



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 152 No. 026
Monday, September 22, 2025

Speaker: The Honourable Francis Scarpaleggia



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, September 22, 2025

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayer

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1100)

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—OIL AND GAS EMISSIONS CAP

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC) moved:

That the House call on the Prime Minister to immediately repeal the oil and gas emissions cap, which in effect is a production cap.

He said: Mr. Speaker, there is breaking news today, really good news for some. TC Energy just announced that it is investing \$8.5 billion in the energy sector. In fact, it said it is betting big on the energy sector. The bad news is that it will be in the United States. That will be \$8.5 billion from a Canadian company investing in the United States instead of investing it here in Canada. That is \$8.5 billion that will put people to work, pay royalties to state governments, create thousands of jobs in spinoffs and, of course, provide Americans with safe and secure energy sources.

I remember when TC Energy was called TransCanada Corporation. After 10 years of Liberal policies that absolutely devastated the energy sector here in Canada, it decided to take the word “Canada” out of its name, and now it is known just as TC Energy. The Commonwealth of Virginia will have a major pipeline built by Canadian companies. That could have happened here, but not now.

Before I go on, I should just mention that I will be sharing my time with the hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrahk.

Let us be very clear about why the investment is not coming to Canada. It is because there is a production cap. The Liberals like to call it an emissions cap. It is, in fact, a production cap. If members take away one thing from today's debate, it should be this: If members say yes to the cap, they are saying no to a new pipeline. It is as simple as that.

Let us think back to the election campaign, when the Prime Minister was desperately trying to convince people that he was going to do things differently from the previous Liberal government, the

Trudeau government, to which the Prime Minister was a senior economic adviser. When he needed Canadians' votes, he was pretending to be in favour of energy sector developments. He said all kinds of things during the campaign, but as soon as the votes were tallied, the Prime Minister showed himself to be just another Liberal. He has broken those promises and broken all those commitments. He has a long history of opposing energy developments.

The Prime Minister cheered on and congratulated the previous prime minister, Justin Trudeau, when Justin Trudeau vetoed the northern gateway project, which would have taken western Canadian energy to a deepwater port in northern British Columbia, opening up billions of dollars' worth of market access in Asian countries and growing countries with increasing demand for oil and gas, such as India, Japan and Korea. All of that was killed when Justin Trudeau vetoed the northern gateway project, and the Prime Minister cheered him on.

It is completely impossible to build another pipeline as long as the cap stays in place. If the cap stays, no new pipelines will ever be built. It is increasingly clear that the Prime Minister has performed a complete bait and switch, saying something during the election, changing the rhetoric of the Liberal Party, but delivering the exact same policy as the previous Trudeau government.

TC Energy is not the only company building in the United States. Enbridge is as well. Enbridge is building two pipelines in the U.S. Again, these are Canadian companies with strong, proud histories of getting things built in Canada that have to go offshore into the United States to get new projects built. What does that mean for Canadians? It does not just mean lost jobs. Remember, oil and gas production in western Canada fuels the entire country's economy. I should point out that this is an issue not just for western Canada; I know that other colleagues will be speaking to the motion, colleagues from Atlantic Canada too, where their hopes for economic growth are underpinned by the ability to develop their abundant natural resources.

Business of Supply

The world is consuming more and more oil and gas. Pipelines are being built in other countries. In fact it is ironic to note, and Canadians should never forget, that while the Prime Minister was cheering on Justin Trudeau and advising him to cancel Canadian energy projects, his company, Brookfield, was investing in other countries to build pipelines in other countries and develop other countries' natural resources. Of course that was fine for his shareholders, and those projects would be even more economically viable in other countries if Canada did not produce its own natural resources.

● (1105)

If Canada develops its own natural resources and we build pipelines here in Canada, then Brookfield's investments in pipelines in other countries will be worth less because it will face increased competition. That is something Canadians should never forget about the conflicted Prime Minister.

It is not just the direct jobs that oil and gas production creates. Every paved road we drive on, every hospital we or our loved ones might have to visit and every school a child goes to is in some way, shape or form funded by natural resource development. When companies invest, they create jobs along the production site. Those workers support local economies, and the royalties gathered by the provincial and federal governments pay for important social services.

Maybe policies like the production cap are the reason that over \$50 billion of foreign investment has fled the Canadian economy, right at a time when we need to be firing on all cylinders to respond to the unfair U.S. tariffs. We need more and more money flowing into the Canadian economy to develop our natural resources, to bolster our GDP and to put Canadians back to work when their jobs are disrupted by trade disputes, but instead the government is continuing the attack on the oil and gas sector, the attack on the natural resource sector.

Let us be clear about a few things. Not only will the emissions cap keep investment dollars out of our economy, but it also means that Canada will continue to sell at a discount to the United States. Members may have heard on CBC the Polish ambassador's explaining where Poland is getting its LNG from. When the host asked if it was buying its LNG from the United States, the ambassador had to stifle a laugh. He chuckled and said that not all LNG it is buying from the U.S. is American; some of it is Canadian. Of course, the U.S. buys it from Canada at a deep discount and then sells it to Poland at a big profit. We are literally subsidizing the American economy by means of the Liberal government's policies.

Conservatives have a better idea. Instead of pipelines being built in countries that have terrible human rights records, instead of royalties being paid to governments that do not share our values and instead of people being put to work in other countries, let us bring those dollars home. Let us bring those investment dollars to Canada so Canada can provide the world with a clean, ethical, safe and reliable source of energy. Let us put the steelworkers in Regina back to work building the pipelines. Let us put the engineers back to work. Let us put the blue-collar workers back to work, workers who tap a well and see it all the way through to completion. Let us support our hospitals, schools and roads with the royalties paid by these companies.

Greenhouse gas emissions do not need a passport to travel around the world. If oil and gas production is going to increase, Conservatives believe that we should see it increase here at home, because we know that we can extract our natural resources with the highest environmental standards and the lowest emissions intensity and that Canadians will see the benefit of that.

To conclude, Liberals have a choice. They can vote in favour of our motion and lift the emissions cap, the production cap, or they can say today that they oppose new pipelines, that there will never be a pipeline built under the Liberal government. They could at least be honest with Canadians and provincial premiers, who are desperately clinging to hope that the government might reverse the Trudeau policies. If they vote in favour of the motion today, they would effectively be saying that there will be no new pipelines in Canada under the Liberal government.

As for the list the Liberals came forward with in Bill C-5, let us be clear that giving the power to selectively enforce Canadian laws when it comes to new energy projects will not matter as long as the production cap is in place. As long as the emissions cap is in place, it does not matter what they do with the powers they have given themselves under Bill C-5, because nothing will be able to flow through any kind of project they might support.

The key to energy independence and abundance and to getting off the U.S. market and diversifying our customers and natural resources is to lift the emissions cap. The Liberals have a choice. We call on them to support the energy workers in this country and pull their emissions cap.

* * *

● (1110)

OFFICIAL REPORT

Wade Grant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. On Friday, I misspoke during question period. While answering a question, I said that emissions are 41% lower than they have been in the past, when I intended to say they are 41% lower than they would have been under a Conservative plan.

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—OIL AND GAS EMISSIONS CAP

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Prime Minister has actually been very clear to Canadians and to members opposite about how Canada is going to continue to build a strong economic economy that, at the end of the day, factors in energy.

I would like to contrast even just the beginning of what the current Prime Minister did with what Stephen Harper did when the member was sitting in the Speaker's chair. During that period under Stephen Harper and the Conservative government, it is important for Canadians to realize, not even one inch of pipeline was built that led to tidewaters.

An hon. member: That's not true.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, that is the reality. The member opposite might say that is not true, so then he should give us the pipeline that went directly from Alberta to B.C., Churchill or Atlantic Canada.

Hon. Andrew Scheer: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I know we do not debate points of order, but I think it is so telling that the first moment of this debate kicked off with the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change's admitting that what he said on Friday was not true and that emissions are not going down under the Liberal government's plan but are in fact going up. He has to make up some kind of hypothetical qualifier to get away from accusations of deliberately misleading the House.

Four major pipeline projects, including access to tidewater, were built under the previous Conservative government. The current Liberal government inherited a proposal list with 18 LNG facilities that it has completely blocked or sat on. The Liberal government cancelled the northern gateway and energy east projects, which would have taken western Canadian oil to displace foreign oil imported from other countries. It is clear that if Canadians are hoping to develop the natural resource sector, it will not be with a Liberal government.

[*Translation*]

Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question for the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle is pretty simple: Do the Conservatives have no shame?

The same week that the Canadian Climate Institute tells us that we will not be reaching our greenhouse gas emissions targets for 2030, the Conservatives bring up a matter that will produce even more greenhouse gas emissions.

Personally, I cannot help but draw a parallel to what happened in the spring. Is this the new Conservative leadership, and is this the message they got when Canadians left them on the opposition benches after they supported a gag order on Bill C-5?

What is the role of His Majesty's loyal opposition if they support gag orders against the environment, supported Bill C-5 and are now moving a new motion that would allow Canada to recklessly pro-

Business of Supply

duce even more greenhouse gas emissions? Where is the Conservatives' environmental vision?

• (1115)

[*English*]

Hon. Andrew Scheer: Mr. Speaker, let us be very clear: Canada can help lower global emissions by developing our own natural resources. The two go hand in hand.

After 10 years of a Liberal government's vetoing natural resource projects and chasing away foreign investment, those investment dollars have just gone to other countries, countries that do not have anywhere near the same environmental standards as we have here in Canada. Take LNG alone; by exporting more LNG, we can help other countries get off coal-fired electrical generation. That is what the Conservative plan is all about with technology, not taxes. We can help lower global emissions while developing more of Canada's natural resources.

Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, during the recent election, at one out of every three doors I knocked on, the question I was asked was how our party was going to facilitate diversification of the economy. Our economy is totally dependent on auto sector jobs.

The hon. opposition House leader was in my riding a couple of weeks ago, and he had the opportunity to visit a company called Southwestern Manufacturing. This was a tool-and-die business; it has diversified into oil and gas and nuclear. I would like the opposition House leader to enlighten the House as to what his discussions were and what he heard from the folks at Southwestern Manufacturing.

Hon. Andrew Scheer: Mr. Speaker, we had a fantastic meeting, and we heard loud and clear that as long as there are not new major pipelines built in Canada, as long as there are not new major energy projects, companies will have to continue looking to the U.S. to make their products. As long as the tariffs are in place, Canada is even more vulnerable to this situation. When I tour energy facilities all over western Canada, I see parts, component pieces and heavy equipment vehicles, all manufactured in Ontario. The link between manufacturing jobs in southwestern Ontario and development in western Canada or in Atlantic Canada is obvious to everyone who is not a Liberal.

Hon. Bardish Chagger: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I know you are newer to the chair, but the hon. member for Regina—Qu'Appelle has occupied it and even has a portrait on these walls. To use terminology such as “deliberately misleading” is him doing indirectly what he cannot do directly. I think we should have much more professionalism and order in such an important debate today.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): I thank the member for her intervention. We should all use judicious language.

Business of Supply

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrahk.

Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrahk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to take part in this debate today, which will set the record straight for Canadians about who we are and what we can be if we reach our full potential here in Canada.

Canada is a wealthy country, and it draws its wealth from its millions of citizens, from its hundreds of thousands of innovative businesses, and from its natural resources. The fact is we have been truly blessed here in this country. We have it all, all of the natural resources—whether it be critical minerals, minerals that we have been using for centuries, or what is rightly known as green energy, like hydroelectricity or biomass. We have everything in Canada to develop our potential and provide energy to meet all the needs of Canadians.

That is why I believe that, for as long as we need what we call fossil fuels, these fuels will have to come from Canada. Let us take advantage of this wealth we have to develop our full potential and, as my colleague so aptly stated just a few minutes ago, send Canada's natural resources to the rest of the world along with the Canadian workers whose labour creates that wealth. We need to allow these businesses and their full potential to be used how they were meant to be used.

Moreover, it is disappointing to hear the Prime Minister claim that, in certain circumstances, there is no viable business case for fossil fuels. That is completely false, as we will see later in my speech. Let us not forget that Canadians consume 51 million litres of oil and gas per day to meet their needs. Therefore, as long as Canadians need fossil fuels, I will support Canadian oil and gas and Canadian energy.

Two troubling examples have come to light that demonstrate how this government is stifling the potential of our natural resources.

First, I would like to quote a report by Olivier Lemieux out of Quebec City, which was broadcast by Radio-Canada on March 19. According to an expert from Texas, “Canada has made bad choices” for the oil industry. The author explains how it all works. Oil leaves Alberta, goes to Texas, and then comes back to Canada—not far from my riding, in fact, in Lévis—to be refined. However, rather than having our oil go through Texas and enriching Americans along the way, things could have been done differently.

According to Jean-Paul Rodrigue, professor at the department of maritime business administration at Texas A&M University, “Canada is stuck in a situation that puts it at a disadvantage”. “Canada has made bad choices for ideological reasons”, laments the Montreal native, who has lived in the United States for 30 years. He believes that environmental considerations are preventing Canada from exploiting its vast oil resources to their full potential.

As I said, Alberta's oil goes to Texas and then comes back to Lévis. Obviously, Texans are taking advantage of this to make whatever profit they can.

The other thing is utterly embarrassing. On August 26, a CBC anchor was interviewing the Polish ambassador and informed him

that Poland was buying natural gas from the United States. The ambassador was so embarrassed by the question that all he could do was laugh. He admitted that Poland was buying natural gas from the United States, but claimed it was encouraging Canada at the same time. How so? Well, that natural gas bought in the U.S. comes from Canada. That means Canadians are sending their gas to the United States, and the United States is sending it to Europe. In the meantime, countless business opportunities are being squandered.

That is what prompted commentator Mario Dumont to say the following in the *Journal de Montréal*:

While [the Prime Minister of Canada] was visiting his country, Poland's ambassador in Ottawa revealed during a CBC interview that the natural gas his country buys is still Canadian natural gas.

...

In a nutshell, the gas we refuse to sell to Europe ultimately ends up there anyway, minus a juicy profit margin swallowed up by an American company. The bottom line is this: there is no benefit to the environment, a major economic loss to Canada and a tidy sum being pocketed by the United States.

I am sorry, but this is ridiculous!

That is the issue we are talking about today.

● (1120)

Are we going to keep pretending that everything is just fine? Are we going to keep saying that we, here in Canada, are nice people and will not rock the boat even if others do? Or instead, will we seize the opportunity to achieve our full potential in every energy sector that we, as Canadians, need?

[*English*]

The ambassador of Poland illustrated it very well, saying there is a business case. That is contrary to what the former prime minister said during his campaign, that, sorry, there was “no business case”. What a missed shot that was, because, yes, there is a business case. As very clearly identified by the ambassador of Poland in an interview on CBC, it is time for the government to open its eyes and act correctly for the good of all Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Let us not forget that those folks have been in government for 10 years. They have stepped up only once on an oil project. Let us not forget that Bill C-69 slowed down any momentum, but they did do one thing: They decided to buy a pipeline. First they lecture the entire planet, then they buy a pipeline. Can anyone say that it did any good? Not really, we just have to look at what happened.

When someone decides to buy something that is not for sale, they have to pay more. The Canadian government paid \$4.5 billion to buy the Trans Mountain pipeline, which had not even been built yet. It paid twice what it was worth. Not only did we get ripped off a bit on the price, but then it still had to be built.

When the Liberal government bought the pipeline the estimated cost was \$7.4 billion. Any idea how much it actually cost? It did not cost two, three or four times more, but five times more. The cost went from \$7.4 billion to \$34.2 billion. Add to that the \$4.5 billion and that is almost \$40 billion. That is taxpayers' money that was used to buy a pipeline and build it, when that is absolutely not the government's mandate. In our view, the government is there to ensure that everything is done properly according to the rules and not to get in the business of pipeline ownership. Today, the government is trying to sell it and all the experts agree that if it sells, it will be worth half of what it cost. Congratulations.

Fortunately, Canadians can rest assured because the government created the position of minister responsible for government efficiency. The minister who holds that position is the one who came up with the bright idea to buy the pipeline. That is amazing. I know that minister well. He is my neighbour. It is the member for Louis-Hébert, whom I respect and admire. I hope he will learn from what he did and never do it again.

I am proud to be a Quebecker and proud of the extraordinary legacy that has been handed on to us thanks to the vision that Quebec politicians had in the 20th century and still have today. They have been able to develop the full potential of electricity. However, there is also potential in fossil fuels, whether it be oil or gas. Quebec makes its own choices, but here is the reality for Quebeckers. According to an annual analysis by the École des hautes études commerciales, oil accounts for 36% of Quebec's energy, whereas natural gas accounts for 13%. Last year, Quebec consumed 9.7 billion litres of oil. Although I support electrification, the reality is that we still need oil in Quebec, and as long as we need oil, then I will support Canadian oil. Transportation is on the rise, and 9.7 billion litres is a record level of consumption in Quebec. Consumption is not dropping. It is increasing. Let us not forget that the F-150 has been the best-selling vehicle in Quebec since 2016.

The current provincial government has shown some openness on the issue of gas. On July 4, Quebec's premier stated that he would be open to the idea of building a plant. He is also open to the idea of building a liquefied natural gas terminal, if Quebeckers support the idea. Even yesterday, he said that he would take a page from the federal government regarding Bill C-5 and table a bill that he is calling Bill Q-5. We will see. I should point out that Bill C-5 included Bill C-375, a bill I tabled that sought to ensure that a single assessment be undertaken for each project. However, the Liberals rejected it.

I will now happily answer my colleagues' questions.

• (1125)

[English]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate the concerns the Conservatives have today with regard to the issue of pipelines. It is interesting. What we have heard from the Prime Minister are nothing but positive, encouraging signs, for the Prairies in particular, in the energy field. We have to provide the Prime Minister the opportunity to demonstrate how well he has been working with the premiers of the different provinces. We need to be a bit more optimistic. If we contrast

Business of Supply

the Prime Minister with the results that Stephen Harper had while he was prime minister, it would be best for members of the Conservative Party to co-operate a little more and maybe be a little more optimistic.

Gérard Deltell: Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to answer questions from the member for Winnipeg North.

Obviously, the Liberals cannot do worse than what they have done in the last 10 years. The member asked me to be more co-operative. He picks up our bill and picks up our ideas, such as cancelling the carbon tax, but would he pick up my personal idea to have one project, one evaluation? A year ago, I tabled Bill C-375, and what did the member and all of his colleagues around him do? They refused it. It was never time to be good, but it is now time to be good for the energy sector and to be open to new projects as soon as possible.

• (1130)

[Translation]

Marie-Hélène Gaudreau (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I want to get back to the subject at hand. Those who are watching us are wondering what is going on. First, the government is buying pipelines; then, the opposition wants to repeal anything and everything related to the oil sector's emissions cap.

I do not understand.

Should we believe the Auditor General and the environment commissioner or not? Our emissions reduction targets are not being met, and we are in a climate emergency. Can my colleague explain why we are talking about this on an opposition day when the planet is burning?

Gérard Deltell: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for that very relevant question. We are talking about meeting people's needs. As long as people need oil and natural gas, why not produce it in Canada?

Nearly half of the oil we buy comes from abroad, specifically from the United States. However, a lot of that oil from the United States is actually from Canada. I know my colleague is very fond of Quebec and Quebeckers, but I also know that, like me, she recognizes that facts are facts, and that oil consumption is not declining in Quebec; it is increasing. That is the state of energy consumption in Quebec.

The École des hautes études commerciales has confirmed this. It has also indicated that the F-150 truck has been the top-selling vehicle in Quebec since 2016 and that natural gas consumption is also on the rise. Another reality is that the Quebec government is now prepared to open the door to natural gas plants and a liquefied natural gas terminal, which is the complete opposite of its position just one year ago. I invite my colleague to listen to Quebeckers.

Madeleine Chenette (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages and to the Secretary of State (Sport), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrahk. In Quebec, we are keenly aware of this climate reality.

Business of Supply

However, I really want to highlight that our government is focused on making Canada an energy superpower, in both clean and conventional energy, and on improving our climate competitiveness, which reduces emissions while strengthening our economy.

Discussions about capping our emissions are not going to solve the problem. Instead, why not work together more effectively on finding solutions?

G rard Deltell: Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my colleague on getting elected. This is the first time that we have had a chance to engage in the House. I want to thank her.

Let us remember that auto sales in Quebec are up 13.7% compared to 8.2% for Canada as a whole. We are very open to collaboration, but we still need to make the right decisions. Prime Minister Trudeau claimed that there was no business case for exporting natural gas. That is not true. The fact is, as the Polish ambassador so embarrassingly pointed out—

[English]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Resuming debate, the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources.

Corey Hogan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for LaSalle— mard—Verdun.

Once again, the Conservatives have brought forward a motion designed not to help Canadians but to divide them. Today's motion proposing an end to the oil and gas emissions cap, a regulation that has not even been finalized, is an example of this. I would like to be crystal clear as we begin debate on this motion: The government does not make policy decisions based on opposition motions. We are focused on results, not Conservative games.

Canadians elected the Liberals to make this country an energy superpower, one that leads the world in both clean and conventional energy, and one that grows our exports and reduces our emissions at the same time. That is exactly what we are doing. We are retooling Canada's economy by advancing nation-building projects, LNG terminals with indigenous partnership, carbon capture and storage, and transformative clean energy.

Just last week, we approved the Ksi Lisims LNG project in British Columbia, led by the Nisga'a Nation, which will be paired with a natural gas pipeline owned by first nations. It is the second-largest private investment in Canadian history, and it will export the cleanest LNG in the world. That is how we build an energy superpower. It is with low-cost, low-risk and low-carbon projects that get Canadian energy to market, cut emissions and create jobs from coast to coast to coast.

In Alberta, representatives from industry also agree that building a responsible, competitive oil and gas industry means advancing projects, such as Pathways. That is the core of the grand bargain, pairing transformative emissions reduction with new infrastructure that diversifies our exports. Let me remind my colleagues that we do not get these things done by negotiating in public.

Serious governments work with provinces, industry and indigenous partners. Conservatives want to blow up those discussions for

their own partisan gain. It is worth asking the question, why are Conservatives so frustrated? I think the answer is that their own allies in Alberta have found common ground with the Prime Minister.

Premier Smith said, "I found more common ground with the prime minister when I met with him yesterday than I have in any meeting with a prime minister." She encouraged Albertans to "not lose faith in the process". I agree with the notion that we should work together on nation-building projects because we are all stronger when we work together. Premier Smith also said, "I am more optimistic than ever that the concerns of Albertans are FINALLY BEING HEARD."

That is why the Conservatives are angry. Their whole playbook involves rage farming and division. When the Prime Minister is working productively with provinces such as Alberta, it leaves the Leader of the Opposition asking what his purpose is.

The truth is that Conservatives cannot stand the progress that is being made that they could not have made if they had won the last election. They have talked about Bill C-69, and they are now talking about the emissions cap, as being barriers to pipelines being built. I do not think there is an environmental regulation they do not think would kill the pipeline industry in Canada, but it is stronger than they think, and the Chicken Little routine is getting a little bit tiresome.

The Conservatives are desperate to derail sensitive discussions by negotiating in public, but Canadians know better. They know that co-operation is how we build projects of national interest, not through performative motions in the House. Let us be clear about what is missing in this Conservative motion. If the Conservatives want to repeal the emissions cap, then Canadians deserve to know what the plan is to reduce emissions in the oil and gas sector.

Building the strongest economy in the G7 means unlocking us as a conventional and renewable energy superpower with high environmental standards. Members opposite need to stop treating that as a conflict. In the last 10 years, we increased oil and gas production as a country by 34% compared to it being up globally by 6%. The population grew 15%, yet total GHG emissions declined 6.5%. Strong environmental protections and indigenous support are increasingly becoming table stakes for our trading partners.

Business of Supply

Where are the Conservatives' ideas to ensure we remain competitive in a world that is demanding cleaner energy? Will they support Canada's enhanced methane regulations, which are some of the most economically efficient emissions reductions possible in the oil and gas sector? Will they support Canada's industrial carbon pricing system, which has already attracted more than \$57 billion in investments and is a key reason our allies see us as a responsible supplier? Is their plan simply to do nothing, to walk away from progress, and to make Canada less competitive?

The silence from the other side is telling. The Conservatives rail against the Liberals' plan, but they have nothing to replace it with. They have no creditable path to reduce emissions, no plan to attract investment and no strategy to strengthen Canada's energy sector in a world where climate competitiveness matters more every day.

Let us also place this debate in its global context. The evolving geopolitical landscape is directly impacting Canada's economic and climate ambitions. We are in the midst of an unprompted trade war. Investors are weighing Canada against our peers and asking whether we will remain attractive compared to other markets.

The reality is that the world is moving fast. We need to meet the federal government's goal of attracting \$500 billion of private capital into clean and conventional energy to build the projects that will secure our future. That is why the Prime Minister has made it clear that our government is working on a climate competitiveness strategy. It is about results, not rhetoric. We are strengthening our economy while reducing emissions, securing investment and ensuring Canada wins in the global race for energy competitiveness.

• (1135)

Rage farming just does not work anymore. Canadians want solutions.

The House leader on the other side talked about selling oil and gas at a discount. The last I checked, the WTI-WCS differential was \$14, which is actually pretty low when we consider the quality differences and the fact that the spot price and transportation costs are involved. I am curious what the member thinks an appropriate differential would be. He talked about Canadian oil and gas being sold to the U.S. and then to Europe. The Conservatives act as though they have never heard of a swap market before. The fact is that this is a very integrated economy, just as the auto sector is.

Let me close with this: Our government is delivering real results. We are increasing exports of Canadian LNG off the west coast, approving transformative projects like Ksi Lisims LNG and advancing the Pathways project as part of a grand bargain that cuts emissions and grows jobs. By developing a climate competitiveness strategy that will allow us to attract \$500 billion in investment, we will make Canada the strongest, most competitive economy in the G7.

We offer a plan to build Canada into an energy superpower while reducing emissions and fighting climate change. That is a test the Conservatives failed to meet during the last election and a test this motion fails to meet. It would do nothing to advance Canada's interests and fails to acknowledge the fact that Canada is in a trade war. For these reasons and more, I do not believe I will be supporting this motion, which seems unserious.

• (1140)

Clifford Small (Central Newfoundland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I heard the parliamentary secretary for natural resources talk about how the Liberals want to make Canada a natural resources superpower. I wonder if he knows that Newfoundland and Labrador's oil and gas is already at tidewater? The Bay du Nord project is going to be the very last project in Newfoundland and Labrador's offshore, by the looks of it, because it will put us up against the emissions cap.

Just a few weeks ago, Energy Fermeuse announced a \$14-billion or \$15-billion project to liquefy natural gas. I wonder how that could happen if we are going to be up against our emissions cap. Was that announcement by Energy Fermeuse just election fodder for the provincial Liberals, or will the government lift the cap?

Corey Hogan: Mr. Speaker, the member opposite underestimates the ingenuity of our oil and gas sector. Certainly, we have seen that it has done an exceptionally good job of reducing emissions intensity over the years. That said, there is more than one way to skin a cat, and I think this is a pragmatic government that is keen to talk to partners about how we can best meet our global climate ambitions while still developing the strongest economy in the G7.

[Translation]

Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Mr. Speaker, despite all the Liberals' promises and good intentions, pretty much all experts agree that Canada is not meeting its greenhouse gas reduction targets.

Year after year, the commissioner of the environment and sustainable development keeps challenging the government's action on climate change and confirming that it is failing. Year after year, the conclusion is the same. We are witnessing a climate failure. What does my colleague have to say about that?

[English]

Corey Hogan: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned in my remarks, oil and gas production in Canada is up 34% in the last 10 years. As well, emissions went down 6.5%. Therefore, we have found that it is possible to decouple these two. To create a conversation as though there is a conflict inherent in these is not accurate. Certainly, we can all agree that we are in a very different world and a very different situation than we were recently with this ongoing trade war with the United States, so it will certainly require us to look at things a bit differently going forward, but our climate ambition has not changed.

Business of Supply

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the approach of the Prime Minister on energy issues is much the same as the approach of Justin Trudeau, which was to feign interest in energy development and, at the same time, pile on barriers to make it effectively very difficult, if not impossible, for projects to move forward.

The member asked what our plan would be. When Conservatives were in government, we had major pipelines move forward, and we had a fifth, the northern gateway project, approved. The government passed Bill C-48, which was designed to kill that project. It piled additional regulations never seen before on any project on the energy east pipeline, which were designed to prevent that project from going forward. Then it acted surprised when the private sector pulled back in response to the additional burden it imposed.

Is this not just more of the same Liberal approach to energy, which is to feign interest but pile on things, such as a production cap, that make it nearly impossible to move forward?

Corey Hogan: Mr. Speaker, I am so glad to have the opportunity to talk about northern gateway, which I noted came up in the opposition House leader's remarks.

The fact of the matter is that that was a project that was rejected by the courts for failing to meet environmental and consultation standards. As a result, that pipeline was declined.

Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, the Trudeau Liberals, who were very much the same as these Liberals, passed Bill C-48, which was explicitly designed to block pipelines from going to northern B.C.

Would the member have supported Bill C-48 had he been in the House at that time?

• (1145)

Corey Hogan: Mr. Speaker, yes, I think so.

[*Translation*]

Claude Guay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge that we are gathered on the traditional, unceded territory of the Algonquin Anishinabe people. May we be guided by the wisdom of the indigenous peoples, especially their elders, who have cared for these lands for millennia.

Canada is at a critical moment that is marked by global uncertainty, economic transformation and an urgent need for climate action. The choices we make will have repercussions far beyond our borders and our lifetimes. They will determine whether we succeed in keeping up with the demands of a changing world or fall behind in a race that we cannot afford to lose.

Our energy sector has long been a pillar of Canadian prosperity. It fuels our homes, fuels our industries and supports hundreds of thousands of workers from coast to coast. Today, the sector has to generate growth and confidence: the confidence of workers, investors and the entire world in Canada's ability to provide safe, reliable, affordable energy in a clean, responsible, resilient way.

A big part of that is clean technology. It enables us to strike a balance between economic ambition and environmental responsibility. That is how we are going to get to net zero by 2050 in a way

that supports growth. It is also how we are building an energy future that is both sovereign and sustainable. Clean tech is already transforming the oil and gas sector across Canada. It allows producers to reduce their emissions while producing more competitive oil and gas. It makes operations more efficient, transparent and competitive in a world that is increasingly embracing low-carbon solutions.

In Alberta, Enhance Energy is developing the Origins carbon storage hub. Supported by \$5 million in federal funding, this project will permanently store emissions from multiple industrial sources, including oil and gas activities, and could eventually store up to 20 million tonnes of CO₂ per year. That is like taking 3.5 million cars off the road every year. This is not just a climate solution; it is a model for industrial-scale decarbonization.

Occam's Technologies, a start-up based in Nisku, is tackling one area of the sector that is the most difficult to decarbonize: diesel engines in oil operations. With \$2 million in federal support, its Direct Oxyfire Carbon Capture system is designed to capture more than 90% of CO₂ emissions from diesel engines. This is the kind of ingenuity that turns a challenge into a technological opportunity.

However, carbon capture is only part of the solution. Canada's clean tech ecosystem is vast and growing. Electrification is replacing diesel equipment with electric motors, reducing direct emissions and paving the way for the integration of renewable energy. Predictive analytics and artificial intelligence are being used to optimize drilling and refining, reduce energy waste and help companies achieve emissions reductions.

Methane detection and mitigation technologies, supported by the federally funded Methane Centre of Excellence, are helping producers find and eliminate fugitive emissions that are far more potent than CO₂. These innovations are not theoretical. They are being implemented right now. They are reducing emissions right now. They are positioning Canada today as a global leader in responsible energy production.

These results did not happen by accident. They were the outcome of strategic and deliberate investments. Under the decarbonization incentive program, the federal government invested \$150 million in 38 clean tech projects in Canadian industrial sectors. These projects include advanced carbon management systems, electric boilers and biomass deployment projects. All of them aim to cut emissions in sectors where reducing emissions is difficult, like the oil and gas sector.

• (1150)

This is not just climate policy; it is industrial policy. It is about building the infrastructure needed to create an economy that will excel in the future, an economy that is resilient to global shocks, responsive to market demands and rooted in Canadian innovation.

Canada's major energy producers are not just sitting back and waiting. The Pathways Alliance, a coalition of the six largest oil sands companies, is proposing a \$16.5-billion carbon capture and storage network in Alberta. This project would capture CO₂ from more than 20 facilities and transport it 400 kilometres away to a storage facility in the Cold Lake area, allowing between 10 million and 12 million tonnes of emissions to be stored every year. It is considered one of the most ambitious decarbonization efforts in the world.

The world is hungry for clean energy, and Canada is uniquely positioned to supply it. Its LNG exports, including those from the LNG Canada project in Kitimat, are among the cleanest in the world, with emissions well below global averages. As phase two of LNG Canada moves forward with federal support, we are opening doors in Asia, Europe and beyond.

Clean tech is what makes all of this possible. It enables us to meet the demands of our global partners, uphold the new carbon standards and attract investments from markets concerned with environmental, social and governance criteria. In short, it transforms emissions reductions into economic opportunities. These opportunities are not limited to large producers. Across Canada, small and medium-sized businesses are developing clean tech solutions that are being exported around the world. From fuel and hydrogen systems in British Columbia to biofuel innovations in Saskatchewan, Canadian companies are proving that climate action and economic growth are not mutually exclusive, but mutually reinforcing.

We are talking about people. We are talking about workers in Fort McMurray, engineers in Calgary and indigenous communities that are shaping the energy future on their land. We are talking about young Canadians who want climate action to go hand in hand with economic opportunities. Clean tech enables us to balance these interests. That is how we are building one strong, sustainable and sovereign Canadian economy. Let us be clear about what is at stake. The world and the markets are changing, and if we do not lead the way, then we will be left behind.

However, we are focusing on innovation, investing in clean tech and supporting industry leaders. Now is not the time to hesitate. Now is the time to act. Together, let us choose to lead by example, to invest and to build a cleaner, smarter and more competitive energy future. Let us move forward together.

[English]

Clifford Small (Central Newfoundland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I heard my colleague mention that it is time to act and that it is time to move forward. The really fast way to move forward is to start developing Newfoundland and Labrador's offshore oil and gas, which is already at tidewater and requires no pipelines. Of course, the emissions cap has us at a point of being about to develop our last project, which is Bay du Nord.

Business of Supply

For companies such as Fermeuse Energy, which just announced a \$15-billion LNG project, how can projects like that go ahead? Will Newfoundland and Labrador's natural gas be stranded under the ground and under the sea because of this emissions cap, or does the government intend to lift the cap so that projects such as Fermeuse Energy can go ahead and liquefy natural gas?

Claude Guay: Mr. Speaker, our government is making Canada an energy superpower in clean and conventional energy. This includes increasing our export of Canadian LNG, with the lowest carbon footprint in the world, to allies who are asking for more of our energy and who share our values, not just our borders. We will advance LNG projects while protecting the environment and respecting indigenous rights. We know demand will continue to exist, and Canada is the best, cleanest supplier that will meet that demand.

• (1155)

[Translation]

Marie-Hélène Gaudreau (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ): Mr. Speaker, how can Canada possibly meet its 2030 greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets? That would require 40 megatonnes a year in reductions by 2030, starting now.

Canada has committed to reducing them by 40% to 45%. I will now quote our analyst at the Canadian Climate Institute, Ross Linden-Fraser, who said, "We saw zero megatonnes of reductions in 2024, and we are seeing fewer climate policies on the table today". Could my colleague explain what we are going through in 2025?

Claude Guay: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her question, which gives me a chance to talk about the progress that has been made.

For the first time in Canadian history, emissions are going down, while our economy continues to grow. Emissions are down 9%, which is the equivalent of taking over 19 million vehicles off the road. Canada's emissions are now 41% lower than they would have been under Pierre Poilievre's do-nothing plan.

Canada's climate plan is designed with our economy and trade realities in mind. It builds on our strengths in clean energy, critical minerals and innovation.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Before moving on to the next question, I would like to remind the hon. member that he cannot name other members in the House.

The hon. member for Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong.

*Business of Supply**[English]*

Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I wondered if the member opposite is concerned that, after all this talk about how they are going to “build, build, build”, the current emissions cap, which is really a production cap, is actually contrary to the plan to build.

Claude Guay: Mr. Speaker, we are retooling Canada's economy by advancing nation-building projects that will make it stronger and more competitive. This means shortening project reviews to two years and removing duplication while maintaining environmental standards and respecting indigenous rights.

[Translation]

Ginette Lavack (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indigenous Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleague to tell us more about his thoughts on increased investment in clean technologies or carbon capture and whether, in his opinion, this can play a more significant role.

Claude Guay: Mr. Speaker, those are both tremendous opportunities. We want to be a world leader in carbon capture, a sector that offers numerous opportunities for innovative companies across Canada.

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it hardly makes sense that we should be having a debate and an opposition day today on eliminating an oil and gas emissions cap when no such cap even exists. In fact, the only thing on the table are draft regulations to cap emissions in the oil and gas sector, a sector that is not only growing, but that ranks number one as the worst polluter in the country. There is no cap right now because the Liberals failed to pass regulations, even though they were in power for 10 years and even though, as I would remind members, the government can make regulations whenever it wants. Instead, the government dragged its feet, delayed and wavered, and because of that, no cap exists today.

Why is a cap needed? As I mentioned before, the greenhouse gas emissions generated by the oil and gas sector, the worst polluter of them all, are a major problem in Canada. The sector is growing quickly because the Liberals encouraged the expansion of oil sands production in different ways, starting with their \$34-billion Canadian investment in the construction of the Trans Mountain oil sands pipeline. Obviously, increased transportation and export capacity means increased oil sands production.

Between 1990 and 2022, greenhouse gas emissions from the oil and gas sector, the production of oil and gas, increased by 83%. I repeat, 83% since 1990. Again, if we are serious about fighting climate change, we need to lower emissions, not increase them. Yes, emissions have gone up. Yes, the government bought an oil sands pipeline. Yes, the government invested money in addition to Trans Mountain. In 2024, it allocated \$28.5 billion in funding for fossil fuels. I repeat, \$28.5 billion in 2024 alone was put on the table by the Liberals for the oil and gas sector. If we go back further, we quickly get to \$75 billion.

Their budget earmarks \$81 billion in potential funding for the oil and gas sector, including \$5.7 billion for carbon capture and storage. They love this technology, but it is highly problematic because it does not work very well, it requires a tremendous amount of pub-

lic money and creates a loophole that allows oil companies to increase production and do exactly what the government is doing, namely claim that their oil will be green oil. That is the biggest joke of the year, in my opinion.

Canada's oil and gas industry has greatly expanded. The oil sands alone produce more greenhouse gas emissions than every economic sector in Quebec combined. While Quebec is making an effort to reduce emissions—not quickly enough, I agree—Alberta and Saskatchewan are increasing their emissions without any constraints.

Today, our Conservative friends are asking us to repeal an emissions cap that does not exist. What is going to happen in this country if a province like Quebec is making an effort to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions, but the other provinces are not doing their part? It will become completely impossible to meet our greenhouse gas reduction targets. That is why, last week, the Canadian Climate Institute published a report clearly indicating for the first time that, according to its experts, it will be impossible to meet the country's greenhouse gas reduction targets for 2030. The main reason is that the emissions from the oil and gas industry are not under control but are increasing. The government should take no pride in the fact that greenhouse gas emissions dropped by 0.1% in one year. Yes, I said 0.1%. These emissions should be dropping dramatically.

● (1200)

If this government were serious about its own greenhouse gas reduction targets, if it were serious about the Paris Agreement and what science requires, and if it were serious about the people and families who are currently suffering the consequences of wildfires, it would be taking a different approach. We are seeing more frequent and more devastating wildfires because of climate change, which is directly related to oil and gas production. We are talking about human lives, health problems and the need for a serious response to the climate crisis. However, the Conservatives are spending yet another day trying to dismantle the only measure we have in the fight against climate change, which, by the way, has not even been implemented yet.

It has gotten to the point where the Liberals across the way seem to be adopting exactly the same game plan as the Conservatives and the oil companies. The first thing the Liberals did when they came to power was scrap consumer carbon pricing. That will result in fewer greenhouse gas emissions reductions. Why did they do that? It is because the Conservatives spent years saying that it was not a good policy, even though economists were all very clear that we need to put a price on pollution and that it was an effective policy to send that message. This is a good policy because, if oil and gas companies are not paying, then everyone has to pay for the consequences of climate change.

The government's current proposal is extremely concerning. The Canadian Climate Institute has made it very clear that Canada is not on track to meet its targets and that it will miss its 2030 greenhouse gas reduction target. In response, the government is backtracking. It backtracked on carbon pricing.

It backtracked on the EV incentive program that it had promised to reinstate. It also told people not to buy electric vehicles, on the pretext that they should wait for the incentives to return. Everyone understands that. Who is going to buy an electric vehicle today when the government says to wait until the rebates are brought back? Consequently, almost no one is buying EVs anymore. It goes without saying that sales are falling and oil consumption continues. The government is going even further. It said that some car manufacturers in Canada had asked it not to force them to sell more electric vehicles. As a result, the government backtracked on the zero-emission law, which was supposed to force manufacturers to offer more electric vehicles for sale to the public. More electric vehicles means more choice and cheaper prices. The government backtracked on that, too.

Another thing we saw was a partnership between the Liberals and the Conservatives to push through Bill C-5 under a gag order. This bill focused on building pipelines, among other things. The official opposition actually muzzled itself by not asking the government any questions because it was happy with the bill. This stunt made it possible to roll out the red carpet for oil and gas companies, which asked pretty much for everything that was included in Bill C-5.

Bill C-5 is fundamentally undemocratic. Not only did this bill pass under a gag order thanks to an alliance between the Conservatives and the Liberals, but it also means that many projects could now escape the scrutiny of environmental assessment. Bill C-5 represents one of the biggest setbacks in environmental law in modern Canadian history. I am not the one saying this. That is the opinion of Ecojustice, a group of environmental law experts. The reason is that Bill C-5 amends 12 statutes, many of which were put in place to protect the environment, and now the government no longer has to comply with them. These include the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999, the Species at Risk Act and the Marine Mammal Regulations. We are talking about a whole range of laws and seven regulations that are being set aside, which is unprecedented.

Why is the government doing this? It is because some projects are bad, and the only way to move bad projects forward is to get rid of the laws that would prevent them from going ahead. The Bloc Québécois's position is clear. We support development, but not just any development and not done willy-nilly. Oil and gas development is incompatible with human health and with our greenhouse gas reduction targets. This is clearly not the kind of project we support.

• (1205)

If there are good projects, they should be carried out in a way that respects the environment and the environmental protections that have been put in place over the past few decades. However, that is not what the Liberals are proposing. They are proposing to take things even further, or in other words they are proposing to eliminate other environmental protections outside of Bill C-5.

Business of Supply

What we are seeing here, and we are seeing the same thing with zero-emission vehicles, is a new cabal among our Conservative friends. What are they doing? They are determined to listen to the oil and gas companies and the manufacturers that have been dragging their feet and to remove every constraint so as not to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, particularly in the transportation sector, the second largest sector. Obviously, the two are related. Oil production leads to oil consumption. That is obvious. They have an interest in doing that, unfortunately.

This is the type of vision and backtracking we are seeing from this government, which has been unable to defend its policies and regulations. Unfortunately, that is what we are also seeing from the official opposition party, which is not being constructive, not proposing anything to fight climate change, and only proposing to go backward and to respond to the agenda that the oil companies want to impose on this petro-state called Canada.

We see that there are things being done right in this country that are good for the environment. There are regulations that are good for the economy, for people's wallets and for people's health. However, none of these proposals are in the Conservatives' playbook, and so far we have not seen the government take any positive measures in this regard since it returned to office. All we have been seeing is the government backtracking on environment and climate change measures and doing nothing to make up for that. We have reason to be concerned.

We have reason to be concerned because we are talking about our children's future. We are talking about our future today, right now. When we see that cities like Montreal and Toronto are among the top 10, or even top five, most polluted cities because of forest fires, that people are closing their windows and that people in Montreal are being affected by the poor air quality even with their windows closed, that is a problem.

What are the Conservatives proposing in this regard? They are proposing fewer regulations and fewer restrictions on oil and gas companies. We are not hearing them say that the government should stop subsidizing oil and gas companies. It has been a long time since I have heard the Conservatives speak out on this issue.

The Liberal government had proposed a half measure in terms of eliminating subsidies to oil and gas companies. This half measure was supposed to be followed by a more ambitious and essential measure, which would have eliminated subsidies to oil and gas companies once and for all. However, we have not heard anything more about this other measure that was supposed to be implemented. This troubles us.

We know what is going on. The Conservatives are campaigning on behalf of oil and gas companies to get the government to back off its plan to implement an oil and gas emissions cap. We will hear them talk about this topic all day. No doubt we will hear them talk about it for the next few weeks as well.

Business of Supply

However, what we are asking is for the government to stand up for Canadians, not for the oil and gas companies, to stop listening to the Conservatives and co-operating with them, and to present a real and credible plan for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. This includes dealing with the most polluting sector, that is, the oil and gas sector.

The Liberal government had proposed regulations. Again, it could have adopted these regulations. However, the government is turning its back on its former environment minister, who proposed these regulations. Today, the government has made a 180-degree turn.

In fact, let me go back to those draft regulations that should have been adopted long ago. Even what they proposed was too limited in scope. The Bloc Québécois members were not pleased. Obviously, we reject the idea of forgoing a cap on oil and gas emissions, as the Conservatives are proposing. We would rather go even further than what the government proposed.

The government proposed watering down its climate action yet again for oil and gas companies. It proposed that the oil and gas sector not be required to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions as much as other sectors in Canada. It proposed that the oil and gas sector not contribute as much to meet our greenhouse gas reduction target. We have a target in Canada that the government is abandoning, and that concerns us a lot, but what the government proposed was to lower this target for the oil and gas sector.

Now, is the government going to backtrack even more and get rid of the target altogether because that is what the oil companies want? That is what we are afraid of. Worse still, when we look closely at the details of the draft regulations, we see possible offsets as well. Oil and gas companies could buy carbon credits, probably for things they would have done anyway.

● (1210)

It was completely insufficient in terms of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. However, the Conservatives' magic solution is to get rid of that insufficient measure. The same goes for the Liberals. Not only are they doing away with measures, but they are also ignoring the climate crisis. It no longer exists, simply because Mr. Trump is the President of the United States or simply because certain governments, such as the United States, are backing down. However, there are others who are able to move forward, to stand up and look children in the eye and tell them that yes, there are ways to fight climate change and grow the economy.

That is what we are asking of the House. We are asking it to take responsibility. We want to be able to go back to our ridings and look our constituents in the eye and tell them that we are taking our role seriously, that we are fighting climate change and that we are doing so by improving the cost of living, improving health and improving the overall quality of life.

I do not hear the Conservatives talking about the need to develop public transit. I do not see them tearing their hair out because \$5.3 billion has already been spent through the Canada public transit fund and not one penny went to Quebec.

I do not hear the Conservatives speaking up in the House to say that it is unacceptable that, during the election campaign, the government sent Canadians \$4-billion worth of cheques for a price on pollution that no longer existed and that Quebeckers had to cover \$800 million of that cost. Not a single Conservative or Liberal from Quebec complained that it was unacceptable for Quebeckers to have to pay \$800 million to send cheques to everyone across Canada except Quebeckers. That is the kind of constructive debate that we would like to have with the Conservatives. We do not want to take part in debates on lifting non-existent regulations in the oil and gas sector.

When we look at the health impacts, it is pretty clear that what is happening right now is not fiction. It is reality. Seniors in my riding are experiencing heat waves described as deadly. This means that people are dying. It means that people are ending up in the emergency room. It means that people with cardiovascular problems are facing a reality that is unlikely to get better. That is the reality. We also need to look at the cost of climate change. This includes health care costs, as well as human tragedies. This includes the record insurance costs incurred last year because of the climate crisis. According to the Insurance Bureau of Canada, these costs amounted to \$8.4 billion. That is just the beginning. On top of that, the current droughts are causing more and more stress for our farmers.

If everyone looked at every climate measure as just an expense and failed to consider the cost of the repercussions of climate change, then everyone would vote for the Conservative Party. The Liberals are going to sit down with the Conservatives and develop their game plan. They are already doing it. However, I can assure the House that the Bloc Québécois will stand up and demand that the government meet its 2030 greenhouse gas reduction target. Canada is a rich country because it developed with oil and gas, among other things.

Globally, that is no longer what is being developed. Instead, electric vehicles, solar energy, wind energy, energy efficiency, thermal energy storage and public transit are being developed. These projects have economic and environmental benefits.

Quebec has everything to gain from changing course. In Quebec, buying oil costs us more than \$10 billion every year. Instead of doing that, we could electrify our transportation through Hydro-Québec, a source of national pride. We could electrify heating systems in buildings and industries. We could electrify our SMEs instead of further developing oil and gas. Quebec said that it would not develop oil and gas. It was one of the first nations in the world to make that statement. Of all the places in the world, we are better placed than most to make this shift, this transition, but we are currently being held back by Canada, which only has an pro-oil agenda that is funded to the tune of billions of dollars.

The Liberals have not spoken out in favour of going ahead with the emissions cap, and we are concerned about that. What the Conservatives and Liberals are once again proposing today would mean backsliding in the industry that is contributing the most to climate change in Canada, the oil and gas industry. That is very worrisome.

• (1215)

[*English*]

Corey Hogan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I completely agree that the world is changing, markets are changing and climate action is essential. This is a big, multi-year change and it sets our goals. However, we are in the middle of a shock change with this trade war and more erratic world, and that does have to set our strategies and tactics. I believe we share the same environmental goals. I truly do.

I am wondering if the member could expand on other ways to tackle climate change, either in addition to or by replacing some of the actions that have been proposed.

[*Translation*]

Patrick Bonin: Mr. Speaker, I must reiterate my serious concern about the fact that the Liberals are not saying anything about what the Conservatives are proposing today. We can see them backtracking in a big way. No one on the other side of the House, on the Liberal side, has indicated that they are committed to capping emissions in the oil and gas industry.

Obviously, we could talk about other solutions. There are plenty. We are aware of them. There is the electrification of transportation, renewable energy, energy efficiency, public transportation, green building and sustainable industry. There are solutions out there. We could talk about them, but instead let us talk about how we need to stop backtracking, like the Liberals are currently doing on another key measure they had, which is the cap on emissions in the oil and gas industry. That is worrisome.

The Liberals should not be changing the subject. They should be talking about the real issues and looking at their track record, which is atrocious. The Liberals are backtracking after 10 years in office. They are taking the biggest step back we have ever—

• (1220)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): The member for Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrahk.

Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrahk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his speech and commend him for his decades of commitment to the environment. I welcome him to the Chamber. We would have preferred a Conservative MP, of course, but we obviously respect the will of Quebecers.

Before I get to my question, I just want to clarify two things about the carbon tax. We moved a motion during that debate to pay the money directly to Quebecers. The amendment was not accepted, which is part of the public debate, but we did move it.

Also regarding the carbon tax, my colleague said that experts around the world have said that it is the best way to combat climate change. I just want to tell him that he is not alone in saying that,

Business of Supply

because all the Liberal members spent 10 years saying that it was the best thing since sliced bread for fighting climate change. However, in the end, they got rid of it. When did they do that? They got rid of it before they were even re-elected. Most importantly, they did it Trump-style, with an executive order signed in front of applauding ministers, including the former minister of environment.

My question is as follows: Is the member listening to Quebecers?

Patrick Bonin: Mr. Speaker, on the subject of amendments, yes, we are listening to Quebecers. Yes, we said that the \$814 million that the Liberals stole to send cheques to all Canadians must be repaid to Quebecers. That is not what we heard from the Conservatives.

When it comes to fighting climate change, the vast majority of Quebecers want their government to do more, not less, as the Conservatives are proposing. Yes, we are listening to Quebecers. Quebecers are particularly active in the fight against climate change. Quebec has a government that has helped reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Unfortunately, the Conservatives are not proposing anything, and that is worrying. They have made no proposals. All the Conservatives are proposing are to set back the fight against climate change.

Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would describe the Conservatives' motion as kicking down an open door. They are proposing that Canada repeal a cap that does not exist. I would like my colleague to tell us a little more about this.

Earlier, a Liberal colleague said that greenhouse gas emissions are down 9%. Is that true? I have the impression that they are plateauing, that they are not falling enough.

Patrick Bonin: Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear that emissions in Canada are not falling. According to the latest inventory, emissions are stable. In some areas, including electricity generation, they are decreasing. In the oil and gas sector, emissions are increasing. There is no room for doubt. This is the science.

What is also clear is that this country cannot meet its greenhouse gas reduction targets unless serious steps are taken to cap and cut emissions in the oil and gas sector, which, by the way, which is heavily subsidized.

As a matter of fact, the sector is being subsidized in two ways. I would remind the House that \$28.5 billion in direct funding was provided for the oil and gas industry in 2024. However, that is not the only subsidy it is getting, because everyone is on the hook for the costs of climate change and its effects on health, not to mention costs related to insurance, taxes and health care. I would like to know the Conservatives' opinion on that.

*Business of Supply**[English]*

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after hearing the member's speech, I am very alarmed that the Bloc Québécois wants to take a position that increases the power of Ottawa. In British Columbia, we do not want the federal government to impose tanker bans on our coast. In fact, removing the tanker ban would allow Canada to fulfill its critical minerals strategy. It would empower first nations in the region, which are opposed to the tanker ban.

Why can the Bloc Québécois not understand British Columbia for a change and understand that we want to see the economic development that is going to drive Canada forward and give Quebec more money through equalization payments? Can they not respect our sovereignty for a change?

• (1225)

[Translation]

Patrick Bonin: Mr. Speaker, I would love to talk about sovereignty with our colleague. I would also love to send him a cheque for the costs of climate change, which are directly related to increased emissions in Alberta.

That being said, the Supreme Court was very clear. We are talking about capping greenhouse gas emissions in the oil and gas sector. Canada can and must do this, because Alberta is doing nothing. Emissions are increasing, and that is the main problem in Canada. Some people want to bury their heads in the sand and avoid the situation altogether. That is what Conservatives are doing.

However, we will not back down on our climate commitments. We know we need to do even more. That is what we want the government to do.

Marie-Hélène Gaudreau (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my colleague thinks it is time to put a cost on climate change. Everyone is trying to say that it is a need, that we need oil. Where are my 77 colleagues from Quebec when we know full well that it is in Quebec that we are going to succeed in maintaining, if not reducing, our greenhouse gas emissions? We have already proven it.

Does my colleague agree that we are going to have to provide numbers to try to get around this lobby campaign to protect their own local economy?

Patrick Bonin: Mr. Speaker, I would like my Conservative and Liberal colleagues to look more at the numbers and the science. There is an agreement called the Paris Agreement. Canada is a signatory to that agreement, which requires us to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 50% by 2030 compared to 2019 levels. That is the baseline year. That is what the science says.

People can pretend that it does not exist, but we see what is happening today. Families, refugees and thousands of Canadians had to leave their homes this summer because of forest fires. The same goes for the rising number of deadly floods, droughts and heat waves. They cost billions of dollars annually. No one talks about that in the House. They only talk about developing the oil and gas sector.

Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleague to speak about the fact that the Quebec government is probably preparing to withdraw from the carbon exchange.

Could my colleague comment on that?

Patrick Bonin: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to my hon. colleague, I have no idea where this information comes from. I have seen nothing to suggest Quebec would back away from the cap-and-trade system. On the contrary, according to the latest news, the Quebec government and all parties in Quebec are in favour of a cap-and-trade system. It is not perfect, but it allows us to work with California and the most progressive states to fight climate change. Quebec can be a world leader. It already is one compared to other Canadian provinces.

That is why we are concerned that the Conservatives want to remove all restrictions on oil and gas companies in Canada. If we do that, we will not be on a level playing field with the rest of the country. Quebec has nothing to gain from it.

[English]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal illusion is now on a collision course with reality. See, the Prime Minister ran an entire election campaign promising to be the opposite of who he was and to do the opposite of what he had been saying and writing and what the Liberal government had been doing for the prior 10 years. It was not just on the question of developing our resources; it was on questions of fiscal policy. He had obviously caused a massive inflation and housing crisis in the U.K. by printing nearly endless sums of money over there, and then he came back here promising that he would spend less, a promise he promptly broke.

The Prime Minister advised the then prime minister of this country, Justin Trudeau, to do likewise and then promised to do precisely the opposite. He argued not only that there should be a carbon tax, but that the tax should be raised even further, only to promise that he would get rid of it, a promise that he is already in the process of breaking. He campaigned around the world to defund the energy sector, convincing financial institutions to stop loaning and investing in Canadian energy, writing that he believed that “as much as half of oil reserves, proven reserves, need to stay in the ground if we're going to get to where we are.” He further said that it was a “sensible” decision to cancel the northern gateway pipeline, stating, “I think it's the right decision.”

Business of Supply

Those were his positions up until about two months before he launched his campaign for prime minister, at which point he suddenly reversed them and tried to plagiarize the positions of the Conservative Party. The problem with someone pretending to believe something he clearly does not just to get elected is that after the election is over, he reverts quickly to his original course. This is what we have seen. While there have been many illusions that the Prime Minister would change course, that he would approve projects, that he would build at unimaginable speeds, none of this has materialized in any form of reality. Here we are six months into the latest Liberal term, and there is not a single new project that was not already in the works and had been given the green light, and certainly not one that is under construction. Today, we have an opportunity to find out what the Liberals' real position is on the subject of a pipeline, because, yes, this motion is about our ability to ever build a pipeline.

Let us break it down. We all agree that Canada has the most resources in the world. We all agree, at least Liberals and Conservatives agree, that the only reason we cannot build pipelines to move those resources to tidewater is federal bureaucracy and federal laws.

One might ask how the Liberals could agree with that proposition. The answer is that they passed Bill C-5, the foundation of which is that we need to go around all the Liberal laws and bureaucracies in order to get things built. The law literally allows the Prime Minister, through the stroke of the pen, to go around all of the environmental and public safety laws and associated bureaucracies, which means that he believes those laws and bureaucracies are neither necessary to protect the environment, nor possible if we want to get anything done.

Therefore, we agree that laws and bureaucracy are the obstacle. Here is where we disagree. The Prime Minister's view is that to solve the problem of Liberal laws and Liberal bureaucracies, we need more Liberal laws and Liberal bureaucracies, which is to say he confuses the problem with the solution. We believe that if there are Liberal laws and bureaucracies roadblocking development, then get rid of those Liberal laws and bureaucracies. Put simply, get out of the way. Let investors pour the hundreds of billions of dollars of private investment into building the projects of the future, projects that will pay tax rather than take government handouts. Get out of the way. Grant fast permits so that our workers, our prodigious welders, pipefitters, industrial carpenters and labourers, can get busy earning six-figure paycheques so they can build our country and make us independent from the Americans. In other words, get out of the way.

• (1230)

I will split my time with the member for Edmonton West.

Liberals would retort that they could still get a pipeline built without removing all of the destructive laws and rules that are in place because their new powers would allow them to go around those laws and rules, but here is the problem: Even if the Prime Minister were to use the powers in Bill C-5 to lay out a path to build a pipe from, say, Hardisty, Alberta, the biggest tank farm in Canada, all the way to the Pacific to either Kitimat or Prince Rupert, no one would build that pipeline today because the govern-

ment bans the production of the oil going into it and the shipping of the oil coming out of it. It is another illusion. We see what the Prime Minister is setting us up for here. He wants to be able to say, "Geez, we would really love to build a pipeline, but there are no proponents. No one wants to build it. There is just not a market case for it. That's too bad."

I guess we can just move on to another money-losing corporate welfare project that will make the Prime Minister's friends fabulously wealthy and make other people poor, because no one wants to build a pipeline. I guess pipelines are just out of fashion. Forget that they are being built far and wide outside of Canada, including by Canadian companies. In Canada, they are not being built. Why is that? It turns out that nobody wants to build a pipeline when the government bans companies from producing the oil to put into it and from shipping what comes out of it. They ultimately have to get rid of the production cap that is preventing the oil from going in, and the shipping ban that is preventing the oil from coming out. These are two things that the current government has so far refused to do.

To put this into context, the production cap that the government has imposed, according to the Parliamentary Budget Officer, will cause over 54,000 job losses and blow a \$20-billion hole in Canada's GDP. It will also make it impossible for us to get our oil to any market other than the United States of America, making us ever more dependent on the U.S., which is exactly the opposite of what the Prime Minister promised. Here we have yet another Liberal bait and switch. The Prime Minister who ran on elbows up has been elbows down. Now he prevents us from shipping to overseas markets, making us even more reliant on the Americans. It is no wonder that President Trump said it would be a lot easier for him to deal with the Liberals. He was right. He knows that the Liberals want to continue to hand over our resources to the U.S. at enormous price discounts.

That is why Conservatives propose to get rid of the production cap. We are giving the Liberals an opportunity to vote here and now. If they vote to keep the production cap in place, it will be a signal that all of the flirtations the Prime Minister has done with the possibility of building pipelines were nothing but an illusion, a tragic and extremely costly illusion.

Business of Supply

Let us put the illusions behind us and get to the real deal. Here is what it is: We need to pass a Canadian sovereignty act that would get rid of the production cap, repeal the anti-pipeline law Bill C-69, legalize shipping oil off the northwest British Columbia coast and axe the entire carbon tax, the industrial carbon tax, the fuel standard and all of the taxes that make our energy uncompetitive. We need to replace it with a law that would allow us to approve major projects in just six months and axe the capital gains tax for any business owner or person who reinvests their money in Canada. This would be rocket fuel for our economy. That is what we need. This is a plan for stronger take-home pay with a more powerful dollar that would buy food, fuel and homes at a more affordable price for our people.

The goal in all of this is to make our people richer, to give them bigger and bolder opportunities and to make this, once again, a country that is strong and self-reliant, and that stands on its own two feet. This is a patriotic act. We call on the government to adopt it. We will work with anyone from any party to get this done because, as always, we put Canada first.

• (1235)

Hon. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Leader of the Opposition's comments, but I do have a question for him.

How does he explain to energy workers that he spent 10 years in cabinet and did not build one single pipeline to the coastline, which cost Canadians millions of dollars? What does he have to say to those people today?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, the answer is that we did. We approved and completed four pipelines. Then we actually approved the northern gateway pipeline, which would have shipped half a million barrels of oil from Hardisty, Alberta, to the Pacific, before the Liberal government came along and vetoed and shut down that project.

I was curious about what the now Prime Minister thought of that decision, so I hauled him before the industry committee. I asked him if he agreed with Justin Trudeau's decision to kill the northern gateway pipeline. He said that it was a sensible decision and that he agreed with it. As a result of that decision by Justin Trudeau and the present-day Prime Minister, those half-million barrels have to go at a price discount to the Americans, making us weak. That is exactly what the Prime Minister has delivered.

• (1240)

[*Translation*]

Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Conservative leader for his speech.

I would like to know what he thinks is behind the increase in forest fires, floods, climate disasters and global warming. Does he believe that there is a climate emergency?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, this Liberal government is grossly mismanaging our forests.

Take, for example, the massive wildfire in Jasper, Alberta, where government officials, Conservative MPs and real environmentalists and conservationists warned the government to manage the forest and remove the dead wood to avoid a major wildfire. For years,

people wrote reports and letters, but the Liberal minister at the time did nothing. At the same time, she accused everyone who was against the carbon tax of being arsonists and trying set the world on fire. In reality, it was mismanagement. We need to manage our forests, we need to remove dead wood and, yes, we need the forestry industry to cut down trees to prevent major wildfires.

[*English*]

Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canada has the gift of abundant natural resources, yet for the last 10 years we have seen a government here in Ottawa telling this industry that it does not matter and that its jobs should not exist. While it has now started to change some of its tune and is admitting that government policies have caused this change, the reality is that we do not have proponents for pipelines because those laws still exist.

What solutions does the hon. member have for Canadians who are struggling right now? They are struggling to put food on their tables. They are struggling to find jobs in these industries because of policies by the Liberals.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is asking a very tough but fair question.

The member points out that the Prime Minister has changed his tune. He is plagiarizing Conservative words, but he is governing like Justin Trudeau or worse. In reality, he has not changed anything. That is the grand illusion. In reality, he has a “keep it in the ground” caucus that is rebelling against him. That is why the Liberals will never be able to get anything done over there. We need a Conservative government in order to do it.

How do we get more affordable food? One of the ways we do it, in addition to getting rid of the carbon taxes, the inflation tax and all the other Liberal taxes, is to have a stronger dollar. How do we get a stronger dollar? We grow our biggest export sector, oil and gas. That is right. If we are selling more oil and gas, we would have a stronger dollar, and everything that is priced globally would become more affordable in our domestic market. That dollar would go further and buy more. We would have more affordable food and fuel, and more affordable homes. That is all part of the Conservative plan for stronger take-home pay and a better life for our people.

Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat pleased and somewhat not pleased to be rising today on this opposition day motion. I have to wonder this: In what world do we have a country so blessed with natural resources, but members of Parliament must stand up to advocate for actually developing and selling the resources? Only in Canada do we have that.

Business of Supply

I want to quote the dearly departed Rex Murphy. He was talking about a very similar bill brought forward by the Liberals. It was Bill C-50, but this applies today. He offered up a title for it. He called it, "An Act to Inspire, Lubricate, and in all other manners Facilitate the Separation of Alberta from [Canada]". This is very much what this government seems hell-bent on doing. At a time when separatist leanings are on the rise in Alberta, along comes the Liberal government to try to make things worse.

President Reagan famously stated, "The nine most terrifying words in the English language are: I'm from the Government, and I'm here to help", but this government seems to be saying, "I am from the Liberal government and I am here to make things worse".

I want to start by listing all the countries in the world that have an oil and gas cap. There are none. Not a single country in the world has an oil and gas production cap or an emissions cap. Just to be sure, I asked ChatGPT if it could name any, and it came back saying it could not find credible evidence that any oil-producing country has in place a regulatory cap. There are effectively no other countries that have a cap on oil and gas production or emissions. I looked far and wide, and no one else does it, so why are the Liberals the only government in the world looking to have their country commit economic suicide? That is basically what an oil and gas cap is.

The Fraser Institute just came out with a report showing that, in the last five years, GDP growth per capita has been the worst since the Great Depression. That is, wealth creation has been the worst since the Great Depression in the last five years, which of course coincides with the five years the current Prime Minister was the economic adviser to Justin Trudeau. Here we have the economic adviser for the worst five-year performance of our economy and wealth creation since the Great Depression.

What is the Liberals' solution to all this? What is their solution to the issues of rising unemployment, catastrophic youth unemployment and a productivity crisis? It is to push the economy off the cliff altogether.

I want to quote some chilling numbers from the Conference Board of Canada on what would result from an oil and gas cap. We have previously heard the Parliamentary Budget Officer state some numbers, but this is from the Conference Board: "To illustrate the magnitude of these impacts, under the most likely scenario...the cumulative reduction in GDP over the 11-year forecast would be...\$597 billion in nominal terms between 2030 and 2040." That is almost a \$600-billion loss in GDP.

We have a productivity crisis, as mentioned. The most productive work in the country, with the most value added, is in our oil and gas industry, and the government is bent on destroying it. The report further says, "Real GDP in the oil and gas sector alone [will be] reduced by between \$14.2 and \$25.7 billion", which is "11...per cent from the baseline". It says that in total employment there will be a loss of "151,000 [jobs] in 2030, boosting the unemployment rate...despite a modest reduction in labour force participation rates." They are saying that even with fewer workers in our economy, unemployment will go up.

To put 151,000 jobs in context, there are about 25 million or 26 million people working in Canada out of a population of about 42 million. That would be the equivalent of every single person currently working in Burnaby being without a job. Every single person in Kitchener, Ontario, would be without a job, or in Longueuil or Windsor. It would be every single person. That is what the government would do.

Manufacturing would also take a hit and lose about 10,000 jobs by 2030. Who do Liberal members from Ontario think is buying all those Ford F-150s? It is construction workers and oil and gas workers in Alberta. Manufacturing would be wiped out.

● (1245)

Commercial services employment will drop by 52,000, and slackness in the labour market will contribute to a 1% reduction in nominal wages. We already have an issue right now with dropping wages. Apart from the government flooding the country with temporary foreign workers, blocking young people from being able to take jobs and suppressing wages, the Liberals want to come along and say, "Hey, I am here from the Liberal government; I am here to make things worse."

For Alberta, I hope I will see the Liberal member for Edmonton Centre or the member for Calgary Confederation rise in the House to speak to this motion, so we hear what they have to say. I would like to see them stand and stand up for Alberta in today's debate. This is what the Conference Board says is going to happen to Alberta: "real GDP in Alberta" will decline by "\$28.5 billion". We are looking at a \$6-billion deficit in Alberta this year, and the government wants to take another \$28 billion. That will be about a 7% drop in our GDP "relative to the baseline in 2030." Alberta's GDP will decline a further \$31 billion "per year between 2030 and 2040 in real [dollars]".

Thirty billion dollars is almost the total amount we spend on health care in the province right now, and the Liberal government wants to take that money away for no reason. I look forward to the members for Edmonton Centre and Calgary Confederation standing in the House and explaining why they are going to back the Liberal government in trying to shut down Alberta's economy.

The report continues, saying that employment, of course, will be shut. There will be 102,000 fewer jobs in Alberta, but the report goes on. There is some good news from the report on the Liberals' attempt to destroy our economy. Here is the great news; there is an upside: The "negative [economic] impacts" of the oil and gas production cap will be "mitigated slightly by lower interest rates and a depreciation of the Canadian dollar." Why? It is because we will have economic collapse.

Business of Supply

Last week, it was quite funny watching the Minister of Finance cheer that it was a great day for Canada because interest rates dropped. He does not seem to realize that interest rates are dropping because the economy is in the tank; it is collapsing. A lower economic output results in lower interest rates, but the finance minister is cheering it on. He does not seem to understand that low interest rates are a problem.

We are going to see lower interest rates because of lower economic activity and a continued depreciation of our dollar. The oil and gas industry is the main thing propping up our dollar right now. It is our largest export, and the Liberals want to crater it altogether.

A great comment from the past Liberal minister of energy, who is probably going off with his tail between his legs to a posting overseas, was that “oil [and gas] is probably peaking this year”. That was in 2024.

A year later, the International Energy Agency releases a report. The IEA is probably one of the most ideologically captured international organizations. It is no longer a friend to the oil and gas industry. It says that demand is going to increase to a record high this year, not a record drop. OPEC and Goldman Sachs say that we will have growing demand to 2050.

Canada is the third-largest surplus producer in the world. By surplus, I mean that there is a difference between what we produce and what we consume. Higher than us are Russia and Saudi Arabia. Shutting down our oil and gas does not mean the world reduces oil and gas consumption. It moves on to the next producers, Russia and Saudi Arabia. Probably, in the Kremlin's cafeteria right now, they are changing the employee of the month picture to show the Liberal caucus, because all it is going to do is drive jobs and money from Canada to put in the pockets of dictators.

We need to reverse that. We need to grow jobs and revenue in Canada, not send them away to foreign dictators.

• (1250)

Hon. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the problem with the member using ChatGPT is that the member is not the only one who has it. I asked the same question as he did. I asked what countries have regulatory emissions caps, to which the response was the European Union, the United Kingdom, South Korea, China, Canada and some states in the United States. Then I said, “I bet he asked a really specific question.” I asked what countries had oil and gas caps, and the reply was Canada and some of the United States.

The member is selectively choosing information. In reality, according to ChatGPT, his source, jurisdictions with economy-wide caps, which include oil and gas, are the EU, the United Kingdom, South Korea, China, Vietnam and Indonesia. In addition to that, other countries, such as China, Vietnam and Indonesia, are currently exploring them.

Would the member like to apologize for his misinformation?

Kelly McCauley: Mr. Speaker, we can certainly always count on the member for Kingston and the Islands to stand up and blabber mistruths in the House. If he actually looked at it, he would see the information says that no one has anything similar to what Canada is

proposing. It also says these are oil and gas-producing countries. There is not a single major oil and gas-producing country in this world that is wilfully planning economic suicide as the Liberal government is. The government should wake up and look at reality.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer says it will crater our economy. The Conference Board of Canada says it will crater our economy.

We are in a crisis right now. We have a looming deficit and a productivity and unemployment crisis. It is time for the Liberals to get on board, stop their virtue signalling and support Canada.

• (1255)

[*Translation*]

Marie-Hélène Gaudreau (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I feel like I have stepped decades back in time. It hardly even seems like 2025 anymore.

Nowadays, the topic of our discussion is outdated. The 21st century is supposed to be a time for a big energy transition. Here we are, however, still talking about pipelines, oil and relaxed regulations. Do members talk to their constituents on the weekend? The public is against those things.

Why is the Bloc Québécois the one saying that we are moving backwards and that we need to act now?

[*English*]

Kelly McCauley: Mr. Speaker, the reality is that oil and gas demand is going to continue to rise for the foreseeable future. It will be sold to the world by an ethical, lower-emission country such as Canada; it will be filled in by a higher-emission oil producer from Russia, putting money toward dictators promoting war; or it will go to a country like Saudi Arabia that has higher flaring than Canada.

Perhaps in 20 or 30 years, when oil production lowers a bit, it might be a proper conversation, but for the foreseeable future, the world is going to need oil and gas. Canada should be the one to provide it, not dictators.

Tako Van Popta (Langley Township—Fraser Heights, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Edmonton West for a very enlightened speech on an ill-conceived Liberal idea that is going to ruin our oil and gas sector, the emissions production cap.

I have a question about another ill-conceived Liberal idea, and that is the north coast tanker ban. This is what the CEO of the National Coalition of Chiefs says, talking about the tanker ban: “No proponent is going to look at investing in a pipeline to the north coast with that kind of legislation in place”.

Business of Supply

I wonder if my colleague could comment on what a productive oil and gas sector could do for indigenous reconciliation in British Columbia and throughout Canada.

Kelly McCauley: Mr. Speaker, that is an excellent question. The oil and gas industry is probably the largest private employer of indigenous people in Canada, the largest wealth creator for first nations. We need economic reconciliation with first nations to build up jobs and prosperity. We need economic reconciliation, not just the virtue signalling about reconciliation that the Liberals offer.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise and speak to a very important issue. Being from the Prairies, having grown up or lived in all three of our prairie provinces, I understand the importance of our commodities, such as oil, and their potential. I am actually fairly excited about the future. I look forward to seeing how Canada will continue to evolve to be an energy superpower.

That is something we hear a lot of coming from the Prime Minister of Canada today. I believe he truly understands the needs of western Canada and the desire of people living in the Prairies and beyond; we want to see our commodities and energy being developed in an environmentally responsible fashion.

It has been interesting to follow this debate over the years. My colleague, the deputy House leader, put a question to the leader of the Conservative Party, challenging him to say what pipeline he actually built. We can remember that the current leader of the Conservative Party sat in the Stephen Harper cabinet. Reflecting on the Harper days, we can see that they were unable to build an inch of pipeline that was direct to coastal waters. As much as the Conservatives like to jump up and down, saying all these wonderful words about the development and promotion of our energy, I question the degree to which they were actually effective at doing so in the past.

The most recent generational pipeline to coastal waters, if I can put it that way, was in fact the Trans Mountain pipeline. I remind members opposite that this was not a Stephen Harper initiative, but a Justin Trudeau initiative. The Conservatives cannot take credit for that.

Being from the Prairies, I understand that in Manitoba, my home province, hydro development is the best energy source we have, which we are promoting. We still have oil and so forth, but there is no doubt that it is about hydro development. We have other resources there that we want to see being utilized in one fashion or another.

I lived in Saskatchewan. When I think of Saskatchewan, it is in terms of everything from potash to oil, copper and so much more.

When I was serving in the military, I was actually posted in Edmonton. I think of Strathcona, the oil sands and the opportunities there.

We can talk about LNG out in British Columbia.

We can talk about nuclear in the province of Ontario. Many of my Ontario colleagues talk a great deal about that.

We can talk about Atlantic Canada and how, in particular, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland and Labrador are looking at offshore wind.

Do members remember the Atlantic accords, in which two provinces worked with Ottawa to have mirror legislation that would ultimately advance green energy? I recall it for the simple reason that not only was it good for their respective economies, but the federal government was working with provincial governments on an idea and legislation that was going to have a seriously positive impact on renewable energy in Atlantic Canada. I was shocked to see Conservative members of Parliament vote against it, as many of my Atlantic colleagues were.

I am hopeful about the way our new Prime Minister talks about making Canada an energy superpower, as opposed to taking the negative side of things, as the Conservatives have continuously done over the years. They have actually ramped that up. We have a Prime Minister who is going out to make a special extra effort for our Prairies, yet I have seen prairie MPs standing up to criticize the approach he has brought forward.

● (1300)

Whether it is discussions in meetings with the Prime Minister and other ministers in Calgary and Edmonton or our national caucus going to Edmonton and reaching out, we want to better understand the needs not only of Albertans but of all Canadians so that we can get this right.

Five or six months ago, we had a national election. The Prime Minister made it very clear that we want to build one Canadian economy as a way to have more independence as a nation and be more sovereign, in good part because of what we are witnessing south of the border. One of the very first initiatives we brought forward was legislation to build major projects in Canada. The Prime Minister met and had discussions with premiers of all political stripes, with territorial leaders and indigenous community members, to talk about identifying projects together and getting behind some projects that will ultimately help advance Canada's one economy. That was the big push. What we saw was a great sense of cooperation, and that is what we need to see.

However, it is not only government that needs to play the role; we have to look for other stakeholders. When we think of the big projects that are out there, we must think of the investments. For the first five projects, if memory serves me correctly, it is around 60 billion dollars' worth of investment. For those five projects, there was a consensus; different levels of government came together to say this is what we need as a nation, to build these projects.

Business of Supply

We brought in the legislation in a very short time frame. Earlier, we were criticized by the Bloc because we brought in time allocation on it, but believe me, had we not brought in time allocation on it, and not gotten some support from the Conservatives, that legislation never would have passed. The economy matters. The Prime Minister wants to see action. That is why we had to bring in time allocation on that legislation, so that we could get those projects on the table. They are substantial projects. We know the private sector has money and is prepared to invest.

I was talking with the Minister of Agriculture a couple of hours ago. He was telling me about Imperial Oil and what it, as a private company, is doing. I printed off a few things I was able to pick up from the Internet about what Imperial Oil is doing. This year, over the summer, it completed a \$720-million Strathcona renewable diesel facility. That is an incredible project. It is Canada's largest renewable diesel facility. It will produce somewhere in the neighbourhood of a billion litres of fuel. That is virtually on an annual basis. It is converting biofuel feedstock-type stuff, like canola as an example. It is investing in carbon capture and storage. It is investing \$16.5 billion as part of a consortium of oil sands companies.

● (1305)

This year, Imperial Oil donated a \$37-million research lab facility to the Southern Alberta Institute of Technology in Calgary, establishing the Imperial Energy Innovation Centre. This is the largest corporate gift ever to an Alberta post-secondary institution, and it aims to advance energy research. Further, the company's Cold Lake operation is piloting next-generation solvent technologies to improve production and reduce emissions. This is one corporation, albeit a very important corporation, that is contributing to the larger picture. As Imperial Oil makes these types of investments, it is looking for certain types of returns. It is trying to please its board and its investors.

I can say that the Prime Minister and the entire Liberal caucus see Canadians as our board members, and we are committed to working hard to deliver for our board members. That is what those five major projects are all about in terms of Bill C-5. I will go through those projects. There will be another coming out just before the Grey Cup game, or in and around that time. I will expand on that because I have some things I would like to see as part of the grander national plan.

I have heard many Conservatives stand in the chamber and talk about LNG and how important LNG is to the nation. The first project listed was the expansion of LNG. We are looking at doubling Canada's production of LNG. Canada's LNG is world-class liquefied gas that is going to make a difference and make our environment, in the long run, that much better. Again, we are talking about billions of dollars' worth of investment.

In that particular project that the Prime Minister has highlighted, indigenous people are directly involved, the province is directly involved, and obviously, Ottawa is directly involved, as well as many other different stakeholders. Many jobs will be created. A natural resource here in Canada will be utilized around the world because we have a system in place through the passage of Bill C-5, which was a priority piece of legislation from the Prime Minister, to ensure that it actually happens.

We have even established an office, which happens to be located in Calgary. I see that as a positive thing. When we think of all the national projects we are talking about, where is that head office going to be? It will be in Calgary, Alberta. I think it is the appropriate place. I could not think of a better place. I might have suggested Winnipeg, had I been asked, but that is for another debate. The bottom line is that the office is there to facilitate, ensure and support quick action so that we see that project get off the ground in a very tangible way and get finalized, doubling production. It is a very incredible project.

Let us talk about the Darlington nuclear project. When we talk about energy and the issue of emissions, my Ontario colleagues are very proactive on this particular file because they see the value of nuclear energy. The commitment that is being made here will have an impact around the world. Let me give members an example.

● (1310)

Last year, I happened to be in the Philippines as part of a government mission. I sat around the table with individuals from the nuclear industry in the Philippines, and they talked about how Canada might be able to contribute to the development of nuclear energy in the Philippines. There are all types of opportunities. I would encourage Doug Ford, along with the Prime Minister, to take a look at that. When we think of the nuclear industry and how we can export our expertise, we should not forget about the Philippines. There is a wonderful, special relationship between our two nations, and I think we can look at this as one industry in which we can have some back and forth. I was especially pleased to hear about that. Canada needs to be, and can be, a world leader when it comes to the development of nuclear energy, and this investment is going to ensure that Canada remains a world leader.

We are talking about energy. I also want to make reference to the third project, indirectly. The expansion of the Port of Montreal is another one of those major projects that is going to be incredible, and I look forward to seeing that materialize. Not only will the people in the area around the Port of Montreal benefit by it, but all Canadians will benefit, whether directly or indirectly, through that project.

Going back to the prairies, we can take a look at the fourth project to be reviewed. The copper mine project in Saskatchewan is a major project; again, we are going into the billions of dollars. We can then go back to the west coast, where we have the Red Chris mine, which is copper and other metals. Over there, with that mine and the others, the LNG and all those projects that I just listed off, we can run the total and it is \$60 billion, and that is just part one. We are going to be getting another announcement.

At this point, I would like to give my personal plug, and I join the member for Winnipeg South and other colleagues. The member for Winnipeg South, a good friend for several decades now, has been a very strong advocate, as has our minister in Manitoba, for the community of Churchill in developing the Churchill port. To me, that is one of Canada's hidden treasures. We need to look at the Port of Churchill. From a personal perspective, I very much want to see some sort of a potential pipeline going to that port. I want to see that port developed, and I know politicians at all levels of government want to see that developed. The Prime Minister is currently at least looking at that project through his established review and recommendation of projects, but we will have to wait and see.

The bottom line is that we have a Prime Minister who is committed to making Canada an energy superpower while at the same time being sensitive to the needs of our environment. He is a Prime Minister who is listening to what Canadians have been saying. We have a Liberal caucus determined to generate the jobs that are necessary not only for today but also for tomorrow. To not look at the energy needs of the world, our own energy needs and the exports of our many commodities would be irresponsible, which is why it is such a high priority for this government. Hopefully, unlike what the Conservatives did on the Atlantic accord, they will see the benefits of what we are talking about and get onside. I think it can make a great difference.

• (1315)

Anna Roberts (King—Vaughan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question, but I want first off to state something from the PBO. He estimates that oil and gas production caps will lower real gross domestic product in Canada by 0.39% by 2032, reducing nominal GDP by \$20.5 billion.

Here is the other part that concerns the people of Canada. The PBO estimates that achieving the legal upper bound will reduce economy-wide employment. The employment numbers, by 2032, in terms of full-time equivalency, will be down 54,400 jobs. How do we explain that to the Canadians who are relying on jobs in order to feed their family and support their home?

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, what I would suggest is that the member look at the actions that are currently being taken. The Prime Minister is working very closely with the premiers of Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Alberta and British Columbia, where many of the resources are. Doug Ford, on the nuclear file, is working with the federal government. There is a high sense of co-operation. All those politicians combined understand the importance of the environment and emissions, but they also understand what it is going to take in order to make Canada an energy superpower. I believe that is the end goal. That is what I am going to continue to advocate for.

• (1320)

[Translation]

Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Winnipeg North for his speech, in which he boasted about Canada's investments in liquefied natural gas in Canada.

He has also sung the praises of major projects of national interest and defended Bill C-5, going so far as to claim that it was drafted in

Business of Supply

collaboration with stakeholders from indigenous communities. Nearly all these communities, however, say that they were not consulted. He should have been in his riding in Winnipeg. I was there myself this summer, or near there, to attend the Assembly of First Nations' annual general assembly, where I heard them complain that they were not consulted on Bill C-5.

Last week, the Canadian Climate Institute told us that Canada was not going to meet its 2030 greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets. Is this government proud of that, or is it ashamed? I wonder.

[English]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, what I said is that the Prime Minister and, in essence, the leadership of the government have in fact been working with indigenous community leaders because we cannot advance energy projects without doing so. At the end of the day, it is a solemn commitment that has been made. If we take a look at the projects that have been approved, we will see a very strong indigenous influence, to the degree that it also includes some form of ownership.

In terms of Bill C-5, that is totally different from what I am referencing. I indicated that Bill C-5 was an important piece of legislation. It was with the support of the Conservative Party that we were able to get it passed through the House. Otherwise, we still would not have it passed. It was critical to have it passed in order for us to continue to have negotiations with indigenous leaders, premiers and others.

Tim Louis (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the King's Privy Council for Canada and Minister responsible for Canada-U.S. Trade, Intergovernmental Affairs and One Canadian Economy, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague talked about co-operation. I think we can all agree that Canada has the potential to be an energy superpower in the world, in both traditional and clean energy. The Major Projects Office is something he talked about. This is a place where stakeholders, projects, federal government, provincial and territorial governments and indigenous nations, anyone, can come together and work together to expedite projects.

Can the member expand on how important the Major Projects Office is going to be in this process?

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, just to amplify, from a Prairies perspective, as a member of Parliament, I was really pleased. I think it sends a very strong message to the Prairies that the office was, in fact, located in Calgary. Having said that, I believe that no matter where we are in Canada, any stakeholder will have access to that particular office to ensure that the projects being designated will in fact materialize.

The nuclear industry is an example I cited extensively in my comments. I believe in the nuclear industry. Canada plays a strong world leadership role in nuclear development, and this will further enhance it.

Business of Supply

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, it is really hard to know where to begin, with the number of narratives and fantasies that were included in the member's speech. It does seem to me, as a parenthetical comment, and I will put a question to my friend, that there is a desperate attempt here from the Liberal Party to try to steal votes from the Conservatives and abandon all the people who thought Liberals were once part of what we thought of as a progressive group of parties in this place.

I will ask the member this: Is he not aware of, or did he forget, when he accuses falsely the Leader of the Official Opposition of failing to do anything when he was in Harper's cabinet, Bill C-38, which repealed the Environmental Assessment Act, and that the Kinder Morgan pipeline was given a red carpet with accelerated speed and a long—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): I do have to give time for the member to respond.

The hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader has the floor.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate the concerns the leader of the Green Party would have. I believe we had a discussion once in the chamber, and the Green Party would not have any problem in terms of decommissioning pipelines where it could, at least that is what I can recall, and the member is nodding her head in the affirmative.

I believe that sustainable economic development that shows economic growth and the protection of the environment can take place. I know that the Prime Minister also believes that. I see that as a positive thing. Canada can be an energy superpower to the nth degree, and this is something I would like to think all members can get behind. We can still care about the environment and still achieve it.

• (1325)

Ellis Ross (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the current regulatory authorities have no idea how projects would get assessed through the Major Projects Office. They have no idea whether or not the standards and regulations that are formed inside the impact assessment authority, for example, are going to get implemented.

Is there a plan to implement the current environmental standards through the Major Projects Office, and if not, why not?

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, with all honesty, I could not provide the details the member might be looking for. I can appreciate that the general political will, which is that different levels of government have expressed the desire to see the projects sped up. I believe it is within the two-year time frame. I would expect the necessary regulatory work or any other work that is necessary would be done in order to be able to accommodate that.

[*Translation*]

Sébastien Lemire: Mr. Speaker, it is rare that we get to ask a follow-up question. I want to keep talking about Bill C-5, because it could have an impact on the greenhouse gas emissions cap. In that regard, indigenous people are stewards of the land, and we thank them for that.

Let us talk about the process. The Indian Act has been excluded from the laws that the committee, the group of close friends of the Privy Council, can decide whether or not to consider. With that in mind, does the member for Winnipeg North commend the work of the Bloc Québécois, which was able to remove the Indian Act from schedule 2 with the support of the Assembly of First Nations and the Conservatives? Was that the right thing to do? Should that have been included in this bill, or would that have led to very serious repercussions?

[*English*]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I am going to choose to answer within the framework of Bill C-5 and the relationship I have with indigenous community members, in particular the grand chief, Cindy Woodhouse. I have always had an open door policy in terms of listening to what they, whether it is a premier or a chief, would have to say in regard to developments. In particular nowadays because of the passage of Bill C-5, I think it needs to be amplified that much more.

I would like to emphasize that, when we talk about the major projects, indigenous concerns are in fact being seriously looked at and considered, and indigenous involvement is there and is very, very real.

Greg McLean (Calgary Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address one of the issues that have been dogging this country for years, a cap on emissions in our oil and gas industry. A cap on emissions is of course a cap on production. To pretend otherwise is to be talking out of two sides of one's mouth; that is something the government is becoming better and better at, but eventually it has to land on some real solutions.

The government talks about an energy superpower, which are old words that it chose from a previous government. Let us recognize what that means. An energy superpower is one whose economy contributes to energy around the world so that we actually influence security outcomes around the world and not just the price of oil and gas, although that is part of it.

We think about our supply to the world. We think about what we do for oil and gas around the world. We think about what we do for the environment. All these things are connected, but the most important thing in the unveiling world context right now is our energy supply as a strategic resource for the world as it faces a more and more conflict-based and more and more risky future. I analyze what we are talking about regarding getting an emissions cap cancelled, which is frankly a production cap on the oil and gas industry, by design or by consequence.

The government has, for the past 10 years, tried to punish the most productive part of the Canadian economy. When I say productive, I mean the most value per job and the highest export value of any industry in Canada. We have to get back to the point where we are adding some value to make sure we contribute to the world.

Before I proceed any further, I want to make sure the House understands that I am splitting my time today with my hon. colleague from Skeena—Bulkley Valley.

In order for us to contribute to the world from a security perspective, an energy perspective and an environmental perspective, we need to make sure the world is doing better with the outcomes we have. One of the consequences around the world is the economic and strategic messaging that we have in this country versus what we have to deliver to the world. The world is begging for energy. Let us think about how many countries in the last five years have said, "Please give us natural gas. We need LNG delivered here." Russia then started a war in Europe that caused the disruption of the energy industry all the way across Europe and, as a result, around the world.

Suddenly it became obvious to many countries, the United States in particular, that they could export their resources to Europe, which was desperate for those resources. Who else needs those resources? Everybody in the world is demanding clean resources because where the world goes for energy right now is increasingly toward coal. Most people who are not in Parliament do not realize this, but the consumption of coal around the world has increased significantly over the past 10 years, primarily because most developing nations want power more than they want something green. Members of the House know that coal is a higher-emitting energy source than natural gas or oil, so the fact that coal consumption is increasing around the world is an indication that the world is going toward the energy solutions that it can find first and foremost, because we cannot supply our liquefied natural gas.

We have liquefied natural gas in abundance here in Canada. We are the fifth-largest producer in the world and could be much higher if we actually took advantage of the opportunities of providing this much cleaner fuel to our allies, to our friends and to the developing nations around the world that do not have that option right now. That option would increase their standard of living and their environmental outcomes.

I beseech members to recognize that there is one atmosphere, and when we emit CO₂ around the world, we are emitting CO₂ for everybody around the world. Therefore any type of reduction that we can benefit from here in Canada with respect to the production of Canadian resources, to abate emissions around the world, is one we should take advantage of. We have ignored that for far too long because of prejudicial policies that have been put upon our oil and gas industry by the government for 10 years. We need to make sure they are repealed in order for us to contribute to the world, to contribute to solutions for the environment, to contribute to our economy and to contribute in the way we can to security around the world.

• (1330)

A lot goes on with liquefied natural gas, and I noted the Prime Minister's statement on the first five fast-tracks of his major projects office, which he announced from Calgary, the city I am from. He announced a major projects office, and then he announced the first five projects he is going to fast-track. One of those projects, of course, is LNG Canada, the only liquefied natural gas export facility built in Canada over the last 15 years. Why has this taken so long to do in Canada, when at the same time as we built one in Canada, the United States built 14 and is exporting natural gas around the world? As a result, higher-cost, higher CO₂-intensity natural gas is being distributed from the United States to allies in

Business of Supply

developing countries around the world, while we in Canada have sat on our hands because we are trying to limit our potential and limit our contribution to the world from an energy, environmental and security perspective. This has to change.

The first way to make that change is to undo the cap on emissions, because the cap on emissions is a cap on production. There is no other formula that equates to how we reduce emissions. However, let us talk about what we have succeeded at in emissions in Canada.

Many organizations have looked at the emissions reductions we have in our oil and gas industry across Canada. We had have a 32% reduction in the CO₂ associated with our oil sands production over the last 16 years in Alberta. That is a significant contribution to the emissions reductions in this country as a whole. In fact, it is the largest contribution. The tough part is the industry is actually measuring it.

We can take a look at the environment commissioner hearing in Canada. Canada's emissions reductions are largely determined by Environment Canada, which keeps changing the formula year by year, very opaquely. The environment commissioner has condemned Environment Canada for the opacity in not showing the real numbers to Canadians and in how it calculates the reductions in CO₂ emissions. The oil and gas industry in Canada knows those numbers and has done a great job in reducing the CO₂ impacts associated with oil and gas production in Canada.

Coal, as I said, has gone up. It has record production around the world. Let us also look at oil and what is happening in the oil markets right now. For years, we have been hearing that oil has peaked. Right away, I will say that this year will be another peak, and there will be another. The peak that should have happened 20 years ago, according to some of my colleagues on the other side in their reading of partial and prejudicial information, has not happened.

There will be over 102 million barrels a day of production this year. That tells us that we will continue to consume oil around the world. Why are we not contributing more to that? It is because we have a cap on production. What is the point of exporting energy if we cannot produce it? We have to make sure we produce energy with better environmental standards than anybody else around the world.

OPEC just increased its target for production by 137,000 barrels per day. That is a significant increase, and of course, people think it will have an impact on the price of oil around the world. They are probably right, but the fact of the matter is, OPEC would not be increasing oil production if it did not see that there is a demand for oil, which we do not seem to recognize in Canada.

Business of Supply

We have to get out of our own way to make this work for Canadians, work for the environment and work for our partners in security around the world. It is eminently important that we get this cap off. This cap on emissions is a cap on production.

Why bother with the LNG expansion the Prime Minister reported when we cannot do that without increasing our emissions? It is the cart before the horse. We have to make sure that we have the ability to produce and get products to the world market, which is demanding product from Canada. We must get clean, dependable, safe, environmentally friendly energy to the world so we can develop better, develop our country, develop the environment around the world and make sure we are a security partner for all our partners around the world. Step one is that we have to remove the emissions cap.

• (1335)

[*Translation*]

Madeleine Chenette (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages and to the Secretary of State (Sport), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when I hear that message, I realize that working and being a leader in clean and conventional energy is extremely important.

Why waste time talking about emissions caps when we can talk about how to innovate? We need to step up and show leadership in conventional and clean energy to improve the lives of our citizens, and that needs to happen across Canada.

Greg McLean: Mr. Speaker, it is interesting because clean energy is defined differently by different people. For the member on the other side of the House, I think it might mean solar and wind energy. However, I am not sure that they are as clean as the energy we have now.

Natural gas, LNG, is a source of clean energy for the world. It is currently the cleanest form of electricity generation in the world. It is important and necessary that we lead the way in exporting natural gas around the world.

Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I see a contradiction in what my colleague said. We have heard many people here say that oil can be decarbonized, that there could be green oil or that we could find a way to make oil less polluting. Now some people are saying that lowering the emissions cap means reducing production, so they are admitting that that it is not true. There is no such thing as green oil. Oil inevitably leads to increased greenhouse gas emissions.

I also want to know whether my colleague agrees that we need to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions if we want to reduce the number of climate disasters that are occurring.

• (1340)

Greg McLean: Mr. Speaker, we deal with greenhouse gases better here in Canada than they do in many other countries around the world. The situation is better here than in other countries, but we also need to produce energy for the whole world. Coal-fired energy in Asia is not as clean as what we produce here in Canada. Liquefied natural gas from Canada is very important to the world when it comes to reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

[*English*]

Marc Dalton (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the need for oil and gas is increasing worldwide, and if we do not meet that need, if we do not step up, it will be taken up by other countries and other producers. I wonder if the member could comment more on how reducing and holding back production negatively impacts services for Canadians, such as health care, transportation and infrastructure. How are we shooting ourselves with this policy?

Greg McLean: Mr. Speaker, I alluded to that a bit in my speech, but we have an industry that the government has held back for nine years. It has done its best to punish the Canadian economy by punishing the oil and gas industry. After nine years, it has found out that it has not worked. The rest of Canada is slavishly now deeper and deeper in debt, and we have to address that as quickly as possible.

The Liberals talk about the crises in housing and productivity. One crisis follows another. The fact of the matter is, the most productive industry we have in Canada by dollars per job is the energy industry. We have to make sure we are contributing to the world. By contributing to the world's needs, we are contributing to ourselves as well. The energy industry provides the most taxes for Canadians' benefits of any industry across this country. That is how we are going to benefit Canadians going forward.

[*Translation*]

Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of a climate crisis. While drought, floods and forest fires are on the rise, the Conservative Party is moving a motion to say that we should pollute even more.

Last week's Canadian Climate Institute report told us that we are not going to reach our greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets because of the oil and gas sector. What does my colleague have to say about that?

Greg McLean: Mr. Speaker, I am not familiar with the report my colleague is referring to, but I know that the greenhouse gases coming from Canadian natural gas are much cleaner than the coal that is currently being burned in China and the rest of Asia. It is very important to export Canada's natural gas around the world.

Business of Supply

[English]

Ellis Ross (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to be here on behalf of Skeena—Bulkley Valley. I have not had the chance to do this, so I would like to thank all the people of Skeena—Bulkley Valley, the EDA for all its work and all my supporters and volunteers. I would especially like to thank my family. I have been doing this kind of work for 20 years, as a councillor, chief councillor, an MLA and now an MP, and it takes away from family life. My wife is in Ottawa today. I got her to come and join us. It is quite the accomplishment to get our spouses to join us.

I would not say it is timely that we are talking about emissions and major projects in Canada. As I said, I have been doing this for 20 years. I have heard all the reasons from all the different members, and none of the reasons have changed for me, but for some reason, the Liberal government has woken up to listening to the people of Canada and what Canadians want.

Back in my region, in my province, Canadians and first nations have been asking for this for 20 years. If we think about the LNG projects in B.C., there were 18 major projects in 2018. All but three have left Canada with all the investment. One major project was \$40 billion, and the next one in Kitimat was \$30 billion, and the \$30-billion project left B.C. That is lost investment.

As a first nation community, we had to learn about environmental assessments, permitting and economics, but it never escaped us that our people needed a future outside of the Internet. Those who have not experienced poverty, exclusion or the Indian Act have no idea how important a job is to somebody who has never experienced one, let alone a group of people who want a better future. First nations leaders have gotten it from both ends. They have gotten opposition from a Liberal government that has not wanted to entertain oil and gas projects over the last 20 years or have gotten it from environmental groups that oppose them, yet the simple, fundamental underlying factor is how to address poverty and the violence of poverty. I have not heard an in-depth conversation in either this House or the provincial legislature about how bad that is.

We talk about crime, drugs and violent crime, and that is what first nations leaders have been trying to address. We have this new aha moment of listening to Canadians and first nations, but when the Liberals imposed the tanker ban, their treaty partner, the Nisga'a people, opposed it for the reasons I just outlined. Plus, they thought they had a partner in Canada to breathe life into the treaty. Lax Kw'alaams opposed it because it had not been fully consulted and thought the tanker ban was going to put a limit on the future of its people.

People only need go to Kitimat. If they want to talk about emissions, permits, environmental assessments and the quality of life, they should go to Kitimat Village. We have talked about these issues for the last 20 years, and it is a hard conversation given the opposition from political parties and environmental groups. A first nation has to talk not only about air impacts, which is what we are talking about today with the emissions cap being imposed, but about impacts to water and land. If anybody can talk about that, it is Kitimat Village, because it has had industrial development for 70 years.

One would think that a territory that has been so degraded by industrial development would say no to development. In fact, it is the opposite. It engaged to make the standards and regulations higher, and it did so to uplift not only its people, but all the other first nations along the pipeline route that were experiencing tanker traffic down channel and the non-native communities that surrounded it. As a judge once said, and I am paraphrasing, we are all in this together and none of us is going anywhere.

● (1345)

I am not sure if members are aware, but we do not have services on reserve. We do not have hospitals. A lot of us do not have water. We depend on non-native communities for services, so it only stands to reason that we would want to see our own communities and our non-native communities succeed, for those medical services, those highways and those schools.

I think this is a relevant conversation, given the nation-building conversation that we are currently having and the existential crisis that the United States has put us in. We have a lot of work to do, not only in emissions, but also in what we are leaving for future generations.

We are addressing affordability. We are trying to address that. We are trying to address housing, but I ask what is in it for the next generation, when we are exporting all our product, all our services and all our jobs to the United States. In B.C., they shut down the log industry. That means a number of mills all across B.C. closed down. Where did they go? They went to the United States.

These big corporations can come and go at their will. It does not matter to them. They have different interests in different countries, but the worker has to find a different employment income. The family has to think about whether their children will graduate from the school that they grew up going to. The municipality has to think about its tax base. Everybody else benefits because of bad Liberal policy.

We are talking about an oil and gas emissions cap, and somehow we are in a new era with a new Liberal government, but everybody in Canada has known for years that over 90% of oil and gas product goes to the United States at a discount. What does the United States do? It uses that product for domestic and export purposes. The United States is an energy superpower. The United States never thanks us for supplying it with a good-quality product at Kmart prices.

Business of Supply

Poland was smirking at us, almost laughing at us, regarding how we export our oil and gas to the United States. I do not know about anyone else, but when another country laughs at us because of our policies, our legislation and our regulations, I would say that would actually contribute to our conversation about nation building and emissions caps.

Germany came here for LNG because they are in a crisis of their own, given the war in Ukraine. What did we do? We said, “No, there is no business case for LNG, but we will sell you hydrogen.” That is what Germany left with.

The world still needs energy. It still needs and wants resources, and Canada is rich in energy and resources, but we have artificially restrained our exports, not only for the international market, but also for our own domestic needs.

There are a number of projects in the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act that propose using natural gas to produce electricity. They have been there for years in energy-deficient areas. Given that B.C. imports electricity from the United States, we should be looking at this seriously. The United States uses natural gas and coal to produce electricity, but with B.C. having a clean, green record, we import electricity.

We are not going to become an energy superpower if we put more limits, such as the industrial carbon tax, on Canadians, because they will trickle down to Canadians. We will not become an energy superpower if we put unreasonable limits on emissions. We have good, robust regulatory standards, but there has to be a balance of what is good for the average Canadian and first nations, what is good for our country, and what is good for the environment.

We have not had that conversation yet. I am hoping to have that here today.

• (1350)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I took a look at the motion that is before us today, and I think the priority for Canadians, even Conservative voters, is to see a higher sense of co-operation within the House. A part of that would be taking a look at what the government has been proposing through the new Prime Minister. These five major projects are critically important to the advancement of Canada's national economy. The LNG is a great example of that.

I am wondering if the member can provide his thoughts, specifically from an indigenous perspective, on why it is so important to do what we have done in incorporating indigenous ideas, thoughts and partnerships in these projects.

Ellis Ross: Mr. Speaker, I definitely can. We need to stop the politics with LNG because it provides benefits to aboriginals and non-aboriginals alike. It increases GDP.

I will say, there are no permits or authorizations needed by the federal government to approve phase two. It is all approved, and we just found that out today in committee. What is Canada fast-tracking? There is nothing else to approve.

• (1355)

[*Translation*]

Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleague to share his concerns about the future of the planet. We cannot keep developing oil and gas without worrying about the consequences.

Doing away with environmental laws and protection mechanisms will obviously have consequences. At some point, what is going to happen? Is there any real concern over this or is this simply a race to be the best at job creation?

Does the Conservative Party understand the urgency and consequences of this situation?

[*English*]

Ellis Ross: Mr. Speaker, yes, and I am not the only one who thinks that Canada already has the highest environmental standards in North America, if not the world.

As I have said for the last 10 years, we cannot have this conversation in isolation. We are not the biggest polluters in the world. China, Russia, the United States and emerging economies have no environmental standards. They have no emissions cap. They have no carbon tax.

Yes, let us keep doing what we are doing with environmental standards, but let us take a bigger lens and look at the rest of the world if we are going to look at the global situation.

John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his incredible speech. He is certainly advocating for his constituents and first nations across the country.

The Liberal government is showing it is much of the same as the previous Liberal government. We had some of our most important allies come to Canada and request access to Canadian LNG, like Germany, Japan, Italy and Greece. The Liberal government said we did not have a business case scenario, but now we see that Japan has signed an LNG contract with the United States for 20 years. It is worth billions of dollars.

What does my colleague think the economic benefit is to first nations in his constituency and across Canada? What would have been the financial benefit to first nations had Canada been able to sign those agreements instead of the United States?

Ellis Ross: Mr. Speaker, I invite members to Kitimat, and I will show them the benefits that have accrued not only for first nations members in my community, but also along the pipeline route and down channel.

One of the concerns we had, and one of the decisions we made when we started getting into real LNG development, was that we wanted to get away from the Indian Act. We wanted our people to build their own lives. We wanted to be independent. I am very proud to say we accomplished that. There are a number of first nations in our communities in B.C. that are on the same path.

The development that went to Alaska instead of B.C. would have contributed to first nations' health and safety, and it would have contributed to B.C. and Canada overall. We sure missed an opportunity.

Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my colleague's speech was enlightened. This weekend, I had the opportunity to go out to Fort McMurray 468 First Nation in my riding of Fort McMurray—Cold Lake. I got to see the fall fair. Part of the reason this large fall fair could be put on was the natural resource revenue the nation has because they have been partners in prosperity for generations in my region. It sounds like it is very similar to what the member has experienced in Kitimat Village.

Can the member explain why, specifically, caps on emissions and caps on production are so detrimental to indigenous communities in their growth?

Ellis Ross: Mr. Speaker, I recognize all the work that has been done by first nations all across Canada. It is very progressive, but it all comes down to what the benefit is to the people. My colleague from Alberta knows the benefits as well. There are a lot of first nations in Saskatchewan.

If we want to take a look at the real benefits, we can take a look at the status quo of first nations that do not have economic development. It is always the same saying, which is that there is nothing to do there and there are no jobs. An emissions cap would take away the future of first nations and Canadians in general.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

• (1400)

[English]

GENDER EQUALITY WEEK

Tim Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this Gender Equality Week, I rise not just to celebrate progress but also to challenge us to go further.

Despite women making up half our population, their voices are still too often dismissed or diminished, even in places of leadership like the House of Commons. Research shows that women are interrupted significantly more than men, and when they do speak their ideas are often only recognized when repeated by someone else. I have seen this happen to family, staff and colleagues, some of the strongest women I know. I will admit I have not noticed it enough, but once we notice something we can change it.

Men have a crucial role to play, so here is my call to action: Men must be the ally in the room. They must listen more and interrupt less, give credit where it is due and speak up when they see bias. Gender equality is not achieved by one group; it is everyone's responsibility. Let us commit to making this real together.

Statements by Members

[Translation]

AIRMEDIC TRAGEDY

Joël Godin (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on June 20, during a rescue mission in the North Shore, a tragic helicopter crash claimed the lives of three Airmedic crew members and their patient.

Among them was Olivier Blouin, a constituent of Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier who lived in Pont-Rouge. This respected and admired man is mourned by his partner, Rosalie Larivière, as well as his family members and colleagues. Olivier was known for his commitment, professionalism and generosity. He was dedicated and driven by one mission: to serve and rescue. Like his colleagues who also perished in the crash, he exemplified bravery and selflessness to the end.

The men and women who dedicate their lives to protecting and supporting the community are real heroes. Today, as we express our immense sorrow, we would also like to recognize their commitment and acknowledge the legacy they leave behind. I would like to offer my condolences to the family of the patient, Claire P. Tripp, and to the families of the crew members, Sébastien De Lutio, Sébastien Groulx and Olivier Blouin.

I want to thank them for their service. We will remember them.

* * *

[English]

GEORGETOWN BOYS

Kristina Tesser Derksen (Milton East—Halton Hills South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday we honoured Armenia Independence Day.

Today, I stand before the House representing the good people of Milton East—Halton Hills South to recall a pivotal moment in Canadian history: the arrival of the so-named Georgetown boys to my riding in the 1920s. They were a group of over 100 orphaned Armenian children rescued from the Armenian genocide and brought to Cedarvale Farm in Georgetown. Their story is often called “Canada's noble experiment”. At that time, admitting non-British orphans was unprecedented. As such, this effort was the first humanitarian resettlement of its kind in Canadian history, setting a precedent for Canadian compassion in guiding policy.

Statements by Members

On this day, I rise to honour not only the courage of those orphaned boys but also the values we declared then: that Canada can act as a force of hope in the world. Let us recommit ourselves to those values and ensure that the noble experiment begun in Georgetown a century ago continues in our policies, in every effort to welcome and in every act of compassion.

* * *

[Translation]

PROSTATE CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, September is Prostate Cancer Awareness Month. This disease affects more than 27,000 men each year in Canada.

Earlier this year, I was diagnosed with prostate cancer. Like many men, I did not expect it. It came as a shock, but thanks to early detection, an extraordinary medical team and the unwavering support of my family, I was able to undergo effective treatment. Now, I am in remission.

I consider myself extremely fortunate, but the reality is that too many men ignore the signs or avoid seeking medical advice out of embarrassment, fear or simple neglect. I would encourage all men to take note of this for their next doctor's appointment. I urge them to determine whether they should take the screening test that saves lives, that saved my life.

This month, let us think of those who are fighting and those we have lost, and above all, let us commit to talking openly about men's health.

* * *

THÉÂTRE TOUT TERRAIN

Natilien Joseph (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to draw the House's attention to the outstanding work of Théâtre Tout Terrain, a cultural force in my riding.

The Théâtre Tout Terrain travelling theatre sets itself apart from the rest with its free public performances and its efforts to weave art into the fabric of our daily surroundings and public spaces. In collaboration with Arrière Scène, it breaks down the walls of traditional performance halls to make theatre accessible to everyone across Montréal.

Théâtre Tout Terrain also takes a profoundly human approach that places the audience at the centre of the experience. The productions and workshops it offers at schools promote gathering, openness and francization. I want to give a big shout-out to the entire Théâtre Tout Terrain team for their invaluable contribution to Quebec culture.

* * *

• (1405)

[English]

FERTILITY RATES

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, a couple of years ago, an Angus Reid survey for Cardus asked families about the number of children they wanted. The Canadian women surveyed wanted, on average, 2.2 chil-

dren, coincidentally right around the replacement level. After that survey, the actual fertility rate in Canada hit an all-time low of 1.26 children, which means there is a gap between the desire and the outcome of almost one child per woman. For the first 15 years of this century, fertility rates in Canada held steady between about 1.5 and 1.6 births per woman but have dropped precipitously since 2015. The Angus Reid data confirms that people did not just become less interested in children after 2015. Financial concerns played a major role in their decision to have fewer children than desired.

It seems unsurprising that policies that put jobs and homes out of reach are forcing delayed family formation and leading to fewer kids. One of the many consequences of lower fertility rates is greater loneliness for seniors who do not have the same human contact with the shrinking next generation. A shifting population age distribution also makes social programs for the elderly harder to sustain.

All of us need to work together to rebuild an economy where it is easier for people to have kids.

* * *

SKILLED TRADES

Shannon Miedema (Halifax, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the contributions of Canada's skilled tradespeople, who build our homes, our infrastructure and our future. From ironworkers and welders to electricians and painters, along with all the apprentices starting their careers, tradespeople are the backbone of our economy.

Through our government's focus on major projects, we are creating more opportunities for Canadians to train, to work and to build lasting careers in the trades. Our government knows that investing in training is investing in Canadians' future. By investing in apprenticeships and training, we are ensuring young people can enter these professions and experienced workers can keep their skills sharp. These investments are not just strengthening our workforce. They are strengthening our communities and ensuring Canada remains competitive on the world stage.

Canada has always been a nation of builders. With the dedication of our unionized workforce, I am confident we will continue building a stronger and more prosperous future for all Canadians.

* * *

FOOD PRICES

Connie Cody (Cambridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I recently got an email from a senior in Cambridge. She told me about her trip to the grocery store. She paid over \$47 for a few basic items that would only last a few days. She was not asking for luxuries, just enough to eat and get by.

The Prime Minister promised to create the fastest-growing economy in the G7, but he delivered the fastest-shrinking one instead. There used to be a guarantee in Canada that if someone worked hard, saved up and got a good job, they would be all set. However, after 10 years of Liberal government, Canadians are worse off. According to Food Banks Canada, more than a quarter of all Canadians are facing food insecurity. The Prime Minister asked us to judge him on costs at the grocery store, and Canadians are. With every \$100 grocery bill, he gets a failing grade.

I have a message for the Prime Minister on behalf of the 5,000 people of Cambridge using a food bank and the thousands more going hungry every day: Stop punishing them with high taxes and high inflation.

When will the Prime Minister start giving Canadians full plates instead of empty promises?

* * *

[Translation]

YVES GINGRAS

Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski—La Matapédia, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to sincerely congratulate Yves Gingras, a professor of history and the sociology of knowledge at the Université du Québec à Montréal, who was awarded the 2024 Prix science et laïcité, or science and secularism award, in Paris at the 18th annual ceremony of the Comité Laïcité République. This award recognizes Professor Gingras' commitment to distinguishing between scientific knowledge and beliefs, as exemplified in his book *L'impossible dialogue. Sciences et religions*.

As the director of the Observatoire des sciences et des technologies, Yves Gingras embodies intellectual rigour and critical thinking. As a knight of the Ordre national du Québec and recipient of the prestigious Prix du Québec Léon-Gérin, he has been defending the separation of knowledge and beliefs for over 40 years. His efforts are vital for science, secularism and democracy. They remind us that science is universal and transcends borders.

On behalf of the Bloc Québécois, I offer him our most sincere congratulations.

* * *

[English]

ROSH HASHANAH

Ben Carr (Winnipeg South Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, some of my fondest childhood memories include Jewish holiday dinners around the table with relatives, laughing, eating traditional foods and sharing a sense of collective pride in knowing that we were honouring our ancestors and building a stronger community for the future. I can still hear my father's booming voice and see his contagious smile as he eagerly greeted family entering our home. Those gatherings meant as much to him as they do to me.

Sundown tonight will mark the beginning of Rosh Hashanah, the Jewish new year. Although there will be cherished moments together this evening for Jews across our country, the joy of a new year will be accompanied by fear and anxiety, worsened by the increasing anti-Semitism that has found an emboldened place in our coun-

Statements by Members

try. Despite the hate that they continue to face, Jews in Canada will, as we have for thousands of years, continue to persevere.

On the eve of this new year, I am proud to stand as a Jew in this chamber and wish the community a *Shana Tova*. May the upcoming year be filled with peace, joy and the prospect of a brighter future.

* * *

• (1410)

PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA

Cheryl Gallant (Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is a carnival barker. He promises we can win the prize while he rigs the game.

He promised the fastest-growing economy in the G7. Instead, he gave us a shrinking economy and the second-highest unemployment rate in the G7. He promised affordability but gave us higher food prices. He promised to get more homes built but gave us a phony housing announcement in front of fake homes. He promised that nation-building projects would be built at impossible speeds but has not issued a single permit. He promised elbows up but tucked in his tail and ran. He said we would have a deal by July 21, but all he has done is surrender on every issue.

If this were a school, he would get a failing grade. If this were a business, he would be fired. However, this is the Liberal Party, so he keeps the prize.

* * *

BUYING CANADIAN

Peter Fonseca (Mississauga East—Cooksville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, every time we purchase something made, grown or produced here at home, we are supporting our neighbours, strengthening our communities and investing in Canada's future. Here in Mississauga, we have so much to be proud of, from the chicken we serve our families and the chocolate bars we love to the planes that connect us to the world. Companies like Maple Lodge Farms, Magna and our aerospace innovators keep thousands of local people working.

Some sectors are being hit hard by tariffs and trade disruptions. That is why the Liberal government is stepping up to help, making sure that Canadian industries get the backing they need to stay competitive. Canada's government will be Canada's number one customer, with a clear commitment to supporting Canadian businesses.

Next time we shop for groceries, furniture or a vehicle, we can look for the maple leaf and choose Canadian. Together, we can protect jobs, grow our economy and keep Mississauga and Canada strong.

*Oral Questions***PUBLIC SAFETY**

Blaine Calkins (Ponoka—Didsbury, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in the Speech from the Throne, the so-called new Liberal government claimed it would tackle crime while protecting the rights of law-abiding gun owners. It was a staggering admission of failure by a government that saw illegal gun crimes skyrocket by 130%.

Since then, it has shown it is no different from the last Liberal government. Not only will it spend four times the money to harass legal gun owners than it will to harass criminals and gangs, but it has also doubled down on its promise to finish its gun grab within the year. In an astonishing turn of events, both the Prime Minister and the public safety minister have now said that their gun grab will be voluntary, but, in a leaked audio clip, the public safety minister was caught saying that Canadians would never get arrested if they did not turn in their now-prohibited guns.

Is the minister suggesting that gun owners follow gun laws the same way the last Liberal prime minister followed ethics laws? Do the Prime Minister and the public safety minister realize that it is a crime to counsel people to not follow the law?

* * *

[*Translation*]**GENDER EQUALITY WEEK**

Linda Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on this first day of Gender Equality Week we need to face reality: In Canada, one woman or girl is killed every 48 hours, most often by an intimate partner or a former spouse.

These femicides are not headlines. They are the most brutal symptom of a power imbalance and a misogyny which, far from disappearing, is making a big comeback, sometimes even unabashedly. We thought we had made irreversible progress but now the fact is we are losing ground. Gender equality begins with a fundamental right: the right to live without fear.

I want to pay tribute to the survivors, the frontline organizations, the shelters and all those who fight against gender-based violence. Faced with this resurgence of hatred, we must name, denounce, and act. Equality cannot be decreed: It must be defended, every day.

* * *

● (1415)

[*English*]**RECOGNITION OF PALESTINIAN STATE**

Shivaloy Majumdar (Calgary Heritage, CPC): Mr. Speaker, ignoring the massacre of eight Canadians on October 7, siding with their killers and dehumanizing their families, the hostages still held and over 1,200 stolen souls is evil. Granting a state to those who practise state terror as statecraft and pay pensions for murdering Jews is evil. Not requiring the state to even recognize Israel's right to exist is evil. None of their conditions were met. There was no election, no release of all hostages and no demilitarization of Hamas.

Lying about these intentions is evil. Doing this on the eve of Rosh Hashanah, and emboldening mobs and violence upon our Jewish communities, is evil. The fascism once buried in the last

world war has risen again as modern terrorism. This is not diplomacy. It is appeasement. It is betrayal. The Prime Minister has dispensed with human dignity and the rule of law. He has emboldened terror with a state, and it is evil.

* * *

[*Translation*]**MARIE-JOSÉE TURGEON**

Louis Villeneuve (Brome—Missisquoi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the semiconductor industry is at the heart of our national security and our economic competitiveness. In Brome—Missisquoi, we are fortunate to have the Centre de Collaboration MiQro Innovation, the largest microelectronics and semiconductor research centre in the country.

I would like to acknowledge the exceptional contribution of its CEO, Marie-Josée Turgeon. She recently got international recognition for her visionary leadership when she received the Engineer Woman Award as part of FEMWORX 2025 at Hannover Messe, the world's leading trade fair for industrial technology. This distinction reflects her commitment and ability to drive change in a rapidly changing sector. Ms. Turgeon is also a member of the G7 Semiconductor Point of Contact group, which is helping to position Canada as a key player in this strategic industry.

I am proud that a leader of this stature is working in our region and putting Canada on the map.

ORAL QUESTIONS[*Translation*]**FIREARMS**

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, by releasing criminals and wasting money on targeting law-abiding hunters and sport shooters, the Liberals have increased gun crime by 130%. We already knew that.

However, the Minister of Public Safety accidentally told the truth and was recorded saying that that to confiscate firearms from law-abiding people was a waste of money.

Does the Prime Minister agree with his minister?

[*English*]

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, I had a conversation with an individual I have known for many years, who recorded it without my knowledge and had it leaked to a gun lobbyist. In that conversation, the subject of the assault-style firearms buyback compensation program was discussed. In trying to address this issue and the individual's frustration, my comments were misguided.

Oral Questions

Having said that, it is important to have the program in place. This is what Canadians are looking for. I want to note that the Leader of the Opposition has voted against every single gun measure—

The Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, by freeing rampant gun criminals and wasting billions of dollars of police and border resources targeting law-abiding, licensed, trained and tested firearms owners, the government has overseen a 130% increase in violent gun crime.

Over the weekend, the Minister of Public Safety accidentally told the truth, and he was recorded doing it. He said that the gun grab is not worth the money, that it will go over budget, that it would be better just to lock up the criminals, but that the government is going ahead with the bad policy because it is good politics. Does the Prime Minister agree?

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a good thing there is a recording of it so that Canadians can have a look themselves.

Let me be very clear. Canadians want responsible gun control. They wanted it in 1989 after a man killed 14 women at École Polytechnique. They wanted it after six people were murdered at the Quebec City mosque shooting, and they wanted it after the biggest mass shooting in our history, where a man opened fire and killed 22 people in Nova Scotia.

Why are the Conservatives against keeping guns off our streets?

• (1420)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the minister said that his gun grab will not work, that it will go over budget, that it would be better to lock up criminals, as Conservatives have been suggesting, but that the government is going ahead with the gun grab anyway because the Prime Minister wants to pursue electoral politics.

When a mother is hit with a stray bullet, a police officer is murdered by a firearm or a bullet flies into a child's bedroom as part of an extortion case, we do not have time for politics, so why is the minister caught on tape playing politics with guns?

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in order to have a real conversation about crime, we need to have a real conversation about guns. Canadians want responsible gun control. They wanted it in 1989 after a man killed 14 women at École Polytechnique. They wanted it after six people were murdered at the Quebec City mosque shooting, and they wanted it after the biggest mass shooting in our history, where a man opened fire and killed 22 people in Nova Scotia.

Why are the Conservatives against keeping guns off our streets, and why has the Leader of the Opposition voted against every single gun control measure he has been in Parliament for?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the minister did have a real conversation about guns. Unfortunately for him, it was caught on tape. He was caught on tape admitting that the gun grab is a waste of money, caught on tape admitting it would go over budget and caught on tape admitting it

would be better just to lock up the gun criminals who are doing the crime.

Why is it that Liberals only tell the truth when they do not think anyone is listening?

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate that it is a good thing this conversation was caught on tape. In fact, it will counter every single claim the Leader of the Opposition is making.

Let me be very clear: Canadians want responsible gun control. We are in a position to do that as a government, and we committed to it during the last campaign. Canadians gave us a mandate on April 28 to ensure that we move forward on this program, and we look forward to its implementation.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, while the Liberal government blocks criminal justice reforms that would lock up gun criminals, it wants to go ahead and take nearly \$1 billion away from border security and police officers to go after licensed, law-abiding, trained and tested hunters and sports shooters, a project that the OPP refuses to enforce and numerous provincial governments have said they will not go ahead with. The government has even had to ask Canada Post to collect these firearms.

The minister himself has now admitted that it would not work. Why will the Liberals not drop the politics and save lives?

Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the member is concerned about advancing legislation that is actually going to keep Canadians safe, he would work across the aisle with us as we seek to table legislation during this legislative sitting to ensure that violent repeat offenders are kept behind bars and make sure the most serious offenders are facing stiffer penalties.

It is hard to accept criticism, when it comes to keeping our communities safe from gun violence, from a member who for more than two decades has voted against the very specific measures that are designed to take guns off our streets and has voted repeatedly for measures that weaken our border and do not prevent the inflow of guns in the first place.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I and we have voted against policies that have given Canada a 130% increase in gun violence.

Oral Questions

Speaking of getting things through Parliament, the minister said “seek” to introduce. The government has been in place for 10 years. It has softened penalties for repeat offenders. The minister took the summer off and still has not introduced any criminal justice reforms to stop guns.

We put forward a “three strikes and you’re out” law that would lock up repeat violent offenders. Instead, the government is spending \$700 million of police resources going after licensed, law-abiding people. Why?

• (1425)

Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have news for my friend on the other side of the House of Commons. If he believes that I have not moved forward with legislative efforts this sitting when it comes to criminal justice reform, I would have invited him to show up for work on Friday last week, when we did that very thing.

The member should look forward in this fall sitting to seeing two additional pieces of criminal legislative reform. One is on bail and sentencing and would make sure violent repeat offenders are not walking our streets, and the second would protect those who are at risk of intimate partner violence or at risk of being victimized by sexual offences.

When it comes to the summer, I was meeting with law enforcement and provincial counterparts. He was fighting for his job.

The Speaker: As the member knows, we cannot suggest that somebody was present or not in the House. I am assuming he meant it in a very vague way and that it had something to do with something else. I will give that warning to the member.

[Translation]

The hon. member for Saint-Jean.

* * *

JUSTICE

Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Ottawa's brief to the Supreme Court challenging Bill 21 is the stuff of conspiracy theories. In their challenge against state secularism, the Liberals are claiming it would create a slippery slope that could lead to nightmare scenarios, such as the banning of places of worship. They even suggest that Quebec could reinstate slavery or executions.

It says a lot about how Canadians see Quebecers: They should not get too much parliamentary sovereignty or they might be crazy enough to bring slavery back. If the government wanted to trash the reputation of Quebecers, what better way to do it than with this brief. Will it withdraw it?

Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this case deals with issues of national interest. It is very important for the federal government to intervene to protect the Constitution. As the member is well

aware, this case is before the Supreme Court of Canada, which is the appropriate forum for making such arguments.

Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the federal government is attacking much more than secularism at the Supreme Court, it is attacking Quebec's parliamentary sovereignty by amending the Constitution without debate through the courts. This is a blow to the basic function of the notwithstanding clause, which is to protect democracy from a government of judges.

If the federal government wants to amend the Constitution, then let us debate it in our parliaments and in the public arena, not in court. Will it withdraw its factum and stop using judges against Quebec's parliamentary sovereignty?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to my colleague, what she is saying is misinformed.

The federal government's intervention before the Supreme Court will not prevent the provinces or territories from continuing to use section 33 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in the Canadian Constitution and to use the notwithstanding clause if they want. The Minister of Justice, who is seated next to me, would very certainly be pleased to explain to her the process we are proposing. We will always stand up for Canadians' rights and freedoms. We are the party of the Charter and we always will be.

Rhéal Éloi Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ): Mr. Speaker, when the Liberals say that they are not attacking secularism before the Supreme Court, that is incorrect. What they should be saying is that their attack is not limited to secularism. By attacking the notwithstanding clause, they are also attacking protections afforded to the French language and signage in French. They are even attacking matters of consensus, such as protecting the identity of children involved in public proceedings, or foregoing the need for lawyers in small claims court. They are attacking democracy, and even the Quebec model.

When will they abandon this challenge?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am a very proud Quebecer. There are a lot of very proud Quebecers on our side of the House. We have been defending the Quebec model for years if not decades.

What the member opposite is saying is simply not true. We are the first federal government to have acknowledged the decline of French and to have invested \$4 billion in official languages. For the first time in history, we achieved the target of 4% francophone immigration outside Quebec. We are heading toward 7%, and after that, 8% and 12%. Our party is going to keep defending French. That is what we are doing, together.

*Oral Questions**[English]***THE ECONOMY**

Jasraj Hallan (Calgary East, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after 10 years of Liberal government, food prices have skyrocketed 40%. The Prime Minister said he would be different, and he is right; he is even more expensive than Justin Trudeau was. He is doubling the deficit, racking up the federal debt and blocking anything that would help bring food prices down. With Liberal inflation, food prices are 75% over the bank's target.

Why does the Prime Minister not just get out of the way so that Conservatives can pass common-sense legislation such as the Canada sovereignty act and actually bring down the cost of groceries?

• (1430)

Hon. Wayne Long (Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the last election, Canadians had a clear choice between a leader who has economic and business experience versus a leader who has none.

We are focused on affordability for Canadians and cutting taxes for 22 million Canadians. We are cutting the consumer carbon tax. We are cutting the GST for first-time homebuyers, and we are going to build homes at a scale not seen since the Second World War.

I ask the Conservatives to cut the rhetoric and get on board.

Jasraj Hallan (Calgary East, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in the last election, Canadians were duped by a guy who is committing economic vandalism.

The finance minister said that he would bring down the cost of groceries by Thanksgiving 2023. It is almost Thanksgiving 2025, and the cost of groceries has skyrocketed. It is as though the Liberals' solution to the cost of living crisis, which they created, is to spend even more than Trudeau did.

Why does this Prime Minister not stop competing with Justin Trudeau to be the most expensive Prime Minister in Canadian history and get out of the way so Conservatives can fix everything these guys broke?

Hon. Wayne Long (Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last summer, we crossed the country and went from coast to coast to coast, and the message from Canadians was resoundingly clear. They want us to spend less and invest more in national projects, invest more in building our country, bring down interprovincial trade barriers and work together.

We have a plan to build the strongest economy in the G7. That is exactly what we are going to do. I ask the Conservatives to stop the rhetoric and get on board.

Leslyn Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, 10 years of Liberal rule, and what do Canadians have to show for it? Soaring food prices, food insecurity, four million visits to food banks in Toronto alone last year. A quarter of Canadian households cannot afford to put food on the table. That is 40% higher than the year before.

When will the Prime Minister stop obstructing Parliament and introduce a budget that lowers food prices?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when Canadians are facing a hard time, they want a government that will invest in them. Today, the Canada's Building Trades Unions visit us in Ottawa, celebrating the investments in major projects that are going to create great Canadian jobs for tradespeople all across this country, with a government that is focused on making sure that we cut taxes for 22 million Canadians.

We are making sure that Canadians have what they need. Canadians chose well, and they chose this government.

Leslyn Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians want a government that will deal with this affordability crisis. This crisis happened on the Liberals' watch. The Prime Minister promised Canadians that they could judge him by the price of groceries. Well, the numbers are in. Apples are up 14%. Potatoes are up 16%. Canned food is up 26%.

When will the Prime Minister stop obstructing Parliament and introduce a budget that will bring back food affordability to Canada?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are intelligent and knew better than to place their vote with the opposition, the Conservatives, who were threatening and indeed voting against everything that was making their lives more affordable. Whether it was the school food nutrition program, the Canada dental care plan, investments in seniors, increasing supports for seniors or investments in infrastructure, time and again, Conservatives voted against these measures. Canadians saw with their eyes that they could not count on Conservatives to protect them.

* * *

HOUSING

Scott Aitchison (Parry Sound—Muskoka, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after 10 years of the Liberals, experts are now warning of up to 100,000 job losses in the housing sector by 2027. Builders are laying off their trained staff, even though the Prime Minister promised to double housing construction. Housing starts have stalled completely in the GTA and the Lower Mainland, where the housing crisis is the worst. In Ajax, housing starts are down 100%.

Oral Questions

Builders are praising our common-sense plan to remove the GST on all homes under \$1.3 million, saying it will restart homebuilding. Why does the Prime Minister not want home builders building homes?

• (1435)

Hon. Gregor Robertson (Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, to the member opposite, that is exactly why this government is committed to the most aggressive affordable housing program in our history. We need to focus on affordability.

Canadians have spoken. Canadians have elected this government to deliver on affordability, with a tax cut and a focus on affordable housing. We are seeing right out of the gate that we have “build Canada homes” focusing on 4,000 homes in six cities across Canada, \$1 billion in supportive housing and 700 units of housing in Nunavut. We need to scale up. We expect the Conservatives' support.

* * *

[Translation]

THE ECONOMY

Gabriel Hardy (Montmorency—Charlevoix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after 10 years of Liberal government decisions, food inflation is very real. According to Food Banks Canada, 25% of households say they are struggling to put food on the table. This morning's newspaper reported that an elderly woman who worked her entire life is going without food to pay for housing. I spent the summer travelling around Montmorency—Charlevoix, meeting with constituents to hear their concerns; good people who work hard and are struggling to make ends meet.

When will the Prime Minister stop obstructing Parliament and table a budget showing lower food prices?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite knows full well that the budget is coming. He should pay attention because we will ask him to support it.

Canadians sent us here to bring forward a plan to build Canada, provide more job opportunities for young people, and use steel, aluminum and Canadian expertise. Watch out: we are coming and we want his vote.

Gabriel Hardy (Montmorency—Charlevoix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after 10 years of this same Liberal government, requests for food assistance are skyrocketing. In Montmorency—Charlevoix, and across the country, food banks are facing an unprecedented increase in demand. Where I come from, our regions have seen a 30% increase in just one year. Food Banks Canada gave Canada a grade of D for food insecurity.

The Prime Minister told us to judge him by the cost of groceries. Well, what grade would he give himself? Would it be an F for “food” or an F for “failure”?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since this member is new to the House, perhaps he has not yet

had a chance to meet with his party whip. What will his whip tell him? He will tell him to vote against any measures that support Canadians, to vote against food assistance in schools, to vote against child care, to vote against child benefits, to vote against support for seniors, to vote against legislation that protects workers in Canada, to vote against all of that, against his will. In any case, this member will learn the hard way.

* * *

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Radio-Canada has made a shocking revelation. Members of organized crime are entering Canada on student visas and getting rich off fraud, car theft, identity theft and so on.

Once again, instead of taking responsibility, the Department of Citizenship and Immigration is burying its head in the sand. In its response to the report, Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, or IRCC, blamed the universities, even though screening the identities of those entering Canada, including foreign students, is solely the federal government's responsibility.

IRCC is responsible. When will it start working to combat organized crime instead of blaming universities?

Hon. Lena Metlege Diab (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians have given us a mandate to restore our international student program to sustainable levels, and that is what we are doing. Nearly 100,000 fewer students arrived in 2025, and the latest figures show that the number of student visa holders dropped by 144,000. We want to attract the best talent while protecting international students.

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister obviously did not watch the report. The problem is not the universities; the problem is international organized crime. Criminals are taking advantage of Immigration, Citizenship and Refugees Canada's negligence to make hundreds of millions of dollars.

Border services know that this money is being used to prop up a criminal organization in the Ivory Coast, and even to fund terrorist activities. While Europe is fighting this network, which it calls the African mafia, Ottawa treats it like the problem is students cutting class. It is easy to understand why Canada is a prime target.

When will Ottawa take responsibility?

Hon. Lena Metlege Diab (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we just campaigned on strengthening our borders. Fraud is getting increasingly sophisticated, so we need effective tools to maintain a migration management approach.

The House is currently considering Bill C-2, which seeks to ensure equity in our immigration system and to improve visa and asylum application processing. We want to protect the integrity of our system, and I invite all parliamentarians to support us.

● (1440)

[English]

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, since the minister was appointed, many more people have been abused and defrauded by Canadian immigration consultants who contribute to the chaos in Canada's immigration system while the minister just lets them. Instead of taking advice experts have been giving for years, which is to make immigration consultants report to lawyers, the minister said this summer that this is fine, and she doubled down on a system that is clearly not working.

The Prime Minister chose an incompetent minister for one of the most important files in government. Why?

Hon. Lena Metlege Diab (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Prime Minister for choosing me to be the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship. I am very proud of my record from when I served as Nova Scotia's minister of immigration.

Protecting prospective newcomers from those who try to take advantage of them is critically important. That is why we have established the College of Immigration and Citizenship Consultants to regulate consultants and protect the public. This is something that we are very serious about, and we will ensure that it gets done.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the minister mentioned her record as immigration minister in a provincial government. During that time, a Nova Scotia auditor found that there were the following issues: There was “No process to determine provincial labour market needs and assess whether these are being addressed” by Nova Scotia's provincial nominee program, and “None of the eight recommendations from a 2020 fraud risk assessment [had] been implemented.”

I will ask the same question: Why did the Prime Minister put an incompetent minister into this position?

Hon. Lena Metlege Diab (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank the Prime Minister. In fact, I want to thank the people in Halifax West for electing me to this Parliament. I am here to do the best job I possibly can do with my experience, with my expertise and with my love for Canada and love for Canadians. We will continue to do that.

With respect to my record as minister of immigration provincially from 2013 to 2021, the record is clear. I would invite parliamentarians to look at it.

Vincent Ho (Richmond Hill South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after 10 years of the Liberal government, our immigration system is in chaos. This summer, illegal border crossers claiming asylum surged by a staggering 277%. Most of their claims will be bogus. This has put massive pressure on housing, health care and benefits across Canada, especially in Quebec. What did the immigration minister do? She did absolutely nothing. She enjoyed her summer vacation while our borders were left wide open.

Oral Questions

The Prime Minister promised to be different, but instead of fixing it, he let the situation spiral out of control while Canadians paid the price. Why did the Prime Minister appoint such an incompetent minister to one of the most important jobs, when she is making the crisis worse every single day?

Hon. Lena Metlege Diab (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am not going to thank the member for that question, but I will answer the question. I have spent my summer, a whole 10 or 11 weeks, working seven days a week without taking one day for vacation.

Having said that, this government is intent on ensuring that our immigration system becomes sustainable, as well as intent on protecting our borders. That is why we have Bill C-2 in front of us in Parliament, which would be an aid for us here. I urge all parliamentarians to get on board and support it.

Sandra Cobena (Newmarket—Aurora, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after 10 years of the Liberal government, Canada's immigration system is broken. The Prime Minister promised he would be different, but nothing has changed. The only way to stop illegal border crossers from abusing our asylum system is to end the incentives that turn it into a back door for economic migration, yet the immigration minister has done literally nothing all summer.

Therefore, I ask again, why has the Prime Minister put a minister who is totally out of her depth and making things worse on one of the most important files in cabinet?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am a little puzzled and a little concerned about the tone coming from the opposition. We do not treat MPs and ministers in the House in this way. This minister is doing a fantastic job and has presented legislation before this Parliament, which that party needs to respond to, that will clean up our immigration system.

While they are at it, the Conservatives can perhaps answer for why, in Cloverdale—Langley City, they are forcing temporary students to come and campaign for them in by-election campaigns. Those are the questions the incompetent Leader of the Opposition and his party need to answer.

● (1445)

Sukhman Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the minister said she worked all summer, and the system is worse. The Prime Minister promised he would be different, but illegal border crossers have been surging into Canada to abuse the asylum system all summer, and the minister has done nothing to stop it.

She has not strengthened the safe third country agreement. She has not reviewed the benefits they receive to put a stop to the ones who come into our country. She has let the asylum seekers become even worse than the predecessor she followed.

Oral Questions

The Prime Minister chose to be incompetent and chose an incompetent minister for the cabinet. Why?

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government is working hard to secure our borders. This morning, I had the chance to meet with the president of the CBSA, who advised that border crossings are down 60%. We will strengthen our borders and invest more resources through security screenings as well as quickly identifying and removing those who are inadmissible. We will hire a thousand more RCMP and CBSA officers.

We have Bill C-2 in the House right now. If the members opposite are serious about border crossings and immigration, then they should pass it swiftly.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

John-Paul Danko (Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Hamilton is proud to be Canada's steel city, with a long history of organized labour and skilled trades. Our country's industry, housing and infrastructure, the foundations of our economy, have always been built by workers in the building trades.

Could the Secretary of State for Labour update the House on how our government is supporting apprentices and helping workers get the training they need to literally build Canada's future?

Hon. John Zerucelli (Secretary of State (Labour), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, finally, there is a good question. I have been meeting with workers from Surrey to St. John's, including Canada's building trades unions that are in town this week, and they all say the same thing: It is time to build. That is exactly what we are doing.

From major nation-building projects to building Canadian homes, we are building big with Canadian steel, Canadian lumber, Canadian unionized workers. We are creating thousands of jobs and apprenticeship opportunities through the union training and innovation program. We are investing in training the next generation. While the Conservatives talk down Canada, we are building Canada up with Canadian workers.

* * *

FIREARMS

Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the public safety minister told the truth. It is true. He spoke about how this confiscation buyback is an incredible boondoggle. Let us actually hear what he had to say: "This is the mandate I was given by [the Prime Minister] to complete this...and not revisit this." It sounds like he does not even believe in this.

If the public safety minister does not believe in this program, why are we spending 742 million taxpayer dollars to keep it going?

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have addressed this issue a number of times, but let me just make it very personal. In the last four months in this role as Minister of Public Safety, I have received a great deal of vitriol from the gun lobby. If we go into my social media accounts, we will see hundreds if not thousands of comments of hatred that are

coming through the gun lobby. What the party opposite is doing is reinforcing that.

We have a serious plan to ensure that guns are off our streets. This is why we will be going forward and implementing this program. I invite the party opposite to come on board and ensure our streets are safe.

Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is always somebody else's fault. What this minister fails to mention is that in Bill C-5, he voted so that people who do drive-by shootings can serve their sentence on house arrest, people who do robberies with guns, house arrest.

Nobody wants a part of this program. Canada Post does not want a part of it. Local law enforcement does not want a part of it. The OPP does not want a part of this \$742-million boondoggle. The minister told us he just has to put it to an end.

Why are the Liberals still intent on having this program go forward when all he wants to do is end it?

● (1450)

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives constantly want U.S.-style politics here, whether it is the "three strikes and you're out" rule or assault rifles on our streets, which the Conservatives would make legal again. We have seen these policies fail in the U.S., and they would not work here either. They should come up with some comprehensive, meaningful change like the change that we are going to bring with bail reform and sentencing reform.

Arpan Khanna (Oxford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal gun grab scam unfairly targets law-abiding Canadians while giving criminals a free pass. This failed scam has been rejected by the police, the provinces, Canada Post and now even their own public safety minister. In a leaked audio, he says the Prime Minister pressured him. He admits that this plan will not work, and he even promised to pay his tenant's bail if he is arrested. I cannot make this up. What the Liberals say in public versus what they say behind closed doors are totally opposite.

If the minister will not stand behind his own plan, why should Canadians foot the \$700-million bill for the scam?

Oral Questions

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are moving forward in a responsible way to make sure that gun ownership in Canada is safe. There is no reason to have assault-style firearms on our streets or in our homes. We are going to be responsible. We are going to make sure we do not have the gun crisis that we see in the United States, just south of us. If Conservatives had their way, they would make guns free and legal for everyone.

Roman Baber (York Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Conservatives have been saying from day one that the gun buyback program is an awful idea. Law-abiding gun owners do not commit gun crime with lawfully purchased guns. Criminals commit gun crime, gun criminals who terrorize our streets because of the Liberals' failure on law and order. We know that the OPP will not participate in the program. Canada Post will not participate in the program. Local police will not participate in the program. Now we learn that the Minister of Public Safety does not want to participate in it either.

Why is this minister going ahead with a program that he does not want to participate in?

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives need to get serious about resolving and coming up with solutions when it comes to crime and when it comes to firearms in our country. When they were in government, the Conservatives cut funding to the RCMP and to our borders, and they would go back and make assault-style firearms legal in our country.

If they care so much about the safety of our nation, maybe their leader should get a security clearance.

Michael Guglielmin (Vaughan—Woodbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, leaked audio from the Minister of Public Safety revealed the truth: Not even he believes the Liberal gun confiscation program will work. He begged a law-abiding citizen, "Don't ask me to explain the logic to you". He knows it is wrong, and he admits the Prime Minister is forcing him to ram this failed policy through, even though he knows it will not fix their soft-on-crime record.

Why is the minister still proceeding with this \$742-million boondoggle when even he admits it is a failure?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Nathalie Provost (Secretary of State (Nature), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, 35 years ago, I was shot four times by a legal gun owner.

For the past 35 years, Canadians have wanted assault-style weapons to be taken off our streets and, this year, we will do that.

* * *

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals' student visa policies are causing chaos in Canada, especially in Quebec. These policies are allowing African mafia networks to infiltrate the country and take advantage of the most vulnerable Quebecers.

Radio-Canada reported on the sophisticated scam run by Mamadou Berthe, an Ivorian national who defrauded two Quebec re-

tirees of more than \$500,000 and may have stolen \$1 million from 20 victims.

Can the Prime Minister tell us what he is doing to combat this scourge of fake students who are actually criminals?

Hon. Lena Metlege Diab (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians gave us a mandate to bring international student programs back to a viable level, and we are doing just that.

Nearly 100,000 fewer new students arrived in 2025. The House is also considering Bill C-2, which would reduce the number of applications and prevent sudden spikes in applications. We are here to strengthen our borders and make them more resilient as well.

I invite all parliamentarians to support us.

● (1455)

Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the minister clearly does not understand the problem. She needs to understand that, among the visas issued to students, 200 have been issued to Africans who are part of the African mafia and who are currently living in Quebec. They are committing crimes such as child prostitution, fraud and car theft. This international crime network has now reached Canada because of the Liberals' lax immigration policies.

Can the minister confirm that the government will resolve this issue of fake student visas?

[*English*]

Hon. Lena Metlege Diab (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, anybody who commits a crime in Canada, regardless of their status, will face consequences.

[*Translation*]

Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada is working with the Canada Border Services Agency and all our partners to ensure the following.

[*English*]

If we need to deport somebody, we will. That is CBSA's job. Again, we work with other government departments to ensure that Canadians are protected and that fraud is limited.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Shuvaloy Majumdar (Calgary Heritage, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have an administrative question for the Prime Minister.

I went to check the Ministry of Foreign Affairs website to see what this new state he has announced might look like. There is no map. Can we expect the Prime Minister and the Minister of Foreign Affairs to upload a map of the borders of this so-called state? Could they identify its capital?

Oral Questions

Hon. Robert Oliphant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I respect the question. However, at this point, I will simply say that there is no military solution to the conflict at hand. There is only a political solution, and in the vein of Lester Pearson, this side of the House will continue to work for peaceful solutions to ensure that Israel and Palestinians have safe and secure borders for each of them so they will live in peace together. That is what this side of the House will work on.

Shuvaloy Majumdar (Calgary Heritage, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Palestinian Authority runs a program perpetuating generational genocidal hate with penchants for terrorists who murder Jews. The PA, the PLO and Fatah all embed terrorism into their institutions. The PLO founded the Al-Aqsa Martyrs Brigades, a listed terrorist entity responsible for the attacks on October 7.

If recognition of statehood is to have any real meaning, will the Prime Minister designate this as a state sponsor of terrorism?

Hon. Robert Oliphant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me also state that Canada supports Israel and its right to defend its people every day. Let me also be clear that Hamas is a terrorist group. It must release hostages immediately who have been held cruelly for two years. It must disarm, and it will play no role in the future governance of a Palestinian state.

We will continue to defend the state of Israel and we will continue to defend the people of Palestine to ensure we have two states with equal justice and equal rights to prosperity.

* * *

[Translation]

WOMEN AND GENDER EQUALITY

Tatiana Auguste (Terrebonne, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Gender Equality Week starts today. It is a time to recognize the progress we have made and to stand firm in our commitment to promote gender equality for all Canadians. It is clear that, to build the strongest economy in the G7, we need the full and active participation of women.

Can the Minister of Women and Gender Equality tell us about the measures that the government is taking to promote gender equality?

Hon. Rechie Valdez (Minister of Women and Gender Equality and Secretary of State (Small Business and Tourism), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we cannot build the strongest economy in the G7 without the full participation of women. Thanks to the women's entrepreneurship strategy, we have helped over 400,000 women in Canada. With the national action plan to end gender-based violence, we are taking action to end violence against women.

This week, we acknowledge the progress achieved and we renew our commitment to gender equality.

* * *

[English]

NATURAL RESOURCES

Dane Lloyd (Parkland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in the last four months, \$54 billion in investment has fled Canada, and that is in

addition to nearly half a trillion dollars lost in 10 years under the Liberal government. The Prime Minister promised strength, but all he has delivered is weakness. His oil and gas production cap is killing Canadian prosperity. Conservatives today are calling for the end of this production cap.

Will the Liberals keep their boots on the neck of our energy sector, or will they vote with Conservatives to axe the cap?

● (1500)

Hon. Tim Hodgson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians voted to strengthen our economy by growing our energy and natural resources industries while combatting climate change. We will support innovation, increase our competitiveness and attract billions of dollars of investment to get to net zero.

Let me share something the Premier of Alberta said just this weekend: "I am more optimistic than ever that the concerns of Albertans are...BEING HEARD". Perhaps the hon. member on the other side could give up his division and work with us to build Canada strong.

Burton Bailey (Red Deer, CPC): Mr. Speaker, 10 years of Liberal policies aimed at killing our energy industry have shrunk our economy and driven up unemployment. The Prime Minister promised he would be different, but instead, it is more of the same.

Alberta's energy industry has powered and enriched this nation for decades, but if the production cap stays, there will be no pipelines and Canada will remain at the mercy of U.S. and other foreign interests.

Will the Liberals vote for our Conservative motion to eliminate the Liberal job-killing energy cap, or will they continue obstructing getting Canada built?

Hon. Tim Hodgson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are focused on results that enhance our climate competitiveness. Our government, Alberta and industry agree that building a responsible, competitive oil and gas industry is part of the grand bargain.

As someone who spent his career making deals, I know we do not get things done by speaking in public, but let me share something with the hon. member that his premier said this weekend: "I am more optimistic than ever that the concerns of Albertans are...BEING HEARD".

We would appreciate the member getting on board. Let us end the division, get the unity together and build Canada strong.

Oral Questions

Glen Motz (Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals' oil and gas emissions cap will continue to devastate jobs in the energy sector and make life more expensive for Canadians. The Parliamentary Budget Officer estimates that the emissions cap will cut our GDP by about \$20.5 billion annually and eliminate 54,000 more jobs by 2032. The Prime Minister promised he would be different, but those promises have been broken.

Will the Prime Minister support the Conservative motion to repeal the oil and gas emissions cap, or will he and the Liberals continue to be obstructive?

Hon. Tim Hodgson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the grand bargain is about taking transformative steps to dramatically reduce our emissions and put new cards in Canada's hand that increase our competitiveness. That has the potential to create thousands of good-paying jobs and careers and create a world-leading clean-tech ecosystem that exports our innovation around the world.

As I said, the Premier of Alberta said this weekend, "I am more optimistic than ever that the concerns of Albertans are...BEING HEARD". I would invite the hon. member across the aisle to get with us and build Canada strong.

* * *

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

Philip Earle (Labrador, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for too long, northern communities like those in my riding of Labrador have had to rely on diesel-generated electricity to keep the lights on, at costs that are too high.

Can the minister share with this House how our new government is replacing diesel with dependable, clean power in the north while helping communities build the sustainable future they deserve?

Hon. Rebecca Chartrand (Minister of Northern and Arctic Affairs and Minister responsible for the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our new government is supporting indigenous-led transitions from diesel to dependable, clean power. In Yukon, Kluane First Nation's wind and battery project provides about half the community's power and saves over 300,000 litres of diesel a year. In Nunavut, the Inuit-led Sanikiluaq wind project will replace up to 70% of local diesel use.

Project by project, we are delivering cleaner, more affordable power across the north.

* * *

● (1505)

[*Translation*]

HOUSING

Jason Groleau (Beauce, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat the question I asked on Friday because, obviously, I did not get an answer.

The Liberal government has announced it is building 4,000 new housing units at a cost of \$13 billion. That is \$3.2 million per home. Are the walls made of gold? With \$3.2 million, people in Beauce could build 15 homes, not one. With \$13 billion, people in Beauce could build 60,000 homes, not 4,000. Even in Canada's big

cities, \$13 billion would pay for 20,000 new homes, not 4,000. The numbers do not add up.

Why is it always, always, always more expensive with the Liberals?

[*English*]

Hon. Gregor Robertson (Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I know it is only the second week back, but the Conservatives are already getting the math wrong, and we need to set it straight. "Build Canada homes" will have \$13 billion to invest in affordable housing across the country. We have a number of projects to launch, with 4,000 homes in six cities across the country, 700 homes in Nunavut, as I mentioned earlier, and \$1 billion for supportive transitional housing. That will be roughly 5,000 homes for people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness.

We are going to see tens of thousands of homes across Canada built. We look for members' support on the budget.

* * *

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY

Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this weekend, thousands of people across Canada joined the Draw the Line protest to send the Prime Minister a very clear message: Enough is enough. Why? It is because the Prime Minister and cabinet are pushing through legislation and measures violating the rights of workers, violating the rights of indigenous people and violating the rights of migrants, while undermining gender equality, civil liberties, disability justice and environmental protection.

Why is the Liberal government bulldozing over our Constitution to fast-track its corporate agenda?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what the question is in all of that, but what I can say is this government was elected to focus on Canadians, to be pragmatic, to stand up for Canada, to make sure people have great jobs and to make sure that Canadians can count on their government when things are tough. That is exactly what we are doing day in and day out. We are focused on what Canadians need and what they are telling us they want to invest in. We have an ambitious plan and we are acting on it.

*Business of Supply***GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[Translation]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—VIOLENT CRIME AND REPEAT OFFENDERS

The House resumed from September 18 consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: It being 3:07 p.m., the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion of the member for Brantford—Brant South—Six Nations relating to the business of supply.

Call in the members.

● (1520)

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

*(Division No. 35)***YEAS**

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Anderson
Anstey	Arnold
Au	Baber
Bailey	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt)	Berthold
Bexte	Bezan
Block	Bonk
Borrelli	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Chambers	Chong
Cobena	Cody
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	Davidson
Davies (Niagara South)	Dawson
Deltell	d'Entremont
DeRidder	Diotte
Doherty	Dowdall
Duncan	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)
Falk (Provencher)	Gallant
Généreux	Genuis
Gill (Calgary Skyview)	Gill (Brampton West)
Gill (Calgary McKnight)	Gill (Windsor West)
Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Groleau
Guglielmin	Gunn
Hallan	Hardy
Ho	Hoback
Holman	Jackson
Jansen	Jivani
Kelly	Khanna
Kibble	Kirkland
Kmiec	Konanz
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kronis	Kuruc
Kusie	Lantsman
Lawrence	Lawton
Lefebvre	Leslie
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lloyd	Lobb
Ma	Mahal

Majumdar
Mantle
Mazier
McKenzie
Melillo
Moore
Morrison
Muys
Patzner
Poilievre
Reid
Reynolds
Roberts
Ross
Ruff
Schmale
Shipley
Steinley
Strahl
Stubbs
Tochor
Uppal
Vien
Vis
Warkentin
Williamson— 139

Malette (Kapuskasing—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)
Martel
McCauley
McLean (Calgary Centre)
Menegakis
Morin
Motz
Nater
Paul-Hus
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Richards
Rood
Rowe
Scheer
Seeback
Small
Stevenson
Strauss
Thomas
Tolmie
Van Popta
Vierson
Wagantall
Waugh

NAYS

Members

Acan	Al Soud
Ali	Alty
Anandasangaree	Auguste
Bains	Baker
Bardeesy	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Belanger (Desnethé—Mississippi—Churchill River)
Bendayan	Bittle
Blair	Blanchet
Blanchette-Joncas	Blois
Bonin	Boulerice
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr	Casey
Chagger	Champagne
Champoux	Chang
Chartrand	Chatel
Chen	Chenette
Chi	Church
Clark	Connors
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Dandurand
Danko	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
DeBellefeuille	Deschênes
Deschênes-Thériault	Desrochers
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Duclos
Duguid	Dzerowicz
Earle	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson	Fancy
Fanjoy	Fergus
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Fuhr	Gaheer
Gainey	Garon
Gasparro	Gaudreau
Gazan	Gerretsen
Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)	Gould
Grant	Greaves

Government Orders

[English]

CITIZENSHIP ACT

The House resumed from September 19 consideration of the motion that Bill C-3, An Act to amend the Citizenship Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at the second reading stage of Bill C-3.

● (1530)

[Translation]

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

(Division No. 36)

YEAS

Members

Acan	Al Soud
Ali	Alty
Anandasangaree	Auguste
Bains	Baker
Bardeesy	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Belanger (Desnethé—Mississippi—Churchill River)
Bendayan	Bittle
Blair	Blanchet
Blanchette-Joncas	Blois
Bonin	Boulerice
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr	Casey
Chagger	Champagne
Champoux	Chang
Chartrand	Chatel
Chen	Chenette
Chi	Church
Clark	Connors
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Dandurand
Danko	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
DeBellefeuille	Deschênes
Deschênes-Thériault	Desrochers
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Duclos
Duguid	Dzerowicz
Earle	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson	Fancy
Fanjoy	Fergus
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Fuhr	Gaheer
Gainey	Garon
Gasparro	Gaudreau
Gazan	Gerretsen
Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)	Gould
Grant	Greaves
Guay	Gull-Masty
Hajdu	Harrison
Hepfner	Hirtle
Hodgson	Hogan
Housefather	Hussen
Iacono	Idlout
Jaczek	Joly

Guay	Guilbeault
Gull-Masty	Hajdu
Harrison	Hepfner
Hirtle	Hodgson
Hogan	Housefather
Hussen	Iacono
Jaczek	Joly
Joseph	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Klassen	Koutrakis
Kwan	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)	Lapointe (Sudbury)
Larouche	Lattanzio
Lauzon	Lavack
Lavoie	LeBlanc
Leitão	Lemire
Lightbound	Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacDonald (Cardigan)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malette (Bay of Quinte)	Maloney
May	McKelvie
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McKnight
McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)	McPherson
Ménard	Mendès
Michel	Miedema
Miller	Mingarelli
Morrissey	Myles
Nathan	Nguyen
Noormohamed	Normandin
Ntumba	Oliphant
Olszewski	O'Rourke
Osborne	Perron
Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon
Powlowski	Provost
Ramsay	Rana
Robertson	Rochefort
Romanado	Royer
Sahota	Sarai
Sari	Savard-Tremblay
Sawatzky	Schiefke
Sgro	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
Sodhi	Solomon
Sousa	Ste-Marie
St-Pierre	Sudds
Tesser Derksen	Thériault
Thompson	Turnbull
Valdez	van Koeverden
Vandenbeld	Villeneuve
Watchorn	Weiler
Wilkinson	Yip
Zahid	Zerucelli
Zuberi — 189	

PAIRED

Members

Allison	Anand
Epp	Hanley
Jeneroux	Lake
McGuinty	Naqvi
Sheehan	Zimmer — 10

The Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Government Orders

Joseph	Kayabaga	Gallant	Généreux
Kelloway	Khalid	Genus	Gill (Calgary Skyview)
Klassen	Koutrakis	Gill (Brampton West)	Gill (Calgary McKnight)
Kwan	Lalonde	Gill (Windsor West)	Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux	Gladu	Godin
Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)	Lapointe (Sudbury)	Goodridge	Gourde
Larouche	Lattanzio	Groleau	Guglielmin
Lauzon	Lavack	Gunn	Hallan
Lavoie	LeBlanc	Hardy	Ho
Leitão	Lemire	Hoback	Holman
Lightbound	Long	Jackson	Jansen
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacDonald (Malpeque)	Jivani	Kelly
MacDonald (Cardigan)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Khanna	Kibble
Malette (Bay of Quinte)	Maloney	Kirkland	Kmiec
May	McKelvie	Konanz	Kram
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McKnight	Kramp-Neuman	Kronis
McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)	McPherson	Kuruc	Kusie
Ménard	Mendès	Lantsman	Lawrence
Michel	Miedema	Lawton	Lefebvre
Miller	Mingarelli	Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Morrissey	Myles	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Lloyd
Nathan	Nguyen	Lobb	Ma
Noormohamed	Normandin	Mahal	Majumdar
Ntumba	Oliphant	Malette (Kapusking—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)	Mantle
Olszewski	O'Rourke	Martel	Mazier
Osborne	Perron	McCauley	McKenzie
Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon	McLean (Calgary Centre)	Melillo
Powlowski	Provost	Menegakis	Moore
Ramsay	Rana	Morin	Morrison
Robertson	Rocheffort	Motz	Muys
Romanado	Royer	Nater	Patzer
Sahota	Sarai	Paul-Hus	Poilievre
Sari	Savard-Tremblay	Redekopp	Reid
Sawatzky	Schiefke	Rempel Garner	Reynolds
Sgro	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Richards	Roberts
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard	Rood	Ross
Sodhi	Solomon	Rowe	Ruff
Sousa	Ste-Marie	Scheer	Schmale
St-Pierre	Sudds	Seeback	Shipley
Tesser Derksen	Thériault	Small	Steinley
Thompson	Turnbull	Stevenson	Strahl
Valdez	van Koeverden	Strauss	Stubbs
Vandenbeld	Villeneuve	Thomas	Tochor
Watchorn	Weiler	Tolmie	Uppal
Wilkinson	Yip	Van Popta	Vien
Zahid	Zerucelli	Viersen	Vis
Zuberi — 189		Wagantall	Warkentin
		Waugh	Williamson — 138

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Anstey
Arnold	Au
Baber	Bailey
Baldinelli	Barlow
Barrett	Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt)
	Bexte
Berthold	Block
Bezan	Borrelli
Bonk	Brassard
Bragdon	Calkins
Brock	Chambers
Caputo	Cobena
Chong	Cooper
Cody	Dancho
Dalton	Davies (Niagara South)
Davidson	Deltell
Dawson	DeRidder
d'Entremont	Doherty
Diotte	Duncan
Dowdall	
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)Falk (Provencher)	

PAIRED

Members

Allison	Anand
Epp	Hanley
Jeneroux	Lake
McGuinty	Naqvi
Sheehan	Zimmer — 10

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[*English*]

Accordingly, the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration.

(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee)

I wish to inform the House that because of the ministerial statement and the deferred recorded divisions, the time provided for Government Orders will be extended by 24 minutes.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1535)

[English]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

ACCESS TO INFORMATION, PRIVACY AND ETHICS

John Brassard (Barrie South—Innisfil, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the third report of the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics, entitled “Proposed Review of the Conflict of Interest Act”.

HUMAN RESOURCES, SKILLS AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Robert Morrissey (Egmont, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the first report of the Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities in relation to the motion adopted on Thursday, September 18, “Youth Employment in Canada”.

* * *

LIVING DONOR RECOGNITION MEDAL ACT

Ziad Aboultaif (Edmonton Manning, CPC) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-234, An Act respecting the establishment and award of a living donor recognition medal.

The Speaker: Before I proceed, I will say that there are many private members' bills being introduced in the next few minutes, and I would just remind members to be succinct. That generally means about 60 seconds.

The hon. member for Edmonton Manning has the floor.

Ziad Aboultaif: Mr. Speaker, the bad news is that today there are 4,700 Canadians awaiting a life-saving organ transplant. The good news is that most of those on the waiting list could be saved by a living donor. A living donor is someone who donates all or part of an organ to save the life of a fellow Canadian.

I am a living donor. On December 8, 2003, I donated part of my liver to save the life of my son Tyler, but I am not alone. Across Canada, there are hundreds of people alive today because someone bravely, generously and selflessly gave a part of their body to another person to save their life. These donors stepped forward, took on risks and gave the gift of life. To me and to the people they saved, they are true heroes.

Living donors are not paid and are not allowed to be compensated for their donations, and this is a good thing. They have freely given what they can to save the life of another. It is a priceless gift. However, as a transplant recipient once said to me, “I just don't feel a thank you card is enough. I wish we could do a proper job of recognizing them.” That is why I am proposing through my private member's bill the creation of a living donor recognition medal.

Living donors volunteer to give a part of their body to another person to save their life, and this selfless and altruistic gesture is worthy of significant recognition. We recognize citizens for bravery—

Routine Proceedings

The Speaker: Can the member wrap up fairly quickly?

Ziad Aboultaif: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will be done in a minute.

We recognize citizens for bravery, selfless acts and compassion toward their fellow citizens. This should be no different for living donors. The medal would be a way to raise awareness and discussion surrounding living donation. It would save more lives. If we do this, Canada would be only the second country in the world to add living donors to its national honours system—

The Speaker: We have to move on now. I know it is a very important bill and the member is very sincere about presenting it, but we do have to be succinct.

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

* * *

• (1540)

RESPECTING FAMILIES OF MURDERED AND BRUTALIZED PERSONS ACT

Jeff Kibble (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, CPC) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-235, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (increasing parole ineligibility).

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to table my private member's bill today, an act respecting families of murdered and brutalized persons. I have the utmost respect for my colleague, the member for Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, who originally tabled the bill. I am honoured that he is here today to second the important bill before us, which speaks to the most heinous cases, where criminals abduct, sexually assault and murder their victims. Think of Bernardo, Pickton, Rafferty and McClintic, or Wellwood and Moffat. The act would increase parole ineligibility from 25 years to 40 years for these types of cases.

The bill is fair. It would not change the outcome; the offenders are unlikely to ever be released. The bill is just; courts and judges would retain their discretionary powers based on the circumstances of the case.

Most importantly, the bill is compassionate; it is about sparing the victims' families and loved ones from appearing at unnecessary parole hearings year after year. The hearings feed criminals' depraved nature to revictimize as they describe their heinous crimes in detail. Victims' families are dedicated to attending, to advocating and to giving a voice to their loved ones who can no longer speak for themselves. Families relive the experience and trauma of their loved ones over and over.

The bill previously received wide support from the members opposite and was set to pass to committee in 2021. However, an early election was called.

Routine Proceedings

I look forward to continued broad support from across the House as we look to prevent the revictimization of the families of murdered and brutalized persons.

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

* * *

ADDRESSING THE CONTINUING VICTIMIZATION OF HOMICIDE FAMILIES ACT

Dane Lloyd (Parkland, CPC) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-236, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Corrections and Conditional Release Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to reintroduce McCann's law in the House today.

In 2010, Lyle and Marie McCann of St. Albert were tragically murdered, and to this day their remains have never been found. The individual responsible has refused to disclose where the remains are, compounding the pain the McCann family continues to endure to this day. Sadly, their case is not an isolated one. Missing and murdered indigenous women make up a disproportionate number of these tragic cases.

McCann's law would empower judges, parole boards and correctional officers with the tools to hold offenders accountable. It would extend parole ineligibility and ensure that co-operation in recovering victims' remains is a major factor in parole decisions. In Canada, killers can walk free without ever disclosing the location of their victims' remains. Families have a right to know where their loved ones are. They have a right to give them a proper funeral, and the people who would deny them these fundamental rights must be held to account.

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

* * *

FISHERIES ACT

Jonathan Rowe (Terra Nova—The Peninsulas, CPC) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-237, An Act to amend the Fisheries Act (Atlantic groundfish fisheries).

He said: Mr. Speaker, whether I am in Trinity Bay, Bonavista Bay or any other bay in Newfoundland and Labrador, the number one topic of concern is our food fishery. The collapse of our cod fishery was over 30 years ago. Stocks are up, and even commercial fishing has begun, yet my family and I cannot go out and get a codfish on a Wednesday afternoon. Newfoundlanders and Labradorians are fed up. People in other parts of Atlantic Canada can fish any day of the week, but we are restricted to weekends.

It is disappointing that the struggling families, the ones that cannot afford groceries because of Liberal policies, are the ones that cannot go out on a Thursday afternoon to get a codfish when the weather is calm. Instead they have to wait until the weekend, their only weekend off, to risk their life in high winds and high waves.

Not only does the bill have mechanisms that would help improve science and data, but at its foundation it would also put Newfoundland and Labrador on an even playing field with the rest of Atlantic Canada, allowing us to fish seven days a week.

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

* * *

● (1545)

CRIMINAL CODE

Viviane Lapointe (Sudbury, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-238, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (restitution orders).

She said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand in the House today to present my private member's bill, which is calling for amendments to the Criminal Code in crimes related to drug trafficking and human trafficking.

We have all seen the devastating impacts that these crimes have had. The impacts are far-reaching for victims, their families and also communities, specifically the community agencies that are providing support services, often life-saving services, to the victims.

Criminals who are charged with these crimes should be made to pay. They should make restitutions to victims and their families, and certainly to the community agencies.

I want to take this opportunity to thank the frontline service support workers who are doing great work in keeping our communities safe and resilient.

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

* * *

CANADA HEALTH ACT

Sukh Dhaliwal (Surrey Newton, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-239, An Act to amend the Canada Health Act (accountability).

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to rise today to introduce my private member's bill, seconded by my esteemed colleague and dear friend, the hon. member for Winnipeg North, an act to amend the Canada Health Act, accountability.

This bill would ensure that provinces receiving federal health transfers develop their own accountability frameworks, set clear benchmarks for timely access to care and publish annual reports so that Canadians can see the results. It would strengthen transparency by respecting provincial jurisdiction.

Canadians deserve to know that every federal health dollar is making a difference in reducing wait times and improving access to quality care. I urge all members of the House to support this important bill.

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

Routine Proceedings

[English]

OFFENDER REHABILITATION ACT

Kelly DeRidder (Kitchener Centre, CPC) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-240, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, to make related amendments to the Corrections and Conditional Release Act and to amend the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act.

She said: Mr. Speaker, today I rise to introduce the proposed offender rehabilitation act. The bill seeks to address one of the most urgent and heartbreaking crises facing Canadian families: the devastating impact of substance addiction.

Canadians see the toll: lives are lost; families are shattered; and public safety is eroded. Our justice system must do more than punish. It must also heal.

The bill would empower courts to prescribe structured rehabilitation measures, including education, skills training and treatment programs, to be undertaken during custody. These are not soft-on-crime measures. They are smart-on-recovery interventions.

The bill would strength the Corrections and Conditional Release Act to ensure that rehabilitation objectives are considered during parole decisions, and it would amend the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act to treat large-scale fentanyl trafficking as an aggravating factor, reflecting the gravity of the harm inflicted in our communities.

I look forward to working with all members of the House to restore dignity, health and hope to those caught in the cycle of addiction.

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

* * *

● (1550)

[Translation]

NATIONAL STRATEGY ON FLOOD AND DROUGHT FORECASTING ACT

Tatiana Auguste (Terrebonne, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-241, An Act to establish a national strategy respecting flood and drought forecasting.

She said: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to introduce this bill again. It proposes a national strategy to improve flood and drought forecasting.

I would like to start by thanking the hon. member for Lac-Saint-Louis for the work he did. This bill reflects the Government of Canada's priorities, which are to protect our communities, build climate resilience and build a sustainable economy.

In Terrebonne, where the Rivière des Mille Îles serves as a reminder of how beautiful and fragile our environment is, this bill is particularly meaningful. It seeks to protect families, support the local economy and preserve our natural heritage.

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

JAIL NOT BAIL ACT

Arpan Khanna (Oxford, CPC) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-242, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and the Department of Justice Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise to introduce my private member's bill, the jail not bail act. This bill would fix the broken bail system, lock up repeat violent offenders who are terrorizing our communities, and restore safe streets. We have been lucky and blessed to have the support from all levels of government, law enforcement, Crowns, defence lawyers, victim advocacy groups, victims and survivors, and their families.

I look forward to having the support from all members, irrespective of party and affiliation. It is time we restore our safe streets and get Canada back on track.

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

* * *

CORRECTIONS AND CONDITIONAL RELEASE ACT

Kerry Diotte (Edmonton Griesbach, CPC) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-243, An Act to amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act (parole review).

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to introduce my private member's bill today in honour of Brian Ilesic. It would simply amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act so that convicted murderers would no longer be eligible to apply for parole each and every year after they have served their minimum sentences and after their first application for parole is denied.

Instead, parole would be reviewed in accordance with statutory time frames. This would be a common-sense approach in recognition of the significant trauma and harm caused to victims and families having to be put through repeated parole hearings year after year.

I look forward to debating this in greater detail when the time comes and having the support of colleagues on all sides of the House.

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

* * *

CLEAN COASTS ACT

Patrick Weiler (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-244, An Act to amend The Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999 and the Wrecked, Abandoned or Hazardous Vessels Act.

Business of Supply

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise in the House to introduce the clean coasts act. This bill takes two important steps to better protect our coastal environment, boaters and coastal residents by proposing to amend key federal laws.

First, it would amend the marine dumping provisions of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act to clarify that marine dumping is a strict liability offence. This is critical to prevent incidents such as the 2015 oil spill in English Bay, when the MV *Marathassa* leaked oil for nearly 24 hours, without consequence.

Second, it would amend the Wrecked, Abandoned or Hazardous Vessels Act to require pleasure craft owners to take reasonable steps to avoid transferring their vessel to someone who is unable to maintain it, which is often a tactic used to avoid disposal costs. This would help address the growing problem of abandoned and derelict boats along our coasts.

Together, these two changes would strengthen accountability and better protect Canada's marine environment and coastal communities from pollution. I urge all members of the House to support this important piece of legislation.

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

* * *

• (1555)

PETITIONS

PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am so proud to rise today to table petition e-6488 to demand that the Government of Canada appoint a disability commissioner to hold the government accountable when the human rights of persons with disabilities are violated.

People with disabilities make up one in four Canadians, and their rights are affirmed in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the Canadian Human Rights Act and international treaties, such as the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. However, like the petitioners have suggested, all too often these rights, which are enshrined in Canadian and international law, are violated or disregarded.

I want to give a special shout-out to Jay Woodruff, who took so much time getting this petition together, running a campaign. I encourage everybody to look on the website for this petition.

SUDANESE REFUGEES

Salma Zahid (Scarborough Centre—Don Valley East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to present petition e-6555, signed by over 1,000 Canadians. The petitioners draw members' attention to the prolonged delays in immigration processing for Sudanese refugee claimants and how these delays have humanitarian implications, hindering family reunification and leaving families in limbo, unable to move on with their lives.

The petitioners ask the government to prioritize security checks for Sudanese applicants, facilitate timely reunification of families affected by the Sudanese war, consider a policy solution to the age limit for dependents in these cases and create a special humanitari-

an pathway for the reunification of extended family members prior to receiving permanent residence.

[*Translation*]

ENERGY TRANSITION

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise today to present this petition on the issue of the transition to clean, green, renewable energy.

[*English*]

Petitioners are calling on the House, in looking at the Paris Agreement and the need to transition our economy, to not forget the skills and the needs of oil and gas workers, to ensure there is a just transition for workers in the fossil fuel sector, and to ensure, working alongside workers in these sectors, Canada puts forward a strong plan based on the task force on just transition for Canadian coal power workers and communities.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

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

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—OIL AND GAS EMISSIONS CAP

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Hon. Kody Blois (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join today's opposition day debate. This is a really important topic about how we can drive national projects of importance forward while also maintaining a climate competitiveness lens to what we do.

• (1600)

I look forward to getting into that, but I know you will permit me about 60 seconds to mention something. Members will notice that today I am wearing an Acadia University tie. This morning, I was in Wolfville, Nova Scotia, where we made an announcement alongside the provincial government for 104 child care spaces, in partnership with Acadia University. It is great news for the local community. I give full credit to Minister Maguire and our local MLA in Kings South. It is a great example of federal and provincial co-operation.

I did not have the opportunity to talk about the Hon. Ken Dryden, a great Canadian, as the Prime Minister and many parliamentarians highlighted in their remarks last week celebrating his legacy of accomplishment. I cannot help but think that Ken Dryden would be proud of that announcement in Wolfville. It matters for affordability for families, it is important for children and, of course, it is sound economic policy long term to make sure we have the next generation of leaders. I will get to the debate, but I had to make sure we had a moment to talk about how proud of an announcement that is.

We are here today to talk about the opposition day motion. I thoroughly enjoy debating and bringing forward positions, whether of the government or my own, on opposition day motions. Today's is in relation to the government's emissions cap on the oil and gas sector in this country.

I want to start by saying that Canada is an energy superpower. The Prime Minister has made that clear. We as parliamentarians should take great pride in this country that we have what the world wants, whether it is conventional energy, renewable energy or critical minerals. The hon. member for Sudbury and I have conversations often about the importance of the mining sector in this country, because at the end of the day, if we are going to get to a clean future where we are able to reduce emissions, it is critical minerals that will be so important to that pathway. They are going to be mined out of places like Sudbury, places in northern Ontario and places up north. There is tremendous economic potential for the regions of this country. I want to give credit to the member for Sudbury; she is a great champion in this regard.

It is important to highlight this to Canadians. It should be a great source of pride, and it is on government benches. I am from the province of Nova Scotia. It was not that long ago that I graduated proudly from Hants East Rural High, a rural high school in Hants County. About half of my graduating class, particularly the male cohort, who wanted to get into the trades or skilled labour went west or went to the Atlantic offshore in Newfoundland and Labrador to pursue their future through the oil and gas industry. This was 2009, and our province was not in great economic shape at the time.

It is important to recognize that Canada is the fourth-largest oil-producing country, fifth in natural gas, and we have the cleanest natural gas in the world. That should be a source of pride for all Canadians. That is something we should embrace, and we need to make sure we support that sector. Frankly, despite the fact that we hear from the opposition benches that the previous government did nothing in this sector, there has been a lot of success in it. Moving

Business of Supply

forward, that sector has a bright future because the world needs Canadian energy, and this government and this Prime Minister are hell-bent on making sure that happens.

That is why we have seen the introduction of legislation like Bill C-5. It is to make sure we can have major national projects advance, and not just in the oil and gas sector. I note that LNG phase 2, in British Columbia, when it is fully realized and goes through the regulatory process we are looking to expedite, it will be the second-largest LNG facility in the world and the lowest-emitting, employing thousands of Canadians in British Columbia and from all across this country. It is not just British Columbians. I know there is great pride in that province, but this is a Canadian national project, and it is providing energy security around the world. It is Canadian energy, and it is zero-emission at its production base.

I know members of Parliament in this place will talk about it being a transition fuel and say we have to look at and continue to push harder on renewables. That is fair. We are going to continue to do that work, but this government is of the view that we have to do both at the same time. We have to explore projects all across this country, whether in conventional or renewable energy. If we look at hydrogen, there are great opportunities in Atlantic Canada. This government is focused on building major projects that are going to drive our economy.

[*Translation*]

• (1605)

This is a critical issue, because the world has fundamentally changed. Given that the U.S. administration wants to reconfigure its free trade relationship with countries around the world, it is absolutely crucial to focus on the resilience of free trade and Canada's relationships around the world.

I support the work of the minister responsible for free trade, the Minister of International Trade, whose goal is to forge international bonds.

[*English*]

We saw this in the pragmatic way the Prime Minister approached the G7. Of course, we invited our friends, our long-standing allies of the G7, to have important conversations, but we also invited other world leaders who would not always be invited, those on the margins of the G7, to have these very pragmatic conversations about what the future looks like and how Canada can have relationships with countries that we may not always agree with on every single thing, but with which we want to find the sandbox of co-operation so that we are able to find partnership in a world that is ever-changing.

Business of Supply

I have been in and out of the chamber, and I have listened to some of the debate on the opposition motion today. We understand this, and the government is going to have a pragmatic approach to how we tackle major economic imperatives, such as major projects that matter for regional economies and the national economy, but we are a government that is also focused on climate competitiveness because it does matter. I was speaking to the hon. member for Winnipeg North just before this debate. I hope to be proven wrong by my opposition colleagues when it gets to questions, but in my six years in this place, I do not remember a single time that I have heard the opposition advocate for an initiative or a project that pairs economic competitiveness with reducing GHG emissions. I know that right now, the economic imperative is clear: We need to move forward and build up Canada's economic sovereignty. However, I have never heard it, and I am going to go through a few examples that I thought were pretty good examples.

The member for Lakeland, from Alberta, will perhaps give me some examples of where that comes in, but I want to remind the member for Lakeland that when the last government introduced programs that would help individuals who were in energy poverty or energy insecurity in Atlantic Canada and across this country revert to more eco-friendly options on heating homes and reduce energy bills, the Conservatives were against them. In Atlantic Canada, just shy of 40% of the homes in Nova Scotia still use home heating oil. Instead of just railing on about the carbon price, the last government actually removed the carbon price and introduced a program to help people transition. It was a thoughtful approach of not just dealing with the short-term objective but thinking longer term about energy security. The Conservatives stood against those programs.

There were \$20,000 loans given to anyone below the provincial median income in Nova Scotia, and the Conservative Party said it was a bad policy. Single women seniors in my riding would call my office and say that without this program, they would not have been able to make the transition to a more affordable way to heat their homes. Of course, the environmental impacts were very clear and pronounced, but the Conservatives were against it. They called it a bad program. I do not understand that. This is one clear-cut example of a program that my constituents at home can point to that helped countless individuals, thousands of households, and the Conservatives said no to it.

How about biofuel policy in this country? There is a policy where we mix in ethanol, which can be sourced from western Canadian farmers, to help reduce emissions and help drive price points, and the Conservatives were against it. The Conservatives are saying they introduced the policy in 2008. Well, we do not hear a whole lot of support for it right now.

• (1610)

I was just in China with Premier Moe. We are going to engage with the Chinese to see if there is a pathway forward. We are going to engage with other markets in countries that need and want Canadian canola. However, there is a domestic policy lever as well, which is a biofuel policy that this government has supported. This government has actually augmented it to try to drive more demand at a time when pricing is extremely important, but the Conservatives say they are against that too. That policy could reduce emis-

sions and also directly support rural businesses and farmers in western Canada, and the Conservatives are against it.

I listened to the leader of the official opposition on CBC with Catherine Cullen, and he said that he is an “environmentalist”. What policies would he point to? Again, I am not saying the priority should not be on economic projects, but when do the Conservatives ever have a lens that considers how we can match both? How can we chase both and think long term? The member for Lakeland will stand up proudly, I am sure, in about 16 minutes and tell me exactly what those policies are.

Particularly on LNG, this is where we differ. We see the Conservatives trying to paint our new Prime Minister as similar to the old one, but this is a different government, and Canadians have picked up on that. This is a Prime Minister who has different priorities. This is a Prime Minister who is going to protect some of the social infrastructure that was introduced that I would hope all parliamentarians agree with. This is a Prime Minister who is going to be different.

In fact, there are a number of constituents in my riding of the Progressive Conservative ilk, moderate Conservatives, who say a government led by this Prime Minister, the hon. member for Nepean, is more in line with their thinking than the member for Battle River—Crowfoot, who represents a different ilk of Conservative. We can notice how the Conservatives are trying to paint him as just another Liberal. Yes, he is a Liberal prime minister, and we are proud of the work we are going to do in the days ahead, but this Prime Minister is fundamentally different.

For example, we are going to pursue LNG projects in this country. The Prime Minister was in Europe just a couple of weeks ago. We are focused on what we can do to get LNG to Europe. I just mentioned LNG Canada in British Columbia. These are examples of where we are willing to be pragmatic.

When it comes to the emissions cap, the Liberals reject the premise that the cap is a production cap. I know the Conservatives want to make that out to be the case. We believe there is an ability to partner with the provinces and industry to reduce emissions in our oil and gas sector, which absolutely matters to this country.

It is also about being able to maintain and protect extremely important jobs that matter not just in western Canada, but also in Newfoundland and Labrador and all across this country, including in Kings—Hants, to go back to the example I just gave, which was about the individuals from my riding who transit back and forth across the country proudly supporting this sector. We support it too in terms of what it represents.

Business of Supply

The government is a pragmatic government. What I do not see in the opposition day motion is any mention of work with the provinces. This is an important element. If the suggestion is to just throw out a federal policy, what thoughtful public policy would replace it? How would we offset the fact that the policy is not there? What would we do differently?

This is where I go back to the point that it is an economic imperative. There is zero lens, zero thought and zero mention of anything to do with emissions reduction. This is a very serious threat. Climate change is real. We have seen the impacts across the country. Do I think this government is going to be more pragmatic and do I support that more than I did with the last? Yes, I do, but we are still going to have a lens on the competitiveness of our climate objectives, because it matters for trade and matters for relationships around the world. The European Union wants to see products coming from countries that are taking this question seriously.

If we were under a Conservative government, it would have no answer to what the European Union would be asking for as it relates to trade, because the Conservatives put zero thought to that on the floor of the House of Commons, except if we look to the Conservative platform, which said to spend more taxpayers' dollars. To them, we should not have any policy that encourages the private sector to reduce emissions and drive their competitiveness. We are just going to plow on more government spending, apparently more than the last government. That is how the Conservatives would get their outcome.

I would ask the hon. member for Lakeland, or any other member on that side, where the conservatism is in that. That is not actually Conservative policy, because carbon pricing, an industrial policy, at its core was actually introduced first by Conservative governments in this country. It baffles me a bit that while we are talking about policies that are inherently small-c conservative, we have an opposition that either does not talk about this at all or, when they do talk about it, talks about pouring on government spending and larger government programs. That seems to run contrary to how Conservative principles ought to play out on that side of the House of Commons, but again, I am sure the member for Lakeland will have an answer, and I look forward to that back-and-forth.

● (1615)

In terms of industrial pricing, Conservatives want to get rid of it. Premiers in Alberta and Saskatchewan actually support the idea of having an industrial price, because if we are even remotely serious about balancing economic questions with some form of emissions reduction, what are the other policies? What are the objectives? Again, it is a huge, massive spot on the agenda of the Conservative Party on this point. I believe in what our Prime Minister is doing, which is meeting the moment right now in terms of big projects that matter to the national interest, with the understanding that Canada's energy has to be unleashed. I believe this is going to be part of our foreign policy.

I was listening to the Prime Minister speak at the United Nations General Assembly while I was on the way up to Ottawa this morning. He was talking about how Canada can deliver not only on food security, and we should be proud of our farmers, but on energy security and on critical minerals that the world needs. I think of our

Minister of Foreign Affairs, whom I have a close relationship with. She is a good Kentville gal. That is where she grew up. We are proud of her in the Annapolis Valley. When she goes out and has these conversations with her counterparts around the world, she is talking about how Canada can deliver on the energy security that the world needs at a lower-emitting dynamic, and that does matter if there are two alternatives.

People want price and the security of the source, and if we have a lower-emitting source, that is going to matter when people are comparing two different places they can source that energy from. We hear none of that talk from the Conservative Party and none of it in this opposition day motion. There is nothing about working with the provinces or about keeping any element of public policy that blends the economic imperative of the moment with the need to continue to move down the line toward a more sustainable economy. It is just simply not there.

I go back to the point about Conservative policy to date. I hope the Conservative members will correct me if I am wrong that the policy to date is the platform of the Conservative Party of Canada vis-à-vis April 2025, which was the election. That is the foundation that I can go look at. There was actually a lot of policy about spending more government money to be able to reduce emissions: way more. How does that jive with the questions that I hear from the opposition benches about the need for fiscal discipline, which this government agrees with?

This government is going to be working toward balancing the operational spending of the government within the next three years. I would expect that the Conservatives would support that. I would hope they would, but I ask how it jives that the Conservative policy would actually be to spend more than the last government on incentives toward emission reduction. It is not Conservative policy, and it is certainly not fiscally responsible in this environment. We have to have some regulatory policies that help work alongside the private sector to be able to move forward.

It is important, when we have these conversations, to look at what this government is doing. The government is serious about building nation-building infrastructure and working alongside indigenous communities, the provinces and the private sector to build in this country. We think that is extremely important.

We are a pragmatic government. This is a new Prime Minister, as much as the opposition would love to have the old guy back. They had a lot of obsession about that. This is a new Prime Minister who is popular in this country. Canadians across the political spectrum, from the left to the right, are seeing his pragmatic nature and his decorum about how he is bringing the country together. This includes premiers who do not always agree and have not always agreed with Liberal governments in Ottawa. They are saying that they like what they are seeing from the Prime Minister.

Business of Supply

We will continue to take that approach on a case-by-case basis, working alongside the provinces and working alongside industry, to make sure we can be smart about growing the economy at a critical time, building out Canada's economic sovereignty and looking at our climate competitiveness at the same time. We do not see that level of sophistication from the opposition benches. That is why we are here, and that is why we are going to continue to be here in the days ahead.

Clifford Small (Central Newfoundland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I heard my colleague from across the way speaking proudly about his fresh, shiny new Prime Minister and the required regulatory process that he is so very proud of: the emissions caps.

Here is what the emissions caps have done: The emissions caps have pretty much identified Bay du Nord as our last offshore oil project in Newfoundland and Labrador, because we are getting up against our cap. Furthermore, by 2033, our existing oil fields, such as Hebron, Hibernia and White Rose, will have to reduce their production as these emissions caps tighten.

I would like to ask my colleague if he is proud about persecuting Newfoundland and Labrador's offshore oil and gas industry?

• (1620)

Hon. Kody Blois: Mr. Speaker, I am deeply proud of the men and women who work in Canada's offshore energy sector in Newfoundland and Labrador and, of course, all across this country.

I will remind the hon. member that under the Harper government, it was a 900-day process to actually get a regulatory review and approval. The Liberal government moved it to 90 days. I am happy to actually put on the record here in the House of Commons that I am willing to bet steak dinner, fish dinner, lobster dinner or whatever he wants, we can do it, that there will be projects in Newfoundland's offshore in the days ahead, within the next six months.

I am happy to say that I believe in our Canadian offshore industry. We are going to see success because the Prime Minister is sending the right signal, that we are going to make sure energy projects get built in this country.

The member can say what he wants in this place. I am willing to put money on the line. How about supper? How does that sound for Bay du Nord?

[*Translation*]

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to be having this debate today, especially since it comes after a decade of Liberal rule.

We just heard it again. The Liberals approved the Bay du Nord project. They funded the Trans Mountain oil sands pipeline at a cost of \$34 billion.

Climate backtracking has accelerated since Mr. Carney's arrival—

The Deputy Speaker: I have to interrupt the hon. member. Members cannot refer to the Prime Minister or other members by name.

Patrick Bonin: Mr. Speaker, backtracking on climate change has accelerated since the new Prime Minister's arrival. Among other

things, he scrapped carbon pricing and passed Bill C-5, which bulldozes environmental legislation and authorizes pipeline projects.

In another step backward, the Prime Minister did not renew financial incentives for purchasing electric vehicles. He also backed down on the requirement to sell more electric vehicles. In addition, he refuses to commit to meeting greenhouse gas reduction targets for 2030. Today, the next step backward is very clearly under way, as the government is backtracking on regulations to cap greenhouse gas emissions for oil and gas.

Will he commit—

The Deputy Speaker: I have to interrupt the hon. member and give the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister an opportunity to reply.

Hon. Kody Blois: Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his question.

Our government's position is crystal clear: We will continue to take economic interests and the importance of climate competitiveness into consideration. Our Prime Minister thoroughly understands the importance of addressing the challenges raised by climate change and the importance of reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

That said, the world is now a different place. The global free trade environment and economic threats have changed. That is why the Premier of Quebec is saying that he is open to the idea of a pipeline and other projects—

The Deputy Speaker: I have to interrupt the hon. parliamentary secretary to continue with questions.

[*English*]

Questions and comments, the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands.

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, in this place, the notion is that there are projects in the national interest.

To describe LNG Canada as a Canadian project is to have failed to look at the investors. They are almost entirely Asian: PetroChina, a Korean company and a Japanese company. There is a significant alliance with the Haisla Nation. This project has been heavily subsidized by the Government of British Columbia. It is a climate-killing project as LNG that is fracked has the same carbon footprint as coal.

In any case, to the hon. member, how can this project be described as Canadian when the investors are in Asia?

Hon. Kody Blois: Mr. Speaker, our government believes that there is an important role for foreign direct investment in this country. We want to deploy Canadian capital for projects, and we want to support Canadian companies. However, there is capital that is global that wants to invest in Canada, support Canadian workers and provide Canadian energy to the world.

Business of Supply

I would remind the hon. member that when we look at the Indo-Pacific right now, coal that is being generated for electricity is actually on the rise. Canada needs to provide its low-emitting LNG to help reduce emissions for countries that do not have available access to other energy sources. LNG Canada is a great example of indigenous partnership.

We are making sure equity is supported in this country. It is a great example of Canadian ingenuity. We are proud to have foreign investors alongside Canadian companies that want to invest in Canada's energy sector right here in this country.

• (1625)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the many words that my colleague has said. Could the member amplify something?

A few months ago, our new Prime Minister brought in legislation to build one Canadian economy. We now have five significant projects. The member just made reference to LNG. That project is virtually going to double the production of LNG, which is a positive thing. Canada can be an energy superpower. This is something we have talked about as a Liberal caucus, and the Prime Minister has made a commitment to working towards it on behalf of Canadians. This is a positive thing for the economy; at the same time, it is sensitive to our environment.

Hon. Kody Blois: Mr. Speaker, I would agree with the member for Winnipeg North. The Prime Minister has said this himself. He is a pragmatic individual. He is putting forward a pragmatic government that is looking to balance those two really important metrics. I highlighted, and I think I have made the case to the House and to my hon. colleagues, that there is now an economic imperative. There always is, but it is particularly the case in the global environment we find ourselves in right now. The hon. member will know that we have put the Port of Churchill in his home province of Manitoba on the agenda. He mentioned LNG. There is an opportunity for offshore wind in Atlantic Canada.

The government is about building major projects focused on economic development and making sure that there is a competitive lens on reducing emissions at the same time. It is what Canadians want, and it is what Canadians are going to get.

Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member is talking a lot about the new Prime Minister. He seems to want to forget the record of the last 10 years. In fact, the member did not even want to run under the previous prime minister. That is how much he wanted to forget the record of the last 10 years. He was a part of a government that did everything it possibly could to stop the progress and prosperity of the nation.

I have a constituent, Belinda, who wrote to me and said, "Please help Canadians. My husband works a job downtown, and I work. We have three teenagers. We are not able to afford anything but basic necessities. I have never written to my MP but feel like the whole country is falling apart. Mental health is being affected. We no longer have the funds to do anything fun. We have to pull our kids out of sports next year, and it's killing me inside. Help us, please. Help it change."

What does the hon. member have to say to Belinda, and why should she believe him now?

Hon. Kody Blois: Mr. Speaker, I would say to Belinda that this is exactly why we introduced a middle-income tax cut in the last session of Parliament to help support 22 million Canadians. That is why we have removed GST on purpose-built homes in the country. That is why we are advancing major national projects that we think are going to stimulate the economy.

I will correct the hon. member. I was always proud to run under a Liberal banner. Even if I did not agree with the previous right hon. prime minister about everything, I certainly believed in the Liberal Party as a better vehicle to represent this country than the official opposition and the leader from Battle River—Crowfoot.

I am particularly pleased that the hon. member for Nepean now sits in the Prime Minister's chair. I believe in his vision. That is exactly why we are going to move forward.

As a note, there was a 40% increase in oil and gas under the last guy, Mr. Trudeau. I do not think it has been a completely terrible day for the oil and gas sector in the country, but we are going to make sure we support our energy—

The Deputy Speaker: Questions and comments, the hon. member for Mirabel.

[*Translation*]

Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to wish a remarkable young lady from my riding, Arielle Courcy, a happy 13th birthday.

That being said, civil society, the media and the government have been very critical of the United States, which is experiencing an institutional breakdown.

How can we criticize our neighbours to the south when we ourselves have a government that is backsliding on the environment to the point that it no longer respects its international treaties, including the Paris Agreement?

Hon. Kody Blois: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to wish my colleague's constituent a happy birthday.

Our government is focused on two priorities: advancing projects in the best interests of the country while ensuring that we continue to fight climate change—

• (1630)

The Deputy Speaker: I must interrupt the hon. parliamentary secretary as his time has expired.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Lakeland.

[*English*]

Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will split my time with the new, great member for Terra Nova—The Peninsulas.

Business of Supply

In 2023, the Liberals imposed yet another step in their anti-Canadian energy agenda, an oil and gas emissions cap they touted as the first and only kind in the world, designed to limit Canadian oil and gas production, which will really cap and kill Canadian jobs, businesses, private sector clean tech, and revenue for all levels of government to provide programs and services Canadians value. Its true intent, to limit production of Canadian oil and gas specifically, is clearer in the words of the current Prime Minister, who was a senior economic and energy adviser to the then prime minister, Trudeau, when he announced it.

The current Prime Minister, of course, said, “as much as half of [proven oil reserves] need to stay in the ground.” The Liberals, 20 months and three weeks ago, said the Canadian oil and gas cap was bold climate leadership. However, common-sense Conservatives saw it for what it was: an unprecedented, arbitrary production cap, the only one of its kind in the entire world, and self-harm to Canada by our own federal government.

That is right, and let me be extra clear about it. No other country, and importantly, no major oil- or gas-producing country, has imposed an absolute cap federally on its own production: not the United States, Canada's biggest energy customer and competitor, which, because of the last anti-development Liberal decade that killed at least four Canadian pipelines and dozens of LNG projects, turned the world away from Canada and drove hundreds of thousands of jobs and billions of dollars in major projects out of our country; not Norway; not Saudi Arabia; and not a single OPEC nation made up of hostile, anti-freedom regimes with lower and often non-existent environmental and human rights standards.

Even though the current Prime Minister is another Liberal, he suddenly claims to want to make Canada an energy superpower and put shovels in the ground on major projects at unimaginable speeds not seen in generations. However, how can Canada be an energy superpower when the Liberal government blocks Canadian energy production and exports with its own laws and policies that are all still on the books?

How can Canada lead when the Liberals decided to impose a policy that interferes in provincial jurisdiction and that experts, proponents and indigenous entrepreneurs all say will kill major projects and thousands of jobs? The layer of the Canadian oil and gas cap on top of other anti-energy laws and policies block the very projects that would create Canadian jobs, reduce emissions and get Canadian oil and gas out to allies and to global markets.

The last, lost Liberal decade of domestic policy attacks on Canadian energy has put Canada in a vulnerable, dependent position that was totally preventable. Canada of course still sells up to 90% of our oil and gas to the United States at steep discounts because the Liberals killed two potential export pipelines outright: one to the west coast to access growing Asian markets in the most direct, affordable and safest route, and one west-to-east pipeline that would have ensured Canadian self-sufficiency with western oil for eastern refineries and more competition for customers with exports to Europe.

At the same time, both Democrat and Republican administrations turbocharged the American production and exports of oil and LNG, turning the U.S. into the world's leading global supplier, while the

Liberals, while watching all this happen, increased their stranglehold on Canadian oil and gas and workers at every single step. Various experts estimate the discounts cost Canadians big, about \$25 billion every year. Just imagine what infrastructure, programs or services that revenue could provide right now and could have contributed during the last decade to benefit Canadians everywhere, if the Liberals had not spent the last decade killing active private sector pipeline proposals to ensure that no new ones would be proposed.

The truth is that the Liberals announced the Canadian oil and gas cap publicly with little consultation and economic analysis in advance. The Prime Minister was even in another country when he imposed it. The Liberal-NDP-Bloc coalition at the time did a short study on it at committee, but Conservatives had to dissent in order to properly highlight the cautions about the wide-ranging and catastrophic impacts of the Canadian oil and gas cap.

Witnesses during the committee work did warn them. Dale Swampy of the National Coalition of Chiefs said the government “treat[s] the oil and gas sector like they're the enemy and a problem to be fixed” and that “a cap on emissions will be, in effect, a cap on production”, which kills economic reconciliation opportunities for indigenous communities and business owners who need it most.

● (1635)

The Liberals were warned the cap would harm indigenous, rural and remote communities the worst, but they did not care, even though Canadian oil and gas developers spend about \$14 billion through procurement from 585 indigenous-affiliated vendors across 110 municipalities and 45 indigenous communities. That is real money that makes a real difference for indigenous people, all threatened by the revenue-killing, job-killing Canadian oil and gas cap.

Business of Supply

Since then, the independent Parliamentary Budget Officer has reported that the Liberals' oil and gas cap will kill 54,000 jobs by 2032. That is almost double the population of the Alberta-Saskatchewan border city of Lloydminster. There are hundreds more cities of that size across Canada. That number of jobs will be lost in six years because of the cap, a cut of \$21 billion from Canada's GDP. The cap will shrink Alberta's GDP by 4.5%, and the rest of Canada's economy by 1%. It will cause \$191 billion of lost activity in Alberta and \$91 billion in the rest of Canada.

Why should this matter to Canadians in every part of the country? This is why: The oil and gas sector contributes 7.7% of Canada's GDP. It is still Canada's top export despite the damage the Liberals have done. Over \$208 billion every year is what it contributes to Canada's GDP, with \$166 billion from direct activity and \$42.8 billion from the supply chain. It supports over 446,000 direct and indirect jobs, including more than 10,800 indigenous jobs.

Nearly 900,000 Canadians depend on the oil and gas sector through spinoff or induced job creation. These are also not easily replaceable minimum wage jobs, since the average compensation for an oil and gas worker is nearly twice the national average for goods-producing sectors. Alberta employs 54% of the supply chain workers, but B.C., Ontario and Quebec together account for over a third of those jobs. That means that the cap threatens jobs, paycheques and government revenue from Vancouver to Montreal, and everywhere that oil and gas is produced, from Fort St. John to St. John's and Saint John.

The Conference Board of Canada warns that between 2030 and 2040, the cap could reduce Canada's GDP by up to \$1 trillion, and strip \$151 billion in federal revenues, money that could go to defence, to border security, to fighting crime and to federal programs, and could be shared with provinces to build hospitals, schools, roads and provide social services.

Proponents across Canada agree the cap is bad policy and that it disadvantages Canadian businesses and jobs. Since growing Canadian oil and gas production and exports is the solution to ensuring Canadian energy security and to help lower emissions globally, the Liberals were warned "this could lead to greater global emissions as we see more coal being utilized than natural gas and sources of supply...coming from jurisdictions that don't have [Canada's] high standards."

World-class oil and gas operators across Canada point out their ongoing aggressive reductions in both absolute and emissions intensity, which, by the way, the Liberals' oil and gas censorship bill precludes them from talking about. The cap could also have the opposite impact from what its proponents claim, by driving more projects and investment out of Canada, and could "bring all action to a halt".

The truth remains today that the oil and gas sector, among all private sector developers, invests the most annually in clean tech and emissions reduction technology, more than all other sectors in Canada combined. Warnings that the cap will do exactly what the Prime Minister said he wanted it to do, which is to keep oil and gas in the ground and kill businesses, jobs and government revenue,

and that it will also not even achieve the environmental outcomes its proponents claim, should be heeded.

The Liberal oil and gas emissions cap is a production cap. The former environment minister also admitted that oil and gas production falls under provincial jurisdiction, so the cap also inflames already divided provincial governments and sparks legal challenges with more uncertainty that drives away investment.

While Canada caps production, of course the world is passing Canada by, because the Liberals have let them. The EU has signed a \$750-billion deal for American energy, and other countries have been forced to sign deals with hostile authoritarian regimes for LNG after the Liberals spent 10 years saying there is no business case.

The Conservative motion today is very clear. We are the only party fighting to repeal the job-killing, economy-killing, emissions reduction-killing cap, full stop. Canadians cannot afford another lost Liberal decade. The motion is clear: Repeal the cap. Unleash Canadian energy to make a strong, united Canada self-reliant—

• (1640)

The Deputy Speaker: Questions and comments, the parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, part of the problem for the member opposite is that I was actually here for part of the years Stephen Harper was the prime minister, in 2015. If we were to be honest, what we would say is that Stephen Harper could not even build an inch of pipeline to our coastlines. The member talks about the east-west pipeline proposal, which is something that was determined by the economics, and that is the reason Harper could not do it. It actually took a different administration to get Trans Mountain built. It had nothing to do with the Conservatives. Where the Conservatives might get credit is on propaganda, misinformation and so forth.

Does the member not believe it is a good thing when we have Ottawa and the provinces, in particular Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, working more closely together to ensure that we can build big projects?

Business of Supply

Shannon Stubbs: Mr. Speaker, it sure is an indictment of his own government and of his sitting here, at least in the last decade since I was elected, that he just admitted the federal government has not been working with provincial governments co-operatively over the last 10 years. Instead, today a consequence of the Liberal government is more division in provinces and people pitted against each other than ever before. What a shame that is.

Of course the truth is that under the former Conservative government, four pipelines were built, and all the private sector proposals for both the LNG projects and the pipelines that the Liberals outright killed. The former prime minister vetoed the northern gateway pipeline, and the Liberals interfered in the regulatory process deliberately to put a pin in the west to east pipeline so Canada could not be energy self-sufficient and have more customers.

The Liberals are the ones who have a track record of killing pipelines. That is who they truly are, and the Conservative Party is the only party that has been consistent on behalf of oil and gas workers in every corner of this country.

[Translation]

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we have seen quite a bit of backtracking on several environmental issues since the new Prime Minister's arrival, particularly with regard to carbon pricing, electric vehicles and Canada's greenhouse gas emission reduction targets.

Now, we sense some backtracking on the idea of capping emissions from Canada's oil and gas sector. This shift seems virtually tantamount to climate skepticism. I am wondering what my Conservative colleague thinks about global warming. Is it an established scientific fact?

[English]

Shannon Stubbs: Mr. Speaker, I certainly could not begin to tell the member how Canadians are supposed to decipher the last decade of uncertainty and the current uncertainty that the Liberals are causing. He raises a great point for voters in every single part of the country who voted for the Liberals based on their concerns and their support of anti-energy and anti-development policies that the government has imposed over the last 10 years.

The people in this place who have to answer for why they are baiting and switching and flipping and flopping, and who can stand here shamelessly and take positions that are diametrically opposed to the ones they defended for a decade, including just six months ago, are the people who have to answer to Canadians about what their views are and what they are going to achieve.

Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Lakeland, just to the south of my riding, gave a very passionate speech defending people who work in the energy industry. As she very rightly pointed out, a cap on emissions is a cap on production, which will hurt with respect to creating jobs

Could the member explain why there are so many concerns being raised by people in our ridings and throughout Canada about the constant attack from the Liberals? While Liberals appear as though they might possibly change their opinions, with what they are say-

ing with words, we have seen no actual action. I am just wondering whether she could give her feelings on that.

Shannon Stubbs: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for being such a great representative and advocate for the people in her riding, which makes an outsized economic contribution to the entire country and directly helps contribute to programs and services that are delivered in every province across Canada.

I could not begin to explain the thinking of the Liberals or the damage they have done to their own credibility, but what really dismays me after 10 years is all the lost opportunities, which they did deliberately and were warned about. Hundreds of thousands of jobs lost by people right across Canada because of the anti-energy policy is unconscionable.

• (1645)

The Deputy Speaker: 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 Saanich—Gulf Islands, Climate Change; the hon. member for Regina—Lewvan, Natural Resources; the hon. member for Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, Small Business.

Jonathan Rowe (Terra Nova—The Peninsulas, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I serve a big riding. I have knocked on thousands of doors. The consensus is clear: Newfoundlanders and Labradorians do not want these emissions caps choking our economy. These emissions caps do not just affect my riding. They affect the whole world. We have allies throughout the world who are starving for more energy.

Our energy is some of the most socially inclusive oil and gas in the world, with the strictest environmental standards. We should be supplying our allies with this energy so we can build our economy, reduce emissions and provide international security.

When Russia invaded Ukraine, the message was clear: Europe needed to eliminate its dependence on oil and gas from Russia. The countries affected, such as Germany, came to my province of Newfoundland looking for more oil and gas, specifically LNG, liquefied natural gas. Instead of the Liberal government working with Germany and our private investors, the government said that there was no business case and tried to sell it hydrogen instead. If the Liberal governments had not axed the LNG projects the last Conservative government started, Germany would have already been purchasing our resources rather than funding Russia and giving it more money and more influence in Europe to fund its wars, wars which our taxpayers send their money to combat. It is an oxymoron.

Business of Supply

To recap, we have emissions caps that choke our industry, allowing for more opportunities for Russia to sell its energy to fund its wars. While our taxpayer dollars lose billions in royalties, we send our taxpayer dollars to Ukraine to fight that very country. It is a lose-lose. It does not even begin to make sense. Why will the Liberal government not remove the emissions caps so we can produce more for our allies and provide international security for both of us?

Believe it or not, providing the world with our oil and gas would enable us to reduce carbon emissions. We do not need to choke our economy to lower global emissions. We can actually lower global emissions by producing more and getting more Canadians back to work. Natural gas produces roughly half the emissions of coal. The Fraser Institute estimates that doubling Canadian gas production and exporting it to Asia could reduce global emissions by as much as 630 million tonnes per year, almost 90% of Canada's total amount. Let that sink in. There is also a significant carbon savings for replacing coal with traditional oil. That is why we as Conservatives are standing for it. It is a win-win.

Regardless of what the Liberals fantasize about, as third world countries are rapidly developing, the global demand for energy is skyrocketing. I was once asked this question: What year did the world burn the most amount of coal? I pondered it, thought about it and figured it was probably during the late nineties or late eighties. I was shocked to learn that the answer was last year. It has always been last year and it will continue to be last year for many years into the future. That is heartbreaking.

Last year, the world consumed nine billion tonnes of coal. If the world really wants to eliminate coal consumption, we need to produce an initial 41 billion barrels of oil. I think we can do it here in Canada. The reality is that we cannot miss out on an opportunity to have a better tomorrow because we are fantasizing about having a perfect tomorrow.

Where should these nations turn to to source this natural oil and gas? While our allies look elsewhere, Canada keeps selling almost all of its oil and gas south of the border. Natural Resources Canada confirms that 98% of our crude goes to the U.S., nearly four billion barrels per day. While the Canada Energy Regulator shows that almost all of our gas goes to the U.S., we even sell it at a discount compared to the U.S. benchmarks. It is rumoured that every one dollar of crude that we send to the U.S. is exported for three dollars. Talk about a markup.

It gets worse. While visiting a natural gas plant in Alberta, I found out that it is selling to a grid that can be brought down to the Americans for five cents a unit. The Americans liquefy that and sell it for over \$12 U.S. a unit. Something is wrong here.

That is why Conservatives believe Canadian energy should be cutting coal abroad instead of being sold off to the Americans for pennies on the dollar. We are in a trade war with a country where Trump yells, "Drill, baby, drill". Oil companies are investing in the U.S. rather than here in Canada because there is not enough room under these production caps. The Liberals claim they are trying to fight Trump and build our economy, but they are trying to do it with one arm tied behind their backs.

• (1650)

We need to build these pipelines. We need to build a nation that is able to export to other countries so we can truly lower carbon emissions, yet as the Liberal government was going around claiming it wanted to do that, it refused to take the first step to eliminate the emission caps. Were the Liberals intentionally deceiving voters during their election campaign, or were they simply too stubborn to take the first step?

The reality is that if we, as Canadians, do not supply this energy, other countries will. If there is one country in the world that will benefit from selling energy, I propose that it be Canada. I propose it be Newfoundland. Newfoundland and Labrador's GDP relies on oil and gas more than any other province, even more than Alberta. Newfoundland has more undiscovered offshore oil and gas than we do discovered, yet companies will not invest any further in exploration because of these emission caps.

The Bay du Nord project was delayed time after time because of these Liberals' failures, and if it goes ahead, it will be the last offshore project in Newfoundland due to these emissions caps. There is simply no more room. It is capped. Not only will it be the last project, but also, in 2032, the emission caps will decrease, and the current offshore industry will have to cut back on production. Can our economy really take another hit when unemployment is at an all time high and people can barely afford groceries?

We, as Conservatives, promised to work with the industry to double oil and gas in Newfoundland, which would have added an additional 25% to our provincial GDP. Imagine the roads that we could have paved. Imagine the doctors we could have hired, even in St. Lawrence. Instead, we have a Liberal government that wants to leave the emission caps in place, in effect leaving our roads and health care system in despair.

I have worked in the oil and gas industry, and I can tell members that our oil and gas is the most socially and environmentally acceptable oil in the world. In addition to having some of the strictest environmental regulations in the world, we have the highest safety requirements to protect workers and prioritize quality of life. We have some of the most inclusive oil and gas production in the world. The Canadian energy sector does not discriminate. We hire people of all races, all genders and all sexual orientations. We ensure that our oil and gas benefits everybody in this country.

Business of Supply

Without naming names, I am not confident that all energy-producing countries have the same equality that we have here in Canada. Why do our allies, who believe in equality, believe in safety and want to see strong environmental regulations, keep buying dirty dictator oil? It is because the Liberal government refuses to repeal the emissions cap so that we can meet their supply.

As I stated before, we cannot miss out on our opportunity to have a better tomorrow because we are fantasizing about having a perfect tomorrow. I hope this message will move the Liberal government to work with us Conservatives to repeal these emissions caps so that we can put Canada first for a change.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we cannot trust Conservative policy. The member is being critical because the United States is taking our oil and then making a profit from it. However, when I was questioning the critic, I mentioned that the Conservatives had not built any pipelines. Stephen Harper did not build any pipelines to the west coast. The response was that they built four. Those four pipelines went to the United States. We can contrast that to the one major pipeline that we put into place, which went to the west coast. Does the member not see the hypocrisy there?

Not to mention Bill C-49, which was to the economic advantage of Atlantic Canada, and the Conservatives voted against it. Would the member not acknowledge that the leader of the Conservative Party and his seatmates were wrong to vote against C-49?

• (1655)

Jonathan Rowe: Mr. Speaker, I will acknowledge a few things. If it is not one thing on one side of the country, it is another thing on the other. The Liberals say that we cannot sell our oil and gas because we cannot get it to market from Alberta. However, for Newfoundland, there is no excuse. We are at tidewater, yet the emissions caps keeps us choked.

If it is not one thing, it is another. I am tired of excuses. Canada is tired of excuses. A Conservative government would be working together to build this country.

[*Translation*]

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, since the arrival of this new government, we have seen a competition between the Conservatives and the Liberals to see who likes oil and gas the most. This is on full display yet again today, with both sides calling to get rid of all environmental regulations.

Investment credits of \$5.7 billion are allocated to carbon capture and sequestration, a measure that seeks to help oil and gas companies. Do the Conservatives agree with allocating billions of dollars in this way to an industry that is already making multibillion-dollar profits?

[*English*]

Jonathan Rowe: Mr. Speaker, the member is saying that Conservatives and Liberals are trying to see who is the most pro oil and gas. Every province in Canada is happy to take oil money, but they are not all that happy to play the oil game. We cannot have oil money without playing the oil game.

Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as a first-generation Albertan with a mother from St. John's, Newfoundland, I want to say how happy I am to have the member joining us from that great province of Newfoundland and Labrador as an advocate for energy workers and resource development right across the country.

Speaking of that, we both know that generations of young Atlantic Canadians have had to find work in other places and that there have been massive job losses since the Prime Minister came to office, specifically in natural resources. Year over year, there have been hundreds of thousands of job losses. In May, June and August, there were losses in forestry, mining, fishing, quarrying, and oil and gas. That is the reality of the Liberals' record and for the future.

What does the member have to say to the people he represents and all Canadians about that?

Jonathan Rowe: Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland and Labrador has some of the highest unemployment rates in the country. Next to Newfoundland and Labrador, not far behind is Alberta. That is because the Liberal government has brought in emissions caps and has been choking our economy. Newfoundlanders and Labradorians have been travelling back and forth to Alberta and other provinces for years. The member for Fort McMurray—Cold Lake is in agreement with that because she understands. She sees that.

The economy of Newfoundland and Labrador is not just in the offshore industry but also in Alberta. When the west does better, all of Canada does better, including the east coast and Newfoundland.

Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, one of the things the member from Newfoundland so rightfully pointed out is that, for the last 10 years, the government in Ottawa has been telling the energy industry that it should not exist, that it should transition away to something else and that the Liberals were ashamed of it.

Now, the Liberals are saying they are different, but they have not really done anything different. They have not gotten rid of the anti-energy laws. All they have done is created a new framework so they can bypass their own bad policies—

The Deputy Speaker: I have to interrupt the member to allow the member for Terra Nova—The Peninsulas to respond.

Jonathan Rowe: Mr. Speaker, we have an interconnected economy. We want to thank Fort McMurray for all the work it has done for Newfoundland and Labrador, and we look forward to working with Alberta to build the best country that we can for change.

The Deputy Speaker: When the previous member was speaking, a member crossed in front of him. Standing Order 16(2) says that a member cannot cross between the Speaker and the member who is speaking. The guideline is not the TV screens but whether the Speaker is in the chair and the member is speaking. This is a reminder for members so this does not happen to the parliamentary secretary.

Resuming debate, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change has the floor.

Wade Grant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Carleton.

Today, we are highlighting the concrete progress that greenhouse gas emission limits are making across this country. This policy measure is not just an abstract goal; it transforms the way we build our homes, transport our goods, produce our energy and manufacture essential materials such as concrete. Through these goals, we are seeing tangible results for the environment, public health and the Canadian economy.

Every tonne of GHGs avoided contributes to cleaner air, a more stable climate and more resilient communities. With respect to housing, the residential and commercial sector accounts for a significant share of national emissions. The limits encourage the adoption of stricter energy standards for new and renovated buildings, the optimization of heating and cooling systems and the integration of renewable energy sources. Canadians benefit from efficient homes, with lower energy bills and increased comfort. These improvements not only are good for the environment but also generate jobs in construction, engineering and energy-efficient retrofit services.

Transportation is one of the sectors where limits have a direct impact. Policies that accompany the limits, such as the clean fuel regulations, stimulate the use of low-carbon fuels and support the transition to electric and hybrid vehicles. By reducing the carbon intensity of fuels and encouraging the adoption of cleaner technologies, we are improving air quality in our cities and helping to prevent respiratory and cardiovascular diseases. Canadians benefit from a healthier environment while seeing new economic opportunities emerge in the transportation and sustainable mobility sector.

In the industrial sector, the limits encourage innovation and process modernization. Industries such as cement, steel and chemicals are investing in carbon capture and storage, energy optimization and reducing fugitive emissions. These initiatives not only reduce the carbon footprint but also position Canada as a leader in the production of low-emission industrial goods that can compete in an increasingly sustainable global market.

The concrete and building materials sector is particularly energy-intensive and responsible for a significant share of industrial emissions. Thanks to the limits and complementary policies, we are seeing the increasing adoption of low-carbon formulations, alternative cements and carbon capture technologies. These advances reduce the carbon intensity of construction while maintaining the quality and durability of materials. They are a perfect example of how emission limits encourage innovation and create economic opportunities in traditional sectors.

Business of Supply

A central element of this progress is the reduction of methane emissions. Methane is a potent gas, responsible for nearly 30% of global warming to date and hundreds of thousands of premature deaths each year due to air pollution.

Canada is a co-lead of the comprehensive methane arrangement, alongside the European Union. This includes measures in the oil and gas sector, as well as in landfills. These actions not only reduce emissions but also improve air quality, public health and the competitiveness of Canadian products in the global marketplace.

Reducing GHG emissions and air pollutants, such as volatile organic compounds, directly improves the health of Canadians. Volatile organic compound regulations in oil and gas facilities reduce exposure to harmful substances such as benzene. Each reduction in emissions helps prevent respiratory diseases, premature deaths and health costs estimated at more than \$146 billion annually. This shows that emissions reductions are not only good for the climate but essential for the well-being of communities.

The success of the boundaries depends on collaboration with provinces, territories and indigenous communities. Each region has its own priorities and solutions to reduce these emissions. The government is working in partnership to align policies, maximize reductions and support communities in their energy transition. Indigenous communities are actively involved in the design of clean energy projects right across the country, contributing to local solutions while benefiting from sustainable economic opportunities.

Emissions reductions drive innovation across all sectors. Companies are investing in clean technology, energy efficiency and carbon capture, creating low-emission products and services that meet the growing demand of international markets. At the same time, programs like the biofuels incentive program support the domestic production of renewable fuels, creating jobs and economic opportunities for regions right across the country.

Business of Supply

● (1700)

The goal of reducing emissions has already produced concrete results. Fugitive methane emissions from the oil and gas sector decreased by 33% between 2013 and 2023; the concrete, steel and clean fuel industries are adopting innovative technologies to reduce carbon intensity; and buildings and transportation are experiencing energy efficiency gains and increased adoption of low-emission solutions. This progress illustrates that emission limits are not an abstract idea but an effective tool to achieve tangible results for both the environment and the economy.

Limits on emissions are making a real difference in the lives of all Canadians. In housing, transportation, industry and even the concrete sector, we see measurable improvements in energy efficiency, emissions reduction and air quality. Combined with methane reduction and Canadian leadership on the international stage, these measures position our country as a global leader in climate and clean energy. They show that it is possible to reconcile economic growth, public health and environmental responsibility.

The national emissions cap is not just a policy; it is a road map to a cleaner, safer and more prosperous future for all Canadians today and tomorrow, for my children's generation and my grandchildren's generation.

● (1705)

Scot Davidson (New Tecumseth—Gwillimbury, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have never heard so much fluff, and I really do not even know where to start.

To the member, first of all, if he could comment, my riding did not receive the rural top-up under the carbon tax that the government defended for 10 years. He talks about the retrofit program: "Federal government pulls plug on home retrofit loan program". Thirdly, he talks about the transition. The northern part of my riding is on propane. We have been pleading for 10 years for a natural gas line. We cannot even get a natural gas line. We have old, phase one hydro infrastructure.

This is what frustrates the people in my riding. When the government sends money overseas, they are on the outside looking in, saying, "What about us?"

Wade Grant: Mr. Speaker, that is why we are investing in LNG Canada phase 2. We are investing in new technologies to ensure that the future of this country is safe and secure for future generations. We will continue to do that today, tomorrow and for the future. I want to ensure that my kids and grandkids, in the future, can live, play and recreate the way I did on the mouth of the Fraser River.

[Translation]

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, experts at the Canadian Climate Institute were very clear last week: Canada will not meet its greenhouse gas reduction target for 2030.

This is because of oil and gas production, whose emissions increased by 83% between 1990 and 2022. Last year, they increased even more and that cancels the efforts in other sectors, including the efforts of Quebec. Will the government unequivocally commit to capping greenhouse gas emissions in the oil and gas sector to ensure that Alberta finally makes the efforts it needs to make?

[English]

Wade Grant: Mr. Speaker, Canadians expect and deserve a clean, low-carbon and resilient future. That is why we will continue to work hard, making sure that we make bold decisions for all Canadians right across this country and trying to reach our targets as strongly as possible. That is what this side of the House will continue to do and what I will continue to do as the parliamentary secretary for Environment and Climate Change Canada, working, hopefully, on both sides of the aisle.

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Waterloo, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is a diversity of views and perspectives, and it is essential that we do grow the economy.

People in my riding of Waterloo share that, but I also hear from many constituents who are saying it is important that we take the environment seriously. They have been noticing that premiers from coast to coast are really onside with this new government's vision and recognizing the importance of getting it right, to ensure there is safety, security and energy security for generations to come. I know the government stands with energy workers.

I would like to hear the member's comments in regard to the importance of ensuring that the environment is considered as we grow the economy and as we secure and procure Canadian energy spaces for Canadians and around the world.

Wade Grant: Mr. Speaker, there was a saying from one of my elders when I was growing up: We cannot have an economy without the environment. The environment is a key player in making sure we have a great economy today, but we also need to preserve it for the future. We do not have to have one without the other; we can have them together.

This is what we are doing, investing in and ensuring we have technologies that are going to build this country going forward, greener and cleaner. This what I am proud of, to stand here and tell my children.

● (1710)

Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, a friend of mine who works in the energy sector just came back from West Africa, and he discovered that the U.S. government takes our oil and sells it to these nations at three times the price it pays us.

The question he had was this: When is the Canadian government going to do something about this and keep that money in our country as opposed to giving all that money to the U.S.?

Wade Grant: Mr. Speaker, fighting climate change is not only a moral imperative but also an economic imperative. By embedding climate considerations into our economy, we are driving innovation, unlocking new markets and positioning Canadian businesses to lead globally five, 10, 15 years down the road.

Bruce Fanjoy (Carleton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we meet here today on the unceded territory of the Algonquin Anishinabe, and we do so at a moment that calls for both courage and clarity from all of us who serve Canadians.

As this is my first speech in the chamber, I want to take a moment to thank the constituency of Carleton, my volunteers, my campaign team, my EDA and especially my family: my wife Donna, who was a remarkable support throughout this process, and my children, Adrienne and Ben. I am determined to leave a strong, sustainable world for them and for their children. Also, I thank my father Emery and my mother Nan, who are not here to witness this moment but who for years and decades prepared me for this moment.

From the earliest days of Confederation, this country's story has been one of resilience, ingenuity and overcoming extraordinary challenges together. Today, as the world faces a period of transition in global trade, energy markets and climate action, Canadians are once again choosing to meet this challenge with ambition. In the energy sector, the ambition is clear. Our allies are looking to Canada for energy they can trust that is reliable, secure and increasingly lower in emissions. The world's need for secure, responsibly produced energy has never been greater, and neither has our opportunity to shape what that means for decades to come.

The Prime Minister has been unequivocal: Our goal is to secure Canada's place as an energy superpower, drawing on our resources, our people and our capacity for innovation to meet the future head-on. This means not just maintaining our leadership in energy production, but leading in sustainability, technology and responsible climate action.

Creating energy security is a responsibility, as is climate action. The goal before us is net zero by 2050. It is a shared objective among industry and provinces. Forward-looking Canadian energy companies are already advancing innovative pathways to reach net zero, including the pathways plus carbon capture and storage initiative, which the Major Projects Office is looking at now. What unites us from government to industry and from coast to coast is a shared determination to ensure that Canada remains a leader as the world transforms.

Net zero by 2050 is not just a target; it is a commitment to future generations of workers, to local communities and to our partners and allies, which want climate responsibility alongside energy security. We know, as the Prime Minister himself emphasized recently, that the path to net zero means investing in technologies and solutions that reduce emissions while supporting jobs and prosperity right across the country. Canada is preparing to advance this with a climate competitiveness strategy to ensure that our climate action is ambitious and effective and benefits Canadian jobs and competitiveness.

A key lesson of recent years is that top-down approaches can only go so far. This government is committed to working in close

Business of Supply

partnership with industry, provinces, indigenous peoples and communities, not imposing solutions, but enabling the innovation and investment already under way across Canada's energy sector. The Prime Minister has been clear: We are stronger when we work with industry, not against it. Canadians have made it clear they want a pragmatic, effective approach that ensures both environmental progress and economic opportunity.

● (1715)

The message is already guiding the work of our new Major Projects Office, launched to help unlock the potential of major investments in next-generation energy, infrastructure and innovation. By streamlining assessments and fostering partnerships, this office will make Canada a global destination for responsible resource investment, including in the clean technologies that are reshaping the sector.

We are advancing a stable, predictable framework, not by building more barriers, but by providing clarity and speed. Together, the Major Projects Office and our climate policies create an environment where industry investors, indigenous peoples and indeed all Canadians can innovate for the long haul. Our focus is not on static limits, but on enabling pathways for companies and communities to reduce emissions while growing prosperity.

We believe the best way forward is one that draws on Canadians' strengths, world-class expertise, advanced technologies and meaningful collaboration. As we prepare to release a new climate competitiveness strategy, Canadians can expect an approach that supports industries and workers as partners on a path to net zero. That is not just climate leadership. It is a competitive advantage as international buyers increasingly seek out cleaner energy.

The world is shifting. Allies are looking for energy partners that can deliver reliability and security, but also demonstrate real progress on emissions. Canada is one of a small number of countries with the credibility and capability to deliver both. Recent investments, such as LNG Canada and major new infrastructure projects, prove that with the right frameworks, Canada can attract billions of dollars in investment, create thousands of good jobs and deliver some of the cleanest energy on the planet.

Business of Supply

Canada's path to energy leadership also depends on reconciliation and inclusion. That is why our government has established the Indigenous Advisory Council for the Major Projects Office. It is to ensure that indigenous people are partners at every stage from planning to ownership and that major projects deliver real, lasting benefits for our communities. We cannot and will not meet our energy and climate goals without meaningfully including indigenous voices and respecting their rights. This is both a moral duty and a source of strength for Canada.

Canadians want to know how we will turn today's opportunities into progress and shared prosperity. They want to know how we can provide energy security for our own families and for our allies, especially in an era of global uncertainty. The answer is not to pit prosperity against climate responsibility, but to insist, as the Prime Minister has, that Canada can and must lead on both fronts. That means investing in our workers, accelerating innovation, reducing emissions sector by sector and forging partnerships at home and abroad.

As we prepare to bring forward the climate competitiveness strategy, our message is clear: Canada's ambition is to be the partner of choice. We will deliver energy that our allies can count on. This is the Canadian way, building on our strengths, solving problems together and aiming higher. Let us show the world that Canada's energy future is one of progress, partnership and pride.

• (1720)

Marc Dalton (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the new member for Carleton to the House.

He talked a lot about our allies looking to us, but the Liberal government has basically given our allies and partners the bum's rush. Germany and Japan came to us wanting us to export LNG, and the former prime minister wanted to see if there was a business case. Basically, he was saying there is no business case. The whole cap and trade policy is actually causing investment to pour down south, tens of billions of dollars of it.

To bring it home here to Ottawa, my cab driver today was saying how difficult it is for him. He said he used to work five days a week, but now he works seven days a week, 10 hours a day, and it has gotten very hard.

Does the member not recognize how the Liberals' policies against oil and gas—

The Deputy Speaker: I have to give a chance to the member for Carleton to respond.

Bruce Fanjoy: Mr. Speaker, time and time again, the Liberal government has supported ordinary Canadians and is making life more affordable. We are in an energy transition. It is happening around the world. It is in the interests of Canadians and Canadian industry that we not be laggards in this energy transition. Being laggards will cost us more and will mean we miss out the economic opportunities right before us.

[*Translation*]

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, since the new Prime Minister took office, the message is undeniably “drill, baby, drill”.

Canada is back in the oil and gas sector. Just recently, an LNG project was approved that will double exports of a gas that, let me remind members, is produced by hydraulic fracking. This technique was banned in Quebec because it is extremely harmful to the environment. The Prime Minister says he is open to the idea of a pipeline and praises the oil sands. It is clear the government is backtracking on the idea of setting a cap on emissions from the oil and gas sector.

Can the government tell me how it will respect the Paris Agreement if it does not compel the sector primarily responsible for emissions, the oil and gas sector, to reduce its emissions?

[*English*]

Bruce Fanjoy: Mr. Speaker, I enjoy working with the member on the environment and sustainable development committee. I assure him that this new government is absolutely committed to our international obligations. We are in a period of transition. We need to make sure the economy supports Canadians, but Canadians also need a sustainable environment, and we are absolutely committed to that.

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I will add my words of welcome to the hon. member for Carleton.

One area that is very difficult is when people who generally should agree, like people who want climate action, end up repeating things that are not the case. In the case of liquefied natural gas coming from British Columbia, the liquefied natural gas comes from fracking. Fracking threatens our water supplies. Fracking causes earthquakes and releases vast quantities of methane. According to energy experts, this means the carbon footprint of fracked gas is the same as that of coal.

I wonder if the hon. member for Carleton has any comments or questions in relation to that reality.

• (1725)

Bruce Fanjoy: Mr. Speaker, one thing I respect about this government is that it has a vision for the future that includes sustainable development and clean energy, but we realize where we are today, and we need to power the economy. We need economic activity sufficient enough to support the programs Canadians depend on right now. LNG is a fossil fuel, yes, but it is better than some, and we are going to continue the work to get to even cleaner forms—

The Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate, the member for Long Range Mountains.

Carol Anstey (Long Range Mountains, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Tobique—Mactaquac.

Before I begin, I just want to acknowledge my Conservative colleague from Terra Nova—The Peninsulas, who is also a new MP. He had so much passion in what he was speaking about, and I share that passion.

It is an absolute honour and privilege to be back in the House after spending the summer in my riding and serving the incredible people of Long Range Mountains. It is a great privilege to rise today and support our Conservative motion calling on the Prime Minister to immediately repeal the oil and gas emissions cap.

Let us be clear. This is a production cap. Despite repeated attempts by the Liberal government today at the environment committee to frame this policy as merely an emissions cap and not a production cap, the reality is that it will directly cut production, kill jobs and weaken our economy.

This issue gets right to the heart of something that matters a lot to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador: good jobs in the offshore oil and gas sector, investment in their communities and the ability to provide for their families with powerful paycheques. This is not just a provincial resource; it is a national asset, one of the few resources with direct access to tidewater.

It has the potential to strengthen Canada's trade diversification, supply our allies with responsibly produced energy and secure prosperity for generations to come. Instead of unleashing that potential, the Liberal government, with the support of Mark Carney, is imposing an emissions cap that functions as a—

The Deputy Speaker: There is a point of order from the hon. member for Waterloo.

Hon. Bardish Chagger: Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the member is newer, but it is important that we maintain the Standing Orders in this place, and the member should not be referring to the Prime Minister or any member by their name.

The Deputy Speaker: I thank the member for Waterloo. That is a great reminder. We cannot use the first or last names of any member, including the Prime Minister or cabinet ministers in the chamber.

The member for Long Range Mountains.

Carol Anstey: I have a point of order as well, Mr. Speaker. During my colleague's speech earlier, the member for Waterloo called him just an excuse—

The Deputy Speaker: It is not a debate. That is the rule, and we cannot break the rule.

I will recognize the member for Long Range Mountains to continue her speech.

Carol Anstey: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is imposing an emissions cap that functions as a production cap, creating uncertainty, driving away investment and threatening the livelihoods of thousands of workers across our province. Offshore oil and gas requires high upfront capital costs and long timelines to production. Without certainty, there will be no investment. That is why this cap must be repealed to give investors the confidence they need to develop our resources and create powerful paycheques for Canadians.

Newfoundland and Labrador has a saying. If a person is talking out of both sides of their mouth, it means they are saying one thing

Business of Supply

while their actions show the opposite. The Prime Minister came to the province and talked a good game about supporting our offshore oil and gas, but he has refused to repeal the production cap. Now is his chance to prove that he is not talking out of both sides of his mouth by backing up his words with action and supporting our motion. The truth is that this policy carries devastating real-world consequences. Newfoundland and Labrador's offshore sector employs tens of thousands of Canadians and significantly contributes to our GDP each year. By continuing to impose a cap, the government threatens thousands of jobs for the next generation.

Every year, families leave Newfoundland and Labrador in search of well-paying jobs elsewhere in Canada. These are not just numbers. These are our neighbours, our friends and our children, who are forced to relocate because opportunities in their own province are being stifled. The offshore oil and gas sector has the potential to create these high-paying jobs right here at home, keeping families together and communities thriving. The stakes are national. Instead of strengthening our economy and supporting workers, the Prime Minister's emissions cap would devastate jobs in the energy sector and drive up costs, making life more expensive for Canadian families.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer laid this out plainly back in March. This cap would slash oil and gas production by nearly 5%, wipe out \$20.5 billion from our GDP annually and destroy 54,000 full-time jobs by 2032. This is not a theory; these are facts. These are numbers verified by Parliament's own budget watchdog, yet, despite all this, the government presses on with its ideological crusade against Canadian energy. What does this mean in practice? It means shutting down opportunity for Canadians while forcing our allies to buy more oil and gas from dictators. The world is crying out for more secure, responsibly produced energy, and no country does it better, and in a cleaner or safer way, than Canada.

However, instead of backing our workers, the government doubles down on policies that drive away investment. From May to September alone, \$54 billion of investment fled Canada. That is on top of the half a trillion dollars lost during the Liberals' first three terms. What do we have to show for it? We have no new pipelines, no new mines, no new nuclear plants and now a proposed shadow carbon tax on top of the industrial carbon tax.

The Prime Minister promised strength but has delivered weakness. He promised results but has delivered rhetoric. He promised to stand up for workers but, instead, stands up for ideology. This matters deeply to my province. This sector has the potential to be a cornerstone of Canada's trade diversification strategy, because offshore oil is one of the few Canadian resources with direct access to tidewater, allowing us to sell to markets beyond the United States.

Business of Supply

Under the Liberal government, the story of Newfoundland and Labrador's offshore is one of decline. Since 2016, offshore capital spending has dropped by 60%. This year, not a single new exploration well has been drilled. Meanwhile, other offshore jurisdictions, such as Norway and Brazil, are attracting billions in new investment. Why? It is because their governments provide certainty, clarity and confidence for investors. Here in Canada, we provide confusion, delays and regulatory paralysis.

I have spoken directly with proponents in this sector, including OilCo, the provincial Crown corporation responsible for managing our offshore. OilCo CEO Jim Keating calls the federal government's emissions cap an "investment killer". That is what Keating told reporters at the Energy NL Conference in St. John's. This policy creates deep uncertainty in investment decisions, because companies cannot and will not commit billions of dollars when they do not know if Ottawa will allow them to produce the energy that Canada and the world need.

● (1730)

The facts are undeniable. The Liberal government has imposed policies that stifle investment, drive away capital and threaten the livelihoods of thousands of hard-working Canadians. Newfoundland and Labrador's offshore oil and gas sector represents a unique opportunity: high-paying jobs, billions in GDP, access to tidewaters and a direct contribution to Canada's trade diversification.

However, instead of supporting this potential, the government has layered on regulatory uncertainty and maintained an emissions cap that functions as a production cap. Families will continue to leave our communities in search of opportunity, and investors will be forced to look elsewhere. Repealing the cap is not just a policy choice; it is a chance to signal that Canada values its workers, its provinces and its energy future.

This motion is a clear step towards restoring certainty, growth and prosperity for Newfoundland and Labrador, and the country as a whole. The government needs to answer this: Is the emissions cap still its policy, or is it finally willing to scrap it in favour of measures that would actually attract investment instead of driving it away?

Canadians know what is at stake. Nearly a million people across this country rely on the energy sector for well-paying jobs. Communities in Newfoundland and Labrador, Alberta, Saskatchewan and British Columbia depend on this sector for opportunity and growth. Our energy industry is also the single largest private sector investor in clean technology; it is driving innovation and cutting emissions while upholding the highest standards of environmental protection.

After 10 years of Liberal government and anti-growth policies, what do Canadians face? They face lost jobs, lost investment, lost opportunities and a government more interested in ideology than results. Only Conservatives will stand up for our workers, our energy and our country.

This is the Prime Minister's moment to put words into action. By voting with Conservatives on this motion, he can finally demonstrate that he truly supports Newfoundland and Labrador's offshore industry, a sector with direct access to tidewaters that aligns per-

fectly with his mandate to diversify Canada's trade. He can stand behind Canadian workers, secure investment and deliver prosperity for our province. The people of Newfoundland and Labrador are watching. Now is the time to act.

● (1735)

Will Greaves (Victoria, Lib.): Madam Speaker, my colleague and I represent ridings on opposite sides of the country, and there is a lot of space between Newfoundland and Vancouver Island, and my riding of Victoria. I understand that the member may not be entirely familiar with what we have lived through in British Columbia over the last 10 years.

I will share that we have seen a huge amount of economic development, growth and resource extraction in our province. We have seen the government support not only the construction of a new pipeline to tidewater but also new LNG projects in our province. We have seen investments in mines and infrastructure. We have seen a 400% increase in the number of oil tankers that pass my riding of Victoria every day from the port of Burnaby, where the TMX pipeline ends.

I invite the member to actually come to British Columbia and see that this narrative that the Conservative Party is propagating is incorrect.

Carol Anstey: Madam Speaker, the reality is that it is not about investment; it is about removing the emissions cap.

This is signalling to investors that once the Bay du Nord project goes through, there is no more space. We have all kinds of potential. The government wants to leave it in the ground. It does not want to develop this resource.

It is fine to say what is happening over on your side of the country. I am happy the member is seeing that development, but removing this emissions cap is crucial to our industry on my side of the country. That is what I represent, what I will stand up for and what I speak for.

[*Translation*]

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Madam Speaker, an international report released today clearly shows that oil and gas production is currently on the rise and that, by 2030, it will be twice as high as it should be if we hope to comply with the Paris Agreement. The report ranks Canada among the six worst countries in the world when it comes to projected greenhouse gas emissions.

Can the government explain to me how it intends to comply with the Paris Agreement when it is backtracking on such a vital policy as the oil and gas sector emissions cap?

[English]

Carol Anstey: Madam Speaker, I am not sure whether my colleague was directing his question to me, as he addressed the government.

Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for her amazing speech and for her support of Bay du Nord, which is important to Newfoundland.

Many people I grew up with have moved back home to Newfoundland as a direct result of the investment they have seen. However, they are concerned that it is going to be a one-and-done project. If this emissions cap stays in place, it tells investors: “Don’t worry, we are closed. We don’t want any more.”

However, we are currently importing 500 million barrels of oil, half a billion barrel, into this country every single day. We cannot get our oil from the east coast to the west coast and from the west coast to the east coast because we do not have these things called “pipelines” that go from those two places.

I was wondering if the member could speak to what she sees in her riding of Newfoundland.

● (1740)

Carol Anstey: Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague. We share a lot of commonalities.

A lot of people from Newfoundland and Labrador end up over in Alberta. The member is exactly right. Regardless of the commentary or the narrative that gets spun around these conversations, the reality is that proponents tell us time and time again that this is the problem and that this is why the sector is not growing.

The emissions cap needs to be scrapped in order to signal that there is investment opportunity in this offshore sector, and that is exactly what needs to happen for us to prosper in this space.

[Translation]

Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette—Manawan, BQ): Madam Speaker, former U.S. president Barack Obama said we are the first generation to feel the impact of climate change and the last generation that can do something about it.

Does my hon. colleague agree with this statement? If so, what measures does she suggest we take, aside from eliminating the cap on greenhouse gas emissions?

[English]

Carol Anstey: Madam Speaker, I am proud to say that those in the oil and gas sector are constantly creating technology and innovation to reduce emissions. They are leaders in this industry. We can reduce emissions in this country if we allow them to thrive and move forward in this space.

Richard Bragdon (Tobique—Mactaquac, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is an absolute honour to rise in the people’s House yet again and to have the opportunity to speak to this, our motion on eliminating the caps on oil and gas and energy emissions, which have been to the great detriment of Canada’s unbelievable and incredible potential that has yet to be fully realized.

Business of Supply

Today I could not help, in preparation for these remarks, reflecting upon a film that was somewhat before my time. I was but an infant when it was first released, but it got re-released, I think, in the 1990s, when I was in my teen years in high school. It was a movie entitled *When a Stranger Calls*. There was one particular line in that movie that seemed to go viral, as it were, before “viral” was even a known word; it went quite far and wide, and it still echoes to today. That phrase was this. A young lady was receiving call after call of a threatening nature. She was afraid and paranoid and absolutely terrified. She was on the run and hoping to get help. Of course, the calls kept coming. She managed to get a call through to the police. Finally, the police returned her call and said, “[The call is] coming from inside the house.”

I could not help but think that perhaps the greatest threats we face are not from without; those calls and those threats are coming from within, through bad legislation, misplaced priorities and putting the boot on the proverbial neck of our producers, our workers, our energy and oil and gas sector. I think it is time that we deal with the call that is coming from within the house, and we can do that by passing our motion, which calls for the elimination of the caps on oil and gas emissions and production.

This type of policy has done more to sabotage Canada’s future than any threat coming from without. If we only got out of our own way and unleashed our own potential, by allowing our workers to do what they do best, Canada could come out of the economic malaise in far better shape than we could have imagined. We could stand on our own two feet with fortitude and confidence and face any other challenge that comes from without if we got our house in order from within.

There are many, many people in our country who recognize the potential that Canada has to step into the vacuum and the void that is being created internationally. The world wants Canadian energy. It wants Canadian oil. It wants Canadian gas. We have the best regulatory regime for those sectors, and we also have the best workers for those sectors. We can have the best, most reliable and dependable energy supply to give to a vulnerable, energy-hungry world that we could ever imagine, but we have to get out of our own way. The opposition motion is a great first step to doing that, and I hope the government will join us in passing this.

It is time to unleash Canada’s potential. Our greatest threats are those that have been self-inflicted, whether they are interprovincial trade barriers or emissions caps. I think that what Canadians are demanding is for us to get our own house in order. It is time for us to realize our potential. We have to get beyond the era of empty promises and grand announcements.

Business of Supply

The government has become a master at making great announcements. It is wonderful. I love seeing all the happy talk. It is great. We have meeting after meeting and lots of happy talk, but really, when we bore down through all the noise, there have been no really substantive moves to develop the infrastructure necessary to get our resources to market. There has not been one new pipeline agreed to be built since all of the promises of becoming an energy superpower. There has not been the removal of the tanker ban so that we could export our resources to global markets. There has not been a putting in place of the infrastructure necessary to get liquefied natural gas to the markets.

The frustration of Canadians is getting high. They are wanting to know when the government will deliver on all of these promises that it is making in meeting after meeting. The best way we can deliver on those promises is to make sure we start by passing the opposition motion, to get our resources unleashed so that we can supply a world that wants Canadian energy.

• (1745)

The PBO came out with a report just recently, in March 2025, that talks about these threats. It says that because of the oil and gas production emissions caps, our oil and gas production will fall by nearly 5%, the national GDP will shrink by \$20.5 billion every single year and 54,400 full-time jobs will disappear by 2032. These are not abstract figures; they are people's livelihoods.

This is about subsistence for many families living throughout this country, whether in Alberta, Saskatchewan or Newfoundland, and the spinoffs that affect the rest of the country. When we shut down oil and gas production, we also shut down transfer payments. I speak as an Atlantic Canadian in a province that has been the beneficiary of transfer payments that have helped us meet our budgets and keep our schools and hospitals open and our economies going through economically challenging times.

As a New Brunswicker, I am thankful for western energy production, the oil and gas sector in Newfoundland and the oil and gas sector generally. It has kept Canada rolling and kept us, our schools and our services functioning in difficult economic times. If the Liberals want national unity and want to unleash Canada's potential and pull us together as a country, they should stand on the side of Canadian energy, which is responsibly developed and responsibly sourced. It is a good news-story, and we need to stand on the side of Canadian producers.

These types of policies have a devastating impact on rural Canada. Much of our natural resource and energy are based in rural Canada, along with our agriculture. It is these two sectors that have helped build this country, and these two sectors will be key to our country's comeback. It is time we stop the anti-rural Canadian approach to governance and recognize that it was rural Canada that built this country and that rural Canada will be key to our country's comeback. We can do that through unleashing our natural resource and energy sectors, getting off their backs and lifting off the punitive measures that keep our resources in the ground while allowing other countries that do not have the regulation or human rights to advance their economies at our expense. It is time to get our own house in order.

The globe is calling for it. How many missed opportunities have we had as a country? Japan wanted our natural gas. We said there was no business case, so it signed a \$550-billion liquefied natural gas contract with the U.S. Europe wanted to do business and buy Canadian energy. We said there was no business case for that and that we were moving beyond the old sources of energy, and guess what. It signed a \$750-billion contract with the United States. Germany came here wanting to do business with us and sign contracts, but the previous government, which is the current government, said there was no case for that. I am sorry, but there is a great case for it, and we have watched over 1 trillion dollars' worth of economic productivity and opportunity slip through our fingers because we have been putting the boot on the very sectors that could lead to our prosperity.

I could not help but think of a famous old story as I was preparing for this. It is an ancient story, and I know I am down to one minute, so I have to do this quickly. There was a lady who was in real trouble in ancient times. Her husband had died. She was left with two sons, and the collectors came and said, "We are going to take your two sons and put them in slavery to pay off your debts." She said, "I do not know what I am going to do. I do not know where I am going to turn."

She went to a wise elder in the community, and the wise elder said, "What do you have left?" She said, "I have just a little bit of oil, sir." He said, "Go back, close the door, get your sons to borrow all the vessels they can and use that little bit of oil. Pour it out." They kept pouring out the oil into the empty vessels, and guess what. They kept filling and filling those vessels. She went back to the wise man and said, "We have filled all the vessels." He said, "Now go sell that oil to take care of your debts, and it will take care of your family."

I think there is a truth in that ancient story. It is time we release the oil and allow it to get us out of the economic malaise we are in. The answer is in the house; we just have to release it.

• (1750)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I listened to the member for Victoria, and he talked about witnessing oil exports going out of Burnaby as a result of a pipeline that was built by the Trudeau government. That was a very strong and positive thing. The Conservatives opposed it.

I can look at Bill C-49. The member, I am sure, is familiar with Bill C-49. It allowed for additional energy development in Newfoundland and Labrador, along with Nova Scotia. Both premiers were onside, yet the Conservatives voted against it.

It seems to me that the Conservatives are good at talking, but when it comes time to actually do things, to support good ideas and vote for things that will help the industries where the member feels we are falling short, the Conservatives have been found wanting.

Richard Bragdon: Madam Speaker, it is always good to see my hon. colleague. He is a workhorse here in the House, but I must say that I think he has been sorely misled on this matter.

The only ideas the Liberals think make successful projects when it comes to oil and gas are ones they stretch out over 10 years, regulate and strangle to death, and pump billions of dollars of taxpayer funds into, without really incorporating the private sector because the private sector has long left the scene. The private sector realizes that Canada is not a secure place in which to invest for energy purposes under the current regime. It wants stability and predictability. We believe on this side of the House that government needs to get out of the way, stop over-regulating and allow the private sector to come in and do what it does best.

Let us partner with the private sector. The Conservatives have done that in the past, four times under a previous administration, and we built four pipelines.

[*Translation*]

Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Madam Speaker, I have been listening to the debate since this afternoon. On one side, we have the Liberals engaging in wilful hypocrisy, and on the other, the Conservatives engaging in wilful blindness.

The arguments we are hearing in today's debate in the House are arguments we have been hearing for the past 30 years. Economic interests are being promoted over environmental interests.

In a world where the climate is changing, where our forests are burning and our lands are drying up, where flash floods are causing our vegetables to rot in the fields, which is a huge problem for our farmers, and considering that climate change will impact the cost of living, how much longer can we remain wilfully blind to environmental interests?

• (1755)

[*English*]

Richard Bragdon: Madam Speaker, sometimes, it is better to answer a question with a question. As my hon. colleagues feel that oil and gas and energy development are dirty, bad for the planet and not good for the environment, are they willing to turn down all future transfer payments coming from the oil and gas sector and say they do not want dirty oil and gas money anymore? Do they want all of it reallocated? We could put that money into better forest management practices and the purchase of water bombers to help with forest fires. Maybe a productive use of the energy of this House would be reallocating transfer payments to provinces that appreciate the oil and gas sector.

Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Madam Speaker, what I heard from my colleague tonight was that words really matter. The government plays a great deal with words. As an example, quickly, a young person told me that the Prime Minister said into the camera that he would build homes people can afford. I said that was an open-ended sentence and asked if he heard “homes you can afford to buy” or “homes you can only afford to rent”.

He said he is going to make Canada the wealthiest in the G7 with government investment, but what is government investment? It is taking our tax dollars and depleting them. What is private invest-

Business of Supply

ment? It is creating more tax dollars. What is an emissions cap? It is to get rid of oil. However, really, it is a production cap.

What is the difference in the use of those words in regard to this topic of emissions versus production?

Richard Bragdon: Madam Speaker, Canadians are demanding a whole lot less talk and a whole lot more action, and it is time we end the era of Canadian self-sabotage, get out of our way and start to unleash the potential. We have unlimited potential in this country. We just have to—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): We have to resume debate. The hon. member for Victoria has the floor.

Will Greaves (Victoria, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands.

I am pleased to rise today to speak to the motion submitted by the member for Battle River—Crowfoot. To succeed in a more competitive world, Canada must define and invest in its competitive strengths. This includes our energy sector, which remains a major driver of our economy and jobs across the country.

In 2023, oil and gas accounted for 7.7% of Canada's GDP and \$160 billion in exports. We also have proven reserves of over 1.7 billion barrels of oil, most of which are found in Canada's oil sands.

At the same time, for Canada to prosper we must find ways to reduce emissions from oil and gas and lay the foundation for a low-carbon economy. Building a competitive low-carbon economy is not just an environmental imperative; it is an economic one. The global energy system is changing at an unprecedented speed, and countries that can produce energy while driving down emissions will be the ones that succeed in the decades ahead.

While Canada's energy resources have helped support our economic prosperity, oil and gas production accounts for 30% of our overall greenhouse gas emissions as a nation. While Canada's emissions across the economy have fallen by 8.5% since 2005, emissions from oil and gas have increased by nearly 7% over the same period of time. This contrast underscores the scale of this challenge. If other sectors are doing their part, Canada's biggest-emitting industry must do so as well.

The good news is that Canadian companies are stepping up, with innovative clean technology companies working with the energy sector through initiatives like the Clean Resource Innovation Network, which received \$227 million from the strategic innovation fund. These collaborations help make our energy sector more sustainable by decreasing emissions.

Business of Supply

Clean technologies will be central to that effort, providing solutions that reduce environmental impact, boost resource efficiency and support economic growth. Adopting clean technology is a strategic choice that, when commercialized and adopted at scale, will enable our industries to support the achievement of Canada's climate targets.

No single solution will deliver all the reductions we need, but taken together, they can lower emissions, improve efficiency and support good jobs.

Canada is a world leader in clean tech and is home to several companies developing innovative clean technology solutions that are important for decreasing emissions from the oil and gas sector. This includes methane detection and measurement, nuclear fusion, geothermal energy, long-duration energy storage, and carbon capture and storage. These and other technologies have the potential to better manage our resources while working to eliminate scope 1 and scope 2 emissions.

Canada's strengths position us to lead in developing, deploying and exporting the solutions needed to reduce emissions not just from oil and gas but across all heavy industries. The government is committed to becoming a world leader in carbon removal and sequestration technology, but industry itself recognizes what is at stake and has committed to developing carbon capture utilization and storage technologies as a key tool for reducing the environmental impacts of the energy sector and meeting its obligations.

The Pathways Alliance was recently identified by the government as being on track for consideration as a project of national interest. This industry group represents 95% of Canada's oil sands production and has proposed a vast carbon transportation and storage network to cut its emissions by 22 million tonnes per year by 2030. This reflects the scale of change required and represents an opportunity to lower emissions and grow Canada's clean tech sector.

Another area in which the oil and gas sector must curb its emissions is with respect to methane. In 2023, 45% of Canada's total methane emissions originated from the oil and gas sector. Methane mitigation is one of the fastest, most cost-effective ways to reduce emissions. Canadian companies are already global leaders in this space, from designing sensors and satellites to detect emissions to developing the software and analytical methods to process the data, providing the service to repair leaks, and designing and manufacturing the equipment to reduce or capture vented and flared gas.

● (1800)

Many of these reductions can generate revenues that help fund GHG mitigation efforts. This creates good jobs at home and gives us an edge in international markets from Europe to Asia that demand cleaner energy. Failure to meet evolving international standards could severely restrict Canada's access to these crucial markets in future. By acting swiftly and effectively to reduce methane emissions, Canada's energy industry can enhance its competitiveness, secure access to global markets and diversify its energy exports from traditional reliance on the United States. This strategic shift is vital from both an economic and an environmental perspective.

The government is committed to helping the oil and gas sector succeed in its commitments to decarbonize. Our actions include methane regulations implemented by the federal and provincial governments, which have spurred an internationally recognized ecosystem of innovation and a robust methane mitigation industry here at home. Leading Canadian clean technology firms have gained international success because of our government's efforts on methane.

Federal, provincial and territorial carbon pricing systems for industry play a key role in driving clean technology. The government is committed to improving the federal system and actively working with provincial and territorial governments to ensure that carbon markets continue to function well and to ensure that they establish a long-term signal to lock in future investments.

The Canada growth fund plays a pivotal role in accelerating emissions reduction in Canada's oil and gas sector by addressing one of the main barriers to large-scale investment: market and policy uncertainty around future carbon prices through carbon contracts for difference.

The clean technology, clean hydrogen, clean electricity, and carbon capture, utilization and storage investment tax credits implemented by our government will play an important role in driving investments, including in the oil and gas sector. To further support this goal, the government will ensure that the full value of the CCUS investment tax credit is extended to 2035.

In short, clean tech is the key to unlocking emissions reduction in the oil and gas sector. It will allow us to reconcile two vital imperatives: cutting our emissions and sustaining our prosperity. Our government will continue to work with industry, provinces, territories, indigenous partners and communities to drive down emissions, foster innovation and build a low-carbon economy that is competitive, resilient and sustainable.

Canada can position itself as a global leader in responsible energy production and clean technology development. We can and we must. This is not just about reducing emissions; it is also about building the economy of the future, one that sustains prosperity, meets our climate commitments and ensures that Canadian workers, communities and businesses have the tools they need to thrive.

● (1805)

Scot Davidson (New Tecumseth—Gwillimbury, CPC): Madam Speaker, I was in trouble at school all the time. I was sent to the office so many times, and I knew where the office was. It was unbelievable.

Business of Supply

I listened to the member for Carleton earlier, and he said “the Major Projects Office” 14 times. The Major Projects Office that the supposed new government has under way, that the Liberals are going to move at lightning speed on, is unprecedented. However, I just Googled it, and I will ask my colleague a simple question: Could he give me the address, telephone number and email address for the Major Projects Office, and how many employees it has in the budget? I Googled it, and there is no address and there is no telephone number. Could he help us out?

Will Greaves: Madam Speaker, I am not sure that the hon. member directed a question to me in his remarks. He referred to the member for Carleton.

I was an excellent student and never spent any time in the principal's office. I will defer to my hon. colleague for his time in detention, which undoubtedly exceeds my own.

[Translation]

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Madam Speaker, what we have seen over the past few months is that this new government is all about “drill, baby, drill”. It is open to the idea of pipelines. It is praising the oil sands, when they are already the main environmental issue in Canada. Emissions from oil sands production alone are higher than all of Quebec's greenhouse gas emissions.

Given that the government is backtracking on the emissions cap for the oil and gas sector, can my colleague explain to me how it is going to force oil and gas companies to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions if it drops the cap, the only tool the government was planning to use to ensure that this sector takes responsibility?

[English]

Will Greaves: Madam Speaker, there are a number of tools that the Government of Canada has introduced to ensure that people in the business and industry sectors have the signals and the regulatory framework necessary to drive down their emissions. One of the most important tools is the industrial price on carbon. This is the cornerstone of how it is that heavy emitters in this country, very much including the oil and gas sector, would have the price incentive to clean up their business model to reduce how much pollution they produce in the course of their operations. This government and the Prime Minister have committed to maintaining and strengthening the industrial price on carbon alongside new measures that will be introduced in the coming session.

Clifford Small (Central Newfoundland, CPC): Madam Speaker, I listened intently to my colleague across the way as he gave his speech. I wonder if he realizes that his own province exports a tremendous amount of metallurgical coal. In fact, it is the largest export for British Columbia. All experts agree that converting coal burning to using natural gas reduces emissions by 50%. In Newfoundland and Labrador, we are up against our emissions cap, which means that we are going to leave all that clean natural gas sitting under the Grand Banks. Does the member agree with stranding resources that are able to cut emissions in half, or does he agree with pumping out more coal?

• (1810)

Will Greaves: Madam Speaker, as the member for Carleton said earlier in his remarks, the world is in the midst of a clean-energy transition. This is a revolution in the way human beings produce the

energy that we need to live our lives, and it is well under way across this planet.

When I hear concerns about stranded assets and when I hear concerns about making poor investments, what my mind goes to and what the conversation in my province of British Columbia goes to is the risk of sinking billions and billions of dollars of investment into what is ultimately the 20th century's form of energy, which will not be profitable over the long term in this century. When the government is supporting major projects or other projects, it is doing so not with a vision to the energy future of the past but with its eyes clearly set on the horizon of the clean energy future of tomorrow.

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, I will begin by welcoming my hon. friend from the neighbouring riding of Victoria to this place as a new member of Parliament.

I am going to start, actually, by answering a question that was directed to the hon. member for Victoria just moments ago, and that is to clear up some misconceptions. As a matter of fact, having been in the House all day through the debates, I would like to dedicate the time I have to cleaning up misconceptions.

The first one concerns British Columbia's exports of coal, and 95% of the coal produced in British Columbia, which is 95% of the exports, is metallurgical coal. It is designed for purposes that do not include direct burning, do not produce electricity, and have an entirely different kind of greenhouse gas footprint from thermal coal.

It is an interesting story about thermal coal exports, although they are relatively minor. I think there are, off the top of my head, \$12 billion in exports in metallurgical coal to \$2 billion in exports of thermal coal. The thermal coal exported from B.C. is kind of an interesting story. It comes from the United States. It is shipped up through and over the roadways through I think South Surrey—White Rock and over to the port of Vancouver.

There is tremendous concern locally because the coal dust contaminates the air, so it is an air pollution problem and a health issue. For those and other reasons, I suppose, the Liberal Party platform in 2021 promised to end the exports of thermal coal through the port of Vancouver.

Members might have wondered, as I explained the situation, why it is that thermal coal comes up by road from the U.S. just to go to the port of Vancouver for export. This is because, all down the western coast of the United States, shipping thermal coal to Asia has been banned for climate reasons. However, Canada is very accommodating. It takes the thermal coal from across the United States, takes it to the port of Vancouver and ships it to China.

Business of Supply

We did have a bill before this place, Bill C-33, which was at the point of third reading when it died on the Order Paper January 6, and it would have lived up to the Liberal election promise of 2021 to ban the export of thermal coal from the port of Vancouver.

I hope to see this bill reintroduced at some point. It had a lot of other measures that were important for coastal communities in British Columbia, as well as for rail safety. Again, Bill C-33, as it stood, ready to be passed at third reading, would have ended the practice of bringing in U.S. coal for purposes of burning for electricity. As a number of speakers have mentioned, it would be best not to burn any thermal coal for electricity anywhere on the planet.

It still, until recently, was the cheapest way. It certainly is the cheapest of the fossil fuels. It used to be the cheapest way to produce electricity, but that is no longer the case. Solar panels produce energy and electricity far more cheaply than coal and without the side effects of global warming and immediate health effects. As a matter of fact, the reason the Province of Ontario took the steps years ago to ban burning coal for electricity was for reasons of human health, to reduce hospital visits for people who suffered from asthma and hospital spikes that occurred during smog days.

Another area to clear up a misconception, and this one is more complicated, is what the difference is between exporting natural gas when found in pockets, pools of actual natural gas, versus fracking for unconventional natural gas. When we go unconventional, there are more emissions.

Let us imagine *The Beverly Hillbillies* for a moment, the shooting up of oil out of the ground and how happy Jed Clampett was. We do not have oil like that anymore. It is harder to get to oil, so there is that return on investment on oil that has to do with the energy invested to get the oil, and we are down to the place of diminishing returns.

By the time we get to bitumen, we have to put a tremendous amount of effort into getting the bitumen out of the ground, and that has been done in the oil sands. Another place where we see unconventional oil is what blew up in Lac-Mégantic, getting crude oil out of Bakken shale.

Again, once we have to get fossil fuels out of layers of geological formation, it takes more energy to get it, costs more and involves more pollution.

● (1815)

Going back to natural gas, in British Columbia, our natural gas comes from fracking. In the areas where there is fracking, we have earthquakes caused by fracking. We also have water contamination from the composition of the water that is injected deep into breaking up the fractured gas that occurs in areas of British Columbia, as well as other areas where fracking produces natural gas. It does not have the same impact on climate as the natural gas that was found in pooled natural gas. Fracked natural gas, because it is fracturing different layers geologically, has a tremendous volume of what are called fugitive methane emissions. Methane is a far more powerful greenhouse gas unit for unit than carbon dioxide.

While some people here, well-meaning I know, have referred to fracked natural gas as a transition fuel, it is conventional natural gas

that could be called a transition fuel. Unconventional natural gas, as in fracked gas, is not a transition fuel when examined by experts like David Hughes and others in looking at the carbon footprint for the whole cycle of producing fracked natural gas. It has the same carbon footprint as coal through its whole life cycle because of the fugitive emissions, the methane that is released by the fracking.

The liquefied natural gas project that the Prime Minister has announced is on the government's short list for a project of national significance, as other members have pointed out, has already gone through all stages of approval, so we can hardly say it is being fast-tracked. However, we cannot say it is Canadian either. It is a consortium of a number of companies from around the world: Petronas of Malaysia, PetroChina of the People's Republic of China, one company from Japan, one company from Korea, and a very progressive alliance with the Haisla Nation. It is not Canadian.

Going back to other misconceptions, there has always been great talk of the east-west pipeline, if only it had gone ahead. The difficulty there is that an east-west pipeline for dilbit, dilbit being diluted bitumen, because bitumen is a solid, would only succeed if we diluted the bitumen. The only reason we are doing that is to get it to flow through a pipeline.

Another misconception is about, as I mentioned, the explosion of Lac-Mégantic. That was when Bakken shale blew up. It is appalling how negligent the shippers were. Nobody even realized when putting it on board a train that Bakken shale, if it blew up, would create a fireball and kill many people. Bitumen put on a train is 100% safe. Solid bitumen, when loaded into a train car, could fall off a high cliff and crash onto the cliff below and would lie there like a lump. We could not set it on fire with a blowtorch because it is a solid. It is a tar.

Now that we have built the pipeline, which the Canadian public paid \$34 billion and counting for, there is this great argument, speaking of misconceptions, that if we could only get our bitumen to tidewater, we could get rid of the price differential because it is so unfair. It is because the bitumen is landlocked, so the story goes, that we cannot get a fair price for our bitumen compared to West Texas Intermediate. If anyone has looked at the price lately, they will find, having gotten bitumen to tidewater, we are not getting paid more for it. That is because bitumen is not even synthetic crude. It cannot go right into a refinery. Therefore, wherever the shipped dilbit goes, when it gets to its destination, the diluent has to be removed, the “dil” part, which means fossil fuel condensates like naphthalene or even benzene. Then we have the solid lump of tar again. Then we have to put that through an upgrader. Once we have put it through an upgrader, we can refine it.

With respect to the east-west pipeline, the Irving refinery in Saint John, New Brunswick, made it very clear that it had no intention of ever building an upgrader. Therefore, at its end-point destination, when that project was a live one and had a private sector proponent, it was to go on tankers and leave the port of Saint John, New Brunswick, to go somewhere else.

What is happening now that we have the port at what was the Kinder Morgan pipeline? We now have the port of Burnaby shipping out dilbit, and some of it is going to China. As I said, it is a solid, and an astonishing reality is that one of the reasons we do not get more money for it now that it reaches tidewater is it is still a product of inherently low value and is very expensive to produce. To get all the way over to China, about a third of what—

• (1820)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): I have been trying to signal the hon. member. Time is up.

Clifford Small (Central Newfoundland, CPC): Madam Speaker, does the member of the Green Party know what her own carbon footprint is in travelling from British Columbia to this place in a year? How much of that could she save? Would she consider travelling by horseback or even walking from British Columbia to here?

Elizabeth May: Madam Speaker, I am very aware of my carbon footprint. That is why I buy carbon offsets, and I have not flown on a vacation or travelled on an airplane for any personal reason for the last 15 years.

It is grievous to me, but I find that I am able to be more effective as an MP here and not by staying at home on Zoom, but I thank the member for raising the point.

[*Translation*]

Rhéal Éloi Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ): Madam Speaker, I thank our Green Party colleague for her speech. I know she is an expert in this field.

There is one thing I would like to hear her thoughts on. We could decide to continue along the same path and abolish the cap on greenhouse gas emissions. In other words, we could decide to just sit back, stay on the same path we followed in previous years and forget about the Paris targets. If we do all that, what will happen?

Business of Supply

In my colleague's opinion, what will be the consequence on all Quebeckers and all Canadians of the laxity the Liberals are proposing?

Elizabeth May: Madam Speaker, the consequences would be dire. Scientists from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, or IPCC, issued a clear and unanimous warning.

Human civilization is at risk of extinction if all of humanity and all of the planet's economies continue to ignore the threat. We must act. We are running out of time, but it is not too late.

[*English*]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am interested in getting the leader of the Green Party's opinion on two things.

The first is that she has talked in the past about the decommissioning of pipelines. The second is with respect to the consequences of Canada not having pipelines, and the impact, not only in terms of the current ones but also what may come in the future. I am thinking specifically about jobs and government revenues, whether federal or provincial.

Elizabeth May: Madam Speaker, I am not certain of the question, but I will say this: We know we are facing something that is not easy. It is time to stop sugarcoating it. Whenever I hear someone say the economy and the environment go together, and over the years I have heard many Liberals say this, I always picture Thelma and Louise, with their hands clasped, going over the edge of the cliff.

The decisions we need to make now are not easy, and the longer we procrastinate, the harder those decisions get. As a result, we need to figure out how to decarbonize quickly, while building those sections of our economy that stand to benefit, including new technologies. The ability to have a 100% renewable energy electricity grid, east-west and north-south, will drive a lot of economic growth in this country. It is possible, but it does not happen without making some very tough choices, like keeping in place the emissions cap.

• (1825)

Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is hard to know where to begin with the speech that was just delivered by the member from the Green Party, who took her entire time to just spread a lot of misinformation and untruths about Canada's driving industry.

Canada has an abundant series of natural resources. We have an opportunity right now where we can choose either to continue developing our natural resources or to leave them in the ground. We know her opinion is that she wants to leave them in the ground.

Business of Supply

The challenge is that Canada is importing half a billion barrels of oil every day. The choice is this: Do we want Canadian oil or do we want dirty dictator oil? What would the member prefer?

Elizabeth May: Madam Speaker, I do not think I said a single thing that represented misinformation, but the position of the Green Party is that we should not import any foreign oil. We should use only Canadian oil and Canadian fossil fuels as we conduct a phase-out and a phase-down. That only makes sense.

By the way, for dictator oil, people point to Saudi Arabia. The only refinery in Canada that uses Saudi oil is, again, the Irving refinery I mentioned earlier.

[Translation]

Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is always a pleasure for me to rise to speak in the House on behalf of the people of Calgary Midnapore.

[English]

The motion we have before us today is, "That the House call on the Prime Minister to immediately repeal the oil and gas emissions cap, which in effect is a production cap." We are standing here today talking about the emissions cap, but what we are really talking about is not just the emissions cap. We are talking about the future of a nation.

Failure is not an option here. Failure is not an option, because hundreds of thousands of jobs are on the line. Failure is not an option, because seniors are starving and are going to food banks. They are on fixed incomes. They do not know where they are going to find their next meal. Failure is not an option, because we have record youth unemployment. This is an epidemic in our country. Failure is not an option, because housing costs are through the roof. Failure is not an option, because investment is fleeing this country.

When we are talking about the emissions cap, we are talking about the obstacles that the Liberal government created for over a decade, obstacles that prevented Canada from becoming a prosperous nation. We are a nation today that has created a system of dependence and a culture of desperation, one that could have been avoided by investing in our natural resources sector.

The Prime Minister won his mandate for one reason, and one reason only. Canadians, for better or for worse, put their trust in him to do what he said he was going to do: build a prosperous Canada.

The Conservatives gracefully supported Bill C-5 in the spring. We want to see the government succeed in its major projects. We did everything we could to give licence to the government. We wanted to give the Prime Minister everything he needed to begin these major projects, to fulfill his promise to Canadians. However, we have yet to see one new project announced or one shovel in the ground.

Relative to today's motion, we have yet to see the Prime Minister commit to taking the first steps to achieving these major projects, of which eliminating the production cap is only one step. We have offered the following suggestions to the Prime Minister and the Liberal government several times, on which they refused to act: repeal Bill C-69 and repeal Bill C-48.

Bill C-69, as members will remember, is the "no more pipelines" bill, the bill that prohibits any type of genuine infrastructure being built in this country that allows for our prosperity. Bill C-48, the "no more tankers" ban, does not permit Canada to export its natural resources abroad.

We could also eliminate the industrial carbon tax. The government likes to say it has eliminated the carbon tax. We know that this is not true. The industrial carbon tax still exists, and this is another step that the Prime Minister needs to take, in addition to immediately repealing the oil and gas emissions cap.

Until the Liberals take these steps, they have yet to prove to us, the official opposition, and to Canadians that they are serious about digging us out of this hole that they created and restoring quality of life to Canadians. Canadians are suffering.

The government just received an F from Food Banks Canada on food security. One cannot get a worse grade than an F. Canadians earning less than \$75,000 are spending 57.3% on groceries, utilities and transportation. Food inflation is rising 70% faster than the government's inflation target. For all of these reasons, Canadians are suffering. For all of these reasons, the Prime Minister needs to keep his promise of restoring Canada's prosperity.

● (1830)

What hope has the Prime Minister given the official opposition? What hope has the Prime Minister given Canadians? His record from before he arrived in the House of Commons is not encouraging. We all know the best predictor of future behaviour is past behaviour, so let us take a look at the past behaviour of the Prime Minister.

When asked by the leader of the official opposition at industry committee if he supported Justin Trudeau's decision to veto the Northern Gateway pipeline, the Prime Minister replied, "given both [the] environmental and commercial reasons...I think it's the right decision." That is interesting. It sounds like a 180 compared with his position today.

Then, just six months later, at COP26, the Prime Minister said, "we have...far, far too many fossil fuels in the world" and "as much as half of oil reserves, proven reserves, need to stay in the ground". These are words from a Prime Minister who is trying to convince us that he wants to restore the promise of Canada and restore the prosperity of Canada. How can Canadians be encouraged by these words or believe his sincerity about doing something?

Let us look at his record since he got here, which is also an indicator that his actions match his words. Everyone knows that the right thing to do when preparing to do something is to under-promise and over-deliver. Let us see if the Prime Minister has in fact done this. This is the most basic of lessons for anyone, whether it is in Dale Carnegie or for schoolchildren. It is to under-promise and over-deliver.

All major projects that have been announced to date were projects that were previously announced. No oil pipeline made that list of major projects. Without introducing a budget, the Prime Minister has doubled the deficit, which is expected to be the largest non-pandemic deficit in Canadian history, giving us the fastest-shrinking economy in the G7 after he promised the fastest growth; homebuilding dropping like a rock, when he promised to double homebuilding; and a record \$54 billion in investment that has fled the country.

The Prime Minister won the election on his message of “elbows up”, saying that he was the person to handle Donald Trump’s threats of tariffs and annexation. Today, the tariffs remain in place, with 50% on steel and aluminum and 25% on autos. Can I point out the obvious fact? There is no trade deal signed. For all of these reasons, we must question the Prime Minister’s sincerity and his ability to deliver on what he said he would do.

The next thing we have to look at is the team that the Prime Minister has surrounded himself with. We look at the present Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture, who stated, “COP28 calls for groundbreaking goals to triple renewable energy [and] double energy efficiency, and, for the first time ever, we reached a historic consensus to move away from fossil fuels in energy systems.” He went on to say about pipelines:

The atmosphere and our climate certainly don’t need them. Many of us believe we cannot build pipelines and meet our international climate commitments at the same time.

And with the world working around the clock to avoid the worst effects of climate change, it makes no sense from an ethical and a moral perspective to produce and ship more of a substance that is causing a problem, that disrupts the future of our children and our grandchildren.

This was from a minister close to the Prime Minister.

● (1835)

In addition, we have the words of the Alberta premier. She said, “I am very concerned the Prime Minister has appointed what appears to be yet another anti-oil and gas Environment Minister... Not only is she a self-proclaimed architect of the designation of plastics as toxic, but she is a staunch advocate against oil sands expansion, proponent of phasing out oil and gas”. The premier also said she was put off by the minister’s close ties to long-time thorn in her side, the Minister of Identity and Culture, to whom the current Minister of Environment served as parliamentary secretary for four years.

When we look at the motion that was presented here today, we see it is clear that the Prime Minister is not sincere. As a young woman in university, I was to meet my sister to show her around the university, but I did not meet her. Instead, I spent time with my friends, and when I got home, I got a lecture from my father. He told me that sincerity is doing what one says one is going to do.

It is time for the Prime Minister to keep the promise he made to Canadians in order to win the election and do what he said he was going to do, and that starts with eliminating the production cap.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): It being 6:39 p.m., it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forth with every question necessary to dispose of the business of supply.

The question is on the motion.

Adjournment Proceedings

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, we would request a recorded vote, please.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): Pursuant to Standing Order 45, the division stands deferred until Tuesday, September 23, at the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I suspect if you were to canvass the House, you would find a willingness to call it 6.54 p.m. so we can begin Adjournment Proceedings.

● (1840)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

[English]

CLIMATE CHANGE

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, I am pursuing a question that I asked the Minister of Environment in question period on May 30, when we were in the midst of unprecedented wildfires throughout the Prairies and the state of emergency as it existed in several prairie provinces. I pointed out that we were, at last count, only 7% below 2005 levels, with a due date for our emissions reductions to 40% to 45% by 2030. The response from the hon. Minister of Environment was to not answer the question that I had asked, which was, “When will the government present a plan?”

Certainly by that time, we knew that the new government, under the new Prime Minister, was cancelling plans put in place by the previous government, so my question was very pressing. We knew by May 30 we were not close to meeting our target that is due in five years, so I asked when the government would replace the things that are being cut that deal with emissions reductions so that we have a chance to ensure a livable world for our children. The minister did not answer the question as to when we would see a plan, but she did confirm that the Liberals would “make sure that we reduce our emissions, fight climate change and keep Canadians safe.”

Adjournment Proceedings

Here we are some months later, and we now have the very clear and devastating report from the Canadian Climate Institute that takes us forward and says what we can now expect in terms of emissions reductions from Canada. Those were the legally binding targets that we once filed, called nationally determined contributions, with the United Nations under the terms of the Paris Agreement, in which I have to say Canada took a lead role in negotiating, just as we did in 1992 with the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. We were the first industrialized country to both sign and ratify that treaty. It is legally binding, and through it, our Paris Agreement targets are legally binding.

On our commitment to reduce our emissions by 40% to 45% below 2005 levels by 2030, we knew we were falling short when I asked the question in May. Now we know from the Canadian Climate Institute report of a few days ago that this is how far behind we are: We can expect at this point that we are on track to reduce our emissions by 20% to 25% below 2005 levels.

The numbers make people's eyes glaze over. What do they mean? They mean that when people speak of drought in the Prairies in a particularly bad year, it is a trend that may well be unstoppable, not of drought as individual episodes but of aridification as a process that will dry out areas that are breadbaskets and make it very difficult for prairie farmers to survive.

When we look at what is happening across the country, we are seeing wildfire after wildfire, extreme flood events and extreme heat dome events, and around the world, we are seeing people dying from the effects of a climate crisis. We know and understand what must be done, and yet we fail to do it. Is it cognitive dissonance? Is it opportunism and political strategies that come ahead of saving the lives of our own children?

I ask the minister this: When will we see a plan?

Wade Grant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Madam Speaker, Canadians are living through the climate crisis in real time. Fires, floods, droughts and storms are happening with a frequency and severity we have never seen before. I have family and friends who have lived through these events. The impacts on lives, livelihoods and communities are clear. The costs are growing each year. That is why climate action is not optional. It is essential to protecting Canadians, strengthening our economy and preparing for the future.

Canada does have a plan. We are committed to fighting climate change and are working to launch a climate competitiveness strategy soon to advance that commitment and to position Canada to lead in a global economy that increasingly wants decarbonized goods, services, technology and know-how. Achieving this requires a coordinated mix of measures that both cut emissions and builds resilience against climate risks.

Since 2015, Canada has made significant progress. Back then, projections showed emissions rising 9% above 2005 levels by 2030. Today, we have bent that curve downward. Greenhouse gas emissions in 2024 were 7% below 2005 levels, even as the population and economy grew. Canada's economy is now over 30% less carbon intensive than it was in 2005. A key part of this progress is reducing methane, a potent greenhouse gas responsible for about 30% of observed global warming to date.

Between 2013 and 2023, fugitive methane emissions in Canada's oil and gas sector decreased by 33%. Canada is now a co-convenor of the global methane pledge, leading international efforts to cut methane emissions by at least 30% by 2030. At home, we are on track to exceed that goal, with more than a 30% reduction expected. These actions deliver multiple benefits, including cleaner air, fewer health impacts, and a competitive advantage for Canadian energy and technologies in a world increasingly focused on low-carbon solutions.

At the same time, Canada is investing in resilience. The national adaptation strategy was developed in collaboration with provincial and territorial governments, indigenous partners, the private sector, non-governmental organizations, adaptation experts and youth. Its goal is to guide actions across five key areas: disaster preparedness; health and well-being; nature and biodiversity; infrastructure; and the economy and workers. The Government of Canada's adaptation action plan was released alongside this strategy. It outlines over 70 actions to guide federal contributions to achieving Canada's adaptation goals. Canada's national adaptation strategy sets out a vision for safer communities, stronger infrastructure and a more resilient economy.

The government's plan is clear. We are cutting emissions, investing in clean industries, and building resilience. These steps are credible, measurable and designed to protect Canadians while growing a strong, sustainable economy.

• (1845)

Elizabeth May: Madam Speaker, I have another opportunity to welcome a new member to this place, the member for Vancouver Quadra. In the language of Musqueam people, I think it is Hul'q'umi'num', *hych'ka siam*.

Unfortunately, there was not an answer there for when we would see the new programs that would replace eliminating the consumer carbon price. There is not an answer there for what we are going to do if there is a pause on electric vehicles.

With my 30 seconds left, I will only ask this question of the hon. member: How do we explain to our grandchildren that we let them down so badly when we failed to take the steps that we could have taken when we still had time to ensure a viable biosphere and a livable human civilization for them? The scientists are clear. Why do the politicians fail the children?

Wade Grant: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague in my language of Hul'q'umi'num: *hay ɛxʷ qə*.

Canadians expect climate action that is practical, science-based and effective. That is what is under way. Our plan combines emission reductions, particularly in methane, with investments in clean energy and resilience tools that help communities prepare for the risks that we already face.

Progress is real. Emissions are declining. The economy is becoming less carbon-intensive, and Canadian innovations are helping lead the global transition.

Meeting our Paris targets requires steady work and collaboration with provinces, territories, indigenous communities and industry. Canada is committed to this path because a safe, clean, and competitive future depends on it.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am happy to be here this evening to maybe get some more answers to the question I asked in question period before we rose last spring.

We had an election and an election campaign, and a lot of commitments were made by the Liberal Party about building infrastructure. There was a lot of talk about pipelines during the campaign but not a lot of action after.

The Prime Minister has been in office for six months now, and he has finally announced his Major Projects Office. However, the big, breathless announcement that the Liberals ran out to make was about five projects that were already being looked at and already halfway to getting regulatory approval. I can think of one, Foran Mining in Saskatchewan up by Creighton. I have a friend who works for Foran Mining. It has been working on its project for four years now, so I would not say it is a new project.

The question I asked in question period was about building pipelines and about the hard-working men and women at Evraz steel in Regina, where, at the peak, when products and pipelines were being built, there were 1,100 or 1,200 people working at the steel plant. They are now down to about half or even fewer than half of that many employees. These are hard-working families that depend on the good jobs at Evraz steel to make ends meet, and these men and women are now struggling to get by, living paycheque to paycheque. I wonder if there will be a pipeline project in the next tranche of major projects that will be announced. Perhaps more projects will be reannounced.

In Canada, we are blessed with an abundance of natural resources. I have seen polling done throughout the provinces, and there is a desire to get major projects built in the country once again and to get people back to work in industries like steelmaking and pipeline building. A lot of good, hard-working unionized employees in the building trades are looking to see if the government's actions will follow the talk. Is it going to talk the talk or actually walk it? That is what people in Regina are asking about regarding the Liberal government.

A lot of promises were made, as with the slogan “build back better”. There have been a lot of slogans from the Liberal government

Adjournment Proceedings

over the last 10 years. I have been here since 2019, and I have not seen a lot of projects being built.

I will end with one last comment. For some projects that were being built, the issue was the dumping of cheap steel. Canadian steel is not being used in some of the projects that have moved forward. China, India and other countries are flooding the market with cheap steel that is not as environmentally friendly and is not as good quality as what is being built in my city of Regina, in Hamilton and in Canada.

I would love a response from whoever is going to take the question. When will projects be built? When will new projects be announced, not old projects being reannounced? I would love to make sure the projects that get built use good, environmentally sustainable Canadian steel.

● (1850)

Corey Hogan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Madam Speaker, Canadians have always come together to seize new opportunities and set paths for future generations, and in this moment of challenge, we will see the same. Canadians can find consensus even when it seemed previously unattainable.

Our government has said repeatedly that it is prepared to work towards building new energy infrastructure in many forms. That includes interprovincial electricity transmission, and it extends to pipeline projects if consensus exists and if proponents come forward. However, there is an important principle guiding this openness: Clean technology must also be put in place so that we can meaningfully reduce associated emissions.

Our ambition as a country is nothing short of being a clean and conventional energy superpower. Increasingly, our customers are demanding oil and gas developed to high social and environmental standards. As mentioned, steel, for example, is built to those high environmental standards. In a changing climate and in an uncertain world, it is a sentiment Canadians share.

Adjournment Proceedings

We are committed to a future in which Canadian energy projects lead in both economic value for our workers and communities and in climate responsibility and innovation. It is the better way, and doing better is going to take all of us. That is why we work with the provinces, stakeholders from across sectors and interests and always with indigenous rights holders. This is why we established the major projects office, an initiative that acts as a single point of contact to prioritize and help streamline transformative major projects in Canada that, under the Building Canada Act, are intended to strengthen Canada's autonomy, resilience and security; provide economic or other benefits to Canada; have a high likelihood of being successfully executed; advance the interests of indigenous peoples; and contribute to clean growth in meeting Canada's climate change objectives. Through this office, we support proposals that meet the environmental standards Canadians demand, embrace the latest technological innovations and respond to the needs of indigenous peoples, local communities and Canadian businesses.

On that list, as it was announced recently, some needed a nudge, some a big lift, but all will benefit from the help and all needed assistance getting over the finish line. Projects such as LNG Canada phase 2 and pathways plus, in which the "plus" is a pipeline or other type of egress, now under consideration by the office, demonstrate that resolve.

To be built, many projects will require Canadian steel. As mentioned, it is the cleanest, most environmentally friendly steel.

Without any hesitation, I can say today that our government will stand firmly behind Canadian workers and the use of Canadian materials, including Canadian steel, for infrastructure projects that move forward. Our commitment to Canadian steel workers is resolute, as was affirmed by the Prime Minister when he announced new measures to protect and strengthen Canada's steel industry and the communities that rely on it for goods and good, sustainable jobs.

As the Prime Minister announced in July, we will ensure that Canadian steel and other Canadian materials are prioritized in construction. We are also changing federal procurement processes so that companies contracting with the federal government are required to source their steel from Canadian companies. This is more than just economic policy; it is an expression of support for the many families who depend on the steel industry for income and an expression of firm belief in Canada.

This spirit can also be found in the new "build Canada homes" initiative. Through it, the government is executing large-scale procurement from Canadian sources to accelerate the adoption of modern methods of construction. By focusing on Canadian workers and materials for these developments on public lands, "build Canada homes" is helping to fill critical market gaps.

In all of this, our government remains pragmatic and forward-looking. We are driven by the conviction that the future belongs to those who innovate, co-operate and build with purpose. By working together across governments, industries, communities and even, dare I hope, across the aisle, we can and will build Canada strong.

• (1855)

Warren Steinley: Madam Speaker, I appreciate that kind of, sort of answer. There was a lot of word salad there. I heard "build back better" again. As I always say, instead of build back better, I would love it if the Liberals put it back the way they found it.

One question I have for the member across the way is this: We just brought in a new bill for the Major Projects Office to get things fast-tracked, but we could have just repealed Bill C-48 and Bill C-69. I have not heard much conversation on this, but Bill C-69 was ruled unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. The government has never even talked about that or tried to make Bill C-69 better.

We need to repeal it. Without repealing Bill C-48 and Bill C-69 and getting rid of the industrial carbon tax, it will be virtually impossible to convince proponents to come forward to build these major projects. We heard that from a letter signed by 100 CEOs about how hard it is to find proponents because of that legislation—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Corey Hogan: Madam Speaker, there is not a major pipeline project in the last 15 years in which I was not involved in some way, shape or form. While these seem like easy, quick solutions, "just make it easier to build things," what we know in Canadian history is quite different. It actually makes it more difficult and puts these projects at risk. We find all of a sudden that the courts are weighing in and saying that duty was not done. Certainly, with indigenous rights holders, we have seen that happen time and again.

As we wrap up debate, I want to share a quote from my hon. colleague, the Minister of Industry and the Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions. She said, "Protecting Canada's steel industry means defending Canadian jobs, securing our economic sovereignty, and building the future right here at home. Canada's steelworkers are critical to building a strong Canadian economy; protecting their jobs is protecting Canada's economic future."

Another way we protect Canada's economic future is through strong regulatory environments that can sustain core challenges and that work with indigenous peoples to make sure that the benefit is broadly shared.

SMALL BUSINESS

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Madam Speaker, earlier this spring, I rose in the House to highlight how small businesses are struggling under the weight of red tape, particularly through, at that time, the customs programs at CBSA that were supposed to help businesses but have instead caused confusion, delay and unnecessary costs.

Adjournment Proceedings

In 2024, the average small business owner lost the equivalent of 32 business days, an entire month of productivity, just dealing with red tape. The cost of regulation across all three levels of government now stands at \$51.5 billion. Over one-third of that, almost \$18 billion, is wasted on pure red tape. Altogether, businesses spent 768 million hours filling out forms, waiting on approvals and complying with overlapping rules. That is the equivalent of nearly 394,000 full-time jobs tied up in paperwork instead of producing the goods and services Canadians want to see from Canadian businesses.

For example, last week I met with B.C. Food and Beverage and Bimbo Canada, and I heard first-hand how much they are spending on the government's plastics registry alone. Business owners are required to report, every year, on the quantity and types of plastics they produce or use, creating a heavy administrative burden.

It is not just one regulation that makes this difficult; it is the cumulative effect of three levels of government, all demanding time and money from our businesses. This red tape takes time away from running the business, hiring workers and growing our economy. At the same time, our country faces one of the lowest rates of productivity growth in the OECD. Projections show Canada will see the weakest GDP per capita growth among advanced economies in the years ahead.

Now, the solutions are not easy, but this month, the President of the Treasury Board outlined that the Government of Canada would start a red tape review, so in some respects, the government does agree with what I am saying here today.

Tonight, on behalf of the 46.5% of private sector workers in Canada and on behalf of the hundreds of thousands of small businesses, what is the government going to do? What can it signal to Canadians that it is going to do to help businesses, not in a government program but by reducing the overall weight of government on small businesses in our country?

I look forward to the government's response.

● (1900)

Wade Grant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am thankful for this opportunity to inform the House about some of the work carried out each day between the Canada Border Services Agency and commercial importers. A little-known fact is that I was a Canada border agent during the summers when I was young, so I know exactly what they do day in and day out; they ensure the free flow of legitimate trade. That is important because it is part of the agency's mandate.

I want to clarify for the hon. colleague opposite that in order to eliminate time-consuming paper-based processes, the CBSA replaced its aging system for collecting duties and taxes on imported goods. I am of course talking about the Canada Border Services Agency assessment and revenue management system, known as CARM. The CBSA fully launched CARM last October.

When it comes to the release prior to payment program specifically, for years importers complied with regulations by using the financial security of customs brokers. This system did indeed help move goods into our country, but it did not allow the CBSA to properly secure debts owing to the Crown. That was because the

agency could not claim against a custom broker's financial security to cover an importer's bad debt, the result of which was significant debt writeoffs.

What do I mean by that? First, let me remind hon. members that each year, the CBSA manages \$40 billion in duties and taxes. Before CARM was introduced, the debt writeoff averaged \$13 million annually. To address such losses, the CBSA's CARM system now requires importers to post financial security so they can benefit from the release of their imported goods at the border without having to immediately pay duties and taxes.

When implementing CARM last fall, the government included a seven-month transition period to give commercial importers the additional time they needed to post their financial security electronically, while continuing to benefit from the release prior to payment program. That was the transition period that ended on May 20. It was what my hon. colleague was referring to in his question. It was not a surprise move.

The CBSA introduced the first version of the CARM client portal in 2021. The CBSA conducted years of outreach to help importers and other stakeholders familiarize themselves with the new system. The changes for enrolling in the release prior to payment program and its enabling regulations came into force in October 2024. The work on that front continues; that is because helping with the importation of legitimate goods with minimal interruption is an important part of the CBSA's responsibilities, which it takes seriously and does very well. Border wait times for processing commercial shipments remain within service standards.

As of May 2025, over 157,000 businesses have registered on the CARM client portal. Importers who have already posted financial security to obtain release prior to payment represent over 97% of the total volume. In the event of any disruptions at ports of entry, the agency is ready to deploy mitigation strategies to keep legitimate goods flowing across the border without interruption. The CBSA continues to work diligently with importers and others involved in the entry of goods into our country. That includes local stakeholders, including bridge and tunnel operators, airport authorities and trade industry groups.

Adjournment Proceedings

As I said earlier, outreach efforts with the trade chain partners have been successfully continuing for years. The goal remains to spread awareness about the process for importers to enrol in the release prior to payment program and post financial security before coming to the border.

● (1905)

Brad Vis: Madam Speaker, while I appreciate the Coles Notes version of CARM, which I think is welcome by many businesses, my question actually was referencing the tariff notices put forward by CBSA.

When we had a government that said we were at economic war with the United States, many small business exporters in the region where we live were looking at the notices put forward. They had great difficulty managing what they had to report to the CBSA for the purposes of tariffs and what actually was covered under the tariff notices with the United States, in conjunction with CUSMA. It was not the current program I was referencing; it was the notices and the bureaucratic headache they have caused for so many businesses that were only trying to do the right thing.

I will pose my initial question again: What is the government going to do? What is it going to signal to small businesses about reducing red tape and the overall administrative burden put on them by the Government of Canada?

Wade Grant: Madam Speaker, I want to address part of the hon. colleague's question that has to do with border operations. The CB-

SA actively monitors commercial volumes and wait times. It does this to allocate resources and adjust staffing levels to minimize how long it takes to process goods and to keep unnecessary delays at our ports of entry to a minimum.

These are some of the measures the agency takes. It can adjust and augment staffing levels to manage processing and streamline operations. It can prioritize time-sensitive or perishable goods for release at commercial offices. It can add resources on the CBSA client support help desk to assist importers in using that portal, enrolling in RPP, or posting of financial security.

It also maintains communication with warehouse operators to identify an overflow plan for the storage of unreleased goods. The warehouses play an important role in supporting the continued flow of commercial shipments at the border. Bonded carriers can transport goods to an accredited warehouse. An importer can either post the financial security required so they can benefit from the release prior to payment program or submit a commercial accounting declaration and pay the amounts owing.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 7:07 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Monday, September 22, 2025

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Business of Supply

Opposition Motion—Oil and Gas Emissions Cap

Scheer	1881
Motion	1881

Official Report

Grant	1882
-------------	------

Business of Supply

Opposition Motion—Oil and Gas Emissions Cap

Motion	1883
Lamoureux	1883
Lemire	1883
Gill (Windsor West)	1883
Deltell	1884
Lamoureux	1885
Gaudreau	1885
Chenette	1885
Hogan	1886
Small	1887
Beaulieu	1887
Genuis	1888
Guay	1888
Small	1889
Gaudreau	1889
Gladu	1890
Lavack	1890
Bonin	1890
Hogan	1893
Deltell	1893
Beaulieu	1893
Vis	1894
Gaudreau	1894
Gourde	1894
Poillievre	1894
Kayabaga	1896
Beaulieu	1896
Goodridge	1896
McCauley	1896
Gerretsen	1898
Gaudreau	1898
Van Popta	1898
Lamoureux	1899
Roberts	1901
Lemire	1901
Louis	1901
May	1902
Ross	1902
McLean (Calgary Centre)	1902
Chenette	1904
Beaulieu	1904

Dalton	1904
Boulerice	1904
Ross	1905
Lamoureux	1906
Lemire	1906
Barlow	1906
Goodridge	1907

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Gender Equality Week

Louis	1907
-------------	------

Airmedic Tragedy

Godin	1907
-------------	------

Georgetown Boys

Tesser Derksen	1907
----------------------	------

Prostate Cancer Awareness Month

Gourde	1908
--------------	------

Théâtre Tout Terrain

Joseph	1908
--------------	------

Fertility Rates

Genuis	1908
--------------	------

Skilled Trades

Miedema	1908
---------------	------

Food Prices

Cody	1908
------------	------

Yves Gingras

Blanchette-Joncas	1909
-------------------------	------

Rosh Hashanah

Carr	1909
------------	------

Prime Minister of Canada

Gallant	1909
---------------	------

Buying Canadian

Fonseca	1909
---------------	------

Public Safety

Calkins	1910
---------------	------

Gender Equality Week

Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)	1910
---	------

Recognition of Palestinian State

Majumdar	1910
----------------	------

Marie-Josée Turgeon

Villeneuve	1910
------------------	------

ORAL QUESTIONS

Firearms

Poilievre	1910
Anandasangaree	1910
Poilievre	1911
Anandasangaree	1911
Poilievre	1911
Anandasangaree	1911
Poilievre	1911
Anandasangaree	1911
Poilievre	1911
Fraser	1911
Poilievre	1911
Fraser	1912

Justice

Normandin	1912
Fraser	1912
Normandin	1912
Guilbeault	1912
Fortin	1912
Guilbeault	1912

The Economy

Hallan	1913
Long	1913
Hallan	1913
Long	1913
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	1913
Hajdu	1913
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	1913
Hajdu	1913

Housing

Aitchison	1913
Robertson	1914

The Economy

Hardy	1914
MacKinnon	1914
Hardy	1914
MacKinnon	1914

Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship

Brunelle-Duceppe	1914
Diab	1914
Brunelle-Duceppe	1914
Diab	1914
Rempel Garner	1915
Diab	1915
Rempel Garner	1915
Diab	1915
Ho	1915
Diab	1915
Cobena	1915
MacKinnon	1915
Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)	1915
Anandasangaree	1916

Employment

Danko	1916
Zerucelli	1916

Firearms

Caputo	1916
Anandasangaree	1916
Caputo	1916
Sahota	1916
Khanna	1916
Sahota	1917
Baber	1917
Sahota	1917
Guglielmin	1917
Provost	1917

Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship

Paul-Hus	1917
Diab	1917
Paul-Hus	1917
Diab	1917

Foreign Affairs

Majumdar	1917
Oliphant	1918
Majumdar	1918
Oliphant	1918

Women and Gender Equality

Auguste	1918
Valdez	1918

Natural Resources

Lloyd	1918
Hodgson	1918
Bailey	1918
Hodgson	1918
Motz	1919
Hodgson	1919

Northern Affairs

Earle	1919
Chartrand	1919

Housing

Groleau	1919
Robertson	1919

Government Accountability

Gazan	1919
Hajdu	1919

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Business of Supply

Opposition Motion—Violent Crime and Repeat Offenders

Motion	1920
Motion negatived	1921

Citizenship Act	
Bill C-3. Second Reading	1921
Motion agreed to	1922
(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee) ..	1922

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Committees of the House

Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics	
Brassard	1923

Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities	
Morrissey	1923

Living Donor Recognition Medal Act

Abouttaif	1923
Bill C-234. Introduction and first reading	1923
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	1923

Respecting Families of Murdered and Brutalized Persons Act

Kibble	1923
Bill C-235. Introduction and first reading	1923
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	1924

Addressing the Continuing Victimization of Homicide Families Act

Lloyd	1924
Bill C-236. Introduction and first reading	1924
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	1924

Fisheries Act

Rowe	1924
Bill C-237. Introduction and first reading	1924
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	1924

Criminal Code

Lapointe (Sudbury)	1924
Bill C-238. Introduction and first reading	1924
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	1924

Canada Health Act

Dhaliwal	1924
Bill C-239. Introduction and first reading	1924
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	1924

Offender Rehabilitation Act

DeRidder	1925
Bill C-240. Introduction and first reading	1925
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	1925

National Strategy on Flood and Drought Forecasting Act

Auguste	1925
Bill C-241. Introduction and first reading	1925

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	1925
--	------

Jail Not Bail Act

Khanna	1925
Bill C-242. Introduction and first reading	1925
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	1925

Corrections and Conditional Release Act

Diotte	1925
Bill C-243. Introduction and first reading	1925
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	1925

Clean Coasts Act

Weiler	1925
Bill C-244. Introduction and first reading	1925
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	1926

Petitions

Persons with Disabilities	
Gazan	1926

Sudanese Refugees	
Zahid	1926

Energy Transition	
May	1926

Questions on the Order Paper

Lamoureux	1926
-----------------	------

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Business of Supply

Opposition Motion—Oil and Gas Emissions Cap	
Motion	1926
Blois	1926
Small	1930
Bonin	1930
May	1930
Lamoureux	1931
Kusie	1931
Garon	1931
Stubbs	1931
Lamoureux	1933
Bonin	1934
Goodridge	1934
Rowe	1934
Lamoureux	1936
Bonin	1936
Stubbs	1936
Goodridge	1936
Grant	1937
Davidson	1938
Bonin	1938
Chagger	1938
Gill (Windsor West)	1938
Fanjoy	1939

Dalton	1940
Bonin	1940
May	1940
Anstey	1940
Greaves	1942
Bonin	1942
Goodridge	1943
Ste-Marie	1943
Bragdon	1943
Lamoureux	1944
Thériault	1945
Wagantall	1945
Greaves	1945
Davidson	1946
Bonin	1947
Small	1947
May	1947
Small	1949
Fortin	1949

Lamoureux	1949
Goodridge	1949
Kusie	1950
Division on motion deferred	1951

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Climate Change

May	1951
Grant	1952

Natural Resources

Steinley	1953
Hogan	1953

Small Business

Vis	1954
Grant	1955

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: <https://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 des communes.

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 :
<https://www.noscommunes.ca>