



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

---

# House of Commons Debates

Official Report  
(Hansard)

Volume 152 No. 070  
Tuesday, December 9, 2025

---

Speaker: The Honourable Francis Scarpaleggia



## **CONTENTS**

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

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, December 9, 2025

The House met at 10 a.m.

---

*Prayer*

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

- (1000)
- [*English*]

### OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

**Hon. Shafqat Ali (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2) of the House of Commons and subsection 85(1) of the Official Languages Act, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the draft of the proposed regulations for advancing the equality of status and use of English and French. Pursuant to Standing Order 32(5), the proposed regulation should be referred to the Standing Committee on Official Languages.

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2) of the House of Commons and section 48 of the Official Languages Act, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the 2023–24 “Annual Report on Official Languages”. Pursuant to Standing Order 32(5), the report should be referred to the Standing Committee on Official Languages.

\* \* \*

### BUILDING A GREEN PRAIRIE ECONOMY ACT

**Hon. Eleanor Olszewski (Minister of Emergency Management and Community Resilience and Minister responsible for Prairies Economic Development Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2) I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the first progress report on the Building a Green Prairie Economy Act. This report is part of the legacy of the late Hon. Jim Carr, who sponsored the Building a Green Prairie Economy Act, which is the foundation for the framework.

\* \* \*

### VICTIMS OF CRIME

**Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2) I have the honour of tabling, in both official languages,

the 2024-2025 annual report from the office of the federal ombudsperson for victims of crime.

\* \* \*

### PROTECTING VICTIMS ACT

**Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-16, An Act to amend certain Acts in relation to criminal and correctional matters (child protection, gender-based violence, delays and other measures).

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

\* \* \*

### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

#### STATUS OF WOMEN

**Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the second report of the Standing Committee on the Status of Women, entitled “Gender-Based Violence and Femicides in Canada”. Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this report.

Femicides are up; a woman in Canada dies every other day. We do need to address this national crisis, and the recommendations would go a long way to helping that.

- (1005)

#### AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

**Michael Coteau (Scarborough—Woburn, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the distinct honour to present, in both official languages, the first report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food, entitled “Unleashing the Potential of the Canadian Agriculture and Agri-Food Sector through Regulatory Reform”. Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this report.

We know that agriculture is one of the most important sectors here in Canada, and we have to keep looking for ways to support farmers and the sector to build it so it continues to add to economic growth.

*Routine Proceedings***PETITIONS**

## NATIONAL FIRE ADMINISTRATION

**Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, it is an honour today to table petition e-6745, which was signed by 747 Canadians.

Petitioners cite that Canada has around 3,200 fire departments, of which approximately 80% rely solely on volunteer firefighters; that the scale and complexity of events Canadian fire services are expected to respond to have increased dramatically in recent years, and that trend is anticipated to continue; that all levels of government in Canada are involved in aspects of fire and emergency management; that collaboration and strategic coordination are necessary to prepare for major emergencies and ensure efficient use of resources; and that there is a need to integrate a fire and emergency management perspective into policy and into decision-making for other issues, including but not limited to housing, green technology, transportation, tariffs, first responder mental health, and defence.

The petitioners call on the government to support motion M-12 to create an office of the national fire administration or a fire liaison. This is supported by the Canadian Association of Fire Chiefs. I hope all members will support the petition.

## SCALLOP FISHERY

**Clifford Small (Central Newfoundland, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition on behalf of constituents of mine in the Coast of Bays area who signed it. They want to be able to use mechanical scallop haulers. There is discrimination against elderly people and against people who have disabilities and other physical constraints. Rakes, with scallops and rocks, are very heavy to haul up, and this presents a safety danger.

In addition, the petition calls for commercial harvesters to be allowed to fish scallops recreationally.

## FIREARMS

**Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, today I rise to present three petitions.

The first is on behalf of residents in Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford regarding the gun confiscation program that will cost Canadian taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars. They feel it unfairly targets law-abiding firearms owners, and the petitioners note the Parliamentary Budget Officer estimates the cost to compensate firearm owners alone will exceed \$750 million. Even the public safety minister, petitioners mention, has serious doubts as to the effectiveness and validity of the program.

The residents call upon the Government of Canada to rescind the program and to prioritize public safety with change to our bail laws.

## SAFE CONSUMPTION SITE

**Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition I would like to present is on behalf of angered parents who are again calling upon the Government of Canada to enforce its agreement with British Columbia and not allow for a safe consumption site across the street from a school track. Parents are calling for the Government of Canada to cease all funding to BC Housing until it comes to its senses and finds a more suitable location for supportive housing.

## PUBLIC SAFETY

**Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, third, I would like to present a petition today on extortion.

Petitioners are concerned about daylight shootings, murders and violence, which underscore a broader public safety issue. The residents are calling upon the Government of Canada to reinforce the process of public reporting so Canadians can clearly see how federal, provincial and local governments are working together to prevent further increases in violent organized crime.

Petitioners raise this in honour of Darshan Sahsi, who was murdered outside his home in my riding.

• (1010)

## RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

**Andrew Lawton (Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is a great honour to present a petition on behalf of Canadians alarmed that Liberal-Bloc amendments to Bill C-9 would be used to criminalize passages of the Bible, the Quran, the Torah and other sacred texts. A lot of this concern emanates from the fact that the man who is now the Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture said that prosecutors should be able to “press charges” for people citing scripture the government finds objectionable.

The petitioners believe that the state has no place in religious texts or teachings of any faith community and that the House must stand firm and protect freedom of expression and freedom of religion. Petitioners call on the Liberal government to protect these fundamental freedoms and reject any incursions on them in Bill C-9 or any other legislation.

## NATURAL HEALTH PRODUCTS

**Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am standing today on behalf of people who are calling for freedom of choice in health care, which is becoming increasingly curtailed and further threatened by legislation and statutory regulations of the Government of Canada.

It is a fundamental right of individuals to be able to choose how to prevent illness or how to address illness or injury in their own body. Canadians want the freedom to decide how they will prevent illness and how they will address that illness or injury in their own body. They are competent and able to make their own health care decisions without state interference.

Therefore petitioners call upon the government to guarantee the right of every Canadian to health freedom by enacting the charter of health freedom, drafted by the Natural Health Product Protection Association on September 4, 2008.

#### REGISTERED DISABILITY SAVINGS PLAN

**Hon. Bardish Chagger (Waterloo, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, petitioners raise an issue of equity and dignity, as well as of basic autonomy, for people with disabilities and their families.

The RDSP is meant to secure a person's long-term financial future, yet petitioners raise that the current rules create unnecessary barriers that prevent many people from even opening a plan. When qualifying members lose their ability to act after 2026, and when only a narrow set of relatives are permitted, people will be left without support and could be forced into costly and intrusive legal processes that undermine their rights and independence.

Petitioners call on Parliament to extend and expand access so trusted supporters chosen by the individual can assist without delay, and to ensure that these practices are consistent across Canada.

At its core, the petition, initiated by Amy Ross and Sue Simpson from the riding of Waterloo, is about respecting people's self-determination and ensuring that no one is denied financial security because of outdated rules.

#### PUBLIC SAFETY

**Sukhman Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise today on behalf of residents of Abbotsford—South Langley who are deeply concerned about the increasing prevalence of organized crime, extortion and intimidation in our community of Abbotsford. Recent daylight shootings, homicides and other violent incidents underscore a broader systemic public safety crisis within our country.

The petitioners mourn the death of Darshan Singh Sahsi.

Residents call upon the Government of Canada to reinforce the process of public reporting so Canadians can clearly see how the federal, municipal and provincial governments work together to further prevent increases in violent and organized crime.

\* \* \*

#### 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 it agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[For text of questions and responses, see *Written Questions website*]

#### *Business of Supply*

### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

#### BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

##### OPPOSITION MOTION—PIPELINE CONSTRUCTION

**Hon. Tim Uppal (Edmonton Gateway, CPC)** moved:

That the House:

(a) take note of the Memorandum of Understanding between Canada and Alberta of November 27, 2025; and

(b) support the construction of one or more pipelines enabling the export of at least one million barrels a day of low-emission Alberta bitumen from a strategic deepwater port on the British Columbia coast to reach Asian markets, including through an appropriate adjustment to the Oil Tanker Moratorium Act, while respecting the duty to consult Indigenous peoples.

**The Speaker:** Since today is the final allotted day for the supply period ending December 10, 2025, the House will go through the usual procedures to consider and dispose of the supply bill. Do hon. member agree that the bill be distributed now?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

● (1015)

**Hon. Tim Uppal:** Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the great member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley.

Today, the House of Commons will debate and vote on a Conservative motion calling for a new oil pipeline to the Pacific coast, overriding the tanker ban on shipping bitumen to Asia.

Just eight months ago, the Prime Minister told Canadians that his government would build things previously thought impossible at speeds we have not seen in generations, and that he would build Canada into an energy superpower. When announcing his memorandum of understanding with Alberta, he said, “At the core of the agreement, of course, is a priority to have a pipeline to Asia. That is going to make Canada stronger, more independent, more resilient, more sustainable”. The language in today's motion comes directly from the Prime Minister's own MOU with Alberta. It states:

That the House:

(a) take note of the Memorandum of Understanding between Canada and Alberta of November 27, 2025; and

(b) support the construction of one or more pipelines enabling the export of at least one million barrels a day of low-emission Alberta bitumen from a strategic deepwater port on the British Columbia coast to reach Asian markets, including through an appropriate adjustment to the Oil Tanker Moratorium Act, while respecting the duty to consult Indigenous peoples.

Canadians cannot afford any more delays. A pipeline to the Pacific coast, shipping a million barrels of oil a day to Asia at world prices, would mean stronger take-home pay for Canadians and a resilient, self-reliant economy. A pipeline is what Canada needs now, not more broken Liberal promises and not more bait-and-switch tactics from the government, yet the government continues to stall and stand in the way of this pipeline.

*Business of Supply*

The government promised one thing to Alberta and another thing to British Columbia. Even its own Liberal caucus is divided. Some Liberal MPs insist that a pipeline must have B.C.'s consent and, specifically, that it must have the consent of the Premier of British Columbia. They say that without it, there will be no pipeline.

The constitutional reality is that British Columbia does not have a veto over an interprovincial pipeline. Only the federal government has that authority. That is a good thing, because the B.C. NDP premier has been clear that he is against a pipeline, saying, "it will never be built".

Conservatives brought forward this motion today because the Prime Minister's MOU does not promise that a pipeline will be built. Instead, it only commits that seven months from now, a proposal will be referred to a federal office for two more years of study, while the B.C. premier will still effectively have a veto on this pipeline.

Why, then, do the Liberals refuse to assert federal jurisdiction, choosing instead to allow political obstruction to continue while Canadians struggle to pay their bills? Energy workers deserve better. Families deserve better. Canada deserves better. The Liberals need to do just one thing for a pipeline to happen: Get out of the way. That means repealing the industrial carbon tax, granting a permit for a pipeline and unblocking the billions of dollars in private sector energy investment that is ready to build.

For an entire decade, the government has treated Canada's energy workers and energy-producing regions not as a national strength, but as a problem to be solved. It has blocked pipelines, cancelled projects, imposed punishing regulations and created a climate of uncertainty that has driven investment out of this country at record speed.

It is no wonder that Canadians no longer trust the Liberals' promises and announcements, which so rarely result in anything. For 10 years, their policies have not just harmed the energy sector; they have hurt everyday Canadians who rely on affordable fuel, good jobs and a strong economy to support their families. Across the country, people are working harder, paying more and getting less. Groceries, housing and basic essentials keep rising in price, while paycheques stretch thinner and thinner. Monthly food bank visits keep smashing records, and people who once donated to their community food banks are now lining up for help for their families.

● (1020)

When investment flees Canada, workers pay the price. When pipelines are blocked, paycheques shrink. When energy costs rise, the price of groceries, heating and housing rises with them. Good energy jobs that once sustained entire communities are leaving our country, and when that investment leaves, opportunity leaves with it.

For years now, business after business has concluded that Canada is no longer a place where major projects can get approved, built or completed. Even the Prime Minister has admitted that Liberal laws make it impossible to get anything built. From Bill C-69, the "no new pipelines" law, and Bill C-48, the west coast shipping ban, to the oil and gas emissions cap and the punitive industrial carbon tax,

these Liberal policies have sent thousands of Canadian jobs straight to the United States.

Canada should be a country of big dreams and big projects. We should be attracting investment, not driving it away, but under the Liberal anti-investment agenda, over \$500 billion in private sector investment has vanished. That is not an abstract number. That means thousands of paycheques that never went out, mortgages that became unaffordable and careers that were cut short. Instead of supporting workers and the industries that sustain them, the Liberals have spent a decade blocking major infrastructure, stalling resource projects and creating uncertainty that chases investment to other countries.

Instead of supporting Canada's world-class energy industry, the Liberals have undermined it at every turn. Just this year alone, from May to September, nearly \$54 billion of investment left Canada. This is in addition to more than \$500 billion lost under Liberal governments. That is money that could have gone to jobs, wages and opportunities for Canadian families.

The energy sector is a major employer, with nearly a million workers, and it contributes to \$1 billion in revenue for the government. This is money that should have been building pipelines, supporting workers, strengthening communities and lowering costs for Canadians, not building prosperity in other countries and lining the pockets of dictators around the world.

Liberal policies and energy production caps are projected to reduce oil and gas production by nearly 5%, cut GDP by \$20 billion annually and eliminate over 54,000 full-time jobs by 2032, yet the Liberals are still committed to the same anti-growth policies that drove investment away.

Today, the House of Commons has an opportunity to turn things around and give our country a brighter future. Members will vote on our Conservative motion to build a new pipeline to the Pacific coast and ship a million barrels a day to Asia at world prices, not the discount prices we see today. This motion today is about putting more money in the pockets of Canadian workers and raising paycheques across the country. This pipeline from Alberta to the Pacific coast would mean stronger take-home pay, lower long-term energy costs, billions of dollars of private investment and a more self-reliant, secure Canadian economy.

*Business of Supply*

The path forward is straightforward. If the Liberals truly want to build this pipeline, they must do just one thing: Get out of the way. Canada does not need more announcements or studies; Canada needs action, Canada needs jobs and Canada needs lower costs for struggling families. Conservatives will fight for stronger pay-cheques. We will fight to make energy, food and housing affordable and we will fight to rebuild a self-reliant, secure, sovereign Canadian economy.

It is time to build that pipeline, it is time to restore Canada's economic strength and it is time to bring home Canadian prosperity.

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, let us be very clear on this point: The Conservative Party, while in government, built zero inches of pipeline to tidewater. That is the reality.

Fast-forward to today. We have the Province of Alberta signing a memorandum of understanding with the federal government that is supported by a number of premiers, and we have the Conservatives cherry-picking to try to sow division among Canadians. I find it distasteful, and so do Canadians.

Will the member and the Conservative Party fully endorse the memorandum of understanding today?

• (1025)

**Hon. Tim Uppal:** Mr. Speaker, the real question is, will they support this motion?

The wording from this motion is directly from their MOU with Alberta. The fact of the matter is that they have left a veto in the hands of the Premier of British Columbia. Only the federal government has the full authority, under the Constitution, to build this pipeline and take oil to the Pacific Coast.

We need to have that pipeline built. The federal government can get it done.

[Translation]

**Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the last pipeline infrastructure built in Canada was the Trans Mountain expansion. It cost taxpayers \$34 billion.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer has said in numerous analyses that this infrastructure is not profitable. It would have to operate at full capacity over the next 40 years just to break even. My Conservative friends like to talk about the Liberals' pipe dream, but I think they have a dream too.

Building infrastructure is not profitable. It is all well and good to tell the government to get out of the way, but private companies will not build it because it is not profitable. I want my colleague to explain the Conservative dream of finding a proponent to build pipeline infrastructure.

[English]

**Hon. Tim Uppal:** Mr. Speaker, the reason it was not profitable was that it was under the Liberal government. The Liberal government created so many regulations, continually moved the goalposts and made it impractical for any private business to make that

project profitable, so the government had to step in. What it needed to do was what we are asking it to do: Move out of the way.

Private industry is ready to build major products in Canada, including a pipeline, if the government just gets out of the way. That would be profitable for the government and bring great prosperity to Canadians.

**Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I wish you a merry Christmas.

The Prime Minister wrote a book called *Values*, in which he said that 50% of Canadian oil, 50% of natural gas and 75% of coal “need to stay in the ground”. He reiterated those points in interviews prior to the previous election.

I would ask a simple question of the hon. member from Alberta. Does he fully believe that the Prime Minister really wants to build a pipeline to the B.C. coast?

**Hon. Tim Uppal:** Mr. Speaker, that is a great question from my colleague, because, at the end of the day, that is the problem. It is why so much investment is leaving the country. Billions of dollars of investment have left the country because businesses do not trust the Prime Minister or the Liberal government. They say one thing and do another. They say one thing in Alberta and a completely different thing in British Columbia.

The reality is that in Canada, it is almost impossible to build major projects. The Prime Minister has supported the idea of keeping oil in the ground, so no one believes him today.

**Michael Coteau (Scarborough—Woburn, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I support the MOU. I believe we need to build partnerships in order to move forward on major projects.

With regard to indigenous communities, do you think they should have a say when it comes to the future of pipelines in this country?

**The Speaker:** Before I let the hon. member for Edmonton Gateway respond, when members use “you”, the Speaker is not going to respond; the member will respond.

The hon. member for Edmonton Gateway.

**Hon. Tim Uppal:** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to hear that the member supports the MOU, so, of course, he will support our motion. The wording is from the MOU directly, so I look forward to his support moving forward today.

Of course, we want indigenous communities to be consulted, be a part of this and be a part of the prosperity that this—

**The Speaker:** Resuming debate, the hon. member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley.

• (1030)

**Ellis Ross (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the motion on the floor today is:

### *Business of Supply*

That the House...support the construction of one or more pipelines enabling the export of at least one million barrels a day of low-emission Alberta bitumen from a strategic deepwater port on the British Columbia coast to reach Asian markets, including through an appropriate adjustment to the Oil Tanker Moratorium Act, while respecting the duty to consult Indigenous peoples.

This is the Liberals wording, word for word, from the MOU. Having the Liberals oppose and debate their own wording is confusing. This is why we are trying to put this motion on the floor today. Canadians deserve an answer, yes or no.

In B.C., the Liberal Party will tell British Columbians that there will be no pipeline built, but in Alberta, those same Liberals will say that yes, a pipeline will be built. Which is it? This is the first opportunity for the Liberals to tell the truth in their intentions to build Canada strong, to turn us into an energy superpower, to turn us into the best performing country in the G7, but we are watching Liberals argue with Liberals. Liberals are arguing their own climate action plan. In fact, ministers are resigning because they are saying that the Liberals are walking away from their own climate action plan and their commitments to the Paris Accord.

It was not too long ago when the Liberals were condemning everybody who did not support a carbon tax or did not support a climate action plan. Now, Liberals are condemning Liberals for not supporting their own climate action plan. The Conservatives have been trying to help the Liberals turn Canada into an energy superpower. We would not have agreed to using emergency powers like the former prime minister promised. I think that is going too far. Do members remember the emergency powers? They are the ones that allowed convoy truckers to be thrown into jail and have their bank accounts frozen. The courts found it unconstitutional. I could not have agreed to that.

The Liberals claimed that they needed superpowers to get pipelines built, so they brought in Bill C-5, the Building Canada Act, and it got passed by the House of Commons. They knew full well they did not need Bill C-5, as they had all the powers already, but this is typical of what the government has been doing. The Liberals promise, promise, promise, and then they do not deliver when they become government.

The Prime Minister promised to reduce the prices at the grocery store, and his words were that he would be judged by the prices at the grocery store. Then, not one item in the budget actually talked about prices at the grocery store.

I think the real problem we are dealing with here is something that has to be revisited, and it is how this all came about, which is the United States and, specifically, President Trump. We cannot take what President Trump says about Canada literally. President Trump said that Canada should become the 51st state of the United States. We cannot take that literally, but we should be worried about Canada becoming a vassal state. A vassal state is a country with limited sovereignty that is subservient or submissive to a more powerful state, often paying tribute in the form of taxes or resources.

Canada, under the Liberals for the last 10 years, intentionally weakened its own economy by saying no to extracting and exporting its own resources. This would have been okay if the Liberals had replaced the economy with something else, but they did not,

and now they are scrambling to fix a problem that they created. Canada should not have been in this weakened state to begin with. With or without Trump, this would have happened. When we take away the strength of a country, we leave ourselves vulnerable to other powerful countries. There are two powerful countries in the world right now: China and the United States.

Let us get back to the pipeline. Canada exports oil to the United States, with 93% of Canadian oil going to the United States. While our brilliant Prime Minister banker says that we have to get off our dependence on the United States, he offers to the United States another pipeline going to the United States.

• (1035)

The Prime Minister offered to build Keystone XL. What is the point of that? President Trump was so happy that our Prime Minister offered to export more oil to the United States, do members know what he did? He imposed more tariffs on Canada.

What is next? As a tribute to the United States, our Prime Minister offered to invest \$1 trillion of private Canadian money in the United States. How did Trump respond? He imposed more tariffs. What is the point of negotiating when the situation just keeps getting worse?

The Prime Minister then condoned an ad that was run in the United States, which United States lawmakers refer to as foreign interference. Canada was interfering with the politics of a foreign country, which just happens to be a global superpower. What did Trump do? He imposed more tariffs and increased tariffs.

What is happening now? After the latest meeting with Trump, what did our Prime Minister learn? He learned that Trump is going to threaten tariffs on Canadian fertilizer. That is more exports.

By the way, is potash being shipped out of B.C. ports a reality? No. The company decided to ship out of United States ports instead. That is more tribute to the United States and more private Canadian investment money going to the United States.

Stellantis is an example of more private Canadian money going to the United States. In this case, we could argue that this is public money because the Liberal government gave Stellantis \$15 billion. Stellantis then packed up the auto manufacturing facility and moved to the United States. Stellantis then offered \$13 billion to President Trump as tribute. The government says that it is going to get that money back, even though it did not read the contract that it signed with Stellantis. I hope it has been read by now.

*Business of Supply*

On top of this, there is CUSMA, the trade agreement between the United States, Canada and Mexico. President Trump is threatening to withdraw from that agreement. The argument is that the default will be the previous agreement that existed before CUSMA. That is a weak premise, given who we are dealing with south of the border. Do we really think that Trump is going to agree to that?

In this new world of geo-economics, Canada is now in a weakened position, with no leverage to negotiate with the United States, much less anybody else. Liberals are now starting to beg Europe for some type of alliance. There are the fighter jets that they are talking about buying. Instead of buying jets from the Americans, as promised, they want to buy from Sweden, but the licensing technology belongs to the United States.

With all of the insults that the Prime Minister has given across the board, saying that pipelines are “boring” and responding, “Who cares?” when asked if he had talked to the President of the United States, do we really think that the United States is going to allow licensing to leave any of the manufacturers all around the world?

This is a different world we are living in. In Canada, we are 10 years behind the times because of failed Liberal policies. The vassal state is a reality. If it continues on the road it is going down, our grandchildren and children are going to have to not only deal with failed economics but also deal with the politics that are playing out, right now, here in Canada.

We have not even begun to talk about the Arctic and Arctic sovereignty. How are we going to fund that when we have no economy? Right now, the Liberal answer to this is to go back to taxes or hide it through rates.

• (1040)

**Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think we diverge on a very significant point above all others, which is that, over here, we believe in the future of Canada and in our ability to create our own future, to make our own decisions and to choose our own destiny. Part of choosing that destiny is the negotiations with members and the constituent parts of our vast and great land, which includes, of course, the province of Alberta and the province of British Columbia, as well as all provinces, which have rights holders and first nations as well.

Would my hon. friend prefer to have an MOU and everything that is contained in that MOU, including great advances on the environment, or would he prefer to just have one part of that MOU, which is what his party is advocating for?

**Ellis Ross:** Mr. Speaker, it is 10 years too late to believe in Canada. Why did you not believe that 10 years ago, when you started all these policies? There was Bill C-69, the tanker moratorium. Why did you not believe it then?

**The Deputy Speaker:** I will just interrupt the member as his comments should be going through the Chair, not directly to the government House leader. The member is using the word “you”, which refers to the Speaker, so he cannot use it.

The member may continue.

**Ellis Ross:** Mr. Speaker, to the government House leader, we are not arguing. We are watching the Liberals argue over this MOU. We are watching them argue over the climate action plan. We are trying to be supportive.

[Translation]

**Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, aside from the fact that the government has obviously completely abandoned the fight against climate change, the big question that we will have to ask ourselves today is this: Is there really a proponent that is interested in building a pipeline?

There do not seem to be very many people lining up to do that. The Liberals and the Conservatives are going back and forth about who has the longest pipeline, but no one is interested. There is no commercial interest in building a pipeline. Not a single proponent is interested.

My Conservative friends will have to be clear about whether they are willing to put public money into this type of infrastructure. We lost \$34 billion in the past. We need to know whether the Conservatives are willing to put public money into this.

[English]

**Ellis Ross:** Mr. Speaker, this is a Liberal MOU. This is a Liberal decision. This MOU never came to the House.

By the way, on the idea of a private investor, there is no way a private investor would invest in Canada when we have the tanker moratorium and Bill C-69, the environmental laws. It is just too much. Today, it can be a signal. There has got to be 10 to 20, maybe 30, signals that have to be sent, on top of legislative amendments to be made to all the policies. They have restricted investment in the first place.

**Hon. Tim Uppal (Edmonton Gateway, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I send congratulations to my hon. colleague and friend for a great speech. I agree with him that the Liberals are always creating confusion. In fact, the Liberals, especially the Prime Minister, always speak out of both sides of their mouths. To the “leave it in the ground” caucus, they say no pipelines, but to Alberta, they say that they will build a pipeline. The Prime Minister supports the tanker ban, but then he says he may somehow override it for a pipeline.

Can the member talk a bit more about how the Prime Minister says one thing to one group of people and another thing to others to create confusion and division?

**Ellis Ross:** Mr. Speaker, that is exactly why we want to talk about this today. What we are talking about today is not definitive. This is just the Liberals' wording in the MOU, but it will be definitive once the application is made. At that point, the Liberal government will have to make a decision. Will it allow a pipeline to be built? Will it allow it to be fast-tracked? Will it go to the Major Projects Office?

*Business of Supply*

Today is all about yes or no to different provinces, depending on which audience is sitting in front of the Prime Minister.

**The Deputy Speaker:** We have time for a very short question.

The hon. member for Vancouver Kingsway.

**Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I was in the House when the Prime Minister said that this pipeline would require the consent of the Government of British Columbia, as well as first nations. I then, of course, read the MOU, and it says no such thing. I think the energy minister went to British Columbia and then said that it would require free, prior and informed consent of indigenous nations.

What is the position of the Conservative Party? Do the Conservatives believe—

• (1045)

**The Deputy Speaker:** I did say it had to be a short question.

The hon. member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley can respond, in 15 seconds or less.

**Ellis Ross:** Mr. Speaker, this is basically the whole problem. We do not know what the government's position is, whether we are talking about indigenous consent or provincial consent. We do not know. Today will be a huge day for—

**The Deputy Speaker:** I have to interrupt the member.

Resuming debate, the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources.

**Hon. Tim Hodgson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the hon. Minister of the Environment.

I appreciate the opportunity to take part in this debate. I want to begin by acknowledging the people who have the most at stake in this discussion, Canada's first nations, Métis and Inuit people and their rights, which our government has committed to uphold consistently, including in the MOU referenced in this motion.

I would also like to thank the workers and communities who power Canada's energy sector, the governments and citizens of Alberta as well as British Columbia.

Canada is in a trade war, one we did not ask for but one we must win. In a moment like this, we need unity and execution. We need to focus on building real things that will stand the test of time, not Conservative partisan theatre intended for social media clips. Canadians expect more from the House, and we will deliver it for Canadians. That is why the government supports the full memorandum of understanding signed between Canada and the Conservative Government of Alberta. I say the full text of the MOU, because the whole agreement matters. The accomplishment of the full text is that it sets out the conditions needed to make the progress Canada and Alberta agree on. It is a framework and a path for prosperity, nation building and reduced emissions, things Canadians elected us to deliver.

This Conservative motion before us does the opposite. It cherry-picks one outcome and ignores the framework that would make that outcome possible. In an attempt to score cheap political points, the motion is dripping with cynicism. Endorsing that approach does not

bring a pipeline closer. In fact, by ignoring the importance of engagement with British Columbia, the possibility of indigenous co-ownership, the role of the private sector and the crucial decarbonization efforts inherent in a possible pipeline, such as the Pathways project and a strong carbon market, it risks pushing it farther away.

Not only does it not reflect the deal that was actually signed. It also does not represent the full plan Alberta has laid out. Perhaps that is no surprise, since the leader of the official opposition has never made a deal in his life. He only parachuted into Alberta this year. Does he understand what Albertans want?

Let me be clear about this. I support the idea that Canada should diversify its trade and expand access to global markets. I support the idea that a pipeline could be a key part of this, if built right. Just look at what the TMX did for our economy in the first year alone. However, that is not the same as supporting a motion that is designed to only play divisive games rather than build consensus.

I appreciate the Conservatives are taking some inspiration from the deal we negotiated with Alberta, which includes diversifying exports beyond a single customer, increasing resilience to market shocks and supporting good jobs and investment in Canada. I suggest they read the entire MOU a bit more closely.

Unfortunately, what they left out of today's motion is what would make a real project possible. They omitted that any pipeline must be constructed and financed by the private sector. They omitted a joint commitment by Canada and Alberta to strengthen the industrial carbon price through Alberta's tier system, including a minimum effective credit price of \$130 per tonne. They omitted that a phase one Pathways project must be approved and under way before a pipeline proceeds. They omitted the requirement to engage British Columbians through friendly dialogue. They omitted that any adjustment to the Oil Tanker Moratorium Act would only be considered if necessary. Those are not footnotes; they are conditions for success.

• (1050)

They are also the part of the memorandum that actually answers Canadians' practical questions: Who pays for the project? How do we earn public trust and social licence? How do we reduce emissions in a way that attracts investment and protects our planet? How do we work with British Columbia and indigenous partners on an approach that supports team Canada rather than divides us?

*Business of Supply*

The Prime Minister and the government know what it takes to build nation-building projects, and so do our provincial partners, whether they are in Alberta, British Columbia or beyond. If they do not want to collaborate with us, perhaps my Conservative colleagues across the aisle should take cues from them. Therefore, the government will not support this motion. We must vote against it because it is incomplete by design and undermines the practical pathway set out in the memorandum that Canada and Alberta have agreed to.

If Conservatives actually want a pipeline built, I would suggest there are three realities they need to accept. First, on the role of industrial carbon pricing, I will continue to challenge Conservatives to make clear whether they agree with Premier Smith that industrial carbon pricing is an essential part of diversifying Canada's energy exports beyond the United States. The Leader of the Opposition has spent years attacking industrial carbon pricing and undermining certainty for investments. Premier Smith is signing an agreement that strengthens industrial carbon pricing. Canadians deserve to know which side Conservatives are on. It does not appear to be the side of Canadians.

The second reality that Conservatives must accept is that the endeavour upon which we are embarking must be legitimate. In Canada, legitimacy starts with respecting the rights of indigenous peoples and the duty to consult. This is not a box to check at the end. It is a responsibility that begins at the beginning of the process. It is about economic partnership. Many indigenous communities want to be owners and investors in major projects, not spectators. In fact, we have already heard from treaty nations interested in possible co-ownership, a desire completely left out of the Conservative motion. Legitimacy also means working with British Columbia in good faith. It requires serious engagement with the province, coastal communities and indigenous peoples whose lands and waters would be affected. The MOU we signed recognizes that reality. The Conservative motion tries to skip it.

The third reality is that we must accept that there are lessons we should take note of from the Trans Mountain expansion. The TMX is an essential piece of infrastructure that fundamentally changed Canada's ability to be a resilient energy superpower. Unfortunately, Conservatives often try to exclude it from conversations because it does not fit their political narrative. That is because Liberals can and did actually build pipelines. One very important thing we can learn from the TMX is the importance of having a private proponent. There is significant work needed to be done with Alberta to attract that proponent, and that work is being done. We will not let the federal Conservatives pretend that an opposition day motion can substitute for a real project proposal, real financing and a real review.

I also want to address the Oil Tanker Moratorium Act because Conservatives have cherry-picked this measure for this debate. Our approach to this is straightforward. The memorandum makes clear that an adjustment to the Oil Tanker Moratorium Act will only be considered if necessary and only in the context of an approved project. In other words, we are not going to turn the moratorium into a political football for the sake of a cynical headline. We will develop an appropriate adjustment, if required, based on evidence and a real proposal, not a desire to be on television.

• (1055)

At its core, this Conservative motion is not about building; it is about dividing. It tries to pit regions against each other while ignoring the collaborative nature of the very agreement that Canada and Alberta signed to create a path forward. We are in a trade war, and Canada needs a team Canada approach. That means—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès):** I have to interrupt the hon. minister. We are past time.

The hon. member for Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong.

**Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong, CPC):** Madam Speaker, the northern gateway pipeline had all of the environmental assessments and had all of the indigenous consultation, and it was cancelled under Justin Trudeau. The government asked Conservatives to support Bill C-5 so that it could exempt projects in the national interest from all the terrible laws that it passed in the last 10 years, and we did support that. Now, the minister has a pipeline that meets all of the criteria he has been talking about in his speech.

Does he want to build the pipeline, yes or no?

**Hon. Tim Hodgson:** Madam Speaker, I know members opposite wish it were still 10 years ago, but that is not the government we are in today. This government is committed to work constructively with the Conservative Government of Alberta on a total MOU to develop and build Canada strong. That is what we will do.

[*Translation*]

**Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I am having a very hard time understanding the following. It cost \$34 billion to expand a pipeline infrastructure project. What is more, not a single private proponent wanted to get involved, and not a single private proponent wants to buy the Trans Mountain pipeline. We also know that it will take more than 40 years for Trans Mountain's infrastructure to be profitable. However, some people seem to believe that a private proponent will magically show up wanting to build a new pipeline.

I know the Minister of Natural Resources is very good at math and knows the numbers. I am curious to know whether he thinks this pipeline is profitable. He needs to be honest with Albertans and tell them the truth.

Is it really likely that a private proponent is going to show up to build a new pipeline infrastructure project, seeing as no one ever came forward to expand the other one?

[*English*]

**Hon. Tim Hodgson:** Madam Speaker, Alberta has said that it wants to be the proponent. It said that it will attract a private sector proponent. It is up to Alberta to do that. My understanding is that it is working with several private sector proponents. If and when that private sector proponent comes forward, we will evaluate the proposal.

*Business of Supply*

**Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I have a few points to discuss on the MOU regarding collaboration. The MOU states that the Government of Canada is going to collaborate with British Columbia. Under Bill C-5, the government has granted itself powers to exempt the federal government from following other existing legislation.

How is the Minister of Natural Resources going to square that with the anti-energy, anti-private property Premier of British Columbia, who does not believe in pipelines or the development of further natural resources?

**Hon. Tim Hodgson:** Madam Speaker, I would like to correct the member opposite. The MOU says that Alberta and the federal government will collaborate with the Province of British Columbia.

**Hon. Bardish Chagger (Waterloo, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, constituents within the riding of Waterloo have been talking about this MOU. It has definitely been gaining a lot of traction. They are noticing that it is a comprehensive document, which provides some certainty for investors and provides certainty for Canadians for the economy. They were pleased to see that the federal government is wanting to work with provinces and with indigenous communities, because it is the right approach. We should all be able to be at the table.

Premier Smith has agreed that industrial carbon pricing is essential to attract investment and decarbonize production. Will the minister explain how strengthening Alberta's tier system is key to competitiveness?

• (1100)

**Hon. Tim Hodgson:** Madam Speaker, a functioning industrial carbon price has attracted over \$80 billion of clean tech to Canada over the last several years. Further strengthening the industrial carbon price will allow the Pathways project to proceed. The Pathways project will be the largest, single carbon capture, utilization and storage project in the history of the world. It will be done with Canadian technology, which will be exported all over the world, creating wonderful jobs and long-term careers for Canadians. That is why industrial carbon pricing is important.

**Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of the Environment, Climate Change and Nature, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, it is a privilege to rise in the House this morning. Before I begin, I would like to acknowledge that we are gathered on the traditional unceded territory of the Anishinabe Algonquin nation, and I would like to express my gratitude for the privilege of sharing this land with them to this day.

[*Translation*]

Today, I want to talk about the future, our future, and the foundation that the Government of Canada is putting in place to build a stronger, more sustainable Canada. I am talking about a future that is not only net-zero but also full of new opportunities for clean, resilient and lasting growth. I am talking about building new industries that anchor long-term jobs in all the regions. I am talking about opportunities for workers and communities, such as thousands of skilled jobs for electricians, energy advisers, engineers and construction workers, as well as community-owned renewable energy projects that keep wealth circulating locally. I am talking about opportunities for Canadian competitiveness through selling clean aluminum, low-carbon steel and sustainable forestry products. In

other words, I am talking about a Canada that is climate competitive, a Canada that takes the lead by building on its strengths.

[*English*]

Let me put that into perspective. Countries around the world are making the transition to clean, low-carbon energy, industries and technology. They are competing to design the cleanest technologies, produce the cleanest fuels and operate the cleanest industries. They are competing for capital, for talent and for innovation. This transition reshapes opportunities in trade, investment and jobs. It is bringing opportunities.

I see these very opportunities developing in my home city of Toronto, with more public transit running on clean power and with more walkable and bikeable communities. We have opportunities to change the way we heat and cool our homes, with heat pumps, better insulated homes and smart thermostats that learn routines and reduce wasted energy, with cleaner and more dependable electricity, solar rooftops and grids powered by wind, nuclear and storage, like I saw in Edmonton, where communities were retrofitting their homes to reduce their energy bills while at the same time reducing emissions.

This is impacting how we think about our sustainable future. It is also changing how we connect with nature, with more protected areas, more urban forests and more opportunities for outdoor recreation close to home.

[*Translation*]

A net-zero future makes the cleaner choice the cheaper choice, the smarter choice and ultimately the easier choice. That is why making the foundational changes needed to build a net-zero future is economically smart and fiscally responsible. Moreover, it is essential for protecting Canadians and the places they call home.

[*English*]

Let us speak about the Conservative motion before us today. More importantly, let us talk about what is missing. There is no mention of climate, clean electricity grids or interties between neighbouring provinces. There is no mention of the environment and no mention of a net-zero future for Canadians. In the motion, they ignore any mention of environmental policy, environmental assessment, emissions reductions or collaboration with the Province of British Columbia. All these things were found in the MOU the Premier of Alberta signed this week with the federal government. The Conservatives have no credible policy. They have no plan on climate change.

There are two things we know for certain about the Conservative Party: It has absolutely no plan for the environment, and it has a complete inability to build responsibly for this country. Conservatives love to talk about pipelines, but they never want to talk about climate action. Instead, they are committed to being divisive and to dragging us into the past.

• (1105)

Let us talk about what is in the memorandum of understanding. This memorandum of understanding recognizes that both Canada and Alberta are committed to achieving a net-zero electricity grid that is affordable and reliable. It commits to interties with neighbouring provinces. This memorandum of understanding is contingent upon commitments to enhance methane regulations and to the completion of a new carbon pricing agreement to achieve a six-fold increase in carbon credit prices. All of this is to be finalized no later than April 1, 2026.

We are working with the clean electricity regulations, not around them, in collaboration with the Province of Alberta to get a net-zero grid. Each jurisdiction looks different, and we are co-operating to find an approach that works best in Alberta. As a country, we cannot move forward toward our targets and achieving climate goals if we are not doing it together. The fact is that fighting climate change is both a moral obligation to our future generations and an economic imperative.

[*Translation*]

That is why the Government of Canada released the climate competitiveness strategy in budget 2025.

The strategy positions Canada to seize the opportunities presented by the global transition to clean economies by reducing our emissions and driving investments. It creates the clarity and conditions for the investment needed to build an affordable net-zero future, a future in which Canadian businesses and industries are well positioned to compete and lead in the global economy, Canadians have the security of a strong economy and good jobs, and Canada leads in the global clean energy transition.

[*English*]

The climate competitiveness strategy is a central pillar of the government's plan to become the strongest economy in the G7. It is about building certainty for investors while continuing to take strong action to address climate change, building new infrastructure, and building major projects more efficiently while ensuring they contribute to a clean, competitive economy. It is about supporting clean Canadian innovation, scaling homegrown solutions and capitalizing on projects that further Canada's standing as a clean energy superpower. It is also about exploring nuclear and renewable energy, investments in low-carbon fuels and initiatives aimed at improving the emissions intensity of the oil and gas sector; expanding into emerging opportunities like critical minerals, carbon removal, resource efficiency and high-value manufacturing; training workers to participate in these opportunities; and engaging with indigenous rights holders as appropriate. All of these are investments in long-term prosperity.

However, let me be clear. Canada is not just entering the race. Canada is in this race with some of the smartest and most talented

### *Business of Supply*

workers. That is what we bring to the table: some of the cleanest power, unique energy and resource sectors, and world-class industries. We also bring a strong domestic market where Canadians can be our own best customers. In sum, climate competitiveness strategies aim to grow our economy to build a stronger, more sustainable and more competitive Canada, and to create lasting prosperity.

Let me close with a picture of what Canada can look like if we stay the course. It is a Canada where the power in our homes and the air in our cities are clean, a Canada where jobs in our communities are future-focused and where students can look forward to working in global leading industries, a Canada where indigenous engagement is rooted in respect and responsibility and a Canada where climate action is a catalyst, sparking innovation, inspiration and investment. This is the climate-competitive economy that Canada is moving toward. We are doing it, working hand in hand with indigenous governments, with provinces and territories, with industry and all sectors, because climate action is an opportunity for everyone. This is the Canadian way.

I look forward to continuing that work.

• (1110)

**Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC):** Madam Speaker, forgive my cynicism today, but my riding of Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford is one of the most trade-exposed regions in all of Canada. We are the breadbasket of British Columbia. We have one of the most diverse economies. Four years ago, we suffered the most disastrous natural disaster caused by climate change in the history of Canada.

Where has the Government of Canada been on securing our supply chains so goods can go through to the port of metro Vancouver? We have three rail lines. Where was the Government of Canada instead of working collaboratively with the first nations that have been calling it to the table to sit on the transboundary committees on the Nooksack River? Where has the federal government been in our time of crisis because of climate change? It has been absent.

**Hon. Julie Dabrusin:** Madam Speaker, where have we been as a government? We have been side by side with Canadians in communities right across this country to make sure that we continue to provide the support they need, but also hand in hand to make sure that we are seizing the opportunities for the future.

If the member opposite thinks the motion today moves us in any way forward in working in partnership with his home province of British Columbia, I recommend he relook at its wording. Nowhere in that wording does it refer to actually working in partnership with the Province of British Columbia or respecting its agreement.

*Business of Supply*

[Translation]

**Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I have a lot of respect for the Minister of Environment. I know she is in a difficult position today, but I would just like to point out to her that some things are irreconcilable.

Sometimes we take positions in politics, guided by our ideas and our intentions, and there comes a point when we reach a breaking point. I think that is what happened to the member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie.

To me, building oil and gas infrastructure is irreconcilable with protecting the environment. The desire to develop a new strategy to invent low-carbon oil is irreconcilable with the energy transition.

I would like my colleague to explain how she manages to reconcile the irreconcilable.

**Hon. Julie Dabrusin:** Madam Speaker, let me be very clear. We cannot achieve our environmental and climate change targets and objectives if we do not work with the provinces.

Personally, when I look at what is in this agreement, I see that we, as the federal government, are prepared to work with the Province of Alberta to have stronger industrial carbon pricing. We are working on stronger methane regulations. We are working together on clean electricity.

I think it is a big step forward if we can work with the provinces and ensure that we are making progress in the fight against climate change.

[English]

**Ellis Ross (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, CPC):** Madam Speaker, the whole origin of the MOU came because of the pipeline, but the Liberals are now trying to paint this as Conservative opposition to climate action. We are watching the Liberals argue their own climate action plan. In fact, a minister resigned saying the Liberals flip-flopped on their climate action plan.

Does my hon. colleague agree with the minister who resigned saying the Liberals are backtracking on their climate action plan?

• (1115)

**Hon. Julie Dabrusin:** Madam Speaker, I think on this side of the House, we would all be absolutely clear that we know that under the previous Conservative government, our emissions were going up with no plan to bring them down.

Over the past decade, we have not only flattened that trajectory; we have brought emissions down. They are at the lowest they have been in almost three decades, except for the COVID years. We have shown a continued commitment to fight climate change.

What we are united in knowing and saying is that the Conservatives have no plan. If they wanted to show something, they would have said something in the MOU today. They chose not to.

**Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Madam Speaker, I will say briefly to the minister that she must have been aware that in the budget, on page 348, there is a commitment to no fossil fuel subsidies for “enhanced oil recovery”.

Was the minister consulted before that was reversed in the MOU? I sure was not.

**Hon. Julie Dabrusin:** Madam Speaker, when we are talking about the agreement today and the climate competitiveness strategy, we have an overarching plan to move forward in terms of how we actually put in place the pieces that we need to fight climate change. That includes industrial carbon pricing. That includes methane regulations. That includes clean electricity. The Conservatives, every time, vote against.

[Translation]

**Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Repentigny.

The agreement between Alberta and the federal government is a perfect example of what I believe is wrong with Canadian politics, and frankly, today's debate is only contributing to that. It is clear that our political processes are powerless before the almighty oil and gas industry, and that is the only lens through which the politics of the Canadian economy are viewed.

Every time a crisis arises, the government's response is to have more oil and gas. My Conservative colleagues are just the same way. I remember when we were emerging from the COVID-19 crisis, and the government created an economic recovery plan. What did its recovery plan call for? It called for more oil and gas. With regard to the conflict in Ukraine, the solution that my Conservative and Liberal friends came up with was to supply more oil and gas to the Ukrainians. I say this because it confirms once again what we are going through today. It is something I have been seeing since I arrived here in 2019: Oil and gas are one of the strongest symbols of Canadian identity. This very fact makes Canada's clean energy transition all but impossible.

The idea behind the agreement between the government and Alberta was that it would strengthen national unity. The government basically decided to just give in: it dropped all of the weak proposals it had for fighting climate change, in addition to losing a minister who was back in the media this morning with an open letter, all to please Alberta and defend a form of national unity that aligns with its interests, and therefore with the interests of the oil and gas sector.

As public policy-makers, we have a duty to act. We have to act responsibly, and this means that we have to recognize that the climate crisis has not gone away just because there is a trade dispute with the United States. Sadly, wildfires remind us of that every year. Sadly, climate fluctuations remind us of that every year. However, the federal government is acting as though these issues have gone away.

Furthermore, there is a whole side of this agreement that is deeply problematic, because the government is giving itself the right to negotiate with a province about building infrastructure on another province's territory without consulting that other province. We have learned that British Columbia was not consulted at any point during the federal government's negotiations. B.C. was presented with a *fait accompli*. The government decided to negotiate an agreement at the expense of British Columbia. That is pretty scary for many Quebeckers. Does this mean that the energy east project will be revived?

I said that oil is a strong symbol of Canadian identity, so let me explain. Members will recall that the federal government agreed to purchase a pipeline for \$34 billion. I have also lost count of the number of times since I first came here in 2019 that the Liberals have invested billions of taxpayer dollars in chasing pipe dreams under the guise of fighting climate change. They are still doing that. They are talking about carbon capture and storage. They claim that Canada will produce clean oil, net-zero oil, while in reality, the sole objective is to once again shamelessly support the oil and gas sector. I also remember that during the COVID-19 crisis, the infamous emissions reduction fund was supposed to reduce oil and gas emissions. Ultimately, it became clear that the only thing it did was to increase the sector's production. In my opinion, it is clear that Canada has become captive to its own energy policy and it cannot find a way out.

• (1120)

I spoke about the COVID-19 crisis, the post-pandemic recovery and the economic plan that was tabled. Well, now the pretext has changed. Now it is the trade war. Under the pretext that Canada is caught in a trade war, the government has decided to take prompt action on one of Canada's biggest sectors: the fossil fuel industry. Meanwhile, we are still waiting for action on the forestry industry. I will come back to that later.

Speaking as an outside observer, I do not think the pipeline will be built. Albertans deserve to know the truth. Why do I say that there will never be a pipeline? I say it because there will never be a proponent, unless the Government of Alberta agrees to foot the bill in full. That would be a disaster because the project might end up like Churchill Falls, where the federal government ended up paying for a province's energy infrastructure. I see a disaster in the making. Otherwise, there will never be a proponent.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer has prepared many reports and has told the Standing Committee on Natural Resources over and over that Trans Mountain is not profitable. When this infrastructure was expected to cost \$21 billion, before the price tag went up to \$34 billion, the Parliamentary Budget Officer appeared before the committee and told us that the infrastructure would never be profitable. It would have to operate at full capacity for 40 years and with very high prices in order to break even. No private business would want to do that. This infrastructure will not break even for 40 years, so by building it, we are making ourselves captive to the gas and oil sector for the next 40 years. So much for the energy transition. That will not exist any more. New low-carbon technologies will not be developed. We are captive to the oil and gas sector. That is the message we are getting from the government.

### *Business of Supply*

I would like to get back to the issue of the day. While the pipeline may never exist, carbon capture and storage may. The federal government wants to invest in that as a solution to the trade war. Let us take a good look at this technology. The four members of the Pathways Alliance, which account for 80% of oil sands production, are Canadian Natural Resources, Cenovus Energy, Imperial Oil and Suncor. They represent 80% of the real force behind the oil sector, and they are 73% foreign-owned and 60% American-owned. The oil lobby wants to energize the Canadian economy, but it is doing so to serve American interests. I could not make this up.

This means the federal government is prepared to spend billions of dollars on infrastructure in response to a trade dispute, but who will actually benefit? American interests will benefit: 60% of all dividends paid by the oil sector between 2021 and 2024 went to American interests. We are paying for infrastructure in response to a trade dispute so that they can get even richer. From 2021 to 2024, these companies made record profits of \$131 billion. The message the government is sending them today is that it is perfectly happy to pay for infrastructure and make their lives easier by passing a bill like Bill C-5. The energy transition no longer exists. Environmental regulations no longer exist. All that profit can flow straight to the United States. It is utterly obscene.

Worse still, the Conservatives are adding fuel to the fire by saying that this is how we will combat inflation. What creates the most inflation is when the oil and gas sector boosts its refining margins. In 2008, refining margins were 9.4¢. The last time we studied this issue, in 2022, they were 48¢. This is a transfer of wealth from the general population to the greedy oil and gas industry, and both the Conservative Party and the Liberal Party are complicit.

Today they are trying to convince us that this is part of the trade war we are waging against the Americans. It is a scam.

• (1125)

**Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I agree that we should not be sending our money to the United States. However, we obviously need a pipeline in western Canada and another one in eastern Canada. Furthermore, 60% of Quebeckers support the idea of a pipeline project.

Will the Bloc Québécois support the construction of an eastern pipeline, particularly in Quebec?

**Mario Simard:** Madam Speaker, I find it hard to believe that 60% of Quebeckers support a pipeline. The question should be asked again more clearly, with specifics on the number of waterways that the pipeline is going to cross. I should also point out that we are not just a corridor for moving western energy.

*Business of Supply*

Quebec needs structural investments. The forestry sector is in the throes of an unprecedented crisis. Even though the government announced funding in August, no one has seen a cent of that money. Under the false pretext of national unity, Alberta is going to get its way while Quebec is left behind.

[English]

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, the Bloc is a separatist party. Its members love it when there is conflict in the nation. They have demonstrated that on numerous occasions.

We have a memorandum of understanding that clearly shows how well federalism works. Not only is it good for the environment, but it is good for the economy. It shows the degree to which the federal government continues to work in supporting Canadians, the lumber industry, the steel industry and the aluminum industry. These are all important achievements.

Will the Bloc party not recognize that federalism does work and that all Canadians benefit by this memorandum of understanding?

[Translation]

**Mario Simard:** Madam Speaker, the member for Winnipeg North just realized that we are a separatist party. Well done, it is about time. As for the rest of his question, we are not at all the kind of people who seek out conflict. All we are doing is defending Quebec's interests, which are very poorly served here.

Forty-four Liberal Party members were elected in Quebec. I do not see any of them standing up for the forestry industry, which is collapsing. The member for Winnipeg North has never been able to tell us why his government is ignoring that sector. As I just said, the government announced support measures for the forestry sector in August. It is now December and no one has seen a penny of that money. The forestry sector is being hit with 45% tariffs, and you are washing your hands of it.

The oil and gas sector is making record profits that are going to the United States, and still, you are letting Alberta get its way.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès):** I would like to remind the hon. member that I am doing no such thing from my chair.

The hon. member for Waterloo.

**Hon. Bardish Chagger (Waterloo, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, the motion before the House today was moved by the Conservatives, who picked out a few parts of the agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of Alberta. In my opinion, the full agreement is a document that gives the federal government, the provinces and indigenous communities a way of working together.

Does the member agree that it is important for all levels of government and indigenous communities to work together and to have important discussions so that we can build a better future for all Canadians?

• (1130)

**Mario Simard:** Absolutely, Madam Speaker. More co-operation and consultation are needed. That is why the first thing that the

government should have done when negotiating its agreement was to go and see the people of British Columbia to tell them what it was doing. Unfortunately, the government did not do that. The government negotiated behind British Columbia's back regarding infrastructure that may pass through its territory and significantly change its political future.

Now, the government is talking about the importance of co-operation and consultation. That is rather rich.

**Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ):** Madam Speaker, let us be clear. What we are talking about today is an Alberta-Canada oil and gas agreement that amounts to literal climate betrayal. Canada is abandoning its greenhouse gas reduction targets. It is abandoning all of the environmental policies it has put in place over the past 10 years. It is abandoning biodiversity by revoking measures like the west coast oil tanker ban. It is abandoning protection for indigenous lands. Simply put, the Prime Minister is rolling out a political oil and gas agenda that is moving ahead at top speed, no matter the price and whatever the cost. This is climate betrayal by the Liberals.

Not only did this cause the member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie to resign as a minister, it also resulted in two expert advisors to the Prime Minister walking out. We have a Prime Minister who is circumventing legislation and pushing out everyone around him who cares about the environment and climate change. Whether they are ministers or experts, it is, "Thank you and good night, the Prime Minister no longer needs you."

Then he goes and signs an agreement with Alberta to produce and export 1.3 million barrels of dirty oil per day, without the consent of British Columbia and first nations. There was no discussion with first nations before the agreement was signed. There is no obligation in the agreement to respect the rights of first nations. First nations have stated unanimously that the tanker ban had to remain in place. They also very clearly stated their position that this agreement had to be revoked. What is the Prime Minister doing? He is doing absolutely nothing. He is not listening to first nations.

It is the same for British Columbia. There was no consultation with British Columbia prior to this agreement. The Premier of British Columbia found out in the papers that the Prime Minister of Canada was negotiating an agreement with Alberta in secret. He was never consulted, and there is nothing in the agreement that allows British Columbia to refuse to have a pipeline forced down its throat. The agreement says only that British Columbia must be consulted.

*Business of Supply*

This is a clear threat to the other provinces and to Quebec, who could basically have an oil and gas fantasy forced upon them. It is one of the worst cases of predatory federalism ever documented. It is an exceptionally violent attack on the environment and on respect for the provinces, which is nowhere to be seen. This agreement essentially shows a blatant disregard, a denial of our institutions and a denial of due process for the presumed goal of rolling out an oil and gas business plan. Once again, the government is exploiting the trade and tariff crisis to go full steam ahead on oil and gas.

That it made plans with the Premier of Alberta is understandable, obviously, but members should remember that this oil is one of the most polluting oils on earth. It is the biggest environmental issue in Canada. The Prime Minister is no longer concerned about climate change. Obviously, a private proponent has yet to come forward, so the Prime Minister is most likely willing to give the oil industry more billions. We know that he believes this pipeline must happen at any cost, but the cost for Quebeckers will once again be in the billions even though they have nothing to gain from it. This is a pipeline for western Canada and the oil and gas industry, even though we know that we should be investing in solutions to build the economy of the future. We should be thinking about clean electricity, green buildings, and the electrification of transportation, companies, and small and medium-sized businesses. We need to build this expertise. The jobs of the future are in these sectors. They are not in oil and gas.

Let us turn back to the member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie, who published a letter this morning. The member was very clear. He said that it would be disingenuous to say that Canada is going to meet its greenhouse gas reduction targets. He was highly critical of this agreement between his boss, the Prime Minister, and Alberta's Ms. Smith. He said this was a fire sale rather than a compromise because essentially, Canadians will get nothing in exchange for the sacrifices made for Alberta. That is also true for Quebec. Not only does Quebec have nothing to gain from this deal, it has everything to lose. The agreement has also abandoned 10 years of environmental measures that have already been implemented. While they may not have been adequate, they have now been abandoned, plain and simple.

Members will recall that these are the highlights of this agreement.

- (1135)

It is essentially about the government giving the oil and gas industry everything on its wish list, as the government has been doing since it came to power. It is about increasing the production of oil and gas, including dirty oil, including gas extracted by fracking. It is about one or more oil pipelines to transport at least 1 million barrels of oil produced from Alberta bitumen, the dirtiest, or almost the dirtiest, oil in the world. It is about expanding the Trans Mountain pipeline system to add 300,000 to 400,000 barrels of dirty oil per day. It is about ending the moratorium on oil tankers on the west coast, which would allow tankers carrying crude oil to travel through a marine protected area, with all the potential risks to this very fragile ecosystem, and to all the jobs in the environmental protection sector in that part of the country. It is about increasing electricity production using gas, a fossil fuel. It is also about suspending the clean electricity regulations for Alberta. This obviously cre-

ates uncertainty, quite apart from the fact that it means we are really not moving in the direction of renewable energy. What are the other provinces likely to do? They are going to ask for the same lax standards.

The agreement increases the industrial carbon price to \$130 per tonne. The government had planned for a price of \$170 per tonne in 2030. However, it is being scaled back for Alberta. The price is now \$130 per tonne, but it is not even known when this price will go into effect. Is it in 2050, for example? What is the trajectory? There is no clarity on this. Then, of course, there is talk of constructing a carbon capture and storage megaproject at a cost of billions of dollars, for the oil and gas industry once again, for Alberta's dirty oil. In addition, the government is going to allow carbon capture and storage to be used to increase oil production through enhanced recovery, something the government said in its budget that it would not do. It is flip-flopping. Not only is it flip-flopping, it is basically walking away once again from its commitment to stop subsidizing fossil fuels.

On top of that there are the methane regulations. Canada is now going to have to reach an agreement with Alberta on the methane regulations. We already know that Alberta has just been given an additional five years, meaning that this province will implement the regulations five years later than planned. What are the other provinces likely to do? British Columbia will probably demand the same thing. What kind of regulation will we end up with when all is said and done? It will very likely be watered down, with less ambitious targets and with additional loopholes built in. In addition to all this, there is one final wish from the oil and gas companies: amend the Competition Act to eliminate the measures for combatting greenwashing.

All of the oil and gas sector's wishes are being granted. Let us now return to the much-discussed emissions cap. In the oil and gas sector, the oil sands currently emit more greenhouse gases than all of Quebec. These emissions have risen nearly 500% since 1990. A new pipeline is obviously going to increase production and increase emissions. This is very clear. There is no such thing as a barrel of decarbonized oil or a barrel of green oil; it simply does not work that way. It is a sham. One need not be the sharpest pencil in the box to understand this. Everyone understands that if production increases, emissions will increase.

The agreement also talks about carbon capture and storage, but 80% of emissions from oil come from combustion. This does nothing to address the problem of emissions. The science is very clear on this. The agreement talks about implementing carbon capture and storage technology, but at this time, the technology is still unproven. It has not been deployed at scale. It is still experimental, and it is extremely expensive. It will require billions of dollars of public funds. Canada is, of course, ready and willing to chip in 50% of those costs for the oil and gas companies.

*Business of Supply*

This is climate betrayal. Many people voted for the Liberals thinking they would be better than the Conservatives. However, their record is currently worse than the Conservatives'. The Conservatives did not even manage to authorize a pipeline under Stephen Harper, who presided over some dark years in terms of the environment. This Liberal government, on the other hand, will have two to its name. It used Bill C-5 to suspend certain laws and Bill C-15 to trample every environmental law in order to push this oil project through. People did not vote for that. The climate crisis is still raging. Using the tariff and trade crisis to advance a Conservative agenda is completely irresponsible.

• (1140)

The Bloc Québécois is obviously going to oppose this plan and refuse—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès):** The hon. member for Leduc—Wetaskiwin.

[English]

**Hon. Mike Lake (Leduc—Wetaskiwin, CPC):** Madam Speaker, while members of the House may sometimes get confused when they see the two of us standing up, let us be assured we could not be further apart in terms of our views on this issue. This is probably more of a comment than a question, because I do not know where a question would even go. The comment would be that the wish list for my constituents, and probably his, would include the strongest health care in the world, the strongest education systems in the world and support for people who are vulnerable.

I would argue that the oil and gas sector in Canada has created untold billions of dollars in financing toward those things. The Liberal approach over the last decade of shutting down the oil and gas sector largely has not benefited the environment in any way. I do not think there has been any benefit to the environment, but I do think it has benefited the economies of Russia, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Venezuela and other oil-producing countries at the expense of our own systems and our own ability to fund important health care, social service and education services in Canada.

[Translation]

**Patrick Bonin:** Madam Speaker, my hon. colleague and I may indeed look a bit alike, but we certainly do not think alike.

Oil and gas in Canada is going from strength to strength. Production is going up, and so are emissions. No one on the other side of the House has shut down the oil and gas industry. On the contrary, the government is rolling out the red carpet for the industry and putting billions of dollars on the table. These billions of dollars are being taken out of the pockets of Quebeckers and from other areas.

We should transition and make plans to move away from oil and gas. As we know, oil and gas production will not be discontinued overnight, but we need to plan for a transition. My colleague mentioned health, but according to the World Health Organization, the biggest threat to health is climate change.

Choosing to bury our heads in the sand and prioritizing oil and gas would definitely be bad for our health.

[English]

**John-Paul Danko (Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, it is good to get the member opposite's perspective. He has been an environmental leader for many years. There are a couple of important things that he mentioned. The first was that becoming an energy superpower includes all forms of energy and that we need to invest in clean energy and invest in jobs in clean energy, because that is where the jobs of the future are.

Thinking about the global transition toward electric vehicles and transportation, electric heating and cooling, electric industrial processes and electric computing and data centres, would he agree it is pragmatic to provide paths forward for natural resources where the market exists and also to invest heavily in electric production and transmission throughout Canada?

[Translation]

**Patrick Bonin:** Madam Speaker, obviously we support electrification because we know we need to accelerate the transition to renewable energy. However, we do not believe we have to give the nuclear industry billions of dollars to generate more electricity for data centres.

Perhaps my colleague misunderstood something. Our party is fully aligned with the goal of becoming a clean energy and renewable electricity superpower. However, we believe that increasing production of some of the world's dirtiest oil and gas is a step in the wrong direction and goes against what the science says. It also goes against what the public wants for Canada. Opinion polls show that the vast majority of Canadians want the government to do more to fight climate change. Unfortunately, your agreement with Alberta is a betrayal of the climate cause and of Canada's targets, and it is the exact opposite of what needs to be done.

• (1145)

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès):** I just want to remind the hon. member that he must address his comments to the Chair.

[English]

The hon. member for Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford has the floor.

**Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I appreciate the discourse from the member from the Bloc Québécois, but unfortunately I do not think he really understands British Columbia and what British Columbians want. British Columbians are the most environmentally conscious people in the entire country. That is a statistical fact. We love our rainforests. We love our natural environment. However, the majority of British Columbians also understand that we can have natural resource development and protect our environment.

We also believe strongly in protecting the sovereignty of Canada, and a pipeline to the coast of British Columbia will allow the country of Canada to export more oil and gas, which will lead to better social services in Canada and will also diversify our economy at a time when we are suffering. I hope the member from the Bloc Québécois can understand that British Columbia is very different from Quebec and that his comments did not properly reflect the way British Columbians truly feel.

[*Translation*]

**Patrick Bonin:** Madam Speaker, I invite my colleague to read what the Assembly of First Nations of Canada very clearly said. It wants the agreement to be withdrawn. Its members unanimously opposed lifting the oil tanker ban. The Premier of British Columbia has also been very clear. He was not consulted, and he does not support a pipeline that would go through first nations territory.

I think this is very clear. All the newspapers reported on this. My colleague may say what he likes, but I look at the facts, and the fact is that the Premier of British Columbia is clearly not happy with this agreement.

[*English*]

**Billy Morin (Edmonton Northwest, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I am honoured to share my time with the member for Battle River—Crowfoot.

How did we get here, to a point where Canada, a nation blessed with some of the world's most ethical oil and hardest-working people, cannot even get a pipeline within our own borders built without years of political trench warfare? For years the Liberal government has fuelled a culture war against Alberta and against Canada's energy workers. It has demonized the very people who power and heat our homes. It has demonized the Canadians who make it possible to have the smart phones, clothing and medical equipment every single member of the chamber uses daily.

There are pipelines beneath our feet right now in this city and this country. Petroleum is everywhere in this room, in the microphone I am speaking into and in the chairs we sit on, yet the Liberals pretend oil is some foreign enemy they play games with.

Worse still, they play games with indigenous communities and exploit first nations as a political tool. They talk endlessly about reconciliation, but what indigenous communities actually get from the Liberals is just more bureaucracy through the Indian Act, more mismanagement through entities like the negligent Indian Oil and Gas Canada office, and more trust monies locked away and controlled by Ottawa. It is all talk with zero structural change.

Standing up for first nations is not cynicism like the energy minister claims the motion represents, which is, by the way, their party's own very words. Asking the government to build trust by meeting its basic responsibilities as a government is not cynicism. The Liberals claim to honour free, prior and informed consent, but let us be honest: This is just more games and exploitation of indigenous communities by them. Liberals are using consultation as a political shield rather than building infrastructure that benefits all Canadians. This is just more games and exploitation.

When 111 out of 129 first nations actively participate in Trans Mountain, where are the Liberals to defend the 18 that do not par-

### *Business of Supply*

ticipate? They do not care about the few who opposed it, because it is just politics of convenience for them. The Liberals have set up Alberta, first nations and British Columbia to fail from the start. The parliamentary secretary said yesterday that the next steps for this are the creation of a trilateral table with Alberta, B.C. and the federal government. Again there is no mention of first nations at that table, the same people he says need free, prior and informed consent.

The Liberals are not serious about respect. They are not serious about UNDRIP. They are not serious about any of that. They are not honest. They are just name-dropping first nations in their public statements, with no intention of bringing them to the decision-making table. Who is really dividing Canadians? The government has two faces, with a bipolar Bill C-5 pipeline policy one day and something completely different the next. It picks winners and losers based on politics, not prosperity.

The government sets up consultation as a political tool. Consultation as a constitutional duty does not need to be political games if backed by solid relationships built beforehand. Trust, reputation, responsibility, respect, honesty, humility and wisdom are how we build pipelines that last; we do not build them with endless promises that are never fulfilled even with the best of the government's brand of consultation.

Conservatives believe that Canada can move at the speed of ambition again. We saw it with natural gas infrastructure. In western Canada, 68 out of 72 first nations and Métis communities across three provinces have signed BCRs and community resolutions to buy critical national gas and petroleum infrastructure. This was done with great partnerships and relationships between the nations and the private sector, because when the right team is in place, Canadians get results. We should expect that same speed when it comes to approval, regulation and construction of pipelines.

*Business of Supply*

Natural resources have been a cornerstone of my family for generations. My own great-grandfather, Chief Billy Morin the first, was there for Leduc No. 1 in the 1940s. He spoke about how oil and gas would fund education, housing, infrastructure and the building up of our community. He spoke about how true economic partnership reduces dependency. Our treaties commit to sharing resources and co-developing as a people thriving with one another, not being excluded from Canada's resource economy. Indigenous peoples want to uplift our communities through resource rights with integrity, respect for the land and water with a fair share of the benefits.

This is what seven-generation thinking means, not whatever the Minister of Finance uses for virtual signalling when he is speaking about indigenous communities. Traditional knowledge matters. Land and water stewardship matter. First nations are already demonstrating this every single day. They are not barriers; they are builders. This is reconciliation, not just more speeches.

• (1150)

However, the Liberal government is actively making our country weaker. While it blocks Canadian oil from reaching tidewater, the United States sails foreign-flag tankers just 12 nautical miles off our west coast. The U.S. gets the market, the jobs and the influence; Canada gets nothing but lectures.

We should be proud of our environmental excellence. Modern technology such as in-situ oil sands and SAGD extraction continues to reduce costs and emissions. We have world-leading spill prevention because of meaningful and real consultations, investments in technology and innovation, and trust built by our Canadian scientists, technicians and communities. Let us believe in them to get the job done and to do this right.

For Trans Mountain there were zero spills from marine shipping since operations began. Yes, TMX went from \$4 billion to \$30 billion-plus under the Liberal government, but what lessons were learned? Clearly none, because the government continues to pile on red tape, block procurement and stand in the way of major project success. The Major Projects Office is a joke about an endless and ineffective set of bureaucracies; it is a bottleneck disguised as a support system.

Canadians cannot afford the Prime Minister's distraction that delays a new oil pipeline to the Pacific coast.

Conservatives believe that unblocking and shipping a million barrels of oil to Asia a day at world prices will generate a stronger economy and take-home pay for our people, but Carney's, the Prime Minister's, Liberals, continue to stand in the way of all this, promising one thing to Alberta and another thing to "keep it in the ground"—

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux:** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Members have to make reference to the Prime Minister by his title as opposed to by his name.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès):** Yes, the hon. member knows that, and I believe he corrected himself. However, it is the rule.

The hon. member for Edmonton Northwest.

**Billy Morin:** Madam Speaker, does the Prime Minister even have control of his caucus anymore?

Conservatives will keep fighting to boost Canadian paycheques and make energy, food and homes affordable and our economy self-reliant, secure and sovereign. Where is the respect for people who want opportunity, for those who sign equity agreements on pipelines, and for the first nations that drilled, engineered, built and protected the resources for generations? Where is the reconciliation in excluding them from the table?

Conservatives have a path forward: Repeal the anti-resource legislation that hold Canadians back, end the political games that pit region against region and Canadian against Canadian, and approve nation-building pipelines, including one from Alberta to British Columbia and infrastructure from B.C. back to Alberta, with the full participation and equity ownership of indigenous partners.

Liberals will offer excuses. They will accuse. They will fearmonger. They will continue to divide and delay, and to diminish Canada, but Conservatives will deliver. We will ensure that our workers can succeed at home, that indigenous communities can benefit from their own lands and that Canadian energy powers the world ethically, securely and proudly.

The world needs more Canada, not less; more prosperity, not poverty; and more unity, not division. It is time to build, and it is time to grow. It is time to get pipelines in the ground again.

• (1155)

**Jaime Battiste (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I have tremendous respect for the member, not only because he was previously a chief of his nation but also because of his lived experience in the first nations in his community.

The member opposite was around the first nations chiefs last week as they gathered at the AFN, and I was there with him. I heard first nations chiefs from all across this country, especially British Columbia, say that nothing should happen without their free, prior and informed consent, but when I hear the member's party opposite, its members seem to think they can ram the legislation through for a pipeline without the consent of first nations.

*Business of Supply*

I ask the member, did he hear something different? Does the member opposite agree with his party's framing that the development of major projects should be rammed through without UNDRIP's free, prior and informed consent laws and the rights entrenched in section 35?

**Billy Morin:** Madam Speaker, certainly we did hear from the chiefs, and they do have concerns, but they are concerns with the government and its failed consultation processes, which I think the Liberal government in the last 10 years has shown.

The other thing is that of course we do agree with the wording; it is right in our motion about consent with indigenous nations. We are not backing away from consultation, which is right in our motion, but when Liberals talk about free, prior and informed consent, I think they are just playing games when it comes to UNDRIP and those things.

Where were the Liberals to defend consent on TMX for the ones who did not agree? Apparently it is just for some, not for all, so when they say "consent", I think it is the Liberals' playing games, at the end of the day.

[Translation]

**Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ):** Madam Speaker, a number of first nations have indicated that they want the tanker moratorium to remain intact. Even if they are consulted, they can ultimately decide to maintain the tanker moratorium. Would my colleague support the government forcing them to set aside the moratorium?

How do we resolve this situation?

[English]

**Billy Morin:** Madam Speaker, I hear the concerns. I hear the concerns of first nations that have environmental concerns. That is totally fair. Again, we are for consultation, as per the wording of the motion, 100%.

However, we also believe in Canadians who do environmental protection, the scientists and the technologists who have been proven time and time again. TMX has had no spill since operation. Now we have to take more risks, apparently, for the existential crisis we are in, but the Liberals keep playing games. They have said they are willing to bend on the tanker ban. We completely support that, but let us not play games anymore; let us actually do it and get the country moving at the end of the day.

**Ellis Ross (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I have sat in the House now for less than a year, and all I have listened to is Liberals lecturing us on aboriginal issues. They are trying to teach us about what reconciliation is and what aboriginal rights and title are, yet our ancestors helped create section 35 and the case law. Central to that was the environment.

Do we need a lecture from the Liberals on what aboriginal rights and title are all about?

**Billy Morin:** Madam Speaker, we do not. There is Canadian law, and there are treaties that have been signed, but I think, again, that Liberals typically play games with these to pit one region or people against another. Canadians and first nations people, indigenous people, are tired of this. When I was a kid, we used to do drumming in our classroom. We used to do singing in our classroom. We were

taught our language, but we were also speaking and singing the Canadian national anthem at the end of the day. When I was a kid, things were different.

Now it is first nations against Canadians. It is different Canadians against other Canadians, and this is the same thing Liberals do to keep power and control. I think first nations and Canadians want a treaty partnership, which was the original intent of 1867; they do not want a pitting of Canadians against Canadians anymore.

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Madam Speaker, we in the Conservative caucus are united. We believe that Canada needs a pipeline to the Pacific and that we need to override the discriminatory anti-Canada ban on shipping Canadian energy overseas. We need this pipeline because it would make for stronger take-home pay, it would make for affordable living, and it would make for a sovereign, self-reliant economy.

Let us talk for a moment about the incredible benefits that such a pipeline would bring. It would allow us to move \$30 billion a year of Canadian energy overseas to the 2.5 billion Asian customers who would then pay world prices for it. Thirty billion dollars would be the single biggest increase in overseas exports that any decision by this country could make. To put this into perspective, recently I pointed out that the Prime Minister, after running on the promise that we were in an existential crisis and needed to do the unimaginable at speeds not seen in generations, had not succeeded in removing a single foreign tariff on Canadian exports despite countless months of world travel. He snapped back that there has been a trade deal with Indonesia.

Well, forget the fact that it was the previous prime minister who negotiated that; something the current one has a bad habit of doing is taking credit for things he did not do. By the government's own projections, if that trade deal were to be as good as the Liberals promised, it would add \$400 million to our exports. The pipeline to the Pacific would add 75 times more to Canada's exports overseas than would the only agreement the Prime Minister likes to brag about. There is literally not a single trade deal the government could sign and not a single government project it could fund that would come anywhere close to opening up the \$30 billion of overseas, non-U.S. exports that this single project would enable.

*Business of Supply*

It would mean thousands of extra jobs for Canadians in western Canada but also, potentially, in central Canada, which might be the region supplying the steel for this patriotic pipeline. It would mean communities on the route would have new life, as workers would be filling restaurants with their paycheques. Local vendors would be able to sell more clothing, more housing supplies and other goods to enable and rejuvenate communities all across the northern part of Alberta and British Columbia. Originating as it would in Hardisty, Alberta, in my wonderful riding, the best people in the world would therefore benefit from this incredible project.

I add that not only would it give paycheques. It would bring tax revenues that would allow us to fund more schools, hospitals and better policing and to increase social services not through higher taxes, as the Liberals so often favour, but rather through a booming economy.

Furthermore, when we export more Canadian goods abroad, we force other countries to buy Canadian dollars. That raises the dollar and therefore the purchasing power of our people. The cost of goods that are internationally priced becomes more affordable. There would be more affordable food, fuel and inputs to build housing. A stronger dollar means a more affordable Canada, and that is our ultimate purpose. The biggest problem in Canada today is that people cannot afford to live, after Liberals doubled housing costs, doubled costs at the grocery store, doubled lineups at food banks and doubled our national debt. One way to make life more affordable is to have a strong Canadian dollar that buys more food, fuel and housing.

All of these incredible benefits would be a no-brainer, and we should not even have to debate it. In fact, we would not have to debate it if the previous Conservative government's decision to approve the northern gateway pipeline to the Pacific had been allowed to go ahead. However, in a November 2016 cabinet decision, the Liberal government killed the northern gateway pipeline. The current Prime Minister, who was not in the cabinet at the time, went on to testify at the industry committee that he agreed with killing the northern gateway pipeline.

• (1200)

The current government continues to have a tanker ban in place that blocks shipping Canadian oil off the northwest coast of B.C. while allowing American tankers to move oil between Alaska and the U.S. west coast. Apparently, it is safe when the Americans transport oil through those same waters but not when Canadians do it. Clearly, that is an act by the government of economic self-harm and of discriminating against Canadians.

The Prime Minister suddenly claimed that he had reversed himself. He signed an MOU. To believe he is actually committed to the MOU, we have to believe he now says he was wrong about everything he wrote and everything the Liberal government did in the preceding 10 years. We have to believe he was wrong about the emissions cap, wrong about the electricity regulations, wrong about shipping oil through a pipeline from Alberta to the Pacific and wrong about the tanker ban. He was wrong about all of those things, but we would have to believe he has accepted that wrong.

Let us give him the benefit of the doubt. Let us give him a chance to come in the House of Commons and vote in favour of

what he promised. Conservatives brought forward a good-faith motion just to make sure Liberals meant what they said, to get them all in the House of Commons to vote on whether they want a pipeline to the Pacific and whether they are prepared to open up our waters to shipping energy overseas.

Now, the Liberals went dead quiet. I expected them to enthusiastically applaud this gesture of goodwill. They went dead quiet over the weekend, telling reporters on background they had no idea how they were going to vote on their own MOU proposal for a pipeline and an adjustment to the oil tanker moratorium. I even used wording right out of the Prime Minister's MOU to make it easy for them, but it still was not easy enough.

As we know with Liberals, they often start by making promises and then they go to making excuses. They have been generating a whole lot of excuses about why they have to vote against the wording in their own MOU. Let us go through some of the excuses. They said it did not mention they want to accompany the pipeline with a carbon capture project. They claimed it did not go far enough in spelling out indigenous engagement and ownership. They claimed it did not clearly lay out the plan to engage with British Columbia.

Let us forget for a second the obvious fact that if the Liberals are telling the truth when they say they support the whole MOU, then they should be prepared to vote for any part of the MOU. After all, it is their MOU. That obvious contradiction aside, we know the Liberals have made these excuses. I am going to help brush away those excuses for them. We are going to amend our own motion in order to include the things that the Liberals claim we left out.

We are going to amend the motion so that it will support green-lighting carbon capture and storage, green-lighting indigenous ownership in the project and engaging with British Columbia, in the spirit of good faith. We are removing all the Liberal excuses because we know what the Prime Minister's plan is. He wants to pretend that he supports a pipeline, like the majority of Canadians, just long enough to get through the next election, while he quietly whispers to his "keep it in the ground" caucus, "It will never happen. Do not worry. Just hang tight with me, and be quiet. We will kill it after the election." To make sure he cannot play that duplicitous game, we are going to give him this amendment.

I move:

That the motion be amended by inserting after the word "including" the word "(i)" and by adding after the words "Indigenous peoples" the following:

"(ii) Green lighting the world's largest carbon capture, utilization, and storage (CCUS) project for the purpose of making Alberta oil among the lowest carbon intensity produced barrels of oil in the world."

(iii) providing meaningful opportunity for Indigenous rightsholders to participate in consultation processes and economic opportunities through Indigenous ownership, partnerships and benefits,

*Business of Supply*

• (1205)

(iv) engaging with British Columbia immediately in a trilateral discussion on the pipeline project, and during the potential development and construction of the bitumen pipeline referred to in the MOU, and to further the economic interests of B.C. related to their own projects of interest that involve the province of Alberta, including interties, and Canada working with B.C. on other projects of national interest in their jurisdiction”.

• (1210)

[Translation]

**Mario Simard:** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

I would have liked to hear the amendment put forward by the leader of the official opposition, but I do not know what happened. There were some strange noises. I do not know if the leader of the official opposition had a digestive issue, but it was so disruptive that the interpretation stopped.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès):** The hon. member will hear the amendment again. There was indeed an alarm ringing during the presentation.

[English]

Since the party leader is moving the amendment, I take it for granted that there is consent to accept the amendment.

The amendment is in order.

Questions and comments, the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy.

**Corey Hogan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I welcome the progress made in the amendment, but I am very curious as to how it did not mention industrial carbon pricing and the increase of the industrial carbon price as part of this amendment, one of the most important parts of the MOU. Would the member be willing to consider further amending his motion to do the entire MOU rather than, again, cherry-picking the things that his caucus seems to be willing to support?

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre:** Madam Speaker, I think we just heard the Liberal member for Calgary Confederation say that he opposes a pipeline to the Pacific unless it includes a massive, crippling carbon tax on his own province. I would encourage him to go around his province, talk to the energy workers in his riding and say the reason he voted against a pipeline is that he does not think Albertans are paying high enough taxes. He wants a higher tax on the Alberta oil sector, a higher tax on Alberta gas and a higher tax on industries that build homes or farmers who produce food.

Conservatives wants a pipeline without a tax. That Liberal member for Calgary Confederation wants a tax without a pipeline.

[Translation]

**Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ):** Madam Speaker, the leader of the official opposition repeatedly called it a pipe dream during question period. The federal government announced a fantasy pipeline. This rarely happens, but I agree with what the leader of the official opposition is saying.

This pipeline is indeed a pipe dream, a fantasy, because most serious investors know full well that it has no long-term profitability

unless it is built with public money. Alberta is the proponent for now, but there will never be a private proponent.

Can the leader of the official opposition confirm that he thinks this pipeline will never happen and that it is a fantasy?

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre:** Madam Speaker, this pipeline will get built if a Conservative government is elected, because we are going to get out of the way. Only one authority can approve or block the pipeline, and that authority is the federal government. Section 92A(1) of our Constitution clearly specifies that any project crossing an interprovincial border comes under exclusive federal jurisdiction. Under Bill C-5, the decision rests with the Prime Minister of Canada. If the Prime Minister wants a pipeline, it will happen; if not, it will not happen. This project is going to be extremely cost-effective and profitable without subsidies. All it needs is the green light.

• (1215)

[English]

The exclusive power to approve this pipeline is the Prime Minister's under the Constitution and the law. If he wants to green-light it, it will happen. If he wants to block it, he will block it.

As future prime minister, I will green-light this pipeline and allow Canadians to build a pipe to tidewater so that Canadians can be richer, our lives can be more affordable and our economy can be more sovereign.

**Hon. Mike Lake (Leduc—Wetaskiwin, CPC):** Madam Speaker, the hon. member talked about the Liberal decision to kill this pipeline back in November 2016. Of course, the biggest beneficiaries of that decision were Iran, Russia, Venezuela, Saudi Arabia and other oil-producing countries around the world.

How important would this pipeline be in accruing benefit across Canada, instead of in those oil-producing dictatorships?

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre:** Madam Speaker, it would be very beneficial. It would also diversify our economy. The Prime Minister made grand promises that he would diversify our trade and double exports to non-U.S. markets. This is the single biggest export of Canadian goods to non-U.S. markets that we could ever imagine. There is literally not another project that would even come close to the \$30-billion-a-year of overseas exports that this project would enable.

The Prime Minister has had eight months since becoming Prime Minister on the promise to build the unimaginable at speeds not seen in generations, and he has not even begun consulting on the pipeline. He has not even stated clearly that he supports a pipeline.

*Business of Supply*

All we are doing now is taking the wording from the MOU he signed on the pipeline, the tanker ban, the issue of carbon capture, the issue of indigenous consultation and the engagement with B.C. so that he can vote for his words. Will he do it?

**Hon. Kody Blois (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, it is always a great opportunity to stand up on opposition day motions, and today is no different.

I will be splitting my time this afternoon with my hon. colleague from Vancouver Granville, who will have a lot to offer in the debate. I would encourage all of my hon. colleagues to listen to his words, as he resides in British Columbia and has a good handle on this particular issue before the House today.

I would like to take just 30 seconds to recognize that my wife Kimberly and I are proud of our beloved Bernese mountain dog, Louis. If members have been watching, they may know that Louis was up for the global parliamentary pet of the year award, competing against entries from the European Parliament and the U.S. Capitol. I am proud to say that Louis represented team Canada well and he won. He is the global parliamentary pet. It is a little source of pride for Kings—Hants, Nova Scotia and, of course, Canada. We are proud of our beloved Bernese.

More importantly, today is a really important opportunity to talk about Canada's natural resource sector writ large. I am going to use my time to talk about how this government and, frankly, all parliamentarians should be focused on helping to support a critical sector for our country.

It bears repeating that Canada has what the world needs. Canada is the fourth-largest oil-producing country in the world. Some Canadians may not know that, but it should be a great source of pride. It is the fifth-largest producer of natural gas. We have the renewable energy the world needs. We are a leader in that, and we can do more. We have the forestry products and critical minerals the world needs, and although it may not be directly tied to energy or natural resources, we have natural endowments, with arable land, in agriculture. We are an agricultural superpower.

Canadians need to be proud of these realities. We are blessed with these natural endowments. I would argue that there is a moral and ethical imperative for us to produce these natural endowments for the benefit of the world, and Canada has a long tradition of doing just that. This government and this Prime Minister are focused on making Canada an energy superpower, above and beyond what we already are.

I highlighted some of the key statistics, and we should take great pride in them, but on this side of the House, we believe the government we can do even more, and not only on energy and critical minerals; we also recognize the moral imperative to reduce GHG emissions and continue the fight on climate change, and that Canada has a responsibility, when it comes to conventional energy and the energy transition, to do both. That has been the focus of the government, the Minister of Energy, the Prime Minister and the entire cabinet. What can we do to help support the conventional energy development that is needed, ensuring that there is a lens on making the lowest-intensity barrel of oil or cubic foot of gas, or promoting renewable energy and nuclear energy?

I have long been a proponent in the House of the need and the role of nuclear energy if we are going to be serious about reaching our net-zero targets by 2050. This government has taken substantial steps toward promoting nuclear energy and building upon the Canadian ingenuity and success that we have in that domain.

I want to take a brief moment to talk about Atlantic Canada's connection to the natural resource sector. We think about the Nova Scotia offshore. Premier Houston has highlighted Wind West and the opportunities that exist in that sector. We have an offshore energy sector that has existed for decades, including in Newfoundland and Labrador, where I had the opportunity to join Cenovus a week and a half ago to announce the extension of West White Rose. These are important projects that matter to the world, with the lowest-intensity barrel of oil in the world. That is something we should be proud of. While the world still needs this product, it ought to be Canadian and it had better be the lowest intensity we can find. We have that ingenuity and expertise.

I think about my graduating class and the privilege of graduating at Hants East Rural High in 2009, home of the Tigers. A lot of the graduates, particularly on the male side of the equation, would have started their careers, particularly those in the trades, in western Canada. There is a recognition in my region of the importance of the natural resource sector across this country, but particularly in western Canada, and what it means to the entire federation.

● (1220)

If we talk about the oil and gas sector, naturally, we think of Alberta and Saskatchewan. It exists elsewhere in the country, but those are the predominant areas. The benefits of the oil and gas sector are not just for those provinces; they are for the entire country because of how equalization works. Provinces that may not be blessed with the same natural endowments can benefit from the revenues that are collected to help pay for the public health care and infrastructure that matter in this country. We take great pride in that in Nova Scotia. It is important.

We also know that work has to be done to reduce emissions at the same time. That is where I would differentiate the Liberal Party from the Conservative Party.

I look at Conservative cousins at the provincial level in this country. They seem to understand the balance between natural resource development and the responsibility to do the work to reduce emissions. We never hear that from the opposition benches here in the House of Commons. A different strain of Conservatism exists in the federal Conservative Party versus the red Tory or Progressive Conservative traditions. That is why, in my own riding, a lot of people in the last election told me they had been a Conservative most of their life, but they do not resemble the way the party is being represented by the leader of the official opposition.

I want to get to the MOU, because that is what before the House. The Conservatives have stood up all day today, talking about the fact that the government should vote for the MOU that was put in place. If the MOU was in its entirety before this place, then yes, the government would be voting in support of it.

It was too cute by half to see the leader of the official opposition move an amendment today to try to add a few more tidbits of the MOU. It was not the whole MOU, but the parts his party could support. My God, they would never put that entire MOU before the House, because they would never admit to the fact that Alberta is focused on working with us to help reduce methane emissions from the oil and gas sector. They would never admit to or support the idea that we need to have a strong, robust industrial carbon price to make sure that we reduce emissions while also promoting conventional energy in this country. They do not want to admit that Premier Smith is supportive of that. That is why they will not put the entire MOU before the House of Commons. That is where the difference is.

Make no mistake that this government supports the ability for a pipeline to be built by a private proponent, with the support of and consultation with the indigenous peoples who would be affected by a pipeline going through their territory and, of course, working in good faith with British Columbia. We are supportive of this. This is exactly why the Prime Minister has been working with Premier Smith in Alberta to develop this MOU.

Something has been tabled before the House that cherry-picks an element the opposition wants to highlight, without giving the entire context of the other considerations in the MOU that are interrelated and connected. That is the type of politics that tries to cherry-pick, which we will see on social media tonight. We have already seen on social media these “gotcha” clips with no context, going out to people in 45 seconds.

It would be a pretty ugly sight to see the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle come up on a screen today, screaming that the Liberals do not support pipelines. That is not what will happen, because we were the ones who supported the TMX pipeline being built and we were the ones who worked with former premier Rachel Notley to make sure that it happened.

Our government has balance. We are trying to make sure that we develop our natural resources, while also having a thought about what we have to do for future generations to reduce emissions. That level of nuance is just not found on the opposition benches whatsoever. I am not saying there are not some individual members on that side who bring that level of nuance to the conversation, but, boy, it cannot be found in the leadership of that party.

For the benefit of Canadians at home, all we have been hearing about is one aspect of the MOU. It is extremely important to note that we would be willing, as a government, to adjust, as necessary, a tanker ban on the Pacific coast. We would not implement emissions caps as long as Alberta is strengthening its industrial carbon price.

Alberta is also committed to working on carbon capture, utilization and storage, a \$25-billion to \$30-billion industrial project that would be important in sequestering carbon emissions and helping

### *Business of Supply*

to ensure that Canadian oil is some of the lowest-intensity oil in the world. It is also working on nuclear energy co-operation. I am of the belief that if we are going to completely decarbonize the process of establishing and developing bitumen in western Canada, we are going to have to use nuclear energy, but we are going to have to use energy interties, utilizing the hydroelectricity that exists in British Columbia for the benefit of the entirety of western Canada.

None of this is mentioned in the Conservatives' MOU motion. It has none of the work on the methane reduction or the work on AI data centres and the work we can do together. I am going to leave it at that, but that is the problem and that is why we cannot support the MOU today.

I look forward to questions from my hon. colleagues.

● (1225)

**Clifford Small (Central Newfoundland, CPC):** Madam Speaker, we know that the Liberals are against oil and gas.

It is very easy: If the Prime Minister and Liberal government supports the oil and gas industry, Newfoundland and Labrador's oil and gas is already at tidewater. There are no excuses. They would not have to blame it on another province or first nations. It could not possibly fail if we had the right regulations to support our offshore oil and gas, but Bill C-49, Bill C-69 and the emissions cap are all to block Newfoundland and Labrador's oil and gas.

This pipeline through B.C. is going to be a real struggle, and the Liberals know that it will fail. They are setting it up to fail and they will not vote for it today.

I wonder if the hon. member for Kings—Hants will vote for this motion and support his own MOU, or is his party too fractured?

**Hon. Kody Blois:** Madam Speaker, I may play the role of Santa and walk a Q-tip over to my hon. colleague to make sure that he can hear me and that there may not be an impediment with the speech I just gave. I made it very clear that if the Conservative Party had tabled the entire MOU before the House, we would be gladly supporting it. There is an interconnectivity to this. We do support oil and gas. I spoke very proudly about my own home province and the connection to my own riding, where I have a lot of workers who work in the natural resource sector. Whether it is in his home province or western Canada, we are proud as a government about this.

*Business of Supply*

The Conservatives come in, cherry-pick and do not allow the elements that support emissions reductions. That is the party that is fractured. They could never have supported the MOU. They do not support the MOU because of the talk about industrial carbon pricing and methane reductions. They do not have the support of their party to stand up and support the MOU in the House, which is why they cherry-pick.

Quickly, on Newfoundland and Labrador, I was in St. John's to celebrate Cenovus's extension of West White Rose. We fully support the Newfoundland and Labrador offshore oil and gas sector. Our government is willing to work, as I have made very clear, and willing to have conversations with Premier Wakeham's government on Bay du Nord. We believe in the sector.

• (1230)

[Translation]

**Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ):** Madam Speaker, the member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie recently made a public statement on the television program *Tout le monde en parle*. He also published an open letter saying that the agreement was very bad—

[English]

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès):** Hon. members, could I actually hear the question being asked and allow the hon. parliamentary secretary to hear the question?

[Translation]

The hon. member for Jonquière.

**Mario Simard:** As I was saying, the member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie has publicly stated many times that the agreement is a very bad one and that removing the emissions cap and stepping back from clean electricity were harming the environment.

In all sincerity, I want to ask my colleague how he can support such a measure.

Earlier, I asked the Minister of the Environment, Climate Change and Nature to explain to me how she can reconcile two things that are unreconcilable. I want my colleague to tell me how he can see this agreement as something that is good for the environment.

**Hon. Kody Blois:** Madam Speaker, the proposed agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of Alberta includes some very important measures for the environment. It includes, in particular, the Government of Alberta's commitment to increase industrial carbon pricing. That is a key element that will help us ensure that we reduce our greenhouse gas emissions. Other commitments include working with the Government of Canada on methane regulations as well as carbon capture, utilization and storage.

These measures are absolutely crucial. The Government of Alberta must work with the Government of Canada on federal measures and initiatives. Our government must be able to work with the Government of Alberta to achieve our energy and environmental goals.

[English]

**Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong, CPC):** Madam Speaker, this is a very simple debate. In the past, the Liber-

als have cancelled pipelines. Now the Prime Minister is saying that he signed this memorandum of understanding to build a pipeline to the west. Canadians sense the hypocrisy.

Do the Liberals support building a pipeline to the west, yes or no?

**Hon. Kody Blois:** Madam Speaker, yes, we do, with the conditions we have laid out in the MOU, which are working with indigenous communities across this country, working in good faith with the British Columbian government and also ensuring that Alberta commits to the elements that are in the MOU, which the Conservative party failed to put before the House verbatim.

**Taleb Noormohamed (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Innovation, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, it is a privilege to rise in the House today to speak on behalf of and for British Columbians on building a united country and against a divisive motion from a divisive and divided Conservative Party, whose members cannot figure out whether they support British Columbia from one day to the next.

It has become clear, from looking at the flawed text of this motion, that it belies a very important truth, which is that the members of Parliament from the opposite side from British Columbia are not willing to stand up to their leader and for their constituents and for their province. That any member of Parliament from British Columbia would support a motion that has an impact on their home province, with no mention of working with that province, is shameful.

I could not imagine a situation in which this would happen in any other jurisdiction. Let us talk about Alberta, for example. It would be like British Columbia saying that it would like to do something involving Alberta but it will not talk to Alberta, and then expecting the federal government to say yes. Perhaps it would be like talking about building a pipeline or infrastructure through the province of Quebec or Ontario and not having British Columbia as part of the conversation.

This is exactly what the Conservatives are willing to do. They are willing to sacrifice British Columbia's priorities and the very mention of British Columbia in order to advance division in this country, drive people apart and do things that are contrary to what Canadians actually want.

This weekend, like many of us, I was back in my constituency, and I had the privilege of hosting my holiday open house. Many of my constituents came through. They have differing points of view on pipelines. They have differing points of view as to whether there should be one pipeline, two pipelines or no pipelines. However, they were united on one thing. They were united in saying that in order for major projects in this country to get built, they must have the participation of indigenous communities and that the provinces implicated should be involved to ensure it is done correctly.

Conservatives ignore that. Conservatives have no interest in that. This motion has no interest in asking whether British Columbia should be at the table and should be involved or whether British Columbians care about this and their opinions should be part of this conversation. Instead of uniting behind the shared goals of building a strong country, ensuring climate change is part of our path to building prosperity, ensuring indigenous communities are actively engaged and at the table with us and having a partner in British Columbia, the opposition motion seeks to play petty politics. What we have learned to expect from the Leader of the Opposition is petty politics.

Canadians have rejected that time and again. Indeed, even in his own previous constituency, his voters rejected his politics of division, because Canadians understand that building things together is the best way to move things forward. They understand that building things together in a co-operative confederation, as the Prime Minister has noted, is how things get done. Nothing should get built without the participation of the jurisdiction and first nations. We have all made that clear. It is how the federation is supposed to work.

If we actually took that seriously, we would look very carefully at what this MOU seeks to do, the language of which has been parsed by the opposition and put in the form of some kind of motion that is supposed to be some kind of television gotcha for the Leader of the Opposition. It is extremely dangerous politics because it ignores the fundamental truth that Canadians have all spoken to, which is that we want to build big things in this country and the best way to build big things quickly is to do them together.

If members want proof of that, look at the major projects that have already been announced in British Columbia, which are substantial initiatives that are going to transform the economy of British Columbia. Whether it is LNG phase two, the Red Chris mine expansion, the north coast transmission line phase one and phase three or even the Ksi Lisims LNG project, these are projects that happened with the active participation and consent of British Columbia and first nations. That is how we get things built quickly.

• (1235)

If we want to use the Conservatives' plan and the track record of the Leader of the Opposition of having built nothing at all, except for perhaps six homes when he was minister of housing, then let us follow their path. Let us follow the path of running into legal challenge after legal challenge because they do not understand how the federation works.

If we do what Canadians want, which is to build things in a meaningful, thoughtful process that is not only well-intentioned but has the capacity to deliver with speed, then the Prime Minister's path is the one that Canadians would like us to follow. I heard that from my constituents in spades. They said they elected a government that understood nuance, that understood the need to co-operate and that understood the need to be able to negotiate and also to build. They did not choose a government that was going to drive wedges between Canadians and try to make things, everything, really, about a clip on social media.

Making Canada an energy superpower while respecting indigenous rights and provincial jurisdiction and also fighting climate change requires nuance. It requires hard work and it requires the

### *Business of Supply*

ability to work with others, with jurisdictions and with first nations. Conservatives have tried to frame this motion as if it is the entirety of the MOU signed with Alberta, and it is not even close. They have chosen to cherry-pick and manipulate the original text. They are deliberately misrepresenting this agreement because they think Canadians are stupid, and Canadians are not. Canadians understand the importance of complexity and of working through complexity with intelligence—

• (1240)

**Brad Vis:** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe it is under the Standing Orders. This is a misrepresentation of the way Conservatives feel about Canadians. We do not, in fact, believe Canadians are stupid—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès):** That is debate, and the hon. member knows that. We are not debating the issue.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

**Taleeb Noormohamed:** Madam Speaker, I am glad to see a member from British Columbia in the House. I look forward to the questions that I am certain he will ask. I look forward to answering them.

The motion that has been put forward actually leaves out the conditions that Alberta must meet before the federal government would support any such project. That is an important consideration. When we leave out the details and try to make things about simple gotcha moments, nothing gets built and nothing happens.

Remember that in the MOU that was signed, Alberta has made commitments to achieving net-zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050, building Pathways Plus carbon capture, which is going to be the largest in the world; developing nuclear power generation in collaboration with the federal government; cutting methane emissions, which are 28 times more potent than CO<sub>2</sub>, by 75% of 2014 levels by 2030; and raising the industrial carbon price to \$130 per tonne, more than six times the effective rate.

None of that matters to Conservatives. None of it does because it is inconvenient. What is inconvenient are a story and facts that show we can actually build things in this country and we can actually get things done by using rigour, collaboration, intellectual horsepower and the collective will of Canadians to get things done. The projects I spoke about earlier that are going to be built in British Columbia demonstrate that when we respect jurisdictions, uphold indigenous rights and work collaboratively, we can accelerate development on major projects while building trust and delivering real economic benefits.

*Business of Supply*

On November 27, the Leader of the Opposition stood in this place and said that the Prime Minister should “get out of the way”, and he justified ramming a pipeline through British Columbia. That is not how we practice co-operative federalism. The Prime Minister has reaffirmed in the chamber that we will obtain free, prior and informed consent from first nations and that the Government of British Columbia has to agree before any project moves forward.

That is what nation-building projects do. They bring Canadians together, not pit us against one another. We should be looking, in this moment of crisis, this moment of international crisis, at ways to work together and to bring jurisdictions together, which I hope Alberta and British Columbia will do, despite the best efforts of the Leader of the Opposition and the opposition.

We are going to be there to work with British Columbia, with Alberta, with all provinces and with Canadians and indigenous peoples across this country to ensure that when major projects get built, they get built with the right intentions, with the right plan and the right ability to be successful and to be successful quickly.

**Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I think my colleague missed the amendment that we put forward to the motion today, which talks about the Conservative commitment to indigenous ownership, partnerships and benefits, and engaging with British Columbia in a trilateral discussion.

There has never been a prime minister in the history of Canada who has had a more favourable social climate to build projects than the Prime Minister today. The Prime Minister could have used the emergency powers. He did not even need Bill C-5. He could have moved forward with a pipeline right away because Canadians are concerned about sovereignty.

When the government accuses the Conservatives of playing games, the Prime Minister did not even do what he said he was going to do during the election, and that is getting projects built. Why is the government so slow to do anything? Why are they holding Canada back when our sovereignty is at risk?

**Taleeb Noormohamed:** Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his passion. I wish he showed the same passion for working collaboratively to get things built in this country.

As we all know, in the decades that the Leader of the Opposition has been the leader, under his personal watch, nothing has ever gotten built. In the six months that the Prime Minister has been the Prime Minister, in British Columbia alone, we have seen major projects approved, with the consent of first nations and with the participation of British Columbia. Those are meaningful projects that will create billions of dollars for British Columbia and for British Columbians.

That is how we get things built in this country, by working together, by actually looking at what it is going to take to get something done, and then by doing it.

• (1245)

**Sukh Dhaliwal (Surrey Newton, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I have publicly supported the MOU, and if the Leader of the Opposition had included the MOU in its complete form, I would have supported that as well.

My colleague from British Columbia is right: The Leader of the Opposition either uses slogans or plays politics. If the member could explain a little more how he is playing politics with British Columbians, that would be great.

**Taleeb Noormohamed:** Madam Speaker, my hon. friend's question reminds us of exactly what Canadians chose.

British Columbians chose to elect more members of Parliament on this side of the House than ever before, because they saw a Prime Minister who understood the urgency of working with British Columbia. They saw a Prime Minister who understood the urgency of building things, with the ability, the experience and the know-how to build things and to build them well.

They looked at the choice that was offered to them in the Leader of the Opposition, and they said, “Absolutely not. We will not allow our country to be run on Twitter and on slogans. We want responsible grown-ups. We want people who actually know how to get things done.”

They looked at the track record, experience, integrity and ability to bring people together, and that is what Canadians chose.

**Hon. Bardish Chagger (Waterloo, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, the comments shared by the member are quite refreshing.

It was impressive that the Conservatives chose to amend their own motion but still came up short. What is even more interesting is that constituents within the riding of Waterloo recognize that the Conservatives actually never have a plan for the environment.

Today, we see that when the Conservatives bring something forward, they do not recognize the importance of an industrial carbon price actually making our economy and our country more competitive. It is really important that we recognize the importance of working with different levels of government and with indigenous communities, another concept that the Conservatives just cannot understand.

I would like to hear the member's comments on the importance of having a competitive industry and a competitive economy, especially today, more than ever.

**Taleeb Noormohamed:** Madam Speaker, in order to be competitive, we have to understand the rules of the game, how to play the game and how to win.

In order to be able to win, we have to understand that building things in a way that is responsible for the future is critical. In this MOU, we have managed to get Alberta to agree to cutting methane emissions, the first time in an incredibly long time this conversation has even surfaced. It certainly never surfaced when the party opposite was in power, and it is a major accomplishment for competitiveness in this country.

It is going to make Canadian industry better able to compete globally. It is going to give Canadian producers what they need in order to be able to be successful. We are going to work with them. We are going to work with producers, farmers and the Province of Alberta to ensure that to bring these measures to life, they have the support and the commitment they need from the federal government.

**Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I am happy to rise and to speak to our opposition day motion. I will be sharing my time with the great member for North Island—Powell River.

It is particularly significant that I am speaking today because, for those who do not know, oil was first discovered in North America in my riding. That is right. In Oil Springs, in 1861, the Fairbanks bought the property, there was a huge gusher, and it was the start of the oil industry in North America. The precursor to Imperial Oil was Standard Oil. The companies trucked that oil from Oil Springs right to Standard Oil, which became Imperial Oil. They took the technology developed in my riding to 86 countries. There is the Oil Museum of Canada located in Oil Springs, where people can see all this amazing technology and where it all began.

I am going to start there, and then I am going to say, “I love pipelines.” I love pipelines not just because I am a Conservative. I love pipelines because, as an engineer, I have built pipelines and operated pipelines, and because pipelines are the key to prosperity and for Canadians to have the social services that we all value so much. That is why I am happy to rise today and speak to this motion.

This motion is important. Basically, we know that in the past, the Liberals cancelled pipelines. They cancelled the northern gateway pipeline, and they cancelled the energy east pipeline. They cancelled 18 LNG projects that were on the books in 2015 when I was elected. We know that at the time, the current Prime Minister actually testified at the industry committee that he was supportive of cancelling northern gateway. When he now comes and says that the Liberals are going to build the unimaginable at speeds we have never seen before, and that the government now has an MOU with Alberta to build a pipeline to take our oil to the west, we can understand why Canadians are a bit skeptical. Why the flip-flop? Is it ever really going to happen?

We know there is huge division already within the Liberal caucus. The climate caucus is saying that this is a total violation of the climate plan that the Liberals had and of the fact that they said, even in the budget, that they would not subsidize fossil fuels anymore. We had the convicted felon, the former minister of Canadian identity and culture, step down from his position because he saw the total flip-flop. People cannot believe that there is sincerity there, especially when there is a different message being sent to B.C. from the one being sent to Alberta and to the rest of the country. The Liberals are saying to the B.C. folks, “Do not worry about it. It is never really going to be built. There is a lot that has to happen for it to go on.” To everyone else, it looks like they are building a pipeline. That is why we are here.

We have brought the language from the MOU. The motion states:

### *Business of Supply*

That the House:

(a) take note of the Memorandum of Understanding between Canada and Alberta of November 27, 2025; and

(b) support the construction of one or more pipelines enabling the export of at least one million barrels a day of low-emission Alberta bitumen from a strategic deepwater port on the British Columbia coast to reach Asian markets, including through an appropriate adjustment to the Oil Tanker Moratorium Act, while respecting the duty to consult Indigenous peoples.

All day, during the debate, we have had excuse after excuse. This is the Liberals' MOU. It is their language, and they are saying, “We really cannot support the motion, because the Conservatives did not put the whole entirety of the MOU in here.” Well, for Canadians, the question is simple to answer: Do they want to build a pipeline, yes or no? Either they do or they do not, and the rest of it is just word salad.

Now, how did the Liberals cancel all these previous projects? They did it through regulations that take six years to get a project approved and cost billions of dollars. There was Bill C-69, the “no more pipelines” bill. We warned the Liberals for 10 years that this was going to be disastrous, that foreign investors would leave and that nothing would get built, and here we are. Then the Prime Minister had to ask the Conservatives to support him to put across Bill C-5, which allows them to exempt any project in the national interest from all of the horrible legislation that the Liberals put in place over the last 10 years, including the tanker ban, the “no more pipelines” bill, the industrial emissions cap and all of these kinds of things that have discouraged the kind of prosperity that oil and gas has brought to Canada and the money that we need in order to keep supporting systems that are struggling, like our health care system.

● (1250)

If we look at what could be done, what we could build that is unimaginable, at speeds never before seen, well, we could be like Germany, which permitted and built an LNG terminal in 194 days, or about seven months. This government has been here eight months, and it has not built anything. In fact, the things it has announced are things that were already in the pipeline. I am sorry about the pun, but they were already on the way.

We had offers to give our LNG to other countries. Germany wanted us to provide it with LNG so that it could get off heavy oil and coal from Russia. It was going to pay us \$60 billion a year, but we said there was no business case, so Australia took that deal. Then Japan came and wanted to give us \$60 billion a year for our LNG, but again, we said there was no business case, and Qatar took that deal. Then the Netherlands came and offered us \$60 billion a year for our LNG, but the Saudis took that deal, because we did not. Can members imagine having \$180 billion a year more revenue into the country?

*Business of Supply*

We talk about the deficit, and we talk about its inflationary effect and how it is going to burden generations in the future. There is a solution to that, which is to increase revenue so that we can actually afford the social services and so that we can pay down this deficit, yet we said no to all of those things. It also would have helped the planet. LNG replacing heavy oil and coal cuts the carbon footprint by a factor of four, and that is significant.

In terms of this MOU, there are lots of things in it, such as getting rid of the clean electricity regulation and getting rid of the emissions cap. They did agree to raise the industrial carbon tax, which I am not a fan of. I think that just increases the cost of everything. The people who pay the industrial carbon tax just pass the cost on to the consumer, so I do not agree, but in order to get the pipeline approved, Alberta has said yes to that.

Now, there is resistance rising up already, as there always will be. If we want to have 100% of Canadians, indigenous people and B.C. always give their consent to everything, we will never build anything. That is why, according to the law, the power to build something that goes between provinces is exclusively the Prime Minister's power. He can do this, especially with the exemptions that Bill C-5 allows. He has the ability to do it if he has the will to do it, and that is what the debate is about today: Does he really have the will, or is it all smoke and mirrors, just another bait and switch?

We know there is a lot at stake. We have lost 3,000 jobs in the auto sector and 1,000 steelworker jobs, and 34 paper mills have closed, all at Christmas time. The future of our social safety net is at risk. We have an increase in poverty in this country, homeless encampments, food bank lineups, and seniors who cannot afford to eat and heat, yet there is still a doubt as to whether anything is going to happen here. Even with this MOU, they are talking about how, in seven months, they will have a consultation to start something in two years. Well, that does not sound like build, build, build at unimaginable speeds. That sounds like zero progress or lots of delays and negative acceleration.

What are the Liberals waiting for? We are tired of the hypocrisy, and we are tired of hearing them talk out of both sides of their mouth, so the official opposition today is going to force them to say, "Yes, we want a pipeline," or "No, we do not want a pipeline." Are the Liberals serious, or are they not?

We, on this side of the House, do want to expand oil and gas. We believe that building a pipeline to get our oil to Asian markets will increase revenue by \$30 billion. We could use that. The country needs it. Canadians need it.

● (1255)

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, it is truly amazing. We can think about it in this sense: The Conservative leader sat in government for 10 years, and not one inch of pipeline was ever built to tidewater, not one inch. Now that the Conservatives are in opposition, they feel they can just bang their heels together and it will just appear overnight.

We have an agreement, an MOU, signed with the Province of Alberta, which is a very significant accomplishment. There are other

premiers who support it as well. On the other hand, the leader of the Conservative Party is saying, "No, no, no. We do not support the MOU."

I think the member would do a great service to all of Canada if she stood up and answered a very specific question: Do she and the Conservative Party support the MOU that was signed by the Premier of Alberta, who is a Progressive Conservative, and the Government of Canada? Does she support the MOU?

**Marilyn Gladu:** Madam Speaker, there can be no doubt that the Conservatives want to build a pipeline. We want to build a pipeline to the west.

However, one interesting thing in this MOU is that the Liberals are willing to lift the exemption on the tanker ban. Let us think about the tanker ban. Right now, the only people who cannot have oil tankers are Canadians. The U.S. has three refineries right in that area that are shipping tankers all the time, so it is just a punishment on us. We should not have to wait two years to lift that exemption. We could do that today.

● (1300)

**Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I am scared. I am scared for the future of my children, because the Government of Canada is not doing good enough.

As the member mentioned in her remarks, we turned down three major natural resource deals, which would have lifted children out of poverty and lowered global emissions, yet the Liberals said no.

When I was a staffer, the Liberals put forward the most divisive and burdensome regulatory approach, which still exists today. Then they come around to say that they are going to build a pipeline and fix our economy. They are not. What they are doing is playing a game of tightrope with the future of Canadians by not moving forward on natural resource projects, not removing the barriers to building and not giving Canada the foundation of success it needs.

Would the member comment on those points?

**Marilyn Gladu:** Madam Speaker, I love the passion of my colleague. He is from B.C. He is representing people in B.C., most of whom want to see this pipeline get done.

Definitely, I think we need these jobs in Canada at this point. The Liberals will tell us that the jobs were created, but they are part-time jobs. They are, basically, Christmas retail jobs. We need the kinds of jobs we would get from the pipeline and all of the other projects I talked about. We need to build, build, build.

*Business of Supply*

[Translation]

**Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ):** Madam Speaker, earlier, I asked the leader of the official opposition whether he was aware that no proponents are interested in this project right now. He referred many times to the government's imaginary pipeline. His answer was to tell me that if the government gets out of the way, then a proponent will come forward. We know that this project is not viable. In order to be viable, the pipeline would have to be in use for 40 years. It seems unlikely that we will still be using oil 40 years from now.

I would like my colleague, who is an engineer, to tell me how she can see any practical advantages in something that even her own leader thinks is far-fetched.

**Marilyn Gladu:** Madam Speaker, all of the environmental assessments and the consultations with indigenous peoples have been completed for the Northern Gateway pipeline. We could start that project today and have the pipeline built in about three years.

I think the Liberals lack political will. The Liberals are saying one thing to Alberta and another to British Columbia.

I think that Canadians want to know whether the Liberals support the pipeline project, yes or no.

[English]

**Aaron Gunn (North Island—Powell River, CPC):** Madam Speaker, on July 20, 1871, British Columbia became the sixth province to sign on to the audacious vision that was Canada as laid out by the fathers of Confederation, a vision that was as bold as it was courageous, which was to create a new nation, one that would stretch from the Atlantic to the Pacific, through the Rockies, across the Prairies and over the Canadian Shield to unite these small, disparate and insignificant colonies of what was then British North America. It was perhaps the greatest nation-building project the world had ever seen.

Over a century and a half later, we owe much of our prosperity, identity and independence to them and those who followed in their footsteps. They built and defended this country from the ground up. From the national railway through two world wars, their determination and perseverance shaped not only the land around them but also those who called it home. What has happened to that tenacity, that fortitude, that resolve, the ability to get things done? Where are our leaders, our statesmen for a new century, those who could live up to the lions of Canadian history, such as Laurier, Macdonald and W.A.C. Bennett? Where are the leaders who can rediscover the boldness and audacity that built this country and couple it with a vision as befitting a nation as vast and bursting with potential as our own? That vision starts with getting back to the basics, with actually building things.

In the late 1800s, Canada was a small country, divided by language and having a much larger and more powerful neighbour to the south, yet, in that historical context, we completed what many consider to be one of the great political and engineering feats of the time, the Canadian Pacific Railway. Today, the Liberal government cannot even bring itself to openly support a pipeline. It is content instead to sign vague, indeterminate pieces of paper, promising to

one day maybe consider building a pipeline to the Pacific. The consequences of this lack of vision and follow-through are very real.

Today, our lack of market access forces us to sell our oil, our number one export, at a massive discount to the United States, a reality that has cost us tens of thousands of jobs and \$70 million each day, or \$25 billion every single year. At a time of predatory and hostile U.S. trade action, which is a deliberate attempt to destroy our forestry, steel, aluminum and automotive sectors, we are essentially giving our oil to the Americans on the cheap because the Liberal government does not have the political fortitude to get a Canadian pipeline built, a pipeline that would secure our economic sovereignty, energy independence and the leverage that we need over the United States.

However, this is not really a new issue. Back when Macdonald was first proposing the Canadian Pacific Railway and undertaking, as I mentioned, what many thought could not be done, there were loud voices, mainly in the Liberal Party at the time, that demanded that the east-west railway be built through the much easier terrain of the United States. They argued it would have been politically easier, and undoubtedly more affordable, and on those two points they were right, but it would have come at the expense of Canadian sovereignty and left us a mere dependent, a colony of the Americans. Fortunately, our leaders in that era had the foresight and the passionate devotion to our national interest to see through the railway that we now call the ribbon of steel on an all-Canadian route.

Unfortunately, the Liberal government today has essentially accomplished the exact opposite and is moving us in the opposite direction. Let us think about how ridiculous this is. Canada has the third-largest reserves of oil on the entire planet, yet we are still importing oil from repressive, dictatorial regimes, such as Saudi Arabia. Meanwhile, as we have allowed our Canadian oil industry to atrophy, American oil output has grown by more than 50%. What are we doing? We have the oil, the know-how, the skill and the determination of the Canadian people. I can guarantee that. All we are missing are the politicians with the courage and vision to get the job done.

To be clear, and this is an important point, the world needs more energy. It needs it today, and it is going to continue to need it for decades to come. In fact, the International Energy Agency predicts that global energy demand will continue to grow well past 2050, and more than a quarter of that total energy demand will continue to come in the form of oil. The problem is that that increase in demand is concentrated in Asian markets, markets that, without pipelines, Canada has little to no access to.

*Business of Supply*

• (1305)

Today, over 90% of our country's oil exports are sold to one country, the United States. Make no mistake, if we do not get these pipelines built, if Canadian oil stays in the ground, which, by the way, I think is the true objective of at least some members of the Liberal caucus, those investment dollars and jobs will go elsewhere. They will go to brutal, repressive regimes, such as Venezuela and Iran, to fund the priorities of their governments, which are to repress peaceful dissent and export terrorism and hard drugs, instead of supporting the priorities of our government, which are health care, education, roads and the support of our brave men and women in uniform.

Here is the truth: No one does environmental stewardship and safety better than Canada and Canadians. As long as the world needs and demands oil, as much of it as possible should come from right here in Canada. To do that, we need pipelines.

Unfortunately, instead of showing leadership on this file or following in the nation-building footsteps of those who built this country, the Liberal government has done the exact opposite by axing the northern gateway pipeline; killing energy east; and introducing the bill known as the no more pipelines bill, Bill C-69, and the tanker ban, Bill C-48 as well as the industrial carbon tax. It is a suite of policies compiled by design for one purpose, which is to kill Canada's oil and gas industry to leave our most valuable resource, asset and commodity in the ground.

Let us take the tanker ban as one example. Why is it that 24.4 million tonnes of foreign oil are allowed to transit Canada's east coast, including down the St. Lawrence River in Quebec, yet on B.C.'s north coast, this is banned? There is no scientific evidence whatsoever that suggests that tanker traffic in northwestern B.C. presents a greater risk to the environment than anywhere else. In fact, because there is a lack of maritime traffic in general, the exact opposite is true. Here is the kicker: There are already tankers off of B.C.'s coast. Four tankers each day, filled to the brim with American oil, depart Alaska, heading south alongside the very waters where Canadian tanker traffic carrying Canadian oil is currently banned.

It continues a trend of the Liberal government pursuing ideological policies and virtue signalling to one group or another over straightforward, common-sense results. However, there is good news. Canadians are seeing through the spin. In recent polling, 67% of British Columbians believe that new pipelines are important to Canada's economic future, and 54% are confident that pipelines can be built while protecting the environment.

Pipelines are the most environmentally friendly and sensitive way to transport this commodity, yet we have the B.C. Premier saying that the pipeline will "never be built", and the Prime Minister has been unwilling to assert the nation-building and constitutional roles of the federal government to get this project done.

When it comes to building this pipeline, a majority of British Columbians and Canadians agree, but most importantly, it is in the essential national interests of our country. The truth is that the silver lining to this challenge lies in the solution. We do not need the government to step up in any particular way. We just need the govern-

ment to get out of the way to give this country back to those who built it and continue to build it, the people.

That is why I urge every member of the House, regardless of their province, party or ideology, to vote with us for Canadian workers, prosperity, economic sovereignty, energy independence and building things, including pipelines, in this country once again.

• (1310)

**Corey Hogan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, the member made comments about the differential. I agree that it is important to manage the differential between WTI and WCS, or presumably between Brent and WCS, given that he is talking about a pipeline to the west coast. The differential is driven by quality differences, such as the sulphur content and the gravity of it, as well as transportation costs.

I wonder if the member could explain what he thinks would be an appropriate differential, either to WTI or Brent, as he sees fit.

**Aaron Gunn:** Madam Speaker, what it comes down to is that we should be getting the top price for Canadian oil that is possible. We are going to get that top price only if we have access to world markets.

If we allow ourselves to be backed into a corner for the Americans to have ultimate leverage over our number one export, we are not going to be able to get the top price. This is why we need to get pipelines built; we need to get a pipeline built to the Pacific and finally create more Canadian jobs, create more Canadian revenues and start building things in this country once again.

**Kevin Waugh (Saskatoon South, CPC):** Madam Speaker, if we look back into history, how we built this country, I am not sure we can build the country anymore. Billions of dollars have been lost because of Liberal policies, such as Bill C-69 and Bill C-48. In my province, we have uranium mines ready to go, but because of these policies, they are years in the waiting.

Will this pipeline ever get built with the current government in place?

**Aaron Gunn:** Madam Speaker, I cannot predict the future, but I will tell the House one thing: It needs to be built. It needs to be built for the national interest of this country. We cannot continue to be an economic dependant of the United States, an economic colony of the United States. We need to take control of our own future and start building things again. Whether it is mines in Saskatchewan, pipelines in B.C. or nuclear power plants in Ontario, we need to get building again in this country. Unfortunately, I think that only with a new Conservative government will it actually get done.

*Business of Supply*

• (1315)

**Hon. Kody Blois (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, what elements of the MOU that Premier Danielle Smith and the government have committed to does the member not support? It is very clear, as he reads the MOU, that we are willing to support a pipeline to tidewater in the Pacific. We believe it has to be a private proponent, that we have to have indigenous co-operation and, obviously, buy-in and dialogue with British Columbia. What elements of the MOU does he not support? This is why the Conservative Party has not actually put this before the House today: The party cannot agree on certain elements.

Which element does he not agree with in the MOU that Premier Danielle Smith signed on to herself?

**Aaron Gunn:** Madam Speaker, look, the point the Liberals do not understand is that we should not even need an MOU in this country to build things. A private proponent proposed a pipeline and got the project approved by the National Energy Board. The project met all the requisite requirements but was killed for political reasons by the Liberal government.

One should not need to go on bended knee to the Prime Minister to beg for a project to get built. We are supposed to be a first world country, not a banana republic. We set the highest environmental standards in the world. If one meets them, one should be allowed to build the project, whether it is a mine, a pipeline or a new housing development. We need to get things done.

**Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Madam Speaker, I am wondering if Conservatives who have been debating this motion today remember the Conservative Party platform from 2011, which would have prohibited any pipeline to the northern B.C. coast to ship any diluted bitumen to China. The Conservative Party policy at that time was that we should not ship diluted bitumen to any country with lower environmental standards for our refineries.

I am just wondering if anyone remembers that.

**Aaron Gunn:** Madam Speaker, I was 21 at the time, if I am doing the math correctly, so I am not familiar with all the ins and outs of what was or was not in the platform back in 2011.

What I can tell the member is that we support a pipeline. We support getting top dollar for Canada's number one export, expanding our trade markets, becoming less dependent on the United States, actually getting things done, following the science and the evidence, and not making political decisions that kill individual projects.

**Corey Hogan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Winnipeg North.

Before I entered politics earlier this year, I was a regular commentator on political strategy. One thing I tried to do in my appearances, particularly on a popular political podcast, *The Strategists*, was to lift the hood and show how and why political strategic decisions get made. It was my belief that by identifying and naming the strategies and tactics, I was helping people see what was actually happening, and I was helping people defend themselves against those strategies and tactics being used on them. Sometimes what I explained would allow listeners to keep from being fooled by un-

scrupulous politicians, and sometimes what I explained would allow listeners to keep from being fooled by themselves.

While speaking about this Conservative motion, I can do a service to Canadians by explaining the tactics this motion attempts to use and what these tactics reveal. I also think that, while speaking about this Conservative motion, I can do a service to Conservatives by explaining how, at this point, they are most certainly fooling themselves.

Let us start here. If the goal is to get a pipeline built, there is no train of logic that leads to either the original or the amended motion before us today. The Conservatives should know very well the risks of plowing ahead thoughtlessly when it comes to pipelines. In 2016, the Federal Court of Appeal deemed the phase four consultations undertaken by the Harper government on the Northern Gateway pipeline, a pipeline project I worked on, insufficient. It said, "Canada fell short of the mark."

In Canada, to get things built, we need to work with indigenous communities, show respect to indigenous communities and take the duty to consult seriously. While I am glad for the Conservative amendment, merely appending "while respecting the duty to consult Indigenous peoples" to a motion with a predetermined outcome falls laughably short of the mark.

In Canada, to get things built, to de-risk activity, we need to work with all affected communities. Ignoring the role of British Columbians in this conversation does not make a project more likely to succeed. Ignoring environmental concerns does not make a project more likely to succeed. This creates conditions that would concern any investor. By the way, *Pathways* requires a price on carbon, so the amendment does not take a coherent policy position.

Smart money knows we do not ram projects through. A yes vote on this motion would antagonize stakeholders and undermine the important conversations to be had by Canada, Alberta, British Columbia and indigenous peoples. It would make getting to an accord harder. A yes vote would make a pipeline less likely.

How about a no vote? A no vote could be interpreted, and would certainly be spun by the Conservatives, as the government not supporting a pipeline, but nothing could be further from the truth. I will say now, and I will say clearly on behalf of our government, that we support a pipeline. We support the MOU. We support the entirety of the MOU.

*Business of Supply*

If people believe government does not support a pipeline, if companies even have creeping doubt about the government's support, it makes it less likely for a private proponent to come forward, which is one of the conditions of the pipeline proceeding under the memorandum with Alberta. A no vote would make a pipeline less likely.

If a yes vote hurts the project and a no vote hurts the project, what is the point of the motion? This brings us back to strategy. The point of the motion is to provoke divisions and to upset a careful balance. It is to cherry-pick one part of one side of the ledger, building a pipeline, and to focus on one possible resolution, a pipeline that requires an easing of the tanker ban. It is to ignore the rest of a thoughtfully constructed and far-reaching MOU that has the support of this government caucus. The very point is to put the government in a no-win situation. The very point is to try to create a situation in which there is division in the government ranks.

Here, I want to talk about how deep the Conservatives have fallen into their own echo chamber and how they no longer see the forest for the trees. The division they seek, the division that is frankly on display in their own party as they lose members, is one they believe will help their political fortunes. It is a game to them, a game in which there is a winner and a loser. However, with their motion, the loser is Canada and the game hurts this country. The game reduces the chances of a pipeline being built and exposes something they probably did not want exposed: Their interest is coming out on top in a zero-sum fight with the Liberals rather than defending our country at a very challenging time.

Rather than putting nation over party, the Conservatives have put party over nation. To them, the motion is solely and exclusively a political strategy; it serves no other purpose. "Yes" hurts Canada and "no" hurts Canada, but they brought the motion forward anyhow. The win Conservatives seek is for themselves, not for Canada.

There are two ways to detect the influence of a political strategy: We can work backward from the action and figure out what conditions would need to be present to arrive at that action, or we can work forward from a series of stated motives and see if a coherent chain can lead us to the present place. In each case, a deviation shows strategy at work; a deviation reveals true intentions.

● (1320)

The Conservatives' action here, in this motion, does not match the words saying that they deeply care about getting a pipeline built. We must ask what they do deeply care about.

The Conservatives have fooled themselves. They have conflated their interests with Canada's interests. They have come to a place in which they believe that anything that is good for them is inherently good for the country, and they believe this motion to be good for them. I ask them to step back and ask themselves, when they really think about it, if any outcome of this motion would be good for getting a pipeline built or good for the country.

I will close by saying that there is another possibility, but it is one I discount: The Conservatives simply made a terrible mistake, they did not realize that either a yes or a no vote would reduce the chances of a pipeline being built, and they are sincere in simply wanting clarity for all. I do not believe the Leader of the Opposition to be a stupid or thoughtless man, but he has put his cunning in ser-

vice of his political movement rather than in service of this country, and I believe that to be terrible judgment.

Canadians seek serious leadership in these times, and I am glad the Prime Minister offers that leadership. I do not believe the opposition has shown such leadership today, but I do believe in the immense capacity of people to change and improve. It is why I am a Liberal.

I ask my colleagues to step back from the brink and remind themselves of the moment we are in, with a trade war with the United States; an increasingly dangerous globe; and a western world beset by anti-immigrant and anti-intellectual forces, often driven clandestinely by our geopolitical rivals, who love nothing more than to poke at our divisions. I ask if it is not possible for them to take a better, more collaborative and more pro-Canada approach.

As I see it right now, the Conservatives' strategy reveals everything. Under the current leader, the Conservatives are treating matters of nation as political games to be won. The actual question in front of the House is, is the Leader of the Opposition acting as a serious man? Does his leadership reflect a serious party? The answer, unfortunately, came the minute he put forward this motion, and the answer is no. The motion does not reflect a serious party. The motion reflects a party that is addicted to the game of politics and has forgotten how to fight for outcomes and ideas.

● (1325)

**Dane Lloyd (Parkland, CPC):** Madam Speaker, I found it very interesting that the member talked about strategies, but it is clear to me that the Liberals would like to spin the vote into anything but division within their own caucus.

My constituents in Alberta do not trust the Liberal government to ever build a pipeline, and that goes for Conservatives across this country. None of them believe it will happen. We were very surprised to see the Liberals put an MOU forward, which dangled the possibility that they could build a pipeline. However, we were not shocked to see many Liberals, including the member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie, the former minister of the environment in the government, and the member for Victoria, along with many other members, say that, no, this does not mean that a pipeline is going to be built and no, they do not support building a pipeline. This vote forces the Liberals to walk their talk.

Why can the Liberals not stand up and vote for this non-binding motion that only asks them to do what they claim they are promising to do?

**Corey Hogan:** Madam Speaker, this government would be very happy to support a motion for the entire memorandum of understanding. The memorandum of understanding is a balance that makes sure we are striking interests from coast to coast and doing it in a way that strengthens our economy, strengthens our environment and makes us less dependent on the United States.

It is an excellent memorandum of understanding. Part of it is a pipeline, which we fully support. Honestly, this is just a continuation of the games. If the Conservatives do not want to play games, bring us a motion for the entire MOU.

*Business of Supply*

[Translation]

**Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I find it rather surprising to hear the government say that all of its efforts in Alberta will ultimately enable it to free itself from the trade dispute with the Americans, or at least mitigate the effects of that dispute, when we know that 60% of all profits made by big oil go to the United States.

Does my colleague not find it a bit counterproductive to put money into unproven carbon capture and sequestration strategies only to further feed the greedy oil sector, which is primarily American? Is that not counterproductive in the context of a trade dispute?

[English]

**Corey Hogan:** Madam Speaker, that is an excellent question. One thing that struck me about the Conservative amendment was that it had carbon capture and sequestration as something they could support, but it did not talk about a price on carbon, which is essential for carbon capture and sequestration to work. Otherwise, what happens is that we are subsidizing oil companies instead of making oil companies pay a carbon price, which is what makes the Pathways project economical.

I think I agree on some of these components. I will say, and I want to underline, that the benefits of a strong oil and gas sector are felt very strongly by my home province. We see it every day. We see it in employment. We see it in the investment. It is not as simple as just looking at the ownership percentages of major oil companies.

**Viviane Lapointe (Sudbury, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, earlier we heard our colleague from British Columbia talk about the importance of approaching these types of projects with a degree of responsibility as opposed to the degree of recklessness that we have seen across the aisle.

Can my colleague from Alberta, perhaps in his opinion, identify for us some of those elements that would define responsibility versus recklessness in approaching these types of major projects?

**Corey Hogan:** Madam Speaker, there are a couple of ways to look at that. There is recklessness in how we might approach getting a project built, and there is recklessness in the balance between the environment and the economy. I will speak very briefly to both.

First, it would be reckless to not consult with people. It would be reckless to just say we can will these conditions into fruition. We saw what happened when the Conservative government tried to do that in the past. The Federal Court of Appeal struck down the approval of northern gateway, the phase four approval, because there was just not due care and attention put to it.

Second, on the environmental front, the Prime Minister has been very clear that we can and must grow a strong oil and gas sector, but that has to be tied to strong environmental protections. Those strong environmental protections are not just for the benefit of the planet, although that, to me, is the essential component; our markets will increasingly demand that. We are not going to be selling oil to Europe and Asia if we do not have strong environmental protections.

**Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC):** Madam Speaker, the member's industry minister spoke prior to him. She talked

about the importance of learning from Trans Mountain, that we have to have a proponent for the pipeline and indigenous buy-in.

Well, here is the thing that causes a total lack of confidence on the Conservative side of the House and among Canadians. It was the current government that forced Kinder Morgan to go south, taking its \$4-billion investment with it, because of the tanker ban and the permits that were required. It left, and Trans Mountain became an expense on Canadian tax dollars when there was, actually, the Western Indigenous Pipeline Group, with indigenous international oil and gas experience, that came and tried to pitch to the government that it would take on Trans Mountain. It had the buy-in of all of those along that route.

The political strategy of the Prime Minister was clearly to shut down pipelines until it became an issue where he had no choice but to turn around and appear like he supports oil and gas in Canada.

• (1330)

**Corey Hogan:** Madam Speaker, that is simply not the case. I was a senior official for the Government of Alberta at the time. While I cannot go into confidences, the reality is that nothing there approximates reality.

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, let me start off by making very clear, for those who are following the debate, what we are witnessing again today from the official opposition. The starting point has to be that the Conservative Party of Canada, which has moved to the far right with the leader of the Conservative Party, has made the determination that it is better to be an opposition that solely focuses on the best interests of the Conservative Party of Canada, not the best interests of Canadians. This is once again what we are seeing taking place on the floor of the House of Commons.

My colleague and friend just amplified the game being played in a wonderful way so people can really understand it. The reality is, self-interest is the driving motivation of the Conservative Party.

A number of months ago, we had an election. Everyone, no doubt, recalls that. Canadians decided to vote for a Liberal government, headed by a Prime Minister who understands how an economy works. After all, it was Stephen Harper who appointed him as the Governor of the Bank of Canada. He was the governor of the Bank of England. He has an incredible track record in the private sector. He understands what it takes to make the economy work.

The memorandum of understanding that was signed off by the Prime Minister and the Premier of Alberta, I would suggest, is good for the environment, for the economy and for federalism. Once again the Prime Minister has demonstrated that the best way to get things done is by working, where we can, with the many different stakeholders to achieve results that will deliver for Canadians.

*Business of Supply*

Even though he has been Prime Minister for eight months now, there are numerous examples of the Prime Minister being successful at what he committed to do for Canadians. An example would be Bill C-5. Bill C-5, which the Prime Minister and the Liberal government brought in last June and which is now law, talks about the importance of major projects.

Whether it is LNG in B.C., copper going into the prairie provinces, nuclear in Ontario, the port of Montreal in Quebec or, in the second allotment of major projects, things taking place in other regions of the country, these are all initiatives that have been achieved by the federal government and the Prime Minister working with the many different stakeholders, in particular, provinces and indigenous peoples. This is what we have witnessed by the Prime Minister.

Now we bring it to the province of Alberta. All of Canada benefits by it, but I will focus on Alberta. We have a memorandum of understanding that is very clear. Anyone can read the entire memorandum of understanding and, I believe, get a very clear picture. This picture includes consultation in working with indigenous peoples and with the Province of British Columbia. It talks about how it is important to get the private sector engaged on the issue. It enables the potential of a pipeline going from Alberta to the coast on the Pacific Ocean.

The Premier of Alberta is, by the way, a progressive conservative premier, and I highlight the word “conservative”. She and the Prime Minister, in good faith, have signed that memorandum of understanding. I can appreciate that everyone in Canada understands that and values that, in most part, except for the members of the Conservative Party who sit opposite here in the House of Commons.

● (1335)

For them, it was not a good day when the Prime Minister and the Premier of Alberta were onside, even though other premiers in the country are onside with that particular agreement. It is really quite unfortunate. It feeds into what my colleague talked about regarding the motivation of the Conservative Party. I sat in opposition for a part of the years that the leader of the Conservative Party was in government. In fact, the leader of the Conservative Party sat in the government benches for 10 years. Do we know how many miles of pipeline they built from Alberta to tidewater?

It was zero. My colleague from Waterloo is right on. It was zero.

Not one inch of pipeline over the 10 years the leader of the Conservative Party was in government. Why should we believe for a moment that the Conservatives actually know how to get it done? In fact, it took the Trudeau government, through TMX, to build a pipeline to coastal waters.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, now they are complaining that we did it. It is amazing. It really and truly is amazing. Their record is zero, not an inch. Fast-forward to today, when we have a Prime Minister who understands the value of it and who is working and making sure that we can proceed. What does the opposition

have to say? I am going to go back to the political games that the Conservative Party plays day after day in the House of Commons.

If Conservatives genuinely were concerned about pipelines, and my colleague was right, they should actually be saying, “Yes, we can do pipelines. It is possible.” They should not be discouraging industry. They are the only political entity that has a chance to govern here in Canada that is saying no to the industry, saying there is no chance of building a pipeline. It is not like it was back in the Harper days. We can actually get things done. That is the bottom line. The Conservatives might have a number of MPs who represent Alberta, but they are a disaster, an absolute, total disaster, in terms of actually moving forward on the pipeline issue.

We can look at what the leader of the Conservative Party did today. Let us imagine this. First he told Canadians he was going to move a motion, which was just going to say to build that pipeline. Who cares about consultation? He then realized he might have mis-spoken a little. Now he is coming forward and he says he wants to be a little softer on the approach. He says Conservatives like this part of the MOU and that part of the MOU, so they will bring those in and then say, “Now let us challenge the Liberals.”

It is a very clear issue for the Liberal caucus. Every Liberal MP understands what was signed by Danielle Smith and the Prime Minister. It is an MOU that everyone should be getting behind. If one supports the environment, supports building Canada strong or the economy, supports federalism, this is the type of MOU that advances all three of those issues. Only the Conservative Party of Canada would vote against that. We see that. We can look at what the Conservatives brought forward to the House. They cherry-picked, to try to cause more division. They want more division in Canada. They are not that much different from the Bloc at times, it would appear.

If they want Canada to work, they should look at what is in front of their faces and start supporting good ideas. What the premier and the Prime Minister signed is good, in whole. They should get behind it and vote for it.

● (1340)

**Dean Allison (Niagara West, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I sit here amused once again at the absolute arrogance of the Liberals, who think they are the only ones who could have a plan for this country. As a matter of fact, after 10 years of an absolute disaster, they still think their way forward is the best way. When anyone else challenges that vision, Liberals automatically say they are self-interested and only doing it for themselves.

Does the member right there not think that the most self-interested person in the whole government is the current Prime Minister?

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, I did not ask the member to ask that question, but I have a simple answer: No, I do not.

*Business of Supply*

Members can look at what has been accomplished since the last federal election, whether it is the budget implementation bill and the many initiatives that are in it to support Canadians, our infrastructure, our military and so much more, or building Canada strong by looking at ways in which we can develop major projects, with 60 billion dollars' worth of investment.

The answer is no.

[*Translation*]

**Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary secretary is shouting himself hoarse trying to pull the wool over our eyes. This might even be affecting his health. He needs to take a breath between his shrieks. I am really concerned about his personal health.

He can try to pull the wool over our eyes, but what the government is doing right now is providing indecent levels of support to the greedy oil and gas sector, while people in the forestry sector are going through the worst crisis in their history. The government has made only one announcement for that sector, back in August, and people in the forestry industry are still waiting for help.

Meanwhile, the Liberals are prepared to open their wallets wide and make the worst environmental compromises to benefit people in the oil and gas sector.

[*English*]

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, the member and I had an exchange a little earlier today. As I indicated to him then, we have to look at this through a different perspective. He agreed that the Bloc party is a separatist party. What this agreement shows very clearly is that federalism works and that all of Canada benefits by this MOU.

Pipelines, the lumber industry, the steel industry and the aluminum industry are all important issues to the government of the day. The government and the Prime Minister have been working actively on them to ensure we can build Canada strong. Whether it is on any of those issues or looking for other opportunities to expand trade, we will continue to work every day of the week to get the best results for Canada.

**Corey Hogan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, one of the things that struck me about the Conservative amendment that was moved recently was that it expresses support for the Pathways project. However, the Leader of the Opposition emphatically told me that they do not support a price on carbon.

I am wondering if the member has any thoughts on how they could possibly reconcile that without creating a subsidy of tens of billions of dollars to the oil and gas sector.

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, there is irony in that. We need to recognize that out of the entire North American continent, it was the Province of Alberta that led the way in terms of the first price on pollution, a carbon tax. It was the Premier of Alberta who signed the MOU, recognizing the value of a carbon tax. That is why I started off by saying how far right the Conservative Party of today is. I think they should look at a new name. What did mad Max call his party? Was it the People's Party?

At the end of the day, the Conservative Party has gone so far to the right, there have to be a lot of red Tories over there feeling pretty uncomfortable. I would encourage them to look at what we hear day and day again coming from the leadership of the Conservative Party and so many of those far right personalities. They must be starting to feel uneasy and might even want to sit as independents. They should reflect on the value that red Tories have contributed to the country in many ways in the past. I would like to see a few more bold red Tories stand up against the current leadership of the Conservative Party.

● (1345)

**Ned Kuruc (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am splitting my time with the member for Fort McMurray—Cold Lake.

Today I rise on the motion to commit the government to a new pipeline from Alberta to the west coast. First, I think we need to be really clear what this Liberal memorandum of understanding really is. It is not a real commitment to Canadian energy; it is a political charade designed to make headlines rather than put shovels in the ground. Canadians have seen this movie before: big announcements, photo ops and then years of backtracking and filibustering, all leading to cancelled projects.

This MOU is no different. It is not a binding contract. It is not a guarantee to build a pipeline, and the Prime Minister's own caucus is now divided on whether they support their own party's policy. One thing that is for certain is that the Conservatives are all in agreement. No one in Canada has been more clear about the need to get an oil pipeline built to the west coast than we have. We are a resource superpower, and through this decade of Liberal government, we have only put hurdles in front of ourselves by keeping our wealth in the ground. With an unpredictable neighbour down south and economic conditions worldwide being tested, now is the time, more than ever, for the Liberals to step out of the way and let Conservatives deliver on a promise of a prosperous Canada.

Using the Prime Minister's own words, we need to build “things previously thought impossible” at unimaginable speeds and “build Canada into an energy superpower”. The only way we can do that is with the Liberals stepping aside and letting builders build. That is exactly what this motion is: committing the Prime Minister to his very own words.

The MOU signed by the Prime Minister in Alberta in November provides the “necessary conditions” for a pipeline, but it is not a commitment to build one. In reality, the MOU only says that a proposal may eventually be referred to a federal office for years of further study. We have seen this roundabout language time and time again with the Liberal government in attempts to drag its feet on issues and never follow through.

*Business of Supply*

The MOU must have B.C. support, and Premier Eby has been extremely vocal that he would not support it. Not only that, but the Liberals are also keeping the tanker ban in place. The tanker ban, passed by Justin Trudeau in 2019, would make the pipeline bringing LNG to B.C. completely pointless. It would be like building a pipeline to nowhere. We would have no way of getting the oil off the west coast and into foreign markets. To further the problem, with restrictions like this baked into the MOU, the private sector would not support this deal, meaning there would be no one to actually build the pipeline.

The Liberals cannot claim to support pipelines while keeping laws and veto powers that make building them virtually impossible. That is exactly why our motion before the House matters. It is not a vague promise that maybe someday we would build a pipeline. Our motion is clear. It says, yes, we support building the pipeline and exporting a million barrels a day. By voting for this motion, members agree that we need to cut the red tape and bureaucracy, repeal the outdated tanker ban, grant the permits and let private sector investment flow to build the infrastructure we need.

This motion would force clarity. It forces the question: Do they want a pipeline or just more press conferences, studies and headlines? The Prime Minister has been asked in this very House when the pipeline would be built, and his response was that the MOU “creates necessary conditions, but not sufficient conditions”. I ask Canadians listening at home if this sounds like someone who really wants to build a pipeline.

The MOU is not a shovel in the ground. The Liberals campaigned on “keeping it in the ground” policies. This is not a change of heart. It is a political game, and Canadians can see right through it. They tell Albertans they are in favour of a pipeline, while telling B.C. and Quebecers they are against it. The Liberal caucus is not aligned. They have lost a minister over it and now multiple MPs on that side have spoken out against it. This is an identity crisis for them.

• (1350)

Meanwhile, the Prime Minister is speaking out of both sides of his mouth. On June 6, he said he “will not impose a project on a province”. On October 1, he told his caucus that if B.C. does not want it, it is not going ahead. Let us not forget that when Mark Carney was an environmental ambassador for the United Nations, he agreed that 65% of all oil and gas reserves and 90% of all coal reserves must be left in the ground, and that there is no need for any exploration of new oil and gas fields. It is time to make a decision and get the divided Liberals on record for all Canadians to see.

Shipping a million barrels a day of Alberta oil to Asia can have a transformative effect on our economy, which is exactly the promise of this motion. By unlocking access to global energy markets, we attract billions in private sector energy investment, which creates jobs, not just for oil and pipeline workers but across sectors, such as manufacturing, fabrication, steel, transport and infrastructure. It strengthens Canada's economy and sovereignty, reduces our dependence on foreign energy and gives Canadian workers more secure, well-paying jobs. It also helps stabilize incomes while lowering the cost of energy, food and housing. This is a huge factor as many Canadians are struggling under the current cost of living. The new

Nanos Research poll shows that 56% of Canadians support building a new pipeline and 55% are in favour of lifting the ban on tanker traffic to make it happen.

A much overlooked benefit of building major infrastructure like a pipeline is that it gives a boost to the domestic steel markets and fabrication industries. We can consider the steel industry in Hamilton, a cornerstone of Canadian manufacturing. A large pipeline project with its demand for steel structural components, welding and fabrication would generate increased demand for Canadian-produced steel. That means more orders, more stable demand and more work for steelworkers and fabricators in Hamilton and beyond.

Supporting the motion is not about just energy; it is about reinforcing Canadian manufacturing, protecting Canadian jobs and giving Canadian steel a home market advantage against imported materials. This is not just about a pipeline. It is about Canada's economic future. It is about creating jobs in Alberta, B.C., Ontario and, of course, Hamilton. It is about factory floors, steel mills, transport depots and shipping ports. It is about energy, sovereignty, national pride and ensuring Canadian resources benefit Canadians first.

The Liberal MOU is a promise of maybe someday, diluted by countless caveats and subject to vetoes. The Conservative motion before us is a clear statement of support for action, growth and prosperity. We even have some breaking news. The Leader of the Opposition has amended the motion to include the Liberals' concerns, green-lighting carbon capture projects, engaging and consulting with indigenous partners and participating in a trilateral discussion with B.C. on the pipeline.

To quote the finance minister, today is “a good day for Canadians.” Let us build the pipeline, and I hope the Liberals will join us in building a stronger, more self-reliant Canada.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Before we go to questions and comments, I would remind members not to use the first name, the last name or the full name of a member of the House, whether they be a cabinet minister or any member.

Questions and comments, the hon. government deputy House leader.

• (1355)

**Hon. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I ask the member opposite to consider the comments of his colleague from earlier. He said that we are “10 years too late to believe in Canada.” Does the member opposite agree with this statement?

**Ned Kuruc:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote the Prime Minister again when he said that he agreed that 65% of all oil and gas reserves and 90% of all coal reserves must be left in the ground, and that there was no need for any exploration of new oil and gas fields. That is what is actually concerning.

Canadians are seeing right through this pipeline MOU. They want a clear answer, and we have delivered one. I hope the Liberals join us today in voting for Canada and what Canada wants and needs.

[*Translation*]

**Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, today we are debating a motion that deals with the agreement between Ottawa and Alberta for a new pipeline. However, I want to follow up on a concern that my colleague and I share, and that is the cost of living. As the critic for seniors, I hear all the time that seniors can no longer afford rent and groceries. Last week, a study showed that, in 2026, people will be spending at least \$1,000 more on groceries. One of the reasons mentioned for this is climate change.

What does my colleague think about the fact that maybe we should take action on climate change to lower the price of groceries?

[*English*]

**Ned Kuruc:** Mr. Speaker, the member has touched on the point that the Liberals are facing a very big identity crisis. They do not know whether they are for climate change policy or for pulling oil out of the ground, or whether their caucus is completely divided on this issue.

To the member's question on unleashing Canada's economic future, the motion today would produce that. Like I said, it is a good day for Canadians. It is a day when the Liberals and every member of the House can vote to unleash Canada's energy sector and have good economic, prosperous, times ahead. I hope every member of the House votes with us today, because Canadians at home are counting on the House to unleash pipelines, oil and energy so we can become an energy superpower and rely on no one but Canada. I ask members to please vote with us.

**Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, there is a cost to our inaction. Based on the current state of affairs we are facing, our reliance on just one buyer, to whom we have to sell to at a discount no less, we are losing billions of dollars in revenue and thousands of jobs in Saskatchewan, Alberta and Newfoundland, as well as across this country. We are losing influence on the world stage because other countries use energy as a diplomatic tool, while we are sitting on the sidelines.

When the Liberals propose an MOU with no solid timelines, what hope is there for Canadians?

**Ned Kuruc:** Mr. Speaker, that is a fantastic question. I have said over and over again that the Liberals are focused only on headlines. The MOU is going to kick the can down the line and hopefully get

### *Statements by Members*

them into another election by saying they were pro-pipeline. Nothing in the MOU actually says that they are going to build one, but today's motion would accomplish that, so I hope the Liberals will join us and vote for a pipeline that they have proposed. The leader of the Conservative Party has actually put forward amendments that they wanted.

To the member's question, yes, it would secure jobs. His riding and my city of Hamilton need steel, and we have to be self-reliant.

Again I encourage every member of the House to vote for the motion, and I hope they do. It is what the Liberals want, but we, through the motion, would do it faster and actually make a commitment to Canadians.

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

• (1400)

[*English*]

### SQUAMISH CLIMATE ACTION NETWORK

**Patrick Weiler (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Squamish Climate Action Network, Squamish CAN, on receiving the 2025 Edible Communities Sustainability Award for outstanding leadership in community-driven climate action.

The network's impact is felt across the region. Its self-sustaining downtown school farm gives residents and students hands-on experience with regenerative agriculture, distributes fresh food throughout the community, and supplies healthy produce to local schools. Its edible school gardens and indigenous plant garden created in partnership with Squamish Nation elders deepen ecological learning in the classroom and embed cultural knowledge in the community. Through food-security programs, waste reduction initiatives, community education and strong policy leadership, Squamish CAN is reshaping local food systems and strengthening the region's resilience.

I congratulate the executive director, Krystle tenBrink, and the entire Squamish CAN team for this well-deserved honour and for their continued work to build a healthier, more sustainable future for our community.

*Statements by Members**[Translation]***COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS IN PORTNEUF—  
JACQUES-CARTIER**

**Joël Godin (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to pay tribute to the community organizations in Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, as well as to the women and men who keep them running day after day. Whether it is food aid, helping one another or support for families, culture, sports or the most vulnerable, their work is key to a vibrant and united community. Often, we find it is the same people supporting various organizations, the same people who are always there. They are immensely generous with their time, energy and hearts.

Our organizations are vital. They break the isolation and make a real difference in people's lives. I would like to take this opportunity to call on the next generation to get involved. First and foremost, volunteering is about doing good for others, but it is also about enriching oneself as a person, making friends and giving meaning to one's commitment.

I would like to thank all those who work in community organizations. They are indispensable. I wish you a merry Christmas and a happy 2026—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Humber River—Black Creek.

\* \* \*

*[English]***GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE RIVER BASIN**

**Hon. Judy A. Sgro (Humber River—Black Creek, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin is home to 98% of Ontarians and more than 90% of Québécois. It is a critical part of a highly integrated economy, valued at over \$10 trillion and is extremely important to all of us.

Yesterday evening, a coalition of groups dedicated to fostering a prosperous and resilient Great Lakes and St. Lawrence ecosystem welcomed parliamentarians, staff and officials to a reception to learn more about this precious resource shared by both Canadians and Americans. Representatives from the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, Pollution Probe, AquaAction and many other groups were on hand to answer many questions. It was also an opportunity to celebrate the historic and continued investment made by the Government of Canada to protect and restore the basin and to further encourage this important work.

\* \* \*

**RICHARD WILLIAM STARK**

**David McKenzie (Calgary Signal Hill, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, teachers can be the most important people in the life of a student: encouraging, guiding and inspiring; and providing strength, support, caring and love. Richard William Stark was such a teacher.

A university basketball player and later a professional engineer, Dick Stark became a teacher in the 1970s. As a coach, particularly of basketball, and a teacher of science and math at Luther College High School in Regina, Saskatchewan, Dick Stark had an enormous impact on thousands of young people over three decades. If some-

one needed help or support, Coach Stark was there. He was patient and kind, and he possessed a great compassion and energy. He challenged his students to become better members of society and positive examples to others.

Dick Stark inspired many, including me. Dick Stark died on October 10, 2025. Rest in peace, Coach Stark.

\* \* \*

*[Translation]***PASTRY WORLD CUP**

**Tatiana Auguste (Terrebonne, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Coupe du monde de la viennoiserie is an international competition celebrating artisan bakers' excellence and know-how. At the 2025 world cup held in France in November, a Terrebonne resident performed remarkably well. Damien Agliata, a baker at La Shop à pain in Terrebonne, placed third in the world and won the best brioche award. He represented Canada proudly among the 14 competing countries.

Accompanying Mr. Agliata at the prestigious competition were Guillaume Roy, owner of La Shop à pain and three advisors: his father, Laurent Agliata, of La Shop à pain; Philippe Bretignière, a baking instructor; and Roch Desjardins, a pastry instructor and team lead.

I would like to congratulate Mr. Agliata for his award, his talent and his passion, which put Terrebonne on the international pastry map. I would also like to salute the leadership of La Shop à pain owner and baker Guillaume Roy.

\* \* \*

● (1405)

*[English]***FIREARMS**

**Amanpreet Gill (Calgary Skyview, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister admits that the vast majority of illegal firearms used in crime come from across our border, yet instead of stopping those guns, the Liberals are pushing a billion-dollar gun grab scheme that targets the wrong people. In Calgary, hunters, ranchers and sport shooters who follow the law are being punished, while violent criminals walk free. Law-abiding Canadians are not the threat; the criminals are.

While our city faces rising gun violence, the Liberals refuse to fix the border disorder that lets in nearly all illegal guns. Gun crime is up 130% because of their catch-and-release bail system in Bill C-75 and reduced penalties for gun offences in Bill C-5. The buy-back will not stop criminals or smuggling; it only targets responsible citizens.

Conservatives will protect lawful gun owners, crack down on violent offenders and keep Calgary families safe.

\* \* \*

#### MEMBERTOU FIRST NATION LEADERSHIP

**Mike Kelloway (Sydney—Glace Bay, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Chief Terry Paul of the Membertou First Nation, who has been named a 2026 inductee into the Canadian Business Hall of Fame. This is a testament to one of the most remarkable leadership stories in Canada.

For over 40 years, Chief Paul has guided Membertou through economic and social transformation. Under his leadership, Membertou's became the first indigenous government in the world to achieve ISO certification. In addition, employment has climbed to nearly 80%, graduation rates are approaching 90% and the community continues to grow and evolve, strengthening its economy and expanding its opportunities. Chief Paul has also led some of the most significant indigenous business investments in our country, including the 50% acquisition of Clearwater Seafoods.

His leadership has reshaped opportunity for the Membertou, the Mi'kmaq and all of Cape Breton. His induction is well earned and well deserved.

I say, *wela'lin* to Chief Paul.

\* \* \*

#### PENTICTON SHOOTING SPORTS ASSOCIATION

**Helena Konanz (Similkameen—South Okanagan—West Kootenay, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, for over 40 years, the Penticton Shooting Sports Association has operated a facility that includes multiple ranges on land leased from the federal government, but unless action is taken before December 31, it will be forced to close forever. For decades it has provided a family-friendly atmosphere for hunters and sport shooters in a safe and responsible environment.

The range has also provided an essential local training resource for the RCMP and CBSA. National Police Federation president, Brian Sauv , even said today at the public safety committee that the RCMP needs more training facilities like this one. MPs at the same committee unanimously passed a motion to support the extension of the club's lease, and over 10,000 Canadians have signed a petition.

I call on the Minister of Agriculture to renew the lease of the Penticton Shooting Sports Association.

#### Statements by Members

[Translation]

#### DIANE GODIN

**Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to someone with a remarkable professional career. She has been a colleague for six years, but she is now also a friend: Diane Godin, has been a pillar of my office and has played a key role in political life since 1994.

Over the years, she has served five members with remarkable professionalism: Louise Beaudoin, Yves Lessard, Bertrand Saint-Arnaud, Dave Turcotte and myself.

We like to tease Diane, but she epitomizes being young at heart. Diane is our version of Dominique Michel. Sometimes she talks about retiring, but we remind her that we cannot do without her, and rightly so. She is a rock star when it comes to community connections. Not a day goes by without someone telling me about the incredible service she provides to the public. Her empathy and kindness are her greatest assets.

I thank Diane for her big heart and for the countless lives she has touched. Saint-Jean and Quebec owe her a lot.

\* \* \*

● (1410)

[English]

#### ADOLPH HAFEMANN

**Tim Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honour Adolph Hafemann of Wellesley Township, who passed away this fall at the age of 95.

Adolph's life is a story of resilience and of service. Born in Poland, he fled with his family during the Second World War, immigrating to Canada with just 15¢ in his pocket. He worked on farms, then in Kitchener's manufacturing sector, before building a new life in Wellesley Township. In 1970 Adolph and his wife, Emily, purchased a small grocery store in Wellesley. It turned into a thriving business. His character shone through in the quiet moments, gestures like slipping food into the bag of a family in need, or granting credit with no questions asked.

Adolph Hafemann helped found the Wellesley Apple Butter and Cheese Festival, a tradition that continues to bring our community together every year. He was named Wellesley citizen of the year and remained a pillar of generosity throughout his life.

I thank his family and friends for sharing Adolf with us. His life reminds us that true success is measured by the lives we touch.

*Statements by Members***TAXATION**

**Dean Allison (Niagara West, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it does pay to be Brookfield under this government. Just last month, Canadians were told that we are sending \$528 million of our money to the European Space Agency. That is great news for European jobs and an even bigger coincidence for Brookfield, because it just happens to own 50% of a campus in the U.K. that is home to a major ESA facility. I am sure the Prime Minister, the former chair of Brookfield Asset Management, was just as surprised as the rest of us when this deal landed.

This is the same Brookfield that, while the Prime Minister was chair, used Bermuda addresses above bike shops and Cayman Island post office boxes to avoid paying billions in Canadian taxes that could have helped the more than 2.2 million Canadians now relying on food banks every month or the young families who have given up dreaming of ever owning their own home. Connected insiders keep winning, while regular Canadians keep getting the bill.

Conservatives will keep exposing this every single day, because clearly, someone has to.

\* \* \*

**GOVERNMENT PRIORITIES**

**Sonia Sidhu (Brampton South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as we wrap up the fall session, I rise to reflect on the work we are advancing together.

This fall, the government has been working on strengthening health care, including simplifying the residency pathway, so Canadians in every community can access a family doctor, and introducing the PSW tax credit to support personal support workers.

Budget 2025 also invests in communities like Brampton, including \$25 million in TMU's new medical school, the first built in the GTA in more than a century. We are also supporting state-of-the-art AI infrastructure at the University of Toronto. Investments like these have the potential to strengthen and streamline health care.

As we enter the holiday season, I wish everyone in Brampton South and across Canada happy holidays and a happy new year.

\* \* \*

**COST OF LIVING**

**Mike Dawson (Miramichi—Grand Lake, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, in 2012, the Liberals accepted the resignation of Minister Bev Oda over a \$16 glass of orange juice.

Welcome to Mark Carney's Canada in 2025, where every Canadian now drinks \$16 orange juice. The Prime Minister told Canadians that he would be judged by the prices at the grocery store. Well, let us judge. Families in Miramichi are trying to survive on about \$300 a week for groceries. With Christmas only a few days away, families in my riding are putting items back on the shelf in silence. People in Miramichi are being forced to choose between heat or meat.

They say that if you're not at the table, you're on the menu. This Christmas, Canadians are not being invited to dinner. The Liberal government is leaving them only misery and tariffs to eat.

**The Speaker:** I will point out that the member mentioned the proper name of another member in his statement, and that is outside the rules. We have to use titles or riding names.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Beauport—Limoilou.

\* \* \*

**DOMINICAN MISSIONARY ADORERS**

**Steve Lavoie (Beauport—Limoilou, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, over the past few months, I have had the opportunity to meet a number of extraordinary women who are making a real difference in their community. This year, we are proud to celebrate the 80th anniversary of the Dominican Missionary Adorers, who are right in the heart of my riding, in Beauport—Limoilou.

Founded in 1945 by Mother Julienne du Rosaire, the organization has been an essential part of our community for eight decades. Through their active involvement, their compassionate commitment and their contributions to the community's well-being, these women have supported generations of citizens, promoted social development and encouraged initiatives that foster solidarity. Their long legacy is a testament to their ongoing service to the individuals and families in our community.

In celebrating this 80th anniversary, we pay tribute to an institution that remains a pillar of Beauport—Limoilou and a lasting source of inspiration.

\* \* \*

● (1415)

[*English*]**NATURAL RESOURCES**

**Chris Warkentin (Grande Prairie, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, before the Prime Minister was elected, he said that half of all oil reserves should stay in the ground, but two weeks ago, when signing an MOU in the province of Alberta, he said that he is now supportive of a proposal to build an oil pipeline between Alberta and a northern British Columbia port. Now that he has returned to Ottawa, he is telling his “keep it in the ground” caucus not to worry, because this project is never going to get built. The Prime Minister has become a master at telling one group of people one thing and another group of people the complete opposite.

Today in the House, Liberals are going to have an opportunity to finally tell Canadians where they actually stand. Will they vote “yes” to the very words the Prime Minister wrote in the MOU to support a pipeline, or are they going to vote “no” and clearly reject a proposal to build a pipeline that would finally cut Canadian dependence on the United States?

Canadian voters and investors are watching. What is it going to be? It is simple: Do Liberals support this pipeline or not?

\* \* \*

#### MEN'S NATIONAL CRICKET TEAM

**Iqra Khalid (Mississauga—Erin Mills, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today we welcome team Canada's national cricket team to the House, athletes who have shown that Canadian cricket is world class. Cricket in Canada has roots going back nearly 200 years, and it was Canada's first national sport. That legacy is not just history. This team is carrying it forward.

In 2025, team Canada went unbeaten through the Americas regional qualifier to earn its place at the 2026 ICC Men's T20 World Cup, our second straight qualification. With a new wave of home-grown talent and thriving local and national leagues, cricket is flourishing all across the country. Every year, cricket enthusiasts from across Canada come to Ottawa to raise awareness, advocate for the sport and play cricket with parliamentarians.

Team Canada is proving that Canadian cricket is stepping onto the world stage with ambition and a future that Canadians can cheer for.

---

## ORAL QUESTIONS

[*Translation*]

### NATURAL RESOURCES

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canada needs a pipeline to the Pacific Ocean so we can sell more of our products overseas, somewhere other than the U.S. It will make our economy more independent and strengthen the Canadian dollar and the purchasing power of all Canadians.

The Prime Minister has always been against it, but he flip-flopped last week in Alberta. When he came back to Ottawa, there was a rebellion among his MPs.

I took the words straight from his agreement. Is he going to vote against his own words, or can Canadians believe what he says?

**Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, a memorandum of understanding is not something one can pick and choose from.

The Leader of the Opposition took a few words from the agreement, but not all of them. He forgot to mention the stronger industrial carbon price. He forgot to mention methane regulations. He forgot to mention carbon neutrality by 2050.

The Conservatives need to eat the whole meal, not just the meat.

\* \* \*

### CARBON PRICING

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, eating the whole meal would be great if only Canadians could afford to buy the meal.

### Oral Questions

He is talking about a carbon tax that still applies to farm equipment, to fertilizer and to those who deliver food. This has caused food inflation to the point that it now costs \$17,000 a year to feed a family of four.

Why will he not cut hefty taxes on groceries so Canadians can feed their families?

**Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there is no carbon tax on Canadian farms that emit less than 50 kilotonnes of greenhouse gas emissions. That is the first point.

The second point is that the impact of the industrial carbon tax on food prices in Canada is virtually zero, according to the Canadian Climate Institute.

\* \* \*

● (1420)

[*English*]

### NATURAL RESOURCES

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canada needs a pipeline to the Pacific to sell \$30 billion of our energy overseas, outside of the U.S. market, making us more independent and self-reliant, and our dollar, and therefore Canadians' purchasing power, stronger. The Prime Minister always opposed the pipeline, which his party killed, but last week he flip-flopped and promised, in a deal while he was in Alberta, that he would build such a pipeline. I took the very wording right out of that deal and put it into a motion before the House of Commons. He experienced a massive rebellion in his own caucus.

If he is going to vote against his own words, how can Canadians ever believe his words?

**Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as the Canadian national cricket team knows, we have to play the whole T20. It is not just a couple of overs. It is not just the pipeline. It is not just Pathways. It is an industrial price on carbon that goes to \$130 effective. It is reductions in methane. It is net zero by 2050. It is building Alberta strong and Canada strong, durable, sustainable and—

**The Speaker:** The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I took the wording for the motion right out of the Prime Minister's deal. If he votes against the motion, he is voting against a pipeline to the Pacific; he is voting against overriding the discriminatory and anti-Canadian ban on shipping our energy abroad; he is voting against consultation with first nations people and the British Columbian government, and he is even voting against his own beloved carbon capture and storage, all of which I took word for word right out of his own deal.

### Oral Questions

If the Prime Minister is in favour of pipelines only when he is in Alberta, but against them when he is in B.C. and Ottawa, how can Canadians keep track of where he stands on anything?

**Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome the fact that to my hearing, for the first time ever in the House, the Leader of the Opposition has acknowledged the constitutional right of indigenous people to full, free and fair consultation. This is the first time he has ever acknowledged the role of the provinces in these pipelines, but he has not yet acknowledged the need for an industrial carbon price or the reduction in methane, two things the Premier of Alberta acknowledged and signed off on wholeheartedly, as part of a complete meal.

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, not only do we acknowledge the obligation to consult with our first peoples, but we put it right in the motion. It is right there for the Prime Minister.

We put it right there so the Prime Minister could vote for the words that he put in the agreement, but let us be honest: He never planned to honour the agreement. He whispered quietly to the “keep it in the ground” Liberal caucus, “Don’t worry; there will never be a pipeline. We’ll delay it until after the election, and then, God forbid, if we win, we would kill it altogether.”

Why can the Prime Minister not say one thing to all Canadians and champion the pipeline with us today?

**Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the MOU between the Government of Canada and the Province of Alberta is about a pipeline. It is about carbon capture and storage. It is about interties with the clean electricity grid of British Columbia. It is about artificial intelligence data centres. It is about an industrial carbon price that works. It is about methane regulations that bring methane down 75% so we can have the lowest-emission, low-risk, lowest-cost oil in the world and build this country.

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, we put the interties proposal right in the motion, right out of the Prime Minister’s deal. We put the carbon capture right in the motion, right out of his deal. We put the pipeline and the overriding of the oil shipping ban right in the motion. It came right out of the deal that he signed. Now it is clear that the only thing the Prime Minister really cares about is that it does not include an industrial carbon tax that would drive jobs out and drive grocery prices up.

Why is it that the Prime Minister wants a carbon tax without a pipeline, when what we really need is a pipeline without a carbon tax?

• (1425)

**Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the grand reveal has been made.

I am not a lifelong member of the House, so I do not know all the rules, but I do not think there is a limit on the size of motions. In fact since the MOU is already translated, it would be very easy to take the entire MOU, in both official languages, and propose them, if the members opposite would support everything that the Premier of Alberta has done.

[Translation]

### THE ENVIRONMENT

**Yves-François Blanchet (Beloil—Chambly, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, this morning, the former environment minister and former heritage minister, who is still very much a member of the Liberal caucus, published a letter that his replacements are clearly not very happy about. In it, he describes the agreement between the Prime Minister of Canada and the Premier of Alberta as a significant step backwards and a rollback.

I need to know. Will the Prime Minister choose the environment and his own caucus, or will he choose oil company shareholders?

**Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the government is choosing Canadians and the future of Canadians, which means good jobs and a sustainable and prosperous economy, with major investments in all forms of energy, including a clean and prosperous future for Quebec.

\* \* \*

### JUSTICE

**Yves-François Blanchet (Beloil—Chambly, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister’s comments are more cute than accurate.

Let us talk about the religious exemption. Does the Prime Minister agree or disagree with his justice minister, who seems to agree with the Bloc Québécois? I want to know where he stands personally, and I think the public has a right to know that.

Will the Prime Minister serve the interests of religious minorities or will he serve the interests of the majority of Quebecers?

**Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the opposition member is referring to Bill C-9, which seeks to protect access to religious places, such as temples, synagogues, churches and mosques.

I know that the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights is currently discussing possible changes to this legislation.

\* \* \*

### TRANSPORTATION

**Yves-François Blanchet (Beloil—Chambly, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, is Adil Charkaoui among the religious leaders who must be protected?

It is like we are back under Justin Trudeau's government. We have learned that someone close to the Prime Minister, someone close to the Liberal Party of Canada, has lobbied for Driver Inc., drivers who are a danger on our roads.

I would like the Prime Minister to tell me whether he will serve the interests of friends of the Liberal Party or the interests of Canadians, their lives and their safety.

**Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, unacceptable words are always unacceptable. That is absolutely clear.

We are working, and we will always protect truckers. We will always protect rights. That is why the government is tightening the rules for truckers.

\* \* \*

[English]

### CARBON PRICING

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, speaking of trucks, they take steel, unlike what the Prime Minister said when he asked a reporter whether he or anybody uses steel anymore in Canada. Farm equipment takes steel as well, and farming takes fertilizer. All these things are taxed by the industrial carbon tax. I am sorry I have to give this elementary lesson in the supply chain to the Prime Minister, but it is a reality, and with this tax, food prices have gone up so that Canadians now have to spend \$17,000 a year on groceries.

Before Christmas, will the Prime Minister get rid of that tax, or will he be the grinch of the grocery store?

• (1430)

**Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, for a fleeting moment there I thought we were going to get another lecture on wood. We were all bracing ourselves on this side for another one of the Leader of the Opposition's lectures on wood.

I do take his point on steel. Indeed there is steel in farm equipment. Indeed Canadian farmers are the best in the world. Indeed our Minister of Agriculture and the entire government are rallying behind them to support our farmers, support our steel workers, support our economy and build big projects with Alberta and with British Columbia. We are going to keep doing that.

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, nonetheless, the Prime Minister is afraid to stand up to debate grocery prices. He says he knows so much about inflation; well, he certainly caused a lot of it in his life. He should, then, be able to stand up to defend the very industrial carbon tax that he says is even more important than a pipeline from Alberta. It is an industrial carbon tax on farm equipment, fertilizer and food processors at a time when Canadians are paying twice what they were a decade ago for groceries.

At Christmas time, will the Prime Minister do the right thing and get rid of this tax so Canadians can eat?

### Oral Questions

**Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of the Environment, Climate Change and Nature, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, let me make it really simple for the member opposite. The industrial—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**The Speaker:** We have to be able to hear the minister.

The hon. minister, from the top, please.

**Hon. Julie Dabrusin:** Mr. Speaker, apparently I need to repeat it again and again, so let me do that. I will make it simple for the member opposite: The industrial carbon price does not increase the cost of food. It does not apply to farms.

More than that, if we are going to look at the food price report that the member is referring to, perhaps he wants to refer to the other parts of it, which is that climate change and weather events have become a growing concern for agricultural producers, and increasingly severe and unpredictable weather events are disrupting agricultural production, creating supply challenges that continue to influence food prices across Canada.

The Conservatives should get on board to fight climate change.

\* \* \*

### TAXATION

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, no matter how high the Liberals raise the taxes, they are not going to change the weather. The Prime Minister should be willing to stand up before Christmas and look in the eye the seniors who cannot afford to feed themselves, and the single mothers who cannot afford to feed their children and to buy Christmas gifts this winter, while he puts not only an industrial carbon tax on farmers and fertilizer but also a food packaging tax that will increase grocery prices by a billion dollars across the land.

Will the Prime Minister live up to his promise to be judged by the prices at the grocery store and get rid of those hidden Liberal taxes on food?

**Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has said he does not want to do anything about climate change and he wants to talk about imaginary taxes, but when we want to do things for Canadians who are really struggling, as he points out, such as, by the way, indexing the Canada child benefit to inflation; ensuring we have a strong school nutrition program; and signing agreements on child care that are saving families in Ontario \$10,400 a year on average, the Conservatives vote against those supports.

Which is it? If the Conservatives do not want to fight climate change and do not want to stand up for Canadians, what are they doing here?

*Oral Questions*

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, is the member talking about standing up for Canadians? The Prime Minister will not even stand up in the House of Commons to answer a question about groceries. A moment ago he was bragging about his industrial carbon tax, and now his minister says it is imaginary, so apparently the Prime Minister is imagining things again.

How can Canadians keep straight the Prime Minister's story on grocery prices when one day he promises to be judged by the price of food, and the next day he says we need more of a tax on food and his own minister says it is all in his head?

**Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, actually what I said was that it is all in the member's head. There are no taxes on food, and there are no taxes on farms.

Rather than look for solutions, the Conservatives just throw roadblocks in the way of every single Canadian who knows they need supports in difficult times.

By the way, what Canadians are counting on is a government that will stand with them; that will make sure that, when they do not have access to dental care, they can get their teeth fixed; that will make sure that as a senior ages, their income will be geared to inflation; and that will make sure the Canada child benefit will keep up with the cost of living. Time and time again—

• (1435)

**The Speaker:** The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

\* \* \*

**FINANCE**

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, as Canadians walk down grocery aisles week after week, looking at prices rising to the point where they can no longer afford even to buy beef or put meat and potatoes on their dinner table, they see the Prime Minister, who promised he would be judged by the price at the grocery store, unwilling to even stand up to defend his appalling record of increasing grocery bills by \$1,000 for the year to come.

It is not just the industrial carbon tax; the Prime Minister has also doubled the deficit Trudeau left behind, which will once again stoke inflation.

Why is the Prime Minister forcing Canadians to feed his morbidly obese deficit rather than feeding their families?

**Hon. Wayne Long (Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, while the Conservative leader continues to spin the same old rhetoric, we have been focused on cutting taxes for 22 million Canadians. We cut the tax for first-time homebuyers and continue to lean in on affordability, school food programs and automatic federal benefits, and the list goes on and on.

We are laser-focused on this side on affordability. The Conservative leader and his party continue to spin the same old tired rhetoric time and time again.

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad the member got that off his chest, but the reality is that the question was for the Prime Minister. He is the one who promised to spend less, yet he doubled the deficit that Justin Trudeau left behind. His deficit is \$16 billion bigger than he promised, and he has added about \$90 billion of net new spending, most of it on governmental operations. All this will contribute to the inflation Canadians are paying at the grocery store.

Why will the Prime Minister not stand up and take account for the food price inflation he has caused, while Canadians struggle to put Christmas dinner on the table?

**Hon. Tim Hodgson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have a news flash: We are in a trade war. We need to work together.

The Government of Alberta supports the MOU in its entirety. The citizens of Alberta gave our Prime Minister two standing ovations in Calgary for the MOU. The only people divided on this are the Conservatives. They should get on board and build Canada.

\* \* \*

**NATURAL RESOURCES**

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, maybe the minister should tell that to the Liberal member for West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, the Liberal member for Vancouver Granville, the Liberal member for Beaches—East York and the Liberal members for Victoria, Vancouver Quadra, South Surrey—White Rock, Honoré-Mercier, Fleetwood—Port Kells, Laurier—Sainte-Marie, Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam and North Vancouver—Capilano. These are all the 11 Liberal MPs who have spoken out against the Prime Minister's deal.

Instead of standing up to them, instead of standing up to the “leave it in the ground” Liberal caucus, the Prime Minister has backed down, put them back in charge and blocked his own pipeline.

**Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, every one of those 11 people and, indeed, every one of the 170 people on this side of the House were elected to put Canadians to work building major projects, building them with Canadian steel, Canadian lumber and Canadian aluminum, protecting our workers, protecting those most vulnerable and coming to the aid of families. The 170 Liberal members on this side of the House support a strong Canada, a compassionate Canada, and we are completely united on all of that.

*Oral Questions*

[Translation]

## TRANSPORTATION

**Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, we wondered why the Liberals were protecting Driver Inc. truckers by shifting their responsibilities to the provinces. Imagine this: One of the Prime Minister's closest organizers, Tej Dulat, works for the companies that hire these truckers. This generous Liberal donor was even seated right next to the Prime Minister during his swearing-in ceremony. There is no risk of mistaking him for a lobbyist, as he is not listed in the registry. He is using his privileged relationship with the Prime Minister to defend Driver Inc. truckers, even if it means putting lives at risk.

Is that why the Liberals are doing nothing about this situation?

• (1440)

**Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this Prime Minister is the one who called on the Canada Revenue Agency to crack down on Driver Inc. truckers. He is the one who ordered more inspections to ensure compliance with the Canada Labour Code and he is the one who is making sure that legitimate trucking companies can operate in Canada.

This was acknowledged at a meeting I had this morning with the Association du camionnage du Québec, which congratulated the government on all of its actions on the—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères.

**Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Association du camionnage du Québec also says that there are still things the government can do to resolve this situation.

When it comes to Driver Inc., the Liberals once again seem to be protecting the interests of their friends, or possibly the interests of their own pocketbooks. In addition to the organizer close to the Prime Minister who is lobbying unofficially, the Liberals received \$85,000 in donations from people linked to Driver Inc. It is extremely worrying to see the Liberals' inaction when accidents have increased by 35% in Quebec in just one year.

If the Liberals really care about road safety, why have they not implemented the Bloc's 10 demands?

**Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, amidst all the action taken by the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Jobs and the Minister of Transport to crack down on Driver Inc., a system created by Mr. Harper, incidentally, the Bloc Québécois is forgetting one thing. I think the member for Bécancour—Nicolet—Saurel—Alnôbak will be chastising his party because the Bloc Québécois is asking the federal government to interfere in an area under Quebec's jurisdiction to resolve this problem. We will not do that.

[English]

## NATURAL RESOURCES

**Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister cannot be trusted on pipelines. He endorsed Justin Trudeau's cancellation of the approved northern gateway pipeline and stopped the shipment of Canadian oil through northern B.C. He now claims that he might allow a new pipeline but his Liberal MPs insist that it will never get built. Instead of playing both sides, the Prime Minister should definitively endorse a new pipeline to Canada's west coast and cancel the Liberal ban on shipping oil from northern B.C.

Will the Prime Minister finally stop the doublespeak, stop obstructing the pipeline and vote for the Conservative motion today?

**Hon. Tim Hodgson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, a future pipeline means diversifying our trade and greater competitiveness on a global scale. We need to put cards in our hand to fight this trade war, but there are things we need to do to get there, things in the memorandum of understanding that we can get united behind, like the carbon price. The Conservative motion conveniently ignores strengthening industrial carbon pricing. The leader opposes something that the Premier of Alberta agrees with. We support the entire MOU. We hope they will.

**Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, we will take no lessons from a minister who conducts indigenous consultations over Zoom, and we absolutely will oppose a carbon tax in all of its forms.

The Prime Minister has told his “keep it in the ground” caucus that the pipeline will never happen, while he promises Albertans that it might. Today, he can finally come clean with Canadians and provide crystal-clear clarity. He can support our motion, which is based on his MOU, and vote to cancel his tanker ban and greenlight a new pipeline.

Why does he not get out of the way, stop obstructing the pipeline and vote for our Conservative motion?

**Taleb Noormohamed (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Innovation, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, what we are hearing from the member opposite is exactly the problem with this MOU. It discounts several things. One is that in a federation we work together. We work with provinces and we work with indigenous communities to make things happen. Getting out of the way is only a strategy if we want to get nothing done. The way to get things done is to work together, and for every single member from British Columbia on the other side of the House, I ask how they can support a motion that ignores British Columbia and British Columbians completely. They should be ashamed of themselves.

*Oral Questions*

• (1445)

**Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, today is a monumental day for Canada's energy sector and for my province of Alberta. We will see if the Liberals stand behind the Prime Minister's promise to build a pipeline for Canada, or if he will do as his predecessor did and submit to his "keep it in the ground" caucus. Families in my riding are worried that the Prime Minister is paying lip service once again and that these are empty words, and it is no surprise as to why, after how the government has destroyed the natural resources sector over the last decade.

Will the Liberals stop obstructing a pipeline and vote for our motion, or will Alberta have its hopes dashed again?

**Hon. John Zerucelli (Secretary of State (Labour), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member should tell her constituents that the government was elected to do big things and that we are focused on making the largest infrastructure investment in Canadian history. We are going to be building bridges, community centres, hospitals and transit, with thousands of good-paying jobs, with Canadian steel, Canadian lumber and Canadian aluminum, and with Canadian skilled trades workers, but the Conservatives have voted against every single part of this. They voted against building houses, voted against major projects and voted against opportunities for youth. When will the Conservatives get on board?

**Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister continues to talk out of both sides of his mouth. He has mastered his predecessor's art of saying one thing in one province and another thing in another. Albertans want the truth. In a pathetic display of misrepresentation, his own Calgary MP could not even defend the leading sector and source of livelihoods for Calgarians.

Will the Prime Minister stand in the House and tell the nation, tell Alberta, tell Calgary and tell the member for Calgary Confederation that his government will not blame anyone else and not put this on anyone else and that he will ensure a pipeline is built?

**Hon. Maninder Sidhu (Minister of International Trade, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the MOU is about building Canada strong with the people of Alberta. I was born in Calgary. I talk to Albertans every single day, and they know that our Prime Minister is bringing Canadians together to build big things and to build a stronger economy. Meanwhile, the Conservative leader has spent 20 years in the House, including as a minister, and has built nothing. He continues to divide Canadians and continues to play political games. Now is not a time to play games. It is time for serious leadership and to step up and build Canada strong.

**Billy Morin (Edmonton Northwest, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is talking out of both sides of his mouth on pipelines and tanker bans. Behind closed doors, he whispers to the Liberal "keep it in the ground" caucus that the pipeline will never be built, while signing an MOU to build one for Canadians. The Liberals say they are for a tanker ban, but then the Prime Minister promised to override it in the MOU. The Prime Minister promises indigenous communities a seat at the table for a pipeline, but has ignored them for the last eight months and is cutting them out of the tripartite decision-making table.

Will the Liberals stop obstructing the pipeline by voting for their own MOU?

**Hon. Mandy Gull-Masty (Minister of Indigenous Services, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to speak to what the Conservative Party claims this motion speaks to. While on one hand they speak to half the sentence of respecting consultations for indigenous people, they are also speaking out of the other side of their mouth to the jurisprudence that would allow these projects to move forward. I want to understand what they are doing. Are they consulting or pushing projects forward? That is the concern of indigenous people. That is what they are bringing to the table. That is what we are looking at when they come and work with us in partnership, and that is the future that they want to decide on with us.

\* \* \*

**REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

**Chris d'Entremont (Acadie—Annapolis, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister said he would be judged by—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**The Speaker:** I was afraid this would happen.

We will not take it from the top, but the member may continue.

**Chris d'Entremont:** Mr. Speaker, the minister responsible for ACOA knows well that fisheries, forestry and agriculture remain at the heart of Nova Scotia's economy.

When the Atlantic economic panel was announced two weeks ago, were representatives from these sectors included? Can the minister tell us how he plans to ensure that these important industries will have a way to contribute to the panel's work?

• (1450)

**Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the former Conservative shadow minister for economic development in Atlantic Canada for finally being permitted to ask a question about Nova Scotia in the House of Commons. It speaks volumes about the Conservative Party that since the member joined the government, it has yet to replace him and goes without a voice from Atlantic Canada representing the economic interests of Atlantic Canada.

Yes, we rely on these traditional industries that he cited in his question, but we have appointed a private sector-led panel of business leaders to shoot the path forward on energy, on defence and on clean tech to ensure we have good-paying jobs—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Thornhill.

### THE ECONOMY

**Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I think it is safe to say, after all of that, that the Prime Minister regrets telling Canadians that he is going to be judged by the prices at the grocery store because these prices are skyrocketing, and it is only getting worse. Now one in 10 people in Toronto are using a food bank and even full-time job holders have to use one. Instead of getting full carts at the grocery store, Canadians get to watch trending TikTok videos about making what they are calling “poverty meals” out of ramen and hot dogs.

Can the Prime Minister seriously say with a straight face that this is the standard that he wants Canadians to live with?

**Hon. Anna Gainey (Secretary of State (Children and Youth), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, while the Prime Minister is delivering for Canadians, let us take a moment to reflect on the hypocrisy of the members opposite in the House. They voted against meals for children at school. They voted against 800 dollars' worth of savings for families through the school food program. They voted against dental care for seniors and for children. They voted against saving parents thousands of dollars on child care.

If the members opposite want to talk about judgment, they should start by looking at their own record.

**Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, after a decade in power, by saying “let Ottawa feed people's kids”, the Liberals have already admitted their failure. Let me put it in context for the minister. The number of people using a food bank in Toronto alone could fill the Rogers Centre eight times every single month. With the average grocery bill set to rise by \$1,000 next year, the government's \$11-a-year tax cut to those who need it most is not going to cut it. Therefore, no, we will not vote for it.

Instead of giving crumbs back to Canadians, why do the Liberals not cut the taxes off of food and let Canadians have a meal at home?

**Hon. Anna Gainey (Secretary of State (Children and Youth), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there is no tax on food; we can start there. Canadian families with children under six are receiving up to \$8,000 a year tax-free per child. This is a program that is tagged to inflation to meet and keep up with the cost of living. Members opposite, year after year, vote against investments like the Canada child benefit. It is shameful.

**Rachael Thomas (Lethbridge, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians are not asking for more government programs. They are just asking for the dignity and respect of being able to provide for themselves and their families. Right now, Canadians are struggling more than ever to be able to afford things. I just received a phone call from an elderly gentleman in my riding who shared with me that he is now down to one meal per day. He is desperate. He is without hope. He is looking at the government and he is saying that it has abandoned him. He is looking for an answer.

Will the Liberals simply repeat their tired talking points about big government programs and the school food program, or will they actually provide a real solution to Canadians?

**Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency**

### Oral Questions

**for Northern Ontario, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if we listen to the Conservatives over there, there is no solution. The solution is to sink or swim. If a person cannot afford to feed their family, too bad, the state's not there to take care of them.

Here in Canada, we have always believed in taking care of each other. That is why we are known for our universal health care system around the world. We have built on that. We make sure that we take care of people who need food. We make sure that families who need extra help get the Canada child benefit. We make sure that the working poor get a working income tax benefit. Why? We believe Canada is stronger when it includes all of us.

**Rachael Thomas (Lethbridge, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, again, Canadians are not asking for more government programs or to be spoken to in the manner that the minister just did. They are simply asking to be respected and empowered to be able to provide for themselves. One of the best ways the government can do that is by taking unnecessary taxes off food. According to the latest report, food prices next year are going to go up by about \$1,000 more per family.

There is a woman in my riding who recently reached out to me. She has four kids. She relies on the food bank. She feels desperate and without hope. She just wants the dignity of being able to provide for her kids.

Will the Liberals—

● (1455)

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

**Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of the Environment, Climate Change and Nature, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think members have heard it from this side, and we will keep on saying it. We are there to support Canadians. Members have heard about the many programs they voted against but that we are putting in place to support Canadians.

However, if we are going to rely on that food report, we should also look at what it said about, for example, the price of beef. It said, “Nearly a decade of drought in the leading beef producing area of Canada has resulted in the smallest number of cattle since the late 1980s. Reduced supply and consistent demand creates upward pressure.” The cost of food is going up because of climate change.

There is no tax on food, but we will be there to provide the programs to help Canadians.

*Oral Questions***FINANCE**

**Jacob Mantle (York—Durham, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, here is a resident the Liberals are not supporting. He wrote to me and said, “I have lived in the same neighbourhood for more than a decade, and almost every essential cost of living has increased dramatically.” He had the receipts for his groceries, which went from \$200 a month to \$600 a month. What did the Prime Minister say? He said we should judge him by the price of groceries at the store. Well, that is some judgment; it is some failure. Next year, it will get worse. Canadians will pay \$1,000 or more, according to the food price report.

Given those struggles, will the Prime Minister end his inflationary spending, scrap the carbon tax and get rid of the new fuel tax?

**Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance and National Revenue and to the Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is almost the holidays, with goodwill to all. The opposition leader says no, let us circle back next year after his leadership review. Meanwhile, hard-working Canadians wait for a well-earned tax break. They wait for a \$50,000 tax cut for first-time homebuyers. Children wait for healthy meals at school. Families and seniors wait for affordable housing.

In addition to that, this member will not even stand up in the House and support the health care infrastructure fund; this would build a hospital in the Durham Region, which is badly needed for families. He should be ashamed of himself.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**THE ECONOMY**

**Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable—Lotbinière, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister, sitting just a few feet away from me, has made this personal. He told Canadians that they should judge him by the price of groceries. No matter what excuses all the other Liberals come up with today, the Prime Minister was the one who set the bar on how to judge him. Not only has he failed miserably, but next year's grocery bill is going to cost the average family \$1,000 more.

Why is the Prime Minister misleading Canadians as they line up at food banks in growing numbers because of his inflationary spending?

**Hon. Joël Lightbound (Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, after expending so much energy to get elected to the House of Commons, it is sad to see members come here day after day and simply repeat the same talking points written by the Leader of the Opposition.

To answer his question, it is even sadder to see my colleague vote against measures like the Canada child benefit or the national school food program, which is saving the most vulnerable families \$800. He votes against affordable housing and against the Canadian dental care plan.

I would like him to tell me what he is thinking of when he talks about inflationary spending.

**Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable—Lotbinière, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am thinking of the consultants, the bureaucracy, the corporate welfare. Not a single one of those members is standing up to defend the words of the Prime Minister, who told Canadians they would judge him on the cost of groceries. Those were his words. Now 36% of Quebecers are experiencing food insecurity. The food banks in Quebec are receiving three million visits a month. The Prime Minister's wealthy friends do not have to worry because they do not have to skip any meals. They get to eat their fill.

He promised to lower the cost of food. He misled Canadians.

Will he finally keep his word and stop spending so much money so that everyone can eat?

**Hon. Joël Lightbound (Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in my previous answer, I listed everything the Conservatives have voted against. These are measures that directly support the people in my colleague's riding and Quebecers and Canadians across the country.

We were elected to provide opportunities to young Quebecers and to Canadians from coast to coast to coast. That is exactly what we are doing. In November, 54,000 jobs were created. In October, 67,000 jobs were created. In September, 60,000 jobs were created. The unemployment rate is falling and so is the inflation rate because on this side of the House, we are building the strongest economy in the G7.

**Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister said that we should judge him by the cost of groceries. Eight months later, grocery prices are skyrocketing and families are struggling to put food on the table. Canada's Food Price Report 2026 shows that the situation is only going to get worse.

Back home in Saguenay, the Corporation de développement communautaire du Roc, which is made up of 70 community organizations that provide food aid, says that demand is growing faster than resources.

When will the Liberals stop their inflationary spending so that Canadians can finally have enough to eat?

● (1500)

**Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge and commend my esteemed colleague for the great job he did coaching the Chicoutimi Saguenéens.

What he may not realize is that no one in Saguenay is asking the government to eliminate the school food program, support for organizations and volunteers, the Canada child benefit or support for housing. No one in Saguenay is asking for that.

I would like the member to vote with us to keep these support measures for people in Saguenay and across the country.

*Oral Questions*

**Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Liberals need to stop burying their heads in the sand and look at what is happening on the ground. The majority of requests now come from families where both parents work. It is not just single parents anymore. This is alarming. The annual food price report predicts every family will be paying an additional \$1,000 per year for food. This is one of the largest increases ever seen.

When will the government let Canadians eat properly?

**Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement, asked a very important question earlier: What exactly is inflationary spending?

We keep asking this question month after month, day after day, and week after week in this chamber. Is it support for aluminum workers? Is it support for school food? Is it the dental care program? Is it health transfers?

After all these months, can someone tell us what inflationary spending means?

\* \* \*

[English]

**REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

**Ben Carr (Winnipeg South Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in my father's dying days, he mustered the courage to stand in this chamber to fight for the passage of his private member's bill, which set out a vision for the prairie provinces to continue playing their prominent role in our federation. That vision was realized with the passage of the Building a Green Prairie Economy Act, which received royal assent shortly after his passing, on December 12, 2022.

Can the Minister responsible for Prairies Economic Development Canada share how the newly announced prairie partnership initiative enhances this vision and establishes new opportunities for growth across Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba?

**Hon. Eleanor Olszewski (Minister of Emergency Management and Community Resilience and Minister responsible for Prairies Economic Development Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for Winnipeg South Centre for his continued support as we advance the legacy his father set in motion for a stronger prairie economy.

The prairie partnership initiative is a new, coordinated approach that gives significant prairie projects a clear pathway through the federal system so that they can move from ambition to action. By aligning federal expertise with prairie priorities, the PPI will help meet this critical moment by positioning the Prairies at the—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Middlesex—London.

\* \* \*

**THE ECONOMY**

**Lianne Rood (Middlesex—London, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister told Canadians he should be judged by prices at the grocery store. Well, Canadians have judged, and they are angry. When the Liberals came into office in 2015, the Canadian grocery

bill was \$159 a week. After 10 years, it has more than doubled, to \$338. Greg from Komoka wrote to me to say he is sick of the “rules for you and not for me” attitude. Families cannot afford meat, and they are lining up at food banks while the Liberals continue to feast at the public's expense. Why does the Prime Minister think he deserves luxury when Canadians cannot afford lunch?

**Hon. Adam van Koeverden (Secretary of State (Sport), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, watching the leader of the Conservative Party lose in slow motion today has been a little amusing, but what is more interesting is watching him do it with a big grin on his face, because he is so proud of himself. He is proud to vote against child care; he is proud to vote against school food programs, and he is so proud to vote against affordable housing. What else is he proud of today? He is proud to call climate change just “weather”, and he is proud to refer to indigenous people with a possessive pronoun; they are not ours.

He seems very proud of himself, but do members know what Canadians are proud of? They are proud of our institutions; they are proud of programs that support them, and they are proud of this side, of this government: We are supporting them.

• (1505)

**Lianne Rood (Middlesex—London, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, people are starving, and this member is making fun of things.

I say that the Liberals should all be judged by the prices at the grocery store. Bad Liberal policies are what is driving up the cost of food by \$1,000 next year.

Katelyn from Thames Centre says that the government is driving us into systemic destruction as the cost of food, fuel and groceries soar. Alber from Strathroy asks why the Prime Minister promised cheaper groceries, safer streets and more homes, but after seven months, all he has delivered is higher prices, higher crime and less for hard-working Canadians.

Do the Liberals even care that there are over 2.2 million visits to food banks, or are they just here to help Brookfield line the Prime Minister's pocket?

**Hon. Adam van Koeverden (Secretary of State (Sport), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, first, there is no tax on groceries. There is no tax on food. There will never be taxes on groceries, and there will never be taxes on food. That member is a farmer; she should know better. She should know that the industrial carbon price has absolutely no impact on the cost of groceries.

### Oral Questions

The Conservatives keep talking about things like the price of coffee. Maybe they should stand up and talk about how industrial carbon prices in Canada affect the Colombian price of coffee. It is absurd.

Conservatives are very proud to vote against all the programs that support Canadians, but they could provide Canadians with just one solution to help them at the grocery store over this holiday season.

Merry Christmas.

\* \* \*

### CARBON PRICING

**Kevin Waugh (Saskatoon South, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister told Canadians he should be judged by prices at the grocery store. I have a better idea: He should come to my food bank. There are 23,000 visits a month at the Saskatoon Food Bank. Better yet, we have a resurgence of scurvy in northern Saskatchewan. “Canada’s Food Price Report” confirms that an additional \$1,000 will be needed next year to feed a family of four.

Is the Prime Minister ready to remove the industrial carbon tax?

**Hon. Buckley Belanger (Secretary of State (Rural Development), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, let us see what this tired, old opposition has accomplished in the last 10 years. As for addressing food affordability, there is zero achievement. As for addressing housing needs, there is zero achievement. As for building major projects, there is zero achievement. As for addressing the challenge of tariffs, there is zero achievement.

However, their negative attitude towards Canada must stop, because if the Conservatives do not stop attacking Canada, I am saying today that I am going to take every single one of them off my Christmas card list.

\* \* \*

### THE ECONOMY

**Sukh Dhaliwal (Surrey Newton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, last week, the President of the Treasury Board held and co-hosted a summit on reduction of red tape, bringing together leaders from across the country. Could the president update the House on what came out of this summit and how this work will help cut red tape, speed up approvals and strengthen Canada’s economy?

**Hon. Shafqat Ali (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the summit was an important step forward, building on the 60-day red tape review we launched in July. We recently announced a new series of horizontal reviews. These reviews look across government to eliminate regulatory barriers and deliver faster and more reliable services so that we can grow our economy faster, build Canada strong and build the strongest economy in the G7.

\* \* \*

### CARBON PRICING

**Kerry Diotte (Edmonton Griesbach, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister told Canadians that he should be judged by prices at the grocery store. Well, eight months later, those prices have skyrocketed. I have heard countless horror stories in Edmonton of fam-

ilies struggling to afford food. I have even heard of single moms selling their furniture online to pay for rent and groceries. Just this week, Miranda from North Edmonton told me she honestly does not know how people are getting by; it is heat or eat.

When will the Liberals cut their inflationary spending and gas the industrial carbon tax so that Canadians can afford to eat?

● (1510)

**Hon. Stephanie McLean (Secretary of State (Seniors), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as 2025 winds down and we are reviewing our Spotify wrapped, let us look at the Conservatives’ 2025 wrapped.

In 2025, the Conservatives lost their fourth election in a row, spent Alberta’s money on a by-election so they could say they created at least one job, invented imaginary taxes and presented a platform with no plan to support seniors or families. Conservatives need to work on their playlist, because they are not listening to the same tunes as Canadians.

\* \* \*

### NATURAL RESOURCES

**Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the former Liberal environment minister says this government approved a bitumen pipeline that abandons Canada’s climate goals and risks B.C.’s coast.

In the House, the Prime Minister said that British Columbia and impacted first nations must agree to this project. In B.C., the energy minister claimed that free, prior and informed consent would be required, but the MOU signed between Ottawa and Alberta says no such thing.

The Liberals are telling one story here, another in B.C., and yet another in Alberta. Canadians deserve to know, is consent for this pipeline required or not?

**Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of the Environment, Climate Change and Nature, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister was very clear in the House. He said that the agreement requires agreement from British Columbia and the agreement of first nations. That has been said in the House, and we stand by that, right here, right now. We will continue to.

## THE BUDGET

**Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Mr. Speaker, one section of the enormous Bill C-15, in the over 600 pages of an omnibus budget bill, has not yet been even mentioned in this place and was not mentioned in the budget either.

The idea that the budget implementation act just implements things in the budget is belied by pages 301 to 304, which would exempt the application of Canadian law to any entity, which could be people or corporations, at the discretion of the minister, with no public oversight.

Can anyone here, particularly the Minister of Finance, explain this?

**Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance and National Revenue and to the Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I agree with the member that the budget bill is full of really great measures for this country.

One thing we can all acknowledge is that Canada has world-class innovators and entrepreneurs, those of whom will help us build the strongest economy in the G7. As part of that process, we are reducing red tape to broaden the use of something called regulatory sandboxes to help foster and spur research and development and innovation.

We will do this in a responsible way and in a forward-looking way. In a temporary way, these will be authorizations that are limited, but they will help us keep up with the speed of innovation in this country.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

## POINTS OF ORDER

### RELEVANCE OF ANSWERS DURING ORAL QUESTIONS—SPEAKER'S RULING

**The Speaker:** I am now prepared to rule on the point of order raised on December 4 by the member for Saint-Jean concerning the relevance of answers during oral questions.

In her point of order, the member for Saint-Jean argued that some recent answers from the government were not only off topic but completely unrelated to the business of Parliament. She asked the Chair to clarify whether, like questions, the answers given during question period must also pertain to the business of the House.

The member for Mégantic—L'Érable—Lotbinière raised a related point about the questions from the member for Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, during a previous sitting, that the Chair had interrupted before he could finish asking them.

I will address these two points in turn.

Regarding the answers provided by the government, *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, fourth edition, states, in section 11.12:

The Speaker ensures that replies adhere to the standards of order, decorum and parliamentary language, but is not responsible for the quality or content of replies to questions.

## Speaker's Ruling

It is not, and has never been, up to the Chair to determine whether an answer is appropriate. Multiple rulings by my predecessors have underscored the Chair's limited authority over the content of answers. In a decision delivered by one of them, the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle, on January 28, 2014, which appears on page 2204 of the Debates, he said the following:

Successive Speakers in our House have maintained our tradition of not intervening in respect of answers to questions, and I do not intend to change that.

With respect to the slightly different concern raised by the member for Mégantic—L'Érable—Lotbinière about questions, *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, fourth edition, in section 11.7, states clearly that questions should be “within the administrative responsibility of the government or of the individual minister addressed.”

● (1515)

[English]

It follows that the Chair then has a role to play in assessing the admissibility of questions. My immediate predecessor made clear what the Chair's expectations are when a member rose to ask a question. On December 10, 2024, at page 28755 of the debates, he stated:

If members want to ensure their questions are in order and to get an answer from the government, they need to phrase them clearly and to quickly make a direct connection to the government's administrative responsibility.

This is advice that I also endorse without reservation. When such a connection is not made, members risk being interrupted by the Chair.

[Translation]

More generally, until the House changes its practices regarding the admissibility of both questions and answers during oral questions, the powers of the Chair to address their content will remain unchanged.

That being said, the Chair understands some of the dissatisfaction expressed by the member for Saint-Jean. The Chair is in full agreement with an assertion made by my predecessor from Regina—Qu'Appelle in the decision referenced earlier:

The onus is on all Members to raise the quality of both questions and answers.

The Chair hopes that this sensible reminder will continue to guide members on both sides of the House in the days ahead.

I thank all members for their attention.

*Business of Supply***GOVERNMENT ORDERS***[English]***BUSINESS OF SUPPLY**

## OPPOSITION MOTION—PIPELINE CONSTRUCTION

The House resumed consideration of the motion, and of the amendment.

**Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, for generations, Fort McMurray—Cold Lake and its oil industry offered a beacon of hope to countless people from across Canada and around the world to work hard and make a great life. My family has called Fort McMurray home for over 50 years. My dad and grandparents moved up to Fort McMurray in the 1970s in search of a better life. They worked hard to provide opportunities for their family and give back to their community.

Fort McMurray Wood Buffalo is home to the third-largest proven oil deposit in the world, and 97% of Canada's oil comes from the oil sands. Ninety-six per cent of Canada's oil sands oil comes from the Fort McMurray region. Canada's oil sands production averages 3.1 million barrels a day.

I am proud to stand here representing Canadian oil sands workers in Parliament. Many years ago, like my dad and my grandfather before me, I laced up steel-toed boots and reported to work in health and safety in the oil sands. I understand how hard the people who work in Canada's energy sector work. They work long hours and rotating shifts in harsh weather conditions, yet thousands of workers show up every single day to ensure that our houses stay warm in the winter and cool in the summer, and that the lights are always on when we need them.

Canada's energy sector currently employs nearly a million people, providing strong paycheques and life-changing opportunities for families and communities nationwide, and the oil and gas industry is among the largest employers of indigenous people in Canada. As I fly back and forth to Ottawa, I meet oil sands workers coming from every corner of the country.

In 2022, oil and gas contributed \$45 billion in revenue to Canadian governments, funding schools, hospitals, roads and other important public infrastructure, yet after 10 years of Liberal governments, Canada's economy is struggling. Eco-radicals sit around the cabinet table and advocate against Canada's world-class energy sector at every opportunity. The Liberal "leave it in the ground" caucus is alive and well, and it has made no attempt to hide its hatred for Canadian oil and gas.

I wish this MOU was a promise for a pipeline. Our country could really benefit from that kind of certainty and hope. The Prime Minister promised to build now and move at unimaginable speeds, yet, eight months in, Canadians have nothing but paper shuffling, press conferences and photo ops.

The anti-energy agenda from the Liberals has been consistent and punishing over the last decade: anti-energy messaging, delays, arbitrary and inconsistent regulatory conditions and an outright veto of an approved export pipeline. The Liberal "keep it in the ground" caucus knows more oil will not be produced if it cannot get to mar-

ket, which is precisely why it is so obstinately against any kind of existing pipeline expansions.

With all the debates happening around pipelines, one might think they were new, yet they have existed since before Canadian Confederation. Canada's first natural gas pipeline was built in Enniskillen Township near Sarnia, Ontario in 1853. That is 172 years ago. In 1862, the first oil pipeline was built from Petrolia to Sarnia in Ontario. It was in 1947 with Leduc No. 1 and 1948 with the Redwater discovery that pipeline construction really started to accelerate in Canada. Alberta's oil was soon connected to markets.

Oil sands, which is a mixture of bitumen, clay, sand and water, was developed by Dr. Karl Clark as a hot water separation process that then paved the way for large-scale development in the Fort McMurray region. The first major commercial operation was the Great Canadian Oil Sands, now Suncor, which opened in 1967.

Just as in the earliest days of oil development, pipelines were the solution to get oil and gas from source to market. There are more than 840,000 kilometres of pipelines that criss-cross the country. This is a direct quote from Natural Resources Canada's website: "Pipelines are a safe, reliable and environmentally friendly way of transporting oil and gas." It goes on to say, "On average each year, 99.999 percent of the oil transported on federally regulated pipelines moves safely."

Canadians should be the world's energy producer and supplier of choice. Our economy should be self-reliant. We should have energy sovereignty and energy independence, yet Liberals time and time again put ideology ahead of supporting our economy. Liberal MPs do not mince their words when speaking about their hatred of pipelines. The MP for Victoria said, "I have heard from my constituents on this today and for several months. They, like me, are decisively not in support." Then there is the MP for Laurier—Sainte-Marie, who quit cabinet over the MOU and said, "I sincerely doubt that the new pipeline will ever get built." The MP for Fleetwood—Port Kells said they must have the consent of the Premier of British Columbia, and if not, "there will be no pipeline".

● (1520)

The B.C. NDP Premier, from whom the member for Fleetwood—Port Kells wants to have consent, has said, "it will never be built" and "I am not in favour of shipping raw bitumen through our coast by lifting the oil tanker ban".

Liberals now claim to value Canadian oil and gas and say they want to increase exports, but after a decade in office, their track record is interfering to kill four pipelines, two of which were specifically designed to export off the west and east coasts. Now they have dangled the promise of a pipeline, maybe, one day.

*Business of Supply*

The Prime Minister needs to do only one thing to get a pipeline approved: Get out of the way. Unblock trillions of dollars of private sector money and investments to build pipelines and energy infrastructure in Canada. By getting governments out of the way, we will boost the Canadian economy, create more good-paying jobs and strengthen the Canadian dollar, which will in turn make gas, groceries and homes more affordable and our economy self-reliant, secure and sovereign.

As described earlier, to so many Canadians, Fort McMurray represented a beacon of hope and prosperity and an opportunity for a fresh start. To the world's leading oil producers, Fort McMurray is a tough competitor that refuses to lie down, but for far too many politicians in this chamber, it is simply a cash cow, and to the fringe eco-activists, it is the enemy.

To me, Fort McMurray has and will always be home. I was born and raised there, and Conservatives of every stripe have always had our back. They understand that when Fort McMurray works, Alberta works, and when Alberta works, Canada works. I will not back down from the politicians in this chamber who seek to landlock and firewall the oil sands. Pipelines and energy corridors are of critical interest and importance for the long-term viability of the Canadian economy.

Hope is on the horizon, though. Conservatives are going to do what we have consistently done for decades: Support Canadian oil and gas, its workers and the Canadian economy. Unlike Liberals, Conservatives are united, and we sure do not have a “keep it in the ground” caucus. We are consistent in our position, and we will say the same thing whether we are in British Columbia, Alberta, Newfoundland or Nunavut, or anywhere in between.

Conservatives will keep fighting to boost Canadian paycheques; make energy, food and homes affordable; and make our economy self-reliant, secure and sovereign. Frankly, it is about time, and we have the energy.

• (1525)

**Hon. Judy A. Sgro (Humber River—Black Creek, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think there is a lot of enthusiasm in the House for things to be done right.

I want to ask the member if she is going to support the government's MOU.

**Laila Goodridge:** Mr. Speaker, it is really challenging. We pulled the words for this motion directly from the Liberals' MOU. We did not mince words or do something, play politics or change anything up. The fact that the Liberals and the “keep it in the ground” caucus have somehow convinced the government to vote against this is shameful.

I hope the Liberals do the right thing, support our motion and show Canadian energy workers that they have their backs, but I highly doubt they will.

**Alex Ruff (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I would like my hon. colleague to elaborate on the benefits of getting more Canadian liquefied natural gas and oil to foreign markets, not only to help combat climate change but also to give economic benefits to Canadians by growing our economy and getting these natural resources to market.

**Laila Goodridge:** Mr. Speaker, there would be a lot of benefits if we were able to get our energy to market. We would be able to displace dirty dictator oil from regimes like Russia and help put an end to the war in Ukraine, and we could help displace coal. We are in the position we are in because the Liberals, for the last decade, have said that there is no business case every time governments have come asking us to develop our LNG in different markets.

We cannot even provide all of the energy to our own country. We cannot get our energy from the west coast to the east coast because this Liberal government, for the last 10 years, has stood in the way at every single opportunity.

Conservatives will be consistent, just like we have been for decades. We will support Canadian energy workers and Canadian energy.

[*Translation*]

**Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski—La Matapédia, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, today is all about the Conservative fantasy: pipelines and “drill, baby, drill”. We need to refocus the debate on the facts. The federal Liberal government bought a pipeline called Trans Mountain. In 2017, it was supposed to cost about \$7.4 billion. How much did it actually cost? It cost taxpayers \$34 billion, which is six to seven times more than the project was supposed to cost. The Parliamentary Budget Officer told us that, if the government were to sell it tomorrow morning, it would lose money. Now the Conservatives are telling us that we need another pipeline. Do they enjoy losing Quebecers' and Canadians' money? Is that what the Conservatives are telling us? Would a new pipeline serve a market in Asia? No, there is no such market. They do not want to say that in their speeches.

Where are those good Conservative stewards of the public purse now? A pipeline is not profitable, okay? It will not put money in Quebecers' pockets.

I invite my colleague to answer this simple question. The other day, I asked a Conservative colleague if the money for this would be public or private. He told me that no public money would be invested. Why are they now saying the opposite?

• (1530)

**The Deputy Speaker:** Before I recognize the member for Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, I would like to remind members that normally, during questions and comments, only one member should rise at a time. Sometimes, depending on where the member is in the chamber, they may appear on camera. I would therefore remind members that they must rise one at a time and that members may attempt to get the Chair's attention when it is time to ask or answer a question.

The hon. member for Fort McMurray—Cold Lake.

*Business of Supply*

**Laila Goodridge:** Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives are calling on the government to facilitate private investment in Canada's energy sector. It has become extremely difficult for companies to invest here, and that means the industry has been dependent on the government for the past decade. Today, oil companies want to invest, but they are hesitant because of delays and the anti-energy policies put in place by the Liberals.

We need to diversify our approaches and build pipelines to access foreign markets. Several countries are clamouring for our natural gas, our liquefied natural gas, or LNG, and our oil. These markets exist, and we need to do more to ensure that pipelines can be built here with private funding.

**Claude Guay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Humber River—Black Creek.

Throughout Canada, from the far north to our urban centres and smaller communities, Canadians expect their government to show true leadership in dealing with the greatest challenge of our time, and that is climate change.

Our path to prosperity, our vision for energy, the economy and security, cannot and must not come at the expense of our planet, our children, or our duty to act with courage and conviction to reach net zero. That is why the memorandum of understanding recently signed between Canada and Alberta is so important. It is proof of our commitment to building Canada while reducing our greenhouse gas emissions.

Canada must provide the energy the world needs with environmental rigour and by advancing unwaveringly towards a prosperous and sustainable economy. While Canada and Alberta work together in a renewed spirit of collaboration, as evidenced by the MOU, we are creating the conditions for projects that will strengthen our economy while fighting climate change. Together, we are moving forward on the Pathways Plus project, the largest carbon capture and storage initiative in the world. The Pathways Plus project will help cut emissions in our conventional energy sector to make it more competitive globally while generating significant economic benefits, including investments of more than \$16 billion and the creation of more than 18,000 jobs.

That is what happens when we collaborate: We have the opportunity to shape a future where Canada's energy leadership and its climate ambitions move forward together. As long as the world is using oil and gas, we must ensure that the oil that Canada provides is produced with the lowest carbon emissions possible. Technologies such as carbon capture and storage will help Canada produce some of the lowest-emitting oil and gas in the world. These initiatives will strengthen Canada's industrial and climate competitiveness, support the development of Canadian clean technologies, and move us closer to our goal of becoming a clean and conventional energy superpower while achieving net zero.

Furthermore, our industrial carbon pricing system is pushing industries to adopt clean technologies and develop clean energy. The MOU signed with Alberta is clear: Alberta's industrial carbon price has to increase from \$25 to at least \$130. According to a report by Clean Prosperity, a minimum price of \$130 in Alberta could reduce

carbon emissions by 70 megatonnes a year and unlock more than \$90 billion in clean tech and energy investments.

Consistent industrial carbon pricing guarantees a sustainable and predictable financial incentive for reducing emissions, investing in clean tech and decarbonizing supply chains. Industrial carbon pricing deserves credit for the largest emissions reduction in our climate plan. The MOU with Alberta is strengthening industrial carbon pricing while building a national consensus in support of it. It is one example of how co-operation and technological innovation can work together to achieve real progress. The MOU clearly states that growth in the conventional energy sector will have to include some of the largest, measurable reductions in greenhouse gas emissions in the world, along with concrete measures for fighting climate change.

These are the facts: The MOU reaffirms the commitments made by Canada and Alberta to achieve net-zero emissions by 2050. That is a section that was left out of the Conservative Party's motion. This is not just a dream. This commitment is based on measures to reduce emissions from oil production through Pathways Plus, a carbon capture and storage project, as well as through robust industrial carbon pricing and through methane emissions reductions.

● (1535)

Indeed, the MOU sets the path for Alberta and Canada to reduce methane emissions. It aims for a 75% reduction in methane emissions from the sector by 2035 compared with 2014 levels. In short, resource development and climate leadership will advance together, ensuring that growth is directly linked to real, verified greenhouse gas emission reductions. These are not generic targets. The MOU sets a goal for Canadian heavy oil to achieve excellence in carbon emissions reduction and reach net-zero emissions by 2050. To achieve these results, the MOU links progress to key investments in transformative technologies.

The MOU supports and promotes rapid growth in the clean energy sectors. By integrating new interconnections between provinces and promoting the expansion of renewable energy production in western Canada, the MOU enables system-wide decarbonization. This is not just about reducing emissions from oil production, but also about building a clean electricity grid.

We cannot call on other countries to cut their emissions while failing to demonstrate that prosperity can go hand in hand with the fight against climate change. Our world-class record in terms of emissions, the rights of indigenous peoples and consultation is precisely what makes Canada an attractive energy supplier for our allies that care about reliability, security and environmental progress. By setting ambitious greenhouse gas emission targets in all sectors, investing in low-carbon technologies and encouraging innovation through a predictable and robust industrial carbon pricing system, Canada sends a clear signal to investors and its trade partners that Canada will influence global trends in the fight against climate change.

There is no trade-off between prosperity and the fight against climate change. There is only leadership and collaboration. The government's goal is to work with provinces, territories and indigenous people to build Canada. A collaborative approach is the very foundation of our Confederation. One of the next steps in the implementation of the agreement will consist in engaging in immediate trilateral discussion with British Columbia and Alberta. Some constructive conversations with British Columbia have already taken place.

Indigenous rights must also be respected by engaging in meaningful consultation and encouraging participation and partnership with indigenous peoples. We have made it clear that shared ownership with indigenous communities is an essential requirement for any prospective pipeline project. That is one more thing that was left out of the Conservative motion.

Canada stands ready to lead with bold action, striking a balance between growth and responsible stewardship and showing the world that prosperity uplifts people and the planet. We are ready to lead by example and to build.

• (1540)

[English]

**Tako Van Popta (Langley Township—Fraser Heights, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, about a year ago Alberta Central reported that with the opening of the TMX expansion, bringing more oil to global markets, the selling price of a barrel of Canadian crude went up by \$8. This is not just the new barrels but all barrels. This is because, with the pipeline, we had more access to global markets and could bid up our price.

Would the member agree that pipelines are good for Canada's economy?

**Claude Guay:** Mr. Speaker, I totally agree, and the MOU is actually to diversify our market. We totally intend to work with Alberta to give access to the Asian market. It actually is stated in the MOU. I regret to inform the member that the motion put forward does not include that portion of the MOU. We totally agree about the market, but we would like all the pieces of the MOU to be included in the motion.

[Translation]

**Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski—La Matapédia, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, what is the world coming to? Now we are wondering whether the Liberals still believe in climate change. From what they are saying, it seems as though they have spent too much time with the Conservatives, or perhaps the Conservatives have spent

### *Business of Supply*

too much time with the Liberals. Either way, red or blue, it amounts to more or less the same thing. They all want more pipelines.

I would like my colleague to explain something to me. As we know, in his previous life, the Prime Minister worked for Brookfield with his friends who have ties to pipelines, but he was also the United Nations special envoy on climate action and finance. At the time, he said that we needed to keep fossil fuels in the ground.

Now that he is Prime Minister of Canada, he is telling us that we need a new pipeline, that we need to diversify our economy and that we need to placate the separatists in Alberta and not stir them up too much, because that could lead to Quebec becoming independent. What he is telling us today is pure hypocrisy through and through. First the member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie resigned as minister, and now they are telling us lies.

What is the real story? Do the Liberals believe in climate change or not?

**The Deputy Speaker:** One of the last words used by the member is not usually allowed in the House, so members must be careful how they use it, even if it is not directed at one member in particular.

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources.

**Claude Guay:** Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what my hon. colleague was doing during my 10-minute speech in which I talked about climate change and all the measures we included in the framework agreement we signed with Alberta. We are very proud to have persuaded Alberta to agree to diversify our conventional and clean energy sources by signing this agreement, which includes many climate change measures and related language.

My response to my hon. colleague is that, yes, we believe in climate change, and we will continue to address it while building a strong Canada.

**Hon. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would first like to congratulate my colleague on his excellent speech.

I have a question for him. A Conservative member said in the House earlier that we are 10 years behind the times when it comes to believing in Canada.

Could my colleague comment on the fact that the Conservatives no longer have confidence in Canada and that they spend all their time here in the House, as elected officials, speaking out against Canada? They have a truly anti-Canadian attitude.

What does my colleague have to say to the Quebeckers who elected him to this place?

*Business of Supply*

• (1545)

**Claude Guay:** Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to call attention to the last motion moved by our Conservative colleagues. This motion seeks to divide Canada.

Conservative representatives from different provinces across the country support the framework agreement. We have persuaded a province that had been relatively reluctant until now to participate in our decarbonization measures and to embrace a series of federal government measures, and we should be very proud of that.

I find it unfortunate that our Conservative friends chose to include only one aspect of the framework agreement in a motion that says nothing about climate change.

[*English*]

**Hon. Judy A. Sgro (Humber River—Black Creek, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is always good to see you in the Chair, keeping control of all of the comments that are made here in the House.

I am pleased to rise today to speak to the issue of the recently signed Canada-Alberta memorandum of understanding and the duty to consult with indigenous peoples on its implementation.

Let me begin by saying that Canada and Alberta are committed to respecting aboriginal and treaty rights. We have heard it from the minister and we have heard from the Prime Minister continually about engaging in early, consistent and meaningful consultation with indigenous peoples. This will have to be done in a manner that promotes reconciliation and respects the rights and cultures of indigenous peoples while advancing economic opportunities through indigenous ownership and partnership.

The Building Canada Act makes sure that first nations, Inuit and Métis people participate in full partnership in building a strong, fairer economy. It is intentional that section 35 rights are embedded in the legislation, with a requirement to engage in consultation with affected section 35 rights holders at key stages: first, before a project is designated as being in the national interest; second, before the issuance of the conditions document; and, third, before any amendment to the conditions document.

I am going to repeat those three conditions. They are before a project is designated, before the issuance of the conditions document and before any amendment to the conditions document. All of that will have to happen before any progress will be made.

Free, prior and informed consent will also be a central tenet guiding the federal government's approach to implementing the Building Canada Act. Major projects will only proceed following meaningful consultation and, where appropriate, accommodation. This past summer, the government convened three distinctions-based meetings with first nations, Inuit and Métis leaders to discuss the Building Canada Act and how best to work together. There were frank exchanges, and first nations, Inuit and Métis representatives from across Canada had the opportunity to comment and to share their views.

Further, as promised by the Prime Minister, collaboration has continued with first nations leadership at all levels through regional dialogue tables. These meetings are helping shape the path forward together to advance major projects, including projects of national

interest. The Major Projects Office is the single point of contact, as well as the leadership, on major projects, partnering with federal departments, provinces, territories, indigenous peoples and the private sector. Its mandate is to advance nation-building projects that connect Canada's economy, diversify trade and industries, create good jobs, protect the environment and uphold indigenous rights.

By streamlining approvals and committing to a two-year timeline for major project decisions, the Government of Canada is creating a more efficient and predictable environment to give investors and project proponents, such as Iqaluit hydro, the certainty they need. What I have heard from all of the members on the other side today are ways to move things along faster when they have the right conditions.

Advancing the interests of indigenous peoples is a vital part of advancing major projects and one of the factors considered in the designation of projects to be in the national interest. I wish to underline that meaningful consultation is key to the success of all future major projects. I do not think anyone on this side of the House is prepared or would be prepared to ram something through, which is what I am hearing on the other side of the House.

That is why Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada has been engaging with indigenous partners to improve how federal consultation happens, including during major project processes and Crown consultation coordination, and to better understand indigenous priorities for economic prosperity. We will work with the new federal Major Projects Office and other federal departments to share what we have heard about indigenous interests and economic priorities, including community-supported major projects, consultation expertise and how best to strengthen those partnerships.

• (1550)

This includes updating the federal guidelines on consultation, using consultation protocol agreements and resource centres to help guide and inform these processes, continuing to include consultation provisions in new modern treaty and self-government arrangements and reviewing consultation provisions in existing modern treaty and self-government arrangements to ensure they reflect the latest legal and policy developments.

The Major Projects Office's work also benefits from the leadership and guidance of an indigenous advisory council, which provides expert advice on policy, operational practices and process improvements related to the inclusion of indigenous perspectives and interests in major projects. The council will also support the Major Projects Office by championing indigenous partnerships and economic participation in all major projects in Canada. Consultation continues to be a prerequisite.

The focus of the council will be to provide insightful counsel on policies and processes related to major projects. It will provide expert advice on policy, operational practices and process improvements related to the inclusion of indigenous perspectives on, and interest in, major projects and regulatory processes, including the integration of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act principles. Doing so is reconciliation in action.

Members of the council were selected based on their expertise and knowledge of major projects, economic development, indigenous rights and of course the regulatory space. Members bring diverse perspectives and demonstrated leadership. Some of the members were also nominated by indigenous governments and organizations. The council will also shape how the Major Projects Office works with first nations, Inuit and Métis, as well as modern treaty and self-government partners.

I wish to point out that the duty to consult is a legal requirement that will be carried out by the government and not the council. The establishment of the indigenous advisory council does not replace section 35 obligations for consultations with rights holders under the modern treaties act.

To strengthen the indigenous capacity to participate in these processes, the federal government has allocated \$40 million over two years in dedicated funding to support consultation and preparation for community readiness activities as they relate to major projects. When we invest in indigenous economies, we grow the entire country's economy. When indigenous partners lead major projects, things move faster and the results last longer. That is how we build trust. That is how we build prosperity.

To provide increased opportunities for first nations, Inuit and Métis to gain equity stakes in nation-building projects, we have doubled the indigenous loan guarantee program from \$5 billion to \$10 billion. This program helps indigenous groups get more affordable loans for major projects by having the federal government guarantee the loan. One example earlier this year is from the Canada Development Investment Corporation. Through its subsidiary, the Canada indigenous loan guarantee program issued its first loan guarantee for \$400 million of a \$736-million investment in 38 first nations.

I am pleased to answer questions.

• (1555)

**Ellis Ross (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for that well-documented speech on aboriginal rights and title and aboriginal issues. I was part of a team that helped put together protocols on how to breathe life into section 35 almost 20 years ago. However, we already have an example of first nation issues with the Trans Mountain pipeline that the Liberal government just got through purchasing. It did not get consent from 100% of the first nations involved with the pipeline in consultations.

Does the member believe the pipeline that is being proposed right now needs 100% consent from all the first nations involved in this project?

### *Business of Supply*

**Hon. Judy A. Sgro:** Mr. Speaker, I welcome my colleague to the House. I think this is the first time we have had an opportunity to exchange a few words together. I thank him for the work that he did on establishing those protocols.

I would sincerely hope that everyone on the other side of the House would ensure, as I and I am sure all of my colleagues intend to, that the things we are committing to will happen. If the conditions that are spelled out are not met to their full extent, I would not expect anything to move forward.

[*Translation*]

**Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski—La Matapédia, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleague to explain why her government ignores scientific opinions on projects of national interest, such as the pipeline it proposes to build.

I questioned Canada's chief science advisor at the Standing Committee on Science and Research. When I asked her to confirm that the government was creating a law in order to circumvent every law but the Criminal Code, including environmental, tax and transportation laws, she told me that she was never consulted about the list of projects of national interest and then described the situation as a “nightmare”.

The Liberals, like the Conservatives, are ignoring the science. At least the Conservatives admit it. The Liberals only turn to science when it suits them. I would like my colleague to explain why, in her country, all of the chief science advisor's opinions get shelved.

[*English*]

**Hon. Judy A. Sgro:** Mr. Speaker, at the moment there is no pipeline. There will only be a pipeline when the multitude of conditions that have been put on the table as a possibility of moving forward get met. Otherwise, there will be no pipeline to have a discussion about.

**Hon. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is an excellent colleague who has been here for quite some time and has seen the different phases of Conservatives in the House. Earlier, the member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley, in B.C., talked about the fact that we are 10 years late to believe in Canada. This new brand of Conservatives constantly talks down Canada. It is almost like they have an anti-Canadian sentiment.

Can the hon. member comment on this phenomenon that we are seeing in the House right now?

**Hon. Judy A. Sgro:** Mr. Speaker, this is a time when we all need to be united.

Earlier I asked one of my Conservative colleagues if they would support the MOU. I am talking about the MOU that the government is putting forward that I think has a team Canada approach of working together and advancing team Canada, as we do at international trade. Overall, working together to advance the issues that matter to our constituents is the best thing that we can be doing. It is time that we all did that together.

*Business of Supply*

**Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Mr. Speaker, I will try to compress this to something short for my hon. friend from Humber River—Black Creek.

The memorandum of understanding speaks of a bitumen pipeline. I am wondering if the government has considered that if the goal is really to ship bitumen to the port of Vancouver, or other ports, to take it to Asia, the safest way to ship that is with existing infrastructure on trains to container ships.

• (1600)

**Hon. Judy A. Sgro:** Mr. Speaker, I am sure the government is looking at everything possible to help us with the economic challenges we are currently facing.

**Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, just off the top, I want to note that I will be splitting my time this afternoon.

Canada is rich in natural resources, and our energy sector creates opportunity, growth and prosperity for our country. In my region, energy jobs support families and generate growth for small businesses, contractors, tradespeople and apprentices. These companies do not just produce energy. They create middle-class jobs, they sustain local economies, they invest in local needs and community projects, and they do it while operating under some of the highest environmental and safety standards anywhere in the world.

Canada has the energy that we need as a country and that the world needs. In fact, the world wants more Canada. However, for 10 years, the “keep it in the ground” Liberals have done everything possible to hinder energy development in Canada.

The Liberals passed Bill C-69, the “no more pipelines” bill, a bill that went so far as to give the federal government unprecedented powers over provincial infrastructure, industry and natural resources. Even the Supreme Court has deemed it unconstitutional. They imposed a shipping ban on the northern B.C. coast that blocks responsible Canadian energy from reaching world markets. They have done that while letting foreign ships carrying foreign energy sail freely through the same waters. They have chased away investment, crippled our competitiveness and, in doing so, threatened energy security for not only Canada but also our allies.

Now, after a decade of this, the Prime Minister tells Canadians that his government wants to build things previously thought impossible, at speeds we have not seen in generations. He told us he would turn Canada into an energy superpower. He has now signed a memorandum of understanding with Alberta and claimed that at the core of this agreement is a priority to have a pipeline to Asia.

Today's motion simply asks the Liberals to vote for the very words their own Prime Minister signed, the same words the Liberals have been celebrating and congratulating themselves over for nearly two weeks. It asks them to support a pipeline to the Pacific. It asks them to stop hiding behind premiers and non-existent vetoes. It asks them to be honest with Canadians about their intentions and their priorities.

Already, though, the cracks are showing on that side of the House. Liberal members are openly rejecting the Prime Minister's MOU. The member for Fleetwood—Port Kells said there will be no

pipeline without the consent of the Premier of British Columbia. The member for Victoria has plainly said he does not support a pipeline. Premier Eby, to whom the Prime Minister has effectively handed a veto, has been equally clear. He says that a pipeline to the Pacific will not go ahead, that it will never be built and that he refuses to allow the shipping ban to be lifted.

Well, the Premier of British Columbia does not have a veto. The Constitution is explicit. Only the federal government has the power to approve an interprovincial pipeline. No premier can stop it, and no province can veto it. The Liberal government knows this. Instead of owning that responsibility, the Prime Minister would rather use Premier Eby as a political shield. The Prime Minister is using him as someone he can point to when he backs away from the pipeline after the next election.

If the Liberals cannot stand behind their own MOU in the House, and if they cannot give the private sector the certainty and confidence that it needs to invest in a project of this scale, then this MOU is nothing more than the illusion of progress. It is not real progress. Shamefully, the Liberals have already announced that they will not support today's motion. Liberals are claiming that the motion somehow does not reflect the entire agreement, and that is simply not true.

• (1605)

The motion we are debating takes note of the MOU in its entirety. The Liberal government's unwillingness to stand behind it does not instill confidence. Let us not forget the fact that the MOU does not even promise a pipeline. It does not start construction. It does not commit a single metre of pipe to being laid. All it says is that seven months from now, a proposal might be sent to the federal office for two more years of study. The Liberal government is so divided that it cannot even unite behind such a limited proposal.

After eight months of promises of building at unimaginable speed, Canadians have seen nothing but paper shuffling, rebranded offices, and more and more press conferences. The Liberal member for Vancouver Granville's comments are quite telling. He called this pipeline “a theoretical conversation right now”. Where do we stand today? There is no route, no proponent, no approval process and, as we are seeing, absolutely no commitment from the Liberal caucus.

Canadians cannot afford another Liberal pipe dream, and after 10 years of failed and damaging policies, Canadians cannot afford the Liberal government. The Prime Minister's delays, taxes and regulatory roadblocks have continued to drive investment out of this country. Since he took office, nearly 50,000 more Canadians are unemployed, and nearly \$50 billion of investment has fled the country. As the CEO of TC Energy said, the United States continues to be more attractive for investment than Canada. It is not that energy development and prosperity are not possible here in Canada. They are possible.

However, the Prime Minister needs to do just one thing for a pipeline to happen, and that is to get out of the way: get out of the way by repealing the industrial carbon tax that drives production out of Canada; get out of the way by repealing the anti-development laws like Bill C-69 and the shipping ban; get out of the way by granting a permit for a pipeline to the Pacific and unlocking the trillions of dollars of private investment that would be ready to build it.

Energy CEOs have publicly called on the Prime Minister to cut red tape, reduce timeline approvals and grow energy production. The current trade and global uncertainty is all the more reason to ensure we are doing what we can in Canada to spur economic growth that is within our control.

Getting the Liberal government out of the way would boost Canadian paycheques. It would strengthen the Canadian dollar. That in turn would make energy, food and homes more affordable. It would strengthen our self-reliance, security and sovereignty. It is time to do that.

Canadians need real action, not press releases, not paper pushing and not theoretical pipelines, no more delays and no more deflections. It is time for the Liberal government to stop talking out of both sides of its mouth, to stop blocking Canada's energy potential, to unlock the trillions of dollars of private sector energy investment, to build profitable pipelines and to enable the shipment of a million barrels of oil to Asia. Canadians are watching today. Do members know who else is watching? Investors are watching.

Let us be clear. If Liberals vote against this motion, they are voting against their own commitments. They are voting against the agreement that the Liberal Prime Minister signed and celebrated with the Alberta premier. They are making it once again clear that they cannot be taken at their word.

[*Translation*]

**Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today's Conservative motion leaves a few things out. There is no mention of industrial carbon pricing or of methane regulations. These omissions reflect the fact that the opposition would rather play political games with the MOU than work with us to implement it. I also think it reflects the fact that the leader of the official opposition would not have been able to negotiate such an agreement.

I have a simple question for my colleague, and I would ask her to answer yes or no. Does she support the MOU with Alberta in its entirety? I am not talking about today's motion, which has several

*Business of Supply*

omissions; I am talking about the MOU that was signed with Alberta.

Does my colleague support it in its entirety, yes or no?

• (1610)

[*English*]

**Rosemarie Falk:** Mr. Speaker, as I said in my remarks, we are voting on what the Prime Minister has signed, what he agreed to and came up with along with the Premier of Alberta. If the Liberals stand in this place today and vote against their leader's, the Prime Minister's, MOU, this just means, once again, that we cannot trust what the Liberals say because they will just do the opposite.

[*Translation*]

**Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the MOU with Alberta is proof that the Liberals are abandoning the fight against climate change. It looks like they want to bring Conservative voters on side, but the Conservatives are doubling down with this motion.

What does my colleague think of the Liberals' new approach? Does this threaten the Conservatives' base?

[*English*]

**Rosemarie Falk:** Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are all about stealing Conservative ideas. I look at my own private member's bill that the Liberals stole a couple of years ago and said they were going to implement. I had the minister at committee and asked her about it. She had no idea. They had no intention of implementing my private member's bill to give adoptive families equitable access to parental leave. They had no desire to do that.

This is just like all of their campaign promises. They will say whatever they need to say to get the vote, and then when it comes time, when the rubber hits the road and they have to be principled and take a decision, we know they will do the opposite.

**Steven Bonk (Souris—Moose Mountain, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I know my hon. colleague comes from oil country in the northwest part of Saskatchewan. I am from the southeast, where we also have a lot of oil. Their area is heavy in the SAGD, while mine is more conventional. However, one thing we do know is that we support this pipeline because we know that it would take pressure off of the rail lines that are now causing a problem where other commodities, like potash and wheat, are not able to be shipped to the coast.

Can she maybe comment on that and why she thinks the Liberals are so stubborn when it comes to building pipelines?

**Rosemarie Falk:** Mr. Speaker, absolutely. I mentioned in my speech the amount that energy companies do for local economies and local communities. When someone goes into any hockey rink in my riding, they can see what energy company has donated money to make sure the lights can stay on and the ice can stay Zambonied.

*Business of Supply*

For us out west, we definitely have the frustration that, when we have to stop at the pesky rail crossing and we see oil being transferred by rail, we know we could remove that oil and put it into a pipeline. We could then be hauling more of our canola, our potash, our uranium and our grain to market.

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is interesting. First, I would point out that when the hon. member's leader sat in government for 10 long years, there was not one inch of pipeline to tidewater. The question I have for the member is very simple. We have the Premier of Alberta, who signed the MOU. I would ask that the member pay really close attention to this. The Premier of Alberta signed the MOU, and other Conservative premiers have supported it.

Was the Premier of Alberta wrong in signing the MOU with the Prime Minister?

**Rosemarie Falk:** Mr. Speaker, I guess the member has a short memory. He does not remember that the federal Conservatives actually had four pipelines built. It was the Liberal government that cancelled 7,000 kilometres of pipe—

**The Deputy Speaker:** The parliamentary secretary to the government House leader is rising on a point of order.

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, what four pipelines is she talking about?

**The Deputy Speaker:** That is a matter of debate. That is not a point of order.

I will let the hon. member for Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake return to her comments.

• (1615)

**Rosemarie Falk:** Mr. Speaker, whenever we get under the skin of the Liberals, they have to interrupt the truth that we are speaking. This just speaks to the principle, or lack thereof, that the Liberals have.

**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 Leduc—Wetaskiwin, The Economy; the hon. member for St. Albert—Sturgeon River, Ethics; the hon. member for Courtenay—Alberni, Taxation.

**Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank my colleague from Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake for sharing her time today.

I rise today, as members know, as a member of Parliament for a coastal riding in British Columbia, as the NDP critic for Fisheries and Oceans, and also as a parliamentarian with a responsibility to uphold indigenous rights. Each of these roles carries a duty to speak plainly about risk to our marine ecosystems and to the coastal and indigenous communities whose livelihoods depend on healthy oceans.

Decisions taken in the House do not exist in the abstract; they carry real and lasting consequences for people who work on the water, harvest from it, steward it and depend on it for their very survival. It is for that reason that the motion before us today, as well as

the MOU, is so alarming. It asks that we support a massive bitumen pipeline from Alberta to the north coast of British Columbia, along with the suspension of the Oil Tanker Moratorium Act, and it asks that we do so without the consent of indigenous rights and title holders and without the support of the Province of British Columbia or of the coastal communities that would bear the full risk of an oil spill.

We have been here before, of course. First nations on the coast have consistently opposed crude oil tanker proposals for more than 50 years. They participated fully in the National Energy Board's joint review panel for the failed northern gateway project. Their answer was a definitive and principled no. That has not changed. In 2019 the federal government passed the Oil Tanker Moratorium Act, Bill C-48, to protect the Great Bear Rainforest and the Great Bear Sea on behalf of all Canadians.

We have also been here before on the B.C. coast in a far more literal way. In January 1989, the *Nestucca* barge rammed its own tug off Washington state after a cable snapped. The U.S. Coast Guard ordered the leaking barge towed out to sea. There were 5,500 barrels of oil spilled, oil that floated just below the surface and could not be tracked or contained. Days later, to everyone's horror, it washed ashore near Tofino in my riding of Courtenay—Alberni. That spill was devastating, and it was considered small. Just months later, the *Exxon Valdez* oil spill released 257,000 barrels of oil, nearly 50 times larger, enough to contaminate virtually the entire length of the B.C. coast, and we know the impact it had on the north coast.

If the pipeline envisioned in the motion were built, up to 225 supertankers per year, each carrying up to two million barrels of bitumen, would move through narrow coastal channels and off the shore of Vancouver Island and the north coast. The scale of risk would dwarf both *Nestucca* and *Exxon Valdez*. A spill hundreds of times larger than *Nestucca* would be physically impossible to clean up along our remote, rugged coast, especially given the behaviour of bitumen itself.

The moratorium did not appear overnight; tanker restrictions had been voluntarily in place for more than 30 years before Bill C-48 ever became law. Industry, insurers, scientists and governments across Canada and the United States long understood just how sensitive, dangerous and irreplaceable this region truly is. Yes, the people who would be most affected have declared this position with unmistakable clarity for decades.

Today, Coastal First Nations, representing nine first nations along the north coast, the central coast and Haida Gwaii, has reiterated its nations' position as rights and title holders, in a firm and unequivocal statement that they will not consent to crude oil pipeline or oil tanker projects in their coastal waters. They have made it clear to Canada and Alberta that the project identified in the motion and in the MOU is the same pipeline carrying the same product to the same place. That was rejected in 2012 under the Harper Conservatives, and nothing has changed today with the Prime Minister and the Liberals.

At the same time, the B.C. Assembly of First Nations has passed a formal motion opposing the proposal and calling on all levels of government to abandon the project and to instead support sustainable first nations-led solutions that respect indigenous title and ensure the survival of the land and its people. The Assembly of First Nations has echoed that position nationally, stating clearly that economic incentives, co-ownership promises and piecemeal consultation do not replace free, prior and informed consent.

• (1620)

There is something else that has not changed: The science has not changed. It remains a scientific fact that bitumen cannot be cleaned up in marine environments. When it spills, it sinks and mixes with sediments. It coats the seabed, and it smothers salmon habitat, herring spawning grounds, shellfish beds and the foundation of the marine food web. There is no proven technology capable of recovering bitumen once it disperses under water. That is not speculation; that is what spill science tells us.

For Coastal First Nations, for British Columbia and for anyone who cares about fisheries and oceans, that risk is simply unacceptable. A single major bitumen spill on the north coast would wipe out sustainable fisheries, cultural livelihoods and marine-based economies that have been built over thousands of years.

Meanwhile, the coastal economy that first nations have built is not theoretical. It is real, it is growing and it is rooted in stewardship. Coastal First Nations has made it abundantly clear: It not interested in equity stakes in a bitumen pipeline or in financial compensation for catastrophic risk from a bitumen pipeline, and it has built its own sustainable economy that is working.

New figures from Coast Funds show that an initial \$60 million in economic development capital has generated over \$1 billion in regional economic impact, creating more than 1,400 permanent jobs and supporting over 140 businesses. This is prosperity rooted in conservation, renewable energy, ecotourism, sustainable fisheries and long-term community wealth, not short-term extraction and global speculation.

The Premier of Alberta's rhetoric about oil pipelines and tankers does not strengthen our confederation. The MOU that the Liberal Prime Minister has put forward is the same; it undermines our confederation by threatening the goodwill that first nations bring to major economic projects. Northwest B.C. alone represents roughly 40% of Canada's shovel-ready major nation-leading and nation-building projects, including LNG facilities, critical mineral development, port modernization and clean energy corridors. Coastal First Nations supports projects that respect its rights, protect the en-

### *Business of Supply*

vironment and share benefits fairly. Crude-oil tankers will never be part of that vision.

The motion before us and the MOU that the Liberals have put forward also claim that indigenous consultation must be respected, but let us be absolutely clear: Consultation is not the standard; consent is the standard. New Democrats unequivocally support free, prior and informed consent. Without the consent of indigenous rights holders, the project does not have legitimacy. Without consent, there is no reconciliation. The indigenous rights and title holders most affected by the proposal have already said no repeatedly, publicly and without ambiguity.

The opposition motion and the Liberal MOU further claim that the proposal involves so-called low-emission bitumen. We should be honest with Canadians: Bitumen remains among the most carbon-intensive forms of oil on the planet. Relabelling it does not change the climate map. Global heavy crude demand is projected to decline in the decades ahead.

The motion would pursue a project with no confirmed proponent, no secured market, no private financing and no consent from those whose territories would be at risk. Instead of inflaming regional division and undermining reconciliation, the federal government should be meeting directly and respectfully with Coastal First Nations and the Province of British Columbia. The Prime Minister promised that no project would be imposed on a province or on indigenous peoples. Both British Columbia and Coastal First Nations have said no. It is time to honour that promise, not weaken it under pressure.

New Democrats oppose the motion, and we will oppose it with a vote. We will vote against it because it ignores science. We will vote against it because it ignores economic reality. We will vote against it because it undermines marine protection, climate responsibility and indigenous rights. We will vote against it because it puts ideology ahead of national unity and long-term prosperity.

Canada can and must do better than this. We can build a future rooted in partnership, sustainability and shared prosperity. Our workers deserve better than boom-and-bust politics, our ecosystems deserve protection, and first nations deserve respect, the right to consent and genuine nation-to-nation decision-making. For all those reasons we will be voting against the motion today and are against the MOU that the government put forward.

*Business of Supply*

• (1625)

**David Bexte (Bow River, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is quite inspiring to see an opposition party or a party in the House that has absolute conviction and no equivocation of its principles. I applaud the member for that, and I really think it is a very important feature. This is unlike our Liberal colleagues, who are trying to play both sides of the fence, and I wonder how good that picket fence is feeling right now.

I wonder if the member could comment a little on that inconsistency and the uncertainty in the political and economic environment caused by the government's position.

**Gord Johns:** Mr. Speaker, it puts economic opportunities on the north coast and projects at risk. That is exactly what the MOU does.

The Liberals keep saying that there is no pipeline without support from indigenous nations and British Columbia, but the Building Canada Act, the one they keep citing and rely on, requires consultation only if nations say no. There is nowhere in the act that gives first nations the right to stop the project. It actually protects it.

Maybe the Liberals can explain why they talk about consent in public but remove it from the fine print when they put forward MOUs like the one they tabled, where it actually matters.

[*Translation*]

**Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, climate change is causing droughts and natural disasters. It is also driving up the cost of living because of the financial repercussions involved.

Could my colleague expand on that?

[*English*]

**Gord Johns:** Mr. Speaker, that is an excellent question. The government spent \$34.5 billion to buy the Trans Mountain pipeline. What has happened? There have been record profits: \$6 billion in profit for Canadian natural gas, \$5 billion in profit for Enbridge, \$5 billion in profit for Suncor and \$4 billion in profit for Imperial Oil, which laid off 900 staff and made \$4 billion in profit last year. Alta-Gas made \$3.5 billion in profit. They made all this money, but they cannot even afford to buy the TMX pipeline.

Now the government is putting forward the idea of building another pipeline on the backs of Canadians instead of investing in clean energy, which would be much more affordable and quicker in tackling climate change and would create a long-standing future for our country, a much more sustainable future with true energy security.

I really applaud the work the Bloc Québécois members have been doing in standing up for climate action. This is something we need to be happening right now. There are pipeline wars between the Conservatives and Liberals at a time of a climate crisis and wildfires raging out of control. It reminds me of an arms war, but instead it is a pipeline war in the middle of a climate crisis. Where is the action from the government?

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, to be very clear, the memorandum of understanding is good for the environment, good for the economy and good for

Canadian unity, and it demonstrates that federalism works well. The member made reference to TMX, which was negotiated with an NDP premier. Today we have a memorandum of understanding with a Progressive Conservative premier.

At the end of the day, when a party is in power, it has responsibilities to Canadians and to Canada. The MOU does just that. I am disappointed that the NDP opposes the MOU, which the member made very clear.

I am wondering if the member can express why the provincial NDP seems to support things like this but the federal NDP does not.

• (1630)

**Gord Johns:** Mr. Speaker, actually the provincial NDP took the Liberal government to court. It tried to stop the Trans Mountain pipeline, for good reason: It did not make any sense. It still does not make sense. The federal taxpayer is on the hook for \$34.5 billion to build that pipeline, and the government cannot find a buyer. What does the government want to do? It wants to build another one. We all know where this is going to go; it is going to end up on the backs of everyday Canadians instead of investing in real climate action.

The government members talk out of both sides of their mouth. They say that they are going to have consultation. Consultation is not supporting free, prior and informed consent. They talk about consultation, but consultation not consent. If they will stand in the House and say that they will support free, prior—

**The Deputy Speaker:** Resuming debate, the hon. member for Pickering—Brooklin.

**Juanita Nathan (Pickering—Brooklin, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Vancouver Quadra.

It is a privilege to rise in the House to speak to the motion put forward by the member for Battle River—Crowfoot on the Canada-Alberta MOU, building pipelines to Asia and the Oil Tanker Moratorium Act.

*Business of Supply*

Before I begin, I would like to acknowledge that we are gathered on the traditional unceded territory of the Anishinabe Algonquin nation, and I would like to express my gratitude for the privilege of sharing this land with them on this very day. It is important to recognize that, across Canada, the lands, waters and ice are traditional territories of the first nations, Inuit and Métis peoples. Indigenous peoples have cared for these environments for thousands of years, and their knowledge and leadership remain essential. Our journey toward reconciliation continues to be a priority for me, and it is one of the reasons I am in the House today.

Today I want to talk about the future, our future, and the foundation that the Government of Canada is building for a stronger, more sustainable Canada. It is a future that is not only net-zero but also full of new opportunities for clean, resilient and lasting growth, from such things as building new industries that anchor long-term jobs in every region and developing climate-smart infrastructure that saves money by avoiding costly disaster recovery. There are opportunities for workers and communities, such as thousands of skilled jobs for electricians, energy advisers, engineers and construction workers, as well as community-owned renewable energy projects that keep wealth circulating locally. There are opportunities for Canadian competitiveness through selling clean aluminum, low-carbon steel and sustainable forestry products. In other words, it will be a climate-competitive Canada.

I am talking about a Canada that leads the world by leaning into its strengths. I will put that in perspective. Countries around the world are making the transition to clean, low-carbon energy industries and technology. They are competing to design the cleanest technologies, produce the cleanest fuels and operate the cleanest industries. They are competing for capital, for talent and for innovation.

This transition is a revolution. It is reshaping trade, investments and jobs. It is changing pretty much everything: how we get around, with more public transit running on clean power and with more walkable, bikeable communities; how we heat and cool our homes, with heat pumps, better-insulated homes and smart thermostats that learn routines and reduce wasted energy; and how we work, build and power our country, with cleaner and more dependable electricity, solar rooftops and grids powered by wind, nuclear and storage.

It is impacting how we think about our sustainable future, with green mortgages, pension funds and savings plans investing in long-term clean growth, as well as how we connect with nature, with more protected areas, more urban forests and more opportunities for outdoor recreation close to home.

A net-zero future makes the cleaner choice the cheaper choice, the smarter choice and ultimately the easier choice. That is why making the foundational changes needed to build a net-zero future is economically smart and fiscally responsible. Moreover, it is essential for protecting Canadians and the places they call home. The bottom line is that addressing climate change is both a moral obligation and an economic imperative. That is why the Government of Canada released the climate competitiveness strategy in budget 2025.

• (1635)

The strategy positions Canada to seize the opportunities presented by the global transition to clean economies, by reducing our emissions and driving investments. It creates the clarity and condition for the investment needed to build an affordable net-zero future, a future in which Canadian businesses and industries are well positioned to compete and lead in the global economy, Canadians have the security of a strong economy and good jobs, and Canada leads in the global clean energy transition.

The climate competitiveness strategy is a central pillar of the government's plan to become the strongest economy in the G7. It is about building certainty for investors while continuing to take strong action to address climate change, building new infrastructure and major projects more efficiently while ensuring they contribute to a clean and competitive economy.

It is about supporting clean Canadian innovation, scaling home-grown solutions and capitalizing on projects that further Canada's standing as a clean energy superpower. It is also about exploring nuclear and renewable energy; investing in low-carbon fuels and initiatives aimed at improving the emissions intensity of the oil and gas sector; expanding into emerging opportunities such as critical minerals, carbon removal, resource sufficiency and high-value manufacturing; training workers to participate in these opportunities; and engaging with indigenous partners and rights holders as appropriate.

These are all investments in long-term prosperity. However, I want to be clear: Canada is not just entering this race; Canada is in this race with some of the smartest and most talented workers; some of the cleanest power, most unique energy and resource sectors, and world-class industries; and a strong domestic market in which Canadians can be their best customers.

*Business of Supply*

In sum, Canada's climate competitiveness strategy aims to grow our economy, to build a stronger, more sustainable and more competitive Canada and create lasting prosperity. I will close with a picture of what Canada can look like if we stay the course. It is a Canada where we have clean power in our homes and air in our cities; a Canada where jobs in our communities are future-focused and where students can look forward to working in global leading industries; a Canada where indigenous engagement is rooted in respect, reciprocity and responsibility; and a Canada where climate action is a catalyst, sparking innovation, inspiration and investment.

This is the climate-competitive economy that Canada is moving towards. We are doing it by working hand in hand with indigenous governments, provinces and territories, industries and all sectors. Climate action is an opportunity for everyone. This is the Canadian way: co-operation, practical progress and determination with courage and confidence.

**Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, one reason we are in such a quagmire as a country is that, for nine years under Justin Trudeau, the Government of Canada ignored every opportunity to build additional resource infrastructure.

In fact, when the German chancellor came to Canada, the Prime Minister said no. The Japanese president came to Canada, and the Liberal government said no. The Dutch government came to Canada. They were all looking for our natural gas and other resources, and the Liberal government said no.

Would the member agree that because of the disastrous energy policies and antiresource policies of the Liberal government, Canada is behind and what is at stake now is our sovereignty?

• (1640)

**Juanita Nathan:** Mr. Speaker, we are no longer in Justin Trudeau's government. This is a new government.

We have invested in a very forward-looking budget, and we are in the process of voting on that. I hope the opposition will get on board and support us in building Canada's future. During the last election, we pledged to make Canada an energy superpower and build nation-building projects while protecting our environment. I hope they will get on board.

[*Translation*]

**Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette—Manawan, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her very interesting speech. She spoke at length about the importance of working with first nations. She also acknowledged that we are on unceded territory. The Assembly of First Nations is calling on the government to withdraw from its memorandum of understanding with Alberta to build a pipeline. However, the government has said that it will consult with first nations.

Can my colleague confirm that the government is committed to not building the new pipeline if first nations say they do not want it?

[*English*]

**Juanita Nathan:** Mr. Speaker, the federal government and Alberta are committed to and will continue engaging in early, consistent and meaningful consultation with indigenous people. We have

committed to making sure that they sit at the table as equal partners. We have been extremely clear that this project should only go ahead with sustainable, substantial opportunities for indigenous co-ownership. That is our commitment. This means that the indigenous communities have to agree for this pipeline to go forward, and there is no railroading that.

**Lisa Hefner (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I really appreciated the optimism and hope that the member brought with her words, and I compare this to the Conservatives, who, to this day, say Canada is broken. Perhaps she can reflect on these divergent points of view.

**Juanita Nathan:** Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the member that Canada is not broken. However, we are in a trade war, and we are trying to forge a path forward.

We are working in collaboration with everyone to move the country forward, to create jobs and to find diverse trade opportunities that benefit all Canadians, not just some Canadians. This memorandum of agreement is a document that elaborates on co-operation with the province, indigenous peoples and private partnership. It is something bigger so that a better future can be forged for our younger generation.

**Ellis Ross (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the member emphasized a lot of clean energy initiatives, but countries like Germany and Britain are now experiencing the highest energy costs around the world. How does the member plan to incorporate clean energy in Canada while keeping life affordable for Canadians in terms of their energy bills?

**Juanita Nathan:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for the clean energy question.

We are actually working with partners to build this right now. In my riding of Pickering—Brooklin, we have the biggest nuclear plant. We have invested a lot in nuclear energy—

• (1645)

**The Deputy Speaker:** Resuming debate, the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change.

**Wade Grant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand before the House today to speak about the monumental agreement signed between the governments of Canada and Alberta.

We know that this country is facing a pivotal, once-in-a-generation moment and that to overcome the challenges of our time, we must bolster and diversify our economy, working hand in hand with provinces, indigenous groups and the private sector to achieve lasting prosperity for all Canadians.

This memorandum of understanding is proof that the federal and provincial governments can work collaboratively to enable and attract natural resource development while protecting the environment and respecting indigenous rights. This agreement includes important commitments that create a path to conditions for investment in western Canada and, at the same time, foster the means to lower greenhouse gas emissions and achieve critical environmental goals.

Canada's progress on climate targets depends on a collaboration across all levels of government. We are strengthening federal-provincial collaboration in the energy sector to achieve our Paris targets and net-zero emissions by 2050.

Canada and Alberta agreed on a new framework to build a stronger, more sustainable, more competitive economy while not backing down on our commitment to lower emissions and protect our environment. In this agreement, Alberta agreed to advance multiple ambitious clean energy projects and measures that will drive down emissions and build a more sustainable economy, including strengthened industrial carbon pricing, carbon capture, enhanced methane regulations, clean electricity regulations and ensuring that Alberta achieves a net-zero electricity grid.

By the looks of the motion before us today, the Conservative Party does not agree. The Conservatives have even had a chance to revise their motion through amendment and still refuse to see how important comprehensive climate action is to this country. What the Conservatives do not understand is that, for Canada to achieve net zero and be competitive at a global scale, we need to drive innovation and climate action across the country.

The agreement specifies how Canada will work with the Province of Alberta on the assessment of all major projects, including clean energy projects. The MOU confirms a shared commitment by Canada and the Province of Alberta to deliver a dependable, cost-effective net-zero electricity grid. It is contingent upon the completion of a new carbon pricing agreement with Alberta, which will be finalized no later than April 1, 2026. We are working with the clean electricity regulations, not around them, in collaboration with the Province of Alberta to get to a net-zero grid. Every province faces unique realities, and we are working closely with Alberta to find an approach that fits its needs.

This MOU also includes concrete commitments to ensure meaningful consultation with indigenous groups that may be affected by the development of major projects, as well as opportunities to advance economic reconciliation through indigenous ownership and partnership, so that all could benefit from this country's resources. In fact, the commitments in the agreement demonstrate that there are real opportunities for federal and provincial governments to work in the spirit of co-operative federalism to overcome challenges and create new opportunities to build a strong and resilient economy for all of Canada.

The one commitment in the memorandum of understanding that I want to speak about specifically is the commitment to sign a co-operation agreement on impact assessment with Alberta by April 1, 2026. It was only a few months ago that the first ministers met and agreed to work toward the effective and efficient implementation of the goal of a single assessment process, or "one project, one review", that respects our leading environmental standards and indigenous rights for all major projects.

### *Business of Supply*

view", that respects our leading environmental standards and indigenous rights for all major projects.

Co-operation agreements under the Impact Assessment Act are a key tool for creating an effective and efficient system that enables us to build nation-building projects faster and responsibly. They allow the federal government to rely on provincial processes in cases where the province confirms that its assessment or regulatory processes will address potential adverse effects within federal jurisdiction. Importantly, co-operation agreements would enable the use of new and full flexibilities in the Impact Assessment Act to defer and work through provincial processes to achieve "one project, one review".

Co-operation agreements apply when a project is subject to both a federal and a provincial assessment, which could include a project scheduled under the Building Canada Act. "One project, one review" processes may differ depending on the project, its potential impact and the provincial processes that would apply to it.

● (1650)

By working together under a co-operation agreement, we can streamline assessments and provide greater certainty to proponents, while maintaining the flexibility to implement the appropriate approach on a project-by-project basis and ensuring meaningful engagement with indigenous communities. Once it is signed, Alberta will join other provinces that have also committed to "one project, one review", including New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Manitoba and Ontario, with which we are finalizing new co-operation agreements after a public comment period, in keeping with this government's commitment to transparency and engagement with Canadians. I am confident that we will soon have draft agreements ready with other provinces as well.

The commitment to co-operation agreements under the Impact Assessment Act began in 2019, with the first being signed with my home province of British Columbia. This has enabled most projects being assessed by both the federal government and the provincial government under the Impact Assessment Act to undergo a single assessment process. We have further extended this collaboration to improve coordination on permitting for critical minerals projects and continue to have a collaborative and productive partnership with British Columbia.

*Business of Supply*

These agreements will be essential to achieving this government's commitment to streamlining regulatory processes for major projects so they can be completed in two years. Streamlined assessments for major projects do not reduce regulatory requirements, but rather focus the assessments on the most critical issues early in the process, instead of at the end, in order to inform mitigation strategies and decision-making. It would also be up to the federal government to provide guidance to proponents on early and meaningful engagement with indigenous peoples to address areas of concern well before any decisions are made and to explore opportunities for meaningful partnerships.

As stipulated in the agreement with Alberta, the government remains committed to reconciliation with indigenous peoples. I just want to touch on this a bit, because the Constitution has been talked about a lot over the last two weeks. Subsection 35(1) of the Constitution recognizes and affirms aboriginal and treaty rights in this country. I come from the Musqueam Nation on the mouth of the Fraser River, where that section was tested for the first time under the Sparrow decision, which proved that we had the aboriginal right to fish for food, social and ceremonial purposes.

Since then, we have come a long way in reconciliation, not just through jurisprudence, but through the commitment of reconciliation that we must work in collaboration and partnership. It was a sad day, almost 20 years ago, when the former prime minister stood up and apologized about residential schools. The Leader of the Opposition showed how he felt about first nations people by saying that they need to learn the value of hard work. He continues to show his disrespect to aboriginal people by calling them "our" first nations today in this House. I do not belong to anybody.

Indigenous people across this country have a deep connection to their lands, territories and resources, and the way forward is in partnership with them. The partnership of indigenous peoples in the impact assessment process is an essential way to fully understand the impacts of major projects, including impacts on indigenous rights, and to mitigate those effects to the greatest extent possible.

Under co-operation agreements, the federal government will coordinate consultation and collaboration with indigenous peoples through the assessment process. We will strengthen partnerships with indigenous groups by prioritizing early and meaningful consultation and upholding the principles of free, prior and informed consent.

It is important that we recognize that, across Canada, the lands and waters are the traditional territories of first nations, Inuit and Métis people. Indigenous peoples have cared for these environments for millennia, and their knowledge and leadership remain essential. Our journey toward reconciliation continues to be a priority for me, and it is one of the reasons I am standing on this side of the House today.

Standing in the House today to talk about this government's commitment to building one Canadian economy through co-operative federalism and reconciliation has been an honour. This government is pleased to work together with Alberta. I am confident that we will further strengthen our relationship and put in place the conditions necessary to collaborate on all future assessments and a cohesive climate plan.

**Ellis Ross (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the member mentioned his community's involvement in the jurisprudence. My band was involved in the Haida court case in 2004; we intervened.

Eight months of negotiations on the MOU, and there was no involvement with first nations. The table the Liberals have set up is a tripartite table between Alberta, B.C. and the federal government. Again, first nations were excluded. When will the respect for aboriginal rights and title start with the Liberal government?

• (1655)

**Wade Grant:** Mr. Speaker, I have known the member opposite for many years. I know that he has done great work for his community. I know that this government respects aboriginal title and rights in this country. I do know that those conversations are going to be important as we move forward, as we go toward major projects in this country.

The member opposite represents many of those coastal first nations in northwestern British Columbia. Does he go and speak to them about how they want him to vote on the MOU?

[*Translation*]

**Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski—La Matapédia, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the Liberal government simply wants to do as it pleases. We have a Prime Minister who wants to run the government like a big board of directors.

Here are the facts. The Assembly of First Nations is calling on the federal government to withdraw the MOU that it signed with Alberta for the construction of a new oil pipeline. Other voices within the government, namely two experts and founding members of the Net-Zero Advisory Body, quit because the government is ignoring science and refuses to listen to recommendations from scientific experts. This government does not listen to or consult with first nations, and it does not consult with scientists. It also does not consult with its own adviser, the chief science advisor. I had the opportunity to question her when she came to meet with the Standing Committee on Science and Research. She told me that the current situation, in which the government is creating laws to circumvent all laws except the Criminal Code, is a nightmare.

Do the Liberals still believe in science and climate change, or are they just trying to eat the Conservatives' lunch?

*Business of Supply*

[English]

**Wade Grant:** Mr. Speaker, the short answer is no, I did not want to be a Conservative. The long answer is, I do believe in climate change. I do believe in aboriginal title and rights, and I do believe in the respect to come and speak in meaningful consultation. That is what the commitment has been. In fact, today I had the honour of sitting down with coastal first nations to let them know that I will continue to meet with them, and this side of the House will continue to meet with them in person at their convenience, so that we can make sure that they are fully on board to collaborate on any new future project.

**Karim Bardeesy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think we are quite blessed in this House to have, in our parliamentary secretary colleague, someone who has experience in first nations' governance, in provincial government and in federal government now.

I wonder if he could just share the perspectives that he has gained over the years in relation to the motion before us.

**Wade Grant:** Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to be here as the first member of my first nation for my home riding of Vancouver Quadra. I have watched over the years as my mother, who was chief, as my grandfather, who was chief, as my uncle, who was chief, have further succeeded in making sure that our interests are always first and foremost.

The government on this side has made great strides in ensuring that we respect aboriginal title and rights. I have sat on the other side of the table, and I have spoken with many people on this side of the table. That is why I am comfortable with being on this side of the table, because, first and foremost, aboriginal title and rights will be respected on this side of the government.

**Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Mr. Speaker, I am troubled that UNDRIP was excluded from reference in Bill C-5, when the government said that laws can be broken to build things faster. I am very troubled that the MOU does not reference UNDRIP to say, in clear language, that we will respect free, prior and informed consent.

**Wade Grant:** Mr. Speaker, that is why, in my speech today, I did indicate that free, prior and informed consent is something that we will seek to achieve with indigenous communities right across the province of British Columbia.

**Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is always great to speak on behalf of the people of Chilliwack—Hope in the House.

Today we are speaking to a Conservative motion that basically calls on the government to stop speaking out of both sides of its mouth. That is what we have seen over the last number of weeks. This is a government that goes to Alberta to say one thing to Danielle Smith, then comes back to Ottawa, or goes to B.C., or talks to people in other parts of the country, to say something completely different. That is what we have decided to seek clarity on today with our motion. It acknowledges the MOU that was signed by the governments of Canada and Alberta, but it also seeks clarity on where the government actually stands, because we are not getting the same message, depending on which member we talk to.

When the Prime Minister was trying to get a standing ovation at the Calgary Chamber of Commerce, he talked about how much he supports pipelines. That is very interesting considering the record of the government he now leads. The Liberal government cancelled the northern gateway pipeline, a pipeline that was approved to go from Alberta to northern B.C. The proponent, Enbridge, spent over a billion dollars working its way through the approval process. It had been approved by the regulator. It had a number of conditions attached to it. It had aboriginal equity partners. I think this is a tragic part of this story that often gets overlooked.

I knew some of the negotiators on that. My father, Chuck Strahl, and the Hon. Jim Prentice, who were both Indigenous Affairs ministers and respected in British Columbia and Alberta, worked with those nations to help them to benefit from the economic development that would have come from the development of the northern gateway pipeline. They had an equity stake in that pipeline worth \$2 billion. The Liberal government came in and, with the stroke of a pen, ripped that out of their hands.

At the time, we asked the government if it had consulted with the first nations and the indigenous communities before it stripped away 2 billion dollars' worth of economic development from their communities, and these are often communities that had not had anything close to that sort of economic development for generations. This was an opportunity for them to realize the potential of the hundreds of millions of dollars that was going to be poured into those communities to improve infrastructure, education and the outcomes for the people who live there. It said that it did not have to because it was just cancelling it. Therefore, when the government was taking something away from indigenous communities, when it was ripping money out of their hands for generations to come, it did not even bother to let them know. Now we have the current government pretending to respect indigenous communities through this MOU.

We just heard from the member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley about how the government had been working on this for eight months and did not consider talking to first nations leaders, first nations communities or indigenous communities in British Columbia or Alberta. It was a complete afterthought. Now, it retroactively stands up and tries to virtuously tell us how committed it is to section 35 consultations and how respectful it is.

The Minister of Natural Resources went on TV and said that maybe he would have a Zoom meeting with them, dismissively insulting first nations communities and telling them that, if they want to consult with the Liberal government, they should just jump on a Zoom call. This is outrageous disrespect from a government that holds itself pretty high and mighty when it comes to dealing with indigenous communities.

*Business of Supply*

When Justin Trudeau declared that the Great Bear Rainforest was no place for a pipeline, as if it was some sort of magical forest that could not have a pipeline, there were already, I believe, 207 conditions for the building of it. The work had been done. The engineering had been done. The agreements had been reached with the communities along the route.

● (1700)

When Justin Trudeau declared that it was a pipeline that should not be there, Canada sent a message to Justin Trudeau and the Liberals, many of whom are still here, still getting up after every speech to ask questions time after time. It is the same government with a new leader. When the business and investment communities are told that, even though \$1 billion was put into a project, and everything was done right, with every t crossed and every i dotted, but the government can just rip away that approval, what happens to investment in that country, a jurisdiction that would allow that? It evaporates. Since that decision by the Liberal government, we have lost hundreds of thousands of jobs and tens of billions of dollars that have gone elsewhere because the Liberal government does not foster an environment where things can get built.

When the Conservatives left office in 2015, there were at least four major pipelines. I am sure I am forgetting some of them. I am sure the Speaker knows the ones that I do not know. There was the energy east pipeline, which was proposed to deliver Canadian oil to the Atlantic provinces. That was, by the way, proposed by a private company, TransCanada Energy. There was the Keystone XL pipeline. Again, it was TransCanada Energy that proposed to send Canadian crude to the gulf coast. There was the northern gateway pipeline, which I have talked about, by Enbridge and the Trans Mountain pipeline by Kinder Morgan. We should notice the common denominator. When Conservatives were in government, private sector investors were prepared to put their own money forward to invest in big projects in this country, billions and billions of dollars.

Just a couple of short years later, those were all gone because of the regulatory environment that the Liberal government put in place. It made it so difficult to build anything and invest in the country that TransCanada abandoned both of their projects, changed its name entirely and moved its operations primarily to the south. It is now TC Energy because TransCanada Energy, after the debacle of the Liberal government, did not sound as attractive to investors as it once had. Enbridge abandoned its project after getting a \$1-billion kick between the pockets. Kinder Morgan's project was so risky, after the Liberal government took over and changed all the rules and regulations, that it completely abandoned the project and the government had to buy it. Bill Morneau had to pay taxpayer money to get something that, under the Conservatives, the private sector was willing to do.

● (1705)

We have heard that the Liberals have suddenly seen the light and that they are super in favour of pipelines, but we have the comments from the Prime Minister himself. Apparently, he told the B.C. caucus about the pipeline and said, "If BC doesn't want it, it's not going ahead." The member for Vancouver Granville said that the pipeline must have B.C. and first nations consent and "we will all work to ensure our B.C. coast is protected." The member for

Fleetwood—Port Kells said that the pipeline must have the consent of the Premier of British Columbia. David Eby has apparently been promised a veto by the Prime Minister.

Forgive us if Conservatives do not take these guys very seriously when they talk about how pro-pipeline they are, when every one of their members stands up to talk about how they are going to give consent to the B.C. NDP premier and that, if they do not have consent from David Eby, it is not going ahead. That does not sound like much of a commitment to me.

This motion provides an opportunity for clarity. The Liberals can declare whether the Prime Minister, when he speaks in Alberta, is telling the truth, or when he speaks in Ottawa, is telling the truth. They can declare whether Liberal members of Parliament from B.C. are the ones expressing the views of the government or whether the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources is. It is very clear. It is laid out in the motion, which came, by the way, from the Liberal MOU. The words are drawn straight out of that memorandum of understanding.

Conservatives want to see pipelines built. We want to see Canada prosper, and we want to see people get back to work so that we can all prosper as a nation, build our infrastructure, build our schools, build our education system, build the country that Canadians expect us to build and not have a government that stands in the way of that progress.

● (1710)

**Carlos Leitão (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have a quick question. Could the member opposite clarify if the Conservative Party is for or against the industrial carbon tax?

**Mark Strahl:** Mr. Speaker, I am told by the Liberal government every day in question period that it is an imaginary tax that does not exist. I am very confused.

Of course, we are opposed to the carbon tax. We were the ones who drove the agenda on the consumer carbon tax until the government flip-flopped and agreed it needed to go. This is a government that wants a carbon tax without a pipeline. We want a pipeline without a carbon tax.

**Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the member is a great colleague and parliamentarian. He has been around to see those previous efforts by companies to try to get a pipeline done.

I am the representative for Prince George. We saw over 4,000 people and their interests represented in the consultations to do with northern gateway. The project had, like the member said, all the t's crossed and the i's dotted, and the former Liberal prime minister simply cancelled it. The government is accusing us of just playing games with this particular motion.

*Business of Supply*

Are we really serious about getting a pipeline done in B.C.?

**Mark Strahl:** Mr. Speaker, I am not convinced the Prime Minister is serious about it. If he wanted it to happen, he would make it very clear to his caucus that it is going to happen. He would shut down this ridiculous idea that the Premier of B.C., the NDP premier, has a veto over this pipeline. He would make it very clear by voting in favour of this motion that he supports a pipeline, just like the Conservatives do.

[*Translation*]

**Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski—La Matapédia, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, what is the world coming to?

The Conservatives are accusing the Liberals of not doing enough to buy a new pipeline. Who was it that bought a new pipeline with our public funds? It was the Liberals; the Conservatives never bought a pipeline. Let us not forget the facts: The Trans Mountain pipeline cost \$34 billion, or six to seven times the initial price estimate. In addition, the Parliamentary Budget Officer says that we would lose money if that pipeline were sold tomorrow morning.

The Conservatives, those good stewards of the public purse, are telling us that we need to buy another one, a second pipeline, so that we can lose even more money. They say that it will be good for the economy, that it will make rich oil companies even richer. Can the Conservatives explain to us what good a new pipeline is to Quebecers?

[*English*]

**Mark Strahl:** Mr. Speaker, the member is quite correct that the Conservatives did not buy a pipeline. When we were in government, the private sector was lining up to build pipelines in every direction in this country.

It is the Liberals who had such a convoluted bunch of red tape, rules and regulations that it drove private sector investments away. He is quite correct that the Conservatives have never bought a pipeline. We did not have to. The government now says that there is no proponent for this pipeline. Of course there is no proponent for this pipeline. It has driven them all out of the country. It created a business environment that does not allow for certainty. These investments are billions and billions of dollars over decades. When there is a prime minister like Justin Trudeau, who will rip up a signed deal, it sends the message to invest elsewhere.

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, contrary to what the member might believe, the Conservative never built an inch of pipeline to the Pacific Ocean, not one inch. The question for the member is very clear. The Premier of Alberta and the Prime Minister of Canada signed an MOU. Why will the Conservative Party not support the MOU?

**Mark Strahl:** Mr. Speaker, every word in our motion is from the MOU, so I would invite that member to put his money where his mouth is and vote to support a pipeline from Alberta to the north coast of British Columbia. He can do it in about 30 minutes.

**The Deputy Speaker:** It being 5:15 p.m. and this being the final supply day for the period ending December 10, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the business of supply.

The question is on the amendment.

If a member participating in person wishes that the amendment 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.

• (1715)

**Mark Strahl:** Mr. Speaker, we would request a recorded vote.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Call in the members.

• (1800)

[*Translation*]

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

(*Division No. 54*)

## YEAS

## Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
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
DeRidder	Diotte
Doherty	Dowdall
Duncan	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)	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	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lawton	Lefebvre
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Lloyd
Lobb	Ma
Mahal	Majumdar
Malette (Kapuskasing—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)	Mantle
Martel	Mazier

*Business of Supply*

McCauley	McKenzie
McLean (Calgary Centre)	Melillo
Menegakis	Moore
Morin	Morrison
Motz	Muys
Nater	Patzer
Poilievre	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Reynolds	Richards
Roberts	Rood
Ross	Rowe
Ruff	Scheer
Schmale	Seeback
Shipley	Small
Steinley	Stevenson
Strahl	Strauss
Thomas	Tochor
Tolmie	Uppal
Van Popta	Vien
Viersen	Vis
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Zimmer — 138

**NAYS**

## Members

Acan	Al Soud
Ali	Alty
Anand	Anandasangaree
Auguste	Bains
Baker	Bardeesy
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Belanger (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River)	Bendayan
Bittle	Blair
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blois	Bonin
Boulerice	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Carney
Carr	Casey
Chagger	Champagne
Champoux	Chang
Chartrand	Chatel
Chen	Chenette
Chi	Church
Clark	Connors
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Dandurand
Danko	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
DeBellefeuille	d'Entremont
Deschênes	Deschênes-Thériault
Desrochers	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Duclos	Duguid
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	Guilbeault
Gull-Masty	Hajdu
Hanley	Harrison
Hepfner	Hirtle

Hodgson	Hogan
Housefather	Hussen
Iacono	Jaczek
Johns	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	McGuinty
McKelvie	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McKnight	McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)
McPherson	Ménard
Mendès	Michel
Miedema	Miller
Mingarelli	Morrissey
Myles	Naqvi
Nathan	Nguyen
Noormohamed	Normandin
Ntumba	Oliphant
Olszewski	O'Rourke
Osborne	Perron
Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon
Powlowski	Provost
Ramsay	Rana
Robertson	Rochefort
Romanado	Royer
Sahota	Saini
Sarai	Sari
Sawatzky	Schiefke
Sgro	Sheehan
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 — 196

**PAIRED**

## Members

Dzerowicz Paul-Hus — 2

**The Speaker:** I declare the amendment defeated.

[*English*]

The next question is on the main motion. May I dispense?

**Some hon. members:** No.

[*Chair read text of motion to House*]

**The Speaker:** 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. Mark Gerretsen:** Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it you will find consent to apply the results from the last vote to this one, with Liberal members voting nay.

**Chris Warkentin:** Conservatives agree to apply, but Conservatives will be voting in favour of this motion.

[*Translation*]

**Yves Perron:** Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the results of the last vote and will be voting against the motion.

[*English*]

**Don Davies:** Mr. Speaker, New Democrats will apply the results of the last vote, again voting no.

[*Translation*]

**Elizabeth May:** Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply the results of the last vote and will be voting against the motion.

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

(*Division No. 55*)

### YEAS

#### Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
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
DeRidder	Diotte
Doherty	Dowdall
Duncan	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)	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	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lawton	Lefebvre
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Lloyd

Lobb	Ma
Mahal	Majumdar
Malette (Kapusking—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)	Mantle
Martel	Mazier
McCauley	McKenzie
McLean (Calgary Centre)	Melillo
Menegakis	Moore
Morin	Morrison
Motz	Muys
Nater	Patzer
Poilievre	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Reynolds	Richards
Roberts	Rood
Ross	Rowe
Ruff	Scheer
Schmale	Seeback
ShIPLEY	Small
Steinley	Stevenson
Strahl	Strauss
Thomas	Tochor
Tolmie	Uppal
Van Popta	Vien
Viersen	Vis
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Zimmer— 138

### *Business of Supply*

### NAYS

#### Members

Acan	Al Soud
Ali	Alty
Anand	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	Carney
Carr	Casey
Chagger	Champagne
Champoux	Chang
Chartrand	Chatel
Chen	Chenette
Chi	Church
Clark	Connors
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Dandurand
Danko	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
DeBellefeuille	d'Entremont
Deschênes	Deschênes-Thériault
Desrochers	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Duclos	Duguid
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

*Business of Supply*

Grant	Greaves
Guay	Guilbeault
Gull-Masty	Hajdu
Hanley	Harrison
Hepfner	Hirtle
Hodgson	Hogan
Housefather	Hussen
Iacono	Jaczek
Johns	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	McGuinty
McKelvie	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McKnight	McLean (Esquimalt—Saaneich—Sooke)
McPherson	Ménard
Mendès	Michel
Miedema	Miller
Mingarelli	Morrissey
Myles	Naqvi
Nathan	Nguyen
Noormohamed	Normandin
Ntumba	Oliphant
Olszewski	O'Rourke
Osborne	Perron
Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon
Powlowski	Provost
Ramsay	Rana
Robertson	Rochefort
Romanado	Royer
Sahota	Saini
Sarai	Sari
Sawatzky	Schieffe
Sgro	Sheehan
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 — 196

## PAIRED

Members

Dzerowicz

Paul-Hus — 2

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion defeated.

\* \* \*

*[English]*

## SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (B), 2025-26

**Hon. Shafqat Ali (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.)** moved:

That the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2026 be concurred in.

**The Speaker:** 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.

● (1805)

**Hon. Mark Gerretsen:** Mr. Speaker, we request that the motion be carried on division.

(Motion agreed to)

**Hon. Shafqat Ali** moved that Bill C-17, An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the federal public administration for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2026, be read the first time and printed.

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

*[Translation]***Hon. Shafqat Ali** moved that Bill C-17, An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the federal public administration for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2026, be read the second time and referred to committee of the whole.**The Speaker:** 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.**An hon. member:** Mr. Speaker, I request that the motion be carried on division.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion carried. Accordingly, the bill stands referred to a committee of the whole.

(Bill read a second time and the House went into committee of the whole thereon, Tom Kmiec in the chair)

(On clause 2)

**Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC):** Mr. Chair, can the President of the Treasury Board confirm that the bill is presented in its usual form?*[English]***Hon. Shafqat Ali (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.):** Mr. Chair, the form of this bill is the same as that passed in the previous supply period.**The Chair:** Shall clause 2 carry?**Some hon. members:** Agreed.**Some hon. members:** On division.

(Clause 2 agreed to)

**The Chair:** Shall clause 3 carry?**Some hon. members:** Agreed.**Some hon. members:** On division.

(Clause 3 agreed to)

**The Chair:** Shall clause 4 carry?**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

*Private Members' Business*

**Some hon. members:** On division.

(Clause 4 agreed to)

**The Chair:** Shall clause 5 carry?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** On division.

(Clause 5 agreed to)

**The Chair:** Shall clause 6 carry?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** On division.

(Clause 6 agreed to)

**The Chair:** Shall schedule 1 carry?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** On division.

(Schedule 1 agreed to)

**The Chair:** Shall schedule 2 carry?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** On division.

(Schedule 2 agreed to)

**The Chair:** Shall clause 1, the short title, carry?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** On division.

(Clause 1 agreed to)

**The Chair:** Shall the preamble carry?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** On division.

(Preamble agreed to)

**The Chair:** Shall the title carry?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** On division.

(Title agreed to)

**The Chair:** Shall the bill carry?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** On division.

(Bill agreed to)

**The Chair:** Shall I rise and report the bill?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** On division.

(Bill reported)

**Hon. Shafqat Ali** moved that the bill be concurred in.

**The Speaker:** If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

**An hon. member:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask that it be carried on division.

(Motion agreed to)

• (1810)

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Shafqat Ali** moved that Bill C-17, An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the federal public administration for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2026, be read the third time and passed.

[*English*]

**The Speaker:** 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.

**An hon. member:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask that it be carried on division.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed)

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

### UKRAINIAN HERITAGE MONTH ACT

**Yvan Baker (Etobicoke Centre, Lib.)** moved that Bill S-210, An Act respecting Ukrainian Heritage Month, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to rise today in the House to speak to Bill S-210, an act respecting Ukrainian heritage month. The legislation, if passed in the House, would designate the month of September as Ukrainian heritage month in Canada.

The first Ukrainian immigrants to Canada arrived on September 7, 1891. Since then, generation upon generation of Ukrainians have come to Canada, many of them fleeing oppression and seeking a better life. Ukrainian Canadians have helped to make Canada the great country that it is today, and their contributions span our economic, political, cultural and social life. That is why, for example, in 2011, the Ontario legislature passed a law, unanimously supported by all parties, to declare September 7 as Ukrainian Heritage Day.

When I was president of the Ukrainian Canadian Congress's Ontario Provincial Council at the time, I was proud to be one of the people who wrote the bill and helped to get it passed. That is why I am so proud, as their member of Parliament, to have introduced my own bill in the House of Commons in the last three Parliaments to designate the month of September, every year, as Ukrainian heritage month.

*Private Members' Business*

I would like to thank the member of the other place who introduced the bill and the many members who co-sponsored the bill with me. I hope that members on all sides of the House will support this legislation.

Watching the debate at home right now are members and leaders of the Ukrainian Canadian community. Some of them are immigrants to Canada from Ukraine. Some of them are the children and grandchildren of immigrants to Canada from Ukraine. My mother and my grandparents were immigrants to Canada from Ukraine. My grandparents, Ivan and Olena, came to Canada fleeing oppression and seeking a better life, like so many people who have immigrated to Canada from Ukraine over the past almost 135 years.

My grandparents were incredibly proud of their Ukrainian heritage, but they were also incredibly proud to be Canadian. In fact, I have said many times, and many here have heard me say this before, that my grandparents were among the proudest Canadians I have ever known.

To ensure that I learned about my Ukrainian heritage, my parents and my grandparents insisted that I attend Saturday school. This was not unique to me. This is common to members of the Ukrainian Canadian community. After Saturday school, every Saturday, my grandfather used to pick me up. We used to have lunch together, and then he would help me with my Saturday school homework for the following week. During classes and as I did this homework, I learned the Ukrainian language, culture, history, traditions, etc.

I have to tell the House and I have to admit that when I was a teenager and when I was a kid, I was not so fond of Saturday school. I really did not enjoy doing homework on Saturday afternoons either. There was one day in particular when I was very frustrated. I was struggling with whatever it was that I was working on with my grandfather. I called him *Dido*. I said, "*Dido*, I do not want to do this anymore. I want to stop."

He said to me, "You cannot stop. Let me tell you why. I am incredibly proud of my heritage and my homeland, and I think that as you learn more, you will be too." Then, he also said, "I want you to learn about the history of the Ukrainian people, because so many of them came here to Canada. They came before you did, they came before I did, and they helped to make this country great. I want you to learn about the people who made Canada great."

Since 1891, Canadians of Ukrainian descent have left a historic mark on our country. Their contributions span communities from coast to coast to coast, in all the ridings represented here today. They have impacted our economic, political, cultural and social life. The significance of the bill goes beyond just cultural recognition. It is not merely a symbolic gesture that we are undertaking here today. It is a national acknowledgement of people whose contributions have shaped Canada for almost 135 years. Since 1891, Ukrainian Canadians have played an important role in making Canada the great country that it is today, and through the bill, Parliament, among other things, is recognizing these important contributions.

Since 1891, Ukrainians have been coming to Canada seeking a better life, and since 1891, Canada has supported them. That is why Canada was the first country in the western world to recognize

Ukraine's independence in 1991. That is why Canada was among the first countries in the world to recognize the Holodomor as a genocide. That is why our government has been a global leader in supporting the people of Ukraine as they defend themselves against Russia's brutal invasion. We are relentless in our support for Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Through the bill, Parliament is also recognizing those contributions, the steps that Canada has taken to support the Ukrainian Canadian community and the people of Ukraine. There has never been a more important time to adopt the bill than today.

● (1815)

I told a story about my grandfather helping me with my Saturday school homework. Now I want to tell members a story about my grandfather from 1991, when Ukraine declared its independence from the Soviet Union. I was with my *Dido* Ivan that day, and we were watching the news coverage of what was happening in Ukraine.

For context, my grandfather was born in Ukraine and grew up in Ukraine under Soviet occupation. On many occasions, like many of the people who are watching at home, families risked their lives to achieve a free and independent Ukraine, just as the people of Ukraine are doing as we speak.

In 1991, we were sitting in his home in Toronto in Bloor West Village. We were watching the news, watching Ukraine declare its independence, which may have been one of the most proud days of his life. At one point in our conversation, my grandfather said now that Ukraine was independent, we had to continue the fight for Ukraine's independence. I think I was 13 or 14 years old at the time, and I said, "*Dido*, what are you talking about? It is over. This is done. The Ukrainian people want independence. The world has recognized it. It is done." I said, "*Dido*, you are wrong." Of course, I was wrong.

In 2008, Russia invaded Georgia and the world got it wrong. In 2014, Russia invaded Ukraine, first in eastern Ukraine and then Crimea, and the world got it wrong. We cannot afford to get this wrong again.

Canada has been a global leader in supporting Ukraine since 2022. I believe that there are two key reasons we need to support Ukraine. The first reason is that it is the right thing to do. It is the moral thing to do. Ukrainian people are bravely fighting back to defend themselves against a brutal invasion and war crimes that are occurring daily, and we see that in the news every day. The other reason is that supporting Ukraine is the right thing for Canada, because Ukraine's victory is vital to Canada's security. If Russia wins, it is not going to stop at Ukraine. We know this because Vladimir Putin has told us so over and over again.

Just recently, Vladimir Putin sent Russian drones over European military bases, NATO military bases. In the past, Putin has claimed parts of the Canadian Arctic as Russian territory. European military and political leaders, elected leaders in western Europe, are publicly saying that Europe has to be ready for a full-blown land war with Russia in the coming years.

Russia's invasion is not just about Ukraine. Ukraine is just the first step in Russia's expansionist ambitions. If Russia succeeds in Ukraine, it is not going to stop there. Canadians, Americans and Europeans will be next. We will be defending ourselves against Russian aggression, whether that is with our NATO partners in Europe, in the Canadian Arctic or somewhere else in the world. We either pay a smaller price now to help Ukraine win, or we pay a much larger price later, in Canadian dollars and in Canadian lives. That is why we must stand with the Ukrainian people now until they win.

As I said, the government has been a global leader in supporting Ukraine. Since 2022, Canada has committed over \$22 billion in support for Ukraine. I want to highlight some of the types of aid that Canada has provided. Canada has provided \$6.5 billion in military assistance alone. This includes a range of things, including air defence missiles, howitzers, Leopard 2 tanks, drones, armoured vehicles and other critical equipment. Canada's military training mission, Operation Unifier, has trained over 44,000 Ukrainian soldiers and over 300 Canadian Armed Forces members remain deployed on this mission. Canada has also committed \$389 million to train Ukrainian fighter pilots for the F-16 jets that have been contributed by allies, and more than \$140 million to support Ukraine's domestic drone production. That is military aid alone.

On the financial side, Canada has provided over \$12.6 billion in direct financial assistance. Canada is the largest contributor of financial support to Ukraine, direct or multilateral, per capita in the world. This includes almost \$7 billion in loans through the IMF, \$500 million in direct bilateral loans and an over \$5-billion contribution to the G7's new extraordinary revenue acceleration loans for Ukraine. Canada has also played a leadership role in strengthening Ukraine's economy and long-term resilience, including the modernization and parliamentary ratification here in this Parliament of the Canada-Ukraine Free Trade Agreement, which many members here voted in support of.

● (1820)

Since 2022, Canada has sanctioned nearly 2,300 people and more than 1,000 entities in Russia, Belarus and Ukraine. In total, almost 4,900 individuals and entities are currently sanctioned under Canada's autonomous sanction laws. Ukraine is fighting on the front lines of the global struggle between democracy and tyranny. Its struggle is our struggle. That is why we must support the Ukrainian people until we win. That is why Canada is a global leader in supporting Ukraine.

Coming back to the legislation before us, this bill honours the past, strengthens the present and inspires the future. Ukrainian heritage month will offer a special opportunity for us to celebrate Ukrainian heritage, the role that Canada has played in supporting Ukrainian Canadians and the contributions that Ukrainian Canadians have made to Canada. This is not just a symbolic gesture. It is a concrete, enduring recognition of a community that has shaped this country and continues to do so every day, in every riding represented here by members of the House of Commons.

For me, as I mentioned earlier, as a descendant of Ukrainian immigrants and Ukrainian Canadians, this legislation has a personal element, but it is profoundly national. By passing Bill S-210, Par-

### *Private Members' Business*

liament will be affirming that Ukrainian Canadians are integral to Canada, that their heritage deserves celebration and that Canada stands with the Ukrainian people, not only in wartime but all the time.

I urge all members of the House to support Bill S-210 and to join me in designating each September as Ukrainian heritage month in Canada.

I want to finish with some words from Ukraine's most prolific poet, Taras Shevchenko, who once famously said the following.

*[Member spoke in Ukrainian]*

*[English]*

Translated, this means “teach, read and learn from others but always be proud of that which is your own”.

Today, I feel what my grandparents would feel, what a lot of the people watching at home feel, what their parents and their grandparents would feel and what generations of Ukrainian Canadians who have come to Canada for almost 135 years would feel if they were here today, proud of the contributions that Ukrainian Canadians have made to Canada since 1891, proud of their Ukrainian heritage and proud to be Canadian.

● (1825)

**Jacob Mantle (York—Durham, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am a strong supporter of Ukraine, and I find great irony in the member opposite's speech.

On the very day that he speaks to this motion, he stood up and voted against getting Canadian oil and gas to world markets. That requires our allies to buy Russian oil and gas, directly funding their war effort in Ukraine and leading to more death and destruction. Instead, the member should be focusing on what the government is not doing, as it turns a blind eye to sanctions, evasions and transshipment through which Canadian arms and technology are ending up in Russian hands.

Will the member stand up and explain why he voted against getting our oil and gas to world markets and supporting our allies in Ukraine?

**Yvan Baker:** Mr. Speaker, what I would say to the member opposite is that today we are debating Ukrainian heritage month, the contributions of Ukrainian Canadians to Canada, what Canada has done to support Ukrainian Canadians and Ukrainian people, and how important it is to pass this bill, at this very time, in a non-partisan fashion, as was done in the other place.

*Private Members' Business*

I will just say, let us all come together and support Ukrainian heritage month. People in the Ukrainian Canadian community are watching. Canadians are watching. They would want us to come together on this.

[*Translation*]

**Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to comment on the remark just made by the Conservative member. I understand that he is new to the House. He will have opportunities to experience other moments like the one before us this evening, with a bill intended to establish a heritage month. Other heritage months have been instituted in the past. More will be proposed and debated in the future. Usually, this is a time when members from all the parties come together in a relatively collegial way, while at other times, they join in criticizing the government's poor decisions.

This evening, I want to echo my colleague from Etobicoke Centre in recognizing the importance of the Ukrainian heritage month proposed in Bill S-210. I have worked with this member on the Canada-Ukraine Friendship Group for a number of years, and after the barbaric Russian invasion of Ukraine in February 2022, we saw the full extent of the damage. If this Ukrainian heritage month is introduced, it will definitely teach all Quebecers and Canadians more about the history of the Ukrainian nation. I would like to ask my colleague to explain why learning more about Ukraine than we have seen on the news since 2022 is important.

**Yvan Baker:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his remarks. I am fortunate to work with him and other colleagues on the Canada-Ukraine Friendship Group. He is a great ally of Ukraine and the Ukrainian cause. I sincerely thank him for his work and his efforts.

With respect to his question, I think it is important to celebrate Ukrainian heritage because it is an important part of Canadian multiculturalism. I think it is especially important right now, as Ukrainians are fighting to defend that heritage. I thank my colleague for his support.

**Peter Schiefke (Vaudreuil, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I do not have a question. I just want to make a comment that I think is necessary.

[*English*]

I want to commend the hon. member not only for his speech on what I believe is a very important issue, and I think that I join all members in the House in saying that we look forward to voting in favour of that, but also for his steadfast work in advocating for the support of the people of Ukraine. He is among a select few members of the House who have been steadfast and who have never stopped advocating and fighting to bring the voices of the people of Ukraine here to the House. I want to thank him for that, not only as the member of Parliament for Vaudreuil but on behalf of all members of the House.

**Yvan Baker:** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for his kind words. I want to say that the work Canada is doing on Ukraine is a result of the work of many members. It is a real team effort. I want to thank him and other colleagues for their support. We would not have gotten here without that. This is a team effort. It is in Ukraine's interest. It is the right thing to do, but it is in our interest. We have to make sure the Ukrainians win.

I thank colleagues for their support.

● (1830)

**Jonathan Rowe (Terra Nova—The Peninsulas, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk about Ukraine and Russia, and how Canada has been supporting Ukraine in that war. Newfoundland and Labrador has a great opportunity to be able to provide oil and gas to the rest of the world, including Germany. Councillors from Germany came to Newfoundland and Labrador looking for natural gas, and the Liberal government said that there was no business case for it.

Will the Liberal government repeal Bill C-69?

**Yvan Baker:** Mr. Speaker, there are two points I would make. First of all, Canada actually, in the last government, enabled the pumping of much more natural gas to global markets, which ultimately helps ensure the gas gets to Europe and other allies, brings the price down for our European allies and gets the supply up. Second, the Prime Minister signed an agreement with the Premier of Alberta for an MOU for a pipeline. Therefore, we are working on energy and we are working on supporting Ukraine.

**Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the friendship and the ties between Canada and Ukraine are deep and historic. The first recorded arrival of Ukrainians to Canada took place in the month of September, more than 125 years ago. In the decades that followed, many more Ukrainians made the journey to Canada in search of opportunity. While they settled in communities across the country, their mark is particularly significant on the Prairies.

Living in difficult conditions and enduring harsh prairie winters, they worked tirelessly to build new lives and communities. They cleared farmlands, built churches and schools, raised families and helped shape many of the prairie towns and villages that still stand today. For generations, Ukrainian Canadians have played a foundational role in building not only the Prairies but also the very fabric of our nation. They have enriched Canada's social, economic and cultural life by founding businesses, contributing to local economies, advancing the arts, preserving their language and traditions, and strengthening the civic life of their communities.

Canadians of Ukrainian heritage have also defended our nation and our values in combat. In fact, Ukrainian Canadians enlisted in great numbers to fight for Canada in the Second World War. Their enlistment rate was the highest of any ethnic group outside those of British descent. In a country like Canada, where hockey occupies such a big place in our hearts, they also brought victories on the ice, with names like Wayne Gretzky coming to mind.

A proud Canadian of Ukrainian heritage, I am actually a great-granddaughter of Ukrainian immigrants who settled in southeastern Saskatchewan, on both my mother's and my father's sides. They are the ones who helped plow the land and helped clear the bush. I recall the stories of my grandparents, and even of my parents, who would recall the times when they would be in the field picking stones by hand. It was something we were often threatened with when we were younger, that we would have to go out and pick stones from the field.

There is a strong connection between Canada and Ukraine, and this is deeply personal for me. Today I am wearing my vyshyvanka, a traditional embroidered shirt that reflects the rich culture and history of the Ukrainian people. I want to add that my late mother, who passed away five years ago, is the one who embroidered this for me. My parents fought very strongly to preserve our Ukrainian heritage. I actually did Ukrainian dancing for 14 years of my childhood, and this is one of the vyshyvkas that she embroidered for me so that I could display not only our heritage but the importance of preserving it. This represents the endurance of a community that has preserved its language, traditions and culture despite hardship, displacement and attempts to erase its identity.

My family, like so many others, settled in the Prairies and passed down values, culture and traditions that continue to shape our communities. Today, the Ukrainian diaspora in Canada stands at nearly 1.4 million people. By designating September as Ukrainian heritage month, we would celebrate this remarkable heritage and honour the contributions of Ukrainian Canadians to our shared history. We would also recognize the nearly 1.4 million Ukrainian Canadians who continue to contribute to our nation, and we would celebrate their traditions, their language and their culture, which they have worked so hard to preserve for generations.

• (1835)

The designation of Ukrainian heritage month is significant not just because of the fact that Canada has the third-largest diaspora in the world but also because of the strong bond between Ukraine and Canada. The bond between Canada and Ukraine has always been rooted in our shared values of freedom, democracy and the rule of law. Conservatives have always stood firm in defence of those values, and we have always stood firmly in support of Ukraine.

In fact Conservatives have a steadfast record of standing with Ukraine. On August 24, 1991, Ukraine declared its independence from the Kremlin's rule. It was on December 2, 1991, under a Conservative government, that Canada became the first western country to recognize Ukraine's independence. Later, in 2008, it was another Conservative government that officially recognized the Holodomor genocide. This recognition commemorates the deliberate starvation that killed millions of men, women and children in Ukraine between 1932 and 1933, carried out by Stalin's regime. After Putin's illegal annexation of Crimea in 2014, Prime Minister Stephen Harper delivered a blunt message to Vladimir Putin to get out of Crimea.

Conservatives also negotiated a free trade agreement, and we launched Operation Unifier, a military training mission to support Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity. We also imposed the toughest sanctions in the world on those responsible for Russia's

### *Private Members' Business*

aggression at the time. Since Putin launched his full-scale invasion in 2022, we have continued to stand with the Ukrainian people as they defend their freedom, independence and sovereignty.

It is against this backdrop of resilience that Ukrainian heritage month takes on an even deeper significance. As members of the House consider the designation of September as Ukrainian heritage month, it is in this context, the context of Ukraine being at war with Putin; the context of democracy, freedom and territorial sovereignty being under attack; and the context of its people standing firm in defence of rules-based international order.

A Ukrainian heritage month would offer all Canadians an opportunity to reflect on the values that unite us. It would remind us that freedom is precious and must always be defended. It would remind us of the strength that comes from standing together, and it would reinforce what binds us as a nation. It would celebrate the courage of the people who came before us and the contributions of those who continue to enrich our country today. It would inspire future generations to carry forward these values and contributions with pride and determination.

Again, by designating September as Ukrainian heritage month, we would celebrate the rich history and enduring contributions of Ukrainian Canadians to the Canadian story. We would celebrate the nearly 1.4 million Ukrainian Canadians who continue to contribute to our nation in every province and territory. We would recognize the traditions, the language and the culture that they have preserved against tremendous odds.

These rich traditions are already celebrated across the country through festivals, provincial proclamations, community events and cultural gatherings. These celebrations inspire pride, reflection and a deeper understanding of the vital role Ukrainian Canadians have played and continue to play in shaping our country. The federal designation would give these celebrations national recognition. It would amplify the message that standing with Ukraine and honouring its people and their heritage remains a priority for Canada.

I look forward to supporting Bill S-210, and I hope that the bill will have the support of the members of the House. By embracing the designation, we would do more than celebrate heritage; we would reaffirm our commitment to freedom, to democracy and to the enduring bonds between Canada and Ukraine.

• (1840)

[*Translation*]

**Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, it takes a lot of humility on my part to speak to this topic, especially after the Conservative member for Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake and after my colleague from Etobicoke North, who have family roots in Ukraine and ties to the Ukrainian community. It takes a lot of humility for me, a little Quebecker with no official or family ties to Ukraine, to take the floor and defend Bill S-210.

*Private Members' Business*

Why am I doing this? First, I am doing it to collaborate, to convey a message that I have been advocating for since I became involved with the Canada-Ukraine Friendship Group, of which I have been a member since I arrived in Parliament in 2019. Joining this group and getting involved has taught me a great deal and made me realize that Quebec has not been as fortunate as other provinces that have welcomed immigrants from Ukraine over the centuries and decades, for around 125 years now, to come and enrich their communities.

To be perfectly honest, all I knew about Ukraine—and I will humbly admit my ignorance—is that it was once part of the U.S.S.R. Given that it was part of the U.S.S.R., there were probably not many opportunities for this nation to share and promote its history and culture. However, it is important to do so, especially in the current context. I myself have had the opportunity to do so through various encounters. Initially, in 2019, a few months before the COVID-19 pandemic took hold in March 2020, meetings were obviously a little less frequent. Then came the horrific events of February 2022, which continue to this day and which the Ukrainian people have been enduring since Russia's monstrous invasion: the abuses, brutality and horrors that we see on the news almost every day.

Creating another opportunity to learn more about Ukrainian culture and the rich history of its people, which should be known and celebrated, would likely help us further embrace support for Ukraine in this conflict. The groups I have had the opportunity to meet fall into two categories. Some of these meetings take the form of urgent requests: calls for help and for logistical and financial support for Ukraine as it fights off the Russian invader. There are also other meetings that I would describe not so much as social, but as human, and that are absolutely fabulous. On occasions such as Vyshyvanka Day, we get to discover a side of Ukrainian culture that is utterly irresistible. It is an opportunity to chat with people, young and old, who embrace and belong to this culture, who are proud of it and eager to share it.

I will say it again. Tools like a heritage month are critical in the current context, where the community in question does not get many opportunities to shine and share its great culture. I am sure the Ukrainian community will make good use of Ukrainian heritage month, which would be commemorated every September. It will be an opportunity to share something different, to share Ukraine's wonderful culinary traditions, which I definitely appreciate, as well as its musical and dance traditions, which were mentioned earlier. These are elements that are unique to this culture, but we do not hear enough about them today, and they should be showcased.

I had never heard of the Holodomor before I got involved with the Canada-Ukraine Friendship Group. Ukrainians lived for many years under Soviet oppression, which deprived us of critical and important information that would probably have allowed us to develop a more informed opinion of what this nation and its people are experiencing.

• (1845)

When I learned about all this, I could not believe that these stories were not being shared more widely in Quebec. As I said, we have not had much contact with the immigrant community from

Ukraine. That is why, every year on Parliament Hill, I make a point of reminding people how important it is to share information, teach, and tell stories about things we do not want to see repeated. We must remember the horrors that have been committed throughout history.

The things that matter are education, knowledge sharing, cultural sharing and enriching our common culture. When we welcome immigrants who arrive with such a rich culture, we hope that they will integrate and enrich our common culture. That is what a heritage month is all about. There are a few throughout the year. There are several heritage months for all kinds of cultures, but I would say that this one is particularly close to my heart. I think we would all benefit from learning more about this heritage. If people knew about all the beauty, pride and richness of Ukrainian culture and history, I think that everyone in Quebec and Canada would push for an end to this conflict. We would be much more actively involved and much more aware of the horrors being experienced by the Ukrainian people, who have a great deal in common with Quebecers and Canadians.

Not surprisingly, we strongly support Bill S-210. We strongly support the creation of a Ukrainian heritage month. We will support this proposal enthusiastically and proudly.

In closing, I would like to remind members that we rarely have opportunities for friendly debate in the House of Commons. Generally speaking, we often debate bills that create a lot of tension and disagreement. However, sometimes bills like this one are introduced, and there is general agreement on them. When this happens, I find it refreshing that we can discuss, debate and listen to members from various political backgrounds speak with the same perspective and passion for something that unites us rather than divides us.

[English]

**Peter Fonseca (Mississauga East—Cooksville, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is quite an honour to rise in the House today to speak to Bill S-210, concerning Ukrainian heritage month, and to recognize the extraordinary contributions of Ukrainian Canadians across our country, particularly the vibrant, compassionate and deeply rooted Ukrainian community of Mississauga. Canada is home to over 1.3 million people of Ukrainian descent, a community whose presence here dates back more than 125 years. That is why I want to thank the member for Etobicoke Centre for bringing forward this bill to designate the month of September as Ukrainian heritage month and to give all Canadians the opportunity to learn, to remember and to celebrate.

I want to begin with something personal. I am not of Ukrainian descent; I was born in Portugal. Like so many families, my parents came to Canada seeking opportunity and a better life, but through marriage, family and community, I have gained a deep appreciation and respect for the Ukrainian community and spirit. My wife, Christina Yaremczuk, is proudly of Ukrainian heritage. Her family comes from the beautiful and historic Lviv region, a region known for its culture, its faith and its fierce commitment to freedom.

*Private Members' Business*

Through Christina, her parents and our extended Ukrainian family, I have come to understand what Ukrainian identity means: perseverance, dignity, cultural pride and love of community. Christina is also dedicated to the Ukrainian Catholic Women's League, an organization that has done so much, especially in recent years, to mobilize humanitarian aid and support for newcomers, to preserve traditions and to strengthen community life.

Our two boys, Alexander and Sebastien, grew up dancing with Barvinok, one of Canada's most-celebrated Ukrainian dance ensembles. My wife and I wanted them to learn culture and to feel those stories in the steps, in the music and in the colours. I remember watching them backstage at performances and seeing the pride in their faces as they put on their embroidered *vyshyvanka* shirts and their boots. Those are memories that I hold deeply.

In Mississauga we are proud to be home to one of the most active and influential Ukrainian communities in our nation. Walking through our neighbourhoods, whether in Cooksville or Applewood, or across our broader region, we can see the legacy of a people who came here seeking opportunity, safety and dignity, and who helped build the Canada we know today.

St. Mary's Canadian Ukrainian Catholic Church in the heart of Mississauga has long been more than a place of worship; it is a spiritual anchor and a gathering space for thousands. Just a couple of weeks ago I was there with my family, meeting Father Jerry and the community for their annual Christmas bazaar, where hundreds gathered for folklore and festivities. St. Mary's is where families celebrate baptisms, weddings and Christmas Eve liturgies filled with candlelight, incense and the unmistakable beauty of Ukrainian hymnody. It is where newcomers have found support groups, charitable assistance and a community that welcomes them with open arms.

Nearby, the Barvinok Ukrainian Dance School, under the leadership of Fedir Danylyak, continues a tradition that stretches back generations. The dancers, children, teenagers and adults, carry forward the colours, the steps and the stories of Ukraine. Every time Barvinok performs in Mississauga, across Canada or, for that matter, throughout the world, it reminds us that culture is not only preserved but is lived, danced, and sung, and is passed from one generation to the next.

We cannot speak of the Ukrainian presence in Mississauga without honouring the role of St. Sofia Byzantine Catholic School. For decades, St. Sofia has taught thousands of young people the Ukrainian language, Ukrainian history and enduring values of faith, community and cultural pride. The impact of that school is profound; many of its graduates become leaders, educators, entrepreneurs or artists who carry their heritage proudly while contributing to the fabric of our country.

Not long ago I spoke with a Mississauga parent who told me she enrolled her daughter at St. Sofia because she wanted her to know who she is and where she comes from. That young girl is now in high school, fluent in Ukrainian, still volunteering at community events and still dancing with Barvinok. This is how culture endures. This is how Canada grows stronger.

• (1850)

One cannot spend time with Ukrainian Canadians in Mississauga without hearing stories of sacrifice and resilience. I met a newcomer, a mother, who arrived with her two children after fleeing the war in Ukraine. She spoke about landing at Pearson airport with one suitcase, no job and no certainty about the future, but she also spoke about how St. Mary's parishioners rallied around her, finding her temporary housing, helping her access settlement services, bringing her clothing and food and ensuring that her children were enrolled in school within days.

Canada was the first western nation to recognize Ukraine's independence in 1991, and we remain steadfast in supporting Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity today. Canada and Ukraine are a partnership of values, courage and friendship. We stand for sovereignty, democracy, human rights and peace. Beyond recognizing Ukraine's independence in 1991, Canada was one of the first countries to condemn Russia's illegal annexation of Crimea in 2014, impose sanctions against those attacking Ukrainian sovereignty, provide military training through Operation Unifier, supply humanitarian aid, welcome displaced Ukrainian families and support Ukraine on the international stage in every forum, NATO, the G7 and the United Nations. Canada has helped rebuild power grids, supply medical equipment, support demining and strengthen Ukraine's democratic institutions.

Ukraine is not only fighting for its territory but for the principles that we hold together, and Canada stands proudly beside it. This is why I want to take a moment to thank my colleague, the member for Etobicoke Centre, who has been a true champion for Ukraine in this Parliament, advocating tirelessly for humanitarian aid, military support and the protection of Ukrainian culture and identity. His leadership has been felt not only here but in Ukraine and in communities across the GTA and Canada.

As we celebrate culture and heritage, we must also remember the history, especially its darkest chapters. The Holodomor was a man-made famine imposed by Stalin's regime in 1932 and 1933, killing millions of innocent Ukrainian men, women and children. It was a genocide, an attempt to erase the people, their language, their identity and their existence. In Mississauga, people gather yearly at a memorial organized with the leadership of St. Mary's, and the Ukrainian Canadian Congress, the UCC, has helped to make sure that Canadians are aware of the Holodomor through school programs, public exhibits, the Holodomor bus that arrives at Parliament Hill, survivor testimonials and community vigils.

*Private Members' Business*

The UCC, both nationally and through its Ontario and local chapters, is the backbone of Ukrainian community life in Canada. It advocates, educates, organizes cultural events, supports newcomers and mobilizes volunteers. Its work in Mississauga, together with my wife, Councillor Christina Yaremczuk-Fonseca, and chairwoman Liliya Gulych, held the first Ukrainian flag-raising and art exhibition in the city of Mississauga this year. The UCC ensures that the Ukrainian identity remains strong and future generations understand their heritage.

Ukrainian heritage month is a moment to celebrate the music and art of Barvinok, the faith and community of St. Mary's church, the education and cultural grounding of St. Sofia school, the leadership of the Ukrainian Canadian Congress, the resilience of families that came here seeking hope and the generations that helped build Mississauga into the thriving multicultural city it is today and Canada into a true symbol of hope.

In the House, during Ukrainian heritage month and throughout the year, we reaffirm our commitment to supporting Ukraine, defending democracy, promoting peace and celebrating the heritage of all who call Canada home. May Canada always stand with Ukraine, may our communities continue to grow in friendship, and may the spirit of the Ukrainian people be resilient, hopeful and unbreakable and continue to shine brightly across Mississauga and across our great country.

*Slava Ukraini.*

• (1855)

**Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise on behalf of the people of Fort McMurray—Cold Lake and speak in support of Bill S-210, a bill that aims to designate September as Ukrainian heritage month.

The first documented Ukrainian immigrants came to Canada in 1891 and settled east of Edmonton at Edna, which is now known as Star, Alberta. Tens of thousands of Ukrainians came to Canada during this first wave. They brought with them farming practices, culture, language and incredible resilience. During the First World War, while thousands of first-wave Ukrainians signed up to fight and defend Canada, thousands of Ukrainian Canadians from the Austro-Hungarian Empire were classified by the Government of Canada as enemy aliens and interned in camps across Canada. Throughout their time interned, they experienced large amounts of forced labour, building national monuments, like Banff National Park, that many Canadians enjoy today.

However, after World War I, there was a second wave of Ukrainian immigrants to Canada. At this time, the land in Ukraine had been used as a battleground, leaving entire communities destroyed and thousands of displaced Ukrainians. Many of these displaced Ukrainians were farmers, professionals and intellectuals who came to Canada so they could rebuild their lives. The already strong, rich, vibrant community of Ukrainian Canadians from the first wave of immigration, combined with similar farmlands, made Canada an ideal place for these Ukrainians to find a new home. The conditions were incredibly harsh, but Ukrainians came and they persevered. They created communities, built churches and schools and shared their culture with their new neighbours.

My great-grandparents came to Canada from Ukraine over 100 years ago in the second wave of immigration, and they homesteaded in Gilwood, Alberta, outside of High Prairie in northern Alberta. They faced tremendous hardships, like the many others who came to homestead in this densely forested landscape.

They survived in large part due to the relationships they were able to forge with local indigenous peoples, who showed them traditional harvesting of berries, hunting techniques and how to build homes so that they could survive the incredibly cold prairie winters. Early Ukrainian settlers in the Prairies relied on this traditional knowledge from the indigenous peoples in the region to survive and adapt to their new environment. In exchange, Ukrainians shared their beloved babushkas, flower-printed scarves now known by generations of indigenous people as kokum scarves.

These kokum scarves, tracing back to Ukrainian trade with local indigenous communities, have now been adopted into indigenous cultural practices, including in powwows, fashion and home wear. The floral scarf was found to have similarities to Cree, Dene and Métis beadwork, which led to the communities' sharing of knowledge and culture. The scarves then symbolized a shared history between the Ukrainian Canadian community and indigenous groups, and created relationships, trade opportunities and a welcoming of each other into their communities, an impression that lasted for generations to come.

One of the many symbols of Ukrainian resilience is the spread of a rich and strong Ukrainian Canadian culture through Ukrainian food, dance, newspapers, bilingual schools and monuments. Ukrainian dance has been a way for many young Ukrainian Canadians to connect with their culture and know their heritage. I was lucky enough as a kid to dance with the Fort McMurray Aurora Ukrainian Dancers community, the dance troupe that my son now dances with. It was an opportunity for me and for countless Ukrainians to learn about the culture, to learn about the community and to learn new traditions.

Beyond that, Ukrainian Canadians were instrumental in preserving the Ukrainian identity during times of Russian oppression. What some people might not understand is that the key and the theme of resilience in the Ukrainian community is so incredibly important because through history, Ukrainians have had to fight Russian oppression in so many different spaces and places. Ukrainian Canadians helped preserve their Ukrainian identity, ensuring this rich culture lived on. Over generations, Ukrainian communities kept the Ukrainian heritage and culture alive, even while Ukraine was suffering under Soviet oppression, at a time when Ukrainians were having their culture systemically stripped from them and erased by the Soviet Union.

• (1900)

One example of Ukrainian Canadians preserving Ukrainian culture is dance. Early immigrants brought their vibrant folk dances to the community. These dances were eventually professionalized with dance companies, such as the Shumka Dancers in Edmonton, which is a perfect example of the mark Ukrainian Canadians have left on Canadian society as a whole.

Shumka, which was established in 1959, is distinguished and world-class. It has performed for Queen Elizabeth II, prime ministers and presidents, and they shared the stage with figures such as Andrea Bocelli, Julie Andrews and countless Ukrainian artists. They have performed across Canada and in tours across the world, including in China and the beloved Ukraine. This goes to show that Ukrainian cultural expression in Canada is alive and strong, leaving a mark on our nation and around the world.

Having a strong Ukrainian community that is resilient and passionate was shown also in our strength and recognition of the Holodomor, a despicable and evil, man-made genocide famine by Stalin, which systemically tried to kill Ukrainians simply for being Ukrainian. The very first monument for the Holodomor in the entire world was built in Edmonton, Alberta, in 1983. It was built at a time when speaking of the Holodomor in Ukraine was not allowed, as they were still under Soviet rule. This was the very first time that truth to power was spoken, and that was in the western world. It was an incredibly powerful sentiment to the Ukrainian people, and it demonstrated our strong ties and connections.

In fact, when President Zelenskyy came here just a few years ago, he mentioned the importance of that very monument and what it meant for the Ukrainian people. The U.S.S.R. had intentionally hid this famine, which it had created, from the world, so putting truth to words and having a monument to this was incredibly important. However, the creation of this monument was just one example of the Canadian-Ukrainian community and its strong ties.

One interesting piece that I would like to share that shows part of the Ukrainian-Canadian culture, and anyone who has driven through the Prairies would have seen them, are the beautiful onion dome churches that dot the prairie landscape. When Ukrainian communities came to Canada, they brought their strongly rooted faith with them. As they set up communities, they built these stunningly beautiful churches, which are still alive and well on the Prairies. Many of them still welcome parishioners on Sundays for mass.

One of these western-Canadian Ukrainian churches is here in the national capital region. It is the St. Onuphrius Ukrainian Catholic Church, which came from just outside of Smoky Lake, Alberta. It is located within the Canadian Museum of History and is an active parish that has mass, I am told, once a year so that it can stay an active parish. It gives an opportunity to commemorate, honour and remember the continuing importance and impact that the vibrant Ukrainian community has on both Canada's history and on Canadian society today.

This strong community has created generations of hard-working, high-achieving, outstanding figures, whether it was the first Canadian female to walk in space, Roberta Bondar; the “great one” and hockey superstar, Wayne Gretzky; or people in the political sphere,

### *Adjournment Proceedings*

like the first Ukrainian elected to a provincial legislature, which happened in Alberta, Andrew Shandro. He is a relative of a former Alberta MLA, Tyler Shandro, who is a great friend of mine and UCC board member. I give a shout-out to Tyler. There is also the late, great Gene Zwozdesky, who was the former speaker of Alberta's legislature. Before getting into politics, he was involved with the Alberta Shumka Dancers and went on to become their music director. In Alberta, that is very common.

• (1905)

There is also Ed Stelmach, a former premier of Alberta, and his spectacular wife Marie, who came from Andrew, Alberta, and were fundamental in establishing the Ukrainian Cultural Heritage Village east of Edmonton, which unfortunately sustained some fires but is still spectacular. Part of why we talk about these things is that it is not just about being Ukrainian; it is creating a culture that is alive and well today.

In conclusion, the Ukrainian community is strong, passionate and important to contemporary culture and society in Canada. Conservatives have and will continue to support Ukraine as it fights oppression from Russia and Putin.

• (1910)

**The Deputy Speaker:** The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired, and the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

---

## ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

[*English*]

THE ECONOMY

**Hon. Mike Lake (Leduc—Wetaskiwin, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, today being a late show, I get a chance to follow up on a couple of questions I asked on November 3. Going back to that time, I asked questions, interestingly, about bonuses being paid to executives. Of course, the responses to those questions had nothing to do with the questions I asked at the time, so we expect we will get a chance to hear some of those answers today in the response from the parliamentary secretary.

In the questions, we talked about how every single dollar the Liberal government brags about spending comes from the pockets of hard-working Canadians in the form of higher taxes and inflation. While Canadians are lining up at food banks in record numbers, their own money is being used by the Liberal government to hand out hundreds of millions of dollars in bonuses.

*Adjournment Proceedings*

I raised the alarm that, for example, 100% of Via Rail executives received bonuses averaging \$110,000 on top of their regular pay under the government, and I talked about that being incomprehensible and completely irresponsible. At the time, the Liberals were doing everything they could to force an election that nobody in Canada wanted, with a budget that was completely reckless. The budget actually came out the next day. We had some hints as to what was going to be in it.

The next day we found out that though the Prime Minister had promised a minuscule deficit of only \$62 billion during the election campaign, instead, just a few months later, the self-proclaimed economic mastermind put forward a budget that was \$78 billion in deficit. We went from \$62 billion promised in the election campaign in April to \$78 billion in a November budget. I raised the fact that it was incomprehensible to me that in this fiscal crisis we are in, 100% of Via Rail executives were able to get bonuses.

I pointed out in my second question that in 2015, The New York Times reported that Canada had the richest middle class in the world when the Liberal government came to power. We had a balanced budget when the government came to power. After that, the finance minister who put forward the budget was elected. I raised in my second question the fact that during an epic housing crisis, 99% of CMHC executives received bonuses averaging \$43,000. I asked how that was okay.

We received no answers to those questions, no references at all to the level of bonuses executives were getting paid under the government. I hope after having had a month and a half to research this information, we will hear an answer now.

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is an interesting proposition the member has just put across the floor. I read his question. Traditionally, Conservatives like to downplay Canada. The member talked about being discouraged because of Canada's middle class, and he tried to imply that the government has not been doing a good job. That is a common theme; the Conservatives like to say to Canadians that Canada is broken.

Wanting to address that aspect of the member's comments, I did a very quick Google search. The member can do the same thing and search "best countries in the world to live". Interestingly enough, here is what comes up: The best countries to live in, consistently ranked high for quality of life, happiness, stability and well-being, are Switzerland, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Norway, Australia and the Netherlands. Canada is often at the top. When we look at the top contenders by category, we see that Canada leads in living standards, family life, education and stability. That was just from a quick Google search.

The Conservatives like to talk down Canada. They are very good at doing that. However, there are a lot of good things happening in Canada, but Conservatives like to take what I would classify as potshots and try to give some sort of a false impression.

The member challenged me to give more details on bonuses. I have news for the member across the way: Stephen Harper also gave out bonuses. The Conservatives also gave out grand bonuses

for performances and so forth, sometimes justified, maybe sometimes not justified.

I can tell the House that, at the end of the day, Canada has what I would argue is the best civil service. Countries around the world look to Canada in terms of how we are able to administer the type of public policies we have and the services we provide to Canadians. I have had the opportunity to be at both the federal and the provincial levels of government for a number of years. I can assure the member opposite that whether it is a Crown corporation, the civil service or, I dare say, even MPs' offices, they provide performance bonuses.

I suspect that even the member opposite who raised the issue has provided performance bonuses. I do not know that, so my apologies if he has not, but I think that is all a part of it. Yes, even I get frustrated at times with the amount of a bonus, or with certain situations that take place.

What I like about the budget implementation bill is that when we break it down we see that it would go to many different standing committees. It would allow members to go into the details on some of those bonuses and maybe get some specific answers that the member is looking for. I would really encourage the member to become more engaged at the committee structure level. At the end of the day, a committee is as effective as the personalities that make it up.

• (1915)

**Hon. Mike Lake:** Mr. Speaker, I do not know the last time the hon. member was actually at committee.

Somehow the member talked about taking potshots. I do not know how he defines a potshot. I pointed out that he ran in an election in which his leader promised an already devastating budget deficit of \$62 billion. We are talking about record-level budget deficits. Then, a few months later, the Liberal government put forward a budget with a \$78-billion budget deficit. Somehow my comment was a potshot. I also asked the member to explain how the government can justify 100% of Via Rail executives' getting bonuses. He called that a potshot, but it is a fair question in a democratic society. It is a fair question for this time.

I hope the member will actually answer this question this time.

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, when I was talking about potshots, I was reflecting on the question the member had asked and the way in which the Conservatives continue to downplay Canada as a nation. We can just take a look at the questions he just finished asking. He again takes shots in regard to the Prime Minister because of the deficit, but what he does not tell us is that we can look at Canada as a nation and see that we are number one in terms of the lowest net debt to GDP ratio in the G7. We are the lowest. We are number two on the deficit, and if I compare with who had a worse deficit, I just look at the leader of the Conservative Party, on an inflation basis, with the 2009 budget. However, that is what I mean. They tell half.

At the end of the day, I think there is a lot that we can be grateful for here in Canada.

• (1920)

ETHICS

**Michael Cooper (St. Albert—Sturgeon River, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is a total and complete hypocrite. During the recent federal election campaign, he presented himself as Captain Canada. He wrapped himself in the Canadian flag with his elbows up. He wove a story of having resigned as chair of the multi-billion dollar investment firm Brookfield to come to Canada's rescue at a time of crisis.

Of course, this self-serving narrative is pure fiction, because what the Prime Minister did not tell Canadians is that, as chair of Brookfield, he played a key role in helping Brookfield avoid paying billions of dollars in taxes in Canada through Brookfield's shady use of offshore tax havens. In fact, the Prime Minister has the dubious distinction of being chair of Canada's biggest corporate tax dodger.

Analysis reveals that, of Canada's 123 largest corporations, there is no bigger tax dodger than Brookfield. Brookfield managed to avoid paying a staggering \$6.5 billion in taxes in Canada in only five years, and I want to emphasize that the Prime Minister was not a bystander to Brookfield's tax dodging. He was an architect, including setting up and registering three multi-billion dollar investment funds in Bermuda and the Cayman Islands, which of course are notorious offshore tax havens. Not only that, the Prime Minister stands to profit from one of these funds that he registered in Bermuda in the way of future bonus pay. In short, this is a Prime Minister who stands to make tens of millions of dollars as a direct result of his tax-dodging scheme. So much for Captain Canada and so much for Mr. Elbows Up.

Meanwhile, the Prime Minister has the audacity to tell Canadians that they need to sacrifice more. I have news for this arrogant and out-of-touch Prime Minister. Millions of Canadians get up every day, they work hard, they play by the rules and, yes, they pay their taxes in Canada. Why will he not? He has a responsibility to do so, and in the meantime, he has a responsibility to come clean and tell Canadians how much he has in offshore tax havens.

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I do have a lot to say on this particular issue, but let us be very clear at the onset. It is important to recognize that when we talk about ethical standards, if I can put it that way, Canada has some of the most, if not the most, stringent rules in place, which have been in place now for quite a while. When we think of the current Prime Minister, look at it from this perspective. He has not only met but exceeded the requirements under those ethics guidelines, and he will continue to do so.

Having said that, let us do a bit of a reflection, in terms of what the Conservative Party has focused so much of its attention on. I have always said that it is character assassination. We saw a great demonstration of that just now. Brookfield is a \$100-billion or \$200-billion company. I suspect that it has investments in a lot of things. At the end of the day, some of the investors sit in the Conservative caucus. They might have sold off since they have been called out on it, like the deputy leader of the Conservative caucus. There are a number of Conservatives who actually have invest-

*Adjournment Proceedings*

ments in Brookfield. If we were to start to ask about this and that, and put on the tin hats, I am sure we could come up with some pretty mischievous behaviour coming from the Conservative Party of Canada. There is a whole pile of them who have questionable ethics in terms of the conflict potential that is out there.

In fairness, I am not a Conservative. I am not a conspiracy theorist believing that everything is a conspiracy in order to try to justify some sort of a statement, when we know full well that the Prime Minister has done everything that is required of him and has actually exceeded that. It does not stop the Conservatives, because they know they can score some political cheap shots that are unjustified and completely unfounded. By spreading this, they believe that they can convince people that there is some sort of real corruption that is there. There is not.

That is what we see coming from the Conservative Party when I talk about character assassination. To the Prime Minister's credit, he has not allowed that to be a distraction as he continues to build and work toward building Canada strong. The Prime Minister, as is this government, is focused on what we can do in order to enhance the lives of Canadians in every region. A part of that agenda is one of the reasons we have a Prime Minister who has been doing a great deal of travelling, ensuring that we can break down barriers and open up doors so that we can have more countries to have trade with, literally billions of dollars of potential commitments coming in as a direct result of the Prime Minister's actions, not to mention the budget, which is there to support things like our military, infrastructure and Canadians as a whole, in terms of programs.

These are all things that are positive and that are happening, primarily because, no matter how focused the Conservatives are on themselves and on wanting to have and participate in character assassination of the Prime Minister, the Prime Minister has resisted that and has focused on serving Canadians. That is something I believe he is going to continue to do, because we have a very straightforward goal, and that is to build Canada strong, to build Canada to become the strongest nation of the G7, and to provide hope for Canadians.

• (1925)

**Michael Cooper:** Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that the Prime Minister set up three multi-billion dollar investment funds in Bermuda and the Cayman Islands, and it is a fact that he stands to make tens of millions of dollars in future bonus pay from one of those funds. Those are facts, not a conspiracy theory, as the member across the way suggested. It is typical of the Liberals, who have nothing but contempt for the truth, nothing but contempt for accountability and nothing but contempt for transparency. They have contempt for taxpayers who work hard and pay their taxes in Canada. Meanwhile, we have a Prime Minister who is a tax dodger.

Why will the Prime Minister not simply come clean and tell Canadians exactly how much he has in offshore tax havens?

Why will he not do that?

*Adjournment Proceedings*

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is someone who was appointed by Stephen Harper to be the Governor of the Bank of Canada. He was appointed in England to be the governor of the Bank of England. He has been a successful business person within the Canadian economy for many years. He has an incredible track record. That is something we should encourage, to have successful individuals like the Prime Minister become parliamentarians, become leaders, provide their vision. That is something we should be encouraging, not trying to tear apart with character assassination. I truly do not think it is called for.

We have rules. Those rules are being followed. The Prime Minister will continue to be focused on Canadians.

## TAXATION

**Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians are being bled dry at the pump and the grocery till, on their phone and Internet bills, and by mortgage and credit card payments that keep climbing. People are doing everything they can just to get by, but every month it gets harder, not easier. While families struggle to keep their heads above water, the biggest corporations in this country are posting record profits. RBC made \$16 billion, Rogers made \$1.7 billion, Loblaws made over \$2 billion, and Imperial Oil made almost \$1 billion in the last quarter alone. The question is fair: How much profit is enough? Is there a limit? When will the government actually take some action?

Across this country, Canadians are getting a raw deal. Our phone bills are among the highest in the world. A 2023 study found Canada has the 10th-highest median price per gigabyte of data globally, higher than every country in Europe except for Switzerland. Canadians pay up to 26 times more for data than people in France do, yet Bell still made \$6.3 billion in profits and laid off 700 workers. This is not a result of healthy competition; this is what happens when a handful of powerful corporations are allowed to dominate a market.

At the grocery store, families are expected to pay about \$1,000 more next year just to feed their households. Meanwhile, Loblaws made more than \$2 billion in profits after settling a \$500-million case for fixing the price of bread over 15 years. At the same time, food bank usage has hit record levels nationwide. Families are forced to choose between rent and groceries.

In the oil and gas sector, it is the same story. Imperial Oil made nearly \$1 billion last quarter and more than \$5 billion last year. Then what did it do? It laid off nearly 1,000 workers. All of this happens while abandoned wells sit unrepaired, environmental liabilities grow and communities are left to deal with the costs. Profits are privatized, but the cleanup is a public expense.

We now have the lowest corporate taxes in the G7 and the highest corporate profits in our history. At the same time, Statistics Canada reports that the gap between the richest two-fifths and the poorest two-fifths of Canadians has reached the widest point ever recorded. This is what happens when we normalize out-of-control corporate greed. Corporate consolidation only makes it worse. Rogers swallowed up Shaw for \$26 billion. RBC bought HSBC for \$13.5 billion. The result is fewer choices for Canadians and more power for large corporations to raise prices however they

want. Under successive Conservative and Liberal governments, this is what has happened.

Even in the U.K., Conservative governments recognized that profits had grown out of control. The U.K. introduced an excess profits tax on oil and gas companies, a measure that raised over six billion euros in just two years and helped support households struggling with the cost of living.

New Democrats want businesses to succeed. We want everyone to win. We believe in innovation, investment and good jobs. However, success should never come from gouging Canadians or driving families into debt. Therefore, again I ask: How much profit is enough? Is there a threshold? Will the Liberal government finally include an excess profits tax in the upcoming spring economic statement? Will it stand up for Canadians instead of corporate boardrooms?

It is time to act, because Canadians simply cannot afford more excuses. This place is starting to feel like a corporate boardroom. This is the opportunity for the government to show Canadians they matter and that they are a priority ahead of the big corporations.

• (1930)

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I can assure the member that, whether it is the Prime Minister, cabinet or all Liberal members of Parliament, we are very sensitive to what is happening in our communities on the issue of affordability. That is one of the reasons, for example, we have the tax cut, which is going to benefit 22 million people. By the way, the member opposite is voting against that, in regard to the budget.

There are many initiatives in the budget that are actually a benefit to all of Canada, including communities the member represents. We have had a lot of debate about it inside the chamber. All we have to do is take a look at some of the things in the budget that are genuine attempts to assist Canadians. At the end of the day, there is a lot there.

I could talk about the national school food program, the pharmaceutical program or the dental care program, but I want to stick to what the member is specifically asking about, which is corporations. My concern, with issues of the people, if I can put it that way, has been there for many years, even when I sat in the Manitoba legislature, when consecutive NDP governments consistently reduced the corporate tax rate. As much as the member tries to give this false impression, I do not think that the government is in the pockets of corporations.

The other day I said to Corrine, one of my staffers, who is doing an outstanding job, that we need to look at ways we can promote more competition in cell phone rates. We had a discussion on that topic. She found one company, and if the member is interested, I can get him the information on it, that was, I believe, less than \$100 for the year. There are areas where we have seen improvement .

There are other areas where government has very limited control. Issues come up, such as the avian flu, that have a direct impact on the supply of chickens, and the price of chicken is goes up. If there are demands on beef, the number of cattle available for slaughter cannot be instantly increased, so prices will go up. There are things that cause inflation that are beyond the government's control.

On the issue of affordability, what is important is that the government takes the necessary actions to try to maintain the rate of inflation. I believe the Bank of Canada has set the rate of about 2.2%, which is the target it wants to see us at.

There are always going to be ways in which we could improve the system. I look forward to more federal budgets that will ultimately put us in a better position. All in all, when we take a look at the overall budget, there is a lot to support Canadians at this difficult time. I would hope that we would get more support coming from the New Democrats, recognizing that this budget does support Canadians as a whole.

• (1935)

**Gord Johns:** Mr. Speaker, that would almost be funny if the Liberals were not blaming the avian flu for driving up grocery store prices, which is harming people. This is the kind of answer that I expected today.

We will never hear the Liberals or the Conservatives willing to take on corporate greed. They will place blame everywhere else. Meanwhile, companies such as Loblaws have had record profits, a couple of a billion dollars. This is not because of the avian flu.

### *Adjournment Proceedings*

For big oil and gas, Canadian Natural has had \$6 billion in profits, Enbridge has had \$5 billion in profits, Suncor has had \$5 billion in profits, Imperial Oil has had \$4 billion in profits and AltaGas has had \$3.5 billion. We are seeing record profits for the five big oil companies.

Meanwhile, they are using a taxpayer-funded pipeline, the TMX, which costs taxpayers \$34.5 billion, and we cannot find a buyer for the pipeline. Why are the big oil and gas companies not buying it? It is because of corporate welfare on the backs of the public. The government has its priorities out of order—

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, the member is wrong. We brought in amendments to the Competition Act, for example. With respect to the profits of the grocery companies, the minister responsible called the big five to come to Ottawa. We had standing committee meetings. The government has done its job in advocating on behalf of consumers. In certain areas we have seen a lot of success; in other areas it can be a challenge. I recognize that it can be a challenge, but I would also suggest that, as a government, we are up to the challenge.

At the end of the day, I would like to think that, whether it is through the Competition Act or bringing in direct supports to Canadians, we will be there to have the backs of Canadians.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The motion that the House do now adjourn is deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 7:39 p.m.)





Hogan .....	4837
Lloyd .....	4838
Simard .....	4839
Lapointe (Sudbury) .....	4839
Wagantall .....	4839
Lamoureux .....	4839
Allison .....	4840
Simard .....	4841
Hogan .....	4841
Kuruc .....	4841
Kayabaga .....	4843
Larouche .....	4843
Gill (Windsor West) .....	4843

### STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

<b>Squamish Climate Action Network</b>	
Weiler .....	4843
<b>Community Organizations in Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier</b>	
Godin .....	4844
<b>Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin</b>	
Sgro .....	4844
<b>Richard William Stark</b>	
McKenzie .....	4844
<b>Pastry World Cup</b>	
Auguste .....	4844
<b>Firearms</b>	
Gill (Calgary Skyview) .....	4844
<b>Membertou First Nation Leadership</b>	
Kelloway .....	4845
<b>Penticton Shooting Sports Association</b>	
Konanz .....	4845
<b>Diane Godin</b>	
Normandin .....	4845
<b>Adolph Hafemann</b>	
Louis .....	4845
<b>Taxation</b>	
Allison .....	4846
<b>Government Priorities</b>	
Sidhu (Brampton South) .....	4846
<b>Cost of Living</b>	
Dawson .....	4846
<b>Dominican Missionary Adorers</b>	
Lavoie .....	4846
<b>Natural Resources</b>	
Warkentin .....	4846
<b>Men's National Cricket Team</b>	
Khalid .....	4847

### ORAL QUESTIONS

<b>Natural Resources</b>	
Poilievre .....	4847
Carney .....	4847
<b>Carbon Pricing</b>	
Poilievre .....	4847
Carney .....	4847
<b>Natural Resources</b>	
Poilievre .....	4847
Carney .....	4847
Poilievre .....	4847
Carney .....	4848
Poilievre .....	4848
Carney .....	4848
Poilievre .....	4848
Carney .....	4848
<b>The Environment</b>	
Blanchet .....	4848
Carney .....	4848
<b>Justice</b>	
Blanchet .....	4848
Carney .....	4848
<b>Transportation</b>	
Blanchet .....	4848
Carney .....	4849
<b>Carbon Pricing</b>	
Poilievre .....	4849
MacKinnon .....	4849
Poilievre .....	4849
Dabrusin .....	4849
<b>Taxation</b>	
Poilievre .....	4849
Hajdu .....	4849
Poilievre .....	4850
Hajdu .....	4850
<b>Finance</b>	
Poilievre .....	4850
Long .....	4850
Poilievre .....	4850
Hodgson .....	4850
<b>Natural Resources</b>	
Poilievre .....	4850
MacKinnon .....	4850
<b>Transportation</b>	
Barsalou-Duval .....	4851
MacKinnon .....	4851
Barsalou-Duval .....	4851
MacKinnon .....	4851
<b>Natural Resources</b>	
Strahl .....	4851
Hodgson .....	4851
Strahl .....	4851

Noormohamed.....	4851	<b>The Budget</b>	
Kusie.....	4852	May.....	4857
Zerucelli.....	4852	Turnbull.....	4857
Kusie.....	4852	<b>Points of Order</b>	
Sidhu (Brampton East).....	4852	<b>Relevance of Answers During Oral Questions—</b>	
Morin.....	4852	<b>Speaker's Ruling</b>	
Gull-Masty.....	4852	The Speaker.....	4857
<b>Regional Economic Development</b>			
d'Entremont.....	4852		
Fraser.....	4852		
<b>The Economy</b>			
Lantsman.....	4853		
Gainey.....	4853		
Lantsman.....	4853		
Gainey.....	4853		
Thomas.....	4853		
Hajdu.....	4853		
Thomas.....	4853		
Dabrusin.....	4853		
<b>Finance</b>			
Mantle.....	4854		
Turnbull.....	4854		
<b>The Economy</b>			
Berthold.....	4854		
Lightbound.....	4854		
Berthold.....	4854		
Lightbound.....	4854		
Martel.....	4854		
MacKinnon.....	4854		
Martel.....	4855		
MacKinnon.....	4855		
<b>Regional Economic Development</b>			
Carr.....	4855		
Olszewski.....	4855		
<b>The Economy</b>			
Rood.....	4855		
van Koeverden.....	4855		
Rood.....	4855		
van Koeverden.....	4855		
<b>Carbon Pricing</b>			
Waugh.....	4856		
Belanger (Desnethé—Mississippi—Churchill River).....	4856		
<b>The Economy</b>			
Dhaliwal.....	4856		
Ali.....	4856		
<b>Carbon Pricing</b>			
Diotte.....	4856		
McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke).....	4856		
<b>Natural Resources</b>			
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway).....	4856		
Dabrusin.....	4856		
		<b>GOVERNMENT ORDERS</b>	
		<b>Business of Supply</b>	
		<b>Opposition Motion—Pipeline Construction</b>	
		Motion.....	4858
		Goodridge.....	4858
		Sgro.....	4859
		Ruff.....	4859
		Blanchette-Joncas.....	4859
		Guay.....	4860
		Van Popta.....	4861
		Blanchette-Joncas.....	4861
		Kayabaga.....	4861
		Sgro.....	4862
		Ross.....	4863
		Blanchette-Joncas.....	4863
		Kayabaga.....	4863
		May.....	4864
		Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake).....	4864
		Deschênes-Thériault.....	4865
		Beaulieu.....	4865
		Bonk.....	4865
		Lamoureux.....	4866
		Johns.....	4866
		Bexte.....	4868
		Beaulieu.....	4868
		Lamoureux.....	4868
		Nathan.....	4868
		Vis.....	4870
		Ste-Marie.....	4870
		Hepfner.....	4870
		Ross.....	4870
		Grant.....	4870
		Ross.....	4872
		Blanchette-Joncas.....	4872
		Bardeesy.....	4873
		May.....	4873
		Strahl.....	4873
		Leitão.....	4874
		Zimmer.....	4874
		Blanchette-Joncas.....	4875
		Lamoureux.....	4875
		Amendment negated.....	4876
		Motion.....	4876
		Motion negated.....	4878
		<b>Supplementary Estimates (B), 2025-26</b>	
		Ali.....	4878

Motion for concurrence .....	4878
(Motion agreed to) .....	4878
Bill C-17. First reading .....	4878
(Motion deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) .....	4878
Second reading .....	4878
Adoption de la motion .....	4878
(Bill read a second time and the House went into committee of the whole thereon, Tom Kmiec in the chair) .....	4878
(On clause 2) .....	4878
Kusie .....	4878
Ali .....	4878
(Clause 2 agreed to) .....	4878
(Clause 3 agreed to) .....	4878
(Clause 4 agreed to) .....	4879
(Clause 5 agreed to) .....	4879
(Clause 6 agreed to) .....	4879
(Schedule 1 agreed to) .....	4879
(Schedule 2 agreed to) .....	4879
(Clause 1 agreed to) .....	4879
(Preamble agreed to) .....	4879
(Title agreed to) .....	4879
(Bill agreed to) .....	4879
(Bill reported) .....	4879
Motion for concurrence .....	4879
(Motion agreed to) .....	4879
Third reading .....	4879
(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed) ..	4879

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

### Ukrainian Heritage Month Act

Baker .....	4879
Bill S-210. Second reading .....	4879
Mantle .....	4881
Champoux .....	4882
Schiefke .....	4882
Rowe .....	4882
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake) .....	4882
Champoux .....	4883
Fonseca .....	4884
Goodridge .....	4886

## ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

### The Economy

Lake .....	4887
Lamoureux .....	4888

### Ethics

Cooper .....	4889
Lamoureux .....	4889

### Taxation

Johns .....	4890
Lamoureux .....	4890



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>