

Government Policies

Mr. Brassard.....	29344
-------------------	-------

Government Policies

Mr. Bossio.....	29344
-----------------	-------

ORAL QUESTIONS

Natural Resources

Ms. Raitt.....	29344
----------------	-------

Ms. Hajdu.....	29344
----------------	-------

Ms. Raitt.....	29344
----------------	-------

Ms. Hajdu.....	29345
----------------	-------

Ms. Raitt.....	29345
----------------	-------

Ms. Hajdu.....	29345
----------------	-------

Mr. Deltell.....	29345
------------------	-------

Ms. Hajdu.....	29345
----------------	-------

Mr. Deltell.....	29345
------------------	-------

Ms. Hajdu.....	29345
----------------	-------

The Environment

Mr. Singh.....	29345
----------------	-------

Ms. McKenna.....	29345
------------------	-------

Mr. Singh.....	29346
----------------	-------

Ms. McKenna.....	29346
------------------	-------

Housing

Mr. Singh.....	29346
----------------	-------

Mr. Goodale.....	29346
------------------	-------

Mr. Singh.....	29346
----------------	-------

Mr. Goodale.....	29346
------------------	-------

Carbon Pricing

Mr. Rayes.....	29346
----------------	-------

Ms. McKenna.....	29347
------------------	-------

Mr. Rayes.....	29347
----------------	-------

Ms. McKenna.....	29347
------------------	-------

Small Business

Mr. Poilievre.....	29347
--------------------	-------

Mr. Morneau.....	29347
------------------	-------

Mr. Poilievre.....	29347
--------------------	-------

Mr. Morneau.....	29347
------------------	-------

Mr. Poilievre.....	29347
--------------------	-------

Mr. Morneau.....	29347
------------------	-------

Mr. Poilievre.....	29348
--------------------	-------

Mr. Morneau.....	29348
------------------	-------

The Environment

Mr. Boulерice.....	29348
--------------------	-------

Ms. McKenna	29348
Mr. Julian	29348
Mr. Lefebvre	29348
Natural Resources	
Mr. Martel	29348
Ms. McKenna	29348
Mr. Schmale	29349
Mr. Lefebvre	29349
Mrs. Stubbs	29349
Ms. McKenna	29349
Mrs. Stubbs	29349
Mr. Lefebvre	29349
Housing	
Ms. Benson	29349
Mr. Vaughan	29349
Fisheries and Oceans	
Ms. Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	29350
Mr. Wilkinson	29350
Indigenous Affairs	
Mr. Ouellette	29350
Ms. Bennett	29350
The Environment	
Mr. Godin	29350
Ms. McKenna	29350
Mr. Fast	29350
Ms. McKenna	29351
International Trade	
Mr. Berthold	29351
Ms. Bibeau	29351
Foreign Affairs	
Ms. Alleslev	29351
Mr. Oliphant	29351
Government Priorities	
Ms. Ramsey	29351
Ms. Petitpas Taylor	29351
Taxation	
Mr. Dusseault	29351
Mrs. Lebouthillier	29352
Canada Summer Jobs Program	
Mr. Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	29352
Ms. Hajdu	29352
Ms. Harder	29352
Ms. Hajdu	29352
Mr. Strahl	29352
Ms. Hajdu	29352
Health	
Mr. Eyolfson	29353
Ms. Petitpas Taylor	29353
Ethics	
Mr. Kent	29353
Mr. Blair	29353
Telecommunications	
Mr. Dubé	29353

Mr. Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia) ..	29353
Public Safety	
Mr. Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	29353
Mr. Goodale	29353
Softwood Lumber	
Mrs. McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	29354
Mr. Oliphant	29354
Intergovernmental Relations	
Mrs. Gill	29354
Mr. Lametti	29354
Mrs. Gill	29354
Mr. Lametti	29354
Justice	
Mr. Bernier	29354
Mr. Lametti	29354

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Access to Information Act	
Motion	29354
Motion agreed to	29355
Business of Supply	
Opposition Motion—The Environment	
Motion	29356
Mr. Poilievre	29356
Mr. Sorbara	29357
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	29357
Mr. Doherty	29358
Mr. Beech	29359
Mr. Duvall	29359
Mr. Manly	29359
Mrs. Mendès	29360
Mr. Carrie	29361
Ms. Kwan	29361
Ms. Chagger	29362
Mr. Saini	29362
Mr. Kitchen	29363
Ms. Kwan	29364
Mr. Tabbara	29364
Mr. Lloyd	29364
Mr. Gerretsen	29366
Ms. Quach	29366
Mr. Dreeshen	29366
Mr. Gerretsen	29368
Mr. MacGregor	29368
Ways and Means	
Motion No. 34	
Mr. Lamoureux	29369
Motion for concurrence	29369
(Motion agreed to)	29369
Business of Supply	
Opposition Motion—The Environment	
Motion	29369
Mr. MacGregor	29369
Mr. Genuis	29370

Ms. Lapointe	29371	Mr. Julian	29385
Mr. Garrison	29371	Ms. Harder	29385
Mr. Viersen	29373	Mr. Ouellette	29385
Mr. Lamoureux	29373	Mr. Nantel	29385
Ms. Mathysen	29373	Mr. Anderson	29386
Mr. Kitchen	29373	Mr. Strahl	29386
Motion negatived	29376	Mr. Aubin	29386
		Motion agreed to	29388
Main Estimates, 2019-20		Motion in relation to Senate amendments	
Ms. Murray	29376	Motion	29388
Motion for concurrence	29376	Mrs. Block	29388
Motion agreed to	29377	Mr. Beech	29390
Ms. Murray	29377	Mr. Johns	29391
Bill C-102. First reading	29377	Mr. Cullen	29391
(Motion deemed adopted and bill read the first time)	29377	Mr. Cullen	29392
Ms. Murray	29377	(Motion agreed to)	29396
Second reading	29377		
Motion agreed to	29379	Canada-United States-Mexico Agreement Implementa-	
(Bill read the second time and the House went into		tion Act	
committee of the whole thereon, Mr. Bruce Stanton in the		Bill C-100. Second reading	29396
chair)	29379	Ms. Lapointe	29396
(On clause 2)	29379	Mr. Julian	29397
Mr. Deltell	29379	Mr. O'Toole	29398
Ms. Murray	29379	Mr. Masse (Windsor West)	29401
(Clause 2 agreed to)	29379	Mr. McCauley	29401
(Clause 3 agreed to)	29379	Mr. Easter	29402
(Clause 4 agreed to)	29379	Mr. Ste-Marie	29402
(Clause 5 agreed to)	29379	Mr. Ste-Marie	29402
(Clause 6 agreed to)	29379	Mr. Masse (Windsor West)	29403
(Schedule 1 agreed to)	29379	Ms. Dzerowicz	29404
(Schedule 2 agreed to)	29379	Mr. Arnold	29406
(Clause 1 agreed to)	29379	Mr. Masse (Windsor West)	29407
(Preamble agreed to)	29379	Mr. Hardie	29407
(Title agreed to)	29379	Mr. Barrett	29407
(Bill agreed to)	29379	Mr. Masse (Windsor West)	29408
(Bill reported)	29380	Mr. Julian	29409
Motion for concurrence	29380	Mr. Samson	29409
Motion agreed to	29381	Ms. Hardcastle	29410
Ms. Murray	29381	Amendment	29411
Third reading	29381	Mr. Oliphant	29411
Motion agreed to	29383	Mr. Julian	29411
(Bill read the third time and passed)	29383	Mr. Samson	29412
		Mr. O'Toole	29413
Oil Tanker Moratorium Act		Mr. Masse (Windsor West)	29413
Motion That Debate Be Not Further Adjourned		Mr. McCauley	29414
Ms. Chagger	29383	Mr. Julian	29414
Motion	29383	Mr. O'Toole	29414
Mrs. Block	29383	Mr. Easter	29417
Mr. Garneau	29383	Mr. Mendicino	29418
Mr. Doherty	29383	Mr. Manly	29418
Mr. Zimmer	29383	Mr. Fonseca	29419
Mr. Weir	29383	Mr. O'Toole	29420
Mr. Dusseault	29384	Mr. Masse (Windsor West)	29420
Ms. Alleslev	29384	Mr. Boissonnault	29421
Mr. McCauley	29384		
Mr. Champagne	29384		

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>