



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 148 • NUMBER 087 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Tuesday, October 4, 2016

Speaker: The Honourable Geoff Regan

CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, October 4, 2016

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayer

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

•(1005)

[*Translation*]

COMMISSIONER OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

The Speaker: I have the honour to lay upon the table, pursuant to subsection 23(5) of the Auditor General Act, the fall 2016 reports of the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development to the House of Commons. These reports are permanently referred to the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development.

* * *

[*English*]

COMMISSIONER OF OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

The Speaker: I have the honour to lay upon the table the annual reports on the Access to Information Act and the Privacy Act of the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages for the year 2015-16. These reports are deemed to have been permanently referred to the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PUBLIC SAFETY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Ms. Pam Damoff (Oakville North—Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security in relation to its study of operational stress injuries and post-traumatic stress disorder in public safety officers and first responders.

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

NATIONAL CYCLING STRATEGY ACT

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-312, An Act to establish a national cycling strategy.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a private member's bill to establish a Canadian cycling strategy. We need to do more to make Canada a cycling nation. This act would commit the federal government to setting clear targets for the expansion of cycling-friendly infrastructure and would encourage more Canadians to choose cycling as their mode of transportation.

Canada is facing many challenges, including soaring health care and infrastructure costs, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and traffic congestion. Cycling is a sustainable transportation solution. It is low cost, environmentally friendly, eliminates pollution, can be done anywhere in any weather and by any person, and it is healthy.

Cycling advocates have long called for a national cycling strategy where the federal government would work with the provinces and municipalities to increase commuter recreation and tourism cycling across Canada. My bill is for all Canadians, regardless of age, ability, gender, economic status, or location. Together we can make Canada a cycling nation.

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

* * *

PETITIONS

JUSTICE

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am presenting a number of petitions again today that reflect the fact that in our federal criminal law system, a preborn child is not recognized as a victim with respect to violent crime. When a pregnant woman in Canada is assaulted or killed, because we offer no legal protection for preborn children today, no charge can be laid in the death of that preborn child.

The forcing upon a pregnant woman the death or injury of her preborn child is a violation of a woman's rights to protect and give life to her child. Therefore, these petitioners continue to call upon the House of Commons to pass legislation which would recognize preborn children as separate victims when they are killed or injured during the commission of an offence against their mothers.

Government Orders

FALUN GONG

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a number of signatures on a petition from people in Winnipeg regarding Falun Gong, which is a traditional Chinese spiritual discipline that consists of meditation, exercise, and moral teachings based on the principles of truthfulness, compassion, and tolerance. They are asking the House to recognize, in a public way, that we need to call for an end to the persecution of Falun Gong in China.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

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

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

PARIS AGREEMENT

The House resumed from October 3 consideration of the motion, of the amendment, and of the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am very proud to be here this morning participating in this discussion, which is an important one for our country and for the world.

If the right words and an upbeat attitude were all it took to resolve the climate change crisis, Canada would be a world leader, but the fact is that Canada has no credibility on this file because, year after year, it has failed to take action. I will support this one small step this morning, but it will obviously not get us anywhere close to meeting our international obligations, nor does it explain why the government refused to set the limits Canada needs to fulfill its responsibilities under our international obligations.

● (1010)

[*English*]

I am very pleased to speak on this issue. This is the fundamental issue of our time. It is the issue that our grandchildren and our great-grandchildren will judge us by.

I have been in this House for 12 years, and I have seen the complete lack of leadership and abdication of responsibility by Canada that has been a disgrace internationally. I remember being in this House when I was very young at the time, 12 years ago, and there was the now Minister of Foreign Affairs. He was telling us that the Liberals had this brilliant idea to meet Kyoto objectives. They would have voluntary targets. He was saying that voluntary targets are important and that we have to work with industry and we have to be positive in Canada.

We saw where that got us. It got us 12 years of inaction, of Canada looking like the laggard it has been. It is not good enough. We need

to set the hard targets and put out a vision for what a green economy is about. There has been this false dichotomy all along that somehow we have to choose the jobs versus the planet. That has been as opposed to talking about how, when we actually start to look at moving towards a green economy, we can become much more efficient. We will become a much more positive country.

In my own region, because of the push to get to clear greenhouse targets, we have the Borden mine. The greenhouse gas emissions are being completely removed because it is getting rid of diesel. It is moving to battery power. As it starts to move in that direction, it realizes that it can actually cut down its energy costs. This is a really important thing to discuss.

It is not about replacing our sources of energy only. It is about reducing our overall energy use. It does not matter what kind of energy we use, it has an impact. This country has been completely wasteful in its attitude towards energy.

What does a green vision for a nation look like? Well, I would like to think that if we are going to go \$30 billion in debt under the government, that it be a green strategy that says, "We are going to start to retrofit. We are going to encourage families to make their houses more efficient. We are going to work with first nations to get them off the diesel generators." We can do so much to lessen our overall energy inputs.

However, what I see is a government that came in and said that the Stephen Harper targets were false targets. We all know that. We know that the past government had no intention of doing anything on the climate change file. However, the government has accepted the same targets as Stephen Harper. That is not good enough.

When the environment minister talks about keeping us at the 1.5 degree or 2 degree red line, it is an absolutely bizarre conversation in this House, that we can somehow limit the damage to the planet to this level, or we can get up to that level to limit the damage to the planet. We are going to keep carrying on and carrying on. We need to move beyond these tactics and ask what we are going to do as a nation.

The one thing I note, when the government talks about ratifying the Paris agreement and working with the provinces and territories, is that it is not talking about working with the municipalities across this country, which are on the forefront of the fight against climate change. There are so many strategies at the urban levels that could move us toward meeting many of these targets, but we have to work with them. The municipalities are also the ones that are bearing the brunt of climate change, from the extreme fires to the extreme floods. They are having to plan as they start to build infrastructure on how to mitigate the effects.

Government Orders

It is a bubble effect, the Prime Minister saying he can do this here, and within this chamber we can make these changes. Unless we are talking to the people who are on the front lines, we are going to fail. Nowhere is that clearer than with the fact that the government does not believe it has an obligation to discuss with the first peoples of this country that it can bring in these standards, put a carbon price on, and talk about the fictitious numbers they are going to somehow reach if we all stay positive. It is in Indian country that we are at the ground zero of changes that are already happening. These are the melting ice roads, the effect in communities where people cannot afford to go out on the land because the cost of fuel is so high, where the houses are not properly built. People are living in crushing levels of poverty because they cannot pay for the fuel that is being flown in or brought in on barges. We do not have a government that has any kind of vision about moving these communities toward more sustainable greener futures.

How are we going to talk about getting to a better position as a nation if we are not talking with respect, and with our international obligations that have been laid out in UNDRIP, with the first peoples of this country? This leads us to the government's recent pushing of megaprojects: the LNG project that has been described as a carbon bomb, the Site C dam. What is it, \$9 billion to flood out all that land in the Peace River? Imagine what we could do with \$9 billion in British Columbia if we were not destroying indigenous lands and farmland, and we were instead putting solar in houses or getting people on geothermal. That \$9 billion would go a long, long way.

However, with these federal and provincial governments, we have this love of the megaproject. Whether it is a dirty or supposedly clean energy megaproject, they love the big megaprojects. However, they do not want to do the work that is necessary, the talking with indigenous people who are being affected by these time and time again.

Our Prime Minister has an enormous mandate from the Canadian people. He has captured the positive spirit that Canadians have. Canadians want action, and that is why they gave him this unprecedented mandate. They believed that this was the person who could take us to a better place in terms of where we need to be environmentally. When he went to Paris, so many Canadians were proud. They believed our Prime Minister when he said that Canada was back. Canadians want to take these steps and are ready to take these steps. However, if it is going to amount to tens of thousands of dollars or selfie photos in Paris, and coming back and saying that Stephen Harper's plan was not so bad, we will just be a little nicer about it, that is a betrayal of the Canadian people. It is a betrayal of the larger willingness of the Canadian people to get down and do the hard work of climate change.

I come from a blue-collar riding, from agriculture, from mining. Many of our people fly out on contract work to work camps. However, every one of them tells me they are worried about what it looks like for their children. They want a government that is going to start to make some changes. It is not sufficient that we tell ordinary Canadians to turn light bulbs off at night, or that we put a carbon tax on the hydro of poor Mrs. O'Grady. We are downloading the costs to people who cannot afford to pay it. This has to be done at a national level by securing hard targets for industry. We keep talking about a market solution. The market caused the problem. It is up to

government now to legislate clear hard targets so we actually get to where we need to go.

● (1015)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I do concur with the member's comments when he said that the electorate last year recognized the importance of the issue, and in fact, it looks to our Prime Minister today to take actions on the issue. It is really important that we recognize what we are actually doing; and what we are talking about, in good part, is a price on carbon pollution. If we listen to what Canadians want, we will find they are very supportive of that, as they are with respect to the Paris agreement.

When I look at it and listen to my New Democratic friends, I often hear that we are not doing enough, and yet, when I listen to the Conservative Party, I hear that we are doing too much.

At the end of the day, I believe there has been a coming together of leaders from different provinces and territories, indigenous people, and world leaders. They agree that something needs to be done.

This is indeed a great first step.

Would the member not agree?

● (1020)

Mr. Charlie Angus: Madam Speaker, if laziness were a virtue, the Liberals would all be in heaven, because what we are always told is, "Well, the NDP says we're not doing enough and the Conservatives say we're doing too much, so we'll just sit back and enjoy ourselves". That is what got us into this problem.

That is what got us into the problem when the Liberal government did all its talk on Kyoto and did nothing. It said, "As long as we say nice things about the planet, the planet will suddenly get better".

Yes, they have taken some baby steps. However the reality is not what the Democrats say; it is what the Paris accord says.

The government is making it up. It will not tell the truth. Because the Prime Minister has a Haida tattoo and says that the Great Bear Rainforest is no place to run a pipeline and then runs a pipeline through it, that is suddenly okay because he has a Haida tattoo. Well, so what? How about actually meeting the Paris accord? That is the question.

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Madam Speaker, the member mentioned that northern communities, often indigenous, use diesel and that the cost of living is quite high.

Does he believe, under any plan moving forward as a result of the debate we are having regarding the Paris accord and Canada's actions toward it, that these communities should be exempt from it and that the federal government should help them get off diesel and help them become more energy-sufficient communities?

Mr. Charlie Angus: Madam Speaker, I guess it is how we look at moving forward. The issue is that we all recognize it is not credible to have communities in isolated areas living on diesel generators. It is just not good enough.

Government Orders

How do we actually, then, move forward?

We could regulate it, or with government we have enormous tools to find better sources of energy. That is how we need to start thinking.

For communities to have to fly in fuel to run generators is not a credible way of running any kind of first-world nation. We could actually use the incentives of government. There are enormous geothermal, wind, solar, and other options, including biofuels, that we could look at.

If we are going to talk about a \$30-billion deficit, we need to ask how we start putting in smart investments, so that these communities become more sustainable and they are not on the forefront of greenhouse emissions.

Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his very insightful speech. He gets to the point, always.

One thing we need to keep in mind is that, in our subamendment to the motion before us, we say it is not enough just to talk to the provinces and territories; we should also be talking to indigenous leaders and the public.

What does my colleague think about that?

Mr. Charlie Angus: Madam Speaker, I want to thank my hon. colleague for her excellent work on this.

Yes, we are all in this together. If we are going to deal with the crisis of climate change, we need smart solutions—and smart solutions are happening already, on the ground. Municipalities are in the forefront. Indigenous communities have to be part of this conversation. I would think that a government that says it is having a new historic relationship would move beyond just running the pipelines through their territory with the LNG or the Site C and actually talk to the communities that are affected.

Mr. Terry Beech (Parliamentary Secretary for Science, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I will be splitting my time with my friend and colleague the member for Kingston and the Islands.

It is my pleasure to rise today and speak in favour of this motion.

Over the summer, I conducted several town hall and coffee meetings in Burnaby and North Vancouver. At these meetings and on the doorstep, my constituents regularly raised their concerns with regard to the environment and what action this government is taking on climate change.

I spoke of these concerns on August 19 when I presented a report to the TMX ministerial panel in North Vancouver. I would like to read the ninth section of that report, entitled “Decision within the Context of Climate Change”, as I believe it is pertinent to today’s debate:

Climate change is an immediate and significant threat to our communities and our economy.

Within the first thirty days of its mandate, the Federal Government took a leadership role in Paris with regards to tackling climate change.

Canada is providing national leadership on this issue and working with the provinces and territories to take collective action on climate change, put a price on carbon, and reduce carbon pollution.

These targets must recognize the economic cost and catastrophic impact that a greater-than-two-degree increase in average global temperature represents....

This June, Canada committed with the United States and Mexico to a North American Climate, Clean Energy and Environment partnership.

I believe it is our responsibility to create a legislative and market environment where individual consumers and businesses make climate friendly choices not because they are compelled to do so, but because it is the best economic decision. [Pricing carbon pollution] is a means to accomplish this.

Marketwide policy changes will have a more persistent and significant impact on climate change than focusing on the economic and environmental balance of individual projects.

Properly implemented, these policies will also provide greater certainty to decision makers over the long term, eliminating some of the ambiguity that communities and the private sector currently face.

There are more topics and more detail covered in the report, and anyone who is interested can read the full report at *terrybeech-parl.ca*.

However, I do not want to just talk about carbon pricing today, because there are many ways that we can work to reduce our carbon emissions.

One of the most significant immediate actions the international community could take to combat climate change and contribute to the goals of the Paris agreement is to amend the United Nations Montreal protocol to phase down hydrofluorocarbons, or HFCs. HFCs are a family of potent greenhouse gases used as replacements for ozone-depleting chemicals being phased out under the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer. They are greenhouse gases hundreds to thousands of times more potent than carbon dioxide. HFCs are mainly used in refrigeration, air conditioning, insulating foams, and aerosol products.

Scientists estimate that globally over one billion tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent of HFCs is emitted every single year. That is the carbon dioxide equivalent of 291 coal-fired power plants or the annual emission from 211 million passenger vehicles. This number is growing rapidly as the demand for refrigeration and air conditioning is significantly increasing in developing countries.

That is why Canada and the parties to the Montreal protocol are working this year to negotiate an amendment for a global phase-down of HFCs, a move expected to avoid emissions of more than 75 billion tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent by 2050. This equates to up to half a degree Celsius of global warming by the end of this century. What is more, for some applications, replacing HFCs with climate-friendly refrigerants and technologies can improve energy efficiency by up to 50%, which can significantly reduce energy costs for consumers and businesses. Canada has taken a leadership role internationally in efforts to promote an ambitious HFC amendment under the Montreal protocol, notably by joining forces with Mexico and the United States in putting forward a North American proposal to include a phase-down of HFCs.

Government Orders

Moving away from HFCs will not only make an important contribution to combatting climate change, but it will provide companies in Canada and around the world an opportunity to share their expertise in technologies using climate-friendly alternatives, thereby promoting green growth in Canada and internationally. Indeed, some Canadian companies are already ahead of the game by leading the transition to non-HFC technologies. For instance, some Canadian supermarkets are converting their refrigeration systems to very low global warming technologies that are energy efficient and yield significant cost savings. In particular, Sobeys has converted more than 70 of its stores to be climate friendly, and it plans to extend such conversions to its 1,300 stores right across the country.

• (1025)

Meanwhile, major automobile manufacturers operating in Canada have started to manufacture new models with air conditioners using climate-friendly alternatives instead of HFCs.

Parties to the Montreal protocol are to conclude negotiations at their upcoming meeting from October 10 to 14 in Rwanda. In the lead-up to this meeting, Canada has been active in building support around the world for an ambitious HFC amendment. Notably, in July, the Minister of Environment and Climate Change participated in an extraordinary meeting of the parties, where the minister met with representatives of key countries, such as China, India, and Saudi Arabia, which we need to bring on board to ensure a comprehensive and effective HFC phase-down.

The minister has also co-chaired several meetings of “high ambition” countries, which notably contributed to the adoption of a New York declaration by the Coalition to Secure an Ambitious HFC Amendment.

Canada has also explicitly recognized that implementing an HFC amendment will require additional resources to assist developing nations. In that regard, Canada strongly supported the statement in this year's G7 declaration in which Canada and other G7 countries committed to providing additional support, through the Montreal protocol's multilateral fund, to developing countries for the implementation of an amendment.

On September 22, Canada joined a group of 16 industrialized countries in a declaration signalling that they stood ready to provide \$27 million in additional funding to the multilateral fund as soon as 2017 if an amendment was adopted this year. We are not waiting for the adoption of a global agreement in order to take action at home. The Government of Canada plans to publish, by the end of 2016, proposed regulatory measures to implement a phase-down of HFCs in Canada.

However, Canada represents only a small share of global emissions. This is why Canada has not only been pushing for an agreement under the Montreal protocol. It has also undertaken a range of other initiatives internationally to promote action on HFCs in advance of a global phase-down. For instance, Canada is co-leading an HFC initiative under the Climate and Clean Air Coalition to reduce short-lived climate pollutants, an international partnership composed of 50 countries and more than 60 non-governmental organizations. This initiative is active in promoting alternatives to HFCs worldwide through technology conferences, demonstration

projects, and case studies. This will help galvanize political support across the globe for an HFC amendment under the protocol.

In addition, Canada has been collaborating with the World Bank to promote HFC reductions in the World Bank's investment and project portfolio.

In short, Canada is undertaking continuous and targeted efforts, both internationally and domestically, to champion concrete actions on climate change; and yesterday's announcement is just the beginning of what we can do.

• (1030)

Mr. Jamie Schmale (Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock, CPC): Madam Speaker, I represent a largely rural riding. In a lot of cases, farmers have to get their products to market. However, seniors also have to drive great distances to get to things like medical appointments. We all know that this carbon tax will raise the price of everything, including the price of fuel. Therefore, I have a couple of questions.

I would first ask, for my friend, what I am supposed to tell these seniors who are already struggling with the high cost of hydro in Ontario and who are struggling to pay their rent. We have heat banks in Haliburton county to help those who are trying to pay their hydro bill but cannot afford to because they heat with electricity. Now those who are on oil will be using it.

Also, when looking at British Columbia's greenhouse gas emissions as of 2013, when it introduced a carbon tax, we see they are up 4.3% since the 2010 levels. How is this doing anything for the environment? Rather, it appears to be just a tax grab without income tax cuts.

Mr. Terry Beech: Madam Speaker, I am from the province of British Columbia, which was indeed the first province in the country to implement a revenue-neutral carbon pricing system. That system was implemented in 2008. It started at \$10 a tonne and went up by \$5 a tonne until it came to its current level of \$30 a tonne.

I note that the hon. member talked about carbon emissions having gone up. However, that is total emissions. According to *The Economist* in July 2014, in the first six years of the program the per person consumption of fuels dropped by 16% in British Columbia while consumption rose by 3% throughout the rest of the country. This is a province that has had a revenue-neutral carbon pricing regime since 2008, and it just happens to be one of the fastest-growing economies in the country.

• (1035)

Mr. Kennedy Stewart (Burnaby South, NDP): Madam Speaker, in talking about climate change, of course, one of the biggest projects we have on the table here in Canada is the Kinder Morgan pipeline, a new pipeline from Edmonton to Burnaby. In fact, we might call the member for Burnaby North—Seymour the MP for Kinder Morgan, because the pipeline would terminate in his riding.

I oppose this Kinder Morgan pipeline. Could the member stand up in the House and say whether or not he opposes the Kinder Morgan pipeline?

Government Orders

Mr. Terry Beech: Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Burnaby South for his good over the years before I was elected to this place in October 2015. The hon. member was actually my member of Parliament. Now that we are neighbours and he is the critic for science, we have many opportunities to work together.

The specific question of Kinder Morgan is a complex issue. It is an issue that I have spent three years working on, and because it is such a complex issue, I made sure to put my thoughts into a well-thought-out document. It is a 30-minute presentation that I made to the TMX panel. This 12-page report is available on my website at terrybeech-parl.ca. I would encourage anyone who would like to know my position on the Kinder Morgan pipeline to read that document.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I wonder if my colleague could reflect on the statement that what we are really encouraging through this is the idea of a price on carbon pollution.

I think it is really important that we emphasize the word “pollution”, because I believe that Canadians want to see a government that is proactive in protecting our environment, and this is about dealing with carbon pollution. Could the member add a few thoughts along that line?

Mr. Terry Beech: Madam Speaker, as someone who is trained in development economics, putting a price on carbon is one of the best and most efficient ways forward to take true action on climate change. It not only makes sure that everyone in the country is incentivized to take such action, but also increases the timeline under which sustainable forms of energy become cost competitive with traditional fossil fuels.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise today in the House to speak to this important subject. The Paris agreement is without a doubt a watershed moment in the global community's fight against climate change, and it is an honour to be contributing to this historic debate today.

Canadians know that a clean environment and a strong economy go hand in hand. This principle is something I heard from many of my constituents when I hosted a town hall on climate change in June of this year. There is a firm belief in my community that a strong and innovative economy is closely related to a clean environment.

In my riding of Kingston and the Islands, we see innovation happening in many ways. For example, the Engineered Nickel Catalysts for Electrochemical Clean Energy group, an international research project based out of Queen's University, is on the cutting edge when it comes to developing new clean energy technologies. St. Lawrence College, another post-secondary institution in my riding, has emerged as a leader in renewable energy and has focused strongly on applied research and innovation. I highlight these examples because it is important to emphasize that both basic and applied research will have long-term benefits for both our economy and the environment.

While amazing work is being done in my community and across the country, Canada cannot face this challenge alone. That is why my remarks today will focus on how the close relationship between the

environment and the economy is clearly demonstrated through the collective actions we are taking in North America.

By ratifying this agreement Canada would be standing side by side with a number of our closest allies. In particular, I would like to recognize and congratulate two of our continental partners, the United States and Mexico, for their recent ratification of the Paris agreement. This serves as an example for the global community. I look forward to Canada's joining them shortly, along with other nations that have ratified this historic document. In partnership with our friends, the U.S. and Mexico, we are taking important steps to meet our Paris commitments. At the same time, we are growing our economies in a clean and sustainable way.

In March of this year, the Prime Minister visited Washington, D.C. He and President Barack Obama outlined their common vision for a prosperous and sustainable North American economy. They spoke of the opportunities afforded in advancing clean growth.

In their joint statement on climate, energy, and Arctic leadership, they recognized the importance of the Paris agreement as a turning point in global efforts to combat climate change. In short, they saw this as an opportunity to anchor economic growth in clean development, and I could not agree more. They emphasized not only their shared commitment to implementing the Paris agreement but also to advancing climate action globally through other important initiatives such as hydrofluorocarbon phase-down through the Montreal Protocol.

The president and the Prime Minister also undertook to coordinate their domestic actions on climate change. For example, they made a shared commitment to reduce methane emissions from the oil and gas sector, the world's largest industrial methane source, and they reaffirmed their commitment to finalize and implement a second phase of aligned greenhouse gas emission standards for post-2018 on-road heavy-duty vehicles.

Beyond these commitments to reducing greenhouse gas emissions, they also agreed to work closely with indigenous and northern partners to confront the challenges they face in the changing Arctic. Indigenous peoples, particularly those in the north, are often hit the hardest by the effects of climate change. They recognize, perhaps more than most, that we must take decisive action now to protect our planet.

As such, it is incredibly important to take these steps to conserve Arctic biodiversity while working to build a sustainable economy. Part of this means incorporating indigenous science and traditional knowledge in our decision-making.

I am proud that our governments will coordinate domestic climate action and take steps to build a new Arctic leadership model based on partnerships with indigenous and northern communities.

Government Orders

Let me now turn to one of our other continental partners, Mexico. In June, the Mexican president visited Ottawa to affirm the importance of a renewed strategic partnership with Canada, including with respect to the environment. Our countries committed to advancing a North American approach to the creation of a clean growth economy. By this, they meant that we would jointly tackle the causes and impacts of climate change and promote and develop renewable sources of energy to meet our respective challenges.

● (1040)

These bilateral relationships with our partners in North America are incredibly important, but equally important is finding areas where we can all work together to advance a North American approach to climate change and clean energy.

At the end of June, Canada had the honour of hosting the North American leaders' summit, which proved to be an important moment for North American environmental affairs. In the leaders' statement on North American climate, clean energy, and environmental partnership, the three countries committed to a number of important items.

First is advancing clean and secure power, including a historical goal to strive to achieve 50% clean power generation by 2025.

Second is driving down short-lived climate pollutants, including methane, black carbon, and hydrofluorocarbons. This is a critical step, as these short-lived climate pollutants are up to thousands of times more potent than carbon dioxide when it comes to warming. To achieve a reduction in pollution means we have to set bold and ambitious targets. For example, we have committed to reducing methane emissions from the oil and gas sector by between 40% to 45% by 2025.

Third, we agreed to promote clean and efficient transportation through joint actions that would create jobs while reducing energy consumption, greenhouse gases, and air pollution.

Fourth, we committed to protecting nature and advancing science, including conservation and sustainable biodiversity, and to collaborating with indigenous communities and leaders to incorporate traditional knowledge into decision-making.

Fifth, we committed to showing global leadership in addressing climate change. North American leadership is also evident in our work under the International Civil Aviation Organization. Together, we are pursuing the adoption of a global market-based mechanism that aspires to enable carbon neutral growth in international civil aviation.

Furthermore, in July we made significant progress in Vienna toward an amendment under the Montreal Protocol to phase down the production and consumption of HFCs. An HFC phase-down is one of the most significant measures that the world can take to combat climate change and contribute toward the objectives of the Paris agreement.

Our three countries will work together to build on this momentum next week in Rwanda during the 28th meeting of the parties to the Montreal Protocol. We will lead the global community toward an ambitious amendment on HFCs.

Continental co-operation was further demonstrated last month, when the Minister of Environment and Climate Change participated in the annual Commission for Environmental Cooperation council session in Mexico. The CEC is an institution that for over 20 years has brought our countries together to work on our shared environmental challenges. This environmental agreement was Canada's first regional accord to clearly link trade policy with environmental protection, and serves as yet another example of how a healthy economy and a healthy environment must go hand in hand.

The minister and her counterparts from the U.S. and Mexico committed to build on recent regional commitments on the environment. They recognized the need to develop mid-century low-carbon development strategies, reduce short-lived climate pollutants, and phase down HFCs. Canada is now the chair of the CEC, and I am very much looking forward to seeing our country host the organization's annual meeting in Charlottetown next year.

In conclusion, this year has been a busy year for North American co-operation on climate change and the environment. The special friendships and alliances we have on our continent make a strong statement on multilateral collaboration. Going forward, we must continue to advance our shared objectives to reduce climate change while promoting clean economic growth.

As a member of the environment committee, I continually hear that the battle against climate change is taking place on many fronts. We need a comprehensive and holistic approach that includes investing in clean technologies, promoting innovation, funding basic research, expanding our protected spaces, and incorporating sustainable practices across governments.

As parliamentarians, I know we all take the issue of environmental protection seriously. The decision we make will have a profound and lasting impact on generations to come. Ratification is a big step in the right direction. That is why I am urging all of my hon. colleagues to support the motion we have before us today.

● (1045)

Mr. Martin Shields (Bow River, CPC): Madam Speaker, I work with the member on the environmental committee, and appreciate the input and intelligent discussion he brings to our committee. He brought up some excellent points on this today.

Government Orders

Yesterday, he was involved in the discussion on the economics of elasticity and inelasticity. As I understand from my economics courses of many decades ago, there are industries that do become inelastic and die. Therefore, do you believe that in this process there are those whose elasticity can make differences, but there may be also be industries that die because of the circumstances of inelasticity?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I remind the member that he should speak through the Speaker, because I will not give you my opinion on that at this point.

The hon. member for Kingston and the Islands.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, I would love to hear your personal opinion on this. We will save that for another day.

I appreciate my colleague's question and opportunity to address this topic again. Yes, some industries are inelastic. They do not change. We are forced to pay what the price demands. However, the whole point behind government intervention is this. If the government can intervene, it can help to change habits, in this case creating and developing new technologies so those technologies can become more available, for example, electric cars. If they become more available because of the changes being implemented here, then the elasticity of electric cars, and hence somebody's ability to drive, becomes more available and the prices will fluctuate more with respect to the demand of the market.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Madam Speaker, I listened with great interest to my hon. colleague, but I missed the point. The point was the NDP amendment on the fact that the Liberals have excluded their obligations to negotiate and discuss with indigenous Canadians and indigenous leaders on this.

This is our attempt to help the Liberals. The Liberals talk a lot, but man, they really get bogged down when it actually comes to doing something right. For example, five chiefs fly to Ottawa to talk to the government about LNG and they are told that their meeting is cancelled because people are in Vancouver doing a photo op. The chiefs thought they would be getting discussions on site C, but the Minister of Environment and Climate Change and the Minister of Justice said that they could not discuss that because it was in court, so they will just approve the permits. That is not a relationship.

Will my hon. colleague support our amendment to ensure the government is obligated to involve the indigenous leaders of our country in the climate plan, because the Liberals have left it out? Maybe they are just excited. Maybe because they are a new government, they just forgot to include indigenous Canada. Maybe it is part of a disturbing pattern. Perhaps this debate and the subamendment will help us to find out where the Liberals are going on this issue.

•(1050)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's willingness to want to help the Liberal Party. That is very endearing of him.

However, as I stated throughout my speech, all three governments, in particular, the U.S. and Canada, have committed to having discussions with our indigenous communities. It is very important.

There is no doubt that climate change will affect our most northern communities first.

Do I support the idea of communicating and engaging with our indigenous communities? Absolutely. It is fundamental to any discussion that we have throughout our country on virtually any topic.

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with my friend from Oshawa.

My grandparents were my inspiration for my involvement in politics. My maternal grandmother was a Jewish child who grew up in Nazi Germany, and taught us up the importance of universal human rights. My grandfather was an engineer who worked for Syncrude in Alberta in the 1970s and 1980s. My grandfather made sure that we understood the devastating impact that bad and capricious government policy could have on the lives of ordinary hard-working men and women, men and women who, from the stroke of a Prime Minister's pen, could lose the ability to make a decent living for themselves and their families. This is his story.

My grandfather was born in Toronto in 1922. His parents came to Canada during the Irish potato famine. Even in Canada, he grew up poor. He studied engineering at U of T. He told us that he got good grades in the first year, and then he joined a fraternity. He went on to travel the world, practising his craft in the U.S., the Philippines, Venezuela, and Ecuador, where he met my grandmother at a house party.

Neither of my grandparents were political people in the same way that I am, but they were people whose lives were affected by politics. They settled in BC upon returning to Canada, and then moved to Alberta in 1975. Then, along with an entire generation of long-term and brand-new Albertans alike, my grandfather saw the economic health of Alberta collapse around him under the weight of the national energy program.

This is a common Alberta story, but it was a shock for me to discover, upon starting university in Ontario, that many people in this part of the country had not even heard of the national energy program. For those unfamiliar, the national energy program was a policy of the last Trudeau government that forced oil produced in Alberta to be sold at below market prices. Predictably, oil companies reduced production as a result, reducing wealth and benefiting no one. The program cost Alberta between \$50 billion and \$100 billion. Bankruptcies increased by 150%. We took decades to recover.

Albertans are not bitter people. We are proud and optimistic Canadians. We are proud to do our share, and more than our share. We are not bitter people but we will never forget, and indeed we will be ever vigilant. People like my grandfather, who were hit by the national energy program, were not privileged aristocrats, they were not big banks and they were not oil companies. They were ordinary people who came to one of those beautiful places in the world where hard work was enough.

Government Orders

There is not much so-called old money in Alberta. When Alberta is booming, anyone can make it. It does not matter where people come from or who their parents are. If people are willing to work, then they can make it in Alberta. When Alberta does well, everyone does well. When Alberta does poorly, everyone does poorly.

The national energy program was a high-minded elite scheme that hit ordinary people hard. Here is another thing about it. It was just plain stupid. It did not make sense. Reducing Canadian oil production did not make the east better off, it did not move jobs to other parts of the country; it just killed them.

It is 2016, but 2016 is apparently the new 1980. The Liberal government has once again turned its back on ordinary, decent, hard-working women and men who work in Alberta's energy industry, and all the interrelated jobs in Alberta and from coast to coast.

The government has announced that it is intent on imposing a national carbon tax. If provinces refuse to participate, then the Prime Minister will impose a jurisdiction-specific tax on that province. To my knowledge, this is the first time in Canadian history that we have a prime minister who wants to impose a punitive tax on some jurisdictions and not others in response to what it views is supposed to be their areas of jurisdiction.

What happened to national unity? What happened to working with the provinces? What happened to consultation? This announcement happened while provincial environment ministers were supposed to be discussing the way forward. A prime minister has not behaved this disdainfully toward the provinces in 35 years.

Let us talk about the policy here. Imposing a carbon tax will make it harder to do business in Canada. It will make it more expensive to produce energy. It will make it more expensive to eat, to travel, to heat homes. In the process it will reduce the production and consumption of goods in Canada.

We can hope that Canadian energy production will become more efficient in the coming years, and thus reduce emissions, but a punitive tax is probably more likely to reduce emissions by reducing production. It is not much of a win if that production is replaced by production in less environmentally friendly jurisdictions. The economic theory predicts that taxing a thing reduces its production, but it does not predict the mechanism by which that will occur. In the context of international competition and an already struggling energy markets, it is most likely that a blunt-ended new tax will just see investments not get made.

• (1055)

Canada accounts for less than 2% of global greenhouse gas emissions, so doing our part does not mean cutting ourselves off at the knees to reduce that amount marginally. We can actually do much better than that. We can look for policy solutions that incentivize innovation without incentivizing reduced production.

I would support binding sector-by-sector intensity-based regulations which would require companies to innovate and reduce emissions, but which would also allow them to admit more if they were producing more. I would also support additional incentives for new projects which produced energy in more efficient ways, not just wind and solar but natural gas and energy production that involved effective carbon sequestration.

This is not just hypothetical. Conservatives in office reduced greenhouse gas emissions. GHG emissions went down by 1% from 2006 to 2014 because of this suite of policies, even while they surged under the previous Liberal government. Our critics will say that they went down because of the global economic crisis, an event, incidentally, that they only seem to remember when they talk about the environment. However, the facts do not support that at all. While we were reducing emissions in Canada, global emissions grew by 16%, and we were one of the countries least affected by the global economic recession. Further, while decreasing emissions by 1%, we oversaw GDP growth of 35%.

Other critics will say that emissions only went down under the Conservatives because of policies in Ontario, but in reality emissions increased in every province under the previous Liberal government. Then, under the Conservatives, emissions in every province either went down or increased by a much lower amount than they did under the previous government.

Emissions reductions were not just happening in one province. The facts show that under the leadership of prime minister Stephen Harper, real improvements on greenhouse emissions were evident in every jurisdiction from coast to coast. Those are the numbers and members can check them.

An approach that encourages cleaner production as opposed to less production is good for the environment and it is good for the economy. However, an approach that taxes Canadians and Canadian companies, forcing them to produce less and lay people off, is terrible for the economy and does nothing for the environment as other countries pick up the slack. Let us not forget that China is building a new coal plant every week. Maybe the Prime Minister wants to extradite our coal industry to China, but I would like to keep energy jobs in Canada.

This is just like the national energy program, a proposal that kills jobs and reduces production without actually addressing the problem that it is supposed to address. Some Liberals will say that a carbon tax is a market mechanism. This is sort of like saying that eating a doughnut on the bleachers at a basketball game counts as going to the gym. It is formally correct, but substantively misleading.

I am not sure that the Liberals and the New Democrats believe in market mechanisms in any event, but just to make the point entirely clear, I think it would be considered a market mechanism if it uses market forces to drive behaviour. However, the value of that market mechanism is entirely dependent on its effects. A market mechanism which incentivizes good behaviour is likely good. A market mechanism which incentivizes bad behaviour is likely not.

Government Orders

Here is a simple comparison for hon. members. The United States has experimented with private prisons. Private prisons insert market incentives into prison administration, but they are the wrong kind of market incentives because prison operators do not have any incentive to encourage rehabilitation. In fact, they have every incentive to encourage recidivism and therefore repeat business. One might say that private prisons involve a market mechanism, but it is still a bad market mechanism.

The same is true of carbon taxes. One reduces one's carbon tax take by cutting production, killing jobs, and moving jobs overseas. Again, this might be markets in action, but it is still a bad outcome.

Many of us hear from time to time from representatives of different energy companies, but the government needs to spend more time listening to energy workers. "Bernard the Roughneck" is one of those workers, a young man who came to Parliament Hill two weeks ago to tell his story. This is what he had to say, "We've got people from all over this country coming to Alberta....These are places that you can go being an average person, and if you're willing to work hard and work more than 40 hours a week and bust your butt you can have something and you can have a decent quality of life. I would never have been able to get an education were it not for the oil patch."

Bernard and so many other young Canadians did what my grandfather did. They came to Alberta, they busted their butts, and they made something for themselves and their families. Listening to Bernard's presentation struck a chord with many Albertans, because we or our families have been there before. However, now we are going back to a place of economic policy, which, to be frank, is just plain stupid. It will have a devastating impact on regional and national economies. We cannot let this happen again.

• (1100)

Mr. Omar Alghabra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs (Consular Affairs), Lib.): Madam Speaker, the Conservative Party is against reforming our pension plan. The Conservative Party is against reforming our electoral system. The Conservative Party is against combatting climate change.

Does the member not believe that climate change is caused by carbon emissions? If he believes that, does he not believe that a government has a responsibility to help reduce carbon emissions? If he believes that, does he not believe that carbon emissions must be priced? If he believes that, can he tell us how he expects the government to put a price on carbon?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, it will not surprise members to know that I quarrel with almost the entire premise of my colleague's question. However, to very specifically answer if I believe that carbon emissions cause climate change, and if I believe in the science of anthropomorphic climate change, yes I do, and so does my party. Do I think that we need a policy response? Yes.

What do I think that policy response is? I outlined it in detail in my speech. It is a policy response that not only works in theory but works in practice. We reduced emissions, and I went over the numbers, by 1% under the tenure of the previous Conservative government, which is far better than the previous Liberal government did. We did it while GDP went up 35%, and while global greenhouse gas emissions went up by 16%.

The member should look at our record if he wants to know what it takes to get it done. It is very clear in the numbers, and it was not only in some jurisdictions but across every single jurisdiction in Canada that we made significant progress on these issues.

Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, I listened with great interest to my colleague from Alberta espousing support by his party for cleaner energy production.

I wonder if the member shares my disappointment in his party's failure, in the decade it was in power, to take more strident measures to phase-out coal-fired power. Under his government's tenure, it failed to introduce binding federal regulations to reduce mercury, which Alberta, to its credit, did. Now, other coal-fired power plants in Canada do not have to reduce mercury. Second, the Canadian Medical Association has said that, due to the serious health impacts and deaths associated with coal-fired power, we must move expeditiously to phase-out coal.

Does the member share my disappointment in his party's failure to support Alberta's measures?

• (1105)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, this is really curious, because in my speech I laid out specific numbers in terms of policies undertaken and reductions achieved. However, my colleagues in other parties continue to want to cast aspersions without the facts of the record of the previous government.

With respect to my friend for Edmonton Strathcona, your saying it does not make it true. The record of what happened under the previous Conservative government is very clear. Therefore, if you say nothing was done, if you say emissions were not reduced, well, all Canadians have to do is look at the facts, look at the record.

With respect to coal, let me be very clear that the previous Conservative government did put regulations in place, but they are regulations that respect the reality that we are dealing with in an internationally competitive environment, one in which China adds a coal plant every single week. Therefore, we have to proceed in a way that has an effective suite of policies that address environmental challenges while strengthening our economy at the same time.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I will remind the member to address his questions to the Chair. He can make his comments to the Chair and not "you". Again, I just want to redirect that.

The hon. member for Oshawa may have a very brief question, please.

Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC): Madam Speaker, I listened to my colleague's wonderful speech and he asked about the approach of the Prime Minister. I would ask him what he actually expects, because the Prime Minister said he admires the basic dictatorship of China. His idea of consultations is that he has already decided, with the environmental consultations going on, the health accord consultations, and the electoral reform consultations.

Government Orders

This is what we expect from the government. The challenge we have is this: what is this approach going to do to our international competitiveness?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, that was a great question from my colleague and I look forward to hearing his speech next.

On the issue of process, we have a Prime Minister who had initially said he would negotiate and discuss these issues in good faith with the provinces, but then right in the midst of a meeting, he declared unilaterally that the federal government would impose punitive taxes on provinces that do not agree. This is hardly collaborative federalism.

I believe that it was Premier Wall who said that the provincial meeting was not worth the carbon emissions it took to get the ministers there. It certainly was not if the Prime Minister was not actually prepared to listen to what ministers were saying, if he already had a policy course in place. This shows profound disrespect for provinces, which are actually the ones that will have to do a lot of the practical on-the-ground implementation. It is the wrong approach for Canada. It is not going to help achieve results.

Again, the government should look at the record of the previous Conservative government, which actually achieved concrete results in this respect.

Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC): Madam Speaker, I rise in the House today to participate in what I hope to be a robust debate on the government's initiatives to lower greenhouse gas emissions. I had the chance to review the Paris accord as well as the Vancouver declaration, and while I do agree with the government's decision to ratify the Paris agreement, I cannot support the Vancouver declaration, which, in my opinion, encroaches on provincial and territorial rights.

After calling our previous Conservative government's carbon emission targets unambitious, I am pleased to see that the Liberals are in fact using the nationally determined contribution, the NDC targets, that we had set. This 30% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2030 is an ambitious goal that once again shows that Conservative policies are the best policies.

I want to elaborate on why I cannot support the motion. The Minister of Environment and Climate Change has repeatedly interpreted the Vancouver declaration as justification for the imposition of a national price on carbon on the provinces and the territories. The premier of Saskatchewan, the premier of Nova Scotia, and three territorial premiers have all opposed the imposition of a federal carbon tax and have openly disputed the Prime Minister's interpretation of the Vancouver declaration.

The Prime Minister campaigned and made a promise to work collaboratively with the provinces and territories on a pan-Canadian framework for addressing climate change. That is what he promised just last year. He has now backpedalled again, just like he did with election reform, just like he did with the health accord. He has decided to just go it alone.

This now means that instead of working with the provinces and territories, the Liberals will impose a dictatorial price of carbon on any province that does not come up with one of its own. He has given two options. One is the cap-and-trade system that is being

proposed in Ontario. I want members across the way to Google "cap-and-trade scandal Europe" and see what comes up. The other option he has given is a carbon tax, which we all know is a tax on everything.

As Premier Wall stated, this is not the collaborative approach that the Prime Minister promised when he was elected. Just yesterday, we learned that the price on carbon would start at \$10 per tonne in 2018 and will continue to rise by \$10 per tonne each year until it reaches \$50 per tonne in 2022. This was a unilateral federal decision. While the Liberals claim to be working collaboratively with the provinces and territories, the Prime Minister decided to only give two options for implementing that price. I repeat, it is a direct price on carbon or a cap-and-trade system, which was full of fraud in Europe.

This proposal would cost individual taxpayers thousands of dollars every year and it would also be the contributor to a massive new tax on consumers, the equivalent of an unbelievable 11.5¢ per litre of gasoline. The Liberals' plan to increase the overall tax burden on Canadians is something that I and the Conservative Party are firmly against. While I think all members of the House would agree that we must do our part to lower greenhouse gas emissions, we must do so without raising taxes on hard-working Canadian families. It is possible to protect the environment without taxing Canadians and businesses to death.

Our previous Conservative government recognized that Canada had to do its part by addressing our own emissions, which represented only 1.6% of global greenhouse gas emissions, which is important. We worked with the World Bank to assist countries that were especially vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change. We invested in 19 new green technology projects under the Asia-Pacific partnership on clean development and climate. We invested in carbon capture technology, protected record numbers of parkland, and made historic investments in wetland and boreal forest restoration and protection, adding to Canada's capacity to absorb global greenhouse gas emissions. This is something we should be really proud of and something that Canada needs to be given credit for.

In fact, our policies were the first in Canadian history to see greenhouse gas emissions reduced. Our previous Conservative government had a plan and that plan continues today. We are the only party that is committed to preserving and protecting Canada's environment for future generations, while keeping taxes on Canadians and job creators low.

• (1110)

As the member of Parliament for Oshawa, ensuring businesses remain competitive internationally is extremely important to me and to my constituents. With General Motors being a huge employer in my riding, it is vital that Canada remains competitive on the world stage. My constituents continue to voice their concerns and express to me that the Liberals' plan to impose mandatory carbon taxes will, first, kill jobs; second, as we have seen in Ontario, hurt Ontario's competitiveness; and third, eventually destroy the manufacturing industry in my province.

Government Orders

Both provincial and federal Liberals continue to implement job-killing taxes. We have seen increases to the Canadian pension plan, and now the Liberals are forcing a price on carbon. This is all happening while Ontario's energy rates have become the costliest in North America. These policies are making Canada, but more specifically, my province of Ontario, less competitive. These policies do not benefit manufacturers. They do not benefit hard-working Canadians, and they do not benefit my riding of Oshawa.

The Conservative Party cannot support any policy that will increase the overall tax burden on Canadians. Instead of raising taxes, we should be looking at alternative solutions to lowering global greenhouse gas emissions.

Let us take a look at what is happening around the world today. We have 2,400 new coal plants being constructed or planned to be constructed in developing countries. At the end of 2015, alone, China and India managed to build 665 new coal stations, with plans to build additional 665 plants in the future. That is 1,330 new coal plants in just two countries.

With Canada contributing only 1.6% of global greenhouse gas emissions, our focus should be on helping other countries reduce their emissions from coal-fired power plants. We know the great technology in Saskatchewan. We have seen it. We have done it in Canada. The Prime Minister is failing to promote those technologies around the world.

This would have a bigger impact on reducing emissions globally, in comparison with implementing a mandatory national carbon tax on the provinces. As my colleague stated yesterday, it is scientifically proven that Canada could completely eliminate its carbon footprint and it would not stop or help resolve the issue of global warming.

Our previous Conservative government invested in carbon capture and storage technology, as I said. This could help other countries, such as China and India, reduce their emissions from coal-fired power plants, which ultimately would have a much larger impact on the reduction of global greenhouse gas emissions.

Once again, I am happy to support the Paris agreement, which commits countries, such as Canada, to finding solutions in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. I am really pleased, as well, as I said earlier, that the Liberals recognized that the targets set by the previous Conservative government were not unambitious, as they repeatedly stated.

I do, however, have concerns about the way the Liberals have interpreted the Vancouver declaration, as it is clearly not the same way the premiers have interpreted it. In typical Liberal fashion, the actual meaning and significance of the Vancouver declaration was not made clear enough. The fact that numerous premiers have come out against the Liberals' plan shows that an agreement was not reached. It seems that the Prime Minister's promised new era of collaboration with all levels of government has actually failed.

What we are seeing is Liberal collaboration, and basically, their idea of that is a fraud. They have already decided what they are going to do before discussions are even started. We have seen this over and over again. As I said earlier, it is the same with democratic reform. They made up their minds before they started the

consultation. It is the same with the health accord. They have already made up their minds before opening these discussions. Instead of using a sledgehammer to force the provinces and territories, the Liberals are imposing this massive tax grab on Canadians against their will.

I think any Canadian who is reasonable understands the importance of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Canadians are collaborative people. We want to work together. We want to work together with our partners around the world. However, we do not want to do it in a way that is going to kill our own economy.

As I mentioned, I am from Ontario. We have seen over 300,000 manufacturing jobs lost. These are good-quality manufacturing jobs. One manufacturing job in Oshawa has a spinoff of seven to 10 other jobs in the community.

Why have manufacturers left? It is very simple. Just next door, in the United States, instead of having the highest electrical rates, they have competitive electrical rates. They do not have new taxes such as the CPP doubling, and they certainly do not have a state or a national carbon tax. We need to use common sense here.

● (1115)

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am very glad to hear that the member opposite supports the Paris agreement. I look forward to seeing his vote in that regard.

Let us be clear that our government is committed to meeting our international obligations. We actually have a plan to do so. Previous governments set a target without a plan.

When it comes to the action yesterday, I am very pleased. We have set out two lanes. We have 80% of Canadians who already live in a jurisdiction where there is a price on carbon, through the leadership of provinces like British Columbia, Alberta, Ontario, and Quebec. We have been very clear that this is not a cash grab. This is the way to move forward, and provinces have the opportunity to determine how they would like to use the revenues. They are able to do like British Columbia has done and make it revenue neutral. They return the revenues in the form of a tax cut to consumers and small businesses.

I would like the member opposite to comment on Suncor's support yesterday:

We support a broad-based price on carbon as an important tool to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the fight against climate change. And we will continue to participate in this important policy discussion.

We listen to job-makers. I would like to know if the member opposite does as well.

Government Orders

Mr. Colin Carrie: Madam Speaker, I am happy to respond to what Suncor said, because big corporations will just pass it on to everyday Canadians. As they increase the cost of running factories, running their operations, who pays? It is the average, everyday working Canadians.

I am glad the Minister of Environment and Climate Change stood up, because I am interested to hear what she has to say about the misinformation being put out there that the price on carbon will do anything to lower greenhouse gas emissions.

Our government was the first one to see greenhouse gas emissions actually drop. Under the previous Liberal government, they actually rose over 30%. We are down now at 1.6% of global greenhouse gas emissions.

The minister uses information and words like “carbon pollution”. As we breathe, we are breathing out carbon. The only reason the Liberals call it pollution is because they want to tax it.

How long will it be before this minister will want to charge taxes on exhalations by humans? The Liberals have not seen a tax they do not like. They will tax carbon, air, water. We just do not know what will come next after this minister.

• (1120)

Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, I would like to put a question to the hon. member.

He makes the case that we not be trying to reduce carbon pollution because it will download the costs to ordinary Canadians. If I follow his logic, that also means we should shred all the laws that we have put in place over 40 to 50 years to reduce mercury, to reduce sulphur dioxide, to reduce NOx, to reduce particulate, because when the companies start to spend the dollars to put in place the technology to do so, they raise their prices.

Is the hon. member saying that we should also shred those laws?

Mr. Colin Carrie: Madam Speaker, the misinformation coming from this member is amazing. I did not say that. What I said is that we have to show the proof.

The hon. member has a computer there. She can google “cap and trade”, “Europe”, and “scandal” and see what actually happened. What we want to do and what our government did is to take a real approach, a regulatory approach to lowering greenhouse gas emissions. What does the NDP want to do? It just wants to raise taxes even more. It wants to put unrealistic expectations on industry. Just ask Alberta.

The hon. member does not remember that her former leader, Jack Layton, wanted an 80% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2050. That would have killed our economy. Canada is a resourced based economy, a manufacturing based economy, and a value-added based economy.

The only way to get to those targets the NDP would like us to reach would be to shut down every single industry, every single home, every single method of transportation. There is not even technology out there to have solar airplanes. New Democrats are talking about technologies they think will happen in the future. This is unrealistic and we have to be very cautious, because right now the Canadian economy is fragile, and with the Liberal government's tax

and spend policies, our competitiveness and place in the world is deteriorating.

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is a privilege to rise here today to address hon. members and all Canadians about the importance of ratifying the Paris agreement.

Today the world is at a turning point as the effects of climate change are already being felt. We know that 2015 was the hottest year in recorded history and that before that, so was 2014. Scientists now tell us that 2016 is on track to shatter those records. Decade over decade we have seen increases in temperature. Climate change is real. We can already see and feel the impacts, from the heating oceans to rapid species extinction, to wildfires that rage longer and more harshly than ever before, and the list goes on.

With this great challenge of our time comes great opportunity.

In Paris, after intense and rigorous discussions, the world finally decided to act. For the first time in history almost 200 countries agreed that future generations deserve better.

The story of Paris was an overwhelmingly positive one, and we can be very proud of the role that Canada played. Our delegation included provincial and territorial premiers, mayors, indigenous leaders, and members of the opposition, who worked passionately to bring consensus. In Paris there was an understanding that by taking action now by reducing carbon pollution we would not only stave off the worst effects of climate change but also spark innovation and drive growth across our economy.

As I said, with this great challenge comes great opportunity.

Now here at home Canadians are demanding that we honour our commitment in Paris. Our MPs attended town halls across this country this summer. From Newfoundland to British Columbia, Canadians are calling for our country to lead. Thousands took the time to participate in our online consultations and in town halls in their communities. We have heard from Canadians, young and old, from businesses and labour organizations, from scientists, environmentalists, and indigenous peoples.

Canadians know that future generations deserve healthy cities, diverse economic opportunities, and pristine rivers and lakes. Ultimately, this is the legacy that we will all leave behind, and today, by ratifying the Paris agreement, Canada will become a leader in this new era.

The path forward will not always be easy, as there is much work to do. Years of inaction and indifference here in Canada and around the world have undermined our collective ability to protect our planet and protect our future. What should interest us now is doing something about it. That means ending the cycle in which federal governments have set targets without a corresponding plan. After years of inaction, today we are getting the work done.

Government Orders

During the election last year our party set forth a comprehensive plan to address climate change, and Canadians voted overwhelmingly in favour. We promised to invest in clean transportation systems, to upgrade our infrastructure for the 21st century, and to invest in renewable energy. In our very first budget we stayed true to our promises. We committed over \$60 million for clean transportation, \$2 billion to communities to improve their water infrastructure and make buildings more energy efficient, and over \$1 billion to support clean technology projects.

Canadians wanted change and we are delivering.

● (1125)

[*Translation*]

Creating good jobs for middle-class Canadians is part of our commitment, as is our \$120-billion investment in infrastructure over the next 10 years.

We will create jobs by updating our regulations in the construction and technology sectors. The new regulations will integrate scientific knowledge on climate change. We will create jobs in the area of new technologies and construction by investing in the infrastructure that supports alternative modes of transportation, such as electric vehicle charging stations and natural gas fuelling stations for hydrogen vehicles.

Throughout our history, as a nation, we have made investments to improve Canadians' quality of life and to create opportunities, such as building our railroads and the Trans-Canada Highway.

We can learn from our predecessors, who had the courage to make tough decisions. We, too, can take this important step in the right direction and make the right decisions for future generations.

Canadians deserve a public transit system that relieves traffic congestion in our cities and reduces pollution. These may not be grandiose changes, but I can assure hon. members that these changes are essential.

We will continue to work with all levels of government to create an infrastructure plan that meets the real needs of Canadians, with a focus on sustainable communities and a clean economy.

[*English*]

Of course, there are cynics who say we should not try. They say that if we address climate change our economy will suffer. They could not be more wrong. The truth is that our economy suffers when we do not address climate change.

Earlier, I discussed the wildfires that burn each summer in our country, stoked by changes to our climate. The Insurance Bureau of Canada has estimated that the costs of recent fires could be \$3.5 billion. Experts and insurance companies alike agree that the damage caused by the increased frequency of natural disasters will have a very heavy economic toll. This is a major reason to act.

However, it is not all doom and gloom. Simply put, there are billions of dollars and hundreds of thousands of good, well-paying jobs on the table for countries that get this right. Engineering and design jobs in the clean energy sector; manufacturing jobs, whether of solar panels or electric vehicles; and jobs researching and processing biofuels are just a few examples.

By pricing carbon pollution, by pricing what we do not want, we can also be proactive rather than reactive to the realities of climate change. Members do not have to take my word for it. This past summer, business leaders from across the country lent their support to pricing carbon pollution, including retail leaders such as Canadian Tire, Loblaws, IKEA, and Air Canada; energy producers such as Enbridge, Shell and Suncor; resource companies such as Barrick Gold, Resolute Forest Products, and Teck Resources; and financial institutions, including BMO, Desjardins, Royal Bank, Scotiabank, and TD.

Suncor CEO Steve Williams stated, "We think climate change is happening. We think a broad-based carbon price is the right answer".

Cenovus Energy released a statement that, "Having a price on carbon is one of the fairest and best ways to stimulate innovation to reduce the emissions associated with oil".

These companies understand that when we pressure industry, when we put the right incentives in place, we unleash the market potential of our inventors, engineers, and entrepreneurs to innovate and create. These companies understand that as the world moves forward toward a low carbon economy, it is market pressure that will unlock Canadian innovation and allow us to stay competitive in the 21st century. We will continue to use older forms of energy, but we must take advantage of the staggering opportunities unfolding.

In 2015, there was a major global shift. Close to a third of a trillion dollars was invested globally in renewable power, almost double the amount invested in fossil fuels.

Mark Carney, the Governor of the Bank of England, recently said that renewable energy investments represent a future market in the trillions of dollars. As he reiterated in another speech in Berlin, "The more we invest with foresight, the less we will regret in hindsight".

It is now time to signal to investors that Canada will take an active part in a low carbon economy.

John Kerry, the U.S. Secretary of State, who represents the largest economy in the world, has said, "The global energy market of the future is poised to be the largest market the world has ever known".

There is no time for cynics. The business case is clear. Canada must lead, and we are.

● (1130)

Today the opportunities for Canadians are growing. Canada is blessed with bountiful resources. Our forebears hunted and fished in our forests. Coal and oil helped thrust our ships across the ocean, and propelled our trains from the Canadian Shield to the Pacific Ocean. Today, this legacy continues and at the same time has evolved.

Government Orders

Wind, solar, and geothermal energy sources are plentiful and now course through our electric grid. Our buildings are becoming more efficient and our transportation cleaner. Today, education and research in renewables is occurring across the country. Just this summer, the *Edmonton Journal* reported that students in Alberta are scrambling to take courses in solar panel installation at the Northern Alberta Institute of Technology. Other courses cannot keep up with demands. Many of those interested are electricians, and they see renewable energy as a natural progression for their trade. The same tools and knowledge that they use in one sector are transferring fluidly to the renewable energy sector. As one of the teachers in the article explained, the students know that this is the future and they are excited.

Since 2000, the amount of global electricity produced by solar power has doubled seven times. Wind power doubled four times over the same period. Here in Canada, Alberta is committed to generating 30% of its energy from renewables by 2030. In Saskatchewan, the province-owned utility, SaskPower, decided to one-up its neighbour and committed to 50% renewable energy by 2030. The opportunity for renewable energy extends into our oceans. In Nova Scotia, the Fundy Ocean Research Centre for Energy is leading Canada's efforts as a test centre of tidal energy technology. The latest research suggests that there are more than 7,000 megawatts of potential in Nova Scotia's Minas Passage alone, with a potential for 50,000 megawatts of energy through the Bay of Fundy.

The implementation of these technologies, and the research and know-how to create them, will require well-paying and skilled jobs from across our workforce.

Yesterday, I met in Montreal with environment ministers from every province and territory. First ministers stood together in March and committed to putting this country on a credible path to our Paris commitments. Since then, we have been working hard to do that. One of the topics on the agenda was how to price pollution. I will get to that, but first I want to say that carbon pricing was not the only subject on the table. Far from it.

Yesterday environment ministers came together and agreed on a framework for addressing climate change to send to premiers and to the Prime Minister. That framework included efforts to reduce emissions from our building stock, efforts to ramp up clean electricity across the country, plans for the collaboration of how we can adapt to the changes we are already facing, and ways to encourage innovation in clean technologies. Done right, this will create good middle-class jobs, grow our economy, and reduce pollution, including greenhouse gases. These are also essential pieces of a meaningful path forward on reducing climate pollution in this country. I want to thank all of my colleagues for the excellent work they have put into our discussions over the last six months.

Yesterday, we also spent two hours meeting with first nations, Métis, and Inuit leaders. In Canada, achieving the vision of the Paris agreement will require the inclusion and leadership of indigenous peoples. That is why the Canadian delegation played a key role in seeing that the agreement identified the need to respect the rights of indigenous peoples and consider traditional knowledge when taking climate action.

Our decision to include indigenous voices in Canada's official delegation demonstrates how seriously our government takes our commitments under the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. It reflects the deep commitment of our government to renew the relationship between Canada and indigenous peoples. Ensuring indigenous voices are heard is the essence of meaningful collaboration, especially where issues are as complex as climate change. That is why indigenous peoples have been included in the working group process over the last six months and have submitted detailed proposals to ministers on their priorities for a Canadian framework on climate change. We will continue to bring indigenous peoples into the decision-making process, strengthening our relationship to create better outcomes for all Canadians.

• (1135)

We have invested in our future to upgrade our infrastructure and install clean technologies, but let us be clear, to advance our goals we must also price carbon pollution.

Let me just say that about 40 countries around the world are pricing carbon. Why? Carbon pricing is the most economically effective way to reduce emissions and stimulate clean innovation, which will all be critical to Canada's success in a changing global economy.

A rising carbon price is critical to putting Canada on a path to meeting its Paris climate commitments and to building the foundation for a cleaner and stronger economic future. A well-designed plan will secure Canadian competitiveness in jobs while buffering any disproportionate impacts on vulnerable populations and sectors.

The idea is simple: let us put a price on what we do not want, pollution. Right now, polluters are not paying their fair share of the environmental damage they cause. Let us be clear: polluting is not free. The bill will always have to be paid. Right now, we are passing the true costs on to our kids and to our grandkids.

A price on carbon also sends a signal to Canadian innovators across all sectors that their ideas for reducing pollution are needed. This is a huge opportunity for Canada.

Over the last six months, we have worked with provinces and territories on a detailed examination of carbon pricing across Canada. Provinces have had months to come to the table with proposals and information about how carbon pricing can be done thoughtfully in this country. Our Canada-wide approach reflects this. It works with provinces and territories, building on their existing systems, and allows for regionally tailored paths towards a common goal.

Government Orders

By starting slowly and ramping up over five years, it gives businesses and households time to adjust and plan for lowering their carbon footprints. It allows provinces to keep and manage the revenues from carbon pricing as they see fit. Let me repeat: provinces will keep and manage the revenues from carbon pricing for themselves. Hyperbole and rhetoric aside, this is hardly a one-size-fits-all approach.

Canadians elected us on a clear mandate to implement carbon pricing, and reaction to our approach has been positive, from a wide variety of Canadians. John Stackhouse, senior vice-president, office of the CEO of RBC has said, “This climate policy makes economic and environmental sense. A rising Canada-wide carbon price is the most cost effective way to reduce emissions, spur private investment and simulate clean innovation across the economy.”

Canadian Labour Congress President Hassan Yussuff said, “today’s carbon pricing announcement is an important and necessary step for our government to take towards meeting our Paris commitments”.

Guy Cormier, chair of the board, president and CEO, Desjardins Group stated:

Desjardins Group supports the federal government’s decision to impose a price on carbon, in respect to the provinces’ choice to either implement a similar cost or a cap-and-trade system. [Desjardins believes that] the time has come for all the sectors of the economy to include climate change considerations into their strategic plans, to take advantage of business opportunities, to reduce risks and to meet the needs of Canadians.

Shell Canada president, Michael Crothers said, “balancing Canadian economic development while protecting the environment will be enabled by a reasonable price on carbon”.

Insurance Bureau of Canada, Don Forgeron said, “IBC congratulates the Government on today’s carbon pricing announcement. Severe weather is already costing Canadian taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars annually. This is an ambitious approach that takes the first steps in limiting future damage.”

Let me go through the details of the plan. All Canadian jurisdictions must price carbon pollution by the end of 2018, and the price will be set to the national benchmark. To ensure that the plan will meet our targets, we will review it in five years, in 2022. We have been equally clear that the choices, a carbon levy or a carbon trading system, are both fair and flexible. Provinces that do not have a system are free to choose which one works best for them.

Furthermore, eight out of every ten Canadians already live in a province that prices carbon pollution. The provinces and territories have been early leaders in addressing climate change. Heeding the call of businesses and scientists, B.C., Alberta, Ontario, and Quebec, have all implemented carbon pricing measures. B.C. and Alberta use a carbon levy, and either give money back to citizens through tax reductions or invest in energy efficient infrastructure and clean technology. Quebec and Ontario use a carbon trading system, where emissions are capped and industry must buy and sell credits when they want to emit.

● (1140)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The time is up, but I am sure the minister will have more to say during questions and comments.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Abbotsford.

Hon. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC): Madam Speaker, the minister did not mention, at all, one of the fundamental points of the motion before us that we are being asked to support, which is the Vancouver declaration. There was not one reference to the Vancouver declaration.

I know why that is, and I refer her to the declaration. It talks about working together; a collaborative approach between provinces, territories, and the federal government; ensuring that the provinces and territories have the flexibility to design their own policies; enhanced co-operation; acting together to fight climate change, and on and on. However, the minister was in Montreal yesterday, meeting with the provincial and territorial environment ministers. They were meeting because they were instructed by the premiers and by the Prime Minister to finalize a national climate action plan. In the middle of that meeting, the Prime Minister pulled the rug out from underneath them and said he was imposing on the provinces and territories a harmful carbon tax grab.

I would like to know from the minister who was in the meeting, did she know when she was going in, in good faith with all of the premiers, that the Prime Minister was going to do this to the premiers? How can she justify imposing such a harmful carbon tax on provinces that are struggling and which economies are struggling?

● (1145)

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Madam Speaker, let us be clear. The Vancouver declaration said that the provinces and territories recognize, with the federal government, that we need to meet our international obligations and take serious action to do that.

I have been working over the last eight months or longer with the provinces and territories. I have gone to Saskatchewan to see carbon capture and storage. I have met with industry in Saskatchewan. I have been in Nova Scotia. I have had bilateral meetings. We have had technical meetings. We have had very good discussions.

I would like to point out to the member opposite that we got agreement on a broad framework, which includes actions to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions in a whole range of sectors, from buildings to vehicles. We talked about what measures should be taken to adapt to the impacts of climate change. We are already seeing flooding and droughts, and we know in the north that the impacts are very severe. We also looked at how we can take action on clean innovation jobs.

Government Orders

We are moving forward on a plan, and we are working with all Canadians, including the provinces and territories, and will continue to do so.

Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, I thank the minister very much for her speech and her hard work on this file.

As the minister has said, climate change is indeed real, and we are already feeling the effects in Canada. The minister has also shared that during the election campaign, the Liberals presented the need for a comprehensive plan to address climate change in Canada. So far, regrettably, their budget has only committed part of that.

Today we are debating whether or not the government should move to ratify. We are not debating whether or not there should be a carbon tax, although we were blindsided on that by the Prime Minister's statement. Pricing carbon is just one piece, as the minister knows.

Delivering on the commitments that the minister made in Paris will be much more than before. It is to go eventually to 1.5 °C. My question for the minister is therefore: Will she support our subamendment that calls on her government to engage not only the territories and provinces but also the municipalities, indigenous Canadians, and Canadians in general? Will she commit to providing the full substantive plan, before ratifying, which includes the carbon tax, so that we have a credible plan before the United Nations?

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the member opposite for her advocacy on this file.

We have been working with all Canadians to develop our climate plan. We have held town halls across the country. We have had working groups that have heard from environmentalists, industry, indigenous peoples, and youth, and we continue to engage.

We believe it is important, though, that Canada stands up, that the members here support the actions required to support the Paris agreement, and that Canada be among the first countries to bring the Paris agreement into force.

We will continue moving forward to work with all Canadians to develop our climate change plan because we know this is a huge economic opportunity. It is not only about reducing emissions or future generations, it is about positioning ourselves for the economy of the future.

Hon. Robert Nault (Kenora, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to thank the minister for what I consider one of the most important speeches in the House in this term and maybe one of the most important speeches of our time.

One thing that people do not want to talk about is the effect of climate change on a day-to-day basis. I want to remind the House and let the minister know that as a northern MP, people in the north see climate change a lot more readily than members of Parliament who live in urban centres.

When I grew up, the ice always came off Lake of the Woods, which is home to the Experimental Lakes Area just down the road, in late April, early May. Now the ice comes off Lake of the Woods a month in advance. According to scientists, that has had a huge effect on one of the largest lakes in Canada.

As well, I want to remind the House that when I was a young man, there were no deer in my region. They were further south. Now thousands and thousands of deer live in my region because the climate has changed dramatically.

Could the minister explain in detail the importance of climate change vis-à-vis what is happening in the natural environment and why we have to make these decisions today for our kids and grandkids?

• (1150)

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the member for his advocacy on the north.

The impacts of climate change are real. We see it across the country. P.E.I. is shrinking by an average of 43 centimetres a year. We have seen flooding and forest fires in the west. However, nowhere is the impact of climate change felt more than in the north. It does not have highways like we do. They are ice highways.

I heard a very compelling story yesterday from the president of the ITK organization, Natan Obed. He talked about one of the leading hunters in the north, an Inuit hunter, who fell through the ice and died. He left his family and the community grieving. Why? Because the changes in the climate are so extreme that someone who has lived off of the land and relied on hunting to provide for the community can no longer rely on traditional knowledge to assess when it is safe to go on the ice.

These impacts are real. It is not an inconvenience. It is changing ways of life and we need to take action now. We owe it to future generations.

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Madam Speaker, I listened intently to the minister's speech and I will try this again. As we have seen time and time again with the government, it recycles speeches over and over again. Recycled talking points are really what we have.

The only thing we missed out of this was that when the Prime Minister gave one of very early speeches in which he said that Canada would be known more for its resourcefulness than its resources, that was really foreshadowing. Where are we now? We are falling further and further behind.

Our hon. colleague from Abbotsford asked a very direct question and the minister failed to answer it. What is the message from the minister to the provinces that have spoken out and walked out against the government's heavy-handed approach? What is the message from the minister to those provinces that have said that it heavy-handed, it is a betrayal, and it is utter disrespect?

I want to know from the minister what her message is to those provinces.

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Madam Speaker, my message is that we are going to continue working with them. Politics is politics, but we are here to provide solutions and to work with all Canadians so we position ourselves to tackle climate change and grow our economy.

Government Orders

Hon. Peter Kent (Thornhill, CPC): Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier.

I am pleased to speak to the Liberal motion, to support the first element, which is ratification of the Paris agreement, and to strongly oppose the second part, which would unilaterally impose a federal carbon tax on all Canadians and against the express wishes of a number of provinces and territories.

I am sure members are not surprised that we are supporting ratification of the Paris agreement. It is effectively the continuation of our Conservative government's 2030 emission reduction plan.

It was, after all, our Conservative government that took Canada out of the aspirational but failed Kyoto agreement, which none of the world's major emitting countries joined, and of those who did, involved barely one-third of global GHGs, and which the Liberals signed without any due diligence or intent to fulfill. Of course history will remind us that the Liberals then did absolutely nothing to implement Kyoto. In fact, emissions under the Liberal government rose by 35%.

Our Conservative government joined the Copenhagen agreement and worked diligently to regulate reductions in GHG emissions across the major emitting sectors. At the same time, we campaigned to create an even better post-Kyoto accord, which would include all of the world's major emitters. If China, the United States, India, Brazil, and the other big emitters follow through on their commitments under the Paris agreement, we will now have the engagement that we in the official opposition and previously in the Conservative government sought.

We committed to Copenhagen, and now Paris, even though Canada generated less than 2% of global CO₂ every year, because we believed, and we still believe, that Canada must play its part with all of the major polluters. As a result, our Conservative government was the first in Canadian history to achieve real, tangible, significant reductions of greenhouse gases, even as we enjoyed economic growth.

Members will recall we started with the transportation sector, the largest emission sector in Canada, and we created, in partnership with the United States, tailpipe regulations that would reduce car and light truck emissions by 50% by 2025 and would consume 50% less fuel. We set regulations for heavy-duty trucks and buses that would see emissions from these vehicles by 2018 reduced by up to 23%, which would mean up to \$18,000 a year in savings for a semi truck operator in a 2018 heavy-duty model vehicle. We set marine emission guidelines and began work with the aviation and rail industries. We then moved on to the next largest emission sector.

When the Prime Minister opened this debate, he mentioned the benefits to reduced emissions from coal-fired electricity generating plants. However, I was not surprised that he did not mention that it was our Conservative government that imposed a ban on the construction of new traditional coal-fired units, the first government in the world to implement such a ban.

I was not surprised the Prime Minister did not mention our Conservative government's pilot project investment in a world-leading carbon capture and sequestration project in Estevan, Saskatchewan, which led to that provincial government's trail

blazing billion dollar-plus investment in a commercial CCS unit at SaskPower's Boundary Dam. This project will enable Saskatchewan to benefit from an estimated 300-year supply of coal, not to leave it in the ground but to burn it cleanly, by capturing one million tonnes of CO₂ per year and storing it safely in deep underground reservoirs.

The world is watching the Boundary Dam project, but the Liberals are looking the other way. The Liberals are also looking the other way on our other achievements, hoping Canadians do not remember that our Conservative government also protected a record amount of parkland and made historic investments in wetland and boreal forest restoration and protection, adding considerably to Canada's capacity to sequester GHG emissions in the old fashioned way: nature's carbon storage.

After the transportation and coal-fired sectors regulations, we began work on setting emissions limiting regulations for the oil and gas industry and its sub-sectors. We found the industry willing to participate in the search for emissions intensity limits and compliance fees for over-emitters.

● (1155)

Our Conservative government pioneered the concept that compliance fees raised would remain in the province in which they were collected and would follow the tech fund research investment model created in Alberta.

Unfortunately, although other provinces with significant upstream, midstream, and downstream oil and gas operations were seriously engaged in those talks, time and circumstance did not result in completion of that regulations exercise. The circumstance was that in the wake of the recession there was real concern that Canadian producers, transporters and refiners would have been significantly wrong footed in the highly competitive North American market.

In the absence of matching regulatory action by the United States, the quest for oil and gas regulations was shelved temporarily.

In hindsight, if regulations had been imposed on the oil and gas sector three years ago, they almost certainly would have had to be suspended to protect the Canadian sector and our national economy when resource markets collapsed.

In my home province of Ontario, economic storm clouds are building over the provincial Liberal government's misguided embrace of a failed European model of cap and trade, which comes into effect January 1. Carbon markets have not worked anywhere in this world. The decade-old European market, which saw billions of dollars originally invested, saw most of those same billions evaporate when the market crashed as a result of speculation, fraud, and organized crime manipulation.

Government Orders

We saw another carbon market crash this year in California when that state government's latest option of carbon credits raised barely 2%, or \$10 million of an intended \$500 million target.

Yet now we see in Ontario a lemming-like determination to follow the failed European and California cap-and-trade models. All Ontarians will have to pay for the carbon market through higher consumer prices, except essential major polluters that will get a major windfall of free carbon credits from the Ontario government. This effectively means a big cash transfer from ordinary taxpayers to these major polluters.

Ontario will sooner or later inevitably see this complex voodoo economics-driven carbon market collapse on itself.

A wise man once described cap and trade as the dumbest way to implement carbon pricing. That was before the Liberals' national carbon tax, unrealistically conceived by the same brain trust responsible for the Ontario cap-and-trade cash grabbing boondoggle, estimated to be \$1.9 billion to be scooped annually from the pockets of taxpayers and go into Ontario general revenues.

An escalating national carbon tax, unilaterally threatened without serious analysis or consultation with the provinces and territories that have very different but legitimate ways of countering climate change, is a flagrant violation of the spirit of our federation.

Our Conservative Party, as the official opposition, believes that economic growth and environmental stewardship are not mutually exclusive. We believe in and support open and co-operative federalism, but we oppose the Liberals' high-handed encroachment on areas of shared jurisdiction.

We in the official opposition believe that Canada can and must find the right balance between protection of our environment for future generations and growing our economy to ensure the long-term prosperity of all Canadians.

• (1200)

Mr. Marco Mendicino (Eglinton—Lawrence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will pick up on a few of the last remarks my colleague made. He said that his party believed that economic growth and protecting the environment was not mutually exclusive.

Coincidentally our plan has received the endorsement from a number of business leaders within the natural resources sector. I would like to provide him with a recent quote from Suncor CEO Steve Williams who said, "We think climate change is happening... We think a broad-based carbon price is the right answer."

The CEO of Royal Dutch Shell also said, "We firmly believe that carbon pricing will discourage high carbon options and reduce uncertainty that will help stimulate investments in the right low-carbon technologies and the right resources at the right pace."

Clearly we have business leaders who have come to appreciate that our party is striking a balance and is able to reconcile both protecting the environment as well as encouraging sustainable growth. I wonder whether he might turn his mind to those quotes and support our party's approach to this.

Hon. Peter Kent: No, Mr. Speaker, that will not reverse our opposition to the heavy-handed imposition of a national carbon tax.

Our government, in our time, worked with the major producers in the energy industry on regulations for that industry to set emission intensity limits and to apply compliance penalties for any over-emissions. These producers will accept a national carbon tax because they will pass it on to consumers, and consumers will pay the price for this general tax in a variety of ways. Ontarians are going to pay into the cap and trade system, and the money raised will be used by the Ontario government. It will go into general revenues and will do nothing to effectively lower CO₂ emissions in Ontario.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great fascination to my hon. colleague. My recollections of the Stephen Harper years are a little different from those of my hon. colleague.

My colleague is telling us now that Stephen Harper had a great vision of the environment, but I never saw that in all of my years here. I did hear a lot of huffing and puffing and banging on the table to delay action, which has put us even further behind the eight ball after all of these years.

I represent a region that is heavily dependent on resource extraction. When I talk to people in industry, they get it. They say they are willing to put a price on carbon. Industry is willing, if the government will work with it, to find the incentives to start lowering emissions. Industry recognizes that it has to start moving in a positive direction.

I am not opposed to the government on this, if we can find a credible way to move forward. I agree with my colleague on cap and trade. It is a pretty bizarre concept that, in my opinion, has not really produced results. My concern is that, even if we put the government's price on carbon, we are not going to meet the Paris targets.

Could my colleague tell me how we are actually going to be credible in the international market and the international community, if we do not even have a plan yet that would meet the Paris obligations that we are agreeing to in the House of Commons?

• (1205)

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Speaker, the reality is that we need to recognize that, without a North American climate change plan, we are at serious risk and we will see this as the Liberals impose their one-size-fits-all national carbon tax across the country. We are at serious risk of wrong-footing some of our major industries by applying taxes, which they will pass on to the consumer. In some cases, they will lose competitive advantage in their larger markets south of the border.

Government Orders

There are any number of alternatives to cap and trade in Ontario. British Columbia has the least damaging, the so-called revenue-neutral plan. However, there has been little discussion or examination of the carbon fee and dividend plan, which is even better than British Columbia's co-called tax-neutral plan, because it has been estimated that for most Canadians there would be a greater return of dividends than of the carbon fees that would be paid.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Joël Godin (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Thornhill, Ontario, for sharing his speaking time with me. I would like to point out to the House that my colleague was once the environment minister. He has a lot of credibility.

This morning, I had the pleasure of speaking in the House and to those watching at home on the House of Commons network. I hope the message will be heard, that this government will not put up more smoke and mirrors and that it will respect Parliament by changing its motion in order to allow our country to continue thriving and to adjust the government's position on the environment.

Yesterday, the Prime Minister said that he would impose, and I repeat "impose", a carbon tax on the provinces and territories. The word "impose" escaped the lips of this Liberal Prime Minister. Again, during the election campaign, he pulled the wool over the voters' eyes. I have here a long list of broken promises. He talked about a small \$10-billion deficit. The deficit is now \$30 billion. He said he would bring back letter carriers so that Canadians could get home mail delivery. Where are the letter carriers? The Liberals promised to increase the greenhouse gas reduction targets. Our targets were very good. We acted responsibly and they decided to adopt our targets. They promised to lower taxes for our SMEs, our job creators. That is another broken promise. They said they wanted to work with the provinces and territories, but now they are going to impose their carbon tax plan on them.

They may have once again wasted taxpayers' money by hiring an international firm to evaluate their election promises, which they have not kept. I will provide them with answers and it will not cost much. I will offer my services for free. I can tell them very simply right now that, in the past year, they have not delivered much. There. That just saved \$200,000.

Let us get back to the real issue. Canada must ratify the Paris agreement as indicated in today's motion, which reads:

That the House support the government's decision to ratify the Paris Agreement under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change signed by Canada in New York on April 22, 2016...

Why should we ratify this agreement? Previous agreements have raised our collective awareness. The 1998 Kyoto protocol applied only to developed countries. That was a step forward. The 2009 Copenhagen accord, a somewhat binding agreement, involved only 26 industrialized and emerging countries. The Paris agreement was signed by 195 countries. Do my colleagues know what is being said about that agreement? It is being described as historic because it is the first agreement on global climate issues to be signed by so many countries.

We must be responsible. We must not mortgage the future of generations to come. This government is causing a financial mess

that our children and grandchildren will have to clean up. Can the Liberals pay some attention to the planet for our future generations? Let us try to help give them a better future by leaving them a healthier planet. I am a father, and I believe that I am a responsible family man. As such, I must call on this government to ratify the Paris agreement and meet the targets set out therein. I am doing so on behalf of my daughter Ann-Frédérique, my son Charles-Antoine, and all of the young Canadians who will make up the Canada of tomorrow.

Stop claiming that we, the Conservatives, are the environment's worst enemy. No one on this side of the House in the official opposition gets up in the morning with the intention of destroying the environment. No one. When we were in government, we introduced a number of measures to fight climate change. For example, we created the clean air regulatory agenda; we established new standards to reduce car and light truck emissions; we established new standards to reduce emissions from heavy-duty vehicles and their engines; we proposed regulations to align ourselves with the U.S. Tier 3 standards for vehicle emissions and sulphur in gasoline; we sought to limit HFCs, black carbon, and methane; and we established new rules to reduce emissions from coal-fired power plants.

● (1210)

Furthermore, we put in place measures to support the development of carbon capture technologies and alternative energy sources; we enhanced the government's annual report on main environmental indicators, including greenhouse gases; and we, the Conservatives, even abolished tax breaks for the oil sands.

All these measures resulted in a good environment report card for Canada and confirmed the reduction in greenhouse gases.

In 2014, the last full year our government was in power, we reduced greenhouse gas emissions. Canada's share of global emissions decreased by more than 15% between 2006 and 2014. I did say 15%, which means that our share went from 1.9% to 1.6%; we represent 6.9% of this lovely planet. These results were not obtained under the Liberals. We, the Conservatives, reduced greenhouse gas emissions.

As a Conservative member, I held consultations in my riding of Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, in the beautiful Quebec City area, and I formed a committee on economic development using green technologies in order to help the minister of the environment do her work. Yes, as a Conservative, I worked on sustainable development and I am doing my part just as everyone has a responsibility to do their part.

It makes me sick when we are labelled anti-environment because it is just not true. We are the party that knows that sustainable development and economic development go hand in hand. I would remind the House that greenhouse gas emissions dropped under our watch and that at the end of our term we left a budgetary surplus. The Liberals have to acknowledge that. It is a fact. The Liberal government has already squandered it all.

Government Orders

We think that course of action was worth pursuing. That is why we are in favour of ratifying the Paris agreement. Still, in light of what we have seen from this government, it must not be allowed to impose a new tax because it does not know how to manage things. It is easy for the federal government to impose a tax and tell the provinces and territories to participate and collaborate when it holds a gun to their heads and calls that negotiation. The government encroached on provincial and territorial jurisdiction over health and infrastructure, and it is doing so once again here. Any claim to collaboration and flexibility is just an act.

Yesterday, the Prime Minister arrogantly—if I may use the word—told Parliament that he did not need the House of Commons, and the provinces and territories are being subjected to that same cavalier attitude as he runs roughshod over provincial and territorial jurisdiction.

A new tax will have a devastating impact on Canadian families. The government must not increase the tax burden; it must give Canadians breathing room and enable them to improve their quality of life.

Here is how we think the motion should read. This is what we agree with and are prepared to vote in favour of: “That the House support the government’s decision to ratify the Paris Agreement under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change signed by Canada in New York; and that the House call upon the federal government, the provinces, and the territories to develop a responsible plan to combat climate change that does not encroach on provincial or territorial jurisdiction or impose a tax increase on Canadians”.

We need to try to come up with creative solutions that will have an impact on climate change, and not on Canadian families' wallets.

For our part, we reduced greenhouse gas emissions while balancing the budget. Actually, we did so while leaving a surplus. What is more, we did not stick Canadian taxpayers with the bill. We are asking this government to do the same thing, in other words, to not impose additional taxes on Canadian taxpayers and families.

• (1215)

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in listening to the debate, especially coming from the Conservative side, one cannot help but draw a very clear conclusion, which is that the Conservatives have lost touch with what Canadians really believe and want.

It is very clear that the Conservative Party is unique in the sense that, as other countries move toward ideas that will generate a healthier environment, the Conservatives tend to want to steer away from it.

Are there any circumstances whatsoever in which the Conservative Party would consider a price on carbon pollution a positive thing? Is there any time in the future where we will see the Conservative Party say, yes, there is some merit to a price on carbon pollution?

If they want to start listening to Canadians and watching what is happening in the world environment around us, surely to goodness they would recognize the value of some form of a price on carbon pollution. Would the member not agree?

[Translation]

Mr. Joël Godin: Mr. Speaker, what we would do is consult with the provinces in an open and co-operative manner. That is definitely not what this government is doing.

Yesterday the Prime Minister of Canada said he is going to impose a carbon tax. That is not negotiating; that is pretending to co-operate. We on this side of the House have a different definition of co-operation.

My colleague needs to get back to work and make sure that we are adopting positive measures, rather than imposing another tax. We all have the same goal, which is to protect our planet.

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier for doing such a fine job of reminding members how the former government's approach was realistic, responsible, and respectful of taxpayers. It did not impose a new tax like the current government did yesterday.

I would like to ask my colleague a specific question, since he used to work at the provincial level. Yesterday, we witnessed a situation that could not have been worse for the provinces. While the Minister of Environment was meeting with all of her provincial counterparts, the Prime Minister announced, from his seat in the House of Commons, that a carbon tax would be imposed. These ministers were not even aware that this was happening.

According to the member for Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, who used to work with provincial ministers, was this the right approach? Did it show respect for the authority of the provinces of this Confederation?

• (1220)

Mr. Joël Godin: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague with whom I have the pleasure of representing the greater Quebec City area.

As I said at the beginning of my speech, what happened yesterday was just more smoke and mirrors. While the environment ministers were being kept busy, the Prime Minister, who makes all the decisions and flies by the seat of his pants, announced in the House that a tax would be imposed.

If there is such a strong spirit of co-operation in this chamber, why did three premiers slam the door on their way out? What happened yesterday is unacceptable. What is more, this government demonstrated a lack of respect for the House, the provinces and territories, and especially taxpayers. The government is going to dip into taxpayers' pockets.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I am going to go back to the member on that very simple question with regard to a price on carbon pollution. Does the member in any way, in any fashion, believe that the Conservative Party under any circumstances would support a price on carbon pollution?

Government Orders

[Translation]

Mr. Joël Godin: Mr. Speaker, they must stop imposing measures. They should be more constructive and collaborative. Let us work with the provinces to find the best way for each region to protect our planet. That is just common sense.

[English]

Mr. Michael McLeod (Northwest Territories, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Repentigny.

I would like to begin by acknowledging that we are gathering on traditional Algonquin territory.

As we all know, climate change is a threat unlike any other. We know action needs to be taken to address what I believe is the biggest threat to our lives, our country, and our planet. That is why I will be voting in favour of the motion.

Taking action against climate change is a moral imperative. I do not believe there is another option if we care about our children, our grandchildren, the future of our land and our waters.

To meet this threat and to minimize the potential for its devastating impacts requires global action, global co-operation, and global collaboration. Indeed, our world needs the historic Paris agreement on climate change. It was as a result of our commitment to inclusion and engagement that the delegation to Paris included indigenous leaders from regions across Canada, including from the Arctic and from the north. They are the front line in experiencing the impacts of climate change.

In Canada, achieving the vision of the Paris agreement will require the full inclusion and leadership of indigenous peoples. As Canada's first ministers committed to in the Vancouver declaration, we are working in partnership with the provinces and territories to establish a pan-Canadian framework on clean growth and climate change to reduce our emissions and to ensure Canada takes full advantage of the opportunities associated with the emerging low-carbon economy. This affects all Canadians, and indigenous peoples and northerners in particular.

Going forward, we need to work with our provincial and territorial partners and with indigenous peoples to ensure that all of our voices are heard. For far too long governments did not listen to the warnings from our elders about how traditional knowledge of the patterns of nature did not apply the way it used to, how the ice was thinning and disappearing, how forest fires were becoming more frequent, how new fauna and flora were appearing while others were disappearing.

These changes are having real impacts on real people, and are affecting the ability of indigenous people to exercise their rights, their ability to connect with the land, and their food security. We must listen to the solutions and the traditional knowledge that indigenous people can share if we are to mitigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change.

We are committed to acting. Budget 2016 includes \$10.7 million over two years to implement renewable energy projects in off-grid indigenous and northern communities that rely on diesel and other fossil fuels for heat and power. That kind of partnership is essential and I hope it is only the start of what can be accomplished. We will

invest close to \$130 million over five years to strengthen the science we need to inform decision-making, protect the health and well-being of Canadians, build resilience in the north and indigenous communities, and enhance competitiveness in key economic sectors.

Good things are happening, especially in the north. We can learn a great deal from the spirit of collaboration reflected in the close links among aboriginal peoples around the circumpolar region through the Inuit Circumpolar Council, the Gwich'in Council International, and the Arctic Athabaskan Council. The very existence of these organizations is due to the fact that indigenous nations took it upon themselves to find a way to speak in unison on issues of shared concern.

The visible effects of climate change, from melting permafrost to waning sea ice, makes the Arctic a region that demands our attention. Indeed, in the wake of the Paris conference, the Arctic is the focus of global attention. The world will be watching how we in Canada respond to the real and urgent concerns expressed by indigenous peoples in the north, and northerners in communities across the country. Ratifying the Paris agreement will move us globally in that direction and hopefully will slow down the effects of our warming planet.

I would like to speak a little more on the effects of climate change in the north. As I mentioned earlier, we are seeing vegetation changes, animal migratory changes, and permafrost melting. All of these things are causing abrupt shifts in traditional practices such as hunting and trapping, as well as practical problems such as maintaining infrastructure on melting grounds.

● (1225)

The north is experiencing the impacts of climate change right now. That is a real threat to the sustainability of our communities. This threat is in addition to the high cost of energy and limited infrastructure that already challenge the sustainability of rural and northern remote communities.

Recognizing this, the Government of the Northwest Territories has been working actively to reduce its carbon footprint. Between 2001 and 2011, the territorial government reduced its emissions from operations by 30%. In addition, NWT ranks second in the country on a per capita basis of installed solar power. The feasibility of wind development is also being investigated in the Inuvik region next year.

We in the Northwest Territories understand that a carbon price is an important measure to get people to stop using the fuels that contribute to greenhouse gas emissions, but the very high cost of fuel in our communities is already an incentive to reduce consumption. Northerners do not choose high-carbon options. They are one of the only choices.

Government Orders

In addition to the relative high cost of electricity due to our long winters and the use of heating oil, heating costs in some of our northern communities are seven times the cost of those using natural gas in Edmonton.

The NWT government and residents are being diligent and responsible in controlling emissions of greenhouse gases in the Northwest Territories and preparing for climate change impact. Even though the north only accounts for a small fraction of Canada's overall greenhouse gas emissions, there is a commitment from all levels of government to find a way to reduce our carbon footprint.

It is my hope that we at the federal level will continue to assist northerners in their work to provide reliable, affordable alternatives to carbon-intensive fuels for our communities and businesses. Budget 2016 was a great first step.

It is also important that the federal government understands the potential harm that increased carbon prices could have on the fragile resource-based economy of the Northwest Territories if implemented in a manner that does not work for us in the north. Carbon pricing can penalize northerners by raising their already high cost of living or discouraging the economic development northerners need to support themselves and their families.

I am confident that a supportive approach that recognizes the unique realities of the north will be followed. Through ongoing discussions, partnerships, and innovation, along with investment in green energy, clean growth, and better infrastructure, we in the north will continue to reduce our greenhouse emissions in support of the Paris agreement and the Vancouver declaration. In doing so, we will underscore our commitment to ensure all Canadians, including northerners and indigenous peoples, are partners in this global effort.

• (1230)

Mr. Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague across the way for his speech today about northern communities. Indeed, I am from northern B.C. We see how much costs are for diesel for aboriginal communities and how difficult it is to access it, as well.

We are embarking upon a study about poverty in my particular human resources committee. One of the issues that we brought forward was the carbon tax and how much the carbon tax is going to tax communities where, as the member said, the cost is already extremely high.

How is a carbon tax on something that is already a necessity in northern communities going to help?

Mr. Michael McLeod: Mr. Speaker, maybe the question could be better posed as, "How can we afford not to do it?"

We, in the north, have been wrestling with the issue of how to reduce one of the major cost drivers in our communities, which is the high cost of power, which is pretty much generated in all of our communities by diesel.

I served for three terms in the Government of the Northwest Territories, part of that as the environment minister. We looked at all different ways of lowering the costs and looking at alternate energy. It fell on deaf ears for 10 years. We applied to the green fund. We

applied to many different pots of money that, historically, were in place, only to be rejected or to receive no response.

There is opportunity for us to move forward in the area of biomass. There is opportunity to look at cogeneration. There is opportunity to look at wind, hydro, solar. There are many opportunities, including expanding the lines that we have in terms of supplying our communities with hydro. We have the Taltson River dam, which has been releasing water because they cannot use and sell the power. We do not have the resources to expand the lines. We need a partner.

The current government is the one that has talked to us and has committed to work with us on it. We feel confident. It is time to move forward.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to my hon. colleague. He has expertise on the Far North and brings that expertise to the work of the indigenous affairs committee.

Today we are discussing the amendment the NDP brought forward to help fix the motion being debated, because what we have been asked to vote on in the House does not include the obligation to negotiate, discuss, and meet with indigenous community leaders, as well as the municipalities. The reason it is important to put this in the motion is that we hear all the time that we are going to talk with indigenous communities who have traditional economic knowledge. Yet when it comes to federal environmental assessments, issues are rubber-stamped without the involvement of the communities. The government can approve the LNG pipeline while ignoring the five hereditary chiefs who came to Ottawa to discuss it.

New Democrats think it is really important that this be written into our obligation as parliamentarians. If we are going to move toward ratifying the Paris accord as a nation, we need to include the first peoples, who have been left out, for example, of the health accords. They were not involved. We need to change this nation-to-nation relationship and it has to be done in a concrete manner.

I would ask my colleague if he will support the New Democrat amendment to make sure that these negotiations involve indigenous communities and their leaders.

Mr. Michael McLeod: Mr. Speaker, the Northwest Territories seems to do things a little differently from the rest of Canada. It certainly involves the aboriginal governments in everything it does. The regulatory process, for example, includes 50% representation from aboriginal governments. Therefore, any projects that move forward include the involvement of aboriginal governments from the time the application is first filed with the regulatory board, half of whom are aboriginal members, to the review that takes place, which includes aboriginal governments.

Government Orders

The Government of the Northwest Territories does a very good job of sharing information with aboriginal people across the north. The majority of the membership of the Government of the Northwest Territories, MLAs, are aboriginal. I certainly encourage other governments to do the same and not to try to do a selling job to aboriginal people, but rather to use an inclusive approach. There are many models that we can draw from, but the north has a very good model that could be used. It sets an example and sets the stage for the rest of the Canadian public.

• (1235)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ): I was fortunate to attend the Paris climate change conference, COP21, as the Bloc Québécois representative. I must say that I really felt that I was part of an historic event.

COP21 was much more than a gathering of nations. It was nations, cities, municipalities, NGOs, bankers, businesses, business groups, scientists, and more. It was absolutely the largest international conference ever organized. That shows just how important the issue is.

When Laurent Fabius brought down his small gavel to declare that the final declaration was adopted and no one, not a single person, objected in the least, we all realized that something had changed in the world. It is now clear that climate change can no longer be denied.

The Minister of the Environment said so herself: “Climate change is real and we no longer have time to debate it. The clock is ticking for us to do something about it.” This change in attitude was striking for Canada, to everyone's great relief, including mine.

Parties to the Paris agreement agreed on the facts, which is new. The agreement also spells out a target that applies to everyone, and that is major progress too. Climate change skeptics have been consigned to the dustbin of history alongside flat-earthers.

Agreeing on the facts and on a target is a good starting point, but we still have to do the work. Nobody wants the temperature to rise by more than 2°C. Some said that 1.5°C would be better. Unfortunately, what the states agreed to at the Paris conference will cause the temperature to rise by 3°C, which will be catastrophic. We know we are headed for failure, so we need to change course immediately, but the government is doing just the opposite by adopting the former Conservative government's targets.

Those targets call for reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 30% below 2005 levels by 2030. That first date is important, and the target is virtually meaningless. France's target is 40% by 2030. Quebec's is 80% by 2050. Germany's is 95% by 2050. Sweden threw down the gauntlet to the whole world when it announced its goal to be the first fossil-fuel-free country on earth.

However, it is important to note that Quebec and the rest of the world use 1990, and not 2005, as the reference year. It is no accident that Canada is choosing to ignore the 15 years between 1990 and 2005. It is quite simply a free pass, a free ride for the oil sands industry.

I find it troubling that this government is still thinking about promoting the development of this industry, one of the most polluting industries in the world. I can barely contain my frustration at hearing the Prime Minister claim to be a champion of the green economy, while the energy east project is still on the table. The Liberals do not know how to respond; the Conservatives criticize the Liberals; and the NDP criticizes the assessment process, as if that would in any way change the nature of that project.

From the very beginning, the Bloc Québécois has been standing up in this House and saying what everyone else thinks but would not dare say: energy east is about energy from the last century, and the oil sands will kill COP21.

The energy east project will increase oil sands production by 40%. That is huge. The government would have us believe that this is a historic day and things are going to change, but as the expression goes, the road to hell is paved with good intentions.

Now that it is clear that the government has no intention of reining in dirty oil, we need to ask ourselves who is going to pay the price, for as modest as the Liberal-Conservative targets are, Canada is still headed towards utter failure. Without a major change, Canada is going to miss its target by over 60%. Frankly, at this rate, Ottawa will not see the slightest reduction until 2050.

I cannot emphasize enough that this expected failure does not even take into account the pipeline projects currently on the table, which are being considered against all logic.

• (1240)

If the government does not assume its responsibilities and does not establish an effective strategy that takes into account the efforts made by each province, Quebec will once again pay the price. By choosing 2005 rather than 1990 as the reference year, by ignoring 15 years of explosive GHG growth caused mainly by oil, Quebec's efforts are being swept aside. In those 15 years, Quebec's emissions remained the same. By comparison, greenhouse gas emissions in Saskatchewan soared by more than 50%.

While Canada was pretending to work towards compliance with the Kyoto protocol, Quebec was keeping pace with the rest of the world, not by giving lovely speeches or expressing noble intentions, but by working very hard. Quebeckers bet on the modern era and on the future. We invested billions of dollars to reduce our environmental footprint. For example, our aluminum smelters replaced their old polluting cells at great expense in order to decrease their emissions by 27%. They cannot replace their major cells a second time.

We do not need a calculator to figure out that it would be a joke to require the paper mills, who have already reduced their greenhouse gas emissions by 68%, to work on reducing them by another 30%. That is bordering on 100%, which might push them to close up shop.

To achieve any sort of result in fighting climate change we have to face reality. It must become expensive to pollute and profitable to respect the environment. Those who have made the effort should be able to reap the rewards, and those who have done nothing should pay the price. Otherwise, we are left with good intentions and, worse yet, the polluters are rewarded.

Government Orders

So far nothing in the Liberal plan aligns with this responsible approach. By refusing to set an emissions ceiling, the government seems to be saying that its targets are like New Year's resolutions: we make them on January 1 and we break them on January 2, without any consequences.

There are some things that only a country can do, such as setting emissions ceilings that apply to everyone and setting binding targets that take into account the efforts that have been made since 1990, so as not to penalize the good students by asking them to do twice as much work. As a former teacher, I understand that perfectly well.

We need to ensure that everyone participates in the carbon market, even polluters. Otherwise, we will end up with a market with too many sellers and too few buyers, which is not very effective. Ottawa can and must do this.

Some people in Canada will not be happy, but this needs to be done anyway. Canada could take a number of measures within its areas of jurisdiction. We could be here all afternoon talking about what actions could be included in a proper plan, but that would not do any good as long as people refuse to make polluting a costly venture and being environmentally responsible a profitable one. There is a price to pay for polluting, a real price. For now, Canada is basically choosing not to pay it and is hiding its head in the sand so that it can stay in the 20th century longer.

Wilfrid Laurier said that the 20th century belongs to Canada. We say that the 21st century will belong to Quebec. There is more than one nation in Canada and there is also more than one environmental and economic reality. Some provinces have more work to do than others. Those provinces could shut down coal-fired plants, for example. Since Quebec is ahead of the game, we could take measures regarding the electrification of transportation, something that we are already working on.

When I listen to the debates in the House and look at the past 20 years of inaction on the part of successive governments, I get the impression that Canada is trying to buy time until it can get every last drop of oil out of the ground.

The stone age did not end because there was no more stone, but rather because the human race found ways to do things differently and to do them better. The same goes for oil. Quebec is already looking elsewhere and has already begun the shift pretty successfully.

The 21st century is tailor-made for Quebec to become one of the most prosperous places on the planet. We want nothing to do with the oil age. Quebec should already be considered a big winner on North America's carbon market. We should be the pioneers. We must find our own source of energy, one that is ours alone, with Hydro-Québec, a source of energy that will completely change our trade balance. The oil age is not our age; Quebec wants nothing to do with it. Understandably, this will drive Quebecers to ask themselves whether this country, this oil-fuelled nation, is also theirs.

• (1245)

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear that my colleague from the Bloc has

indicated that we do need to have a tax on pollution. In fact, that is what we are seeing, a price on carbon pollution, and there has been fairly good debate on that particular issue.

My question for the member is this. I understand and I can appreciate and ultimately disagree with what she and her party want to be able to accomplish. I am curious to know to what degree the member believes that a national government has to play a leadership role, where it can, to protect Canada's environment and to look at negotiations and responsibilities. I am referring specifically to the Paris agreement. To what degree does our national government have to implement policies that would be better for the environment overall?

[Translation]

Ms. Monique Pauzé: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his question.

Canada must indeed begin by respecting provincial jurisdiction. That is step one. It must also respect the efforts made by Quebec, such as using 1990 instead of 2005 and investing billions in industries that have invested in reducing their greenhouse gas emissions.

Another thing Canada can do is halt oil sands development. Not everyone is going to like that. It should leave the oil sands in the ground. It could also provide major incentives for people to buy electric vehicles. I myself just bought an electric car, made more affordable by the Government of Quebec's generous subsidies. If Canada had a similar program for electric vehicles, more people could buy them.

Canada could even buy some. Why not? It could replace the government fleet, including all of those little buses that do such a good job of bringing us here. That might be a good idea. It could also invest heavily in environmental research and development. It could support the development of ethanol plants, which use forestry, agricultural, and household waste. Do my colleagues require any more ideas? We can talk about it.

Mr. Romeo Saganash (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member from Repentigny for her very interesting speech.

My question is on the fact that we now have a new government that is committed to respecting indigenous peoples, supposedly through a new nation to nation relationship, as the members opposite like to say ad nauseam. These indigenous issues come up both in the Vancouver declaration and in the Paris agreement. I was rather surprised to see that there is no mention of indigenous peoples in the main motion.

I would like the hon. member's opinion on this fundamental issue. The motion talks about the provinces and territories but omits an important constitutional player, namely Canada's indigenous peoples. How does the hon. member explain this omission?

• (1250)

Ms. Monique Pauzé: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for the question.

Government Orders

I sincerely believe that there is no better barrier to the excessive development of natural resources than the opposition of indigenous peoples exercising their fundamental rights. In that sense, I do think indigenous peoples are helping us. We are standing together against this excessive development.

There is another nation in Canada: the nation of Quebec. The government often seems to forget that indigenous nations and the nation of Quebec are united in their attempts to stop the excessive development of natural resources, which is why we support the NDP amendment.

[*English*]

Mrs. Deborah Schulte (King—Vaughan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Pontiac.

It is an honour to rise today to speak to the ratification of the Paris agreement and the economic opportunities for Canada. Addressing climate change must transcend politics. We owe it to our children and grandchildren to work on this together, all countries, all levels of government, all parties. Doing nothing is not an option.

Through the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in Paris, our government worked hard helping to create an agreement to reduce our global emissions and to mitigate the impact that climate change has on those most vulnerable in our world.

Canadians should be proud of the positive role their country has played in the international negotiations. In December 2015, 197 countries representing 98% of global GHG emissions signed on to the agreement, highlighting that the world is taking action to significantly reduce its carbon footprint. Many countries, including Canada, are in the process of taking the necessary steps for the agreement to come into force as soon as possible.

The Government of Canada embraces the fact that, in the 21st century, growing our economy and protecting our environment go hand in hand. Taking action on climate change provides economic opportunities while maintaining a sustainable environment and thriving communities in Canada.

The world is shifting to clean technologies and deploying clean energy faster than ever before. Due to sustained technological progress, the costs for renewable energy have been falling significantly over time and have become cost-competitive with those of fossil fuels in certain regions. Technological improvements to energy storage have also been gaining momentum, which will facilitate wider deployment of renewable energy.

Clean technologies can also create new opportunities for traditional resource sectors in Canada and will provide new employment opportunities. Focusing Canada's efforts on science skills, business leadership, technical skills, and immigration of highly qualified workers will be paramount to accessing these opportunities.

As an example of the magnitude of these opportunities, the International Energy Agency estimates that the full implementation of climate pledges at Paris would require the energy sector to invest \$13.5 trillion in energy efficiency and low-carbon technologies from 2015 to 2030.

The year 2015 saw a record investment of \$329 billion in the global clean energy sector, up from \$62 billion in 2004. The clean technology sector is already an important contributor to Canada's economy. Around 50,000 people are directly employed in more than 800 firms in the Canadian clean technology sector, and the Canadian clean technology sector grew by about 8% per year from 2008 to 2013, which is more than three times as fast as the economy as a whole. During that same period the global market grew at an even faster rate of 10%, suggesting that Canada has opportunity for further growth if it can keep up with the progress being made by other countries.

In March 2016, the Prime Minister and the provincial and territorial first ministers signed on to the Vancouver declaration. The Vancouver declaration entailed several commitments from first ministers, including the implementation of GHG mitigation policies in support of meeting or exceeding Canada's 2030 target of a 30% reduction below 2005 levels of emission, including specific provincial and territorial targets and objectives; an increase in the level of ambition of environmental policies over time; the promotion of clean, economic growth to create jobs; and an enhanced co-operation between provinces, territories, and the federal government.

In delivering concrete results to Canadians, the Vancouver declaration also established a pan-Canadian framework for combating climate change, under which four working groups were put in place to identify options for action in four areas, including clean technology. One of these federal-provincial-territorial working groups focuses on clean technology, innovation, and jobs, and will deliver options on how to stimulate economic growth, create jobs, and drive innovation across all sectors to transition to a low-carbon economy, leveraging regional strengths.

● (1255)

We are looking forward to the final report, which will be published this fall, providing policy options for federal, provincial, and territorial partners to implement in their respective jurisdictions. This report highlights the strong potential to improve environmental, economic, and social outcomes for remote and indigenous communities to work toward energy independence through greater deployment of clean technologies. It is also important that these new approaches to encourage clean growth across the country should not result in higher costs for essential goods and services in those remote areas.

It is recognized that the adoption of clean technology can be a tool that will both improve the environment and provide economic opportunities to northern and remote indigenous communities, which can act as agents of change to help guide Canada to a low carbon economy. We also recognize the utmost importance of effective engagement and collaboration with indigenous peoples and communities for this effort to be fruitful.

Government Orders

While work is under way to develop options and measures this fall through the pan-Canadian framework, the federal government is already taking action to seize the economic opportunities of climate change.

Budget 2016 recognized that protecting the environment and growing the economy go hand in hand. It noted that the global clean technology market is growing rapidly, presenting Canadian businesses with an immense opportunity to showcase their ingenuity and support sustainable prosperity for all Canadians.

The commitments included in budget 2016 total almost \$2.9 billion over five years to address climate change and air pollution issues. These commitments include \$2 billion over two years starting in 2017-18 to establish the low carbon economy fund; \$128.8 million over five years starting in 2016-17 to Natural Resources Canada to deliver energy efficiency policies and programs and maintain clean energy policy capacity; and \$56.9 million over two years starting in 2016-17 to Transport Canada and Environment and Climate Change Canada to support the transition to a cleaner transportation sector, including through the development of regulations and standards for clean transportation technology.

It is well understood that climate change is a threat to Canada's ecosystems, communities, and the economy. Given the seriousness of climate change, action from all sectors of the economy is required, and the shift of businesses decarbonizing their processes and products has already begun.

It is important for Canada to act quickly to enable a smoother transition, allowing businesses to take the best long-term decisions and thrive in a low-carbon economy. One key measure to provide this clear signal to businesses about the path Canada wants to take when it comes to GHG emissions is carbon pricing. Carbon pricing uses the market to drive investments in low-carbon innovations, leading to the development and adoption of clean technologies, energy efficiency, and reduced emissions. It creates financial incentives for consumers and producers to shift consumption and investment decisions to cleaner alternatives, which consequently foster innovation. A national approach to carbon pricing will be a central component to the pan-Canadian framework for clean growth and climate change.

It is clear that there are economic benefits to acting on climate change, and Canada has significant advantages and the expertise it can leverage to capture its share. It can count on some of the best scientists and researchers in the world to find novel solutions. It has a well-educated and highly skilled workforce.

As many countries are moving rapidly to develop and sell clean technologies across the globe, Canada needs to focus its efforts to stay in the game. To successfully compete in the global market while capitalizing on current and future economic opportunities, Canada will need to be strategic in its approach to clean technology development, commercialization, and adoption. This will allow economic growth and environmental preservation to go hand in hand and will allow all Canadians to continue to enjoy a country that is sustainable, prosperous, and innovative.

• (1300)

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the contribution by the member

opposite to this debate. She did mention carbon pricing. Obviously this is a subject on which few details have been given.

If I were a provincially elected member, I would have questions about the money being collected by Ottawa and then sent back to the provinces. Would there be strings attached to that, linking it to certain pet projects of the government? Would there be GST on top of the so-called carbon tax? These are questions that my constituents have. These are questions whose answers should be known by members of provincial legislative assemblies right across this country. If the member does not know, that is fine, but I do hope that she and her government will be presenting these details in the days to come.

Mrs. Deborah Schulte: Mr. Speaker, that is an excellent question.

I was listening to the Prime Minister yesterday when he made it very clear that any money that is raised from carbon pricing will be going back to the provinces. There will be no money received at the federal level that will stay at the federal level.

The Prime Minister made that very clear in his talk yesterday. We know that carbon pricing is the most efficient way to reduce greenhouse gases. We know that it will stimulate the innovation in clean growth and the creation of jobs for the middle class. We know it is an important thing to do.

The money is to stay in the provinces where it is generated.

Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for her hard work on the environment file. It is a pleasure working on the committee with her.

The question I would like to put to her is whether she is going to support our subamendment. I know that she has read all the documents. I am sure she has read the Paris agreement. I am sure she is aware of the Vancouver declaration.

However, it is important for the member to recognize, having read those, that both the Paris agreement and the Vancouver declaration, which Canada has signed and is now considering ratifying, say that the parties will commit to engagement of indigenous peoples and the peoples of their country.

What we are debating is the motion put forward by the government. The government has simply said it now wants to ratify. Based on what it has put forward so far, generally speaking, apart from some money in the budget, it is saying that at some time in the future there is going to be carbon tax. However, the motion also says that it only commits to engage provinces and territories.

Government Orders

Does the member think that all members of this place should stand and support our subamendment, which specifically mentions adding the necessity to engage indigenous peoples, municipalities, and the people of Canada, and that we should have a full package of proposals to meet our commitments to two degrees in the Paris agreement?

Mrs. Deborah Schulte: Mr. Speaker, I too want to thank the member for her advocacy work over many years on this file.

It is clear that there is a problem, and we need to lean in and do something about it. It is also clear, as I mentioned in my speech, that all levels of government and all parties in Canada, every single person is going to need to be involved in this movement to a cleaner economy and creating a cleaner environment and future for the country.

I definitely agree with the member opposite that this is not something that just governments are going to be involved in. All business are going to need to be players, and so is the public. We all need to engage with this subject. This is one of the reasons our minister asked for consultation all summer. We have been hearing from people across this country on what they believe we should be doing and what they want to see us doing to ensure a better future for themselves, their children, and grandchildren.

● (1305)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the member would confirm, as I believe, that indigenous people are in fact a part of the process with the government, working hand in hand on a number of fronts, whether it is the environment or other pressing issues.

We see that in the throne speech, the budget, and in many of the consultations that have been taking place, the many different public meetings, the many one-on-one discussions, and even within cabinet.

Would the member not agree that all people are in fact a part of the dialogue, the great Canadian debate on Canada's environment and the things that we need to do?

Mrs. Deborah Schulte: Mr. Speaker, that brings me back to part of the question that was asked that I neglected to answer previously.

Absolutely, 100%, first nations are intimately involved in charting the future for Canada. Reconciliation is one of the very important ways that we are going to move forward. I am on the environment committee, and we have been working on protected spaces, which is not only going to help with biodiversity but also with carbon retainers and carbon sinks for the future, as well as helping to mitigate climate change.

We are working on this file, and we went out specifically to meet with first nations and other groups and businesses, but first nations in particular. First nations have been trying to communicate to us what we should be doing going forward. Up until recently we have not been paying much attention.

We are definitely paying attention now. First nations are very involved with the government through working groups and

consultations that we are doing, and in working with us to chart a course forward.

[*Translation*]

Mr. William Amos (Pontiac, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the scientific evidence is unequivocal: the earth's climate is warming.

Climate change is real and Canadians are already feeling its negative effects. Whether it is the increase in the frequency of droughts or coastal flooding, or the accelerated melting of sea ice in the Arctic, the large-scale repercussions of climate change are pushing Canada to take appropriate action.

Previous conclusions are not far-fetched. They are based on an international scientific consensus supported by decades of rigorous scientific analysis and detailed assessments of the state of scientific knowledge about climate change.

Considering that global warming is real and that it is already affecting Canada, perhaps more than other countries, to a considerable extent, it is imperative that we adopt the motion we are debating today, that we continue to work together, and that we call on science to help us face the major challenges that climate change poses for Canada.

Every country in the world emits greenhouse gases that expand throughout the earth's atmosphere, which is why we need concerted global action against climate change. That is the very essence of the Paris agreement, which is based on scientific evidence.

Last December, Canada attended the Paris conference filled with ambition and determination. We worked on an ambitious but balanced agreement. Under this agreement, countries set targets for themselves and report on their progress in a transparent manner. They must also each review and improve their pollution targets every five years.

This agreement is based on sound scientific evidence. Under this extraordinary agreement, each country will take practical measures to hold the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2°C and limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C.

In order to meet the targets set out in the Paris agreement, the Canadian first ministers agreed to work together to develop a pan-Canadian framework on clean growth and climate change and implement it by 2017. This framework will build on the measures being taken by the provinces and territories, be supported by an extensive engagement effort by indigenous people and Canadians, and be guided by facts and science.

● (1310)

[*English*]

In support of this pan-Canadian framework for clean growth and climate change, Canada has established four working groups, with its provincial, territorial, and indigenous partners, in order to take measures to reduce emissions and meet our commitments. We look forward to these four reports being released later on this fall.

Government Orders

[Translation]

Let us be clear. The people of Pontiac and I appreciate the Prime Minister's leadership on pricing carbon pollution. Canada is determined to build a cleaner and more innovative economy where there are fewer greenhouse gas emissions, the environment is protected, and high-paying jobs are created for the middle class and those working hard to join it.

[English]

We cannot afford not to act. The former national round table on the environment and economy, which was killed by the former government, estimated in 2011 that the economy-wide cost to Canada of climate change will accelerate, rising from an average value of \$5 billion in 2020 to between \$21 billion and \$43 billion by 2050. The round table found that the average cost by 2050 would amount to roughly .8% to 1% of GDP. It found that in Vancouver, Calgary, Toronto, and Montreal, climate change will result in additional deaths from heat and pollution in the order of 3 to 6 deaths per 100,000 people per year in the 2020s. This impact will worsen in future decades. The risks of flooding are clear. As many as 16,000 to 28,000 dwellings will be at permanent risk of flooding. Therefore, the economic costs could be in the trillions of dollars.

This is why our insurance rates are going up, and Canadians know this. Canadians are already paying.

A 2015 study by the Insurance Bureau of Canada found that the direct and indirect impacts of weather effects of climate change on our communities will be great. For example, the cumulative estimated cost of weather effects in Mississauga from freezing rain attributed to climate change could reach over \$30 million by 2040. An extreme climate event, such as a 1-in-25-year freezing rain event occurring in 2040 will be estimated to cost as much as \$15.7 million.

However, the costs go beyond freezing rain and flooding. They go to the very heart of what it means to be Canadian.

Let us talk about outdoor rinks. A 2014 study, published in the journal *Nature Climate Change*, found that as a result of weather changes from climate change, we will not be able to skate on outdoor rinks as long as we have done previously. On average, the availability of outdoor rinks will decline by about three to four days per decade through 2090. This means that the Rideau Canal here in the national capital region will be available an average of 40 days in the 2040 horizon, but as few as 15 days in 2090. That is down an average of 50 days from the 1972 to 2013 period.

I want my two children to enjoy the opportunity to skate on ponds and play hockey, and I want their grandchildren to have that same opportunity. The people across Canada and the people in Pontiac demand action. For 10 years, they have seen the federal government fiddle while the world burns.

[Translation]

We all know that the time for talk has passed. It is time for action. It is urgent that we take steps to reduce emissions, reduce the impact of pollution on our health, and reduce our environmental footprint. We have to help developing countries transition to a cleaner energy future. We have to help Canadian communities adapt to the inevitable reality of climate change.

[English]

Canada needs a price on carbon. It may be a carbon tax, a cap-and-trade system, or a combination. Ultimately, it does not matter as long as there is a price on carbon. As long as it is coordinated, it will be in the best interest of Canada's environment and our economy.

However, a price on carbon alone will be insufficient to meet our targets. We need performance-based standards and regulations. This has to be conceived as a human rights issue. It is not just an economic issue. It is not just an environmental issue. It is about human rights.

[Translation]

Climate change poses a serious threat to any number of human rights, including the right to life, water and sanitation, food, health, culture, development, and a healthy environment.

Recognizing the impact on human rights, the parties agreed to a more ambitious target for the Paris agreement. The preamble to the Paris agreement clearly states the following:

...Parties should, when taking action to address climate change, respect, promote and consider their respective obligations on human rights...

Yes, ratifying the Paris agreement has human rights implications, but it is also an incredible opportunity. Canada can and must create green, clean-energy jobs.

● (1315)

[English]

By continuing to invest through our infrastructure funds and through our innovation funds, we need to accelerate the elimination of carbon in our economy. We can create a better future for all Canadians in so doing.

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciated listening to the member, which brought some questions to my mind.

The member said that we cannot afford not to act and that there are disasters that are happening across Canada, which is true. However, has the member thought through how many of those disasters are a result of Canada's emissions versus emissions from larger places, like China, India, and the United States, who are all part of this agreement as well? We have said that we have this huge responsibility within Canada. I would ask the member where the balance is.

Government Orders

In my home province of Saskatchewan, we are carbon sequestering with our coal plants. The minister was there, and it is phenomenal what they are willingly doing. Our southern Saskatchewan ranchers are self-regulated, choosing between environmental methods of protecting the environment for their pasture land, and choosing to do that independently. Our agriculture boasts zero tillage, improved environmental performance on machinery, and we are retrofitting and building homes. We built our own in 1985. Our forest and park systems include and make us, the province of Saskatchewan, carbon neutral, or a negative carbon producing province.

My question to the member is: When he sees what we are doing as a country and the new relationship with the Government of China, what are the expectations in regard to this? The member spoke of human rights in regard to the climate. Should our government not be making some demands—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Time is limited and we will try to get at least one more question in.

The hon. member for Pontiac.

Mr. William Amos: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that this is a national debate. The voices of the provinces must be heard, and they are being heard. This is a great debate for us to continue to have.

Looking internationally, we need to be honest. This is not about Canada getting away with doing less because other countries emit more. Obviously, the United States and China are the world's two biggest economies and the world's two biggest emitters. However, that does not mean they are not doing their part; they are.

President Obama said that he would adopt “an all-of-the-above strategy”. He is working closely with Minister McKenna and the Prime Minister to ensure a continental approach to reducing our emissions so it is most economically efficient and we meet our global targets, which we have agreed to with China, the United State, and all our international partners.

I do not think that at this point in time it can be said, as it was said for so many years under the previous government, that there is international disagreement. There is not. The Paris accord demonstrates it. The science is clear. Now it is time to act. Yes, provinces across the country are taking measures, and I congratulate them for those measures. I congratulate the Government of Saskatchewan for its sequestration work, but it needs to do more, and so it will as will the rest of Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Romeo Saganash (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Pontiac for his presentation.

My colleague from Edmonton Strathcona asked the member for King—Vaughan a very clear question, but she refused to answer it. I would like to come back to that because, as a lawyer, the member for Pontiac must know that the wording of a motion is important.

The NDP noticed that indigenous peoples were not mentioned in the motion. That is why we proposed this subamendment to include indigenous peoples in the equation in today's debate.

The question was very simple and requires only a yes or no answer: will the member for Pontiac support the NDP's subamendment?

• (1320)

Mr. William Amos: Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear that the Government of Canada has been consulting and negotiating directly with indigenous peoples from coast to coast to coast for many months now. Inuit peoples, first nations, and other indigenous populations have been participating in these talks, which have been taking place as part of a pan-Canadian strategy currently being negotiated with the provinces, with the four working groups.

It is crucial that they be part of the solution. I believe that the Government of Canada has a duty to ensure that those discussions are worthy of the crown. Our Minister of Environment, Ms. McKenna, will continue this dialogue.

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: Before we resume debate, in the last half hour there have been a couple of references to the use of members' names as opposed to their titles or ridings. I would remind hon. members to try to get into the third-person way of speaking and to also refrain from using the names of other hon. members.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa.

Mr. Robert Sopuck (Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Bow River.

Before I start my speech, I was interested in my Liberal colleague across the way saying that the Liberals wanted to eliminate carbon from our economy. It shows a lack of science understanding on the other side. I would suggest to him that he should look up the photosynthesis equation, which is the most important equation on earth, and the first element is carbon dioxide.

I rise in the House to speak to the proposed ratification of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change dealing with greenhouse emissions mitigation, adaptation, and finance starting in the year 2020, better known as the Paris agreement.

The motion before us can be supported in one sense, but is significantly improved by our amendment to ensure we do not encroach on provincial and territorial responsibilities, and we must not raise taxes on Canadians. Therefore, I would support the motion as amended. However, it seems clear that the Prime Minister has no intention of seeking consent from or co-operating with the provinces in this regard.

Aside from the actual content of the agreement, what most Canadians will likely remember best from Paris is the return of Liberal excess and entitlement. The great junket cost taxpayers nearly \$1 million. Canadians will also remember going forward that this is the agreement that the Liberals believe gave them the right to unilaterally impose a carbon tax on them.

Government Orders

That aside, we recognize that Canada must do its part in reducing greenhouse gas emissions, but not at the expense of seriously harming our own economy. I would also mention it is good to see that the Liberal government has adopted the greenhouse gas emissions reduction target set by our previous Conservative government, but it is how we get there that matters most.

I am very proud to represent the vast rural constituency of Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa in west central Manitoba. My riding is primarily agricultural and, in addition to producing grains and oilseeds, my riding is the largest producer of canola in the entire country. Our land supports thriving cattle and hog industries, and commercial forestry which supports many jobs in the northern region. My constituency is also blessed with vast tracts of natural habitats and numerous lakes that support hunting, angling and trapping, activities that are critical to our way of life and our thriving tourism industry.

My constituents have a deep commitment to conservation. They live with and among a beautiful environment with wildlife and there are dozens of wildlife and fisheries conservation organizations supporting many fish and wildlife enhancement projects every year. This is the kind of environmental conservation that does not get the recognition it deserves: good, honest people on the land doing good, honest conservation work that benefits the entire country. I am very proud to represent those people in my constituency.

As an example, wetlands are critical to my riding and to environmental conservation across the country. By way of example, many Canadians may not know that just one acre of wetlands gained or restored equates to roughly a full year of carbon emissions from 160 cars on the road. We never hear anything about landscape conservation from the Liberal government when it comes to climate change, although it is equally or more important than much of the activities it is proposing. Partnering with groups that promote wetlands conservation and restoration does far more than targets and frameworks.

However, by focusing so much on carbon emission reductions, the Liberal government is ignoring this very significant environmental opportunity and it is a major opportunity.

Aside from wetlands effectively sequestering carbon, they also purify water, conserve biodiversity and improve flood control. Our Conservative government, through our national conservation plan, supported significant wetlands and other habitat conservation programs that delivered multiple benefits for the same cost. I would urge the government to do the same.

Interestingly in the previous Parliament, the environment committee that I was a part of did a major study on Great Lakes water quality and the loss of wetlands around the Great Lakes was implicated in the decline of water quality in Lake Erie in particular.

Again, the government has an opportunity to spend money efficiently and deliver multiple benefits, and I am using wetlands conservation as an example, and in the case of the Great Lakes, improve Great Lakes water quality and sequester carbon and conserve biodiversity at the same time.

Now that is Conservative-style environmentalism. I know the Liberals are not really familiar with efficient conservation that

delivers real benefits, but I would urge them to adopt that kind of conservation.

• (1325)

This is not to say that projects to expand wetlands to protect wildlife habitats are the only options when it comes to reaching environmental targets. However, we must avoid having our sole focus on mandating compliance and regulating businesses out of existence. There are many technological advances that have and will continue to be made to limit emissions and ensure sustainable development.

I wholeheartedly support advancements in clean technology development and innovation, especially in Canada's national resources and renewable energy sectors. However, government programs must deliver concrete and measurable results for businesses and the environment, and the key word being "measurable".

Surely, it is not just the Conservatives who recognize that governments are notoriously bad at picking winners. We must not subsidize using taxpayer money in the hopes of innovating in these areas if it is not economically viable. Governments can play a role in investing and incentivizing to create a climate for investment, but we must not lose focus on what matters most, actual and real results for environmental dollars spent.

My riding is one that would be tremendously impacted by any federally-imposed carbon tax. How the Liberals cannot realize that a carbon tax will disproportionately hurt Canadians living in rural and remote areas is beyond me. How it will hurt agriculture is obvious. It takes a lot of energy to produce the food to feed our country, and the world. As one farmer said humorously, a Prius cannot pull an air seeder.

Farmers who are already working within margins can ill-afford to have the tax burden on their businesses and families increased. The fact is that people in rural areas will drive places even if a carbon tax is imposed on them. My constituents will not stop driving their children to school or sporting events. They will not stop going camping in our beautiful wilderness and national parks. They simply will not stop living. However, what they will do is end up paying more to the government coffers, with no beneficial effects on the environment. The Liberals are better off to give the carbon tax money to the conservation groups in my constituency that will do real good for the environment.

Where we live, we do not have mass transit. We cannot bike 30 kilometres every day to go to work. Many of my constituents live on modest incomes, and they will be deeply affected by these taxes.

Government Orders

As verified by the National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy in its report on a carbon pricing policy for Canada, and I happened to have been a member of the national round table at that time, “Given income constraints, lower-income households are also less able to adjust their behaviour and spend on technology or energy efficiency measures in response to a price.” In other words, poor people will be hurt the most.

It is clear that the Conservative Party of Canada is the party of the working people. The people in my constituency and all of our constituencies exemplify that. The fact is that the Liberals need to realize that all they are doing is hurting the good, hard-working people who live in rural and remote parts of our country.

The Canadian Taxpayers Federation estimates that a new carbon tax could result in the average Canadian family paying \$2,500 more in new taxes per year. According to the PBO, Canadian incomes will decline 1% to 3% on average thanks to the Paris agreement. These findings are in addition to the tax hikes the Liberals have proposed.

The fact is that countries that implement policies to spur wealth creation generate the best environmental outcomes. To phrase it simply, getting rich is good for the environment, and the math proves that. Our environmental quality in Canada is the result of wealth creation policies, largely put in by Conservative governments, I might add. Increasing taxes on Canadians while their economies struggle is simply irresponsible.

It is also unfortunate that too many advocates of climate change mitigation like this fail to actually do the math on the environmental effects and get lost in their ideological beliefs. Take for example the Liberal steadfast support of wind energy. Advocates have also failed to mention that wind turbines can have negative effects on the environment and wildlife, not to mention local communities.

For example, one study concludes that of all wind energy facilities, about 368,000 bird fatalities occur every year. These things are Cuisinarts for birds and bats. It is also important to note that many of the bird species killed by wind turbines are SARA-listed species, and endangered bats are also victims of wind turbines.

In 2014, Australia abolished its carbon tax after it was proven harmful. The Ontario Liberal government has accepted its green energy failures.

I hope the Liberals will heed these warnings and adapt their means of achieving these targets away from taxation and regulations and toward partnerships with on-the-ground organizations and incentives for Canadian businesses and families. This is the key to both our continued wealth creation and sustainable economic growth and environmental protection.

• (1330)

Mr. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleague started out strong with his speech, it dipped a bit in the middle, and then I did not understand most of the end of it. However, I want to go back to a couple of points he made.

Let us start where he left off. He said the Canadian Taxpayers Federation apparently ostensibly has hard numbers about the costs of complying with this putting a price on carbon plan that we tabled yesterday. First, I would like to ask if the member is prepared to go

back to the Canadian Taxpayers Federation and ask its members a different question. Can they tell the Canadian people what the costs will be on the average household if we do not take action on climate change? Let us flip this around. Let us stop pretending that there will not be consequential costs flowing from climate change effects in Canadian society.

Second, the member did refer to the use and the importance of the planet's wetlands. Canada possesses about one-quarter of the planet's wetlands. The member and I both know that, because for 10 years I was the president and CEO of the national round table that he referred to.

However, here is something that we did do as a Liberal administration. We created a system of national accounts at Stats Canada to track the important things like the extent of wetlands in Canada, to know how much we actually have and to move toward putting a value on the perfect and free water and air infiltration systems they provide. However, the previous government shut down that unit at Stats Canada. Is he prepared to resurrect that, to have us do that, so we can help his constituents understand the integral role wetlands can play in sequestering carbon?

Mr. Robert Sopuck: Mr. Speaker, I am astonished at that Liberal arrogance. To assume my constituents do not know the value of wetlands is deeply insulting. My farm has nine wetland areas on it. There are thousands and thousands of wetlands in my region. My people know what wetlands mean.

The difference between a Conservative and a Liberal is this. Measurement is important, but the Liberal thinks measurement is the be all and end all. We put money into actual programming through the national conservation plan. By the way, I should point out that back in 1986, the Brian Mulroney government started the North American waterfowl management plan, which continues to this day, and is the single-largest wetlands conservation program in the history of the world. We need no lectures on the value of the wetlands from a Liberal.

In terms of the member's first question, again Canada produces 1.6% of world CO₂ emissions. We will do our part, but again the whole world has to act together to make a difference. Again, Canada's 1.6% is Canada's 1.6%.

Government Orders

•(1335)

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would suggest the Liberals could put our hon. colleague on the road as exhibit A of the problem with the Conservative viewpoint. I remember when the Conservatives used to get up and say there was no such thing as climate change, that it was dinosaur flatulence that caused this. Now what we are hearing is that he has a wetland in his riding so what else do we need to do.

I will say that I have a wetland right behind me, and 100 years later there are still lots of birds but we cannot fish in there because it is poisoned with cyanide and arsenic, because the mining industry at the time thought the easiest way was just to dump. If we had asked them to fix up the environment back then, they would have all screamed that they would all be out of business.

All our northern lakes were destroyed by Inco. What did Inco do? It was not voluntary. Inco managers never fixed it up because they thought it was good to help. No, the capitalist economy was legislated to change it. Guess what happened? They became more efficient and they are making lots of money.

There is the idea that somehow if we ever force industry to do anything it is an absolute threat, when in fact industries have gotten away decade after decade with polluting the atmosphere and not paying. This comes from a region full of resource communities that know. Our communities have lived with that environmental impact, so we are not flat-earthers like my hon. colleague. We actually believe that legislation is needed to make these guys live up to their obligations.

Mr. Robert Sopuck: Mr. Speaker, speaking of flatulence.

I used to be the environmental director at a paper mill, and in 1989 the Brian Mulroney government, a Conservative government, implemented the pulp and paper effluent regulations. There is a place for regulations and there is a place for incentives. Regulations work in the case of point-source pollution. In the case of paper mills, the pulp and paper effluent regulations in 1989 forced all the companies, my own included, to spend \$25 million on waste-water treatment plants. In some cases, regulations work.

I have been to Sudbury. I have met people there. I have seen the Sudbury miracle, so regulations work in some cases. In other cases, incentives work. When we try to regulate where incentives are the most appropriate, it simply will not generate any environmental benefits.

For my friend opposite, the New Democrats want all industry, pipelines, resources, and everybody shut down for some strange reason. I guess it is from the Leap Manifesto.

Mr. Martin Shields (Bow River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to stand today to speak to the Paris agreement, which was completed in December 2015.

Paris is a great city. It is known as the city of light, a city with a long and exciting history, one filled with many events that helped define global politics and power to this day. There has been a direct connection to North America in these agreements. First, there was the signing of the Treaty of Paris in 1763, which is very important to the British North American colonies, which became the Canada we

know today. It was important because it ceded all remaining French territory in North America to other powers, mostly Great Britain.

Then there was the Treaty of Paris in 1783, which led to the end of hostilities between the United States of America and Great Britain after the Americans were victorious in the American revolution. Then there was the Treaty of Paris of 1815, which marked the end of the Napoleonic wars in Europe for the second and final time, thankfully. Then in 1898 there was another Treaty of Paris, which when signed led to the dissolution of the remnants of the Spanish Empire and the end of the Spanish-American war. More recently, in 1973, the Paris Peace Accords occurred, which led to the end of the war in Vietnam. It seemed to take as long to decide the shape of the table to negotiate the agreement as it took to complete that accord.

That leads us to 2015, where a different kind of conference took place. That would be the Paris agreement within the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

Canada had a delegation present, including the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, our party's environment critic, the hon. member for Abbotsford, as well as many other officials. The result of the conference was an agreement reached about the climate change priorities of 191 member states. This is a major agreement and it certainly could have short-, medium-, and long-term implications for Canada, indeed, the entire world.

The modern world in which we live is all about how humans can adapt to challenges that are thrown our way. That is why I believe that mitigation, adaptation, and adaptability will be the most important parts of what we discuss here in Parliament with respect to the Paris agreement.

We know that climate change has occurred and it is continuing to occur. What we decide to do about it and the approach we take to tackle these issues is what is important here today. Humans and mother nature combine to create challenges. One explosion of a major volcano and there is a huge effect on the atmosphere. We cannot control mother nature. Usually when we think we can or attempt to do so, we get a rude wake-up call.

However, we can work with the decisions human beings make on this planet. I believe there is a difference in philosophies between the parties in the House about the best way to tackle the climate change issue we face. I believe that there are a great number of adaptation techniques that are currently being applied that are helping us deal with climate change.

For example, we are on the precipice of some very advanced, clean coal technology, which may allow us to re-examine the use of clean coal in some parts of the world, including parts of Canada. I want to be clear that we are not talking about the dirty soot-spewing coal of production in the past, but a much cleaner and modern alternative. That is one example of adaptability.

Government Orders

Windmills are interesting and an increasing power source, but it is taking more and more coal mining to make the steel to make the blades than ever before. Where is that happening? Not in the added-value economies of Canada. That whole production process has some environmental drawbacks.

I believe that there are other power sources. We had the stuff for decades and we will now more likely to be able to focus on it. For example, what about harnessing the tidal power of the Bay of Fundy?

Being an older guy, I know the history of technical advances in Fort McMurray, for example. I first witnessed this process in 1974, and more recently, just a few years ago. Incredible technologies have changed the process since the first plant was built in 1966.

If we go millions of years back in history, we could find ourselves in the Mesozoic era where dinosaurs ran free across the earth. No, I am not a dinosaur. I was not there. The poor dinosaurs could not adapt as well, as we know. Their species became extinct. In fact, not to digress, but the heartland of Canada's dinosaur deposits were discovered over 100 years ago in my constituency, in the UNESCO World Heritage Dinosaur Provincial Park.

The dinosaurs are gone and we humans have to innovate to make sure that we survive the climate change challenges we face. I think the House sees that we are making great strides in terms of technology and expertise right here in our own backyards, right here in Canada. If we are looking at places where we can use money to leverage expertise and resources, I believe the best place we can spend that money would be right here in Canada.

• (1340)

We have the expertise. There are many highly educated, motivated, and innovative citizens. On the issue of climate change, we could really lead the world in developing new climate change mitigation and adaptation technologies and strategies. If the government plans on spending money, let us do it here so we can give Canada a boost, and then lead the rest of the world.

The environmental issues my constituents and all Canadians face would be best tackled by people in their communities. It is my desire that the Paris agreement confirm the ability of our communities, constituencies, and regions to make decisions about how to adapt and mitigate the effects of climate change. Municipalities have been leading the way for many years.

Industries, such as agriculture in my riding, have developed techniques that reduce the carbon footprint. There are innovative businesses in communities right across the country that are ready to be part of the solution. CCR Technologies, from Brooks, in my riding, is an innovative business. It is a great example of local companies making a difference in the world, and recently at Boundary Dam in Saskatchewan. It is working on some very interesting projects we have heard about.

The right approach is to support Canadian industries, domestic companies that are working on innovative clean technology solutions that can be world class.

With this in mind, our party will support the first part of the motion, which agrees with the spirit of the Paris agreement. What we

do have an issue with is the second part of the motion, which relates to the Vancouver declaration. It is problematic. I have concerns when the federal government uses its powers to encroach upon the rights of the provinces to deliver their own climate change plan. It is very important for legislators and decision-makers from all levels of government to respect each other's jurisdictions. Our party has some concerns with respect to interfering with provincial affairs. That is one of the reasons that our side is proposing an amendment to the second part of today's Liberal motion.

We do indeed support a strategy to deal with climate change. We believe it is important for all Canadians to have a stake in the solution and that a broad, science-based, market-based solution to climate change strikes the right balance for any strategy. Adding more to the tax burden of tapped-out Canadians is an approach we cannot support, which is one of the reasons we are offering an amendment.

Another issue I have some concerns with is applying a one-size-fits-all solution that would potentially meddle in provincial affairs and put some provincial governments in an impossible situation. It could also unfairly affect certain parts of Canada.

I have some specific concerns about how supporting the Vancouver declaration could impact northern and Arctic communities. This is one of the reasons why many of the northern territories legislators came out firmly against a one-size-fits-all approach. They are watching the sea ice and permafrost conditions up close and first hand.

It is critical that we strike the right balance. We believe that a strong economy, along with robust environmental policies, is the correct course of action. We also believe that these two concepts are by no means mutually exclusive, but can go hand in hand.

Unfortunately, we have forgotten some of the tried, tested, cultural, and science-based climate mitigation strategies that do not require billions of dollars when practised effectively. I speak of some of the wetland and boreal forest conservation that can be very beneficial to ecosystems and the environment.

Last week, for instance, I met with the Ducks Unlimited people. They were talking about a lot of excellent conservation projects that they work on across Canada. I have visited some of those in my own constituency. People often forget that a major part of Ducks Unlimited's mandate is conservation and the members of Ducks Unlimited, at least in my area, tend to be ranchers and other land users. These people are experts at conservation by design. They have a vested interest in making sure that conservation is always a top priority in their daily activities.

Indigenous people from the Prairies understood the value of forest fires in the regeneration of a varieties of plants and ecosystems. In recent years, national parks have begun to replicate this understood cultural and environmentally positive practice with controlled burns in parks.

Too much of the debate is centred around the desire to spend a lot of taxpayers' money on projects that do not deliver any benefit but are more or less feel-good projects. I would much favour environmental strategies that focus on tangible results, such as funding conservation priorities and by working with organizations like Ducks Unlimited to achieve our common goals.

We are happy to support the first part of the Liberal motion and offer an amendment to the second part.

• (1345)

Mr. William Amos (Pontiac, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I must say that it is refreshing to hear the member for Bow River speak to the reality and severity of the issue of climate change.

I agree he is not a Conservative dinosaur. In fact, I have gotten to know him quite a bit more over the past several weeks and appreciate tremendously what he brings to the House and to the issues of climate change and conservation more broadly for the entire country. I also appreciate that he has focused on innovative businesses.

I would like to get his sense of the following comments by Canadian business leaders. Suncor, to take an example, has stated, “We support a broad-based price on carbon as an important tool to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the fight against climate change”. Shell Canada's president, Michael Crothers, has stated that “balancing Canadian economic development while protecting the environment will be enabled by a reasonable price on carbon”. Finally, the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers, has said that “a national carbon price moves Canada into being a global leader on climate, and that we now need to balance that with the growth of our economy”.

Would the member opposite react to these remarks by Canada's energy industry?

Mr. Martin Shields: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to compliment my colleague across the floor for his strong beliefs and his work in this field and how he brings that to our committee. We have learned much about his background and his interests in this area. Indeed, we can all gain by learning from each other in the House.

It is interesting that in my part of the world, we find that the major corporations, the CEOs, the presidents, and the owners of majors will say this, yet they are also the companies that are cutting back and releasing a lot of staff. A lot of their employees no longer work. These are the people I see in my communities, where the innovation that has been mentioned has not created jobs for them. They are unemployed; they are on EI. These are the ones in my community, at the grassroots levels, from these companies, who are not seeing the benefits.

• (1350)

Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, everyone wants to help the planet. However, Canada accounts for

Government Orders

less than 2% of the world's footprint; therefore, reducing our footprint, alone, will not serve to reduce global warming. China, India, the U.S., and the U.K. make up 60% of the footprint. China has no carbon tax and is still building coal plants. The U.S. has no carbon tax.

I wonder if the member would comment further on what I believe is the right solution: leveraging Canada's carbon emission reduction technology for the substantive contributors so they can create Canadian jobs and help the planet?

Mr. Martin Shields: Mr. Speaker, again, we have people in the House who bring such intelligent and educated backgrounds to help us all learn about these things. That member is one of those people.

Bringing a balanced approach to how we can address this is critically important. I have always believed that a little bit of honey makes things happen a lot quicker than a big stick beating people. Through my career, I have seen a tremendous amount of innovation result when people work together and collaborate. The big stick just does not work. I would agree with the member that we need more of those positive incentives, more of that working together, more of that collaboration. We have phenomenal people in this country who can accomplish that, who will do it with the right incentives and environment.

The Deputy Speaker: Before we recognize the hon. member for Ottawa South, I will let him know that we do not quite have the full 10 minutes before the interruption that will come at 2 p.m., but he can at least get started and he will have the remaining time, of course, after question period and members' statements.

Mr. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, given the shortness of time, I want to focus on a couple of key themes in this debate about our response to and our plan for climate change and the Paris process.

The first thing I want to remind all colleagues is that this has nothing to do with ideology. It is not ideology, it is not voodoo; it is science. There are 2,200 Nobel Peace Prize winners and IPCC scientists telling us that we have to hold global temperature increases to between 2°C and 4°C. We have droughts, we have floods, we have sea levels rising. Ask the mayor of Miami. We have the insurance industry that blew the whistle two decades ago and told us there was a canary in the coal mine. Major storms are becoming more frequent, claim costs are way up, and insurability is way down. Ask Lloyd's of London.

Scientists are also telling us that if we see a 4°C to 6°C temperature increase by 2100, then 30% to 40% of all known species—and we do not know all the species yet—will be threatened. As one of my kids might say, “Houston, we have a problem”.

Statements by Members

First, we must stabilize global emissions by 2050 and then reduce them. That is what we have decided to do as a planet, and it is clear why we are doing this. It is the right thing to do. In fact, it is the only thing to do.

I believe that our plan is about a new generation of politics. It cuts across genders, it throws out the old notion of a left-right spectrum, and cuts across all age groups, all socio-economic clusters, all cultures, all Canadians. Why? It is because there is only one atmosphere, one world, one people, one destiny.

Apparently, we are so insane on this side of the House that we want to get as much as we can from the \$3 trillion environmental technologies market, which Goldman Sachs says is only getting bigger, and getting bigger faster. I think we are all with Sir Nicholas Stern from the London School of Economics, who has said that we can pay now and make the shift and prosper, or pay later and pay an awful lot. That is why he called on the planet to invest 1% of global GDP now to avoid a potential loss of 20% of global GDP by 2050. This is about winning the race and leading the world.

We are heading as a country and a planet at breakneck speed into a carbon-constrained future. As one of the world's top environmental economists once said, we did not get out of the stone age because we ran out of stones. We are also not going to get out of the fossil fuel age because we are running out of fossil fuels. We are going to transition from the fossil fuel age to a new carbon-constrained world.

We spent last week debating national security. This debate, in my mind, is partly about national security, but it is largely about natural security and whether we are going to learn as a species to live within the carrying capacity of the planet. Scientists have told us there is a theoretical threshold that we do not want to cross. They do not know where it is. That is why we continue to invest in science. That is why we have so many data collection points on climate all over the world, in order to monitor and know the effects.

We do not want to play Russian roulette with the atmosphere, do we? No one wants to play Russian roulette with the carrying capacity of the planet, because we have all agreed to take a precautionary approach. We have to take a long, hard look at the planet's carrying capacity to sustain us, and our economies and consumption patterns, all the while assimilating our waste.

• (1355)

We should also be cognizant of this: two billion more people will be coming to join us on this planet in the next 30 years. We cannot feed 900 million of them now, so how in the name of God are we going to deal with this challenge? How are we going to move with our agricultural production processes? How are we going to deal with the consumption trends?

I should say here that I will be splitting my time with the member for Vancouver Quadra. I am sure that member will be coming back to many of these themes.

I want to close before today's statements by members by saying this. When we burn fossil fuels, we are asking our atmosphere to assimilate greenhouse gases. Is it not interesting to note that when construction containers are filled up with waste, a tipping fee has to be paid to drive them over and dump the waste into a dump site, but when we burn fossil fuels we pay very little, if anything, for the

privilege of emitting greenhouse gases into the one solitary atmosphere we have.

That is why pricing carbon pollution is all about crossing the Rubicon. Every single economist tells us that this is the right thing to do. In fact, *soyons honnêtes*, Stephen Harper as Prime Minister of Canada went to London, England, where he gave a global energy superpower speech and said that by 2018 carbon would be priced at \$150 a tonne in Canada under his cap-and-trade system.

This is about internalizing a cost that heretofore has remained outside our economic measurement, outside our economic accounting. It is time for us to internalize that cost, because it will have a profound influence on efficiency.

This is a race about becoming the cleanest economy in the world. Therefore, we have to choose. We are competing. What does it mean to be the cleanest economy in the world? It means being the most efficient economy in the world, most efficient with energy, most efficient with material and matter, most efficient with water. That is the race we are embroiled in, and the jurisdiction that gets it best is the jurisdiction that is going to win, that is going to have the jobs, that is going to create the wealth, and that it is going to lead the way in a trajectory for the future.

• (1400)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: When the House resumes debate on this motion, the hon. member for Ottawa South will have two minutes to conclude his remarks and five minutes for questions and comments.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*Translation*]

REPLACEMENT WORKERS

Mr. Simon Marcil (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Quebec workers under federal jurisdiction are not benefiting from Quebec's 40-year-old anti-scab legislation because Ottawa is still in the 19th century.

Just today, the Canada Lands Company, based in Toronto, replaced employees of the Old Port of Montreal with scabs. It is unacceptable.

My colleague, the hon. member for Bécancour—Nicolet—Saurel, here today, has been working on resolving this problem since 1987. He introduced a bill on the matter and today he is the dean of the House.

Ottawa lacks the will both to protect people who earn an honest living and to stop the wealthy from evading taxes. Just last week, the Liberal government voted against workers and in favour of scabs. Unfortunately for Quebec workers these past 40 years, whether under Conservative or Liberal rule, it is just more of the same.

*Statements by Members**[English]***SAULT STE. MARIE**

Mr. Terry Sheehan (Sault Ste. Marie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a hearty welcome back to you and all my colleagues.

This past summer was a busy one in the beautiful riding of Sault Ste. Marie. I met with many constituents concerning a variety of matters and listened to area leadership about their priorities.

The Minister of Finance was in the Soo to promote the Canada child benefit. He spoke about security and retirement, and showed the government's continued support for steel.

We hosted a number of consultations on a variety of subjects, including climate change. After all, Sault Ste. Marie is the alternative energy capital of North America.

We welcomed five Syrian refugee families to Canada.

I even sponsored a petition to make curling one of Canada's national sports, created by Saultite Scott Morphet and promoted by Olympic gold medalist Brad Jacobs. I would like to ask this House to hurry hard and sign the petition to make curling a national sport.

* * *

*[Translation]***CARMEN DALLAIRE**

Hon. Maxime Bernier (Beauce, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today, I have the great pleasure of welcoming to the House of Commons Carmen Dallaire, whose “wish of a lifetime” is coming true.

Ms. Dallaire is 87 years old and was a teacher for 32 years. I was one of her sixth-grade students. Ms. Dallaire helped me become the man I am today. My dear teacher, thank you for sharing a part of your life with me.

I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to teachers. I would like to thank them for their dedication, great patience, and tolerance. Teaching is a vocation, not a profession. We should be grateful because they are the ones educating those who will follow us.

Once again, I cannot thank you enough, Ms. Dallaire. I hope you are not too disappointed in me.

* * *

*[English]***GERALD GREENSLADE**

Mr. Ken McDonald (Avalon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to a great man, a community leader, a volunteer, and the first mayor of my hometown of Conception Bay South. A veteran of World War II, Gerald Greenslade passed away on September 23, just a few days shy of his 96th birthday.

As a former mayor of Conception Bay South, I have seen first hand the impact that Gerald's spirit, passion, and dedication have had on our community. Without him, our bright town with its bright future would not be what it is today.

Gerald's vision for the Town of Conception Bay South, where he ran his business and raised a family, was endless. Gerald was the

driving force behind the consolidation of nine small communities to become the Town of Conception Bay South.

Gerald's passion for our town, his spirit, and his dedication remain in our community and in our hearts. May he rest in peace.

* * *

*[Translation]***POVERTY**

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the 40,000 people who signed my petition to raise the minimum wage to \$15 an hour. They are sending this government a clear message: in 2016, it is shameful that people are working full time and still living in poverty.

How is that possible? The answer is simple. The minimum wage is too low. A non-unionized woman who works full time in a call centre in Montreal barely earns \$21,500 a year. That is obviously not enough to meet basic needs. These workers have no choice but to turn to food banks to feed their families.

We, as a society, should be ashamed. Regardless of their age, education, or job, everyone deserves to earn enough money to live a decent life.

It is our duty, as members, to do something to really help the people in our ridings and regions. We need to raise the minimum wage to \$15 an hour. The government must join the fight against poverty and inequality. It is a matter of respect, justice, and dignity.

* * *

● (1405)

*[English]***KIVI PARK**

Mr. Marc Serré (Nickel Belt, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mrs. Lily Fielding for her donation of 300 acres of land to create Kivi outdoor park.

[Translation]

It is a beautiful outdoor park located in the far corner of Sudbury—Nickel Belt, and it is dedicated to the memory of her parents, Susanna and John Kivi.

[English]

Mrs. Fielding donated over \$1 million to the City of Greater Sudbury to purchase the land, demolish Long Lake Public School, and create the beautiful, open, vibrant park that it is today. It is an incredible sight of nature.

[Translation]

I therefore invite all members to join me in recognizing the important contribution that Ms. Fielding has made to the community.

[English]

Mrs. Fielding gave this incredible gift in celebration of her 100th birthday, on August 19. Let us stand and wish her a belated happy birthday.

*Statements by Members***TOUR OF THE PEACE**

Mr. Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to rise to congratulate constituents of mine, Dan Webster and his son Sam, on the success of the first-ever Tour of the Peace. The 144-kilometre bike ride for the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation allowed riders to travel throughout what is the most beautiful region in all of Canada, I must say, the B.C. Peace region.

The idea for the race came to Dan after 13-year-old Sam was diagnosed with type 1 diabetes last year, a disease that affects more than 300,000 Canadians and has no cure.

Dan and Sam, as well as almost 20 other participants, along with my constituency assistant Heather McCracken, raised over \$15,000 for diabetes research, and plans have already begun for next year's big ride.

Congratulations once again to Dan, Sam, and all those who participated in the inaugural Tour of the Peace. I look forward to the second Tour of the Peace next year.

* * *

[*Translation*]**CONTRIBUTION OF WOMEN**

Mr. Fayçal El-Khoury (Laval—Les Îles, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize all the hard work done by the extraordinary women and mothers who contribute to every sector of our economy through their unwavering dedication to their family, economic, and social values.

These women bring enduring balance and serenity to all our lives through their contributions to every area of Canadian society.

Today I want to acknowledge all those unnamed women who work behind the scenes, without a title and without any glory, but who are the pillars of our families, and as such, are a reflection of the quality people we have in Canada.

I wish to extend a big thank you to the women of Canada.

* * *

TAYLOR HART

Mr. Dan Ruimy (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the riding of Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge is home to so many incredible people. Today, I would like to talk about one exceptional man in particular.

[*English*]

Taylor Hart is a 27-year-old who was recently diagnosed with metastatic gastric cancer, yet this diagnoses is not slowing him down. He is still currently working and has maintained a sense of humour despite his battle with stage four stomach cancer.

His family has started a fundraiser for a new, very expensive, immunotherapy treatment that his doctors feel may help him. They are more than halfway to their goal of \$100,000, showing what can happen when a community rallies around one of its own.

A pillar of strength for his family and friends, Taylor Hart is a model for anyone facing great struggles in life. Taylor is facing this

fight head on, and is doing so with tenacity and grace, and his family is right there with him.

I ask that everyone in this House join me in wishing him well in his fight.

Stay strong, Taylor.

* * *

● (1410)

BEEF INDUSTRY

Mr. Martin Shields (Bow River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about a founding industry in my riding of Bow River and also much of western Canada, the beef sector. Today it is very integrated, but it has been part of southern Alberta for almost 150 years. However, it is not the industry of our parents. It is now an integrated industry from ranches, auction markets, feedlots, packing plants, to the store shelf. It is a very value-added industry, introducing the best quality beef in the world.

Due to the integrated nature of this industry, if one crucial part of the supply chain is knocked out, like major feedlots, there is a major ripple effect on the whole industry. The inelasticity of fuel costs in many agriculture sectors, especially feedlots and cattle transportation, will be detrimental to the survival of the Canadian added-value industry.

I hope the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food takes this issue very seriously, as Canada may lose a world-class value-added industry.

* * *

WAR BRIDES

Mrs. Alaina Lockhart (Fundy Royal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we reflect this month on women in history, I am reminded of the impact of war brides in our communities.

Thousands came from Britain, including my great-grandmother and my husband's grandmother. Others came from the Netherlands, Belgium, France, Italy, and Germany.

Whether they crossed the U-boat-infested waters of the North Atlantic in troop ships, or arrived after the war with children in tow, we can only imagine their challenges as they dispersed across our great country to begin their new lives.

Ruby Gray, who celebrates her 95th birthday tomorrow, is one of these brave women. She came to Canada to spend her life with her beloved Albert, but over time she touched so many more lives.

Because of her, Sussex now has a Relay For Life. Because of her, the Little Jackie Fund helps children with orthodontic challenges. Because of her, I saw the power of women in politics when she served as deputy mayor of our town.

I thank Ruby for her significant contribution to the history of Canada. We all wish her a happy 95th birthday.

*Statements by Members***EATING DISORDERS**

Mr. Doug Eyolfson (Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the complex and devastating issue of eating disorders in Canada. Unfortunately, not many are aware of the dark reality of eating disorders in this country. Therefore, as part of Mental Illness Awareness Week, I would like to shed light on these difficult illnesses.

They affect an estimated 600,000 to 900,000 Canadians at any given time and impact Canadian men and women of all ages and ethnicities. Research has shown that eating disorders have the highest mortality rate of all mental illnesses.

From my career as an emergency physician, I can attest to the struggles and serious negative health implications that people with eating disorders face.

It is time for all Canadians to look outside the stigma of mental illness and recognize eating disorders as a serious health issue. By acknowledging this mental illness, we are in turn helping the thousands of Canadians struggling to overcome this issue.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL DAY OF THE GIRL

Ms. Rachael Harder (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to have the opportunity to be shadowed by a very strong, bright young woman. She is here taking my seat for the day under the initiative called Girls Belong Here.

In too many countries around the globe, women and girls are relegated to the position of second-class citizens. This is why Canada, under the direction of the leader of the official opposition, led the charge at the United Nations to declare October 11 the International Day of the Girl.

By focusing on the barriers that are unique to women and girls, from forced marriage, to sexual violence, to systemic barriers to education and economic development, we can build a more inclusive and equitable world.

When women's rights are realized, families benefit, communities are strengthened, and our nation will prosper.

On October 11, let us all celebrate the beautiful contribution of our women and girls to building a stronger world.

* * *

MARINE SCIENCE

Ms. Karen Ludwig (New Brunswick Southwest, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in New Brunswick Southwest, we need to do a better job of sharing our success stories, especially in the area of marine science.

My riding of New Brunswick Southwest has a rich history of fishing, aquaculture, and innovation. It is a cluster of the marine science sector.

Canada's oldest marine biological station is also in New Brunswick Southwest. Our billion-dollar aquaculture industry is a leader in innovation.

Since the Huntsman Marine Science Centre opened in 1969, more than one million marine biology students have completed their field courses here.

With nearly half of the world's population living in coastal areas, the marine research displayed in New Brunswick Southwest is transferred globally, and it positions us as world leaders.

We are thankful for the government's investment in smaller science projects. We deliver big results.

* * *

●(1415)

WILD SALMON

Mr. Fin Donnelly (Port Moody—Coquitlam, NDP): Mr. Speaker, next week, I will be announcing support for my private member's bill to save wild salmon. The bill protects wild salmon and allows the aquaculture industry to grow by moving harmful open-net salmon pens to safe closed containment.

I encourage everyone to join my campaign to save wild salmon by going to *findonnelly.ca*. In fact, thousands already have. The list of supporters is as diverse as Canada itself.

It includes noted environmentalists like David Suzuki and Alex Morton; and first nation leaders like Grand Chief Stewart Phillip and Chief Bob Chamberlin. I have endorsements from industry associations like the Sport Fishing Institute of B.C. and trade unions like CUPE BC and UFCW local 1518.

I even have support from Stanley Cup champion Willie Mitchell.

That is not all. Tune in next week for an important announcement from a Canadian icon and actor who knows that, together, we can ensure a healthy future for wild salmon and the people who depend on them. Stay tuned.

* * *

ALBERTA

Mr. Matt Jeneroux (Edmonton Riverbend, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as the jobs crisis in Alberta gets worse, families continue to wait for the Liberal government to present solutions.

We in Alberta know that if we have a strong Alberta, we have a strong Canada, yet we have four Liberal MPs from Alberta who have turned a blind eye to their constituents and to the many families, hurting our province. We know people are reaching out to them, because they are coming to our office.

For this reason, yesterday, the Conservative caucus of Alberta officially launched the Alberta jobs task force. We will be listening to everyday Albertans, employers, small businesses, workers, and others who have valuable insight and ideas to share. The task force will collect this information and produce a report containing tangible policy solutions.

Oral Questions

As we continue to see those same four Alberta Liberals applaud the Prime Minister for job-killing initiatives like the carbon tax, which will further cripple Alberta's economy, we will be working hard on real solutions to ensure that Alberta remains the economic engine of Canada.

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Mr. Don Rusnak (Thunder Bay—Rainy River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today, here on Parliament Hill and across the country, vigils are being held to honour the memory of missing and murdered indigenous women and girls.

We join their families and loved ones in our shared commitment to ending this ongoing national tragedy. We must provide justice for the victims and healing for the families.

The launch of the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls is an important step toward that goal, but there is still much work to be done. We need all Canadians to actively participate in the process.

I wish to thank those who have attended the Sisters in Spirit vigils across the country. I thank them for making their voices heard, and thank them for coming together to take a united stand on ending violence against our nation's women.

I encourage all Canadians to join us in the journey towards reconciliation, honouring the memory of our sisters in spirit, and in thanking families and loved ones for their courage.

Merci. Meegwetch.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[*Translation*]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Hon. Denis Lebel (Lac-Saint-Jean, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, a number of provincial environment ministers left the conference disappointed in the Prime Minister's decision.

They were stunned to find out that they were being forced to accept carbon pricing before the end of the talks. This is another example of the government's encroachment on provincial jurisdiction and its lack of respect for the provinces and for certain conditions. The federal government is making decisions for them.

Will the Prime Minister stop interfering in areas under provincial jurisdiction and leave matters up to the provinces, which are in the best position to make decisions?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we have always said, we understand how important it is for the provinces to take action against climate change and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. We have also always said that the federal government would be a partner. That is exactly what we are doing.

We are working with them to develop systems that will create economic growth and jobs while protecting the environment. Canadians in every province expect leadership from all levels of government, and leadership is exactly what we showed yesterday.

Hon. Denis Lebel (Lac-Saint-Jean, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians do not expect the government to ask them for more money to pay for its promises.

[*English*]

Carbon pricing means bigger government and more money taken out of Canadians' pockets. What the government is suggesting is a great example of how the Prime Minister is interfering in provincial business. A carbon tax is a bad idea, and Canadian taxpayers will be the ones paying the tab. We said it yesterday and we will say it again today: the government should get out of the way and let the provinces do their job.

Will the Prime Minister leave provincial politics aside and let the provinces make their own decisions in their own jurisdictions?

● (1420)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again we see why, for ten years, the previous government was unable to work with the provinces, unable to build a protected environment, unable to create the kinds of jobs that were necessary.

This is the responsibility of all levels of government. The environment is a shared jurisdiction, so we can build a set of solutions that will create jobs for the middle class, innovate and prepare for the future, while protecting our environment for years to come.

This is right for the economy. It is right for the environment. It is about time that Canada had leadership on this file.

* * *

[*Translation*]

TAXATION

Hon. Denis Lebel (Lac-Saint-Jean, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I can understand that the provincial premiers wanted to meet with the former prime minister. He did a lot for them. However, in one year, the Liberals created more problems with the provinces than we did in 10 years.

It is too bad that Canadians' tax burden keeps getting worse. It is great to meet with the provincial premiers, but making decisions without them is disrespectful.

Will the Prime Minister come to his senses, stop pickpocketing Canadians, and just drop this notorious carbon tax?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again, the Conservative Party members are proving that they fail to understand that a strong economy is built by protecting the environment. Canadians expect their government to build a strong economy with new jobs and economic growth enjoyed by everyone, while also protecting the environment. By working with the provinces we are showing the leadership that was lacking for 10 years.

*Oral Questions**[English]*

Hon. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as Canadian environment ministers met in good faith in Montreal, the Prime Minister pulled the rug out from under them by announcing a new massive billion-dollar carbon tax grab on Canadians. Angry ministers walked out of the meeting, saying they had been betrayed and railroaded. Premier Brad Wall said that the disrespect by the Prime Minister was “stunning”.

Why is the Prime Minister betraying Canadians by ramming a carbon tax grab down their throats?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for ten years, Canadians struggled because they had a government that not only did not protect the environment, but was not creating the kind of growth for the economy, the kind of clean jobs, that Canadians know the future depends on.

The leadership we have shown demonstrates that we understand that pricing carbon pollution right across the country is essential to creating a stronger economic future and a stronger environment for generations to come. That is the leadership we have shown that was sorely lacking from the other side of the aisle.

Hon. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday's betrayal of environment ministers generated a firestorm of anger. Yukon's Currie Dixon said, “The air was sucked out of the room.” Saskatchewan's Scott Moe said the tax grab was a “betrayal” and “not a good day for federal-provincial relations”. Newfoundland said it was “railroaded”. Nova Scotia said the Prime Minister “let the province down”.

Can the Prime Minister explain to Canadian families exactly how many more thousands of dollars they will pay in higher heating, electricity, and gasoline bills?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, after 10 years, Canadians grew tired of a government that not only could not protect the environment but was not creating the kind of economic growth that Canadians needed.

That is why we are pleased to be working with the provinces to help them set up a system on pricing carbon pollution that will ensure their provinces flourish, that we create good jobs, and that we protect the environment for generations to come.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Outremont, NDP): Mr. Speaker, last year's Liberal platform promised that a Liberal government would establish new national emissions reduction targets. That is at page 40.

It is not even 12 months since the election, and the Prime Minister broke that promise by endorsing Stephen Harper's old and woefully inadequate climate change targets. Yesterday, the Prime Minister unilaterally announced a plan that would not even achieve Stephen Harper's targets.

Here is a simple question for the Prime Minister. Does he deny anything that I just said?

● (1425)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday we worked across the country to bring in a level of pricing on carbon pollution that is going to make a huge difference to growing the economy and creating jobs.

The fact is, Canadians know we need to build a strong economy and protect the environment together. Yesterday, we showed the leadership that had been sorely lacking in doing just that: creating both jobs and protecting the environment.

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Outremont, NDP): Mr. Speaker, so the answer was “no”.

[Translation]

The Liberals did not have a plan to comply with the Kyoto protocol when they signed it. The Prime Minister himself admitted it last week.

In 2008, Stephen Harper announced a carbon price of \$65 per tonne for 2018. Does that remind hon. members of something? It is the Conservative-Liberal sham.

What will the Prime Minister tell the next generation when this betrayal has exacerbated climate change and threatened the future of the planet?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again there are some on the other side of the House who think that we are not going far enough, and there are others who think we are going too far. The reality is that Canadians expect us to protect the environment and build a flourishing economy for all at the same time. That is exactly what we are doing with this plan to price carbon pollution.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Outremont, NDP): Mr. Speaker, he is not doing one or the other.

[English]

This summer, I wrote to the Minister of Natural Resources, asking him to look into nuclear safety concerns. He not only refused, but he passed the buck to the CNSC president, who actually made jokes about these serious safety issues.

Today the environment commissioner released a report that highlights critical problems with nuclear safety in Canada.

Would the Prime Minister explain his minister's inaction on this file, and would he explain his support for a CNSC president who thinks this is all a laughing matter?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians know that this government takes very seriously the question of nuclear safety and security. That is why we welcome the report from the commissioner.

We will continue to work to ensure that Canada has the highest standards on nuclear safety and security. That is what Canadians expect.

*Oral Questions***FOREIGN AFFAIRS**

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Outremont, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the real question is, why has he done nothing since this summer?

[*Translation*]

Most Canadians oppose selling arms to countries that violate human rights. Will the Prime Minister support our motion to improve oversight of Canada's arms exports?

[*English*]

Canadians do not want our country selling arms to human rights abusers.

Why is the Prime Minister opposing more oversight for the sale of arms internationally? Why will the Prime Minister not just say yes?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, like we promised during the campaign and leading up to it, we are saying yes to signing on to the Arms Trade Treaty. It is important that Canada, after being a laggard for too long on this issue, shows what Canadians and the world expect of it in terms of leadership.

We have also made firm commitments to increasing the openness and transparency around arms sales around the world from Canada. This is what Canadians expect. This is what we will deliver.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. David Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have declared all-out war on struggling rural families. A carbon tax will punish rural areas and farm families. This new tax will drive up the price of fuel. It will drive up the price of fertilizer. It will drive up the price of transportation for agriculture.

Why are the Liberals so determined to target rural people and agriculture with their climate taxation fixation?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadian farmers are responsible stewards of the land, and our government has stood, and will continue to stand, with them.

We have constantly stood up for Canadian farm families, which have seen success. We will continue to work with farmers and ranchers to be sure they remain competitive. We will continue to improve the environmental gains that have already been made.

Mr. David Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC): Mr. Speaker, agriculture producers are already leaders in environmental stewardship. We know that. The machinery they buy already costs tens of thousands of dollars more because of changing emissions standards. A carbon tax would only add more devastating costs to their families.

Why are the Liberals punishing agriculture when farmers have already been addressing these emissions issues for years?

• (1430)

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the leadership of our government yesterday in taking real concrete action to tackle climate change and grow our economy. It is interesting. We

should recall it was the Conservatives in their 2008 platform and speech from the throne who committed to implementing a price on carbon pollution through a cap-and-trade system. The environment minister at the time said, "Carbon trading and the establishment of a market price on carbon are key parts of our Turning the Corner plan...".

After a decade of failure by the Harper government in meeting its commitments to Canadians, I guess the only Conservative plan now is to cap all the things they have said and trade it for no plan at all.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Joël Godin (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is sad to see that this Liberal government is taking the path of least resistance and forcing Canadians to pay even more taxes because of its lack of courage.

Our party acted responsibly and reduced Canada's share of global emissions by over 15%. We did that without sticking taxpayers with the bill. That is a fact. I am asking the Prime Minister to reconsider.

Why is this government choosing the path of least resistance and taking money out of the pockets of Canadian families?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the leadership we are demonstrating with the provinces and territories to address climate change and grow our economy.

Yesterday, Premier Couillard welcomed Ottawa's decision. He said, "The announcement recognizes the autonomy of the provinces and the flexibility of the federation and makes it possible for different systems to be used".

Mr. Joël Godin (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Liberal government announced in the House that it was going to make Canadians pay even more taxes. It is using the Paris agreement as an excuse to force the provinces and territories to implement a carbon tax.

The Prime Minister mentioned that he did not need Parliament to ratify the agreement. He also said that he was going to force the provinces and territories to comply.

Will the Prime Minister show some respect for Parliament and provincial and territorial jurisdictions and stop taking money out of the pockets of Canadian families?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the leadership that Canada is demonstrating with the provinces and territories.

[*English*]

I am quite surprised that the Conservatives, who believe in the markets, do not understand that it is a market-based system that is going to help us grow our economy and advance. However, maybe the Conservatives wanted to listen to job creators.

Suncor Energy said in a statement after our announcement, "...we support a broad-based price on carbon as an important tool to reduce greenhouse gas emissions...".

The president of Shell Canada said, "...balancing Canadian economic development while protecting the environment will be enabled by a reasonable price on carbon...".

The Canadian Wind Energy Association stated that a carbon—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order, please. I am having a much easier time hearing the questions than I am the answers. I ask members to come to order.

The hon. member for Lakeland.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that the Liberal carbon tax will take thousands of dollars every year out of the pockets of Canadian families. However, even supporters of the carbon tax say that the tax would have to be astronomically higher to have any impact on global emissions.

Why will the Liberals not admit that their carbon tax has nothing to do with environmental stewardship, and everything to do with filling government coffers for their reckless spending?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me be 100% clear, because unfortunately the party opposite does not understand.

We understand that we need to put a price on emissions. We have two ways to do this. We can do it through a direct price, or we can do it through a cap-and-trade system. We have 80% of Canadians who already live in a jurisdiction where there is a price on carbon. It is up to the provinces to decide which way they want to do it and what they would like to do with the revenues. They can give it back as a tax cut to consumers in their province or to businesses.

However, this is the way forward. The government is taking leadership because that is what Canadians expect.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this new carbon tax will disproportionately hurt people living in rural and northern communities in Canada. This new tax will disproportionately hurt low-income Canadians, especially those living on fixed incomes, like seniors.

Why can the Prime Minister not recognize that punishing the most vulnerable Canadians with higher gasoline, electricity and heating bills is not fair and will not actually achieve anything except more hardship?

• (1435)

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, I find it very surprising that the party opposite, which had suggested putting a price on carbon in 2008, is now backtracking on this.

We understand that this is the way we will grow our economy and create good jobs for the future. We are positioning ourselves well. We need to show leadership, and that is exactly what we are doing.

* * *

HEALTH

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it looks like the new era of federal-provincial relations lasted about 10 months. After the Liberals announced they would continue Stephen

Oral Questions

Harper's cuts to health care, the premiers wrote a letter to the Prime Minister asking for a special meeting on a new health accord. His response was, "Not interested." Yesterday, the Prime Minister's unilateral approach saw the provincial ministers walk out of their meeting.

Will the Prime Minister agree to the latest request of the provinces? Will he hold off on the cuts to the health care transfers for one year? It is a reasonable request.

Hon. Jane Philpott (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this government is demonstrating an approach to health care that has not been seen in our country in a decade. We are collaborating with the provinces and territories. I will be meeting with the health ministers from across the country two weeks from today.

We will be specifically investing in areas where Canadians know we need change. Canadians need better access to home care, including palliative care. Canadians need better access to mental health care. We will talk to the provinces and territories. We will deliver on those promises.

[Translation]

Ms. Brigitte Sansoucy (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, NDP): Mr. Speaker, after more than three months of radio silence, the provincial premiers finally found out that they will be granted a meeting with the Prime Minister in December to discuss long-term health care funding. This is really not what they were hoping for.

If the Prime Minister is not willing to meet with them before that, will he at least commit to respecting their request to maintain the 6% increase for next year?

Hon. Jane Philpott (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government is currently doing something Canadians have not seen in over 10 years.

We are co-operating with our provincial counterparts across the country. I expect to have a very productive meeting with my provincial and territorial counterparts two weeks from now. We will talk about Canadians' needs and the best way to improve our health care system across the country.

* * *

[English]

THE ECONOMY

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in introducing policy, there is always the devil in the details, and one of those details is my Aunt Collen who lives in Cape Breton. She is a widow on a fixed income. The things that she worries about are the cost of her power, how much it costs to fill her tank, and ultimately how much her food costs.

Oral Questions

Therefore, when she heard about yesterday's announcement on everything going up, her natural concern to me was, "What's going to happen", because this is what it means. It is about her dignity. It is about her independence. It is about her quality of life.

What does the minister have to say to give Collen comfort on these things, which are very real?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what I would say is that we are putting a price on carbon because this is a way to grow our economy in a cleaner way and position ourselves well to have the solutions to produce cleaner natural resources and renewable power, which will create good jobs and a positive future.

However, maybe I should just point to Conservative Mark Cameron, the former policy adviser to the prime minister, who said, "Federal carbon price plan looks like a good start." As most free market economists realize, it is the most effective way to reduce emissions.

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I think the Liberals are not getting the point that actual seniors will be in a lot of pain. A fixed income actually means a fixed income, and that is all they get. If taxes come into it, that means there is less for them to spend on what they put in their gas tanks and whether they put on sweaters in the winter instead of increasing that thermostat a bit.

We have learned that lesson in Ontario. Kathleen Wynne has taken a massive backward step because she realizes that actually cranking the rates on hydro does not work well for politics. Therefore, is the minister cognizant of the fact that at some point people are going to squeal?

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are proud of what we have done to help seniors in our country. In our budget, we actually took a look at the most vulnerable seniors and raised the guaranteed income supplement for them by about \$947 a year. Importantly, we reversed the decision taken by the member opposite's party by moving old age security back to age 65.

More important, we have helped seniors in the future by working together with the provinces to enhance the Canada pension plan. We are so proud to say that B.C. came on board today. Now nine provinces are in support.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

• (1440)

The Speaker: Most members in all parties are able to hear things they do not like without reacting and are able to wait their turn to speak. I ask those who have not been doing it to do so.

The hon. member for Foothills.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, employment insurance claims in Alberta are up 90%. More than 200,000 Albertans are out of work. My home province is facing a jobs crisis. Even Royal Bank's CEO David McKay understands this dire situation, saying that Canada will not succeed if Alberta's energy sector does not succeed. The Liberals' response to this crisis is imposing a punitive job-killing carbon tax.

Why is the Liberal government so determined to destroy Alberta's economy with national energy program 2.0 and why are Alberta's four Liberal MPs willing to let this happen?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are very concerned with jobs across Canada and with the particular situation in Alberta. We are there to help, to support growing the economy both in the short term and the long term with sound environmental, sustainable, as well as sound social policies, of which EI is an important component.

We have signalled very important changes to the EI system, the quality of services, the care, and the compassion we feel for all workers, including those in Alberta.

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Albertans appreciate the compassion, but they want jobs; they do not want EI.

The Liberal government is imposing a carbon tax that is going to plow Alberta's agriculture sector into the ground. Alberta's farmers and ranchers want to know why the government is attacking their livelihoods. One worried farmer in my riding said this carbon tax would drive the cost of his fuel alone from \$125,000 a year to \$150,000 a year, putting his operation in jeopardy.

I am sure the Liberals' response will be to use public transit or get an electric car. The farmers and ranchers in my riding have one question. How many head of cattle can I fit on a bus—

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour.

Hon. MaryAnn Mihychuk (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as a westerner, it gives me an opportunity to indicate how concerned we are about the workers and businesses in Alberta and across Canada. In fact, we stepped up. Not only have we increased EI benefits for workers, we have helped small business through the work-sharing program by doubling it. We have added \$16 million more for skills and training. We have doubled the number of youth getting skills training. We have added 245 young people to help—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Unless it gets quieter, there will be one less question from this side.

The hon. member for Nanaimo—Ladysmith.

*Oral Questions***INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS**

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today Canadians across the country are standing with Sisters in Spirit to honour murdered and missing indigenous women. Families of victims are calling out the government for failing to deliver on its promise for action. They are calling this place the House of broken promises. Families cannot wait until the end of the inquiry before they see real change.

What action will the government take right now to ensure we have no more stolen sisters?

Hon. Carolyn Bennett (Minister of Indigenous and Northern Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member and all members of the House who stood with the families of Sisters in Spirit on the Hill today.

This is a really important question as we go forward. We cannot wait for the result of the commission. We need to get going now on housing, shelters, and safe transportation, but also racism, sexism, policing, and the total overhaul of the child welfare system, as we learned from the B.C. report today, which is devastating.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice was regional chief of the AFN when it took the government to court to end systemic discrimination against first nations children, but now her government has ignored two compliance orders to address the crisis of children at risk.

She has the responsibility to ensure that the government meets its legal obligation, and pretending that an under-funded plan written in the final, dying days of the Harper government was somehow a response to the ruling in January is not acceptable. We are talking about children here.

Will the minister respect the tribunal? What steps will she take to restore credibility in the House regarding these broken promises.

• (1445)

Hon. Carolyn Bennett (Minister of Indigenous and Northern Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the assertion by the minister across the way is absolutely false—

Mr. Warkentin: Minister?

Hon. Carolyn Bennett: The member. One day, Charlie.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: The minister knows we do not refer to members by their first names.

The hon. Minister of Indigenous and Northern Affairs.

Hon. Carolyn Bennett: Charlie Brown.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Hon. Carolyn Bennett: Mr. Speaker, this government promised a new relationship with indigenous people, a new way of doing things. We prepared for and then accepted the ruling of the tribunal and are committed to ending this discrimination.

We have made immediate investments in child and family services on reserve, and we are working with first nations communities and the key organizations—

The Speaker: Once I have the minister's attention, I would ask her not to refer to other members as cartoon characters either.

The hon. member for Northwest Territories.

* * *

NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Michael McLeod (Northwest Territories, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was happy to hear that budget 2016 proposed \$64.5 million over five years to expand Nutrition North.

Can the Minister of Indigenous and Northern Affairs update the House on the actions our government took this summer to help northerners access fresh, healthy food?

Hon. Carolyn Bennett (Minister of Indigenous and Northern Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his important work on this file.

Northerners need to have a direct voice in reforming this program, and we spent the summer listening. This week the parliamentary secretary is continuing listening to northerners as she continues her work in eastern Canada.

We are committed to listening and designing a program with northerners that will work for them for affordable, healthy food. We have already heard very clearly that we need support for harvesters and real access to country food.

* * *

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. Blaine Calkins (Red Deer—Lacombe, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have a love affair with padding the pockets of their friends with taxpayer money. Documents released last week revealed that the Liberals signed off on \$200,000 for their so-called deliverology wizard from the U.K. This self-acclaimed guru sold Ontario a bunch of buzzwords that did not work when he was brought in to deliver for the Liberals in Queen's Park.

Why are these Liberals paying \$200,000 for the same person to deliver the same useless bill of goods?

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister of Small Business and Tourism, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, of course we will deliver on our commitments, and that is what Canadians expect.

We have already, for example, lowered taxes on the middle class. We have implemented the Canada child benefit, which has given money to families with children that need it the most. We have signed a historic agreement in principle to strengthen the Canada pension plan.

The list of the work that we are doing continues. We will continue to work hard for Canadians.

Mr. Blaine Calkins (Red Deer—Lacombe, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we learned that the Prime Minister's BFF, Gerry Butts, brought in his good buddy from the U.K. to consult with the government on deliverology. The last time this individual consulted a Canadian government, Ontario became a have-not province and the most indebted sub-sovereign government in the world.

Oral Questions

Just who exactly is running this country? Is it Gerry, is it Katie, or is it the pinch-hitting guru from the U.K.?

Can someone over there justify this atrocious waste of taxpayers' money?

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister of Small Business and Tourism, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government was elected on a commitment to work hard for Canadians. The government was elected on a commitment to help grow the economy, to create jobs, to create the growth that Canadians need.

The government is committed to delivering on our commitments. We will continue to do the hard work we are doing, and the actions have already started.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we now know that the Prime Minister engaged the services of a British consultant at a cost of \$200,000 in taxpayer dollars, apparently to help him deliver on his agenda.

Given the Liberals' track record, maybe the consultant should be helping them find new ways to raise taxes on Canadian families and waste taxpayer money by incurring unconscionable expenses.

Can the Prime Minister tell us exactly how that \$200,000 really helped Canadian families?

•(1450)

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister of Small Business and Tourism, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we will keep our promises. That is what Canadians expect.

For example, we have already cut taxes for the middle class, which helped nearly nine million Canadians. We introduced the tax-free Canada child benefit, which puts more money in the pockets of nine out of ten Canadian families. We also signed an agreement in principle to enhance the Canada Pension Plan, and the list goes on.

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, again, this Prime Minister is focused more on image and superficial things than on the economy and jobs. Canadians deserve better. They want a Prime Minister who works in their best interest, as the hon. Stephen Harper did.

As my mother always said, good looks do not put food on the table. Instead of spending \$200,000 on pseudo-experts, could the Prime Minister for once act in the best interest of all Canadians?

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister of Small Business and Tourism, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said, we made promises to Canadians and we intend to keep those promises. We will continue to work very hard for all Canadians.

* * *

[*English*]

DISASTER ASSISTANCE

Ms. Cheryl Hardcastle (Windsor—Tecumseh, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to start out with a salute to everyone in Windsor—Tecumseh who is dealing with the aftermath of flood damage.

The Prime Minister stated that he was glad to see relief in the weather forecast for flood victims, but what about financial relief? The Conservatives drastically cut federal emergency funding in 2015.

Will the Prime Minister restore emergency relief and come to the aid of these residents?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the previous government did in fact cut back on emergency support programs.

We are in the process of correcting those errors. There is a cost-sharing formula in place for dealing with current emergencies. The municipality makes the request to the province, and the province makes the request to the federal government. Rest assured, the Government of Canada stands ready to help.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICES AND PROCUREMENT

Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Phoenix pay system is causing havoc in my riding of North Island—Powell River. In one horrible case, a constituent of mine was asked to prove she was in financial default so her case would be deemed a priority. Let me make it clear to the government that if workers are not getting paid, it is a priority.

We know the minister says she did not read the report that highlighted several problems with Phoenix. Will she now act and commit to ending this sluggish process and help workers get paid?

Hon. Judy Foote (Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is totally unacceptable for any person not to get paid for work performed.

We agree totally with that. That is why we have taken so many measures to fix the Phoenix pay system. We have hired additional people to make sure that those who have been in the backlog get paid. We are making sure that people who have gone without pay, get paid. We are working very hard to make sure that every measure possible is being taken to correct this system. It will get fixed.

* * *

JUSTICE

Hon. Rob Nicholson (Niagara Falls, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are always in the business of telling us there are problems with Canadian institutions, so maybe they could tell us what the problem is with having representation from Atlantic Canada on the Supreme Court.

If this has been an issue for the Liberals for the last 141 years, maybe they could tell us where in their election platform they said they were not going to guarantee representation for Atlantic Canada on the Supreme Court.

Oral Questions

Mr. Sean Casey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Niagara Falls for his interest in Atlantic Canada.

What we committed to during the election was to fix a broken Supreme Court of Canada nomination process that was in effect under the previous government. That process was opaque, secretive, out of date, and in need of an overhaul.

That is why we have put in place a process that is transparent, accountable, and open. It involves parliamentarians, and it does not involve attacks by the Prime Minister on the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada. That is real change.

• (1455)

Hon. Rob Nicholson (Niagara Falls, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be born in Niagara Falls, but I am proud to have 150 years of my family from Cape Breton Island. I will take no lessons from the member.

If the Liberals do not want to do the right thing because the Conservatives are telling them what to do, why do they not listen to four Liberal senators from Nova Scotia? They want the Liberals to do the right thing. Or is that the reason, probably, they got kicked out of the Liberal caucus?

Mr. Sean Casey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think I can do one better. I married a Cape Bretoner.

The process that was in place under the previous government was opaque, outdated, and in need of an overhaul.

The four senators absolutely deserve credit for their advocacy on this issue. Those four senators were advocates for Nova Scotia even before the last election. I am pleased to say that the advisory board tasked with coming up with jurists of the highest calibre has included names from Atlantic Canada on its list.

Mr. Michael Cooper (St. Albert—Edmonton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, since the Prime Minister unveiled his Supreme Court appointment process to shut out Atlantic Canada, the silence from the 32 Liberal MPs from Atlantic Canada has been deafening. Now, four senators from Atlantic Canada are calling on the Prime Minister to respect Atlantic representation.

Given that these senators are finally speaking up, will the Prime Minister get around to doing the right thing and appoint an Atlantic Canadian?

Mr. Sean Casey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated, we inherited a process that was badly broken, that was secretive, and that did not involve parliamentarians. We have reformed that process. It is now open, transparent, and accountable.

That process has resulted in a list going forward to the Prime Minister of highly qualified, functionally bilingual jurists, including candidates from Atlantic Canada.

We are perfectly capable of participating in a national competition. We have been doing it for more than 141 years.

[*Translation*]

SCIENCE

Mr. Nicola Di Iorio (Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, young people are essential to the future of research in Canada. We know that young researchers play a fundamental role in producing the knowledge, discoveries, and innovation that help build a strong and healthy middle class.

Can the Minister of Science tell us about the government's investment in training and retaining these young researchers?

Hon. Kirsty Duncan (Minister of Science, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel for the question.

Young researchers are essential to the future of research in Canada.

[*English*]

Yesterday, I announced \$34 million to support more than 200 Vanier Canada graduate scholarships and Banting postdoctoral fellowships. These prestigious awards help Canadian universities attract and retain the best talent from around the world.

* * *

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Ms. Rachael Harder (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister needs to take seriously the plight of Yazidi girls. We are calling on him to stop turning a blind eye to the rape culture of ISIS and other Islamic fundamentalists around the globe. Right now, Yazidi women and girls are being sold into sexual slavery, and the best the Liberals can do is simply to send advisers.

When does the Prime Minister plan on taking action on behalf of those who are being faced with this genocide in Iraq and Syria. When will the Prime Minister take real action instead of lip service?

Hon. John McCallum (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with respect to real action on refugees, in general, we on this side of the House have taken three to four times the action they did a year ago.

On the specifics of Yazidis, we recognize the exceptionally serious nature of this issue and the difficulties involved, so my department is sending an expedition, a group, over to investigate the situation in Iraq. They will be going themselves to gather facts and determine possible courses of action.

* * *

• (1500)

[*Translation*]

SOFTWOOD LUMBER

Ms. Karine Trudel (Jonquière, NDP): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, instead of telling the forestry industry about her plan B for softwood lumber, the minister blamed the previous government for her inability to reach a new agreement with the United States.

Oral Questions

With just eight days until the deadline, the industry wants to see the government's backup plan. According to recent rumours, the United States wants to reduce Canada's share of the softwood lumber market from 34% to 20%.

If an agreement is not reached, will the government support the industry, for example, by establishing an emergency loan guarantee program?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Minister of International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the softwood lumber agreement expired under the former government.

We have been engaged in intense negotiations for months. There is unprecedented co-operation among the producers, workers, provinces, and territories. We will continue to work closely with them.

I met with the U.S. representative, Mike Froman, three weeks ago in Washington, and I will be meeting with him again tomorrow in Toronto. We want to get a good agreement for Canadian workers, not just any agreement.

* * *

[English]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Ms. Pam Damoff (Oakville North—Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, public safety officers put themselves in harm's way to protect our communities. They and their families deserve our support. That is why my colleagues and I on the public safety committee have been studying the issue of operational stress injuries and post-traumatic stress in public safety officers and first responders, and tabled our report this morning. This issue was also an important part of our platform.

Can the Minister of Public Safety please tell us what the government is doing to support our public safety officers?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, at round table meetings this year in Regina, Ottawa, and Halifax, we heard directly from public safety officers that they need better prevention of operational stress injuries, more research and awareness, no stigmas, and better diagnosis, care, and long-term support for first responders and their families.

I want to thank the member for Oakville North—Burlington and all the members of that committee for their report. We are in fact moving forward with the development of a national action plan to ensure that the brave women and men that we rely upon to keep us safe every day have the support that they need when they need it.

* * *

SMALL BUSINESS

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, tourism is a major economic driver in Canada with nearly six million Canadians camping every summer.

Many campgrounds are small, family-run, seasonal businesses. Surprise tax bills in the tens of thousands of dollars are being sent to these small businesses, because the Liberals have decided that unless

a campground has five or more full-time, year-round employees, they no longer qualify for the small business tax rate.

Why are the Liberals targeting small campgrounds to pay for their out-of-control spending?

[Translation]

Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Canada Revenue Agency is currently working with tourism businesses and we will continue to enforce the law.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Rhéal Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we will soon ratify the Paris agreement and this government still has no direction.

Imposing a tax is not a plan. This government has no plan, and adopting Stephen Harper's targets is certainly no way to show leadership in the fight against climate change. This government has no leadership.

Can this government present and will it present a plan like the one in place in Quebec that will make polluters pay and reward provinces, like Quebec, that meet their targets?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the work that I am doing with the representatives of all the provinces and territories, including my Quebec counterpart, David Heurtel.

Yesterday, Quebec Premier Philippe Couillard welcomed our decision. He said, "The announcement recognizes the autonomy of the provinces and the flexibility of the federation and makes it possible for different systems to be used".

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister reminded us of the environmental responsibility we have to future generations.

This morning, I heard some fine speeches from Liberal members. Now, they need to do more than just talk. If the Prime Minister and this government are serious about wanting to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and fight climate change, they need to be consistent. I will continue asking the same question until I get a proper answer.

The energy east pipeline project will produce greenhouse gas emissions equivalent to putting seven million cars on the road. Will the government reject this project once and for all?

● (1505)

[English]

Ms. Kim Rudd (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have said before in the House, our government recognizes that in order to build the economy we need to protect the environment.

We have a strong regulatory system in this country. The National Energy Board has been tasked with processes to ensure the safety and security of Canadians. We are also consulting with indigenous communities, communities along the route, as well as Canadians in general to ensure that the process has the confidence of Canadians.

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members the presence in the gallery of Her Excellency Doris Leuthard, Vice-President of the Swiss Federal Council, Head of the Federal Department of the Environment, Transport, Energy and Communications.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: I would also like to draw to the attention of hon. members the presence in the gallery of the Honourable Jiwan Bahadur Shahi, Minister for Culture, Tourism, and Civil Aviation of Nepal.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: Finally, I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members the presence in the gallery of a parliamentary delegation from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland led by Ms. Helen Jones, MP.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—CREATION OF A STANDING COMMITTEE ON ARMS EXPORTS REVIEW

The House resumed from September 29 consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: It being 3:06 p.m., pursuant to order made on Thursday, September 29, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion relating to the business of supply.

Call in the members.

• (1515)

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

(*Division No. 114*)

YEAS

Members

Angus	Ashton
Aubin	Barsalou-Duval
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Brosseau
Caron	Choquette
Christopherson	Davies
Donnelly	Dubé
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	Dusseault
Erskine-Smith	Fortin
Garrison	Gill
Hardcastle	Hughes
Johns	Julian
Kwan	Laverdière
Malcolmson	Marcil
Mathysen	Moore
Mulcair	Paupé
Piromondon	Ramsey
Rankin	Saganash
Sansoucy	Stetski

Stewart
Trudel— 41

Albas
Alghabra
Amos
Anderson
Arseneault
Badawey
Bains
Baylis
Bennett
Berthold
Bittle
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boissonnault
Boucher
Bratina
Brisson
Caesar-Chavannes
Carrie
Chagger
Chan
Chong
Clement
Cormier
Dabrusin
Deltell
Dhillon
Dion
Doherty
Drouin
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyolfson
Fast
Fillmore
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fry
Gallant
Généreux
Gerretsen
Godin
Goodale
Gourde
Hajdu
Hardie
Hehr
Hussen
Iacono
Joly
Jowhari
Kelly
Khalid
Kitchen
Lametti
Lapointe
Lebel
Lebouthillier
Leitch
Leslie
Lobb
Long
Ludwig
MacKenzie
Maloney
May (Cambridge)
McColeman
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Monsef

Government Orders

Thériault

NAYS

Members

Albrecht
Allison
Anandasangaree
Arnold
Arya
Bagnell
Barlow
Beech
Bernier
Bezan
Blair
Block
Bossio
Brassard
Breton
Brown
Calkins
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Chen
Clarke
Cooper
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhalriwal
Di Iorio
Diotte
Dreeshen
Dubourg
Duguid
Eglinski
El-Khoury
Eyking
Falk
Fergus
Finley
Fisher
Foote
Fraser (West Nova)
Freeland
Fuhr
Garneau
Genuis
Gladu
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Graham
Harder
Harvey
Housefather
Hutchings
Jeneroux
Jordan
Kang
Kent
Khera
Lake
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
LeBlanc
Lefebvre
Lemieux
Lighthound
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
Maguire
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
McCallum
McCrimmon
McGuinity
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)

Government Orders

Morneau	Morrissey
Murray	Nassif
Nault	Nicholson
Nuttall	Oliphant
Oliver	O'Regan
O'Toole	Ouellette
Paradis	Paul-Hus
Peterson	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Picard
Poilievre	Poissant
Qualtrough	Raiitt
Reid	Rempel
Rioux	Ritz
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rota	Rudd
Ruimy	Rusnak
Saini	Sajjan
Sangha	Sarai
Saroya	Schiefke
Schmale	Schulte
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Shields	Shipley
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand	Simms
Sohi	Sopuck
Sorbara	Sorenson
Spengemann	Stanton
Strahl	Stubbs
Sweet	Tabbara
Tan	Tassi
Tilson	Tootoo
Trost	Trudeau
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Vecchio
Viersen	Virani
Wagantall	Warawa
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Wilkinson
Wilson-Raybould	Wong
Wrzesnewskyj	Young
Yurdiga	Zahid
Zimmer — 239	

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

* * *

[English]

**NATIONAL SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE
COMMITTEE OF PARLIAMENTARIANS ACT**

The House resumed from September 30 consideration of the motion that Bill C-22, An Act to establish the National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians and to make consequential amendments to certain Acts, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Speaker: Pursuant to an order made on Friday, September 30, the House will now proceed to the deferred recorded division on the motion of the second reading stage of Bill C-22.

● (1525)

[Translation]

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

(Division No. 115)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra	Amos
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Aubin
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Barsalou-Duval
Baylis	Beech
Bennett	Bittle
Blair	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boissonnault	Bossio
Boulerice	Boutin-Sweet
Bratina	Breton
Brisson	Brosseau
Caesar-Chavannes	Caron
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Champagne	Chan
Chen	Choquette
Christopherson	Cormier
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Di Iorio	Dion
Donnelly	Drouin
Dubé	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dusseault	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Eyking	Eyolfson
Fergus	Fillmore
Finnigan	Fisher
Fonseca	Foote
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Freeland	Fry
Fuhr	Garneau
Garrison	Gerretsen
Gill	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Graham	Hajdu
Hardcastle	Hardie
Harvey	Hehr
Housefather	Hughes
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Johns
Joly	Jordan
Jowhari	Julian
Kang	Khalid
Khera	Kwan
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Laverdière
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Lefebvre	Lemieux
Leslie	Lightbound
Lockhart	Long
Longfield	Ludwig
MacAulay (Cardigan)	Malcolmson
Maloney	Marcel
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Mathysen	
May (Cambridge)	McCallum
McCrimmon	McDonald
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Medicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Monsef	
Moore	Morneau
Morrissey	Mulcair
Murray	Nassif
Nault	Oliphant
Oliver	O'Regan
Ouellette	Paradis
Paupé	Peterson
Petitpas Taylor	Philpott
Picard	Plamondon

Government Orders

[English]

PARIS AGREEMENT

The House resumed consideration of the motion, and of the amendment and of the amendment to the amendment.

The Speaker: I wish to inform the House that because of the deferred recorded divisions, government orders will be extended by 20 minutes.

I also encourage members to take their discussions into the lobbies.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Ottawa South.

Mr. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to pick up where I left off before question period.

I want to go back to the theme I was raising, which was one of opportunity. For so many decades now, the debate around climate change has been steeped in terms that I describe as pain, grief, and cost. It actually is very disappointing to hear today and this week so much narrative from the Conservative official opposition that seems mired, stuck, in this context of pain, grief, and cost.

In every situation, we have moved historically as a species, as a planet, through all sorts of phases. I prefer to shift the discussion from the magnitude of a challenge, and it is a big challenge, what we are trying to do is a big challenge, to the magnitude of opportunity.

Let us refocus the lens to look at opportunity. In some of the remarks I made earlier, I talked about the magnitude of opportunity for environmental technologies. Goldman Sachs is tracking this on an hour-by-hour basis. The reality is that there are tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands, ultimately millions of jobs available to us, if we want to retool our economy. This is the magnitude of the opportunity before us.

I want to end by reminding my colleagues on all sides of the House that this is an issue that really does transcend partisanship. For example, I give Prime Minister Brian Mulroney 100% credit for understanding that the best, most efficient way to solve the acid rain challenge in North America was to use a cap-and-trade mechanism with President Reagan to reduce NOx and SOx emissions across North America, and thereby save millions of freshwater lakes. I support the real Preston Manning, who is imploring and begging Conservatives from around the country to get with the program and understand the role and the purpose of market mechanisms.

As my remarks come to an end, I think we can come to a consensus here amongst all parties. It is time for us to move forward. It is time for us to show the leadership that we can.

• (1530)

Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my colleague comes from Ontario, too, and his speech had a lot in it that was in another familiar speech given about 10 years ago by a colleague in his brother's government. Back when the Ontario government brought in the Green Energy Act, a gentleman named Smitherman mentioned that 50,000 new jobs would be created. The member's brother said it would be difficult switching from making cars to windmills and that it was not an easy thing to transform an economy.

Poissant	Qualtrough
Ramsey	Rankin
Rioux	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rota
Rudd	Ruimy
Rusnak	Saganash
Saini	Sajjan
Sangha	Sansoucy
Sarai	Schiefke
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Shechan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Simms	Sohi
Sorbara	Spengemann
Stetski	Stewart
Tabbara	Tan
Tassi	Thériault
Tootoo	Trudeau
Trudel	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Virani	Wilkinson
Wilson-Raybould	Wrzesnewskyj
Young	Zahid— 200

NAYS

Members

Albas	Albrecht
Allison	Anderson
Arnold	Barlow
Bernier	Berthold
Bezan	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Block	Boucher
Brassard	Brown
Calkins	Carrie
Chong	Clarke
Clement	Cooper
Deltell	Diotte
Doherty	Dreeshen
Egliniski	Falk
Fast	Finley
Gallant	Généreux
Genuis	Gladu
Godin	Gourde
Harder	Jeneroux
Kelly	Kent
Kitchen	Lake
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Lebel
Leitch	Lobb
MacKenzie	Maguire
McColeman	Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Nicholson	Nuttall
O'Toole	Paul-Hus
Poillievre	Raiit
Reid	Rempel
Ritz	Saroya
Schmale	Shields
Shiple	Sopuck
Sorenson	Stanton
Strahl	Stubbs
Sweet	Tilson
Trost	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Vecchio
Viersen	Wagantall
Warawa	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Wong	Yurdiga
Zimmer— 81	

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried. Accordingly, this bill is referred to the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security.

(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee)

Government Orders

Unfortunately, these things did not come to pass. In 2012, Stats Canada actually said that the Green Energy Act would lead to an overall employment drop of 2,200 to 2,500 full-time-equivalent jobs. Overall employment in Ontario basically has been stagnant for the last decade with decreased jobs in mining, manufacturing, and forestry; decreased competitiveness internationally; decreased profitability; and decreased wages. In my community, we are living it in the automotive sector and we are seeing the challenges with international competitiveness.

Has the federal government actually done a cost-benefit analysis and an economic analysis of what the effects of this policy would be for Canadians, particularly in the manufacturing sector?

Mr. David McGuinty: Mr. Speaker, the member is not seriously trying to posit in the House that the green energy plan of Ontario is responsible for the 2008 collapse in the global markets. Surely to God, he is not trying to foist that on unsuspecting MPs who are listening.

The reality is this. It is going to take a concerted effort. It will take an effort to harness our programming, our fiscal incentives. It will take an effort to streamline the costing of carbon. It will take an effort to ensure, as we have promised to do, that all the revenues are transferred to each and every province as a revenue-neutral shift. The provinces can do with that revenue as they wish, just as Alberta has been doing for decades. Alberta led this country in imposing the first serious charge on carbon. There are lots of opportunities here for us.

Let me just cite one that was eliminated by the member's previous government. We had an eco-energy program to retrofit our homes. A start-up sector with thousands of individuals was squashed by a government that did not believe in the role and purpose of government to assist in this transition.

Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I heard the member often mention science and facts. I like that because I want to focus on science and facts.

We have seen that global warming is happening. We have seen that we need to do something about it. When we have looked at the problem, we see that Canada is less than 2% of the footprint, and that 60% of the footprint is with the U.K., the U.S., China, and India.

When it comes to market mechanisms, there is a point to be made about the timing of implementation. If we implement a market mechanism before the U.S., for example, then we see what is happening now in my riding, where jobs and expansions are being cancelled and moved to the U.S. The carbon footprint moves and is not eliminated, so it does not help the planet. It just loses Canadian jobs. I wonder if the member could comment on that.

• (1535)

Mr. David McGuinty: Mr. Speaker, the wonderful thing about the Paris treaty is that for the first time in 50 years all major polluters and parties are inside the tent. That is why it is such a watershed moment for the globe and human history. The United States and China have made hard commitments. They have timelines. They have to move to reduce on their own basis their own targets. We are showing leadership because Canada has always shown leadership. It is going to be important to co-operate with our American and Mexican neighbours in the context of NAFTA. There is no doubt about that.

It is important for us to keep focused here on this watershed moment. For the first time, 200 nations have come together and said, "We are going to get serious, like adults, and deal with this crisis. We can no longer pretend. We can no longer invent a fiction."

With respect to Canada being responsible for a small percentage of the global emissions, not having Canada take action is like standing at a campsite 20 feet apart from others camping beside you, holding a bag of garbage over the lake, as they hold their bag of garbage, and saying we will stop putting our garbage in the lake when they stop putting their garbage in the lake. That is not the way in which we can move forward.

That is why Paris was a watershed moment. I am very encouraged. I think we are going to make huge progress.

Ms. Joyce Murray (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour for me to be engaged in this debate today. I also want to congratulate my colleague from Ottawa South for his leadership on the National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy for many years, which is an organization that did the kinds of analyses that the Conservative member was talking about and showed that taking action on climate change would be positive for the economy as well as the environment.

What I would like to do next is to thank the citizens of Vancouver Quadra for their commitment to action on climate change, and for their support for my various efforts to put this front and centre in the agenda of the government over the past eight years.

Vancouver Quadra is home to many pioneers who understand the challenge of climate change and are committed to solutions. Whether they be members of the David Suzuki Foundation, which raises awareness; professors who have researched this issue and spoken up, such as Dr. Bill Rees, who was the inventor of the concept of the carbon footprint, the environmental footprint; entrepreneurs working on solutions with fuel cell batteries and other clean technologies; the youth who have engaged in a number of organizations and gone door to door to raise the issue of climate change and the impact on their generation; or ordinary people in the streets of Vancouver Quadra, this is a high priority in my riding.

In addition, it is an emotional day for me to rise in support of the important part our government played in the Paris agreement and as a problem solver with respect to climate, and to rise the day after our Prime Minister announced that our federal government would ensure there is a national price on carbon.

Government Orders

A carbon tax has been part of the lives of British Columbians for almost a decade. Our citizens are proud of it. They are proud that the emissions were driven down over a number of years by this carbon tax. They are very proud that our economy outperformed the rest of Canada for most of those years. The carbon tax in British Columbia helped return the B.C. Liberal government to power for its third and fourth terms. This is something that has been proven elsewhere, and it is about time that Canada has a federal government that is prepared to move forward on it.

[*Translation*]

As everyone knows, during the election campaign, we promised to protect the environment while stimulating the economy. We promised to take a leadership role nationally and work with the provinces and territories to address climate change and put a price on carbon emissions to reduce carbon pollution. That is exactly what the Prime Minister announced in our plan yesterday.

In fact, the Prime Minister has positioned Canada as a world leader on this front. Look at what we have done in the past year. In December, we participated in negotiating the historic new climate agreement at COP21 in Paris. The Prime Minister also signed the Paris agreement in New York on Earth Day.

• (1540)

[*English*]

The first ministers have committed to implementing policies in support of meeting or exceeding Canada's 2030 target of a 30% reduction of greenhouse gas emissions below 2005 levels, and there are five working groups helping to build a framework and a plan to turn this into a reality.

At the North American Leaders' Summit in Ottawa this summer, we made an extraordinary commitment. We pledged that by 2025, 100% of the electricity that the government uses in facilities managed by Public Services and Procurement Canada, one of the government's largest real estate custodians, will come from clean energy sources.

To action our commitments, our Prime Minister committed to providing an additional \$20 billion for green infrastructure over 10 years. In addition, in our recent budget, almost \$3.5 billion over five years was announced to address a range of climate issues, including air pollution and ecological protection, and to improve environmental assessments and restore public trust.

[*Translation*]

We are also investing to help Canada make up for lost time in the global clean technology economy.

[*English*]

There are \$280 million to support the development of clean technologies and innovation in this sector in Canada.

[*Translation*]

The investments also include \$120 million in non-polluting transportation networks and charging stations, an additional \$50 million for sustainable development technologies in Canada, as well as \$86 million for energy efficiency and the development of renewable energy sources.

This brings me to a subject that is very important to me, since I have been tackling it directly for the past few months, namely, what we are doing to reduce carbon emissions resulting from federal government operations.

The federal government is the largest employer, property owner, and purchaser in the country. As such, it can make a real difference. By getting our own house in order, we are reaffirming our commitment to the fight against climate change worldwide.

As part of the federal sustainable development strategy, we have ambitious targets and a plan to reduce federal greenhouse gas emissions.

[*English*]

To help achieve these reductions, in budget 2016 we announced we would invest up to \$2.1 billion in repairs and retrofits to our wide range of properties and buildings and in the greening of government operations. That includes improving military housing, which is so badly needed, upgrading border infrastructure, and modernizing the generation of energy for marine communication and traffic services.

It also includes significant reductions in the carbon footprint and energy use of our buildings in the national capital region and elsewhere. For example, Public Services and Procurement Canada manages six heating and cooling plants that serve 85 buildings in the national capital region. These plants currently generate an annual average of 117 kilotons of greenhouse gas emissions, and they are in need of major updating.

[*Translation*]

We will therefore take this opportunity to implement more efficient technologies that will reduce both our long-term costs and our emissions by over 45% in the future. This will also enable us to examine the idea of using biomass as an alternative source of energy, which could produce even better results.

[*English*]

In fact, when I spent a day learning about the emission reduction leadership at the University of British Columbia in my riding, I toured the new biomass fuel power plant that is contributing to the university being on track to achieve its goal of a 67% reduction of emissions by 2020. Climate action is about reducing emissions, saving money, and creating jobs.

Government Orders

I wrote my thesis on global warming 24 years ago. I helped build the foundation for B.C.'s climate action as the provincial environment minister for three years, and now I have the privilege of working on climate solutions in this government. I am happy to say we are creating a systematic plan to reduce the government's own greenhouse gas emissions. We will do that by acquiring tools, improving the environmental performance of buildings, equipment, and operations, minimizing fuel consumption and exhaust emissions from the federal fleet, and supporting green or low-carbon procurement. The plan also could include reducing the carbon footprint of employee activities like travel and commuting.

Our success depends on the collaboration of federal employees, so we will be involving them and seeking their contributions so that they can bring their ideas forward. We are also studying their successes abroad and in other provinces.

We are working toward having a coordinated, ambitious approach for reducing greenhouse gas emissions in the federal government, and I ask members to join us in working toward a clean, sustainable economy that is Canada's future.

● (1545)

Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, I thoroughly enjoyed working with the hon. member when we were both on the environment committee, and I know she is very dedicated.

The member's government has yet again signed on to the G20 that they will remove the perverse incentives to the fossil fuel sector. The former Conservative government promised to do that too and did not do it. There are growing concerns that for some sectors the failure to remove the perverse incentives will simply undo any effect of the carbon tax.

Could the member speak to that and to why the government has not immediately moved to remove those perverse incentives?

Ms. Joyce Murray: Madam Speaker, I have immense respect for the member opposite, and we did enjoy our time together on the environment committee.

I would like to confirm that we have committed to reducing the subsidies for fossil fuels; and that will be phased in. We also committed to putting a price on carbon, and I am delighted to remind the member that we made that announcement yesterday. Further than that, we are working on a plan to address this government's own greenhouse gas emissions in operations right across the country. I look forward to discussing that further with the member in the months to come.

Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to thank the parliamentary secretary for her speech, but I do have a really important question that the previous Liberal member failed to answer. Have the Liberals actually done a cost-benefit analysis, or have they done an economic analysis of what this is going to cost Canadians, particularly in communities such as ours? She comes from a community in British Columbia that does not have a lot of manufacturing. It is extremely important that we be competitive with our international partners.

In the speech by the Ontario government, we heard minister Smitherman promise 50,000 new jobs, but later the government said

it was not based on any analysis. It actually came up with that number without taking a look at it first, and it did not take into account the number of job losses due to higher energy costs.

Would the member let us know in advance? Have the Liberals actually done an analysis on this? How many jobs are going to be affected? How many of these green jobs that were once promised in Ontario are we going to get now? It did not happen before with the same policy, but how many are we going to get now? How many job losses are there going to be because of the increase in energy costs?

Ms. Joyce Murray: Madam Speaker, for the Conservative member, there have been analyses about the economic benefits of a transition to a clean-energy economy for well over a decade, and those are some of the analyses that came out of the Round Table on the Environment and the Economy, which his government not only eliminated, but then it took down all that information, the research, the data, the economic analysis that was on the website, because it did not want the public to see. It is the very analysis that informed his prime minister's decision to commit to putting a price on carbon in 2008, which the Conservatives woefully failed to do. Thanks to inaction by his government, our country dropped 70% in terms of our market share in the clean energy economy.

● (1550)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Romeo Saganash (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, NDP): Madam Speaker, I will try to ask a short question.

We have been listening to this government for a year, and I am one of those people who are tired of hearing fine words without seeing any action. With the NDP's proposed amendment, we are reaching out. We invite the government to walk the talk and include indigenous peoples in this process.

Will the member agree to support our subamendment?

[*English*]

Ms. Joyce Murray: Madam Speaker, I just want to remind the member that there has been a historic commitment to indigenous communities by this government, and it has been far more than words; it has been action.

I would like to remind him of the action yesterday, committing to a national price on carbon. I am excited that we are working toward having the clean energy economy supported fully by this government through the investments that I mentioned, but also through becoming a test bed for innovation, increasing our own use of clean technologies, and supporting entrepreneurs.

[*Translation*]

We intend to improve energy efficiency standards for consumer and commercial goods. There are many other elements in our plan to—

Government Orders

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order, please.

The hon. member for Outremont.

[*English*]

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Outremont, NDP): Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak to the motion asking the House to support the government's decision to ratify the Paris agreement made at the COP 21 on April 22 of this year. Of course, New Democrats in the House will support the ratification of the Paris agreement.

However, we would be remiss if we did not also recognize what a deep disappointment it is for all Canadians who believed the Prime Minister's promise of change; for all Canadians who want a secure, healthier future for their children and grandchildren; and for all Canadians who know that significant emissions reductions are the only way to avoid catastrophic climate change.

Instead of respecting its promise to Canadians and its obligations to future generations, the Liberal government has adopted the woefully inadequate Harper Conservative targets. That will see Canada fail to meet its previous Copenhagen commitment, on top of the previous Liberal failure to meet Kyoto targets. Of course, tragically, that will also mean that we will fail to keep the promise of a 1.5°C temperature limit made by the Minister of Environment and Climate Change in Paris.

Canada is still without a national greenhouse gas reduction plan, and the Liberals have not taken the steps necessary to meet targets here at home to comply with our international climate obligations, including the carbon tax announcement yesterday.

What we can guarantee with a carbon tax increase is an increase in taxes. What we cannot guarantee with a carbon tax is a decrease in greenhouse gases. The only way to do that is with a cap-and-trade system.

Theoretically, if the carbon tax were to get high enough, it would discourage people from doing the types of things that are producing GHGs. However, Canada has the best working model for greenhouse gas reduction, and it is the reduction scheme put in place to come to grips with a problem that was not global warming at the time, but it was acid rain. Instead of CO₂, which is the main greenhouse gas, we were dealing with SO₂, sulphur dioxide.

Big companies like Inco had said that they would never put in the scrubbers in their stacks, because they were going to cost tens of millions of dollars. Madam Speaker, in your part of the world, you know that well. However, when Canada and the United States got together and put in a cap-and-trade system, limiting the amount of SO₂ that could be produced year over year, we took care of acid rain.

Do members know why? It is because companies like Inco were forced to make a market decision at some point. They were either going to have to buy SO₂ credits in the market created for that substance, or they were going to put in the scrubbers; and the year that it was cheaper to put in the scrubbers, they did just that. This is what a cap-and-trade system does. It is a complicated notion, but it actually works.

Canada right now is simply dealing with the Conservative plan. That is what we are taking to the table, and we will once again fail

future generations, because the Liberals, of course, have not followed through on their promise. We share the disappointment of many Canadians who voted Liberal thinking that they would get real change on a big subject like reducing in greenhouse gases, only to realize that what they got was Stephen Harper.

• (1555)

[*Translation*]

Instead of keeping the promises they made to Canadians, the Liberals adopted the completely inadequate targets of the Harper Conservatives, which do not even meet the Copenhagen commitments and break the promise made by the Minister of the Environment in Paris to have a maximum temperature increase of 1.5°C.

Canada still does not have a national plan to reduce greenhouse gases. The Liberals have done nothing to meet the targets in Canada.

Naturally, any progress in this area is a step in the right direction. However, yesterday's announcement will not help us act quickly enough to reduce GHGs, and Stephen Harper's targets will certainly not get us there.

According to the recent report from Environment and Climate Change Canada published in February, Canada will still miss the low targets set by Stephen Harper for 2030. The Liberals will not meet the Harper targets for 2030. This is recent and comes from a non-partisan source, Environment and Climate Change Canada.

What the Prime Minister announced yesterday will not close this gap, and the targets will not be enough to help us meet the international commitments we made under the Paris agreement.

[*English*]

I was listening attentively to my colleague from British Columbia. She told us what the government was going to do to reduce the federal government's emissions. She talked about the federal fleet. That is very interesting.

However, it was not a question of the federal government's action with its fleet that was signed in Paris. The Government of Canada signed an accord that required us to reduce our greenhouse gases. It is interesting to hear her say that they are going to do a certain number of activities, but what is required under article 4, paragraph 4, of the Paris accord is an economy-wide effort to reduce our greenhouse gases.

Government Orders

Now she described the fact, and I knew her at the time, that she spent three years as British Columbia's environment minister. Our paths crossed at the time. For three years, I was Quebec's environment minister. For every one of those three years, in Canada's largest province by territory and second-largest by population, in Quebec, we were able to reduce greenhouse gases. We had an across-the-economy plan to do just that, and we believed in it. That is what happens when we use the resources of our government to produce a positive result for the future.

What others have done, and what the Liberals continue to do, is to try to use this for public relations purposes.

I will never forget my old classmate, Eddie Goldenberg, who did something quite unusual for a Liberal. He told the truth. He explained that when the Liberals signed Kyoto, they had no plan. In fact, he used a lovely expression. He said they signed Kyoto "to galvanize public opinion" which no doubt, in his mind anyway, explains the fact that under the Liberals, after signing Kyoto, we missed our targets by 30%. In fact, we had one of the worst records in the world for increases in greenhouse gas productions. One of the only countries that was worse than us was Kazakhstan. If that is the company that the Liberals are comfortable keeping in terms of dealing with our international obligations, I will leave it to them.

What I know is that Canadians expected better. Canadians who voted for change, thinking that the Liberals would deliver change, are bitterly disappointed to realize that it is just more of the same.

• (1600)

[*Translation*]

Fighting climate change with Liberals or Conservatives is six of one and half a dozen of the other. However, the Liberals do it with a smile and go to Paris.

I was there when the Prime Minister waved his hands and proclaimed that Canada was back. What he failed to mention is that Canada was back with Stephen Harper's plan, targets, and timeline.

Yesterday, we learned that the Liberals did not even have a plan to achieve Stephen Harper's targets. Such is the Liberal reality. As usual, they know how to capitalize on this to improve their public relations. However, they are doing nothing to lower greenhouse gas emissions.

[*English*]

Why is that so important? I remember when I was young and in school, reading in an encyclopedia that if the ice in Greenland melted, it would raise the seas to such a level. A picture accompanied it. I saw large cities around the world that would be completely sunk by the amount of water that would enter the oceans by the melting of the ice cap on Greenland. I remember being terrified by the thought, but saying how could that possibly ever happen? A week ago, new figures published show that hundreds of billions of tonnes of that ice cap in Greenland is melting, moving into the oceans, changing currents, changing salinity, changing the planet. We can do something about it, but it begins with reducing greenhouse gases.

We heard the Prime Minister today. He did not dare deny when I read to him the three cases that were before us, that he had Stephen

Harper's plan, that the government's tax could not guarantee a reduction, and that we were not going to be able to meet our obligations. He could not deny it. Members saw that, as well as I did. That is terrifying for future generations.

Very few of us who are here today will feel the full force of the changes being wrought on the planet by our inaction. We have had enough of the posing, the posturing, the feel-good phrases. They are all empty. It is time for action on climate change, and the only way to do it is to reduce greenhouse gases.

[*Translation*]

We can change course, set new targets based on science that are consistent with our international commitments, adopt a national greenhouse gas reduction plan, and take immediate urgent action regarding internal climate policies in order to meet our international obligations and especially our imprescriptible obligations to future generations.

We have to convert these international ambitions into tangible policies here at home. The NDP knows that it is possible to grow the economy while protecting the environment, but this government is currently failing at both at the same time. So far, the Liberals seem to be continuing the pattern of previous governments: make international commitments and then fail to live up to them.

[*English*]

With each passing day and each new decision, Canadians are questioning whether the Liberals have any intention of keeping their promises. They are finding it increasingly difficult to reconcile the Prime Minister's words with the actions of the Liberal government.

We saw this particularly in the wake of decisions like last week's approval of Pacific NorthWest LNG. Again, I refer to my Liberal colleague from British Columbia who just spoke before me. It was incredible to hear her boast about the work with regard to first nations. What is required by the Supreme Court is meaningful consultation and accommodation, whether it is in the case of site C, where the government approved it while it was still being debated before the courts, or in the case of LNG, which is a single project that will increase the entire greenhouse gas production of the major province of British Columbia.

Liberals did that with the stroke of a pen while it was still being opposed by six major first nations in that province. They say that is respectful. We say it is an abject failure to meet the responsibilities imposed by the Supreme Court of Canada. That Pacific NorthWest LNG project, as planned, would in fact be the single-largest emitter of greenhouse gases in all of Canada. It would produce more than 10 million tonnes.

My Conservative colleagues ask, what about globally? That is one of the Conservatives' main talking points: Canada only represents a small percentage of the globe in the fight against climate change.

Government Orders

What if Canadians, in the Second World War, had adopted this position? That because Canada only represented a small percentage of the overall forces of the allies in the Second World War, we would not have fought. Canada fought. Canada has to do its part to fight climate change.

The Liberals promised a new era of renewed relationships with indigenous nations. I remember when the Prime Minister, just last week, sent three ministers to the Vancouver airport, only 1,000 kilometres away from the people and territory that will be directly affected by their decision. That decision was made without proper consultation and in spite of major opposition.

The Liberals said they would fix the environmental assessment process, but instead they are still relying entirely on the Harper Conservatives' broken promises. That is right, there is a fourth broken promise. This also threatens key juvenile salmon habitat that the Liberals promised to protect.

Four broken promises in one single decision. That is where the Liberals are on the environment and respect for first nations. That is why the NDP knows that we are the only progressive voice in this House, standing up on key issues like climate change.

That has been the story of so many of their other commitments. It is almost as if they have different categories of broken promises. They promised to restore postal delivery door to door in Canada, and now they are pretending that is in a special category. That is a promise that they do not even remember making.

Here, this is a different category of promise. During the election campaign, the Liberals promised a whole new series of targets. Then, once the election was over, they said it is a whole new series of mimeographed targets, the same ones we saw from Stephen Harper. They just forgot that word.

• (1605)

[*Translation*]

Soon the Liberals will be celebrating their first anniversary in power, which will be marked by broken promises and failures on important issues, such as fighting climate change.

What better example do we have of the Liberals breaking fundamental promises than what this party, which prides itself on its image of a party that works for peace, did in Geneva, Switzerland in August. Members should brace themselves. This Liberal government voted against nuclear disarmament in Geneva. Members heard correctly. This is yet another example of the Liberals not keeping their word and they have not even been in office for a year. However, that is fundamental. We saw it with the Kyoto protocol, which the Liberals signed for public relations purposes. We saw it with the Copenhagen agreement when the Conservatives were in office, and emissions have increased significantly since then.

Let us not forget that the federal Liberals have been promising to do something about climate change since 1993. Jean Chrétien ran on that platform in 1993. The Liberals used the same tactic during the last election. They took so many of the same positions as the NDP that many Canadians thought they could count on the Liberals as a way of getting rid of Harper. They thought that, since they had been

having the wool pulled over their eyes by the Liberals for only 149 years, they would give them one last chance.

Less than a year later, those people are starting to realize that they were misled. They are beginning to become disillusioned. The people who voted Liberal are extremely disappointed to see that all they are getting is Stephen Harper's plan but with a smile. Unfortunately, for future generations, that does absolutely nothing to change the fact that greenhouse gas emissions are rising and there have been changes in the climate itself.

If we go above the 2°C mark, we will be at the tipping point. Global warming will have negative and irreversible effects on ecosystems, the global economy, and human beings in particular.

However, it is becoming increasingly clear that even such an immediate and urgent threat is not enough to make the Liberals do more than hold press conferences, make empty announcements, and spout rhetoric, clichés, and platitudes.

• (1610)

[*English*]

The New Democrats have consistently stood up for urgent and effective action on climate change. We have introduced progressive policies for Canada to transition to a new and vibrant low-carbon economy. We will keep fighting on behalf of Canadians because Canada cannot fail the global effort to fight catastrophic climate change.

The Liberals cannot continue to break their promises. Their words on climate change must be matched by meaningful action. They cannot continue to operate under Harper's broken environmental assessment process. We all remember what they promised in cases like Kinder Morgan and others in British Columbia, in particular to the Dogwood initiative. We will bring in a whole new credible environmental assessment process and we will restart those evaluations under that new process, an entirely broken promise. Believe me, the people in British Columbia know it is an entirely broken promise.

When a project like Pacific NorthWest LNG is approved without a new process and one that considers climate targets, that is what we are talking about. How can the Liberals approve any of these major new projects if they are already failing to meet their international obligations to reduce greenhouse gases? It is nonsense. They cannot do it. Yet that is what the Liberals would have us believe, that they can approve these massive new projects, the biggest greenhouse gas emitters in Canada, while at the same time pretend they will meet international obligations. It is impossible to do. What the Liberals should have done was respect their promise to come in with a new process, make it credible, and include the analysis of greenhouse gases every step of the way.

Government Orders

We have proposed an amendment to the government's motion to press the Liberals for a clear plan, with updated targets and specific measures to meet our Paris commitments, including our obligations to first nations, but words are not enough. We are past the point where Canadians will accept empty promises on climate change and we are past the point where our environmental and economic future can afford more broken promises on climate change. Canadians deserve better. The New Democrats will keep working with hope for a better future for us all.

[*Translation*]

I will close by saying that we in the New Democratic Party will always stand strong for real environmental change in Canada. It starts with a commitment to reduce greenhouse gases. That is the only way to curb climate change.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I totally disagree with the leader of the New Democratic Party on many fronts. When I look at how progressive our government has been on the environment file, it demonstrates very clearly this government is listening to what Canadians want. On the one hand, when we talk about the carbon tax on pollution, and that really is what this about in good part, the New Democrats say that we have not gone far enough. On the other hand, the Conservatives say that we have gone too far, that we are damaging the economy.

The leader of the New Democratic Party talked about the LNG. If it were up to the NDP, we know there would be no pipelines. The difference between the New Democrats and the Liberals is that Liberals understand the importance of the environment and the economy. We can move forward on both fronts.

Would the leader of the New Democratic Party not acknowledge that it is in the interest of Canadians for us to listen to them and to move forward on both fronts, and that in fact it can be done? We can deal with the importance of the economy and the environment.

The Paris agreement is a positive step forward on the environment. That is what Canadians want and that is what our Prime Minister and our government are delivering.

Hon. Thomas Mulcair: Madam Speaker, if ever there was a poster boy for empty promises, empty phrases, clichés, and commonplaces from the Liberals, it would be the member.

He said that he totally disagreed with what I just said. What is interesting is I gave his Prime Minister the opportunity at question period to deny those three propositions: that they had Stephen Harper's targets, no plans to even meet those targets, and that Canada would increase its greenhouse gases. He could not deny them. Neither can the member.

He says that the Liberals are progressives. Since when does a progressive government abjectly fail to respect first nations and the Supreme Court mandated obligation of meaningful consultation and accommodation? They are not progressives.

He says that we believe they have not gone far enough. On that he is wrong, because they have not gone anywhere except back to

Stephen Harper's plan, his targets, and his timeline. They have totally failed their obligation to future generations. They have failed Canadians who believed them when they said they represented progressive change. The only way to deal with climate change is to reduce greenhouse gases. They have no plan to do that. They are a total failure.

• (1615)

Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Madam Speaker, I always enjoy the hon. member's speeches and questions. I would definitely agree today with what he said about the broken promises of the Liberals and the absolute lack of a plan, which seems continual for them.

However, I have a concern about the carbon tax. CBC posted the cost increases that people could expect to see under the new carbon tax. I worry about seniors on fixed income and those making less than \$40,000 a year, those who already did not get any tax relief from the government. Does the member share my concern?

Hon. Thomas Mulcair: Madam Speaker, there is no doubt that the Liberals' so-called middle-class tax reduction gave the largest tax reductions to people earning over \$100,000 a year and gave zero dollars and zero cents of tax reduction to families earning less than \$40,000 a year.

I had a chance to visit your riding with you for a few days, Madam Speaker. I do not know, but it seems to me that the middle class in your riding is probably a little like that in a lot of ridings in Canada. A lot of people who earn \$40,000 would describe themselves as middle class. Therefore, who really was the target of the Liberal tax reductions if not the privileged few? Of course, for the Liberals, that means their base, the people to whom they talk.

With regard to the taxes, there is no question that this type of consumer tax will, first and foremost, make it difficult for those at the low end of the spectrum because they have no way of avoiding it. People driving Maseratis do not really care how much they are paying for their gallon of gas. They will keep paying for it. However, it is different for someone who takes public transit and that goes up because of the cost of diesel. One would hope that in whatever formula it takes, whether a carbon tax to put a price on carbon, or a cap-and-trade system to put a tax on carbon, those responsible for applying it would ensure to put in a proviso to ensure those with lower incomes would receive compensation from the government. That would be the only fair thing to do.

Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to put a question for my colleague, the leader of the NDP and the member for Outremont.

Government Orders

Yesterday, the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands suggested that I had misled the House by saying the previous Liberal government had not failed because it actually came up with a plan after it ratified Kyoto. I look forward to my leader clarifying this. My understanding is that under the Paris agreement, and it is very specific under article 4, that when they move to ratify, they actually have to table specific provisions of how they will undertake rapid reductions at the highest possible ambition.

Yes, the government yesterday announced that it would go forward with a carbon tax. However, what the Liberals have not come forward with is the whole bundle of actions, which they promised during the election and for which people are calling, including more rapid phase-out of coal-fired power and to incent the direction toward a cleaner economy.

Does the member agree with me that it is probably not proper to ratify yet, since we do not have a plan?

Hon. Thomas Mulcair: Madam Speaker, we do not have a motion that mentions first nations, and that is something to which the government should be paying attention. I can guarantee it that first nations are paying attention to it.

With regard to the member of Parliament for Saanich—Gulf Islands, clearly she has missed a couple of episodes. Yesterday the Liberals promised to do something starting in 2018. What is interesting is that because it is going to be 2018 none of the information with regard to any reduction or otherwise of greenhouse gases is going to be available for the election in 2019. By the way, 2018 miraculously is also the date that was chosen by Stephen Harper for his \$65 a tonne for carbon. We know that neither ever happened.

My colleague from Edmonton Strathcona asked about the accord. Article 4, paragraphs 3 and 4, require two specific things. Every time they come up with a new figure for their greenhouse gases, it has to show a reduction from their previous figures. That is the first breach of the Paris accord by the Liberals because they are sticking with the same old figures.

Article 4, paragraph 4 says that they have to have an economy-wide plan for a reduction of greenhouse gases that will produce the most important result possible. The Liberals came in today and talked to us about the fleet of trucks in the federal government. That shows how totally disconnected they are from the reality of the Paris accord. They do not even understand what they have signed. However, they do know one thing: public relations like they did with Kyoto.

Let us ensure Canadians know his is empty rhetoric from the Liberals once again.

• (1620)

Ms. Karina Gould (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am a little confused. I thought the motion we are debating today is whether the House supports the government to ratify the Paris agreement and to continue with the Vancouver declaration to have the federal government work with the provinces and territories to develop a plan. It sounds like my hon. colleague is saying that we should not,

and he does not support the ratification of Paris nor the Vancouver declaration.

I hope the hon. colleague who, I assume, would support the Paris declaration would confirm whether he supports Canada to actually ratify this agreement, yes or no?

Hon. Thomas Mulcair: Madam Speaker, I am not allowed to say whether people are present in the House, but I can say from the question that I do agree that the member is a little confused. My opening words were that of course the NDP would vote in favour of the ratification of the Paris accord.

I can understand the member's confusion because her government has been talking a good game when it comes to climate change and reducing greenhouse gases. However, what the Liberals have actually put on the table is a carbon copy, a mimeographed version, of Stephen Harper's plan. It is the same plan, same targets, same timelines. I do not blame the member for being confused. If this is about ratifying the Paris accord, there is nothing in here on first nations, and, by the way, indigenous peoples were key in the Paris discussions and in the accord. There is nothing in here that would allow Canada to respect article 4, paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Paris accord, no reduction in greenhouse gases and no across-the-economy plan.

I understand the confusion. We are hoping to clarify it and we are hoping that the member will stand with us when we insist that the Liberals' motion be amended to include first nations.

Ms. Karina Gould (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to note that I will be sharing my time with my colleague from Halifax.

I rise in the House today to speak to one of the most important issues today—climate change. The decisions we make in the House will have a lasting impact on future generations of Canadians, and people around the world.

[*Translation*]

Climate change was one of the Prime Minister's top priorities when he was elected. The government is committed to transforming Canada into a more vigorous and resilient low-carbon economy and to positioning Canada as a leader in the fight against climate change.

Our government also promised to help the poorest and most vulnerable countries fight climate change. The year 2015 was pivotal in terms of global action, most notably because of the 2030 agenda for sustainable development adopted in September and all of the work that went into finalizing the Paris agreement in December.

The 2030 agenda is a 15-year global framework that recognizes the social, economic, and environmental aspects of sustainable development along with factors related to peace, governance, and justice. The 2030 agenda signals a shift in how the world sees development. It recognizes that issues such as inequality and climate change are important in both developed and developing countries and that we have to work together to address those issues.

*Government Orders**[English]*

On November 27, 2015, at the Commonwealth heads of government meeting in Malta, the Prime Minister announced that Canada would contribute \$2.65 billion over five years to help the poorest and most vulnerable developing countries respond to climate change and adapt to its impacts.

The Paris agreement, adopted on December 12, 2015, is an historic agreement that promotes ambitious action by all countries toward low emissions and a climate-resilient global economy. More than before, the Paris agreement brings to the fore the impacts of climate change on poverty, food security, health, and the ability of people to realize their human rights.

Developed countries have committed to provide resources to assist developing countries to address climate change, and Canada has already stepped forward to help in a number of ways, including \$30 million for the least developed countries fund to support adaptation efforts among the poorest and most vulnerable countries; \$10 million to the World Meteorological Organization for its work to develop climate risk early warning systems; \$50 million in contribution to the achievement of the G7 commitment to enhance access by developing countries to climate risk insurance; \$150 million in contributions to the achievement of the G7 commitment to develop renewable energy in Africa; and \$300 million to the initial resource mobilization of the green climate fund, a key global facility aimed at mobilizing climate finance in support of the climate efforts of developing countries.

Climate change and the environment are key considerations throughout all of Canada's development programming, and we will continue to work with our development partners to help them adapt and support their transition to low carbon, resilient economies.

The implementation of the 2030 agenda for sustainable development is a priority for the Minister of International Development and La Francophonie, along with the entire government. We are committed to reducing poverty and inequality in the world, in part by refocusing our development assistance to help the poorest, most vulnerable, and fragile states.

During my recent visit to Guatemala, I witnessed how climate change has impacted one of the country's most important lakes, Lake Atitlán, putting the economic livelihoods of thousands of families around its shores at risk.

At the end of August, I also saw the devastating results of an El Niño-related drought in Ethiopia, which is facing its worst food security crisis in decades. Failed rains in much of the country have left an estimated 18.2 million people in need of emergency food assistance. Canada's \$125 million productive safety net program, recently approved by our government, is just one of the ways we are helping Ethiopia to improve household food security, nutrition, and economic well-being in the face of climate change.

Canada has much to offer in terms of know-how, expertise, and technology to help the poorest and most vulnerable tackle climate change. The impacts of climate change that I saw in Guatemala and Ethiopia are only two examples of how our world is changing. It is clear that climate change is a global issue. However, it is also intensely local and personal.

At COP21, Canada joined “mission innovation”, a global partnership aimed at doubling government investment into clean energy innovation over five years, while also encouraging private sector leadership in clean energy. Starting in 2017, Canada will provide over \$1 billion over four years to support clean technology development in Canada, including in the forestry, fisheries, mining, energy, and agriculture sectors.

• (1625)

We will also be investing \$100 million each year to support clean technology producers to promote a clean environment and a strong economy, and an additional \$200 million to support innovation. These strategic investments, as part of an ambitious export and trade strategy, will help us tackle climate change while also creating jobs and encouraging growth.

While I spoke about the impacts abroad, we also know that climate change is impacting us right here at home. On August 4, 2014, 190 millimetres of rain, two-months' worth, came down in approximately eight hours on my riding of Burlington. In my riding, roads and highways were flooded, creeks filled with debris, and more than 3,000 homes were damaged. This was a wake-up call. In Burlington, we realized that we are not immune to changing weather patterns.

This past summer, my community found itself facing the opposite: drought. The Niagara Peninsula received between 40% to 60% of its average precipitation this summer. Farmers were calling it the worst season in decades for crops.

This contrast of flooding one year and then drought the next is the local impact that we are beginning to feel. On the two-year anniversary of the Burlington flood, over 200 people came out to my town hall to discuss federal action on climate change. This turnout was unprecedented for a town hall event in Burlington. It demonstrates that Canadians want and need us, as legislators and as leaders, to act on this issue.

This is why I am proud of the Prime Minister's announcement yesterday of our plan to price carbon pollution starting in 2018. Carbon pricing is one of the most effective ways to incentivize Canadians to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions. Our plan puts in place nation-wide reduction targets that are realistic and achievable while the economy still grows. They go hand in hand.

Government Orders

Pricing carbon is just one of the many ways we can reduce greenhouse gas emissions. At my town hall, I heard great suggestions from members of my community. Many residents discussed the importance of using systems thinking rather than individual thinking when it comes to climate change action. There are broader structural system changes that can be catalyzed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Where 40% of our emissions are produced by the transportation sector, residents talked about the need to examine whole supply chains to ensure that transit and infrastructure developments are green, resilient, and self-sustainable.

When we talk about the Paris agreement and agenda 2030, we also need to think about local solutions for local needs. At my town hall, residents talked about planting more trees, fewer lawns, and more native plants which are self-sufficient and drought-resistant. This would result in less water use, more carbon capture, and more oxygen in the air.

Residents also spoke of the need to support the reduction and recycling of food and material waste, expanding compost programs and banning plastic bags. These are small but significant measures we can all take.

Burlington residents emphasized that we also need to ensure that environmentalism is affordable for all Canadians. Lower-income Canadians need to be included in this process. Green living should not be an exclusive lifestyle.

My constituents also stressed working with indigenous Canadians to build communities that are resilient to climate change; protecting clean air, water, and land; and building on local knowledge and expertise. Overall, we need to make sure that all Canadians are part of this process.

In my community the message was clear: the federal government has an opportunity to step up and take leadership on this file. It was even suggested that perhaps we start with the renovation of 24 Sussex, and that the construction of all new federal buildings be mandated to meet the principles of the Living Building Challenge or its equivalent.

I know that environmental problems seem insurmountable at times, but there are practical and doable solutions that we can be taking right now, and we must not lose momentum. We can start right now by ratifying the Paris agreement.

I look forward to working on this file with my colleagues in the House.

● (1630)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP): Madam Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's comments and speech. However, I am having a hard time reconciling two things: the Liberals' fine words about signing the Paris agreement, which they are now asking us to ratify in the House, and the tangible plans and measures they presented in the House.

They are still approving major energy production projects that are going to increase our greenhouse gas emissions. I have a hard time reconciling those two things. I would like the parliamentary secretary to explain to all the members of the House how the

government plans to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions when it is still approving new projects that will create more emissions and adopting a multi-year plan that is identical to the Conservatives'. The Liberals also have the same targets as those set by the Conservatives.

Can the hon. member reconcile these two things?

Ms. Karina Gould: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for the question.

[*English*]

It is a bit of a challenge for him to understand this as I understand that the party opposite does not believe that we can both grow the economy and protect the environment at the same time. However, this is something that we ran on, that Canadians know we need to do.

When it comes to the Paris agreement, I think we are in agreement that we should ratify it to move forward.

We are working with our provincial and territorial counterparts to develop a plan for climate change that is pan-Canadian, that is going to ensure that we not only protect the environment for generations to come, but also ensure that there are good jobs, clean growth, and a better economy.

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Madam Speaker, I listened to my hon. colleague's speech and all of the others with a lot of interest because this concerns everybody.

As we have said before, we do support the Paris accord but we do not want to have a new tax. A new tax is less money in the pockets of the people. It is the worst way to make the economy strong.

My hon. colleague referred many times to the Vancouver declaration but the Vancouver declaration belongs to the provinces. It is based on a deal with the provinces and the federal government working hand in hand. We saw everything but that yesterday. Yesterday we heard the government say it was either its way or no way. There was a big surprise however. The provincial ministers were upset with that and three of them left the room and slammed the door.

Do you not think this is really true, the Vancouver declaration, yes or no?

● (1635)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Maybe the member for Louis-Saint-Laurent could address the member as "she" as opposed to "you".

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Ms. Karina Gould: Madam Speaker, we are working hand in hand with the provinces and territories to develop a pan-Canadian strategy. Canadians elected this government to come up with a plan and to work with the provinces and territories. They also elected us to show leadership on this file.

Government Orders

Eighty-five per cent of Canadians already live in a jurisdiction where there is a price on carbon pollution. That means that we want to make sure that there are reasonable and achievable national targets. The Minister of Environment is working with her provincial and territorial counterparts to achieve this for all Canadians.

Mr. Chris Bittle (St. Catharines, Lib.): Madam Speaker, we are finally witnessing climate change. We have seen it in southwestern Ontario, in Niagara, and in Windsor. Right now we are seeing the effects in Haiti where a deadly hurricane has hit.

I would like my colleague to expand on Canada's commitments abroad and the effects not only in Canada but abroad of our climate change commitments.

Ms. Karina Gould: Madam Speaker, Canada's commitments abroad when it comes to climate change are incredibly important, because we all know that climate change recognizes no borders. We all have a contribution to make and we all have a role to play in addressing this.

Our Prime Minister announced \$2.65 billion in climate change mitigation efforts.

As I have travelled around the world, particularly in Africa and Central America, I have seen the devastating impact of climate change. We must work with our partners because this is an issue that affects all of us.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. 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 Trois-Rivières, Housing; the hon. member for Vancouver Kingsway, Health; the hon. member for Nanaimo—Ladysmith, Indigenous Affairs.

[*English*]

Mr. Andy Fillmore (Halifax, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is again my honour to rise in the House to support the motion to ratify the Paris agreement signed by Canada on April 22 in New York.

As well, I am honoured to speak in support of the motion's call for support for the Vancouver declaration signed on March 3, 2016, which calls on the federal government, provinces, and territories to develop a pan-Canadian framework on clean growth and climate change.

Since coming to this House I have spoken many times about the matter of climate change, including on the harmful impacts of climate change in my home town in the riding I represent, Halifax, Nova Scotia. I have often told my colleagues here that I view climate change as one of the most urgent and pressing matters facing this country and this Parliament.

That is why I introduced my private member's motion M-45 to this House, which addresses the growing threat of climate change by requiring GHG analyses of federally funded infrastructure.

I am grateful to all of those in this chamber who helped pass M-45 last Wednesday, and I am also extremely encouraged, not only to see that motion pass but also to see so clearly that the great majority of members in this place, more than two-thirds of those present in last Wednesday's vote, recognize the importance of taking concrete

action to address climate change. It is my sincere hope that this demonstration of support for real climate action is repeated again with respect to the motion we are debating today. I believe we have no other responsible choice.

In the spring of 2016, the Minister of Environment and Climate Change issued a call to Canadians and asked for their help to shape Canada's climate change policy. In the months that followed, certain members of Parliament from across the country hosted town hall meetings in their ridings to solicit that feedback from their constituents. On June 28, more than 250 people packed a room at Dalhousie University for my own town hall meeting on climate change. The energy was intense and Halifaxians were eager.

Participants at that event were split up among 10 themed groups. Halifax residents themselves identified the themes through a social media outreach from my office the week before. Sitting in groups of 10, each group was provided with a single large sheet of paper, a handful of markers, and three simple questions on their respective themes: "What are your big ideas? What do you think government should know about this? What are your top recommendations to government on this?"

In no time, the tables were demanding a second sheet of paper and then a third and in many cases a fourth piece, easily having filled their paper with their big ideas to fight climate change. From a wide variety of backgrounds, ages, experiences, and political affiliations came an extraordinary set of ideas that our government can take to tackle climate change. My team and I took everything recorded on those sheets of paper and provided them, word for word, to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, and I posted them at hfxclimateaction.ca.

The citizen turnout and the passion, the high volume, and the thoughtfulness of the feedback was such a tangible demonstration of just how strongly the people of Halifax want real climate action, but not only that, but of just how much our city wants to be a leader, an ally, in what is one of the greatest challenges facing our government and our planet today.

Then again, this cannot come as much of a surprise. I have said before that Halifax finds itself on the front lines in the battle against climate change, with the rising sea levels and the extreme weather events that go with it. The impact of continuing climate change, if not addressed, will have serious implications for Halifax and for all of the communities we love across this country.

Government Orders

As one of Canada's primary coastal cities, Halifax faces a clear and present danger with sea level rise. It puts the quality and quantity of our drinking water at risk, and it jeopardizes Halifax's status and viability as a great Canadian port city, a key economic driver in my riding, my province, and eastern Canada.

It stands to harm marine habitats and the commercial viability of fish stocks, like salmon and cod. Transportation infrastructure will deteriorate, and increased costs for infrastructure repair and maintenance will become a larger and larger strain on public resources.

The impact of climate change is just as threatening right across Canada, where we are surrounded by more than 200,000 kilometres of coastline, where so many of our beloved cities and communities lie, and where as my colleague the Minister of Environment and Climate Change and the member for the Northwest Territories have pointed out, our indigenous communities are disproportionately affected.

That is why I am speaking in favour of ratifying the Paris agreement and supporting the Vancouver declaration. I will begin with the Paris agreement.

• (1640)

In December of last year, as our then new Minister of Environment and Climate Change and our Canadian delegation left for Paris to participate in climate discussions, I will admit I was very nervous.

I knew our delegation was strong and exceptionally capable and absolutely committed to a positive result, but I just was not sure how successful negotiations would be because, after all, the success of the agreement depended not only on our own government but on the capacity for consensus among many nations from across the world, each with unique interests and challenges. Previous efforts had failed, and I wondered if enough had changed in the world and here at home for the Paris negotiations to reach a better result.

Thanks in no small part to our Minister of Environment and Climate Change, things had changed, and the Paris climate talks were in so many ways a terrific success. More than 190 countries signed the agreement, each agreeing to do their part to keep global temperatures from rising more than 2° Celsius above pre-industrial levels. To date, more than 60 countries have ratified the agreement, representing over half of the world's global greenhouse gas emissions. With that we have surpassed the threshold number of 55 countries required to ratify the agreement in order for it to come into effect, and with the recent ratification by the European Union, we have achieved the requirement that those who ratify it must represent 55% of global emissions. This train is on the tracks.

The agreement is now in force. The global community is forging ahead, and we must join it.

The Paris agreement is a historic one, and it is urgent that we seize its potential. We simply cannot afford to wait any longer to support its ratification and put it into force here in Canada. The climate is changing and the impacts of global warming are closer than they have ever been. I only hope it is not too late.

Our government did its part in Paris, and now we must do our part here at home by supporting the motion before us.

Now I would like to address the Vancouver declaration. In much the same way that Canada cannot act alone to curb global emissions, our federal government cannot act alone to curb our country's emissions. We must work with provincial and territorial governments, as well as with indigenous groups to collaborate on a national plan to fight climate change.

On the heels of the Paris agreement, first ministers and indigenous leaders from across the country met in Vancouver in March of this year to discuss climate change. Parties agreed that we must transition to a low-carbon economy to ensure clean, sustainable growth, and the group committed to developing collaboratively a pan-Canadian framework on clean growth and climate change.

At the conclusion of their talks in Vancouver, parties formed into four working groups: one on carbon pricing; one on clean technology, innovation, and jobs; one on mitigation opportunities; and one on climate resilience and adaptation. The findings of these working groups will help inform the pan-Canadian framework.

I am proud to support a government that respects the need for intergovernmental collaboration on files like the environment. At the same time, our federal government has made it clear that it will take the necessary steps to meet our international obligations.

Pricing carbon pollution, for instance, is one such step, as the Prime Minister outlined yesterday. Indeed, pricing carbon pollution was one of the commitments of the Vancouver declaration agreed to by all premiers.

I believe implementing this mechanism can be done while working with provincial governments, which are already taking concrete steps to reduce emissions within their jurisdictions.

Our government is committed to ensuring each province has the flexibility to meet its individual needs, such as in my province of Nova Scotia, where we are already leading the nation of terms of GHG reductions and where we are well on our way to meeting our 2020 target of reducing emissions to 10% below 1990 levels.

Pricing carbon pollution is only one step, and I look forward to December when provinces and territories come together again to reach a pan-Canadian framework on the entirety of clean growth and climate change.

As I said earlier, we must work together to reach a solution, for none of us alone can fight climate change. No region, no country can win this war against climate change on its own; so we must unite, bound together by our common interests, our common survival, and the trust placed in us by Canadians coast to coast to coast to take meaningful action on climate change.

Government Orders

I believe the Paris agreement and the Vancouver declaration are the best shot we have, and so I fervently hope that the House will join me in voting in favour of the motion that is before us.

• (1645)

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Madam Speaker, I appreciate that and I want to thank my colleague for his speech. Throughout his speech he talked about flexibility and the Vancouver agreement and how hard he wants to work for his province of Nova Scotia. However, the environment minister of Nova Scotia walked out of that meeting in Montreal yesterday, so I do not think the people of Nova Scotia are quite as on board with this carbon tax as the member may believe.

The member mentioned that 85% of Canadians live in an area where a carbon tax already exists. Did the Prime Minister and the government have an agreement in place with the province of Alberta or Nova Scotia to have a \$50 per tonne carbon tax by 2020?

Mr. Andy Fillmore: Madam Speaker, the Vancouver declaration, the one agreed to by all premiers, contains language around a carbon price. What the federal government has done now is to flesh that out with a meaningful action plan.

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Madam Speaker, in 1992-93, I was part of a group of environmental organizations and industry organizations, a collaborative of Trans-Alta, oil companies, etc., working in the name of economic instruments. We were trying to design air quality regulations that would deal with a number of air pollution issues, including climate change. We were proposing economic instruments. We really hoped the Liberals, when they got elected, would take the legislation we had designed, but they did not. That is a very long time ago.

The Liberals were elected in 1993 on a platform of climate change action. Instead, they allowed emissions to increase by over 30%, and the UN reported that our pollution increased more than that of any other signatory to Kyoto.

Knowing the member's commitment to the issue, I am hoping he can tell me what has changed. What lessons have the Liberals learned from making deep commitments that they cannot fulfill?

Mr. Andy Fillmore: Madam Speaker, I have to say I am much more interested in preventing future carbon emissions than worrying about the carbon that is already out there in the world. This historic Paris agreement is about looking forward together, finding solutions, and forging solutions together. These solutions are going to come in a variety of different ways. The federal government is recognizing that flexibility is required, that each province has its own realities on the ground, whether those are economic realities, social realities, or realities about the different ways in which energy is generated in those provinces. A suite of options is certainly going to be available under that rubric of flexibility for provinces to meet those targets.

This government has proven, I believe beyond a shadow of a doubt, that it is absolutely committed to addressing the challenge of climate change in a very serious way.

• (1650)

Mr. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to turn to my colleague, in terms of some of the solutions he was proffering during his speech.

Halifax–Dartmouth is going to have to take a leadership role for Atlantic Canada; there is no doubt about it. Our government is pursuing an innovation agenda for Atlantic Canada.

Could he help us understand where he might see some of the economic opportunities—jobs, jobs, jobs—inherent in addressing the climate crisis by becoming more efficient?

For example, there is a lot of discussion about Atlantic Canada becoming a global sustainable food superpower; particularly, in aquaculture and the fisheries industry.

Could he help us give some thought to how he sees the positioning of Halifax–Dartmouth as a major urban and suburban area to provide solutions and create wealth?

Mr. Andy Fillmore: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for the opportunity to shift away from the pricing of carbon pollution to some of the innovative aspects of addressing this challenge.

Of course, the reduction of burning of fossil fuels creates an enormous opportunity for the development of new renewable technologies. Nova Scotia has been, and continues to be, a leader in those fields; centred in Halifax, largely.

Sequestration of carbon is another area of immense innovation happening right now. There are start-up and clean-tech firms in Halifax right now; for example, CarbonCure Technologies, which is injecting and sequestering carbon into concrete and making a very strong building material that will last over time.

This is an opportunity to innovate. It is an opportunity to embrace the Atlantic growth strategy and create a green economy for the future.

Mr. Michael Cooper (St. Albert—Edmonton, CPC): Madam Speaker, I will be splitting my time with my colleague, the hon. member for Calgary Rocky Ridge.

It was about a year ago that the Prime Minister was criss-crossing Canada, talking about ushering in a new era of collaborative federalism. Not only was the Prime Minister talking about ushering in a new era of collaborative federalism, he was talking about sunny ways, consultation, co-operation, and collaboration. Yesterday, Canadians found out what the Prime Minister really meant when he spoke of collaborative federalism, when he spoke about sunny ways, consultation, co-operation, and collaboration when he unilaterally announced the imposition of a massive federal tax grab on the provinces.

The Prime Minister told the provinces that they shall impose a carbon tax or a price on carbon, they shall do it by 2018, and if they do not do it, the federal government will do it for them by imposing a price on carbon at \$10 a tonne in 2018, escalating to \$50 a tonne in 2022. There was no consultation or collaboration, just a unilateral imposition of a massive tax grab from the Prime Minister. Talk about sunny ways and collaborative federalism.

Government Orders

How did the provinces and territories respond to the Prime Minister's collaborative federalism? Premier Wall said yesterday that he was stunned by the Prime Minister's disrespect toward the provinces and territories. Premier Wall's environment minister said that Saskatchewan had been, effectively, railroaded. He called it a bad day for federal-provincial relations.

The environment minister from the Yukon was so surprised by the Prime Minister's unilateral announcement that he said it literally sucked the air out of the room. Then, later in the day, the environment minister for Nova Scotia walked out of the room on the federal environment minister and was joined by the environment ministers for Newfoundland and Labrador, and Saskatchewan. That illustrates just how the provinces are responding to the Prime Minister's so-called new era of collaborative federalism.

Speaking of the federal environment minister, who had three provincial environment ministers walk out on her yesterday, she had the audacity over the weekend, I think it was, to characterize the sensible measures brought forward by the previous Conservative government and the Conservative government's targets as fake. I will tell the House what is fake. The Liberal government's commitment to sunny ways is fake. The Liberal government's commitment to collaboration, co-operation, and consultation is fake. The Liberal government's commitment to ushering in a new era of collaborative federalism is fake. I will say what else is fake, and that is the Liberal government's commitment and the Liberal Party's commitment to reducing GHGs. That is also fake.

Canadians will not forget that this is the same Liberal Party that, in 1993, campaigned on reducing GHGs by 20% from 1988 levels by 2005. What happened between 1993 and 2005? GHG levels increased exponentially. What about Kyoto? That was the Liberal commitment to reduce GHGs 6% below 1990 levels. What happened to Kyoto? It was a promise made, a promise broken. It was another fake Liberal commitment.

• (1655)

However, what is not fake is the cost that this massive Liberal tax grab would have on hard-working Canadians. The average Canadian family would end up paying as much as \$2,600 annually by 2022. That would be \$38 billion out of the wallets of hard-working Canadians. Premier Wall characterized this Liberal massive tax grab as one of the largest tax increases in Canadian history, and he is right.

Looking across Canada, let us face it, the economy is slowing but in my province of Alberta things are particularly difficult right now. We have seen in the last year some 200,000 Albertans laid off. Unemployment is reaching near double digits. It is the worst it has been in 30 years. Youth unemployment certainly has reached double digits. I think it is around 16%. In city centres such as Calgary, the office vacancy rate is approaching 25%. Things are tough. People are hurting.

What has the current government's approach been to deal with the particularly difficult situation in the province of Alberta? One of the first things the government did upon coming to office was to kill the northern gateway pipeline, which would have helped get Alberta energy to market, which would have helped Alberta become less reliant on exporting energy to the U.S. Then the government

proceeded to add new layers of red tape to the pipeline approval process to make it more difficult to get pipeline projects approved and ultimately built. Now this massive tax hike would be imposed on the people of the province of Alberta and all Canadians. I cannot help but simply conclude that the current government likes to kick Albertans when we are down.

However, it did not have to be this way. The Prime Minister could have kept his word. He could have worked in a collaborative way with the provinces to come together with a truly pan-Canadian solution. He could have worked with industry leaders to undertake a true sector-by-sector approach to reduce GHGs. However, he did not do that. He simply said it was his way or the highway with a massive, unilateral, federal tax grab.

We know that the result of this would be unfortunately not good. Hard-working, tax-paying Canadians would be worse off, they would be poorer, and Canada would be no closer to achieving its Paris targets.

• (1700)

Mr. Arnold Chan (Scarborough—Agincourt, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I listened with interest to my friend from St. Albert—Edmonton's contribution to this debate on the Paris agreement. I find it kind of rich that he is proposing to lecture this government with respect to its approach on federal-provincial-territorial relations given the approach of the previous government for the last 10 years, which was essentially to ignore provinces and territories. In fact, there was never really any meaningful consultation that ever took place from that particular side of the aisle as it related to the provinces.

If we look at the specific instance of what we have done in the past few days on this particular file, it simply was to impose a pricing system on carbon for those provinces that would not participate in a particular program.

The member also referred to the specific instance of Alberta. Again, I do not accept his characterization because the Alberta government has already put in a particular pricing system, and therefore, it would not need the federal intervention. How does he actually square his party's particular approach with ours?

Mr. Michael Cooper: Madam Speaker, quite frankly, let us talk about the current government's track record on this issue a little further.

The Prime Minister, after the 2015 election, after he went to Paris at the expense of \$1 million to taxpayers on this junket, said that within 90 days the provincial leaders would sit down and they would hammer out a pan-Canadian approach to combat climate change and to implement the Paris agreement. Ninety days came, and there was a meeting in Vancouver, but no agreement. There was merely an agreement to agree.

The Prime Minister said that he has a mandate from the premiers, that they agreed to, basically, this imposition of a carbon tax, but Premier Wall said it was not true.

Government Orders

What we have seen is a complete lack of leadership from the Prime Minister and from the Minister of Environment and Climate Change. They are very happy when it comes to having photo-ops with celebrities and going on junkets to places like Paris, but when it comes to coming up with a comprehensive plan, a pan-Canadian plan with the provinces, the Prime Minister has failed to deliver, and as a result, he was left to impose this unilateral federal tax grab. That is why—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Questions and comments, the hon. member for Sherbrooke.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his presentation during today's debate.

Over the past few months, the Conservatives have been talking a lot about this issue and criticizing the government, but I have not heard them propose many potential solutions. It would be interesting to hear their opinion of a proposal that was in their own campaign platform during a past election, namely, a carbon cap-and-trade system. That was their position. They had even set a price on carbon.

Today they seem to just want to criticize the government. I would like to know whether they have anything to propose. In order to be an effective opposition, it is important to come up with alternatives, so I would like to hear the solutions they are proposing to really reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and ensure a sustainable environment for future generations.

• (1705)

[*English*]

Mr. Michael Cooper: Madam Speaker, when we look at the Conservative track record on reducing GHGs, it is a track record to be proud of.

Under our previous Conservative government, we took a sector-by-sector approach so that we could grow the economy and at the same time reduce GHGs. We imposed a national regulatory regime on the largest sources of GHGs, namely the transportation and energy sectors. We brought forward comprehensive regulations that have effectively phased out building coal-fired power plants. We invested billions of dollars in clean technology.

Do members know what the result of that was? We were the first government in the world to actually reduce GHGs. That is the Conservative record. That is the record I support. That is what we need to keep doing.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I did not want to interrupt the minutes for questions and answers, but before we resume debate, I want to remind members that when somebody else has the floor, pursuant to Standing Order 16(2), when a member is speaking no member shall interrupt him or her except to raise a point of order. Therefore, I would remind members to please hold off. If members have questions, they can get up to ask a question.

The other thing I would appreciate is that, because there is only five minutes when we are doing 10-minute speeches and people want to ask questions, you keep your questions short. If members wish to speak more, then they should try to get on the speaker's list for a speech.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Calgary Rocky Ridge.

Mr. Pat Kelly (Calgary Rocky Ridge, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to say that my Conservative colleagues and I support the Paris agreement and approve of the government's choice to adopt the previous government's emission targets as its own. I am glad to see that the government adopted the standards of the previous government, which led to a 1% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions over a period of 35% growth in GDP, as my hon. friend from St. Albert—Edmonton has pointed out.

This was also a period when Canada's contribution to global greenhouse gas emissions dropped substantially, a legacy of which all Canadians can be proud. We also approve of continued protection of our forests, farms, and wetlands. These are measures that help keep Canada a world leader in carbon sequestration.

However, my colleagues and I cannot support the Liberals' plan to run roughshod over the provinces and impose a job-killing carbon tax, which would raise the cost of living for all Canadians and hurt the most vulnerable members of Canadian society the most. Canada can do several things to minimize our contribution to global climate change while growing the economy. However, first I must ground the discussion in some facts.

Ours is a continent-wide country, which requires vast transportation networks for goods and people. We are blessed with abundant natural resources, which require transportation infrastructure to reach other markets. Most of Canada experiences cold winters, which require affordable heating.

Second, carbon dioxide is a greenhouse gas associated with climate change. However, carbon dioxide is also essential to all carbon-based life on earth, so it should not be mischaracterized as pollution. We should not hold our breath in hopes of a completely carbon dioxide-free economy.

Government Orders

Since Canada's geography and highly developed economy necessitates significant energy consumption, and since a carbon dioxide-free existence is not possible, the question is: How can we produce and consume energy most efficiently and with the smallest effect on climate change? We can start by acknowledging that the global economy is interconnected. We must look at the entire life cycle of energy that we produce and consume. We must consider that global demand for energy sources will likely continue to increase for the foreseeable future. Countries like China, Japan, India, Malaysia, and others will acquire energy supplies from one source or another, and fossil fuels are fungible commodities. If these countries do not buy Canadian energy products because we fail to build pipelines or because we regulate our resources back into the ground, then they will simply buy from countries with weak or non-existent environmental and human rights standards. Indeed, countries like Iran, Russia, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, and Venezuela would benefit the most if we fail to bring energy products to international markets.

If Canada is serious about reducing global emissions, we should build pipelines to get our natural gas to developing countries to meet their current energy needs. We could work with them to develop new sources of energy to meet growing demand for the future. If we do not, other countries may simply build greenhouse gas intensive coal plants for electrical generation instead. If the government is serious about reducing greenhouse gas emissions, it should stop talking and get to work repealing barriers to the kinds of innovation that allow a measured transition to a lower carbon economy.

That said, however ideal a future of renewable energy may be, answering the call of extremism for a carbon-free economy immediately would be an economic disaster. Canada's prosperity and high standard of living depend on reliable, abundant, and affordable energy. Increasing the cost of energy would have a drastic effect on businesses and families. That effect is well known to the people of Ontario. Just last week, I read a news article about a couple in L'Orignal, Ontario, whose electricity bill has tripled since 2012. Despite having a well-insulated home, keeping the thermostat at a chilly 15° C in the winter, and despite only heating select portions of the house to reduce costs, these seniors pay almost as much for power as they do in rent. In a country with such abundant reserves of energy as Canada, it is outrageous that an ill-considered government policy should drive seniors into energy poverty. In a developed country, we must not let a warm home, access to refrigeration, the ability to cook, and to see after dark become luxuries that only the wealthy can afford.

● (1710)

The current government likes to speak about how much it is helping seniors, yet now it is talking about introducing a carbon tax that will raise the cost of living. It seems hypocritical to boast of improving the lot of seniors with more income while implementing policies which drive up costs. Expenses are just as important as revenue and personal finance, government finance, and especially the finances of people on fixed incomes.

Albertans are also struggling and do not want a carbon tax. When asked by The Local Parliament Project during the 2015 election, over 60% of those with an opinion opposed such a tax. I do not need a poll to know that my constituents oppose job-killing taxes like a carbon tax. When I speak to the constituents of Calgary Rocky

Ridge, they described the hardships caused by massive losses in the energy industry. They describe their fear that Alberta's carbon tax threatens years of decline and contraction in our energy sector. They also wonder why Canadian energy companies in Canada are investing in Texas when more than 100,000 Albertan energy workers are unemployed.

My constituents know the answer, which is that the government is scaring investors away from Canada through mixed messages and confusing rhetoric about the so-called green economy. The government is threatening to cripple Canada's energy sector through national carbon taxes. It is running roughshod over the provinces with its style of heavy-handed executive federalism, despite constant rhetoric about consultations and consensus. A good and responsible government must take the effects of its statements and policy plans on Canadian families into account. Fellow Canadians working in the energy sector and its spin-off industries need work today, work tomorrow, and they will continue to need work during any transition period.

In addition, I reject the government's assertion that an economically ruinous carbon tax is a so-called market solution to industrial emissions. There is nothing free market about adding a tax to everything. A market system is when supply and demand set optimal prices naturally. Taxes on carbon dioxide inject dead-weight loss and distortion into the market, destroying value, and making everything more expensive. Likewise, cap-and-trade schemes are not free market based, since they create a new commodity out of thick air and force people to buy it starting at mandated prices.

One can call the trade of carbon credits a market, yet it is merely an exchange of legal fictions to avoid legal fines. Drastically increasing the price of energy could plunge Canadians into the type of poverty the developed world has not seen in decades.

Just as innovation led humans from burning forests to burning coal for heat, from burning whale oil to burning kerosene for light, from using high-emission horses to high-efficiency cars for transportation, real free market solutions to environmental challenges mean government getting out of the way of inventors and allowing them to create the cleaner, more efficient, and more sustainable technologies we need. When alternatives to fossil fuels become more efficient and affordable than fossil fuels are, the market will move us to a post-fossil fuel economy.

Government Orders

If the government is serious about reducing greenhouse gas emissions, it should focus less on selfies with the global glitterati and burn less jet fuel travelling to exciting locations where three bureaucrats can claim over \$12,000 in meal expenses. Instead, it should encourage Canadian entrepreneurs and inventors to create made-in-Canada solutions by cutting red tape and taxes. It should respect the jurisdiction of provinces while avoiding some of the mistakes that have been made at the provincial level of pursuing green dreams while ignoring economic reality. It should create the conditions to bring the price of clean energy solutions down, not plunge Canadians into energy poverty by driving existing energy prices up. These measures may not be glamorous, they may not present many photo opportunities and grandstands, they may not earn approval from movie stars, but these are the solutions that Canadians need.

Canadians deserve a made-in-Canada approach to the concerns of climate change. We need measurable, reasonable, and attainable targets for emissions reduction that take Canada's unique strengths and challenges into account. We need real co-operation between the federal, provincial, and territorial governments. Therefore, unless this motion is amended to prevent encroachment on provincial and territorial jurisdictions, unless it rules out increasing the tax burden on Canadians, and unless it addresses the thousands of unemployed energy workers in my riding while restoring confidence for job-creating investments, I cannot support it.

• (1715)

Mr. Stephen Fuhr (Kelowna—Lake Country, Lib.): Madam Speaker, there has been a lot of talk about taxation, not only in the member's speech but in one of the other speeches also. To keep it short and give others an opportunity, I have a quick question. I would like to know if the member opposite could explain to this House what the term "revenue neutral" means with respect to taxation.

Mr. Pat Kelly: Madam Speaker, I think that Canadians know all too well what revenue neutral means when spoken from a government like that. They do not believe it, and history is on their side.

Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, I appreciated the comments by my colleague from Alberta.

You might want to take a look at the actual costs of fossil fuel, and in particular coal-fired power compared to renewables, if you finally factor in the health costs. We can take a look at what the Canadian Medical Association has told us about health and health impacts.

The question I have for the member is this. You talked about your great concern about retiring in dignity and how the carbon tax is going to make it more difficult for seniors to have an affordable life.

Where was your party, when it was in government, when we called for increases in the OAS, GIS, and pensions for seniors?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I want to remind the member to address the question to the Chair, so it could be where was "the member" as opposed to "you".

Mr. Pat Kelly: Madam Speaker, there were several components to the member's question.

I will start with the beginning about the health concerns and issues expressed over pollutants created from fossil fuel-generated power.

We believe in the evolution toward cleaner technology. This has been under way for decades. We do not see the same types and levels of pollution from power generation in cities. We are getting cleaner. During the time that the Conservative government was in power, we reduced greenhouse gas emissions while growing the economy.

I am proud of the track record of the previous government and believe that we are on the track and can continue.

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Madam Speaker, I know that being from Alberta, the member is already seeing much injury happening because of the regressive policies that have been introduced by the Notley government.

I want the member to talk a little more about how this job-killing carbon tax is going to impact the oil patch in Alberta, how it is going to increase the costs for our agricultural producers, but, more importantly, how it will impact on transportation, when we see diesel fuel increased by 14 cents a litre and gasoline by 11 cents a litre because of the Liberal carbon tax.

Mr. Pat Kelly: Madam Speaker, the impact is going to be on everyone.

It is going to be on the seniors who will be unable to afford to heat their homes. It is going to be on public transit users, which will see a rise in the cost of those services. We have already seen that in Alberta. In fact, we have already seen that in my city. The imposition of a provincial carbon tax has substantially increased the cost for local public transit operators. This is just the beginning.

The federal government wishes to add an additional carbon tax and increase the overall tax on carbon that has already been under way in Alberta. As far as the energy industry itself, the impacts of the provincial government there are already devastating, as we have seen investment dollars fleeing the province.

It is not just about commodity prices. We are seeing investment dollars going from Alberta to other energy-producing areas. It is a jurisdictional problem, as much as it is one of commodity prices.

• (1720)

Mr. Ramesh Sangha (Brampton Centre, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Guelph.

The actions we have taken over the last year have demonstrated this government's commitment to protecting our natural environment and fighting climate change.

We are taking action to create the right conditions for Canada's economy to grow in a sustainable manner, and for Canadians to prosper. This is why in our first budget the government made a bold statement by investing \$3.4 billion over five years to secure a cleaner, more sustainable environment by addressing climate change and air pollution, protecting ecologically sensitive areas, and restoring public trust in the environmental assessment process.

Our unprecedented investment in infrastructure will also generate significant environmental benefits. The first phase of the government's infrastructure plan includes \$5 billion for investment in water, wastewater, and green infrastructure projects across Canada.

While the pan-Canadian framework is being developed, we have already announced support for provinces and territories to advance projects that will reduce emissions. Starting in 2017-18, provinces and territories will have access to a \$2 billion low carbon economy fund.

We are taking targeted action to reduce emissions from Canada's largest sources, transportation and energy. We are providing \$56.9 million over two years to support the transition to a cleaner transportation sector.

We have provided \$139.5 million to deliver energy efficiency policies and programs, maintain clean energy policy capacity, and implement renewable energy projects in off-grid indigenous and northern communities that rely on diesel and other fossil fuels to generate heat and power.

Coupled with our mitigation actions, we are supporting efforts to adapt to the impacts of climate change by implementing programming focused on building the science base to inform decision-making, protecting the health and well-being of Canadians, building resilience in the north and indigenous communities, and enhancing competitiveness in key economic sectors.

Through an investment of \$1 billion over four years for clean technology in the resource sector, we will leverage technology and innovation to seize the opportunity for Canada to contribute global solutions and to become a leader in the global clean growth economy. Additional funding also supports bringing innovative clean technologies to market.

The government has also committed \$345.3 million over five years to work with the provinces and territories on setting stronger air quality standards, monitoring emissions, and providing incentives for investments that lead to cleaner air and healthier communities.

We recognize that climate change and air pollution are international issues that require international cooperation to find solutions. We committed \$61.3 million, over five years, to develop and implement the North American climate, clean energy, and environment partnership and to continue international environmental engagement to advance Canada's climate change and air pollution objectives.

● (1725)

Last November our government also committed to contribute an historic \$2.65 billion over the next five years to help developing countries tackle climate change.

Government Orders

Our environment is part of what makes Canada so special and we will make sure Canadians can continue to enjoy our natural wonders for generations to come.

The Government has been playing a central role in the conservation of our natural scenery and its biodiversity, and is working to further develop Canada's national parks system. More Canadians should be able to experience our extraordinary parks and learn more about our environment and heritage, which is why we have made clear investments in our national parks' trails and highways and are making all visitor admissions to our national parks free in 2017 to commemorate Canada's 150th anniversary. We are investing \$16.6 million over five years to expand the learn to camp program, develop new programming to tell Canada's stories, and to encourage indigenous storytelling and eco-tourism opportunities.

Our lakes and other waterways are a major part of Canada's identity and vital to our economy. Our government committed \$225.7 million to improve evidence-based decision-making through increased funding for ocean and freshwater science and to manage and protect the quality of water in Canada's lakes, oceans, and transboundary waters. Similarly, Canada's marine and coastal areas need protecting, which is why we have committed \$81.3 million over five years to support marine conservation activities.

Climate change is one of the main challenges of our times. Partnership and meaningful consultation is, and will continue to be, a driving force behind our actions on climate change. We have asked all Canadians to think big and come up with inspiring solutions under the pan-Canadian framework on clean growth and climate change. The message we heard is clear: Canadians want to be part of the solution, have ideas and smart solutions, and want to know how they can help.

The Government of Canada is using these ideas and taking concrete steps to address the causes and effects of climate change, protecting our nation's ecosystems, and doing its part to ensure a sustainable and prosperous future for all of us.

● (1730)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech. However, I heard little in the way of solutions and proposals for reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

It seems to me that we may be repeating what happened with Kyoto. In other words, the government is committing to reach ambitious targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, but the opposite is what actually happens. Greenhouse gas emissions will continue to rise, and there will be no strategy or concrete plan to reach the targets.

Government Orders

Can my colleague, or any government member, tell me more about the specific, concrete plan that will enable us to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in Canada, without again resorting to empty rhetoric, which does not achieve anything and ultimately does nothing to help us meet our commitments under the Paris agreement?

[English]

Mr. Ramesh Sangha: Mr. Speaker, our government understands that growing our economy and protecting our environment go hand in hand. That is why our government has decided to spend money on green infrastructure to grow our economy and create jobs as well.

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, many of us are concerned that the signing of the Kyoto accord in 1997 was a bit of a deathbed conversion. The full impact of our lack of action to reduce emissions following that was revealed in 2005, when the United Nations identified Canada as the country that had done the worst. In fact, our emissions had increased, not reduced as the Kyoto protocol required.

Although we support ratification of the Paris agreement, we are concerned that this is a bit of déjà vu.

Would the member explain exactly what his government is going to do, not the mantra about environment and economy, but exactly what actions it will take to really reduce emissions in a way that we can measure? I ask because we need this so badly in our country.

Mr. Ramesh Sangha: Mr. Speaker, our government has taken concrete steps to address the cause and the effects of climate change, protecting our mission and ecosystem by doing our part to ensure sustainability for the future of Canadians.

For that, our government has decided to spend on, and get in front of, green infrastructure and to take actions to create more jobs in innovative ways to reduce climate change and create a better system in Canada.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Prime Minister made a very strong statement that very much responds to what Canadians want, namely strong leadership from Ottawa on the issue of the environment. A carbon tax on pollution and the way in which it is being brought forward are positives if we want to see progressive movement on the environment file.

Would the member not agree?

Mr. Ramesh Sangha: Mr. Speaker, the actual system we are looking to address climate change would result in change for the whole country. This new plan that we are giving here was already decided at the provincial level, and our leader has now taken the lead to proceed for them and to bring it to Canadians and tell them that this is the way we have to proceed in the future to deal with climate change.

• (1735)

Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my full support of the Paris agreement and the promise this agreement holds for Canada's future. Climate change is truly unlike any other challenge the House or, indeed, humanity itself has ever

faced as this struggle is not with a particular nation or ideology, but with an ever-increasing need of human society.

We cannot allow ourselves to forget the means by which we got to this point. By draining marshlands, clearing rain forests, and burning fossil fuels, we released millions of tonnes of CO₂ into the atmosphere. Will we assume our responsibility as stewards to this fragile planet or will we simply sit back and continue to watch our shared planet slide further into the environmental abyss?

Our responsibility as parliamentarians is to address this global challenge and the part that Canada plays in its resolution. On behalf of the people of Guelph, I am here to say that inaction is not an option at all. As a community, Guelph has mobilized in defence of the well-being of the environment and the planet. Guelphites have come together to do our part in curbing the effects of climate change, from our remarkable University of Guelph, which trains half of Canada's environmental engineers every year, to the city of Guelph's community energy initiative, and the residents and businesses that combine to conserve energy and water.

In Guelph, businesses, government, and education always look for ways to collaborate and innovate. The challenge for Guelph has been to reduce its per capita energy and water consumption by 50% between the years 2006 and 2021. Due to Ontario's places to grow legislation, Guelph has been mandated to grow by 50% in the same time period, accepting 55,000 more people and creating 31,000 more jobs.

Guelph's challenge reflects the global challenge. We have limited resources on which to draw from in this period of growth. Guelph draws its water from an underground cistern, being one of the only communities in Ontario that does not have access to lake or river water for its supply. We are also limited by access to power through the power grid and the transformer capacity feeding Guelph. Our community energy initiative is on target to reach its targets.

Over 50% of Guelph's small businesses have adopted lighting retrofits and Guelph generates more than 10% of Ontario's solar power. We are diverting almost 70% of our waste from landfill. Through efficiencies in its waste water management plant, we have increased its capacity by over 50%. Solid waste from its waste water facility is now available for fertilizer and further opportunities are being investigated for biogas applications. Our closed landfill has been generating power from methane for over a decade and now is one of North America's only urban pollinator parks.

Through the royal flush program, Guelph homes have retrofitted their toilets to low-flush models. Similar programs have been instituted for front-loading washing machines and rounding up high energy consumption refrigerators. However, Guelphites are not finished. We are, in fact, restless and we will continue to lead the way and push to reduce their community's carbon footprint.

In fact, last Friday, I attended a groundbreaking ceremony of Gatto Homes. Gatto Homes will be the new net zero ready townhouse development that, upon completion, will have net zero town homes developed in Guelph. Innovative and green developments like what Gatto Homes is doing are precisely the kinds of projects we need if we to seriously tackle the issues of climate change and win. This first-in-Ontario net zero townhouse development will provide homes that use under one-tenth of normal energy for heating and include continuous fresh air intake to provide the ultimate in comfort and healthy living.

Similarly, Fusion Homes in Guelph recently was awarded for its new net zero design of homes greater than 2,500 square feet.

Battling climate change does not need to come at a sacrifice to comfort or cost. Economics is tied with the environment, saving life-cycle costs and, at the same time, reducing our environmental footprint.

● (1740)

As the Prime Minister informed the House on Monday, there are three simple and straightforward reasons to implement a carbon pricing policy.

Carbon pricing gives reasonable and predictable pricing that will drive innovation and encourage businesses to be more competitive and increase efficiency. Giving incentives opens the door to new projects. Clean environment and a strong economy go hand in hand, as I have just said. Reducing our carbon footprint is a benefit that Canadians, especially the middle class, will enjoy. Using pricing on pollution to drive market innovation and to create new and exciting jobs will be something that our communities could look forward to under this new pricing regime.

One-third of \$1 trillion was invested last year alone in green technology globally. Pricing pollution is a proven way to stop major emitters from increasing air pollution and the pollution of waters across the globe. In fact, nine out of ten people live in areas where air quality is poor. Every year, three million people die from causes due to air pollution.

For proof that carbon pricing works, one does not need to leave the province of Ontario. Toronto experienced 53 smog days in 2005. Last year, it was zero. Numbers do not lie. Carbon pricing works.

On a local level, Guelph is taking action. It is our duty as members of Parliament to ensure communities from coast to coast to coast have the funds and guidance to carry out this crucial work. A lot of attention has been paid to putting a price on pollution and coordinating this effort with provinces and territories.

Implementing a price on pollution will drive Canadian residents and businesses to implement creative solutions such as those we are working on in Guelph. Commercial opportunities will also emerge as businesses in the green technology space work on ways to further reduce our carbon footprint. In Europe, where energy costs are more accurately reflected in the cost of pollution, communities have implemented district energy programs, installed combined heat and power solutions, and implemented alternate energy programs.

I recently visited the city of Bottrop, Germany, with a population of 86,000 people. Bottrop has labelled itself “Innovation City” for

Government Orders

the work it is doing on energy and water management. Germany has a word for the programs that Canada would be embarking on: *energiewende*. By learning from innovative international partners like Germany, Canada can accomplish the targets set in the Paris agreement.

Guelph spends \$500 million a year on energy. We have twice the per capita energy costs that Germany has with half the per capita consumption. Therefore, the economic opportunity on cost savings alone represents \$250 million for our community alone. Imagine what freeing up that money could do for our community and our country.

We are at the threshold of another great industrial revolution and Guelphites are only too happy to seize this crucial moment to dramatically reduce our carbon footprint and grow Guelph at the same time. The Paris agreement would open the door for Canada to take a leadership role in the fight against climate change. Therefore, I look forward to voting in favour of this important agreement.

Mr. Fin Donnelly (Port Moody—Coquitlam, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the member stated that inaction was not an option. He went on to talk about what was happening in his riding of Guelph, and he also referenced other countries. However, he failed to mention what concrete action his government was actually taking on reducing climate change and addressing targets.

Committing to the Paris accord is absolutely commendable. As a responsible nation, that is something we must do. However, the government has also signed-off in my province of British Columbia two LNG energy projects, a massive Site C dam project in the Peace River valley. We are hearing rumours that the government is going to sign-off as well on the Kinder Morgan project, which is a huge pipeline project. These projects are going to increase greenhouse gases.

These are huge projects and they have been approved under the old Harper Conservative rules. The Liberals made promises that they would make changes to the new rules and go through changing these rules, the Fisheries Act—

● (1745)

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The time for questions and comments is limited to five minutes. We try to get at least a second question in, so we will have to leave it there for the hon. member.

We will go to the hon. member for Guelph.

Mr. Lloyd Longfield: Mr. Speaker, we can hear there is passion in the House around this issue. We wish we had all day to talk back and forth on it, and maybe we can do some of that in the parking lot as we go forward from here.

Private Members' Business

The action that our government is taking is setting a price on pollution, starting with \$10 per tonne and escalating by \$10 per year to get to \$50 per tonne, which is something unprecedented in Canada. We are putting a price in place, and then working with the provinces and territories to ensure they have programs that will either meet these goals or else offer cap and trade that will offer similar progress.

The LNG projects and other projects in Canada will have to meet strict environmental standards and strict social licence standards. We are looking at 190 conditions that need to be met for those projects to move forward. Again, it is unprecedented in Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Breton (Shefford, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my hon. colleague from Guelph for his passionate speech and for the various measures being implemented in his riding to protect the environment.

Our government is convinced that climate change is a challenge, but that it also presents opportunities. We can build an economy that will foster clean growth and help fight climate change, while creating well-paying jobs for Canadians and the middle class.

Does my hon. colleague not agree with this last statement?

[*English*]

Mr. Lloyd Longfield: Mr. Speaker, the economy is hinging on the new technology we are bringing forward. In Guelph, we have been attracting businesses, such as Canadian Solar, which is Canada's largest solar panel manufacturer, to our community based on our commitment to climate change reductions.

Put another way, if we are not enforcing climate change reductions, when the cost goes up, we really will notice the difference. Therefore, it is important that we embrace the climate change reductions personally and by businesses to avoid future costs.

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister of Small Business and Tourism, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There has been consultation among the parties and if you seek it you should find unanimous consent for the following motion:

That, in relation to the debate on Government Business No. 8 regarding the ratification of the Paris Agreement, notwithstanding any Standing Order or usual practice of the House, at the expiry of the time provided for Government Orders on Wednesday, October 5, 2016, the Speaker shall put forthwith, without further debate or amendment, every question necessary to dispose of the motion.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

• (1750)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Christine Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleague a simple question.

When the Liberals were in opposition they criticized the Harper targets and said that they were not high enough, that it was irresponsible, and that they would not accomplish anything. However, they are using the exact same targets and the plan has not changed.

How can a plan that was irresponsible and not ambitious enough all of a sudden be acceptable to the Liberals?

[*English*]

Mr. Lloyd Longfield: Mr. Speaker, targets are a starting point.

What we saw with the previous government was targets with no plan. In this case, we are putting in a plan and we are looking at the floor level being the targets that were previously put in place. We are going to break through that and achieve what we know, as long as all provinces and territories are on board. We do know that it will be a minimum of the targets that we set.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: It being 5:50 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

FIGHT AGAINST FOOD WASTE ACT

The House resumed from May 12 consideration of the motion that Bill C-231, An Act to establish National Food Waste Awareness Day and to provide for the development of a national strategy to reduce food waste in Canada, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Deputy Speaker: When the House last took up debate on this question, the hon. member for Toronto—Danforth had four minutes remaining in her time for her remarks. We will go to that now.

The hon. member for Toronto—Danforth.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin (Toronto—Danforth, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Berthier—Maskinongé for raising two important issues in this place: food waste and food insecurity.

Food waste is an important issue when we consider its environmental impact, and food insecurity is something that must be dealt with because everyone needs access to healthy food to survive. I agree these are important issues to address, but the problem with the bill, and the reason I cannot support it, is that it draws a link between food waste and food insecurity. That is not the proper way to seek solutions.

There are two issues. First, there is the wrong date. I will start with the wrong date and then I would like to speak about the link.

Private Members' Business

As far as the date goes, the date that was chosen to create a national food waste day was October 16. October 16 is World Food Day. That is the day when people across the world have a chance to talk about food policy and to reach out to each other to try to find solutions. For example, Food Secure Canada will be having a conference in Toronto, spanning the weekend that includes World Food Day, where people can talk about the larger issues around food policy. Personally, I will be present at the Leslieville Farmers' Market, where I can talk with people in my community about food policy, sustainable agriculture, food insecurity, and the issues that are important to them on a broader basis. That is what we really need to talk about on World Food Day. Therefore, it would be a mistake to put national food waste day on this date.

There is also a larger problem with the bill. That is the fact that a link has been drawn between food waste and food insecurity. Food insecurity is due to poverty. It is not about the availability of food. I would like to read a quote from *The Huffington Post*, by Nick Saul, who addressed this issue. He is from Community Food Centres Canada. He said:

...let's not conflate a food waste strategy with a poverty reduction strategy. It's destructive to do so. Are we saying that the poor among us are only worthy of the castoffs of the industrial food system—the majority of which is unhealthy food, laden with fat, sugar, and salt, which increases the risk of diet-related illnesses? There's no question we can and must do better than this as a society.

I agree with that point fully. We can and must do better to address food security and poverty, which is the underlying problem we must deal with.

Some of the ways we can deal with the issue in a much more tangible way is, for example, with the Canada child benefit, which we passed and people started receiving in July. The Canada child benefit focuses on providing funds to families in greater need. That is one tangible way to address poverty in families with young children. Increases to the GIS, which also formed part of budget 2016, deal with seniors in poverty. That is another tangible way we can address the underlying issue of food insecurity. Finally, the investments that we are putting forward in affordable housing is another step in the right direction in dealing with poverty. That is because when we are talking about food security, too often people need to make a choice between having a roof over their heads or having healthy food on the table.

I am very happy we are starting this discussion about food waste and about food insecurity in this place, but I would propose that this is not the right solution and that we should be dealing with the underlying issues of poverty and talking about food policy as a whole.

• (1755)

Mr. David Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC): Mr. Speaker, before I get into Bill C-231, I will say I am surprised to hear my colleague opposite talk about food insecurity after the stunt the Liberals pulled yesterday in the way they introduced their carbon tax. If they wanted to create instability and insecurity across the country, they could not have done it any more effectively than they have.

When it comes to food production, the way Liberals have done this causes instability in rural and farming communities. It is going to cause food insecurity. They are talking about a carbon tax. We

know a carbon tax will hike the cost of everything. It will hike the cost of fuel for farmers as they are trying to do their food production. It hikes the cost of fertilizer. In the production of fertilizer we use products they are planning on taxing. It hikes the cost of things like transportation, so it increases the cost of getting food to market. As the member opposite talks about instability and insecurity, they should be acknowledging that they are creating that. We are going to see greater instability in rural communities, in food production, and certainly it is not a positive advantage for farmers to have to put up with the kind of carbon tax they are suggesting in the future.

Farmers have made a huge contribution, and I am going to talk about that later, but they are the ones who are making the adjustments. They have been making adjustments for years. As was mentioned earlier in question period, farmers are paying up to \$30,000 more for machinery now because of the changes to engines and emissions requirements, and they pay that cost directly. The government comes back and says it is going to slap some more taxes on them because they are not taxed enough yet. Between that and the deceptive way they dealt with the provinces yesterday, it means that their carbon tax proposal is not a recipe for any type of security or food stability in the future.

That brings us to food waste awareness day, which has been proposed by my NDP colleague on the agriculture committee. We would have preferred to have a food awareness day because certainly waste could have been part of that. Rather than an act to establish a negative campaign, we could have celebrated the great production and processing of food in this country.

Certainly the area I come from has been a food producer for this part of the world and the rest of the world for over 100 years. People came from Europe, Eastern Europe, China, and the Middle East and settled in western Canada. Most of the reason they settled there is that they wanted to be farmers. They settled on the land and they wanted to produce food. They wanted to grow beef and sell it around the world. They certainly have done that with great success.

Farming has changed over the years. I mentioned earlier about the technology that has changed, but certainly the crops have changed in our area as well. It used to be that we grew nothing but grains and durum wheat. People did not think they could grow anything else. There have been new crops that have come in, and now lentils are grown probably more than any other crop in our area. Mustard is very popular, all three kinds of mustard; the oriental, yellow, and brown are grown in our area, and it is a big area for mustard growing in the world.

Chickpeas are an item we started growing about 20 years ago, and it actually transformed agriculture in our area because for a few years chickpeas were a very profitable crop and allowed farmers to do very well for a number of years. Peas are another success in our area. Farther north, canola has probably been the biggest success story in western Canada, where it is the highest value crop that is grown in Canada. It has been a tremendous success story as well.

Private Members' Business

We know the beef in western Canada, in my area, has been a very strong contributor to our economy. We see now a couple of feedlots closing in western Canada; again, back to food insecurity. One of the reasons that the latest closure took place is that the operators were not prepared to deal with the carbon tax. They mentioned that in their discussion about why they were shutting down production.

We know that farmers and ranchers are stewards. They raise food, and they protect the environment. They have changed their practices over the years, and the food that is raised in Canada is the safest food in the world. We believe that is what we should be celebrating with the bill. Rather than talking specifically about food waste, we should be talking about food production, about the incredible ways and opportunities that farmers across this country have to be successful, and also about the food processing here. We know we have one of the best systems in Canada for food safety. We regulate for safe and healthy food, and we do that very well. Around the world, Canada is recognized as one of those producers of top-quality food.

• (1800)

It is a good thing we are because we export all over the world. We go to Japan, for example, which is a market that demands top-quality products, and Canadian pork there is seen as one of those products. We also see that around the rest of the world, where they recognize that Canadian products fill those niches at the top of the food chain.

The first part of the bill calls for a waste awareness day. We would have preferred to see something a bit different. Certainly, we would have been more likely to support it had we had seen a bill that celebrated our successes.

I want to talk a bit about the second part of the bill because it becomes very problematic. The bill is short and sweet, but when we get to the second page and start to see what is being called for here under a national strategy, we begin to realize that there will be a really big cost to this and that a lot of work would have to go into putting this bill into effect, without a lot of direction from the author of the bill.

First, the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food would need to have a series of meetings, not only with the provincial and territorial governments—we are talking about first ministers' meetings or meetings with officials across this country—but also then a series of meetings with agriculture and agrifood people, as well.

This is not a minor set of just two or three meetings. My colleague is calling for the minister to have major meetings across the country. We know that will cost a lot of money. The reason she would like to see that is to develop a national strategy; but, again, there are no real specifics on what that national strategy would be, other than we know that it will cost a fair amount of money.

She would also like a national public awareness campaign to be developed. Again, that comes with a cost. However, there is no indication from the member opposite of what that cost might be. I do not know if she is talking about an ad campaign or an educational program across the country, but she just talks about having a public awareness campaign of some sort that needs to be developed and implemented by the government.

Then there is a very vague paragraph here that the government should “put in place the tools needed to allow consumers to reduce

food waste”. I have thought about that but I am not sure what it means to “put in place the tools needed to allow consumers to reduce food waste”. That is so vague. I do not know how much enthusiasm the government would have for this, but it could mean anything, I guess. It is so open-ended that I do not think we can support it.

Then it becomes interesting. She wants the government to begin to redo some of the great work being done already by private and charitable organizations.

Across this country we have things like food banks and charities like the Salvation Army that handle food across this country to ensure that it is still edible and is getting delivered to people so they have the opportunity to enjoy it. My colleague who spoke earlier talked about some of the food apps that are in place now. People can go online and find an app that will explain where food is available. We do not think there is any necessity for the government to begin redoing the excellent work that has already been done by these organizations. Moreover, when bill talks about facilitating the donation of edible food products to community organizations and food banks, we think people are already doing that very well.

There is a call for an environmental study on used food. I do not know how we would do that or how big that study would be, but it seems like another challenge to the government, without much direction.

Then the last one I think that really concerns me is that she wants food waste reduction targets, but it is not clear what that means. Is this mandatory? Is this voluntary? What do those targets mean? We do not know if there are going to be costs from that. How would we enforce it? Would we have little food police running around enforcing food waste regulations? I do not know. I guess with targets, we would have to examine the relationship between production, transportation, and retail, as well. I think that is a huge overreach.

In conclusion, I appreciate my colleague's good intent in this bill, but I do not think we will be able to support it. It is just too broad and complex. It is a very costly strategy to address this issue and will lead to increased costs. We believe it will increase red tape substantially. Certainly, if I am reading this accurately, there would have to be a massive administration to reach this national strategy. We believe there are better ways to address this issue.

• (1805)

Mr. Wayne Stetski (Kootenay—Columbia, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the lack of food security is an important issue facing many Canadians. Today I am pleased to speak in support of a bill related to food security, Bill C-231, the fight against food waste.

This legislation aims to provide for the development of a national strategy to reduce food waste in Canada and establish a national food waste awareness day on October 16 of each year, which is also World Food Day.

Members in the House will recall in the spring when I introduced a private member's bill to celebrate local food day on the last Friday before Thanksgiving. I would encourage all members to think about that this Friday and celebrate their local food producers. If they cannot do that, it is my 38th wedding anniversary and they can all celebrate that as well.

Some hon. members: Hear, Hear!

Mr. Wayne Stetski: Clap for my wife Audrey, not for me.

We, as members of Parliament, have an opportunity to be leaders in this area and implement tools so that all stakeholders in the supply chain, from farmers to consumers, can reduce their food waste.

Food waste is everyone's business because it has both social and environmental impacts. At the same time that we know food waste is a problem in Canada, more than 850,000 people struggle to feed themselves each month, and 36% of them are children. Since 2008, food bank use in Canada has climbed to more than 26% of the population actually having to use food banks at least occasionally. That is simply unacceptable in a country like ours. Reducing food waste is an important part of the solution.

It is important to note that food waste is not the same as food loss. Food that has become unsuitable for consumption due to natural hazards would be considered loss. However, safe food that is thrown away voluntarily, or because it is not commercially viable, or because there is a lack of awareness of what it could have been used for to feed people or even animals, is considered waste.

To truly understand the magnitude of food waste, it is important to consider the numbers. It is estimated that \$31 billion worth of food ended up in landfills or composting sites in 2014. However, that is only the tip of the iceberg when we factor in wasted energy, labour costs, transportation, and capital investments in infrastructure and inventory. Added all together, the true cost of food waste is \$107 billion.

According to Statistics Canada, every Canadian wastes 183 kilograms, or just over 403 pounds of food a year. This represents the equivalent of throwing \$771 per year per consumer right into the garbage. In other words, over 15% of a person's grocery cart ends up in the trash without being consumed, which costs about \$50 per week per family.

With regard to the environmental impact, landfills and avoidable food waste are disastrous. The decomposition of organic matter creates methane, a seriously harmful greenhouse gas, and overwhelms composting facilities and landfills. The carbon footprint of food waste is estimated at 3.3 billion tonnes, making food waste the third top emitter of greenhouse gases after the U.S. and China. One tonne of food waste emits 5.6 tonnes of carbon dioxide.

It is easy to see this problem as very daunting, but taking concrete steps to reduce food waste across the supply chain is doable. Other countries, provinces, and communities are doing just that, and I

Private Members' Business

would like to highlight a few examples of each to show how positive change is possible.

Food waste is an issue worldwide. To date, France has led the charge and was the first country to legislate against food waste. The law, which was passed by its parliament this past February, bans supermarkets from throwing away or destroying unsold food, and establishes a hierarchy of actions to fight food waste. The law fines retailers who voluntarily destroy edible food, and amends the legal framework to remove liability in order to facilitate the donation of name-brand products directly by factories. Lastly, it includes an education program about food waste in schools and businesses. There is now a movement to expand the law across the European Union.

In the U.S., the Bill Emerson Good Samaritan Food Donation Act was passed in 1996. It encourages citizens to donate food and reduce waste. In Italy, Last Minute Market was created in 1998 to help shops and retailers recover and redistribute their unsold food to various organizations.

● (1810)

In Canada there are important examples of communities, provinces and organizations taking action on food waste reduction. In Quebec, waste reduction week is held every October, and two petition with more than 29,000 signatures have been presented to the national assembly requesting that the government facilitates donations of unsold food by food retailers.

In Ontario, the Ontario Association of Food Banks and Second Harvest work in partnership to reduce waste and combat food insecurity.

In the prairies, groups such as Alberta Care, Saskatchewan Waste Reduction Council and Dig In Manitoba work to raise awareness among elected officials, consumers and retailers about food waste.

In B.C., the legislative assembly passed the Food Donor Encouragement Act which provides that people or businesses donating food are not liable for damage caused to consumers under certain conditions. B.C.'s Ministry of Environment is also working with the US Environmental Protection Agency to develop a toolkit to help consumers reduce food waste.

From my riding of Kootenay—Columbia, I am proud to share outstanding examples of community action to reduce food waste, which will hopefully inspire my colleagues in the House with what is possible and what can be achieved.

Private Members' Business

My first example comes from the city of Nelson, the Nelson Food Cupboard, with its long-standing commitment to providing its clients with healthy fresh foods. It runs a number of great food security programs including: the harvest rescue program, which allows local gardeners and fruit growers to share excess produce with volunteers and with the Food Cupboard; the Grow a Row and fresh produce donations, which encourages gardeners to drop off surplus garden produce to the Food Cupboard; and the food recovery partnership, a partnership with Nelson's historic Hume Hotel, where it receives excess food from the hotel kitchen, repackages it and hands it out to the Food Cupboard's clients, which include families with hungry children.

On a personal note, when I was mayor of Cranbrook and we had food left over at a city function, I would personally package it up and take it to Street Angels, a truly innovative organization under the leadership of the Ktunaxa First Nation. It serves a very important role in helping out homeless people of all cultural backgrounds, and I encourage all members to Google Cranbrook Street Angels to learn more about this amazing model of community support.

In the community of Revelstoke, a population of over 7,100 people, food security has been identified as a community priority. In 2014, the city of Revelstoke commissioned the development of a food security strategy. This strategy included in its goals to increase access to local and regional food that was sustainably and ethically produced through personal, business and municipal government actions, and further set as an objective to reduce food waste whereby organic waste products were used as valuable agricultural inputs and/or products that were still edible were recovered and redistributed.

Community Connections in Revelstoke collected surplus food and redistributed it by engaging local food producers and distributors, including a major grocery store. It developed and provided an affordable, reliable system for the donations of surplus food and helped donors feel more comfortable about liability concerns by educating them. It ensured the food recovery program met all food safety regulations.

It picked up donations at the weekly farmer's market. The food recovery program in August had its biggest day with over 800 pounds of food donated in one day. Over the three month period, 16,718 pounds of food were recovered, worth almost \$42,000, and it was redistributed to families in need.

Comment boards were posted in the local food distribution area to capture the feedback of those receiving the food. This is what one client said, "Thank you so much. My husband and I were having a hard time making ends meet and this helped us so much. We were able to feed our son AND pay rent this month. This community has been a helping hand when we had no one else. Please keep up the program and great work. Every bit helps." That really captures it: every bit helps.

It is time for the federal government to show leadership on this important file by building on to the momentum that is happening in communities, in provinces across the country and around the world.

The government says that it is concerned about food security, the environment and social inequity. This bill provides a clear way to

take concrete action on food waste, which touches on each of these important areas.

I encourage every member of Parliament to support Bill C-231 and to support the reduction of food waste in their communities. Working together we can build a better Canada.

• (1815)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Joël Lightbound (Louis-Hébert, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is our job as parliamentarians to discuss ideas that can help make Canada a better country. That is why I want to congratulate my colleague from Berthier—Maskinongé on her bill. I have no doubt it is well-intentioned, but for various reasons that I will get into in my speech, the government will not support it.

To start with, food waste is a very complex issue. There is some debate around the nature and scale of the problem. For example, one question that comes up often has to do with figuring out where we can have the most impact in terms of curbing waste. Is it on farms, at processing plants, at grocery stores, or in Canadian households? We need answers to those questions before we can proceed.

We think that the best way to get those answers is to have inclusive conversations about a national food policy. In fact, the government committed to introducing just such a policy by consulting stakeholders and Canadian families.

We are aware that food loss and waste are serious issues of concern to people across Canada, to our government, and certainly to your humble servant, Mr. Speaker, and rightly so.

In 2014, Value Chain Management International estimated the value of food waste and losses in Canada to be \$31 billion. The organization also indicated that the equivalent of 30% to 40% of food products are wasted in Canada. Approximately 50% of the food waste in Canada occurs in households, whereas about 20% occurs in processing.

There are several causes of food waste, including purchasing too many perishable products, the inability to properly prepare food, which is generally the case for me, poor storage, inadequate portions, and quite simply purchasing food that we do not like.

The remaining waste occurs on the farm, at retailers, in restaurants, and during transportation. When we see the statistics, we cannot simply remain indifferent about this issue, and the government certainly is not. Reducing food waste benefits consumers, farmers, processors, retailers, and restaurateurs. It benefits society as a whole. Furthermore, reducing food waste can help farmers and businesses reduce operating costs.

It is also possible to take full advantage of the by-products. Food waste residuals can be used or converted to make animal feed. Granular biomass can be used for heating or in dyes. Other examples of derived products include ethanol or fertilizers and detergents.

Reducing food waste can also improve food security and help the environment through better use of water and the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from the decomposition of organic materials at landfills. Those are a few examples.

The entire world, including Canada, is addressing food waste. Recently, a number of UN agencies and other international groups launched a global standard for measuring food waste and loss. The purpose of this new accounting and reporting standard for food waste and loss is to have governments, businesses, and other organizations measure food waste and loss internationally in a more consistent way.

In the United Kingdom, leading supermarkets have pledged to drive down food and drink waste by a fifth within the next decade. Retailers there are backing a voluntary agreement that also targets a 20% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions created by the food and drink industry.

By way of example, the United Kingdom's biggest grocery chain also committed to sending no surplus food to waste from its stores by the end of next year by redistributing it to charities.

In Canada, I am proud that retailers are also taking a leadership role in reducing food waste. For example, recently, we saw a large supermarket chain expand its offering of imperfect fruits and vegetables. Canadian consumers can now buy this produce for approximately 30% less than the cost of the other fruits and vegetables that are usually sold in supermarkets. That prevents food waste. Based on the success of the trial period, consumers in Quebec and Ontario can also now buy imperfect peppers, onions, and mushrooms.

The provincial and municipal governments also have an important role to play in managing food waste. For example, in 2014, Ontario implemented a tax credit for food donations made by farmers to food banks or other similar organizations in order to help reduce food waste.

• (1820)

In its latest budget, Nova Scotia announced a similar tax credit for its farmers. Our own government is working hard to fight food waste in a number of ways. For example, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada supports research into reducing food waste at the primary production stage and research into analyzing how much food is wasted or lost.

Our science and innovation investments are also helping to reduce food waste. We have researchers looking for ways to transform vegetables that would normally be thrown out into marketable food products. That is just one example of how our government is working on fighting food waste.

That being said, we clearly need to do more. We definitely have to tackle food waste. However, we believe in giving the matter careful consideration and gathering input from a broad range of stakeholders before crafting a comprehensive, coordinated approach. That is

Private Members' Business

exactly what we are proposing because this issue affects the entire supply chain from farms to families.

One crucial part of the equation is raising awareness of how food is produced. That is why the Government of Canada is planning to include discussions about food waste in our national food policy consultations.

Our government is committed to working in partnership with all stakeholders and Canadians to develop a national food policy. To achieve that, we plan to consult with provincial and territorial governments, stakeholders, and Canadians in order to better shape our food policy and better guide potential initiatives to tackle food waste.

As part of a national food policy, we will first put forward a vision, principles, and objectives and then propose a more collaborative and more integrated approach with regard to the food policy issues. This notion is supported by the Canadian agriculture industry and various stakeholders, particularly the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, Food Secure Canada, the Canadian Agri-Food Policy Institute, and the Conference Board of Canada. Each of those organizations has published reports and made an invaluable contribution to the discussions on food policy.

We will begin extensive public consultations with the food industry and Canadians next year in order to come up with a Canadian food policy worthy of the name. We believe it is important to study this issue as a whole, that is, from farm to table.

Despite the good intentions behind Bill C-231, the government will not be supporting it. We believe that developing a national food policy is the right way forward, which will enable us to hold consultations and focus on future initiatives to tackle food waste in Canada.

In closing, I want to emphasize that this is a very important issue. Let there be no doubt that the importance of reducing food waste warrants an in-depth discussion. With that in mind, I want to thank the member for Berthier—Maskinongé for raising this crucial matter.

• (1825)

Ms. Christine Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to the motion moved by my colleague from Berthier—Maskinongé because food waste is an issue that is very important to me.

Every summer for the past four years I have been touring the farmers' markets in my riding. I take the opportunity to have people sample the regional products and I talk to them about various themes related to agriculture and food.

Private Members' Business

This year, my theme was in fact food waste. Having spent the better part of my summer talking about food waste and raising awareness about it, I think this is quite relevant. My colleague's bill is truly important to me and my constituents. I know from the discussions we had at these farmers' markets how important this is to people.

We talked about a phenomenon that makes no ecological or economic sense to me, specifically the fact that far too often at our grocery stores we find products that travelled thousands of kilometres, when we produce those very same products in our own backyards.

When I go to the grocery store, I do not understand why they are selling ground beef from New Zealand. Just a few houses down from where I live, I have neighbours who produce beef. Nevertheless, the beef being sold at my local grocery store is from New Zealand. The reason I mention this is that transport is one of the reasons why food goes to waste.

The more food is transported from one area to another, the greater the chances that some of it will no longer be fit for consumption when it arrives at its destination. As a result, one of the battles we need to fight is to reduce the transportation of food. Obviously, ensuring that food is consumed as close as possible to the location where it was produced is the simplest way to reduce food transportation. This seems like a completely logical solution to me. What is more, this also prevents significant quantities of greenhouse gases from being emitted during transport. However, these simple solutions are not necessarily included in the policies.

Having a strategy to reduce food waste and establishing a day to raise awareness are excellent initiatives proposed by my colleague. Any general discussion on food and agriculture should include a set of policies, but we must also act on the individual issues. We cannot wait an eternity to do so. If we want tangible measures, we must act now. The bill before us would let us do that. It seems that members do not want to pass the bill, which I find absolutely unfortunate for producers and, generally speaking, for the environment.

Today, food waste amounts to \$771 a year in groceries per consumer. My Liberal colleagues probably do not realize that \$771 is the monthly income of some people. Every year, the amount of food wasted is equivalent to their income for an entire month. That is a lot, and it is not acceptable in a society like ours.

Our grandmothers came up with strategies to waste virtually nothing; they reused everything. Today, we live in a society with huge technological capabilities that let us better manage everything. We have gone from one extreme, where almost nothing was wasted, to the other, where waste is rampant.

● (1830)

Agriculture is very important in my region. Abitibi-Témiscamingue's bio-food sector is worth \$280 million per year and accounts for 8,100 direct jobs, or 11% of all the jobs in my riding. That is why I will not stand for the government dragging its feet on food waste. I think our farmers deserve to be compensated for the work they do every day. We deserve to be able to eat our products.

Every year, when I visit farmers' markets, I talk about the Guyenne tomato incident, which was ridiculous. All of the tomatoes

produced locally in Guyenne were being sent to Montreal and then brought back to Abitibi-Témiscamingue. Those tomatoes travelled 1,300 kilometres before ending up on our plates. That was absurd. That kind of thing should not happen. Shipping tomatoes 1,300 kilometres only to have them end up back on our plates is nonsense. Of course some of the tomatoes were damaged and wasted during that 1,300-kilometre trek. If the tomatoes had travelled a mere 15 kilometres before ending up on our plates, they would not have been damaged. They would not have been wasted.

We can reduce food waste considerably through simple measures. One simple measure we should introduce is ensuring that products are consumed as quickly and efficiently as possible after they are produced. That is why we need to reflect on how we can manage our food more effectively, and how we can ensure that this food makes it to our plates instead of being wasted.

Farmers' markets have become more popular than ever. When I was travelling around Palmarolle, I saw a long lineup of people waiting to purchase fresh vegetables from a local producer. People care more and more about buying fresh, local products. They want to help reduce food waste. We need to give them the tools, since they rely on what is provided to them. If they are offered only products that have come from far away, of course, people are forced to buy whatever they can access. Many people do not have access to several different grocery stores, and therefore have limited choices.

If, unfortunately, the local grocery store only carries carrots from Mexico or the United States, when it could perhaps carry carrots grown in Canada, we do not really have a choice. These products either spoil in transit, or we have to use chemical preservatives to help preserve them, which is also not a good environmental choice.

I am asking members to support my colleague's motion so that we can eat better and make smarter food choices. Not only will this ensure that people eat better, but it will also improve their health. These choices will also have an impact on the environment by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and transportation, as well as reducing the use of various chemicals used to grow the vegetables and to prolong their shelf life. In the end, if we could make it easier to get products from farm to fork, we would not need all these measures.

I also want to point out that the Conseil régional en environnement en Abitibi-Témiscamingue, or CREAT, has been working hard to reduce food waste by using existing networks. Businesses and groups in my riding are putting a lot of effort into reducing food waste. These groups are already very familiar with the issue. Many of our food stores have also gone to great lengths to ensure that local products are accessible. In Ville-Marie, for example, sales of regional products increased from about \$200,000 per year to over \$1 million annually over the past four years. This shows that we can have accessible products when people make an effort.

We must support the efforts of these people and stakeholders and continue to support the consumption of our local products if we want to reduce food waste.

• (1835)

The Deputy Speaker: As no other member is rising to speak, I invite the hon. member for Berthier—Maskinongé to use her right of reply. She has five minutes.

Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau (Berthier—Maskinongé, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would have liked to have more time to talk about my Bill C-231. It is an important bill. I also want to thank all the members who spoke today and during the first hour of debate. This bill means a lot to me because fighting food waste is a very important issue.

I thank all those who supported my bill. We received support from a number of organizations, such as Moisson Montréal, Moisson Mauricie, and Moisson Lanaudière. These organizations across Quebec support the initiative and the objective of Bill C-231.

There is also the Quebec chapter of the Friends of the Earth, Rescue Food in Calgary, and l'Escouade anti-gaspillage alimentaire de l'Outaouais. I thank them for the work they do to fight food waste. I also want to mention the Recycling Council of Ontario, and Second Harvest, in Toronto, the largest food distributor in the country. Eight million pounds of food were distributed in the past 12 months.

The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization commended us on our initiative, Bill C-231, and noted the importance of setting targets for reducing food waste in Canada.

I also recently received the support of Arash Derambarsh, from France. He said:

I am proud to join with my friend...in the fight against food waste in Canada. In France and elsewhere in the world, food waste is a problem that has economic, social, and environmental consequences... I believe it is urgent that the Canadian government legislate to ensure that unsold food is redistributed rather than thrown out.

I would also like to thank researchers, such as Iris Simard Tremblay, author of the essay *Comment réduire le gaspillage alimentaire dans l'industrie agroalimentaire au Québec?*; Éric Ménard, a lecturer, blogger, and food waste expert; and Paul Van der Werf, who did extraordinary work. I want to thank Paul for his help and encouragement. We will not give up.

[English]

Food waste in Canada is everyone's business. A lot of people are concerned about food waste. It is in the news quite often. When we look at what is happening in other countries, we see they have taken some measures that are very important. Canada could be a real leader

Private Members' Business

when it comes to reducing food waste. Food waste has very important social and environmental impacts, and that was mentioned in some of the speeches today.

Earlier today, we had a great debate on the Paris agreement. Is the government serious about tackling climate change?

[Translation]

The fight against food waste is an important part of that. In Canada, we waste 31 million tonnes of food per year, which represents a loss of \$31 billion dollars a year. That is shameful. In a country as rich as Canada, approximately 900,000 people rely on food banks. The food distribution system is broken. There are many improvements that need to be made and this bill is a step in the right direction.

[English]

There are quite a few questions that were raised about the bill. My colleague from Toronto—Danforth talked a lot about poverty. I think that, yes, the government has a role to play in reducing poverty. Maybe a \$15-per-hour minimum wage would be very good. I would also like to say that Second Harvest supports the bill.

My colleague from Cypress Hills—Grasslands, who also sits on the agriculture committee, talked about costs. I think the inaction of the government costs more. Under the Conservatives, since 2008, there was a 26% augmentation of food bank use in Canada. Also, in 2014 there were \$27 million in losses from food waste and now we are up to \$31 million. Inaction costs more than the action asked for in the bill.

• (1840)

[Translation]

Other people have talked about the importance of holding consultations. In the bill, I ask the Canadian government to do just that; we know how much the Liberal government enjoys holding consultations. If the bill is passed at this stage, it will go to committee, where improvements can be made.

In my opinion, as parliamentarians, we also have the duty to reduce inequality and fight against climate change. This bill is a good step in that direction. If it is not passed, I will continue to fight to reduce food waste and food insecurity in Canada.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

Adjournment Proceedings

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 93, the recorded division stands deferred until Wednesday, October 5, immediately before the time provided for private members' business.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

[*Translation*]

HOUSING

Mr. Robert Aubin (Trois-Rivières, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am sure you are familiar with the saying that hope springs eternal, which is why I have an announcement to make. Despite the quality of the answers I have been getting for the past five years, I have not lost hope, so I am sure to live a long time.

The issue I want to talk about today is, once again, a human and financial catastrophe unlike any this country has ever seen. There is ample evidence that this was the worst construction fiasco ever seen in Canada, and people would like to be able to turn the page on it.

Last year, the Liberal government said it would give pyrrhotite victims \$30 million, \$10 million per year. I want to make it clear that \$10 million per year will help about 70 lucky homeowners. There are hundreds of victims, though, so it is something of a lottery. The government is loosening the purse strings just enough to let \$10 million trickle out per year, all the while being very careful not to acknowledge any responsibility for what happened, which is a tragedy in itself.

We are stuck with this construction flaw problem which, I remind hon. members, could happen anywhere in Canada. This could happen anywhere in the world, but that is not what we are talking about. I can say that just last week, the Coalition d'aide aux victimes de la pyrrhotite of Trois-Rivières was in Connecticut, where the situation is exactly the same, with families who are overwhelmed by the problem and the lack of solutions.

Last year, two or three months of the construction season went by before the government opened its wallet. We know that in country with a winter like ours the time for construction work is somewhat limited. The construction season had started, but the funding was not there. Thank goodness the situation has changed since then.

I would like to ask my first question. Bear in mind that this \$30 million from the Liberals' program was a one-off. They said that this sum would fix the pyrrhotite problem, but we are a long way from that. Do we have any assurances today that for the second and third years of the program the money will be there at the start of the construction season?

I would like to raise another issue. I am in favour of helping pyrrhotite victims. As I was saying earlier, it is almost like a lottery. Some people will get lucky, while hundreds of others will not get any support. How is the government determining who is a pyrrhotite victim? Under the program managed by the provincial government, homes must have a pyrrhotite content of at least 0.3% for families or

owners to be eligible for assistance. In the decision handed down, the judge said that a pyrrhotite content of 0.23% would certainly cause problems in the short or medium term. There is therefore a grey area between 0% pyrrhotite and the two benchmarks that I just mentioned, which are not really scientifically proven standards.

The federal government's primary responsibility is to ensure that the federal quality standard for aggregates used in concrete clearly indicates that concrete must not contain a certain percentage of pyrrhotite that has yet to be determined. Right now, the standard is unclear and does not come with any obligations. The Conservatives and the Liberals keep telling us that this was a prerogative of the provincial government. However, I would like to remind members that the standard is a federal standard included in the provincial building code, which is quite different.

I would therefore like to ask two quick questions. First, will the government finally take action to improve the standard? Second, will the funding be available at the beginning of the construction season?

● (1845)

[*English*]

Mr. Terry Duguid (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member for Trois-Rivieres is clearly concerned about the plight of homeowners in Mauricie and other regions of Quebec whose foundations contain pyrrhotite.

I commend him for that, and I am pleased to confirm for the House that progress is finally being made on this difficult issue. This is a longstanding problem that my colleagues from Saint-Maurice—Champlain and Laurentides—Labelle have spoken to me about on this side of the House.

After a decade of inaction by the previous government, the government finally announced in budget 2016 that we would provide up to \$30 million over three years. I will repeat for the hon. member that it is \$30 million over three years, starting this year, to help homeowners who are dealing with the consequences of pyrrhotite.

As the member for Trois-Rivieres knows, on July 11, our government and the Government of Quebec announced that an agreement had been signed to provide this assistance to affected homeowners, beginning this fiscal year. As we said at the time, families must get the help they need as soon as possible to deal with this economic and human tragedy.

This is why the federal government worked so closely with the Government of Quebec, so that funding would be distributed through an existing provincial program. As a result of this agreement, the Société d'habitation du Québec, or SHQ, was given the go-ahead to commit the federal funds through the existing Quebec program to indemnify homeowners who have been impacted by pyrrhotite.

The first \$10 million in federal funding was immediately available upon signing of the agreement. According to the SHQ's estimates, this initial federal contribution will benefit some 130 homeowners. The SHQ undertook to inform its municipal partners of the budgets that will be made available to them, so they could quickly begin to work the approval process with impacted homeowners.

Adjournment Proceedings

The member for Trois-Rivieres should never have doubted the government's commitment to help homeowners repair or replace foundations damaged by pyrrhotite, which can cause swelling and deterioration over time as concrete slabs are exposed to water.

When the Prime Minister visited the Mauricie region during the election, he acknowledged that the people struggling with the pyrrhotite problem were victims of a tragedy. Through no fault of their own, their basement foundations were failing. To show his solidarity with the people of Mauricie and underscore his commitment to provide federal assistance, the Prime Minister returned to the area in April to confirm the \$30 million in federal assistance.

It is worth noting that the Government of Canada bears no responsibility or liability for this situation. Two years ago, the Quebec Superior Court concluded that professional technical consultants, suppliers, and contractors involved in the supply of the faulty concrete were responsible for this calamity.

While there is no legal obligation for the Government of Canada to provide assistance, we will not stand by and ignore the plight of affected homeowners, who continue to suffer financial hardship due to the mistakes and carelessness of others. The problem is serious, the solution costly, and our government is doing its part to help the affected families.

•(1850)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Robert Aubin: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for his answer which, quite frankly, nevertheless was rather predictable.

Although the \$30 million that has been or will be paid by the federal government is welcome, I would like to remind the member that it is simply not enough, at least not enough to get on their soapbox about solving the pyrrhotite problem.

I would like to come back to this famous standard, so I will attempt to explain the situation. The current federal standard is not clear on the quality of the concrete aggregates. Perhaps my colleague could ask the Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development about that. I thought he could give me an answer this evening; however, he could certainly pass on the information. In Canada, we routinely review standards about every five years. Thus, in the previous Parliament, under the Conservatives, the standard for concrete aggregates was reviewed. The conclusion was that there was not enough scientific evidence to make a determination. Thus, it was put off for another five years. In the meantime, nothing is happening.

We should put scientists to work, as was the case at Laval University. Unfortunately, that study was shut down for who knows what reason.

Will the study be reinstated and the standard reviewed?

[*English*]

Mr. Terry Duguid: Mr. Speaker, I certainly understand the member's sense of urgency on this issue, as well as his commitment.

As I noted earlier, the previous government's indifference to the problem delayed federal action for a full decade. However, that did not stop the bills from piling up for homeowners whose foundations were falling apart literally under their feet.

We understand that the federal assistance promised in budget 2016 is needed as soon as possible, which is why we moved quickly to negotiate an agreement with the Quebec government to establish a process for distributing the available funding in a fair and responsible manner.

I can assure the member that we are as determined as he is to resolve a problem that has caused much anguish and financial hardship for homeowners in the Mauricie. In fact, we are taking action to do so, and will continue to provide assistance over the next two years.

HEALTH

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canada is going through a deadly opioid overdose crisis that is so severe and widespread that few Canadians are untouched by it.

In my home province of British Columbia alone, 800 more people are expected to die from opioid overdoses than from motor vehicle accidents this year. In Ontario, opioid overdose is the third leading cause of accidental death, and one out of every eight deaths in Ontario among young adults is related to an opioid overdose tragedy. Last year, 274 people in Alberta died from overdosing on the opioid fentanyl, a drug so powerful that a single particle the size of a salt grain is enough to cause an overdose and two are enough to kill. For the country as a whole, opioid overdoses are expected to claim an estimated 2,000 lives by the end of this year. That is one Canadian dying every four hours.

Although, this has been a national crisis for well over a year, the response of the federal government has been unacceptably slow, leaving individual jurisdictions to tackle this crisis alone. For example, B.C. is currently grappling with a massive influx of fentanyl that led to 238 deaths in the first half of this year alone, leaving Dr. Perry Kendall, B.C.'s chief health officer, to declare a public health emergency for the first time ever in B.C. history.

That is why I moved a motion at the health committee to launch an emergency study to provide recommendations for immediate federal action to tackle Canada's overdose epidemic. This morning, the committee began its study. Hearing from witnesses representing Health Canada, the Canadian Institute for Health Information, the RCMP, the CBSA, and the Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse, we learned a number of cogent and sometimes disturbing facts. Among these are the following.

The federal government has not declared the overdose a public health emergency, even though it recognizes that it displays the characteristics of one and is being regarded as one.

In spite of the overwhelming evidence supporting safe injection sites, the federal government stubbornly refuses to repeal Bill C-2, Conservative legislation that the former Liberal health critic said was deliberately designed to prevent sites from opening.

Adjournment Proceedings

We learned that the government has no plans to invest any new funding to expand much needed treatment for addictions in partnership with the provinces and territories. We also learned that in the absence of national data on opioid prescribing and overdoses, we have no way to capture the full extent of this crisis. Instead, we continue to rely on fragmented and incomplete data to identify the policy changes most likely to address the overdose epidemic.

Despite being successfully employed by the Vancouver Police Department for a decade, we learned that the RCMP hasn't even considered a policy of non-attendance at 911 calls for overdoses. We also learned that Ottawa has not moved to restrict access to devices involved with drug production, such as pill presses and tableting machines, and Canada will not have new prescribing guidelines for opioids until 2017.

We learned that the CBSA lacks the statutory power to open containers smaller than 30 grams to halt opioid trafficking at our borders. This means that traffickers who mail fentanyl to Canada in envelopes under 30 grams will never have their shipments opened under current legislation. Instead, CBSA will call them and request their permission to open the envelopes.

Given the severity of this overdose crisis, more urgent action is needed. When will the federal government finally step up and show the leadership necessary to more effectively confront the opioid overdose epidemic facing our nation and killing our citizens?

● (1855)

Ms. Kamal Khera (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by stating that both I and our government are deeply concerned about the misuse of opioids.

Misuse causes considerable harm to families and communities. However, we also know that patients need to have access to these drugs for legitimate medical treatment of pain. This is why the Government of Canada is supporting a comprehensive approach to addressing this issue and reducing harm associated with problematic opioid use.

To do this, we are supporting properly established and managed supervised consumption sites. We are proposing regulations to control six precursors that can be used in the production of fentanyl, once again allowing physicians of certain patients to apply for access to heroin-assisted treatment under the special access program, improving access to naloxone, and supporting private member's Bill C-224, the good Samaritan drug overdose act. This bill would encourage people witnessing an overdose to call 911 by providing immunity from minor drug possession charges.

These actions are part of our five-point action plan to address opioid misuse. The plan focuses on informing Canadians about the risks of opioids, supporting better prescribing practices, reducing easy access to unnecessary opioids, supporting better treatment options, and enhancing the evidence base upon which policy decisions are made.

Other specific actions under the plan include, for example, an expedited review of easy-to-administer naloxone nasal spray, proposing regulatory changes that would require a prescription for low-dose codeine products, new warning stickers to be placed on

dispensed opioids, and mandatory risk management plans for all high-potency opioids.

Within the context of our comprehensive and evidence-based response to the opioid crisis, we will not be proceeding with new regulations on controlled-release oxycodone at this time. Ultimately these regulations would not have been in the public interest.

Health Canada's review of the evidence concludes that the introduction of tamper-resistant versions of one drug would not reduce the harms associated with opioid misuse writ large. This is because the small number of people who choose to tamper with a drug are more likely to switch to another non-tamper-resistant opioid rather than stop misusing this highly addictive class of drugs. These people may even be at increased risk of harm or death if they switch to using street drugs such as heroin or illegal fentanyl, which are often being disguised as other drugs.

Further, the regulation would have increased the costs to patients that are prescribed oxycodone, because they would have been unable to purchase a lower-cost version of the drug. It would have made no sense to penalize patients with a policy that would not have the intended effect of reducing the harms of opioid misuse.

That being said, the Government of Canada is supportive of tamper-resistant features. Health Canada has published guidance for drug manufacturers that will allow them to request the review and approval of tamper-resistance claims.

I want to be clear. Our government takes the exponential growth in opioid misuse and the rising numbers of overdose deaths very seriously. Next month, the Minister of Health will be hosting a summit on opioids to bring together experts, patient groups, governments, and regulators to discuss the current crisis and identify actions for moving forward.

In closing, I would like to reiterate our commitment to improving public health and safety for Canadians. I look forward to continued collaboration with all my colleagues from across the floor on this extremely important issue.

● (1900)

Mr. Don Davies: Mr. Speaker, the reaction of the government has been far too slow. Hundreds of Canadians have died while the government simply plans a meeting in November.

If the government truly believes in evidence-based decision-making, why is it ignoring the advice of health experts who say the evidence is overwhelming that safe consumption sites save lives and should be used to help address Canada's overdose epidemic?

Adjournment Proceedings

The latest call comes from B.C.'s chief medical officer, Dr. Perry Kendall, who recently implored the federal Liberal government to cut the Conservative red tape imposed by Bill C-2. Indeed, Canada's municipalities, including Kelowna, Kamloops, Vancouver, Victoria, Toronto, Montreal, and Ottawa are publicly expressing their desire to set up new safe consumption sites. However, in two years, there has not been a single new safe consumption site opened up in this country. That is because of the legislation passed by the previous government, which remains untouched by the current government. Meanwhile, two people continue to die every day in B.C. from drug overdoses.

When will the government stop applying Stephen Harper's regressive legislation and repeal Bill C-2 to start saving lives?

Ms. Kamal Khara: Mr. Speaker, our government is very concerned about the opioid crisis and is working hard to address this issue, as I mentioned previously.

As indicated, we concluded that the regulations that would have required tamper-resistant properties for controlled release oxycodone would not have reduced the overall harms of opioid misuse.

The problem with the regulations for controlled release oxycodone is that they would most likely create a balloon effect, where measures to control misuse of one drug would lead people to use another potentially more dangerous drug.

We are deeply concerned about the increasing rates of overdose and deaths from illegal sources of fentanyl in Canada, and we are not willing to take actions that have any possibility of making this crisis even worse and jeopardizing the safety and health of Canadians.

Instead, we have put in place a strong, comprehensive, and evidence-based strategy to address the opioid crisis from various angles, which include support for industry interested in developing tamper-resistant formulations of opioids.

The government will continue to take action to address this serious issue, and again, as I said before, we look forward to working closely with our colleagues and other stakeholders to address this extremely important issue.

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today we recognize the Sisters in Spirit vigil on the front steps of the House of Commons and all across the country. Many survivors of violence against murdered and missing indigenous women, girls, and two-spirited people are glad that the inquiry has started, but they are also expressing still a great deal of trauma and sadness. We still have such a long way to go to achieve closure for these families.

I really want to recognize in the House the advocacy and strength of the families and the indigenous organizations that have brought us to this point and that have pushed to make the inquiry a reality.

The inquiry was announced during the summer while the House was not in session. Indigenous organizations and representatives of families articulated five concerns about the terms of reference for the inquiry, and I would like to get on the record what the government's response was to those dissatisfactions. It may be that it tweaked the terms of reference or did incorporate those concerns.

The first one is that the murdered and missing indigenous women inquiry should have full access to trauma-informed and culturally appropriate counselling, and that would not be limited to the duration of their appearance before the commission. That is culturally appropriate support before, during, and following any testimony.

The second area of concern was whether the inquiry would compel the reopening of cold cases and cases that were dismissed maybe accidentally as accidents or suicides.

Third, what is the role of the police, the provinces, and the territories in the inquiry? We need full participation of those provincial agencies to know that we are getting at the child welfare problems, the domestic violence shelters, all of the police forces that are controlled either by provinces, territories, indigenous governments, or the federal government.

The fourth area of concern is that there was no explicit mention of the need to work with justice partners. Does our criminal justice system deal adequately, and what can we do to address the systemic discrimination that indigenous people have faced in the justice system?

Finally, there is the need for the addition of a sixth commissioner who is an Inuit woman. The president of Pauktutit, Rebecca Kudloo, said:

For this inquiry to be of maximum benefit for Inuit it must be led by indigenous women including us as Inuit women. To me, this is a fundamental matter of principle, equality and trust.

I would like to hear from the government. How did it fill those gaps? How is it moving forward? I hope that some of these identified problems have been filled. We would all benefit from knowing that indigenous families and advocacy organizations were heard and that their concerns are now reflected in the final terms of reference for the inquiry now under way.

• (1905)

Mr. Terry Duguid (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to respond to the question from the hon. member for Nanaimo—Ladysmith, here on traditional Algonquin territory.

It is particularly poignant that we are discussing this matter of national importance tonight. Every year, October 4 has become dedicated to honouring the lives of missing and murdered indigenous women and girls, and supporting families that have been tragically touched by the loss of a loved one to violence.

Earlier today, on in Parliament Hill and across the country, vigils and other ceremonies were held to honour the memory of missing and murdered indigenous women and girls. We join their families and loved ones in our shared commitment to end the violence.

Adjournment Proceedings

As members are aware, the government launched a national inquiry to seek recommendations on concrete actions which governments and others can take to address and prevent violence against indigenous women and girls. All indigenous voices are paramount to this government and to this process.

The government would like to thank Pauktuutit and the Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami, or ITK, for their input into the pre-inquiry process.

Indeed, the ITK and Inuit leadership have been very involved in the engagement of the inquiry into missing and murdered indigenous women and girls. Inuit leaders speak about violence in the home, the need for shelters, safe housing, and needed reform of the justice system.

Over the winter and spring, the hon. Minister of Indigenous and Northern Affairs, the hon. Minister of Justice, and the hon. Minister of Status of Women heard first hand the needs and expectations of survivors, family members, and loved ones for the design of this inquiry. They heard from more than 2,100 participants at 18 face-to-face meetings, with one or more ministers present, across the country, including in Inuit regions.

The engagement also involved obtaining the views on the design of the inquiry from national and indigenous organizations.

On August 3, the Minister of Indigenous and Northern Affairs, the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, and the Minister of Status of Women announced five commissioners who would lead the truly national inquiry, as well as the terms of reference for the national inquiry. The commissioners named to the inquiry have the background, characteristics, and experience we heard was necessary in the pre-design phase to lead this inquiry.

The inquiry will both recommend concrete actions to prevent future violence as well as help identify the underlying causes of this ongoing national strategy.

The government is also taking immediate action on root causes, with historic investments on priorities, including women's shelters, safe water, housing, education, and child welfare.

In the North, this government is investing in a wide variety of areas, including infrastructure, affordable housing, education, and physical and mental health, helping Inuit and northerners to secure the foundations of healthy and safe communities.

Canada is grateful to the survivors, families, loved ones, and indigenous representative organizations which provided input during the pre-inquiry process. The input received helped shape the inquiry that the commissioners will now be leading.

We will rebuild trust, ensure justice for both victims and survivors, and healing for their families.

● (1910)

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson: Mr. Speaker, with respect to my colleague across the floor, he has not answered any of the questions that I asked tonight.

Again, I thought I was giving the government an opportunity to show us, to tell us how it had incorporated the feedback of these most valued partners.

For the government to say that a relationship with indigenous people is the most important relationship it has, but then not be able to say "These are the ways that we've incorporated their input" is very saddening.

We heard people on the front steps of the House of Commons today say that in Cree "sorry" means action. We heard survivors ask, inside the House of Commons, "How would you feel if it was your daughter who disappeared? Would you say that you had done enough?" They asked, "Where's the support for families, for trauma, for victims, for addictions?". They said that they did not want to wait to the end of the inquiry to see real change. They very much wanted to know that their outstanding concerns about the inquiry had been addressed.

I will give the government a final time to brag about the good work it has done. I express my great hope that we can work together and achieve the result we need in our country for indigenous women and girls.

Mr. Terry Duguid: Mr. Speaker, I will repeat for the hon. member that there has been unprecedented engagement in the design of the inquiry, with the input of Pauktuutit and ITK. The pre-inquiry engagement was instrumental in ensuring that the terms of reference reflected the views of indigenous voices from coast to coast to coast in every corner of the country, including from Inuit people.

As I have said, the commissioners named to lead the inquiry have the background, characteristics, and experience we heard in the pre-inquiry design phase were necessary to lead this inquiry. With the commissioners now beginning that work, the inquiry will recommend concrete actions to prevent future violence and identify the underlying causes of this ongoing national strategy.

This government is also determined to work with all those who have been impacted, including Inuit leadership and communities to take immediate action combatting the violence.

I think that answers the hon. member's question.

In addition to budget 2016 investments for on-reserve women's shelters, this government also announced an investment of \$89.9 million over two years for the construction and renovation of shelters and transition houses for victims of violence in provinces and territories, and many other measures.

● (1915)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 7:15 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Tuesday, October 4, 2016

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development

The Speaker 5425

Commissioner of Official Languages

The Speaker 5425

Committees of the House

Public Safety and National Security

Ms. Damoff 5425

National Cycling Strategy Act

Mr. Johns 5425

Bill C-312. Introduction and first reading 5425
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) 5425

Petitions

Justice

Mrs. Wagantall 5425

Falun Gong

Mr. Lamoureux 5426

Questions on the Order Paper

Mr. Lamoureux 5426

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Paris Agreement

Motion 5426

Mr. Angus 5426

Mr. Lamoureux 5427

Mr. Albas 5427

Ms. Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona) 5428

Mr. Beech 5428

Mr. Schmale 5429

Mr. Stewart 5429

Mr. Lamoureux 5430

Mr. Gerretsen 5430

Mr. Shields 5431

Mr. Angus 5432

Mr. Genuis 5432

Mr. Alghabra 5434

Ms. Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona) 5434

Mr. Carrie 5434

Mr. Carrie 5435

Ms. McKenna 5436

Ms. Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona) 5437

Ms. McKenna 5437

Mr. Fast 5440

Ms. Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona) 5441

Mr. Nault 5441

Mr. Doherty 5441

Mr. Kent 5442

Mr. Mendicino 5443

Mr. Angus 5443

Mr. Godin 5444

Mr. Lamoureux 5445

Mr. Deltell 5445

Mr. McLeod (Northwest Territories) 5446

Mr. Zimmer 5447

Mr. Angus 5447

Ms. Pauzé 5448

Mr. Lamoureux 5449

Mr. Saganash 5449

Mrs. Schulte 5450

Mr. Albas 5451

Ms. Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona) 5451

Mr. Lamoureux 5452

Mr. Amos 5452

Mrs. Wagantall 5453

Mr. Saganash 5454

Mr. Sopuck 5454

Mr. McGuinty 5456

Mr. Angus 5457

Mr. Shields 5457

Mr. Amos 5459

Ms. Gladu 5459

Mr. McGuinty 5459

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Replacement Workers

Mr. Marcil 5460

Sault Ste. Marie

Mr. Sheehan 5461

Carmen Dallaire

Mr. Bernier 5461

Gerald Greenslade

Mr. McDonald 5461

Poverty

Mr. Boulerville 5461

Kivi Park

Mr. Serré 5461

Tour of the Peace

Mr. Zimmer 5462

Contribution of Women

Mr. El-Khoury 5462

Taylor Hart

Mr. Ruimy 5462

Beef Industry

Mr. Shields 5462

War Brides

Mrs. Lockhart 5462

Eating Disorders	
Mr. Eyolfson	5463
International Day of the Girl	
Ms. Harder	5463
Marine Science	
Ms. Ludwig	5463
Wild Salmon	
Mr. Donnelly	5463
Alberta	
Mr. Jeneroux	5463
Indigenous Affairs	
Mr. Rusnak	5464

ORAL QUESTIONS

The Environment	
Mr. Lebel	5464
Mr. Trudeau	5464
Mr. Lebel	5464
Mr. Trudeau	5464
Taxation	
Mr. Lebel	5464
Mr. Trudeau	5464
Mr. Fast	5465
Mr. Trudeau	5465
Mr. Fast	5465
Mr. Trudeau	5465
The Environment	
Mr. Mulcair	5465
Mr. Trudeau	5465
Mr. Mulcair	5465
Mr. Trudeau	5465
Public Safety	
Mr. Mulcair	5465
Mr. Trudeau	5465
Foreign Affairs	
Mr. Mulcair	5466
Mr. Trudeau	5466
Taxation	
Mr. Anderson	5466
Mr. MacAulay	5466
Mr. Anderson	5466
Ms. McKenna	5466
Mr. Godin	5466
Ms. McKenna	5466
Mr. Godin	5466
Ms. McKenna	5466
Mrs. Stubbs	5467
Ms. McKenna	5467
Mrs. Stubbs	5467
Ms. McKenna	5467
Health	
Mr. Davies	5467
Mrs. Philpott	5467

Ms. Sansoucy	5467
Mrs. Philpott	5467
The Economy	
Ms. Raitt	5468
Ms. McKenna	5468
Ms. Raitt	5468
Mr. Morneau	5468
Employment	
Mr. Barlow	5468
Mr. Duclos	5468
Mr. Barlow	5468
Ms. Mihychuk	5468
Indigenous Affairs	
Ms. Malcolmson	5469
Ms. Bennett	5469
Mr. Angus	5469
Ms. Bennett	5469
Northern Development	
Mr. McLeod (Northwest Territories)	5469
Ms. Bennett	5469
Government Expenditures	
Mr. Calkins	5469
Ms. Chagger	5469
Mr. Calkins	5469
Ms. Chagger	5470
Mr. Gourde	5470
Ms. Chagger	5470
Mr. Gourde	5470
Ms. Chagger	5470
Disaster Assistance	
Ms. Hardcastle	5470
Mr. Goodale	5470
Public Services and Procurement	
Ms. Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	5470
Ms. Foote	5470
Justice	
Mr. Nicholson	5470
Mr. Casey (Charlottetown)	5471
Mr. Nicholson	5471
Mr. Casey (Charlottetown)	5471
Mr. Cooper	5471
Mr. Casey (Charlottetown)	5471
Science	
Mr. Di Iorio	5471
Ms. Duncan (Etobicoke North)	5471
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship	
Ms. Harder	5471
Mr. McCallum	5471
Softwood Lumber	
Ms. Trudel	5471
Ms. Freeland	5472
Public Safety	
Ms. Damoff	5472

Mr. Goodale	5472
Small Business	
Mrs. Gallant	5472
Mrs. Lebouthillier	5472
The Environment	
Mr. Fortin	5472
Ms. McKenna	5472
Ms. Pauzé	5472
Ms. Rudd	5472
Presence in Gallery	
The Speaker	5473

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Business of Supply

Opposition Motion—Creation of a Standing Committee on Arms Exports Review

Motion	5473
Motion negatived	5474

National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians Act

Bill C-22. Second reading	5474
Motion agreed to	5475
(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee) .	5475

Paris Agreement

Motion	5475
Mr. McGuinty	5475
Mr. Carrie	5475
Ms. Gladu	5476
Ms. Murray	5476
Ms. Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	5478
Mr. Carrie	5478
Mr. Saganash	5478
Mr. Mulcair	5479
Mr. Lamoureux	5482
Ms. Gladu	5482
Ms. Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	5482
Ms. Gould	5483
Ms. Gould	5483
Mr. Dusseault	5485
Mr. Deltell	5485
Mr. Bittle	5486
Mr. Fillmore	5486

Mr. Barlow	5488
Ms. Malcolmson	5488
Mr. McGuinty	5488
Mr. Cooper	5488
Mr. Chan	5489
Mr. Dusseault	5490
Mr. Kelly	5490
Mr. Fuhr	5492
Ms. Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	5492
Mr. Bezan	5492
Mr. Sangha	5492
Mr. Dusseault	5493
Ms. Malcolmson	5494
Mr. Lamoureux	5494
Mr. Longfield	5494
Mr. Donnelly	5495
Mr. Breton	5496
Ms. Chagger	5496
Motion	5496
(Motion agreed to)	5496
Ms. Moore	5496

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Fight Against Food Waste Act

Bill C-231. Second reading	5496
Ms. Dabrusin	5496
Mr. Anderson	5497
Mr. Stetski	5498
Mr. Lightbound	5500
Ms. Moore	5501
Ms. Brosseau	5503
Division on motion deferred	5504

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Housing

Mr. Aubin	5504
Mr. Duguid	5504

Health

Mr. Davies	5505
Ms. Khera	5506

Indigenous Affairs

Ms. Malcolmson	5507
Mr. Duguid	5507

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>