



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 138 • NUMBER 032 • 2nd SESSION • 37th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Tuesday, November 26, 2002

—
Speaker: The Honourable Peter Milliken

CONTENTS

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

All parliamentary publications are available on the
"Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire" at the following address:

<http://www.parl.gc.ca>

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, November 26, 2002

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

NOTICE PAPER

• (0950)

[*English*]

The Speaker: On November 25 a motion standing in the name of the right hon. member for Calgary Centre was placed on notice under the rubric notices of motions, routine proceedings. The notice should properly have been placed under the rubric private members' notices of motions.

[*Translation*]

I regret any inconvenience this may have caused hon. members.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1005)

[*Translation*]

ORDER IN COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS

Mr. Geoff Regan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to table, in both official languages, a number of order in council appointments recently made by the government.

* * *

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

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

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the first report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts concerning chapter 13 of the December 2001 Report of the Auditor

General of Canada (Other Audit Observations: Relief for Heating Expenses).

I also have the honour to table the second report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts concerning chapter 13 of the December 2001 report of the Auditor General of Canada (Other Audit Observations: Human Resources Development Canada and the Canada Employment Insurance Commission).

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

* * *

[*English*]

PETITIONS

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Mr. Darrel Stinson (Okanagan—Shuswap, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to present four petitions from my constituents of Okanagan—Shuswap. They feel that the addition of sexual orientation as an explicitly protected category under sections 318 and 319 of the Criminal Code could lead to individuals being unable to exercise their religious freedom as protected under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. They call upon Parliament to protect their rights as Canadians to be free to share their religious beliefs without fear of prosecution.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Madam Speaker, I have a petition regarding border traffic in the city of Windsor. The petitioners request that there be some public participation in the meetings with the federal government to ensure that there is open transparency to the process. Hundreds of people have signed the petition on that particular subject matter.

STEM CELL RESEARCH

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Madam Speaker, I also have petitions regarding stem cell research. The petitioners express concerns with regard to the process and more importantly, the debate about that particular subject.

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Madam Speaker, lastly I have a series of petitions regarding child pornography and the concerns of my constituents regarding the accessibility of child pornography in our society right now. They are requesting changes.

Government Orders

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to present a petition on behalf of constituents of mine and also many others throughout the Fraser Valley and as far away as Edmonton, Alberta. They are concerned about the current child pornography laws and the way they have been interpreted by the courts. They are calling upon Parliament to protect our children by taking all steps necessary to ensure that materials which promote or glorify pedophilia or sado-masochistic activities involving children are outlawed. They want to find a way to do that and this is one of many petitions on this subject.

• (1010)

STEM CELL RESEARCH

Mr. Joe McGuire (Egmont, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have a number of petitions I would like to present on behalf of constituents from Summerside to Tignish who are concerned about non-embryonic stem cell research. They call upon Parliament to focus its legislative support on adult stem cell research to find cures and therapies necessary to treat the illnesses and diseases of suffering Canadians such as diabetes, muscular dystrophy and spinal cord injury.

* * *

[Translation]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

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

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

KYOTO PROTOCOL

The House resumed from November 25 consideration of the motion.

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Canadian Alliance): Madam Speaker, I am pleased you are back so that I will not have to review everything I said yesterday for your benefit. I am waiting for a few other members who were keen on getting this. They are just getting here. If I see them come in I will deal with the plan in detail.

They were interested in the 40 IPCC models that the United Nations developed. They would probably like me to review the 4,000 that were initially developed and broken down to 40 models. I decided that I would only have time for the 40 models. I want to explain modelling and the science behind it, how it works and the variabilities that we can have.

In case there are members here who did not have the benefit of hearing everything yesterday I want to state that our party does care about the environment. I care very much. I consider myself environmentally conscience. I have an environmental background

with a training in biology. On that basis I will not go through those details again. I stand here in the House on a very serious issue.

We should deal with two subjects: pollution, and climate change and global warming. Both of those subjects deserve the attention of Canadians and of this House. They deserve the attention of all Canadians who care about their children, grandchildren and future generations.

I also briefly reviewed the position of the Liberals on so many things and highlighted their great deal of talk on air pollution and how their inaction has been startling when we think about some of the situations. I used the Fraser Valley as my best example of air pollution. There we have the second worst air shed in Canada and the federal government did almost nothing to get involved in that issue. It is still doing nothing and does not even bother to make representations before the NEB or before any of the hearings that have gone on or will be going on in the future.

The minister's basic argument is that we should all stop driving so much and not have as many cars. We do not need to have two car families and use so much carbon fuel. We should stop barbecuing to help the environment. We should not run our lawnmowers so often. This is the Liberal solution and commitment to air pollution. The Liberals talk big about downtown Toronto and how our cities are being polluted. But when it comes to action and legislation we see little commitment to carry that out.

I talked about water and the lack of commitment there. Literally the amount of one day of spending on the Kyoto protocol would go a long way to improve the water conditions of the world. Most people have said that if the money were allocated to clean water instead of emissions credits we could provide clean water for every single person in the world.

I talked about landfills and the fact that most of the modern world is not putting its garbage into the ground any more. There is a ticking time bomb leaking into our water tables. There are much better ways in which the world is dealing with garbage. The Great Lakes, the Sydney tar ponds, uranium in the north, all those are examples of where the government has done little.

While talking about water, our third world status of putting sewage into the oceans in such notable places as Victoria, the home and constituency of the environment minister, should never be forgotten if we want to see an example being set for future generations of the caring, feel good, hand over heart kind of philosophy that the government has.

I talked about Kyoto and some of the history of it and the fact that during the whole negotiation process Canada negotiated rather poorly. It had a poorly set economic and implementation plan that did little to help itself. Canada's aim was to go 1% below the Americans. On the other hand the Australians had a plan. They knew the economics and have since opted out.

Government Orders

●(1015)

I talked about the questions that Canadians are asking because they do not understand Kyoto. Yesterday I could not help but talk about my visit to Hamilton on Sunday and about how many people in the audience said they had never really heard about or understood how Kyoto would affect them. I thought about the people driving down the road in all kinds of vehicles and how the federal government was about to do something that would impact every single one of us, our families, grandchildren and future generations.

That is the point we have to get across and the reason I want to speak today about Kyoto. Some 63 members in my party want to talk in detail about Kyoto. We want Canadians to understand that it would impact them. The Canadians I am talking about are a little different from the Canadians who the government has consulted. I am talking about families with two kids worrying about making a living, paying for their house, driving their kids to soccer, and single moms and people on fixed incomes and so on. Those are the people I am talking about.

Those are the Canadians who have not been consulted and do not understand what Kyoto is all about. Those are the people who would be impacted by Kyoto. Those are not the people who would become part of the hearings. Those are not the people who read the newspaper every day. Those are the people who would be most dramatically hit by what Kyoto would bring about. My party will talk about that.

I find it extremely offensive that the environment minister spends his time travelling across this country talking about the doomsday scenario. He is Chicken Little and the sky is falling. He runs across this country saying that the floods, ice storms, and droughts on the Prairies would end as soon as we sign Kyoto.

That is absolutely not true. History has told us that. We have had droughts for a long time. I talked yesterday about the 17th century and the 70 year drought on the Prairies. The fact is that droughts have been getting shorter in time. When John Palliser came to the Prairies he said the land would never be farmed because it was so dry.

These are the things Canadians need to realize. The government's Chicken Little philosophy is not based on science. It is not based on anything. The government talked about little Johnny's asthma being cured by Kyoto. Health and pollution are certainly a subject that the government should deal with but this agreement is about climate change, about global warming and about CO₂.

The minister in his speech yesterday talked about the IPCC and how wonderful it was. We will talk further about that and the 40 IPCC models. About 200 world scientists are recommending what will happen and the variability there.

I introduced the idea of adaptation and how important it is and would be and always has been to the people of the world. People must adapt to changing conditions. These conditions do not change overnight. These conditions change over hundreds of years.

I pointed out that we have had eight ice ages and eight interglacial ice periods. We happen to be in one now. There will be a ninth ice age. Scientists agree with that. In fact nobody disagrees with that.

Yet this government would imply that it is not possible and of course it is wrong.

Yesterday I used quotes from the Prime Minister and what he has said. He said the government would have a plan and would not push it down anybody's throat. He said the government would ensure that all parts of the country are treated equally. The Prime Minister also said that Kyoto would not hurt us at all and so on, all of which we know is not true.

●(1020)

I also, of course, talked about the football game, which was an excellent game. I compared the Minister of the Environment to the Viagra man. The reactions were a little different. The Viagra man is very happy jumping over his picket fence. The environment minister would jump over his picket fence, crying, "The world is falling. The insects will take over the world. Man, woman and child will die". He did not do that but I expected him to.

We also talked about the industry minister, the health minister, and the hon. member for LaSalle—Émard and all the things he said.

Then we started reviewing the so-called plan, the powder-puff PowerPoint presentation of the government. We talked about that plan. I know a lot of members here would like me to review that and make sure we talk about it item by item, because that is probably one of the most important things.

Before I do that, and so we have the opportunity to review this, I want to again go through exactly what Kyoto is all about. We must remember that the public, whether they be in Victoria or Halifax, have asked some questions: First, what is Kyoto? Second, what effect will it have on me? Third, how does it affect my family? Fourth, what will it cost me? Fifth, how will it change my life? Sixth, what will it do for the environment? All Canadians care about the environment. The last question they ask, is there a better way?

I want to spend a lot of today talking about a better way. What is a better way than Kyoto? In the next few hours we will talk about that better way, what exactly that might be and what a Canadian Alliance government would do, if we were in power, to involve Canadians, the provinces and industry.

If people were to turn on any newscast today they would see the government's total failure at getting the provinces and industry on side. Of course every day that goes by the polls tell us that Canadians are not on side. I expect that in another several months a majority of Canadians will say no to Kyoto and yes to a much better plan. Our job, of course, as the Official Opposition, is to make sure Canadians understand what a better way is.

The better way is not the status quo and not doing nothing. The better way is to come up with a plan that will work, that Canadians will be a part of and that industry and provincial governments will work into. Provincial governments are the ones that will be delivering on whatever agreement we come up with.

Government Orders

I will make a Kyoto presentation for hon. members. This is the kind of presentation that I would make at a town hall meeting when I am dealing with a variety of Canadians. I can think of a town hall in Vancouver or one we did in Calgary just a week ago. I can think of a town hall in my own constituency. We also have done some in Ontario. This is the sort of presentation I would give and I will share some of that information with the House.

First, what are the accepted facts that we should deal with when we talk about Kyoto? We should first realize that climate change is occurring and it has always been occurring. No one would say that the climate stays constant. There was a period historically in the 18th century when people were predicting that they could control climate totally. Governments were actually saying that if they took control they could control climate.

I do not think we would find anybody agreeing with that being possible today. We cannot even predict the weather for tomorrow or next week, let alone, with Kyoto, trying to predict the weather for 100 or 1,000 years from now. They tried that in the 18th century and finally agreed they could not do that. Here we are again with a government that is saying that it will predict climate.

• (1025)

Let us agree that climate changes. Climate changes slowly over time. Ten thousand years is the sort of segment that we should be dealing in. We can examine what the weather was like in those time periods by taking ice samples and cores samples from the centre of the earth. We can examine what the climate has been like.

Let us remember, as I said, that there have been eight glacial and eight interglacial periods. There has been in the last 100 years a build up of CO₂. CO₂ has increased by about 40% in the last 100 years. We can also agree that the temperature has increased.

With that temperature increase there are some problems. If we take the figures we will come up with about a 0.6° Celsius increase in the last 100 years. The problem is that only for the about the last 25 years have we been taking temperatures from satellites. We have 23 satellites that record the weather every second of the day around the world.

How did we take temperature before that? We took it from ground stations for about the last 100 years. We have had ground stations, usually close to cities and airports in the last 50 years, and that is where we take our temperature. However we must remember that a huge percentage of the earth is covered by water. How did we get the water temperatures out in the ocean? We asked sea captains to take the temperature and record its exact position and then send that in to a data collection centre.

One hundred years ago some of those sea captains probably did not really know where they were. Probably they did not really take those samples. Some of them probably made those samples up. The point is, to say that those are accurate temperature samples, most scientists would question them.

In the last 23 years of satellite recording there has not been much change in temperature.

We also must remember that the ground stations that temperatures are recorded from today have now become more and more populated

areas. Everyone knows that the temperature in a city is higher than the temperature out in the countryside. Obviously some scientists are arguing that maybe there has not been a major temperature increase. Of course, no one is saying that it has been above 0.9° Celsius in the last 100 years. This Chicken Little, "we are going to burn", really is not based on any science at all.

The third thing we should talk about are the CO₂ levels. Yes, the CO₂ levels have increased by 40% in the last 100 years by calculation. Some people say that it is 30% and some say that it is 40% but let us say that is 40%. Probably, and most likely, that is because of the burning of carbon fuels, the breakdown of carbon fuels. It also is because, of course, that we have gone now to 6 billion people and every one of us breathes out carbon dioxide because we are animals. That is part of the process of respiration. Plants take in CO₂ in photosynthesis and produce carbohydrates and animals in breathing release CO₂.

Yes, there is more CO₂ but in the historical past in the ice cores there are periods of time where CO₂ was way higher than it is today. We must remember that the more CO₂ we have the more photosynthesis we have. Obviously that is reason we have plants and great plant life throughout many parts and the country. I live in an area that was an 800 foot deep inland ocean and there was a great deal of plant life that lived there. We have an abundance of oil and gas today because as it decayed and deposited that is what produced the pockets of oil and gas.

• (1030)

During that time there were hundreds of times more CO₂ than there are now and yet some of the Liberals would have us believe that the only source of CO₂ is humans and human activity. The Mount Etna volcano today releases way more CO₂ than all the animals put together would ever produce. Some would say that at least 90% is from nature and 5% to 10% is from human activity. We are talking about a very small percentage of human involvement in CO₂.

What I have just gone through are some of the accepted facts that scientists would agree to.

What are not accepted facts and what facts are under scientific debate? First, has the release of CO₂ from our fossil fuels contributed to global warming? Is that why it is warmer today than it was 100 years ago? There is a lot of uncertainty on that. How much effect have humans actually had on building up the CO₂? That is a major question that scientists cannot answer today. I will be quoting some of them when we look at the models, which is where we can deal with that issue.

Second, will increasing CO₂ emissions contribute to future climate change? Again we have a great deal of scientific discussion. The IPCC says that it will take at least 10 more years before it understands the science well enough to build the models. It has tried modelling based on facts of the past and most of the models have totally failed. When we get to modelling we will discuss that further.

Government Orders

What are the factors driving climate change? Let us assume that it is a happening and that it is a serious problem. The evidence tells us that 97% of greenhouse gases are water vapour. CO₂ is a major component of the other 3% but also in that is methane and all kinds of other things. In fact some of the science even says that what the sun does, and the influence of sun spots and sun activity, is more important than anything else in creating changes in the greenhouse gas composition and CO₂ levels. However, we will get into that as we go on.

The next major point that we need to make is that greenhouse gases are necessary. All of a sudden, because of Chicken Little, most Canadians would say that we have to get rid of all the greenhouse gases. The greenhouse gases are 97% water vapour. It is what makes our clouds, what protects the earth from the sun's rays and what keeps the temperature on earth 37° Celsius warmer than it would be without greenhouse gases.

If we lowered the temperature of the earth by 37° Celsius we would not have life. We would not have plants and animals. We would have nothing. Greenhouse gases are necessary. The problem, according to Kyoto, is that the greenhouse gases are too intense, are bouncing too much heat back to the earth's surface and that is a problem if we do not want it to get warmer.

I think people in certain parts of Canada might argue, "Hey, right on for greenhouse gases", with Ottawa being one of them. The people in Ottawa certainly could stand a few degrees warmer and if greenhouse gases could make that happen I guess they might say that is a good trade off.

However the minister was right when he said that in places like sub-Saharan Africa those extra few degrees could make a heck of a lot of difference and certainly could damage them. That is a given.

•(1035)

So we should address the question of climate change. We are not arguing that. Then we need to ask, what are the sources of these gas emissions? Let us remember that Kyoto is targeting CO₂. That is what it is all about. It is about CO₂, so let us look at where we get that CO₂ from, on the industrial side of things and the human side of things. The figures look something like this: about 25% of our CO₂ comes from transportation; 4% comes from landfill gases; 10% from agriculture; 10% from buildings; 16% from power generation; 17% from mining and manufacturing, from industry; and 18% from oil and gas.

Let us look at those figures, then, and look at the fact that the minister and the Prime Minister say that we are not going to be affected by any changes, that Kyoto will not cost us any more, that it will not really do anything. We are talking about the reduction of CO₂ to 6% below 1990 levels. Today we are 20% above 1990 levels. From 1999 to 2000, we went from 15% above to 20% above 1990 levels. Canadians are increasing their CO₂ output dramatically.

If we are going to reduce CO₂ as Kyoto commits us to do, what will we have to do? Let us look at the big numbers, such as 25% from transportation. We will have to cut 23% of our release of CO₂ from transportation. That means, then, that if we drive a car, if we ride a train, if we ride a bus or if we fly in an airplane, we will need to have a 23% reduction in all of those things. That means that the

cabinet ministers' cars that are parked in front of this building are going to have to be turned off. That also means that those cars out there will have to be little ones. That is what it means. Those cars are running all day out there. That is setting the example for Canadians about reducing CO₂ from transportation.

An hon. member: They're not running. They're sitting.

Mr. Bob Mills: Their motors are running. CO₂ is being released and carbon energy is being burnt. We have to stop doing that. They need to set an example right out front. Right now we could go out there and count them. There are 20 to 30 cars running out there. They will be running all day. That is the example that is being set.

When I was driving on Highway 401 on Sunday, I was looking at all of the people driving beside me. They were all going at between 120 to 130 kilometres in all kinds of big vehicles. I thought to myself, do these people understand what they are getting committed to in the House of Commons, that they are going to have to stop driving at 130? They are going to have to drive at 80 and have smaller vehicles. They will have to put little Johnny into a tighter vehicle with his hockey equipment when they take him to the game. They will be impacted big time. I do not think they know that.

Certainly people in the audience in Hamilton did not know that. They stood up and said that they did not think it was going to affect them. The guy who worked at the Windstar Ford factory that I passed on my way from Toronto stood up in the audience and said, "I didn't think my job was going to be impacted". He makes Windstars. That is just one example. There are other big vehicles. They are not going to be saleable in Canada. Let us go back to my graph. Twenty-five per cent of CO₂ emissions comes from transportation, so we have to cut transportation. We have to cut by 23% across the country, and what kind of country do we have? We have a cold country. We have a big country. We have a country without the infrastructure to allow us to get around.

•(1040)

It is fine for the Europeans to say that they can just use their trains more, but here we do not have the trains to use. Today CN announced another 1,000 job cuts. We are getting less trains, not more trains. We are getting less rapid transit, not more rapid transit. The government is just talking. It is not introducing any of these things.

As for landfill gases, they make up 4%. We should not have landfills anymore. They were outlawed in Europe 40 years ago. This 4% is a small amount, whereas 16% of our CO₂ comes from power generation, so let us examine that.

What does this 16% mean? Fifty per cent of the power in Canada comes from the burning of coal. The old, traditional methods of burning coal are among the dirtiest producers of CO₂. Clean coal technology has been developed in Europe and the U.S., but 2008 is the earliest we will be experimenting with it in Canada. That will be happening in Alberta through TransAlta. In 2008, we will have some new coal technology in operation.

Government Orders

What is the government thinking, then, when it tells Canadians that Kyoto will not affect them? The lights in this place have been dimmed on occasion. I think that maybe the government's next step should be to turn the lights out totally because most of what it does seems like it has them out anyway.

Sixteen per cent of our CO₂ emissions is from power generation and the government is telling Canadians that converting all those coal-powered generating plants to natural gas, nuclear power or whatever, will be cheap, that it will not cost money. We would have to use 23% less power than we are using today and what is the best way to get people to stop using gas and power? The best way, of course, is to raise the price.

At these international meetings I have heard the Europeans say that Canadians should be paying \$2.50 per litre of gas. In Ontario, it is 66¢ a litre and in Alberta 72¢. Many economists say that in Canada next year a litre of gas will cost \$1. That is a long way from \$2.50, but that has to be the trend if we are to live with Kyoto.

One does not have to be a rocket scientist to look at these figures and understand them. Twenty-five per cent of our CO₂ emissions is from transportation. If we want to cut our CO₂, which is what the government is asking us to commit ourselves to, we have to cut transportation. If we are to sign Kyoto, with its 23% below 1990 levels, we have to cut our use of power.

What else? There is mining and manufacturing. Seventeen per cent of our emissions of CO₂ comes from mining and manufacturing. What does that mean? We must remember that mining and manufacturing use energy. If the price of energy goes up by 23% or the use is reduced by 23%, it will be like what SaskPower announced. SaskPower said that if the government signs Kyoto, power rates in Saskatchewan would go up 25%. A half an hour later, and I happened to be on a talk show while this was happening, the president of IPSCO said that what that meant to IPSCO was that it could not pay 25% more for its power and it would have to move south of the border.

The Prime Minister says that we will not lose any jobs, that this will not cost any more money. How is that possible? Does he think Canadians are a bunch of dummies who cannot look at these figures and figure this out? At every town hall meeting where I have gone through these figures, they have figured it out real quick. They understand it totally and they say, "Yes, that will cost us more money. We're going to lose jobs because of it". As I said, a person does not have to be a rocket scientist to figure it out.

Eighteen per cent of CO₂ emissions comes from oil and gas. One place most of it comes from is our tar sands development. They have improved their CO₂ emissions by reducing them by 30% and they feel that with technology they can go even further in reducing those emissions, but the bottom line is that the emissions are still there.

• (1045)

Does that mean we are not going to extract any more oil and gas? That is what one would assume. If we have to cut by 23%, that industry has to take that hit as well. If that industry has to take that hit, who is going to pay for it? There are the jobs. There is an investment freeze in the country. I would go to Venezuela or Malaysia to put my money in where I do not have those restrictions,

because, we must remember, they are not part of Kyoto. Again I ask, how can the government say it is not going to affect some parts more than others?

When I was in Halifax three weeks ago, I asked a cab driver if he thought Kyoto was a good idea. He said, "I know what Kyoto is. It is about that global warming and it is about health". I then asked him if he thought it would affect him. He said, "Damn right it will". He said that Halifax finally has an industry that is giving the city jobs and growth. Halifax is booming. He asked me if I knew why it is booming. He said, "Do you see those oil rigs that are being constructed out in the harbour and that are in for repairs? That is why it is booming". He said that Halifax finally has an industry that is paying the people money and giving them jobs and, because government is government, he said to me, "You are going to take this away from us at the very time we are about to achieve something ourselves". That is coming from a cab driver, who is saying that he has it figured out, that the federal government is going to damage his way of life.

I am not saying we should not do anything, and I will come to that, but I need 10 days to talk about the alternatives in technology that we could come up with. I am not going to take 10 days because my voice might not last, but let us think about the figures that we have just gone through. Let us think about what has to get hit for Canadians and how it is going to affect them if we sign on to Kyoto: transportation, power generation, manufacturing and industry, lost jobs, lost opportunity, higher power rates, higher gas prices and a hit on our economy.

I do not understand how the Americans could figure this out, how the Australians could figure this out or how Mexico could figure this out. Brazil figured it out. China and India, in Delhi two weeks ago, said they were never going to be part of Kyoto, that they will not be shutting down their economies. All of these other major producers of CO₂ have it figured out, but we do not have it figured out. We are following along like little puppy dogs behind a Eurocentric plan that is out to get the U.S. That is my definition of Kyoto. I will elaborate on that geopolitical front a bit later when I have the opportunity.

So what is the Kyoto protocol? Let us go back and review that protocol. One of the major questions people ask is, what is the Kyoto protocol? It was signed in 1997. It requires 38 of the industrial countries to reduce their emissions of greenhouse gases by an average of 5.2% below 1990 levels. The timeframe is that it must happen between 2008 and 2012. Fifty-five countries representing 55% of the emissions of industrialized countries must ratify Kyoto and then must enter into force in a legally binding agreement.

Government Orders

I have heard some people say that we can sign on to this and not have to live up to it. Let me read to the House from the Kyoto protocol about the penalties. It basically states that, according to the Marrakesh accord, nations that ratify Kyoto but do not meet their targets in round one by 2012 are penalized another 30% in emissions cuts and, in addition, such nations cannot sell carbon credits in round two. That makes it pretty clear that there are penalties associated with Kyoto.

• (1050)

Going on from the Kyoto protocol, it states, “in the case of compliance with emissions targets, annex 1 parties are granted 100 days after the expert review of their final annual emissions inventory has finished to make up any shortfall in compliance mainly through emissions trading”.

For Liberals out there or for Canadians out there who are listening to this, remember there are penalties. Beyond that, the European Union has said that it will introduce WTO action which will affect trade. There are definite penalties around the Kyoto protocol.

To go a little further into the history, because everybody asks what is Kyoto?, the environment minister in Ontario has said, “Kyoto is a Japanese car”. A lot of people are probably at the point where they really think Kyoto will not affect them and that it is some negotiated thing in a far off place, in a beautiful city in Japan. As I said yesterday, I expect that Kyoto probably wishes the meeting had not been there. It probably would have rather had it the Ottawa protocol and then the rest of the world could hate Ottawa. However the meeting was in Kyoto.

Let us go back to 1992. The United Nations framework on the convention of climate change included a legally binding voluntary pledge. I think a legally binding voluntary pledge is an oxymoron, but we signed it to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions by the year 2000. We said we would freeze them and they would not increase.

Nobody did anything. If we look at most of the text of that, the whole purpose of it was the idea that within the United Nations there was a concept, probably correctly, that the north had developed all its natural resources, had been responsible for the production of CO₂ into the environment and now they should pay the price. They should transfer money from the north to the south. Most countries bought into that.

What they did not understand was that when the money was transferred to a dictatorship someplace else, that money would not be used for environmental cleanup or to help the people of that country. Instead it would be used to buy F-18s or to invest in Swiss bank accounts. That is what corrupt governments do. They do not think about their people and they usually do not think about the environment.

In 1995 everybody realized that no one was living up to these international agreements and by 1997 we went to Kyoto. We signed this protocol. Everybody in the House during that period will remember the questions which were asked in the House. We asked the then environment minister about the plan and what would happen in Kyoto? Would she agree to this agreement on climate change? Was there an economic plan? Had the provinces been consulted? She did that the week before she left in Regina.

These questions were asked and the answer we received in the House was not to worry about it. The Liberals would not sign anything that would affect us negatively. The Liberals would not do anything to the Canadian people, the provinces and industry that would damage the economy or cost any money. It sounded pretty innocent.

The environment minister went off to Kyoto, and it appeared the Prime Minister was in charge of the file. At that time it was made very clear what our plan was.

• (1055)

Our plan was to ensure that whatever the Americans agreed to that we would beat them. Let us think about that for a minute. We had to beat the Americans. The Americans went there with all kinds of doubts, knowing that it was an economic disaster. They said that they would go 5% below 1990 levels. The Europeans did not do as well. Australia went 8% above 1990 levels. Others could not decide on a figure but said that they would come up with it later. Canada said it would go 6% below 1990 levels and beat the Americans. That was then the triumph back in the House in December 1997, when our environment minister returned and stood up in the House and said, “We had a great victory. We beat the Americans”.

Nobody paid much attention at that time because we had signed hundreds of agreements. The Auditor General said that we signed 200 environmental agreements in the last 10 years. She audited 60 of them and we had been a failure in most of them. We had not done anything. Therefore most people thought Kyoto was just another agreement that we would sign and do nothing about it.

We have somewhat of an international reputation now for doing things like that. We even call the President of the country next door, which is one of our best friends and a superpower, names. We are not too bright when it comes to some of these international negotiations.

However we agreed and without a plan, we then put that on the back burner and basically did very little.

In 1998, in Buenos Aires, there was a meeting of all the members who had signed on to Kyoto. Most of them said that they had some real problems with it. They had done some economic planning and would have to cut power production, or cut the use of fuel or cut air service. They said they would have to do a lot to achieve the goals. They left Buenos Aires in 1998 with really little resolve and with little resolution to move forward.

In 2000, there was another meeting at The Hague of the members of this umbrella group. Most of them not only went to the meeting but they went and said that they could not achieve the targets and left. At this point, a number of countries put forward their problems.

Government Orders

Then in February we went to Trieste. It was interesting because at this point some countries were starting to get the idea of this Kyoto thing.

Russia said that it could be a pretty good deal for it. It could sell credits and get billions of dollars from other countries by selling these credits. The developing countries said that it was a good deal for them because they did not have to hit their targets. The other developed countries would have to hit targets but they could sell more things to those countries and that would be good for their economies.

France said that it was okay. It could hit its targets because it was 80% nuclear. As long as it had nuclear power, it could support Kyoto. France thought it was a good deal because it could then start selling energy to other countries because it had clean energy.

Remember that the European Union is made up of 15 countries that can interchange credits, They can take credits from one country to the other. They have an internal credit trading system.

It was interesting that Germany said that it was okay too. It had credits for all the deindustrialized East Bloc countries. Italy said that it was okay because it had a fixed population, 55% were over 65 and its birth rate was .2%. Therefore it did not have a big problem with that.

Europe is in a totally different ball game. It is smaller, has better transportation, is not as cold, et cetera.

The real crunch came after Trieste when Christine Whitman, the environment minister in the U.S., said that she thought the Americans could go along with it and would come up a different plan. The Europeans would have nothing to do with that. Therefore, in March of 2001 the Americans said that they were opting out of Kyoto. That was a major blow to Kyoto at that time. The Americans were out.

I will talk about the American emissions in a few minutes, but their emissions have been dropping. Thirty-nine states will probably beat Kyoto. That just shows that if the people, the industry and the politicians are behind something it can happen. California is a good example. We always like to say that the Americans are not doing anything. They doing way more than we are, and it is not just talk. They are actually accomplishing something.

We then got to Bonn in July 2001. The former deputy prime minister went there on our behalf. He was in a fog a lot of the time, but he said that we had to have sinks and that we had to have energy credits for forest and agriculture.

• (1100)

That was the first time we had heard that sort of thing. That should have been introduced way back in the 1990s. Clean energy credits and sinks were never introduced. As a result of that Canada, said that if it was not given the sink credits we would opt out of Kyoto. That was probably the wisest thing that any government official ever said.

The Europeans were so set on keeping us in that they said they would give us the sinks for 30 megatonnes credit. We did not have to tell them how we would get there or how we would monitor it or anything, they would just give it to us. It was a throw away to keep

us in the agreement. Following up on that, and I will talk about sinks in a few minutes, Canada took that as a great victory.

That is some of the history.

Mr. Darrel Stinson: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am sitting here listening to this and I am wondering where everyone is. I would like to call quorum.

And the count having been taken:

• (1105)

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): There is quorum. The hon. member for Red Deer may continue.

Mr. Bob Mills: Madam Speaker, I will just review Bonn, just to pick up on that, because I think some of the members were distracted.

In Bonn we got our sinks. The Europeans felt that there was no real science there and that there was no real way to monitor that, but we got them. We said that we really had something, we had 30 megatonnes of which were taken care.

However remember that our gap is 240 megatonnes. We talked a bit about where we would find that 240 megatonnes. I will review that for every member, because I know every member wonders from where we will get those kinds of numbers. Obviously we know now, and everyone will have written this down, that 30 megatonnes is from our sinks.

In November 2001 our government went to Marrakesh keen on Kyoto and the rules were set. This would be the enforcement rule setting. There was a lot of squabbling and late nights by our negotiators, but they came up with some penalties. These penalties are outlined very clearly. Any Liberal who thinks there are no penalties associated with ratification of Kyoto should hear this from the Kyoto accord. These were agreed to in Marrakesh and whoever might be the prime minister in the future will have to know that there are penalties associated with the ratification of Kyoto. It will not be good enough to say that was done by another prime minister and it will will not work. There are penalties to an international agreement.

The ratification in the Kyoto protocol says, "According to the Marrakesh accords, nations who ratify Kyoto but do not meet their targets in round one by 2012 are penalized another 30% in emissions cuts and in addition such nations cannot sell carbon credits in round two".

It goes on to state, "In the case of compliance with emissions targets, Annex 1 parties—us—are granted 100 days after the expert review of their finding annual emissions inventory as finished to make up any shortfall in compliance mainly through emissions trading".

What that says is we can buy the credits if we have not achieved our targets. That would be hundreds of billions of dollars to do that. Members in the House who think they may be prime minister in the future should read the Kyoto protocol. They should understand that there are penalties and they are definite penalties. For members who go out and say that we can ratify Kyoto and nullify it later, they are wrong.

Government Orders

Maybe we should read this again so that it is understood that there are penalties associated with the ratification of Kyoto. Therefore, when the members vote and if they vote in all conscience for the good of the Canadian people, they can never say again in public that they were not told there were penalties because there are definitely penalties.

Also articles from the European Union are being worked on legally to bring World Trade Organization claims against the U.S. We can get caught in that crossfire and those trade restrictions can be put on us when we have not lived up to our commitment. There is no way we will achieve our Kyoto credits.

• (1110)

Again this has to be emphasized in the House and there is no place else to do it. The media that keeps track of this needs to understand that anybody who plans to be prime minister of this country must understand that once Kyoto is ratified, by the end of this year according to the present Prime Minister, there will be penalties. The clock starts ticking then.

As soon as we are one of those countries representing 55% of the emissions, even though we have only 2% of the emissions, we are going to be subject to a 30% penalty that we have to buy our way out of if we do not live up to those commitments. By the year 2012 that commitment could be as much as 30% to 40% below 1990 levels. We will have to turn out all the lights. We will have to stop driving everything. It will bring wreckage on the economy.

I am starting to sound like the environment minister saying that the sky is falling. I do not like that because we have a better way, a better solution, a solution that anyone wanting to be prime minister of this country would want to hear. We have a better way, a made in Canada way, a way that does not trap us into this kind of European quagmire where they are out to get the Americans through the WTO. That is what it is all about. It says it clearly here.

I have heard members in the House who have said out on the public campaign trail that we have no penalties, that we are not going to do anything to hurt our country, and that if we cannot live up to Kyoto, we will not. To say that we will not when it is an international agreement is totally impossible. We cannot do that. That is a total piece of deceit. I would certainly hope that any members who are here now will be voting against that ratification until we know what the costs are, until we know what the plan is, and until we have an implementation.

The member for LaSalle—Émard made it very clear that he must have a plan, that he must have the costs, that he must know how it is going to impact the Canadian people. He cares, I think, about the mom and dad and their two kids. He cares about the people out there. That is why I know he is going to oppose the ratification of Kyoto until we have the costs, the implementation plan and the effect on our economy. It just has to be that way because we certainly would believe that the Prime Minister and future prime ministers are honourable men and know the facts before they do something.

Let me carry on because there are penalties associated with Kyoto and we must all know them. We must constantly quote from the Kyoto accord that the Prime Minister wants to sign.

We are at Marrakesh. The Russians are now getting some steam. They are saying that they want to double their forest credits, that Canada was given them in Bonn and they want them for themselves. They agreed and they doubled Russian credits for forests. That is fine. By the time we got to Johannesburg they really had a head of steam and were saying, "Hey, you thought that carbon credits were going to be millions? We want billions". That is a whole other issue that we will talk about in a minute.

Because sinks are important and because they are part of this, if we talked to our agriculture critic he would say that is great, that these sinks might be a good thing, we have them as credits. That means that farmers are going to have a source of income from their methods of farming. If they change to direct seeding, do not use so much diesel fuel, do not work their crops under in the same way and so on, they are going to get credits. That is probably good for farmers.

• (1115)

The provinces would say it would be good because they would get those credits. Their farmers would not ask for any help because they would already have a source of income, so that should be good. Obviously agriculture and forestry are provincial matters so that should be clear. I do not think there would be any argument, but what has happened? In the government plan all of the credits for sinks are going to the federal government, which is using those credits. They are not going to the provinces, not to the farmers, not to the foresters, but to the federal government.

Today a premier is going before the courts to say it is a total infringement on their constitutional rights. There is not a Bloc member who should be able to vote for this because of the tearing away of those rights from the provinces. They should be totally opposed to this just because this is a grab of power, a grab of the resources of the Canadian provinces, let alone the farmers and the foresters.

Are sinks an important issue? We better believe they are an important issue. We better believe that the millions of dollars that will be spent in court challenges is a waste of money that should be going into new technology, making Canada a leader. We should not be wasting it on constitutional challenges. We should not be providing farmers and foresters with some hope and then tearing it away from them, but I guess that is the Liberal way of handling Kyoto.

What we will do with sinks is try to get more credit for them. How will we do that? First of all we have to establish what they are. Then we have to realize that different aged trees have different amounts of CO₂ absorption. An old tree does not absorb as much CO₂ as a young tree. That is a biological fact.

Government Orders

Obviously someone will have to go out and age all of our forests. That should be a really good bureaucratic job. When the person gets home and tells his mom what he does, he is measuring trees to see how old they are. That should take a while. I can see our endangered species police driving down one road, our species at risk police driving down another road, our forest counters driving down another road and our DFO officers with their flak jackets and machine guns driving down another road. Will everybody become a civil servant in order to handle all this administration?

We will have to go out to farms and tell farmers they did not direct seed this year, they plowed the field or they lit a little fire out there and burnt some of the stubble and we will have to charge them for that. We will have to put them in jail probably. We have put farmers in jail for lesser things than that. Burning a stubble field could be almost capital punishment or something, because we do not really care about our farmers or our foresters. I think this whole sinks issue is an example that we do not care about the provinces either. Again, it is an example is how they have been treated in this whole negotiation.

Where are we with sinks? We are in a big mess. There is a court challenge already started. The Bloc should be pretty upset about it. Already eight of the 10 provinces are totally opposed to it. Farmers and foresters should be really opposed to this.

The number of friends the government will have will be pretty small. The Liberals may find themselves to be like the Conservatives. I have often said that there are legacies. Certainly a former prime minister, Mr. Trudeau, has a legacy. In western Canada his legacy is the national energy program. No one has forgotten that. Bilingualism and multiculturalism programs are all legacies of Mr. Trudeau which people remember.

● (1120)

Mr. Mulroney certainly has a legacy. His legacy was increasing the debt many times as well as the GST. I do not think many Canadians have forgotten whose legacy that was.

I am totally convinced that the legacy of the present Prime Minister will be Kyoto. That legacy will be very similar to the legacy of those other guys. How many other Canadians have the same view?

I could not be any more convinced that Kyoto is the wrong way to go. I would not be doing town hall meetings across the country if I did not believe that. I would not be working seven days a week on this file or talking so long in the House if I did not believe that this is the worst treaty the country could ever sign. It will have the biggest impact on most Canadians than anything we have ever done in the House.

As this presentation goes on I see a lot of people on the other side taking notes and wondering about all of this. It is good that they are because this is stuff they can take home for their town hall meetings. I know they will want to inform their constituents. They will want to talk to the average person who will be affected by CO₂.

Let me talk about the developing countries. They are definitely taking a stand right now, most notably India and China.

Where is China in this whole picture? Basically it has a huge supply of brown coal. It needs energy desperately. The Three Gorges dam will provide 10% of that energy. It has two nuclear power plants where no environmental assessment was done by the government but that is fine because it is just in China. Those nuclear power plants came on stream this month and are providing China with energy but it still has a huge shortage of energy. It will have to burn the soft coal unless Canada is innovative enough to come up with technologies.

Clean coal technology has been developed in Europe and the U.S. The first trial plant will be in Alberta in 2008 by TransAlta. We are not leaders. We cannot transfer this technology to China. We have guys lined up to transfer this technology.

Those countries made it very clear in Delhi that they will not handicap their economies by signing on to an agreement that will damage their economies beyond repair. They are growing and developing countries and they are going to stay that way. If Canada wants to help them be cleaner they will go with that, but if we are telling them to reduce their CO₂ and sign on to Kyoto in 2012 we can forget it. Those negotiations were to begin in 2005. They have said they will not be there. Is that significant or not? Yes it is.

Let us look at China. China on a graph is going straight up with CO₂ emissions because it is a huge developing country. It is now the number two producer of CO₂ in the world. The U.S. has gone from 30% CO₂ to 23% and in 2012 it will be 18%. China is 17% today. China doubles its CO₂ output every 12 years. In five years China will pass the U.S. and will become the number one emitter of CO₂.

The government says it will cut the use of carbon by all Canadians by 20%. Is that not wonderful. We are 2% of the world. We are going to put ourselves in a tunnel and it will not make a bit of difference to the environment, but China is not going to be part of it and we do not care.

● (1125)

India is a huge developing country with over one billion people. That country is now number five in the production of CO₂. India is growing; its industries are growing.

India and China say they are not going to be signing on to Kyoto any time in the future. They are not going to be annex II countries. They are not going to be coming to the table in 2005. How can the government sit here and say it is going to sign it?

I have heard, "We will sign it, but we do not have to implement it," wink, wink, nod, nod. Need I say this again, there are penalties, there are penalties, there are penalties. We will come back to those penalties again. I hope that any future prime minister has gotten the message.

India is increasing dramatically. I know I cannot use props, but I have graphs that show what India and China are doing. I know I cannot use them but there are graphs that show all this and show the exact numbers.

Brazil and Mexico have no targets at all. They have no intention of signing on to this. The government says that Canada will show leadership and that those countries will follow us.

Government Orders

For most of my life I have travelled. I have been in every country in the world pretty well. I know that the status of Canada due to the present government and previous governments is falling. There is not a whole bunch of people out there who will follow us just because we are such wonderful, good, liberal people and we care about the environment.

Tell the people of Fraser Valley how much the government cares about the air. Tell them. There are thousands of people out there who know the government does not care. Talk to the people about the sewage outlets in the three major cities in Canada. Tell the people that the government really cares. Tell the people at the tar ponds. Tell the people in northern Saskatchewan. Tell the native people who have hundreds of boil water orders. Tell all of them how much the government cares about the environment. The Liberals care; if they keep saying it and pounding their chests often enough, they might start believing it.

Let us talk about CO₂ emissions. I will talk about these figures and I know for all the members taking notes it is hard to do. If they call my office I will give them a hard copy of this.

I am talking about world emissions of CO₂ starting with 1995. I will say right now that the developing world in 1995 represented 27% of the CO₂ emissions. In the developed world it was 73% of the emissions. The breakdown is the U.S., 22%; western Europe, 17%; eastern Europe and some other countries in that area, 27%; Asia, 7%; the Mideast, 3%; Africa, 3%; Latin America, 4%; China, 11%; and the other parts of Asia other than China, 6%.

We have 27% from the developing world and 73% from the developed world in 1995. Let us look at the figures for 2035. We will move those forward 40 years and see where it will be. This will be with Kyoto in place and people living up to Kyoto claims. Remember that there are penalties if countries do not live up to Kyoto.

We will assume that they all do. Where would we be then? The developing world will be at 50% of CO₂ emissions. The developed world will now be down to 50%. The developing world has gone from 27% to 50%. The developed world has gone from 73% to 50%.

That is the trend line that carries on in the models of the IPCC which I will get to later. For those models that is the figure being used. They are now projecting to the year 2100. I have chosen the year 2035 as a reasonable length of time down the road.

• (1130)

At that point, the other parts of Asia will be 14%, China, 17%; Latin America, 6%; Africa, 8%; the Mideast, 5%; eastern Europe, 19%; western Europe, 12%; and the U.S., 15%. The U.S. has dropped down to fifth or sixth spot and the developing countries have come up. China will be the leader in the production of CO₂.

It is interesting that western Europe is going to improve by only 5% simply because it did not agree to the targets that everybody else did. This was a European developed way to get at the U.S. and that is exactly how it is developing.

We see the facts. Those are from the models. How can the government deceive people into believing that this is not so? This is from the environment group. This is from the United Nations, the

IPCC, the scientists who say they know and who the government quotes as experts all the time. Are they telling Canadians these things? I have not heard it. All I have seen are the ads on television saying that little Johnny is going to die, that little Johnny has asthma, that the forests are dying.

That is not even the truth. CO₂ is used for photosynthesis. It is to help plants.

Should we deal with pollution? We sure should. Pollution is a terrible problem. The person on the environment committee from the Windsor area in southern Ontario has told me about the terrible air in that community. We should do something about it. The Fraser Valley has the second worst air shed. Something should be done about that. We should deal with it. We should put in scrubbers. We should go after industry to fix it, but that is not what Kyoto is about.

Kyoto is about CO₂. Kyoto is about an international agreement. It appears the government does not understand that.

Let me review again where Europe is. Europe can ratify this thing easily. The 15 countries are together on this. They can interchange credits and they think they are going to be fine. They have the advantage of the deindustrialization of eastern Europe which resulted in all those credits. The European Union can transfer credits from EU country to EU country. They have a bloc of 15 countries in which to transfer credits around.

We are a country of one. We cannot transfer credits. It does not matter if we transfer among the provinces. We cannot transfer to the U.S., Mexico, Brazil or other countries in the Americas. If we are going to have a plan at all, why is it not a made in the Americas plan which involves North America and South America? That would work a lot better.

An hon. member: It could be the western hemisphere, from Italy east.

Mr. Bob Mills: The Prime Minister thinks Italy is in the western hemisphere too. He may even think it is in the Americas, I do not know, but he sort of implied that the other day.

We need something that will work and we need it to be in the Americas. We need to involve our number one trading partner, the U.S. We need to involve our NAFTA partner, Mexico. We need to involve the developing countries of South America. We need all of them on side with this plan. What does the government not understand about that?

Government Orders

In Europe most of the coal generation has been replaced by gas. We could examine how that was done. There are two conclusions I came up with when I researched this. One is that it was getting very hard to get coal inexpensively. That was one of the first things.

• (1135)

The second thing was that Maggie Thatcher wanted to break the coal unions in Britain and she did it by turning all of Britain's energy generation to natural gas. It worked perfectly. She got rid of a real political problem. She had later ones but it worked at that point in time.

As well, Europe is a much smaller place. It has a dense population. Members of my family who live in Europe find it easy to get from point to point by rail. In fact many people there do not even own a car because they can get on a train every 15 minutes and get to the next city. I do not know, Madam Speaker, if you have tried taking the train in most parts of Canada, but in many parts there are not even tracks let alone trains, so we cannot use that as an argument.

Of course, Europe is warmer. The Europeans have more nuclear energy. All of those are reasons. A country like France which is 80% nuclear can easily say it can hit its Kyoto targets.

It is very interesting that in Brussels in October the European Union had a presentation from a group of economists. The economists told the European Union at the European parliament that the European Union cannot hit its targets without damaging the economy of its countries. That is the European Union which has very limited targets with all those advantages and it will have trouble hitting its targets. If it will have trouble hitting its targets and many of those countries are already near 1990 levels and we are at 20% above 1990 levels, going to 30% above 1990 levels, if it cannot hit its targets without damaging its economy, how are we going to do it?

That is what the question is, what is it going to do to Canadians? What will it do to the person on a fixed income? What will it do to the mom and dad with their kids, to that single mom, to the people whom the Liberals—hold our hands over our hearts—care about so much? What will it do to them? It will destroy them. They will have higher fuel bills. They will have higher power bills. They will have more costly transportation. A number of them will lose their jobs.

Why would we sign something? Remember, and let me repeat, for those people who say, “I can vote for the ratification of Kyoto, but boy we are going to go slow on the implementation”, we do not have to do this. For any future prime minister who says that there are not penalties from Kyoto, let me repeat that according to the Marrakesh accords, nations who ratify Kyoto but do not meet their targets in round one by 2012 will be penalized another 30% in emissions cuts. In addition, such nations cannot sell carbon credits in round two.

At the end of this period, if a party's emissions are still greater than its assigned amount, it must make up the difference in the second commitment period, plus a penalty of 30%. It will also be barred from selling under emissions credits and within three months it must develop a compliance action plan detailing the action it will take and it can buy credits to buy itself out of its inability to hit those targets.

If I were going to be a future prime minister, and I do not intend to be, I would certainly want to know that there were penalties. I would certainly not in a speech ever again say, “We can ratify Kyoto just to

make the Prime Minister happy and then we can forget about it and we will not do anything to hurt our economy. We will do nothing to hurt Canadians and our economy will not be hurt by this because if we cannot comply, we will not comply and that is it”. How could any prime minister, present or future, ever say that? They cannot. They would be dishonest to the Canadian people if they said that. They would be dishonest to the provinces. They would be dishonest to every single Canadian.

Let us go on with the presentation—

Some hon. members: More.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Bob Mills: I appreciate that certainly from members of my party but it is appreciated that the Liberals are applauding as well. They did not know a lot of this. They did not know this material. The Prime Minister and the people in cabinet have kept it from them. It is really good that there is this opportunity for all of the Liberals to be informed about Kyoto and to understand it better. Obviously now they will go back home, have town hall meetings, and inform their constituents so they understand what Kyoto is all about.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Challenge them to a debate anytime, anywhere.

Mr. Bob Mills: Madam Speaker, I would be happy to go to any of their communities as their guest speaker to speak on Kyoto. I know the Liberal members would like it. They are so tired of hearing the rhetoric. It is interesting that another party has united with the Liberal Party in the rhetoric. I guess they make good bedfellows, the NDP and Liberals. We used to have another quote, but I guess we will find one for that as well.

While I am on this, it is a little off topic, but it is interesting that the NDP should support this. It is very interesting that the unions support this, provided that they get a \$1 billion fund so that if people lose their jobs, they will get paid. That is real commitment to the environment; they care. Maybe they should put their hands over their hearts as well and say, “We care about the environment, but we care about the money first”.

• (1145)

I have heard other members accuse us of that but maybe they should not call the kettle black. I think they may have a little problem. Let us go on because time is running short and today I think the House ends at 6:30 p.m..

Let us talk about the U.S., why it pulled out and what it is doing. This is not pro-American or anything. It has answered the fourth question that I started out with this morning: Is there a better way? It has come up with the conclusion that, yes, Kyoto is a Eurocentric, bureaucratic nightmare and it does not want to be any part of it.

Government Orders

In February Christine Whitman said that the U.S. would try to stay in and work with the world but then the world decided on all these penalties and everything. The Americans are doing something. They have what is called the clean skies initiative. I will give a few examples of what they are doing.

The statement that kind of leads this off is important. It says that our economic growth is the key to environmental progress. If we have a thriving economy we will much more likely be able to carry out environmental projects, do new research and development and come up with new initiatives if we have the money. If we bankrupt ourselves by sending money to Russia or those kind of countries, that money is gone forever. The money does not come back in jobs for young Canadians or in research and development.

What the Americans are basically saying is that we must keep the money at home, invest the \$4.6 billion in fuel cells, invest in the future, let us become world leaders in the area of environmental biology and let us sell it to the world. Let us thrive economically because we developed it.

What are we saying? We say no, we will sign onto a European policy that will handcuff us, make us achieve 30% cuts in CO₂. We will be hard pressed if we implement that. We must remember that there will be penalties associated with Kyoto once it is ratified. If we do that we will handcuff ourselves. We will not have a pot to—well, we get the idea. We will not have the money. All the other environmental projects that we might get involved in we will not because we will have spent the money on Kyoto.

What are the Americans doing? I will not go through the whole clean skies initiative. Anyone can call my office and get the website address for the clean skies initiative. I see some members are writing that down because that is something they want to get as well. They will see exactly what happens there.

The U.S. is dramatically cutting emissions from its power plants of three of the worst air pollutants: sulfur dioxide, nitrous oxide and mercury. It has a program in place to remove those from all power generating plants. It has forced the plants to put in scrubbers and to do all kinds of environmentally sensitive projects to make sure to keep those pollutants out of the air.

What are we doing? Downtown Toronto had 45 smog days. It is concerned about it. The people in Windsor are concerned about their air. The people in the Fraser Valley are concerned about their air. What are we doing? We are signing Kyoto to reduce CO₂. What are we doing about nitrous oxide, sulfur dioxide, mercury and all the particulate matter? We are doing nothing. We are frigging around with an international agreement that will not work to do anything, and we are doing nothing about little Johnny's asthma. If we want to fix little Johnny's asthma we need to go after these particulate matters and other chemicals in the air. That would be an honest policy.

What the U.S. is also doing is cutting greenhouse gas intensities. It has a program to reduce its emissions by 18% over the next 10 years. A reduction of 18% in greenhouse gas emissions would almost take us to our target. The Americans are doing that voluntarily and it is working.

What does our government not understand? If we get the provinces, industry and Canadians onside, we could have something that will work. Instead, we are ramming through this Kyoto thing that will not do a darned thing for our environment. It does not do anything about pollution and it will not solve a single problem.

The next thing the Americans are doing is they are giving credits to companies that show reductions. What does our government not understand about that? If it is to my advantage as a company to reduce my emissions, and I have a set target and set number of credits, I will do it. It is good for the bottom line, and what is wrong with that? The Americans also have a five year commitment to \$4.6 billion tax credits for renewable energy use.

Let us think about that. I want to put a solar collector on my garage. If I were in the U.S. I would get credit for doing that. That will sure make a lot more people do that.

The Americans are expanding research and development into climate related science and technology and they are doing all kinds of other things to perfect the science to understand climate change better. They have all kinds of fellowships within the U.S. universities to allow people to develop this science better.

As I said earlier, the scientists at the IPCC, the ones the government believes in and who are the gospel, say that they are 10 years away from getting the science correct. When I get into the IPCC's modelling, I will get into that more and be able to demonstrate some of the problems.

I want to move on to the Canadian position. Where are we at? It is a little hard because we only started coming up with a Canadian position within the last year.

●(1150)

This whole thing started in 1992. We agreed to it and signed on to it because we sign every international agreement. We have a fast pen. Bring out an agreement and we will sign it. We will read it later and decide what it means later but we will sign it. Just put it in front of us and we will sign it. We must remember that the government members are Liberals and they stand for good. Canadians are led to believe what the Liberals think. This kind of misleading, hand over the heart and do nothing, is what they do all the time.

I will give another example. If we had a few more days we could get into the other examples of where the government has done this. Let us talk about the three part approach. This was developed in March 2002. I guess it was what led up to that powder-puff PowerPoint presentation. Actually, some people in communications did not think I could keep saying that without getting tongue-tied. One of these times I am going to but I will keep saying it because that is exactly what it is.

Government Orders

In March we had the beginning of what this was going to be. As far as emissions trading, they said that if companies could not reduce greenhouse emissions sufficiently, they could buy emission reduction permits from other companies. I guess that means that if the member over there had a company that was dirty and I happened to be cleaner than what my target area was I could then sell that person credits. The company could keep producing the same amount of CO₂ and I could keep doing what I was doing, but it could buy the credits.

I do not know what is wrong but I do not understand how that helps the environment. All I can understand is that if I am clean enough and can sell enough credits I will probably get rich while the other company will go bankrupt. That is about all I can understand. Then I will have a monopoly that will probably work as well as Air Canada and some of the other monopolies, like the Wheat Board in this country. It is a real example of something that really works well. The Wheat Board is a perfect example. Will we start throwing Canadians in jail perhaps for CO₂ emissions? We will have companies that will be trading permits between companies.

The second thing they say is that companies could buy credits in the international marketplace. Now we would have companies out shopping around to buy credits from some other country.

An hon. member: Europe.

Mr. Bob Mills: Europe would probably like that. Certainly Russia is keen on this idea. Again, how does it help the environment by allowing some other country with dirty technology, way dirtier than ours, produce that CO₂ and then we buy credits from them and transfer money? What is that? We must remember that this is only the beginning of the plan. We will see how it is perfected later on, but that is the start.

Then we say that there will be credits and penalties for emissions. The plan has not really evolved much since March. The first thing I would do if I were a businessman is to ask what the credits are and what the penalties are? They are not spelled out anywhere. There is no implementation plan. I do not know what it is going to cost. Am I going to invest money into a country where I do not know what the rules of the game are? Obviously, what the government does not understand is the investment freeze that results from this kind of activity.

The most important thing that Canada recognized in March 2002 is that there will be no credit for the export of clean fuel to the U.S. We are going to be penalized for producing energy in Canada that we sell to the U.S. Why did the Canadian government not realize that back in 1992? Why did the Canadian government not say, when it signed Kyoto in 1997, that it would not sign on unless it was given clean energy credits for what it sells to the U.S.?

• (1155)

I want to explain those clean energy credits. We extract the gas and oil out of the ground and that takes a lot of energy. It represents 17% of our emissions. When we take the tar sands, which are a bigger reserve of oil than Saudi Arabia, it is not small potatoes. It will be the future of this country's GDP for a long time. When we take that oil out of the tar sands or out of the ground that costs energy. We then ship it in a pipeline down to the U.S. where it is burned as a clean fuel, particularly in the case of natural gas.

We want credit for that. How did we blow that? We only started talking about that in 2002. We did not think of it before then. The Europeans and the Russians did but we did not. The government totally blew it if it had ever hoped to get that.

Now, as I explained earlier, there is no way the Europeans will agree to that. If they gave Canada clean energy credits, they would have to give Russia clean energy credits for natural gas. What the Liberals do not seem to understand as well, when they argue this point, is that the U.S. is not part of Kyoto. How are we going to get credits from a country that is not even in the game?

It is one thing for Russia to ask for credits from European Union countries that are part of the same game, but it is like saying that I am going to buy this company from this guy over here but I am going to talk to that person over there who does not even know the name of the company. That is about the same thing. That is a total mishandling of this file. This file has been mishandled since 1992. How it has been handled is a total disaster.

Most Canadians are starting to realize that. Companies have been telling us that for months. We just have to listen to the provinces on every TV station today telling us how the government has mishandled the whole negotiations around Kyoto. They are not part of it. They have been excluded. The meeting on Friday has been cancelled, which should tell us enough about the cooperation between the provinces.

We are going to get to review the government's plan later on. The first words say, "cooperation, consultation are the key to making this work". This powder-puff PowerPoint presentation, which is not a plan, just will not work.

The next point in the government's plan of March 2002 is a scary one. It says "we are going to have targeted measures". We are going to explore that a little bit further, but these targeted emissions are going to be on residential buildings, on commercial buildings, on transportation, on forestry and on agriculture. The Liberals singled those out as early as March.

If I were to read into that, I would be pretty concerned if I were a contractor building new homes. I would be pretty concerned if I owned commercial buildings. I would be pretty concerned if I were in the transportation industry, in forestry or in agriculture. They have been targeted to try to achieve the 240 megatonnes that are the gap of what we cannot go to.

We are going to follow up on each one of those industries. If we were to go industry by industry across the country, we could show that each industry will be targeted a little differently. We are assuming that is the case because the government has not told them yet how they are going to be targeted. However the government does say in its first discussion of this that is what it is going to target. We should keep that in mind and, for the Liberals taking notes, they should highlight it with a star.

Mr. Speaker, to bring you up to date, I could go back to yesterday so you will feel part of this, but I will just carry on from where I was and not start from the beginning.

Government Orders

•(1200)

Mr. Howard Hilstrom: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. My concern is that since Kyoto is such a large issue there should be a quorum in the House and I am not sure that there is a quorum.

And the count having been taken:

The Deputy Speaker: There being quorum debate will resume.

Mr. Bob Mills: Mr. Speaker, I want to ensure that anybody who might want to be Prime Minister knows that there are penalties when one signs on to Kyoto. Those penalties would be severe for any Prime Minister or future Prime Minister who might want to sign on to Kyoto.

There were a number of early plans. In March 2002 we were talking about emissions trading. We were talking about the fact that we could trade domestically and internationally, and that dirty companies could buy credits from clean companies. No one can explain how that would help the environment.

We would have targeted measures which are a little scary for certain industries. This initial beginning of the plan talked about residential and commercial buildings, transportation, forestry and agriculture. It stands to reason that if the government was thinking that way in March how is it thinking now in November about these targets? It is not telling anyone. It is keeping it secret as to what the costs would be to Canadians. It is not telling industry what the costs would be. It is not telling anybody this.

I guess that is part of the plan. I have maintained all along that if Canadians were to find out exactly what the costs would be and what the implementation plan would be, they would oppose Kyoto. When Canadians find out that it is not little Johnny's asthma and that it is not a health problem, they would reject it. It is just obvious. I cannot understand how more people do not seem to get that connection.

The government would invest in international credits. It would buy emissions credits from other countries and then sell those within the country. Why would we want to set up a bureaucracy where the federal government would buy credits and then sell them within the country? Or maybe it would give them to Liberal supporting companies. But members should recall that we must hit those targets. If we do not hit those targets there are penalties.

I will always take the opportunity to point out those penalties when the opportune time comes in the House. It is important because there are members in the House who have made public speeches and said that we can ratify this, and then go slow on implementation. They said that if we were unable to hit it because it would hurt our economy, we would just not do it.

That is not possible. The rules were set in Marrakesh. Anybody who says that across this country is misleading the Canadian public. We must ensure that any Prime Minister or future Prime Minister does not do that.

Let us move on to the chronology of what happened, what the Canadian government's position is, and look at key dates, key time periods.

September was important because a lot of the oil and gas industry, the manufacturers, the chambers of commerce and the provinces

thought the government would never be so foolish as to ratify this agreement. It would not ratify until it had the full understanding and cooperation, the costs and implementation plan. It would not ratify until it could tell Canadians what it would cost them, the people who work so hard for all of us, and get us elected to represent them. Those are the people who need to understand what it would cost them. All of us and all of them, myself included, thought we would never ratify this without having those things answered.

•(1205)

I was in Johannesburg when the Prime Minister, on September 2, stood among an international community of 190 countries and said that Canada would ratify Kyoto by the end of the year. He said that he would take it to Parliament, not to get its approval but just to let it be discussed in the House of Commons.

I was shocked that anyone who cares about this country, looking at all the history of what other countries have done, would say that we would ratify it even if he had to ram it through. Since then he has said that if we do not ram it through, it would be a vote of confidence and we would have an election. Is that not blackmail and a threat?

The government has not told us what the costs and implementation plan would be, and how it would be done. We do not know that. I will review point by point the so called plan because it does not tell us those things.

Some other bureaucrats there were also shocked. Industry was totally shocked. The provinces could not believe that this had happened. I had talked to a lot of them before that and they said it was just all talk, that he would never do it. But on that day they realized that the Prime Minister was looking for a legacy. The Prime Minister wanted to have on his credentials that he cared about the environment of the world, about his children and grandchildren, and so he would ratify Kyoto. That is the most misleading thing that he could ever do, because it is not about little Johnny's asthma. It is not about cleaning up pollution. It is about CO₂ and climate change.

Should we deal with it? Yes, we should. Should we have a plan? Yes, we should. I will present what that plan should be, the plan that Canadians can buy into, understand, be part of and cooperate with. Possibly Canadians would drive smaller vehicles and put triple pane windows in their houses, but they would do so because they wanted to, because there was a plan and they would know what it would cost. They would know it would make a difference. Kyoto is not that plan and is not going to make that difference.

What did the Canadian manufacturers say? Ontario is the biggest manufacturing market in Canada. There are more manufacturing jobs here than anywhere else in Canada. This should have the biggest impact on Canadians in Ontario.

Government Orders

When I was in Hamilton on Sunday, speaking to a group, a man in the crowd said to me that he had no idea it was going to affect him. Those people driving down the 401 had no idea how it might affect them. I will talk about some of the effects it will have on those people, but as of today, most of them do not know. The environment minister from Ontario said that most people in Ontario think it is a car. It is not a car. It is the most serious international agreement that Canada will ever sign.

There are penalties within the Kyoto agreement. If we do not live up to it, we will have the WTO on our case. Members can ask some of the people in the softwood lumber industry what happens when we depend on that. Members should ask them if the solution to the problem happens overnight.

● (1210)

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. On page 530 of the *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, Edition 2000, edited by Robert Marleau and Camille Montpetit, under rules of order and decorum, it talks about the rules of relevance. It refers to an example where in 1882 Bourinot felt the need to add the comment that:

A just regard to the privileges and dignity of Parliament demands that its time should not be wasted in idle and fruitless discussion; and consequently every member, who addresses the house, should endeavour to confine himself as closely as possible to the question under consideration.

This speaker continues to do a tremendous job of adhering to the rule of relevance and I wanted to bring that up. It is a proper—

The Deputy Speaker: With the greatest of respect to the hon. member for Fraser Valley, I do not believe that is a point of order. There is certainly a great deal of relevance coming from the member for Red Deer. I will agree to that.

Mr. Bob Mills: Mr. Speaker, I thank my fellow members and all of the members who gave themselves a break because they were taking notes of this presentation. Even though I said I would provide them with a hard copy, they are still continuing to take notes and listen observantly to what I have to say. Their constituents are the ones who would be impacted by the signing of Kyoto. They are the ones who would pay the costs of increased transportation and power bills. The fact that there is no way around it is what I hope to develop in my remarks this.

As far as relevance, I do not believe I have said anything that does not refer directly to Kyoto and what Kyoto's impacts would be. That is what makes this subject so important and provides all of us with so much energy to continue this battle.

The Canadian Manufacturers and Exporters are but one group that has examined this. I want to quote that organization as an example because it is a good example of what it feels the impacts would be. It says that Canada would be 40% above Kyoto greenhouse gas targets by 2010 with the expected growth of this country.

Let us go back to Australia for a moment. Why did the Australians say initially that they must have 8% above 1990 levels and in fact they could not sign on to Kyoto? How could they say that? They have now opted out of Kyoto. They argued that they were a big country with a growing population and do not have the transportation infrastructure of Europe. Obviously, that fits Canada too, yet Canada was naive enough to think that it could sign Kyoto with all

those targets and achieve them. It is impossible to achieve those targets.

Should we do something about pollution? Yes. Should we do something about global warming? Yes. But there is a better way.

The manufacturers said that Kyoto would result in 450,000 lost jobs in this country by 2010 and it would cost at least \$3 billion per year in international credits. That is \$3 billion that could be used in research and development to develop a clean environmental industry. That is \$3 billion that could be used in advanced education to train experts. We lose 22,000 graduates per year from this country.

I am pretty proud of my own family members. Let me tell the House their history. My son was a Rhodes Scholar who went to Oxford for four years and ended up teaching there for half a year. He then came looking for a job in Canada. He could not find one. He was offered jobs at Harvard, Yale and Princeton. He is now at Princeton and has tenure there. He is lost to Canada; he cannot come back. Canada did not offer him that opportunity. When we send that \$3 billion or \$5 billion to another country, we will never have the money to put into advanced education, and research and development.

I have a daughter who was just here as a guest speaker at a conference. She is a statistician and develops computer models. She got her Ph.D. in Holland. There were 19 countries that offered her a job, but not Canada. We do not have the money for those kinds of people and that is pretty sad.

The manufacturers state that it would cost Canadians \$30,000 per household to retrofit their homes. David Suzuki says it would only cost \$12,000 per home.

● (1215)

The point is that it does not really matter whether it is \$12,000 or \$30,000. When we are talking about that single mother, that family with two kids or that senior on a fixed income, whether it is \$12,000 or \$30,000 really does not matter much, because they do not have that expendable income to put into retrofitting their houses. The government is counting on 20% of its emissions credits coming from retrofitting of houses. How will that happen? Who will pay for that? Will the government send out a cheque to everybody who wants to retrofit their house? We know what happened in the seventies when they encouraged people to buy more insulation. There were fly by night operations, companies doubled their price for insulating houses, and it was a big rip-off. It ended with a huge bureaucracy trying to chase down all the offenders. Is that what the government has planned? Is that how we will retrofit the houses? It is fine to say that, but how do we achieve it?

Government Orders

The manufacturers, which I am still quoting, say that the cost of electricity will go up by 100%. Our power bills will double. They say that our natural gas bills will go up by 60% and gasoline for cars will go up by 80%. Let us remember what the Europeans said about what should happen to our gas prices. They said that we in North America have no right to charge 70 cents for a litre of gas, that we have no right to do that because it is environmentally unsound and that the price of gas should be in the \$2-plus range. That is how we stop consumption. That is how we fix the environment. That is what the Europeans are telling us. That is what Kyoto is all about.

How will people in the second coldest country in the world, with no transportation infrastructure other than roads, achieve those kinds of targets when the price of fuel goes up? When we have electricity prices and natural gas prices increasing, how will we handle that? Do we not at least have a duty in the House to tell the Canadian public what it will cost, how we will implement it and what it will mean to them? How will it affect their jobs? How will it affect the way they live in this country?

Again we come back to the fact that we have signed 200 agreements since 1992. The Auditor General in her report, of which the House has a copy, said to the government that it has signed 200 agreements on the environment since 1992 and she has just audited 60 of them. That was a month ago.

The quote that we must keep using is this statement:

The federal government is not investing enough—enough of its human and financial resources; its legislative, regulatory and economic powers; or its political leadership—to fulfill its sustainable development commitment. The result is a growing environmental, health and financial burden that our children will have to bear.

That is a pretty harsh condemnation of a country, but we hear that same argument being used: “We will sign on to Kyoto. We probably cannot hit those targets, but do not worry about it because no one will hit their targets”. That is sure real commitment, real honesty with Canadians, and again, there are penalties associated with signing on to Kyoto.

The Alberta government has the name for being the big fighter in this whole thing, but I want to remind hon. members that there are a lot more provinces fighting a lot harder. We can touch on a few of them. The Alberta government has done a fair amount of research and I am sure other governments have. I am surprised that the Ontario government has not committed more to research into what it will cost the average person in Ontario, but let us take up some of the Alberta figures, which talk about a \$23 billion to \$40 billion cut in GDP.

• (1220)

That sort of reduction in GDP is a major figure in our standard of living. That means we would not have money for health care, for interest payments, or for our military. All of these things would be impacted because we signed on to this international agreement, if it costs us that much.

Their research and their econometric models show there would be a loss of about 70,000-plus jobs. The government started off by saying that 60,000 jobs would be lost. That figure is now up to 200,000. The Department of Industry just did a report that said the government underestimated the cost by 30%. What are Canadians to

believe? How do they know what to believe when they get those messages, when the figures do not jive? How do they know what to believe when they are not being told what it is going to cost and what the impact would be? Government studies also say that as well.

It is important at this point in time to talk about the provinces because we now have eight out of ten provinces saying that we should not ratify Kyoto today until we know exactly what it means to us. Eight out of ten provinces is a lot.

I was on a talk show this morning. The number one question was, why can Manitoba sign on? Manitoba can sign on because it wants the federal government to help it develop the hydroelectric potential in northern Manitoba. It wants to send that power to Sault Ste. Marie and get into the Ontario power grid. That province is doing it for money. What a shock. That environment minister who stands up and sounds just so righteous is doing it for money. Manitoba is doing it not for the environment but for money.

What about Quebec? I think Quebec is going to change its position when it sees the grab of provincial authority and agriculture and forestry. I think Quebec as well will see that this power grab by the federal government is a darn good reason to oppose this. Quebec also hopes, of course, to attract a lot of industry because of the clean energy credits for hydroelectricity. That is obvious. Quebec has every right to do that.

What about Atlantic Canada? I quoted a cab driver earlier. I think he probably put it into the best language possible when he said that Halifax finally had an industry bringing revenue to the province, one that is going to last for quite a long time into the future, and the Government of Canada is going to shut it down. The province will be shut down at the very time that it is about to gain self-sufficiency and about to be proud of where it is going.

The provinces of Newfoundland and Labrador, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick also have an opportunity to achieve. Yes, we can improve technology. Yes, we can do a lot better. Yes, we should do something, but we should not shut them down at the very time they are about to get on their feet again. The government is mismanaging this about as well as it mismanaged the cod industry. People out there are starting to draw those comparisons. Again, I know that Canadians across the country are going to oppose this plan simply because of that. B.C. is in much the same situation. It is not going to get credits for its agriculture and forestry. Neither is Saskatchewan. Neither is Alberta, and neither is Manitoba if the government would tell the truth.

So we then come to October 2002. At this point we have to refer to the so-called plan, which, just for reference, is called the climate change draft plan. It is being kind to call it a plan. It leaves out some very important things. What would it cost? How would we implement it? What industries would be impacted? How would they be impacted? How would it affect jobs?

Government Orders

●(1225)

The draft plan is something. It is fatter than what we received in March and it looks a little nicer. Somebody put a little more time putting it together. This is the so-called plan. What does this so-called plan say? Let us analyze it. I do not think the Speaker wants me to read the whole plan into the record. I remember the Speaker once reading a lot of Latin names for a few hours. That was enjoyed. That might be about the same as reading this into the record. It is about as clear and at about the same level of understanding, whether it is in Latin or in English.

Let us talk about some of the main premises in this plan. First, it starts by saying that the science is very clear. That is a profound statement. It is a profound statement particularly when there is one group of 17,000 scientists saying that it is not clear, that they have major doubts about Kyoto and its ability to fix anything. When the plan says the science is clear, I wonder what that means. In what way is it clear? The IPCC, the scientific gurus of this whole issue, say it is not clear. I will quote some of them later on and let members know what the experts say about the clarity of Kyoto.

The plan then goes to say that our economy will grow while we reduce emissions, yes, that our economy will grow. If economists or investment brokers were asked about what is going to happen to our economy next year, 2003, they would tell us that they expect a very sluggish market. They expect a very up and down kind of market, but this plan says that our economy is going to continue to grow by 3% to 4%. I hope that is right. I hope the government can say that our economy will continue to grow by 3% or 4% for the next 10 years. That is just great news.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you know a little bit about investments and a little bit about investment brokers and that system, and you tell me if you can find anybody who will guarantee that the economy will grow by 4% for the next 10 years. In fact, we probably cannot get anyone to tell us that it will grow in the next month. That is just the nature of the markets, of the bull and the bear markets that go on. They cannot be predicted, but this plan says that the government can predict that our economy will continue to grow for the next 10 years. That is really amazing.

I wonder who put this thing together. It is interesting that we had a supply day on October 24 and this showed up on the morning of October 24. It is pretty interesting that a plan would come up that fast and on the same day. Maybe it is coincidence, but I think what it is, and this is terrible to say, is that the bureaucrats worked all night coming up with this and they had to get this all photocopied and put together by 8:30 that morning. Because if it was not that way, how could they make these kinds of stupid statements? How could they say these kinds of things? Almost every single word in there can be analyzed and we can say that it cannot be predicted, that it is just pie in the sky stuff, just Chicken Little running across the country with the disasters. That is where this came from. This is not anything based on fact.

The report then states that “extensive consultations” have occurred. All the provinces and territories are saying that there are 12 things they want and that they do not think they were consulted adequately. All of the provinces are saying that, including Manitoba

and Quebec. They do not think they were consulted properly. They are all speaking out today.

●(1230)

Industry definitely says it was not consulted. It has not even been given targets yet. It does not even know what targets mean or how it will be targeted.

Canadians certainly have not been consulted. There were meetings across the country in June. Those meetings were by invitation only. No media were allowed, no public was involved and then Chicken Little said that Canadians had been consulted. I was not allowed to go. Finally when I was allowed to go, I was not allowed to talk. Is that consultation? Is that public involvement? One can go but cannot talk? Give me a break.

It says “extensive consultations have occurred”. Yes, the government consulted with the special interest groups it funds. It consulted with its public. I doubt if it consulted with its backbench because I do not think they know any different themselves.

I have heard the statement, “no undue burden on any region or sector”, so many times that I just cannot believe the government continues to say it. The automotive manufacturing business is the first target. The oil and gas business is the first target. They are bound to be targets. When they are targeted what does that do to those jobs?

We know it will affect some areas more than others. The province to be hit the hardest by Kyoto will be Ontario. The next provinces to be hit will be Saskatchewan and Alberta and it will go down from there. It will impact some regions more than others. Canadians have a right to know. They have a right to know the costs. They have the right to know which regions will be targeted. We must give them that opportunity.

Because time is short and there is a lot to be said on this subject, I will move on. We have these three steps to an overall plan. I really like this one because it has three segments to it. Step one are actions underway, representing 80 megatonnes. Step two are actions we are thinking about taking, which represents 100 megatonnes. Step three are options for the remainder, which is 60 megatonnes. We do not have a clue how we will do that but maybe we can get clean energy credits from someone. Who knows who might give them to us. Maybe we can con some Europeans into agreeing to something.

Let us look at what these categories might mean. This will be difficult as we go through this because there are varying points of view.

First, let me talk about the predicted implications of this whole thing if we do not do this. If we are to do those three steps, it is pretty important that we know what will happen to us if we do not.

The government says that by the year 2100 we will have a 1.4° to 5.8° increase in temperature. It says that we will have droughts, insect infestations, increased heatwaves, reduced air quality and health problems. It says that we will not develop any new technologies to deal with any of this and that we cannot adapt at all. Even though man has always adapted, we cannot adapt. That is about the worst scenario we could possibly get.

Government Orders

The 40 models that the IPCC has ranges like that, except it forgot to include that one of the groups of models of the 40 says that we might have a problem of the earth cooling. Why would that happen? The biggest reason is alternate energy is reducing its cost by 50% every 10 years. By the years 2030 to 2040 it will become competitive and will not produce any CO₂. Guess what? The IPCC is saying that perhaps we will not have enough CO₂ by the year 2060. Is that right?

• (1235)

The government selectively chooses which pieces of which model it wants to use. There are 40 models. How can it deceive the Canadian public by cherry-picking the models and using what it wants to scare people so it can do something and have a legacy? What is that all about? Canadians across the country ask us all the time why we are ratifying Kyoto. The only answer I can come up with is that it is to make us feel good, to be part of the international club and to give the Prime Minister a legacy. That is a pretty lousy reason for Canadians.

Remember that our target is 6% below 1990 levels by the year 2012. Remember that the megatonne gap is 240 megatonnes. I talked about that already. Remember as well that Canada is the second coldest country with large distances. We have a poor transportation infrastructure and a growing population.

What else does this powder-puff PowerPoint presentation say? It says that for us to do this it will dependent upon collaboration and partnership. The provinces are not onside. Industry is not onside. The chambers of commerce are not onside. Canadians do not know what is about to hit them. Collaboration and partnership?

The only ones that are in partnership are the David Suzukis of this world or the Pembina Institute. All have their hands out to the government. All receive tax reductions for their fundraising. Sure they are onside. That is on what they live. They exist because they have their hands out to the government. They are buddies. They are in bed together. There is no question as to why they would be on side.

Does anyone think they will come out against the government? If they did, their money would be cut off the next day. It is their bread and butter to agree with the government. They are there to let the government con people into some agreement like this. I do not think Canadians are not that foolish. Collaboration and partnership? Let us examine who is onside, who is not and why.

With respect to fairness and balance across the country, I do not think that every province will agree that they are being treated fairly and equally in terms of these negotiations. I do not think many business leaders, certainly not the ones that I have talked to, and I have talked to a lot of them, feel they are being treated fairly. Certainly those people on Sunday in Hamilton did not think they were being treated fairly because they did not even know what Kyoto was. Those are the working people of the country. Those are the people who do not read the newspaper everyday and do not know what Kyoto is.

The government has minimized the costs of this whole thing. It has no details. It has talked about more federal funds for initiatives, for innovation and for research and development. This is one

question I would ask and I think most members here should ask. If we are to have more funds for initiatives, innovation and research and development, from where will the money come? What will cut out to come up with the money for that? From where will it come?

In answering that question, since I do not think anyone will agree to reduce health care or many other government programs, the only solution I can come up with is a tax. What are we aiming at? We will aim at carbon. What will we do? We will tax carbon. What does that mean? That means we will tax anything that utilizes carbon, which is transportation, fuel, energy. All those things are carbon dioxide producers, so we have to tax them. It does not say that anywhere, but what else can it mean?

• (1240)

The government talks about some of the options that we can use in this country. What are some of the things we can do? It talks about targeted measures. It suggests road tolls on major highways and enforcement of the current speed limits. That would save us 4.1 megatonnes.

I was driving to the Toronto airport on Highway 401 on a Sunday afternoon. I will not say what speed I was driving but everyone passed me. They were going 120 kph, 130 kph and 140 kph. We will reduce their speed and we will enforce it. How will we do that? Obviously we will have to double, triple or quadruple the police force. We will have to put in technology on our highways.

Does every Canadian know that we will be putting tolls on major highways, that we will be enforcing the speed limit and that there has even been talk about reducing the speed limit to 80 kph. How will that impact Canadians? It will impact them a lot. Should we do that? Show us the figures. Get our commitment. Show us why we need to do it. We will not do it through this kind of a presentation.

We will get 3.4 megatonnes from the expansion of public transit. That is really good. I think we should do that. That is a great idea, but who will pay for it? How much does it cost? Where will it go? I would love to see a train that went every 15 minutes between Calgary and Edmonton that I could jump on in Red Deer. I would sure do that rather than drive and have the hassle of that. I am not like the cabinet ministers here who leave their cars running all day to keep warm. I would have to leave mine running all week at the Calgary airport. I would have to have a fuel truck go by every few days. I would love to have increased transit, but we are a big country. It is tough to deliver on that one.

We will retrofit 20% of the existing housing stock and commercial buildings. That will save 2.7 megatonnes. That is great, but remember David Suzuki has said, and Greenpeace agrees, that to retrofit a house is about \$12,000. The manufacturers have said that it is \$30,000. Again, I come to the point, that \$12,000 or \$30,000 for a senior on a fixed income, or for a family of four, or for a single mom does not much matter. They cannot afford it.

Government Orders

We will retrofit these houses. What does that mean then? The government puts that in its so-called plan. Will it give credits for that? Will it send out a cheque to those people to do that? Where will the money come from to do that?

It is fine to say that we will have road tolls, that we will make the speed limit whatever, that we will have more public transit and that we will retrofit all the houses, but the government is counting on that as things already done to give us credits. That is a long way to go. Here are the big unknowns.

What are the costs of these targeted measures? What is the effectiveness and feasibility of doing them? There are questions after questions. The government is giving no answers, none at all.

What is the willingness of people to cooperate in all of these things? Do those people driving on Highway 401 want to drive 80 kph? Will they be happy if the technology is used and every one of them pays a traffic ticket? I saw the fines posted on the sign. Literally they will be sending their month's income on charges and probably lose their drivers' licences. That should help the productivity of the country.

In buying permits, if I am a dirty company and he is a clean company, I will have to buy credits from him. Who will handle all this? What kind of bureaucracy do we need to monitor the selling, buying and trading of credits? Who will do that?

• (1245)

The Europeans are putting a bureaucracy in place. They are big on bureaucracy. They love it. We have to do that here. Our biggest trading partner does not have to do any of this, so what effect does that have on jobs? The sensitivity of costs and policy mix; just think about it. Our biggest trading partner's companies do not operate under any of these rules. How are we going to stay competitive? Will our dollar have to drop to 30¢ so we can sell our products in the U.S.?

Is that what Canadians want? Is that what the government wants? It is fine for the Prime Minister to say, "Well, this will be my legacy and let the next guy worry about it". He might dislike the next guy enough just to make this happen to fix the next guy. Is that fair to Canadians? I do not think so.

The final unknown I pulled out of this is the modelling. I cannot believe the deceit in the modelling. Mr. Speaker, if you would like me to I could read into the record about 800 pages of modelling, but I do not know if you want it all. I summarized it last night. I have it tabbed and I will get to it. There was a member yesterday who really wanted to know all of this. I told him I could summarize it and I will get to that.

The government has picked and chosen what it wants from the models. That is not how modelling works. What is put in is what we get out; that is how modelling works. We have to look at these models and look at what was put in.

The government put in figures like 3¢ for a barrel of oil. It put in figures like \$10 for a carbon credit. Those figures were put in, even though some people say carbon credits might sell for \$500, even though some of the oil and gas companies say the cost of production could increase by many dollars, not 3¢. When numbers like that are

put in, sure the models will tell us what we want them to tell us. That is just to be expected.

This is not in the plan, but it has been suggested that these are the kinds of things we could do to achieve our goals. I want to think about these because they are actual suggestions that some bureaucrats came up with. These are some of the ones that did not make it but they were thinking about them.

We could resurface 6,500 kilometres of highways with cement. That does not take into account our weather conditions. It does not take into account slippery roads. Most important, it does not take into account what it would cost to pave 6,500 kilometres of road with cement. We cannot even pave them or fill the potholes, let alone put in cement.

The bureaucrats said we could retrain 250,000 truck drivers. I tried to find out what that retraining would involve. Largely it would involve that they would not brake and accelerate as fast which uses more fuel, and they would drive at the speed limit. Those 250,000 truck drivers would be retrained to drive the speed limit, to not accelerate. I guess they run over a few cars or whatever when they do not stop very fast. We would soon learn whether they had been retrained if there was a big semi coming down on us.

We are going to retrofit 20% of our houses. We talked about the problems with that. We are going to upgrade the heating and other equipment throughout the country. That sounds really good too. We will turn everything to natural gas and get rid of anything else. We will probably use water heat, maybe some solar panels. What will it cost? Who will pay for that, especially when it gets dark as early as it does in December?

We are going to organize and implement permit markets. Bureaucracy, bureaucracy and bureaucracy is what that says to me.

• (1250)

We are going to buy 20,000 alternate fuel vehicles for the government. That sounds like a pretty good idea. It is similar to when the Minister of the Environment sent out his letter to the cabinet ministers and said he thought they would be setting a good example if they all went to energy efficient cars or to alternate fuel vehicles. If we were to go outside right now and check the cars, there is only one.

Mr. Stephen Owen: Two.

Mr. Bob Mills: There are two now. That is excellent. The leader of the official opposition, even before the present one, asked to have one of those and he is still waiting. Of the 33 or so vehicles out there, two of them, I am told, are energy efficient. None of the others responded. The others leave their cars running all day. That is leadership. That is what it is about. That is commitment to the Kyoto targets.

I like this one. Eliminate all speeding on roads. On the highway between Edmonton and Calgary, which I drive on every week, there would be a lot of fines. From my experience on Sunday on the 401, there would be a lot of fines.

Government Orders

I am not sure how we would do that, but that is a tax. There is a tax on fuel. There is going to be a tax on energy, a tax on electricity. Those are all taxes.

Do Canadians not have a right to know that? Do they not have a right to know that is what this means? Do not get me wrong. If they say after knowing all this that they want it, that they want to pay 30% more for everything, then fine, so be it. But to have this thing implemented without even knowing is literally a crime against Canadians. It would be the worst thing that had ever been done to Canadians and they would not even see it coming. It is like that semi rolling down the road with the retrained driver who does not put the brakes on too hard. A lot of retraining needs to be done here, starting at the top.

I could go on and on about the disgust people would have if they were ever to read this. How many Canadians will read this? I would expect not very many. Can we do those things? Will they really make a difference? Would it not be better to come up with a made in Canada plan that deals with two subjects, pollution and climate change? Separate them, because they are separate. Kyoto separates them already.

Time is running short. Question period will soon be upon us and there is so much more to be reviewed. I want to come back to analyze further the document from last week. That document really needs further analysis. It is described as the future plan, and really all they have done is they have gone from a coloured plan in a binder to a stapled, photocopied plan. That was the revision to get ready for the meeting on Friday which has now been cancelled. The new and improved version is a stapled, photocopied retrofit of the same plan. We will analyze it to see the differences.

• (1255)

Let us talk about the plan. I want to time this so I can talk about it and then summarize some of the details. I do not know how we are ever going to get to some of these other features and modelling. I know that members have been asking for information on the modelling because they trust the government's position so much.

I will introduce this subject before we get back to the analysis. It will give me a little break to talk about something exciting and something in which I really believe, which is the future of technology. Technology is where it is at. The government does not understand that at all. It does not have a clue about innovation, about technology and about the future.

There are three areas we need to talk about in a plan. This would be a plan the Canadian Alliance would develop when we are the government. Remember, the problem is that we would be stuck with this Kyoto thing. We would have to have a pretty good plan to achieve those targets. How would we do it?

There are three areas I want to explore. The first one is conservation. The second one is transitional fuels. The third one is alternate energy. Those are the areas upon which I want to expand and try to develop an understanding for members of what they are about.

First, we must have consultation with everyone. We must have people on side. We must let Canadians know the costs, the benefits, and why we should do this. One might say that if our health is being

affected it is obvious we should do something. Kyoto does not deal with health. People do not know that yet. We would make sure that people understood that our plan was two pronged, to deal with pollution and to deal with climate change.

With climate change of course the science has to be worked out. We have to have reasonable targets in reasonable timeframes and let science lead the way. We do not take 40 models and cherry-pick only those things we want. That is what the government has done but that is not the way we should approach it.

We consult. We consult with industry. We consult with the provinces. Most important, this needs to be a bottom-up process. This needs to start in every single chamber of commerce, town council and municipal council across this country so they understand what we are trying to accomplish. They need to know that. They need to know what the costs are and they need to be sure that they are committed to doing it. We need that cooperation. I cannot emphasize that enough. That has to be there before we go any further.

Then we have to have accurate modelling and accurate details of what we will do. We cannot commit to an international agreement where there are penalties. We should only work on doing things that we can accomplish and still keep the economy going. We have to do that or we will not have any money to fix the things that are wrong.

• (1300)

I know we cannot use props in the House, but in talking about conservation I would like to read from this package. It is not a prop. I cannot memorize all of this, but what I have here are light bulbs. Out of a normal type of light bulb we get approximately 1,000 hours of usage.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Bob Mills: I am reading from this. I need to read it. I am sorry, it is my notes. I did not want to destroy the packaging. I need to look at this and I am sure all members would agree.

They are energy efficient light bulbs that can be purchased across the world. They last 10,000 hours. Just to read from my notes here, they conserve our natural resources by using 75% less electricity than standard bulbs. They are suitable for indoor or outdoor use. They provide soft white, pleasant light. They have electronic flicker-free starting technology. They are silent in operation. They are compact in size. They fit most fixtures. They have a long life, meaning the bulbs do not have to be changed frequently. They are guaranteed to last 10,000 hours. They cost more but when we look at how much longer they last, that is conservation.

How could it hurt Canadians to change their light bulbs? Calculations done by an economist in Ontario show that if every light bulb were changed in Canada we would never have to build another power plant ever again in this country. This 100 watt bulb uses 75% less power and gives the same amount of light.

Government Orders

That is the kind of solution Canadians are looking for. That is what Canadians want. They would buy into that. They would agree with that. They would say that it is a constructive way to achieve our goal.

That is a simple example. I wanted it to be as simple as it could be because that is what Canadians want from the government. They want realistic solutions, not emissions credits and the buying of billions of dollars in international trade credits. They want something that will work.

It is fine to say that people will retrofit their houses at a cost of \$12,000 to \$30,000 per house, but what percentage of constituents do members think will go into a massive retrofitting of their houses? Would it be 20% or 30%? I do not think so.

We can say, "Okay, let us not do that to old houses. Let us just have new houses with triple pane glass, double insulation, solar collectors, water heat and so on". What does that do to the average Canadian?

An hon. member: It drives up the cost of the house.

Mr. Bob Mills: Obviously. We do not have to be a rocket scientist to know it will make that house cost more. Who does that affect? It affects young Canadians. It affects the family where both parents are working, trying to make a go of it and get a house of their own. That is going to put the price of those houses out of their reach. That single mom is not going to be there. It would affect jobs right across the whole country.

What does the government not understand about this? It says it is going to retrofit 20% of the houses and that is how it will get its credits. If it does that sort of thing, it is going to shut down the housing industry. People will not be rushing out to retrofit their homes.

Should we do something? Yes. We should change our light bulbs. Let us start there. Let us encourage people who can afford it to put in triple pane glass. Yes, we should do it. Yes, we should reinsulate our houses as we have the money to do it. Should we be forced by international law to do it? There are penalties when we sign on to Kyoto and we had better not forget it.

We need to target cooperation. I drive from Red Deer to Calgary and I see all those oil wells flaring. I do not like those flaring oil wells and oil companies do not like me telling them that. They could put a baby cogeneration plant on top of that well, turn that heat into electricity and put it into the power grid. They do not have to flare those emissions into the air. They do not have to release that CO₂.

What do we need to do to fix that? The government needs to say, "Look guys. This is bad for your image. It is bad for business. It is bad for the environment. Little Johnny's health could be affected by this. Fix it".

Should government have no role? No, it should have a role. It should show leadership. It should show a vision, that it wants to fix things. There are examples of how to do that.

When we talk about conservation, our party would be into that. We would be into encouraging adaptation. We would be into encouraging industry to come up with new and better ways to deal

with the problems. We certainly would be actively involved in the Fraser Valley saying, "There is no way that you will run your power lines down the centre of Abbotsford. There is no way that you will use our aquifer. There is no way that you will dump your sewage into the Sumas River and if you do, you will pay big time."

• (1305)

That is not being a bad neighbour. That is just saying that we protect our environment, that we have a health problem and we will fix it. We should be sitting down with the U.S. to deal with this problem. We cannot have these transborder problems the way they exist in terms of pollution. We need solutions to that. Government needs to show leadership there. All Canadians want that. To say that an Alliance government would buy into industry's idea of just pollute or do whatever is totally wrong.

Industry knows that is not smart. Industry knows it is good to be green and it is good to show it cares about the people who work for it and for its neighbourhood. That is why it gives money to all kinds of charities and why it does all kinds of things. If the government provides companies with leadership, then I know those companies will be on side. I know we can encourage that and do a lot for that.

In terms of the three planks of a plan that the Alliance Party would have, yes, we would have conservation there. We would have sensible, common sense conservation. We would have conservation based on working with the provincial governments, with industry and with citizens to improve things.

I was really surprised when I came to Ontario 10 years ago and found out that it did not have things like recycling and that it did not have nearly the programs that I took for granted and that I thought everybody did. Now these programs are coming into effect but they were not there when I first came here. I am really surprised at the amount of salt that is used, salt that runs down the drain and into our rivers. I am really surprised about that. I am really surprised that we do not use alternatives to that.

This country has a lot of environmental problems. I am shocked that we do not know about the water, about our aquifers. That is shocking. I am shocked that we do not have any kind of plan to clean up contaminated sites. I am shocked that we are simply talking about those poor people in northern Saskatchewan with their uranium mines. I am shocked that we are just ignoring them. It is shocking that the Liberals, who supposedly care so much about our native people, have done nothing about the fact that most native reserves have boil water warnings.

It is amazing that the Liberals have such a lousy environmental record. It is amazing that the environmental Auditor General can find so many flaws in what the government has done. The fact is that it has signed 200 agreements. She has audited 60 of them and the government has not lived up to them. It is shocking that it does not deal with contaminated sites.

Government Orders

The government keeps talking about its environmental record and the environment Auditor General said that it is leaving a horrible environmental legacy to our children and our grandchildren.

A member in the House said "Probably the member for Red Deer does not care about his children and his grandchildren". Anybody who knows me would know that I probably care about them more than anything else in this whole world. That is what this is about. We need to do something. We need to have a plan for dealing with pollution and greenhouse gases, which is why conservation is the way to go.

It is great that the government can talk about it so much, that the whole front row over there can talk about it and leave their cars running all day out front. Just think about that image. If we go out there right now, those cars will be running. Some of them have been there since seven this morning and they are still running. The only reason that the chauffeur leaves is to get a gas refill. Canadians need to have that image of the government and its conservation. That is what it means.

• (1310)

The Liberals would choose not to see that. They may all go out the back door today so they do not have to see that what I am saying is true, but that is conservation.

I heard a member across say that those cars sit there for five or six minutes. Did he help write this report? It sounds like it, because that is the same kind of fictitious statement that is in the report. It is not true that they sit there for five or six minutes. They are sitting there hour after hour. That is the image for Canadians. That is the image that will cause Canadians to say, "Defeat Kyoto". That is the image that Canadians will have to say, "You guys are not telling us the facts about Kyoto". That is the image that Canadians will have of the government when it comes to Kyoto.

Do we need a plan on conservation? Yes, we need a definite plan. We need to change our light bulbs. We need to look at efficiencies of energy. That is a major plank in how we go about doing that. We cannot just talk about it. We must do it. That has to be the main thing.

What about transitional fuels? We could spend a lot of hours talking about transitional fuels, and a lot is being done there. Toronto is looking at various types of bio-diesel and at using soy oil and canola oil in our gas. We have to remember, though, that energy is consumed in manufacturing those things, too, turning them into oil that is mixed in with gas. It is not as cut and dried as it sounds. However there are all kinds of possibilities with hybrid vehicles, with bio-diesel, with the use of ethanol and methane, and some interesting technology, which I think TransAlta is probably one of the Canadian leaders in this area, and that is the sequestration of CO₂.

The Alberta Research Council has developed a project, which I visited and I think I understand. It pumps CO₂ down into deep coal beds. There are coal beds underneath most of this country. These coal beds have a lot of methane in them. They are deep and not economical to mine but they have methane in them. By pumping CO₂ into these coal seams it forces out methane which is then collected on the other end. Methane burns much cleaner than natural

gas. The methane can then be used in power plants in all kinds of ways. The emissions have to be watched at the other end but that can be handled by scrubbers if the company is committed to clean burning energy.

The point is that there is technology that will help us bridge the gap between today and the future. It is not about doing nothing. It is not about status quo.

I am an environmentalist, Mr. Speaker. I could review my past for you but I know you can check the *Hansard* for that. I care about the environment.

These environmental groups often come up with statements that members of the Alliance Party are flat earth people. That is anything but the truth. The truth is that we are saying the status quo is not good enough. Canadians are saying that the status quo is not good enough. Canadians are saying that they want the environment fixed. They not only want us to fix the air environment but they also want us to fix the water.

Time will be a real problem here but if people really want to read about water, I have an excellent, award winning book that talks about the water around the world. If people really care about the environment, they will take much of what is in the book and realize what the problems are when we do not have our aquifers mapped and when we do not understand about the charge and recharge of those aquifers.

• (1315)

In Canada we do not know whether we are in a positive or negative charge in our various aquifers. We do not even know where most of our aquifers are. We take it for granted that we all have clean water but we do not. We have all kinds of water problems. If we put half the energy that Kyoto will cost us into water, we could purify the water of the world with what will be expended. We have to remember that the government has spent \$1.6 billion already on Kyoto and what do we have to show for it?

I will quote some more from this book on water but I will get to that in a bit.

As far as clean coal technology is concerned, a pilot project is scheduled to start in 2008. It is an interesting project. It will clean up the coal that we burn. Most Canadians do not know this, but over 50% of our power comes from the burning of coal. Most people would probably say that hydro was the biggest and that nuclear power was pretty big in Ontario. It is not. Coal is what we use in Canada and it produces a lot of CO₂.

Government Orders

We are going to have to start using clean coal technology. One might say that the technology is not there yet, but the only place that it is not available is in Canada. Europe has been using clean coal technology for a long time. Parts of the U.S. are using clean coal technology. Canada is starting to use clean coal technology but we have a long way to go. We have to stop approving conventional coal power plants. We are still approving those. I know some provinces will not like to hear us say that but that is common sense and it shows that we will deal with the problem.

Exploring the area of transitional fuels of various hybrid vehicles using propane or natural gas will help us get through the next 10, 15 or 20 years until we have the real answer. The real answer and the most exciting answer is in the area of alternate energy.

There are a lot of skeptics of alternate energy. I call them that because some of them have a vested interest and some of them do not want this technology to develop too quickly. We should recognize that. It will be a major change in the way we do business when we go to alternate energy.

Let us explore the kind of alternate energy we might have and what we might use. The fastest growing alternate energy source is wind power. No matter what we know or do not know about wind power, it does have its limitations at present, but it is one of many solutions. It is part of the mix. If we went to a country like Germany, for example, we would see three or four windmills in a quarter section of land. Those windmills generate a lot of power into its grid. In countries like Denmark, windmills make up 20% of its power grid today. Ireland is building major wind farms.

• (1320)

Mr. Sarkis Assadourian: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like the hon. member and the House to know that he has now surpassed the time of the greatest socialist speaker in the world, Fidel Castro. I wish him all the best.

The Deputy Speaker: Clearly that was not a point of order.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Not only do speeches have to be relevant but points of order have to be relevant as well. More important, the member opposite has just compared a speaker in the House of Commons to a Communist dictator in a foreign country. If he wants to use a word like moron, it is probably acceptable—

The Deputy Speaker: That was definitely not a point of order. I think the House would rather hear from the hon. member for Red Deer.

Mr. Bob Mills: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for giving me a moment's break. That was certainly considerate of him. I appreciate that very much. I should tell the member—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Cypress Hills—Grasslands.

Mr. David Anderson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Members seemed so eager to hear the member speak and they made a point of interrupting his speech so that they could point that out. I would like to call for quorum at this time.

And the count having been taken:

The Deputy Speaker: There is quorum. The hon. member for Red Deer.

Mr. Bob Mills: Mr. Speaker, let us talk about the exciting field of alternate energy. That is the future that the government should be looking into. That is the future that the government should be putting out front, the made in Canada plan that involves conservation, transitional fuels and above all alternate energy. That is where we are going. That is where the excitement should be, instead of this negative, sky is falling, Chicken Little minister running across the country saying that everything is going to hell in a handcart not knowing what we are going to do. The government is asking us to implement Kyoto with no understanding, no plan, no cost, no implementation, and no targets; nothing but a blank cheque.

On behalf of our party I am putting forward an alternative. It is a vision that Canadians and provinces can buy into. Industry would love to be part of it. It would be exciting because it would be new. We could lead in something. We could sell that technology to countries like China and India that we talked about earlier. That is the vision I have for my children and my grandchildren, not this plan that is going nowhere.

We talk about wind energy and where it is at. We talk about how Germany is so dependent upon it and how Denmark is the leading country in wind energy. It works on a simple premise. The technology is evolving very quickly. We must remember that the price of wind and alternate energy is reducing 50% every 10 years and that by 2030 to 2040 it would become equal to carbon based energy. That figure has not been lost on Shell, BP, or Suncor. They understand that and they are investing in that whole area of alternate energy.

This is the way wind works. It works on a grade three principle of science. This is something that all of us probably remember back in grade three or four. I am sure most of the hon. members over there got that far. It works on the principle that the earth will heat during the day and cool at night. The ocean stays constant. Because of that, we have the wind blowing back and forth. It is not a big wind always, but always wind.

If a windmill were to be placed far enough out, with the smallest amount of resistance, the most advanced technology, no moving gears inside, it would turn even with the whisper of a wind 24 hours a day generating electricity.

The German wind farm of 600 windmills, 50 kilometres out in the ocean, the Irish one that is being built somewhat the same, the Danish windmills, that have developed the technology so that those windmills have so little resistance they literally could turn a huge windmill without any kind of power being put to it, are now producing 5 megawatts. That is enough for a thousand homes. The new ones are 15 megawatts and would probably produce enough electricity for 3,000, 4,000 or 5,000 homes. That wind farm would produce enough power for several million homes and that is just one project.

There is no CO₂ given off from that. I mentioned a few hours earlier that maybe we will be short of CO₂ in the year 2060 or 2070. Wind power would become so efficient that every country would use this alternate energy. Who knows what that might bring. It is exciting because that is how we solve these problems.

● (1325)

Wind energy maybe only 10% or 20%. The only two provinces that are using it at this point are Alberta and Quebec. Those are the two Canadian provinces leading in wind energy, but not leading in wind energy technology. They are leading in the construction of windmills. I visited the one in Pincher Creek, Alberta. Windmills are being put up at about one every three months. There is a major wind farm being developed there. All of Calgary's transit system works on wind energy. That is not publicized very much but that is the future.

Let us move on to solar power. Solar power has its limitations on earth but members should think about it this way. There are about six billion people in the world and just under five billion who do not have a regular source of power. I was in Tibet this past May. On Tibetan houses there were solar collectors being used to cook food and to power one light bulb per day. Every house had a photovoltaic cell for storing the energy. That is pretty interesting because five years ago the source of fuel was yak dung which was dried on the side of a wall and then burned. The problem with yak dung was the bad smell and it affected people's eyesight. Some 20% of the people have impaired eyesight, right down to blindness.

The developing world would be able to use tiny solar collectors to store energy which it never had before. China is using solar collectors. It used to burn soft coal briquets. I have been in Beijing in every month of the year. I have been there in December and January when I could literally chew the air. I started coughing after being there for a couple of days because the pollution was so bad. It is not that way anymore. Part of it is because China is leapfrogging technology and utilizing some of these innovations.

What application does this have for us? The most interesting solar project I found was one developed by NASA. The project would build the same kind of solar cell as used on a space station but would be a mile square. It would be up in space and rotated by computers toward the sun. There would be no clouds and anything affecting the solar cell. The sun's energy would be available 24 hours a day. The solar energy would be turned into a microwave and beamed down to a generating station on earth to drive a generator.

It would be perfectly clean and cost nothing. It would be there forever as long as the sun shines and there would be no CO₂ being released. That potentially could provide all the electricity that we might need. Is it economical today? No. Will it be economical in the future? Yes, particularly if it gets a buy in from governments.

What governments are promoting it the most? They are Denmark, Germany, the United States and Japan. Those countries are part of these kinds of projects. If our government were to have any commitment to the environment, to cleaning up the environment, to providing Canadians with a guaranteed energy future, it would be into these kind of projects.

Instead it has Kyoto where we do not know the costs. We know the government would have a tax. It is saying we must cut our

Government Orders

energy use by 20%. It would ensure we do by having a tax to make us do it. That is the future that it sees for the country but that is not the future that this party sees for the country.

● (1330)

This party sees a future that is much greater and has much more. We talk about the environment minister and the *Viagara* ad, except he is in reverse. We could come out of that white fence pretty excited about things, if we got into alternate energy.

What about biomass? What is one of the biggest problems with the large agricultural feedlots and so on? We all know what that is, it is the smell. The smell is the rotting manure that is produced by large farms. Humans also produce that and we call it sewage, but there are solutions.

I hate to keep using one country as an example, but I visited Berlin, Germany. I have made a habit over the last 30 years of asking people wherever I go what they do with their garbage. I find the answers very interesting. In Canada we still have landfill sites, we are still building them, but most places do not have landfill sites any more.

I have short side story. I was in Vienna sitting next to the mayor at a banquet. I asked him what he did with his garbage. He said, "Are you interested in garbage?". I said, "Yes, I am really interested in garbage". At eleven o'clock at night I was with the mayor of Vienna driving down a street downtown. We stopped in front of what looked like an apartment building. It was all lit up with curtains and everything. It was only six feet deep. In behind was an incinerator and recycling plant.

Let me come back to Berlin. What does Berlin do with its garbage and sewage? A private company runs their sewage disposal. Sewage is deposited into six large vessels where it is fermented. Bacteria is added and it is fermented big time. Methane is produced and the solid matter is dried. That methane is used to incinerate the garbage, with collectors on top of the stacks so nothing goes into the air or water. What happens to the water in the sewage? The water in the sewage is heated and that heat is then sold in pipes all through Berlin which is how all the buildings are heated.

The pipes are right on top of the ground going into every building. Buildings are heated by fermenting the sewage and burning the garbage. It is a totally closed system. How long has Berlin being doing that? Forty years. That is technology; that is the future.

Our government does not have any vision for biomass, solar power or wind power. It does not even talk about it. Chicken Little never talks about that. He talks about the sky falling.

Government Orders

Geothermal energy has become a favourite for me because it is being used in my constituency. A new recreation unit and swimming pool were being built in Sylvan Lake, Alberta because energy costs were going up. The town wanted to find another way to heat the building and the swimming pool. It found a company located in Calgary which had just moved a division from New Zealand to Canada. It had been using geothermal energy for a long time. The town of Sylvan Lake wanted to take a look at it.

● (1335)

Let me read this letter to the House:

Thank you for your kind letter of October 11th and attached certificate.

They had their opening and I had to be here, but I sent them a certificate.

As we discussed briefly in Innisfail, the geothermal system at the aquatic facility cost us an additional \$200,000 over the cost of a natural gas system. We estimate at today's gas rates that we will save approximately \$80,000 per year in operating costs. This will give us a two-and-a-half year payback, an enviable return on investment which reduces harmful emissions. If you find time for a tour, I would be pleased to make the arrangements. Again, thank you for your support and keep anti-Kyoto work going.

That is small-town Canada. It has a solution.

Does anyone know what happened in that plant? I visited that plant about two weeks ago. The exciting part is that it is now at \$10,000 to \$20,000 above the savings it thought it was going to have. It will have the whole system paid for in under two years and then it will have free energy forever. That is the vision for this country. That is where we are going, but the government does not talk about that. It is going to sign us up to these commitments in an international boondoggle called Kyoto. We will have penalties associated with that. We will be sending our money to Russia to be used there to develop whatever, not spent here to develop technology like that being used in small-town Canada.

It is important that we know and that Canadians know what they are getting into. There are exciting projects going on across the country. We can talk about bio-digesters. One is here in Ontario and now is up and working. There are feedlots in the U.S. that are now collecting methane and burning it as fuel. Are we doing that? Is the government encouraging that? No, it is not. Remember that the government is "feel good, talk about it, but do not do anything". And when it finally does something, it is the wrong thing. Obviously we have a lot of examples of that.

There is also tidal research. I am afraid I do not know a lot about the future of tidal energy, but I do know that it is there. I know there are companies working on it and I know it has potential.

I have left the most exciting one for last and that is the whole hydrogen and fuel cell potential. The use of hydrogen as a fuel is exciting. It is exciting how fast that technology is developing. It is exciting because countries like the U.S. are putting major, major dollars into developing it. It is exciting, and it is sad in a way that Mr. Ballard from Ballard Power in Vancouver is saying that the worst thing this country could do is sign on to Kyoto because it will end the development of the fuel cell in this country. I will quote him later on when I have time to talk about some of these important quotes from Canadian citizens who are out there in this business.

What is hydrogen? There are various sources for hydrogen, but probably the major source is water. It is an interesting project. The technological problem today is splitting the water molecule to get the hydrogen and then storing the hydrogen and using it in the fuel cell, but those problems are being solved very quickly.

It is interesting. General Motors has talked about a project that it is doing in Idaho. It is building a solar factory. The solar factory will use solar energy to split the water molecule and store the hydrogen in titanium tanks. Those titanium tanks will then be put on half-ton trucks. It is building 42,000 half-ton trucks that will run on hydrogen in the year 2004. It is trying them out in Idaho because of the varying weather conditions and because there are enough people to drive half-ton trucks. The reason it is using half-ton trucks is that it works better for the titanium tank than putting it into a car.

● (1340)

The point is, it is being done. The point is, Los Angeles is implementing 1,000 buses that will run on hydrogen and fuel cells. As well, it is interesting that Beijing has ordered 10,000 natural gas fuel cell hybrids because it wants to clear up its air in time for the Olympics. It is interesting that countries like that are doing so much while we are signing on to Kyoto, which is going to send away money that should be used in developing these systems in this country. It makes no sense and I think members are now getting the picture as to why I can put so much into fighting this thing, because it is so wrong. It is just wrong, wrong, wrong. There is nothing in here that makes any sense.

What do we need to think about in alternate energy? What we have to remember is that we need government to set a vision. We need government to provide leadership. We need government to show that we have solutions, because every Canadian cares about the environment. We want to fix the problems that are there. We want to deal with climate change and we want to deal with pollution, but Kyoto is not the way. That is the message we must get out.

We have to remember that when it comes to alternate energy and the excitement of that, the costs are being reduced by 50% every 10 years. That is an important figure to remember. Today it is not economical, but it will be at some time in the future. With government initiative and support, it will happen sooner rather than later. We have to remember that it is estimated now that between 2040 and 2050 these alternatives will be equal to the carbon based fuels.

We will never use up our reserves of coal in this world. We probably will not use up our reserves of oil and gas either. In 1950 we were told that in 10 years we would have no more gas and oil. In 1960 we were told we would be out of oil and gas in 10 years. It has been 10 years, 10 years and 10 years. Today we have more reserves than we had in 1950 and they are increasing.

Government Orders

Should we do something? Yes, we should do something. What should we use the oil and gas for? We should use it for value added things like petrochemicals. We can preserve the oil and gas industry for thousands of years simply because that fuel should not be used in those cars sitting out front. It should not be used for that. We should be using other energy sources, which are of course more environmentally friendly. The 33 cars sitting out front is just an example. It comes back to the whole leadership issue.

I hope this gives people a feeling for where our party would go. Our party would deal with this issue. It would deal with the environmental problems today, but it would not bankrupt us in a phony, good for nothing Kyoto protocol that will not deal with the environment, that is a waste of money, that is a forced bureaucracy and that will lead to our standard of living decaying even further. It is no vision. It is no vision for anything.

As I have presented this across the country, I have not found many people who disagree. In fact in one place some of the people who were there said they thought I almost had the guy from the Sierra Club buying a membership in my party. He could see that we had some solutions, that we had some answers, and I think it is pretty important to demonstrate that.

Mr. Speaker, that is our vision of where we would go. I hope you have appreciated the opportunity to have it explained.

● (1345)

I want to now get back to the actual government plan and the Kyoto protocol. That was just a little introduction to what I have to say. I know that some members across the way will probably ask me to their ridings and have me do a presentation on Kyoto. I would be more than happy to do that and let them know. Of course, I trust that at their caucus meeting tomorrow they will be sure that any Prime Minister or future prime minister knows what the Kyoto protocol says about the penalties. Just in case any future prime minister does not understand the penalties, he should understand this, and if they need copies, I know that the pages would be glad to make them and distribute them to the members.

I would even go further. If they would like me to do a little session at their caucus meeting about Kyoto, I would certainly be more than happy to do that on behalf of the Canadian public.

Let us get back to the Kyoto protocol and some of the issues that I know the government wants to talk about and would like me to really get into.

As far as the polls are concerned, of course with every day that goes by we know that the support for Kyoto drops. We know that people are starting to say that they would prefer a made in Canada plan, one that involves alternate energy and vision for the future, and we know that they are starting to say that they probably do not understand Kyoto well enough but now they have their doubts. They now think it is going to affect their jobs and their standard of living. They now think they will have to pay more and it is going to affect their taxes. Call it a carbon tax or call it whatever we want, but the bottom line is that somebody has to pay for all this and that means a tax for Canadians.

Canadians are starting to realize this and I think the government of course is starting to panic a little bit. The very fact that it is not going

to take the opportunity to send this to committee and have witnesses brought in to look at it I think is pretty indicative of how frightened it is. If it would send this to the environment committee and bring in witnesses on both sides of the issue, Canadians would really understand where it is at. There are as many witnesses saying "don't sign" as there are saying "sign", and Canadians just do not know what those facts are.

We could talk about the polls, and Mr. Speaker, I have so much material here that I hope I can get it done by Christmas.

Let us carry on and get back to the plan, the powder-puff PowerPoint presentation that the government has put forward and faked as a plan. Let us see what the provinces think of this plan, because that is who it was done for. It was not done for the Canadian people. It was certainly not done for our benefit. It was done for the provinces.

The November 21 meeting of environment and energy ministers was postponed. Of course, we now know that the meeting on November 29 has been cancelled totally. Now the government is saying to forget the provinces, that it does not have to consult with them at all. It has told us in the House that it does not have to listen to the MPs at all, that it can ratify this without us.

This means that people elected to represent Canadians here do not matter. Nobody is going to listen anyway. We can talk all we want, but the government is not going to listen. It will not listen to parliamentarians. It will not listen to the Canadian premiers. It will not listen to Canadians. Why should it consult them? They are the ones who are going to be affected by this. It will not consult with the manufacturers. It will not consult with the chambers of commerce. It will not consult with those small businesses out there that are going to be affected.

Think about it, Mr. Speaker. When have we heard any government say that it would not ever talk to the people? What kind of government is it that would do this sort of thing?

● (1350)

An hon. member: Francie Ducros does all the time.

Mr. Bob Mills: Yes, maybe the government has a member of the Prime Minister's staff who could speak for Canadians and tell, certainly our American friends, what we think of them.

However the point is that the government refuses to consult. It refuses to come up with a plan. It refuses to do anything. It is simply saying that it can ratify this without talking to anybody; it does not care what anybody else thinks.

I hope the government pays a huge price for this and it should. We will work to make that happen. The government has shown no leadership, no plan, no cost and no cooperation, yet it dares to talk about that in its plan.

S. O. 31

What are consequences of some of this? There will be hundreds of thousands of jobs lost. There will be \$25 billion to \$45 billion lost from our economy. It will not reduce smog, acid rain or pollution. It is not about that. It is about CO₂. What do they not understand? Can the Liberals not read what the accord says? It says that it is CO₂. It says that it is climate change. It does not say that it is about any kind of pollution which the Liberals hide behind.

It will increase the price of gas, electricity and home heating. It will reduce investment in our country. It will require formation of a whole new level of government. This morning we went through the bureaucracy that could be created by the Kyoto protocol. The members here can list all the things from counting trees, to the bureaucracy of emissions credits.

It will put us at a huge disadvantage with our trading partners. That will affect jobs. What do the Liberals not understand about the jobs that it will affected? It is like that guy in Hamilton on Sunday who jumped up and said that he understood why Kyoto would affect him. Because he worked in a Windstar factory, he thought he would not be affected.

There are huge implications of signing Kyoto. We need to continue to point out the penalties associated with signing onto Kyoto.

The government does not get it. I do not think Liberals know where they are at. I am sure as we have more members here they probably will stay around because I will get into the whole area of modelling. That is really interesting stuff and its fascinating. If they want, I could start with the 4,000 models, but my intention is really to abbreviate it down to just 40 models and discuss those.

We need to analyze some of these points. Let me bring everyone up to date and then we will take a little break, call it question period or show time.

•(1355)

The Deputy Speaker: That is a wonderful idea. Why do we not move to statement by members.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

WORLD OYSTER OPENING

Mr. Joe McGuire (Egmont, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Mr. Patrick McMurray, who at the 48th annual World Oyster Opening Championship in Ireland, recently became the first Canadian to ever win the world title.

Mr. McMurray, from Toronto, qualified for the world championship by winning the Canadian championship this year at the Tyne Valley Oyster Festival, which is in my home village of Tyne Valley, where he needed only one minute and 32 seconds to open 18 Malpeque oysters. When he arrived at the world championship in Galway, Ireland, Mr. McMurray won by opening 30 European flat oysters in 3 minutes and 47 seconds, beating out national champions from 15 countries.

Finally, I commend Mr. McMurray for his desire to use his title to promote Canadian P.E.I. oysters. Islanders will be cheering him on at next year's championship in Tyne Valley.

* * *

FIREARMS REGISTRY

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-68, one of the dumbest and most wasteful bills ever, comes into full force in a month, and what has it accomplished?

We were told it would prevent crime, despite the fact that after decades of registering handguns, they are the weapon of choice for criminals. We were told that the system would cost less than \$100 million, and to date it has passed a billion dollars, with still no end in sight.

Canadians are dying in hospital waiting lines and the Liberals squandered a billion dollars on a useless system. Our military are flying 40-year-old helicopters, while the Liberals waste a billion dollars on a useless system. Child poverty goes unresolved, while the Liberals blow a billion dollars on a useless system. Government projections on Bill C-68 were out 1,000% and it is far from finished.

Now we are faced with a new hoax, the Kyoto accord. Not only does Kyoto not address real pollution, but if government estimates are out as much as Bill C-68, the final cost will be more than all the money needed for health care, the military, child poverty and other measures combined.

Bill C-68 was supposed to address crime, but to waste money as the Liberals have done is the biggest crime of all.

* * *

•(1400)

QUEEN'S JUBILEE MEDAL

Mr. Paul Harold Macklin (Northumberland, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise today to pay tribute to 20 individuals from my riding of Northumberland who I recently presented with Commemorative Medals for the Golden Jubilee of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II.

Some recipients of the medals include Ms. Jacqueline Gorveatt, a member of the Alderville community who works diligently to ensure the services and resources available to the first nations are accessible and of the highest quality.

Mr. David Wilson fosters puppies for Dog Guide Training in conjunction with the Lions Foundation of Canada.

Mr. Gary O'Dwyer, a teacher at St. Mary's Secondary School, has enlightened and enriched the lives of many students through his many active teaching techniques and commitment to social justice.

I wish to congratulate all the recipients and encourage them to continue their efforts in serving fellow citizens.

ZIMBABWE

Mr. Irwin Cotler (Mount Royal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the recent witness testimony and documentary evidence regarding Zimbabwe, including that revealed before our PGA conference, is simply and tragically put, that Zimbabwe is dying.

While this silent death, as David Coltart put it, is not on our radar screen, Zimbabwe is on the verge of an impending humanitarian catastrophe. The pandemic of AIDS is such that Zimbabwe has the highest incidence of AIDS in the world. Also six million Zimbabweans, of whom 2,000 are children, are on the verge of starvation. Some estimates predict that some 600,000 Zimbabweans may be dead in the next six months. Even if only 10% of that estimate is true, we have an impending humanitarian catastrophe of the highest order.

Food policy is being used as a weapon of starvation such that we are witnessing the starvation of dissent. There is an utter breakdown in the rule of law with government sanctioned repression, intimidation, beatings, torture and political murders. Opposition parliamentarians are at risk not only for their speech but for their safety.

The most important and urgent initiative we can take is to restore legitimacy through free and fair elections.

* * *

ROYAL VICTORIAN ORDER

Hon. Andy Scott (Fredericton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise in the House today to pay tribute to a distinguished recipient of the Royal Victorian Order, Fredericton's Anne Reynolds.

Ms. Reynolds, the Queen's visit coordinator in the province, was presented with the order during a private audience with the Queen and Duke of Edinburgh when they visited Fredericton as part of Her Majesty's Jubilee visit.

It is customary for visit coordinators to be presented with a signed photograph of the royals whom they are hosting. However the Queen had something additional for Anne Reynolds in mind, presenting her with the Royal Victorian Order, which the Queen may give to those who have served the monarchy in a personal way.

As a former colleague at Intergovernmental Affairs with the province of New Brunswick, I can appreciate all the dedication and hard work that went in to ensuring that Her Majesty's visit to Fredericton was a success, and I fully concur with the Queen's judgment. Congratulations to Anne Reynolds on receiving this honour.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mrs. Carol Skelton (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I have letters from farmers desperate for assistance in the face of unfair foreign subsidized markets and unreliable, unfair agricultural policy from this government.

Craig Hanson is the type of university educated agricultural professional Canada wants and he has written the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food calling for action. He has done every-

S. O. 31

thing asked of him, yet he still faces financial ruin because of the government.

He, like other farmers, face a marketplace which moves a lot faster than government. They desperately need government to become much more efficient and responsive when dealing with their concerns. Time is their biggest enemy.

Murray Downing has proposed a sensible emergency cash advance program to meet these special needs. He and his fellow farmers want the minister to consult with them. They fear further closed door bureaucratic decisions that will not help. The government gives the impression the problem is resolved when it is not.

Farmers and rural citizens of all political persuasions are seeking a common sense approach and plead for the minister to listen.

* * *

TERRORISM

Ms. Anita Neville (Winnipeg South Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on Friday this past week the government, encouraged by the United States and Britain, took action and froze the assets of a Canadian operated charity, the Benevolence International Fund Canada with links to the terrorist activity of Osama bin Laden.

The time is past due to take action on another terrorist linked organization based Canada, the Hezbollah which, by its own assertion, is committed to the elimination of the state of Israel and the destruction of Jews everywhere.

To freeze the assets of Hezbollah's military wing but to allow fundraising to continue in Canada for Hezbollah's social and political wing defies credibility. Hezbollah itself has refuted the contention that it is divided into separate military and political wings. Terrorist networks and terrorist linked activities must be named for what they are.

As a country, it is imperative that we live up to our commitments made under UN security resolutions and domestic law. Both Canadians and members of the world community expect that Canada show leadership and character in these matters, not be pressured or embarrassed into action by the international community.

* * *

● (1405)

[Translation]

CLAIRE VARIN

Ms. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to highlight the talent of a Quebec author, from Laval, no less, Claire Varin, who was recently awarded the prestigious Prix de la Société des écrivains canadiens for her last novel, entitled *Désert, désir*, in which the West and Christianity are juxtaposed with the Middle East and Islam.

S. O. 31

With a Doctorate in Letters from the University of Montreal, Claire Varin has worked for a number of different cultural programs at Radio-Canada in addition to teaching literature. She is also a Portuguese interpreter and has published two previous novels.

On behalf of the community of Laval I offer congratulations and thanks to Ms. Varin, who is also the recent recipient of the Prix de la création artistique awarded by the Conseil des arts et des lettres du Québec and who was recently appointed president of the Société littéraire de Laval.

* * *

M.A.C AIDS FUND

Ms. Yolande Thibeault (Saint-Lambert, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today it was announced by the Canadian Aids Society that the winner of the prestigious 2002 Leadership Award large business category was the M.A.C Aids Fund.

Since its creation in 1994, the M.A.C Aids Fund has distributed more than \$40 million to over 100 charities in Canada. These organizations help men, women and children affected by HIV/AIDS in Canada.

The commitment made by M.A.C through the M.A.C Aids Fund serves as a real inspiration for other small, medium and large businesses that want to contribute to the welfare of our society. This being National Aids Awareness Week, I would like to congratulate all of the stakeholders, organizations and charity groups for their untiring efforts to provide support for those who live with HIV/AIDS on a daily basis in Canada.

* * *

[English]

KYOTO PROTOCOL

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, we found the top 10 reasons why no one can tell where the member for LaSalle—Émard stands on Kyoto.

Reason No. 10: He believes that taking two or three positions on a single issue is a good way to address the democratic deficit.

Reason No. 9: When one raise \$100,000 a night from big business, one is a little reluctant to bite the hand that buys, I mean feeds one.

Reason No. 8: Canada Steamship Lines would have to park some ships.

Reason No. 7: At the very least, CSL would have to stop emptying its oily bilges into the oceans.

Reason No. 6: What the heck, they should stop polluting anyway.

Reason No. 5: Oh silly me, I forgot, Canada Steamship Lines registers its vessels offshore so it really does not apply to them.

Reason No. 4: He thinks an implementation plan means how to change the locks at 24 Sussex Drive.

Reason No. 3: He has lost his magic decoder ring and he cannot understand the fine print.

Reason No. 2: Perhaps he does not trust Kyoto because he knows in the PMO.

And Reason No. 1: He is reluctant to take a stand, even though he knows we are right, because he does not want to vote with the Alliance yet again. It just kills him. He cannot handle it.

* * *

HIV-AIDS

Ms. Carolyn Bennett (St. Paul's, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House that November 24 to December 1 is National AIDS Awareness Week.

Some people believe that HIV/AIDS is cured in Canada and no longer presents a serious threat. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, the number of people living with HIV in Canada continues to grow. There is no cure and a vaccine is years away.

It is true that people are living longer because of improved treatment. However the medications do not come without serious side effects and they are not a cure. Drug treatments are also failing many people with drug resistant strains of HIV turning up in Canada and around the globe. Still way too many Canadians are contracting this preventable illness.

AIDS Awareness Week is not just a time for us to acknowledge that HIV/AIDS is a continuing health problem. We must also recognize that people living with this disease continue to face stigma and discrimination. We must end the silence around HIV/AIDS if we are going to gain ground on this virus.

* * *

CANADIAN FORCES

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House and to all of Canada a remarkable job that happened on November 17 in Zgon, Bosnia.

Bosnia has been devastated by a terrible war. Many homes have been devastated. The only activity right now in terms of economic development may be forestry. Imagine the reaction of people in Zgon, Bosnia when the only lumber mill in that area caught fire at 4 o'clock in the morning.

Who came to the rescue? The 1st Battalion Princess Patricia's of Edmonton. With unknown safety concerns for themselves, they helped to put out the fire in 100 kilometre winds and helped save many homes occupied by workers of the surrounding mill.

On behalf of all parliamentarians and all Canadians, I salute the members of our Canadian Forces in Bosnia-Herzegovina and wish them good luck and success in the future. God bless them.

•(1410)

[Translation]

MEMBER FOR LASALLE—ÉMARD

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the very day the debate on ratification of the Kyoto protocol began, we learned that Canada Steamship Lines, which belongs to the hon. member for LaSalle—Émard, had been fined a record \$125,000 in connection with an illegal oil spill.

While the member for LaSalle—Émard admits such a violation is quite simply intolerable, Quebecers would like to know whether he finds it equally intolerable that his ships fly under foreign flags; that CSL, his company, had its new ships built in Asia rather than create employment here in our shipyards; that his position on deferring ratification of the Kyoto protocol is at variance with his fine words of yesterday about governments needing to be extremely strict as far as the environment is concerned; and that the same ship, *CSL Atlas*, was also caught in the act in 1991 when the member for LaSalle—Émard was both the president of the company and the opposition critic on the environment.

So which one is the real member for LaSalle—Émard, the opposition environment critic of 1991, the shipping company owner, or the Liberal party leadership hopeful?

* * *

[English]

JOHN MCCRAE SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS

Mr. David Pratt (Nepean—Carleton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome to Parliament Hill 60 grade 10 students from John McCrae Secondary School in my riding. These students are touring the Parliament Buildings to get a better understanding of how government works.

These students are very lucky to live in Ottawa and to have easy access to the institutions of the federal government including Parliament, the Supreme Court and the National Archives. For many students their age, visiting these important sites simply is not possible.

I would like to pay special tribute to their teachers, Mr. Kevin Brown and Ms. Catherine Cosstick. I thank them for their ongoing work to educate our leaders of tomorrow and for taking the time to give their students an important lesson on the Canadian government.

Who knows, perhaps one day one of the students in the gallery today will be the hon. member for Nepean—Carleton, hopefully some time in the distant future. Thanks to their teachers, they are on the right track.

* * *

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the international campaign of 16 Days of Activism Against Gender Violence, a campaign that began yesterday with the International Day for the Elimination of Violence against Women and will close with the anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights on December 10. Throughout this period Canadians

S. O. 31

from across the country will don purple ribbons as a symbol of remembrance of support and of sorrow.

Here in Canada this time of year holds special significance as we gather to mourn the 14 young women who were murdered in Montreal on December 6, 1989.

Violence against women is a threat that is not unknown to Canada. Rather it is a silent and solitary struggle fought in the shadows of family homes.

The purple ribbon is not only a symbol of those mothers, sisters and daughters who are no longer with us, but it is a sign of solidarity with those who defy to this day the terror that is abuse. The message we send is simple and clear: To those who are suffering from abuse, know you are not alone.

* * *

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND MUSIC AWARDS

Mr. Shawn Murphy (Hillsborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last Saturday evening the Prince Edward Island Music Awards Association held its annual music awards ceremony in Charlottetown.

In all, 22 award winners were presented with awards in a number of categories.

On behalf of the House, I want to extend my congratulations to all award winners, including fiddler Cynthia MacLeod, who won five separate awards.

I especially want to pay tribute to Bill Acorn who received the lifetime achievement award.

Twenty-five years ago Bill Acorn started a local cable show featuring country music called *Bill's Jamboree*. The show ran for 25 consecutive years. When it stopped last year, it had been the longest running cable show in Canada. During those years, Bill hosted many provincial and national entertainers. The show was thoroughly enjoyed by thousands of Prince Edward Islanders.

To Cynthia, Bill and the other award winners, on behalf of everyone in the House, I offer our best wishes and sincere congratulations.

* * *

•(1415)

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, Chris Kempling, a Quesnel, B.C. teacher in my riding, is facing possible suspension of his teaching licence. The B.C. College of Teachers has said he overstepped the bounds of free speech by writing his opinions on traditional matters of faith in local newspapers.

Did he overstep free speech in the classroom? Apparently not.

What are his views and why are they in conflict with the public education system?

Oral Questions

They would appear to be the traditional views on sexuality held by most conservative Christians, Islam, Judaism and other faiths. It seems that the only freedom of speech the B.C. College of Teachers allows is what it agrees with.

Thanks to the B.C. college it is now quite evident that such bedrocks of civilization as the Hebrew Bible, the New Testament and the Koran would never be acceptable in a school environment because it might affect how we communicate with students. Yet folks like Robin Sharpe can be exempted from pornography laws because of artistic merit.

Think of it. Teachers are stripped of their licences because of traditional faith and Robin Sharpe could apply for a licence to teach creative writing to our children.

Oh Canada.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

CANADA-U.S. RELATIONS

Mr. Stephen Harper (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, five days ago we witnessed the insult that was heard around the world. Three days ago the Prime Minister refused to accept the resignation of his communications director because, he said, "I don't think it was a major offence". Today we have learned he has accepted that resignation.

Could the Prime Minister offer clarification on what has happened to change his mind?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on Friday I gave an explanation that was the story that the director of communications had told me. She came back over the weekend and because of the controversy, told me yesterday that she did not want to carry on with her duties. I have refused her resignation but she does not want to carry on. It is with great regret that she is going because for four years she has been a very hardworking, efficient director of communications and has done a very good job for Canada.

Mr. Stephen Harper (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the only constant is the Prime Minister's refusal to take full responsibility. It is time he admitted that he should have done the obvious, admit this was wrong and take responsibility for what has happened.

I know the Prime Minister does not find it easy to apologize, but I wonder if he will now simply issue an apology to the President of the United States so we can put this matter behind us.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, she was, in the discussion she was having privately with the reporter, defending the President of the United States. That was the statement that she was making at that time. She explained that herself on Friday in the letter that was read in the House of Commons.

Mr. Stephen Harper (Leader of the Opposition, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed he is still dragging his feet on an apology.

On the anniversary of September 11, the Prime Minister made disparaging remarks about the United States and western allies. He has ridiculed the President's Texas roots in caucus, and now he has failed to deal quickly with these disparaging remarks.

At a time when Canada is facing significant issues on things like wheat, softwood lumber, agriculture and international relations, would the Prime Minister enlighten us as to what useful purpose any of this strategy serves?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I repeat that the director of communications, in what was a private discussion with a journalist, was defending the President of the United States. The hon. member was not there. He is very smart to know what happened there when the only people who know about what was discussed are the director of communications and the other reporter who, under his ethics rules, decided that he would not talk about a private conversation. That is not the standard that is acceptable to every press reporter.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, what is not acceptable are the constant anti-American remarks that have come from the government.

Despite heavy lobbying from the Prime Minister, all provinces agreed yesterday to boycott further discussions on the Kyoto accord. The federal government continues to charge ahead, even though all provinces are denouncing the federal approach to this issue.

What concrete changes specifically has the Prime Minister offered to the provinces to bring them back to the table?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what we want to do in proceeding with Kyoto is to give certainty to the sector. What the opposition is doing is trying to drag its feet and maintain uncertainty for years and years to come.

The fact is that we have decided to proceed. As far as the provinces and the private sector, to focus on the issues, the provinces have put 12 conditions in a communication to us. I reported to the Premier of New Brunswick that nine of them were acceptable, two others could be improved upon and there might be one that would be a serious problem.

● (1420)

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, something is wrong here if the Prime Minister is trying to stop the uncertainty, because billions of dollars of investment have been put on hold precisely because of his rush to ratify.

The government knows it will need provincial cooperation to implement Kyoto, but yesterday the Liberal Premier of B.C. said this:

There was an opportunity to work with the provinces—we have asked for that for months—and in fact the federal government decided it couldn't work with the provinces, for whatever reason.

Why has the federal government decided that it will go it alone and not work with the provinces on Kyoto?

Oral Questions

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have had dozens and dozens of meetings with officials and ministers since the Kyoto agreement trying to make progress. It was always postponement, postponement and postponement. The time has come and it is between now and the end of the year.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister made a commitment to ratify Kyoto in 2002. However, the motion being debated here in the House makes no mention of the 2002 deadline. Yesterday, the Minister of the Environment said that the reason for this was to keep the motion from being too long, which is totally preposterous.

Is the real reason not that the member for LaSalle—Émard wants to delay ratification, and that he has more influence in the Liberal caucus than the Prime Minister?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the member had listened to the answer I gave earlier, he would know that I said the Kyoto protocol would be ratified before the end of the year.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, if that is true, why is the date not included? Why is it not mentioned in the motion? Why refuse to mention it, if not to leave an out to satisfy the provinces that pollute, such as Alberta, and to be able to do as he did with the GST, which is to say one thing and do another?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the Speech from the Throne, which was adopted by the House of Commons, we clearly said that we would ratify the Kyoto protocol this year, before the end of 2002. I have repeated this in the House dozens of times and I am repeating it again now. What more does the member want? It will be done. We will vote on it in the coming days, before the end of the year, once the debate is finished, if they allow a debate. If not, we will ratify it. The debate is a courtesy. The government can act without a debate in the House of Commons.

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—Petite-Patrie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister promised on several occasions to ratify Kyoto by the end of the year. That is precisely what he told us.

Why, then, is he refusing to include a specific date in the motion to be voted on in the House? We are asking the Prime Minister to keep his word and, once and for all, to include a date in the motion.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is a motion that was drafted in advance. He ought to listen to the Prime Minister when the Prime Minister speaks. I cannot give a clearer explanation. The vote will be held, if the opposition lets us hold one, within the next few days. Anyway, the government can act on its own, and ratification will take place before December 31 of the year 2-0-0-2.

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—Petite-Patrie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister continues to refuse to amend his motion by including a specific date.

Can the Prime Minister prove to us that his reluctance to include a specific date in the Kyoto motion is not the result of secret agreements made with polluters behind our backs?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, all they have to do is move an amendment—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. members: We can't.

An hon. member: And we will vote in favour of it.

Right Hon. Jean. Jean Chrétien: I cannot make it any clearer. Whether or not it is in the resolution, when the Prime Minister has been saying in the House of Commons for weeks, and when it is in the Speech from the Throne, that we are going to ratify the Kyoto protocol before the end of the year 2-0-0-2, I trust that the hon. member can understand that the government is speaking fairly clearly.

* * *

● (1425)

[*English*]

PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP): Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday the House voted 234 to 0 to support an NDP motion that the finance minister withdraw regressive changes that had been proposed regarding the disability tax credit.

These changes were seen as a callous attack on tens of thousands of disabled Canadians who were afraid they would be ineligible for this modest tax credit. Now that the vote has passed Canadians are confused and seeking clarification.

My question for the finance minister is, will he withdraw the proposed changes to the disability tax credit in light of last week's vote?

Hon. John Manley (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me first of all be clear that the objective of the proposed amendments was, very specifically, not to reduce the government's support for persons with disabilities. Rather it was to ensure that it goes to the persons who most need it, which is in line with the intention of the disability tax credit.

However, a number of people have been very concerned about the proposed amendments. I have asked my officials to meet with the representatives of the disabled community to hear their concerns and to ensure that proposed amendments will not have unintended consequences.

Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP): Mr. Speaker, that response will be very disconcerting to the people who have made calls to our offices and I am sure all MPs' offices. They are concerned about the impact of all this.

Let me specifically ask the finance minister what the timeframe is for those proposals for the people most affected by this disability tax credit?

Hon. John Manley (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, just so that we are clear what we are talking about here. We are talking about the effect of the Hamilton decision which strictly affected some people who may have certain dietary restrictions which may cause them to apply for the disability tax credit. That is specifically what we are referring to.

Oral Questions

We are working as quickly as possible with representatives of the disabled community. We hope that we can give them the required clarification very quickly.

* * *

[Translation]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC): Mr. Speaker, Quebec's environment minister confirmed to journalists that when it comes to Kyoto, Ottawa "acknowledges the possibility of signing bilateral agreements that will respect provincial jurisdiction".

Prior to giving their approval for ratification, Quebecers deserve to know exactly what it involves.

Can the Prime Minister confirm unequivocally his intention to negotiate a bilateral agreement with Quebec? Will this option also be offered to the other provinces?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this highly complex file involves the interests of the provincial governments and those of various industries in each of the provinces. We are in contact with the various industrial sectors and the provinces.

This treaty will come into effect in the year 2012. We plan to conclude agreements with anyone required to ensure that by 2012, the objectives of the treaty are respected by all of Canada.

[English]

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC): Mr. Speaker, no guarantee.

The Prime Minister insists that the federal government will proceed before January 1 with Kyoto even if the provinces continue to object. Under our Constitution Canada cannot make Kyoto work without the provinces. For example, meeting Kyoto targets would require the use of credits related to carbon sinks and emissions trading.

Is the government confident that it has the constitutional authority to introduce those systems on its own without provincial cooperation? Has the government sought a specific legal opinion identifying this authority and will it table that opinion?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have the authority.

* * *

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

Mr. Vic Toews (Provencher, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court decision to allow imprisoned murderers the right to vote undermines Canadian democracy. Even more disturbing is the active involvement of the Liberal government in funding those groups who asked the court to grant that right to prisoners.

Why did the Liberal government use taxpayers' money to give murderers the vote?

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government argued against this position in court. The government lost the position in the Supreme Court of Canada. The hon. member

is a former minister in a province. He should be aware of how those rules work. The government is now reviewing the decision with a view to legislating wherever we have the constitutional authority to do so.

• (1430)

Mr. Vic Toews (Provencher, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government has refused to distance itself from the recent Supreme Court decision on prisoner voting. Now we know, through the court challenges program, it financially supported the right of prisoners to vote.

Why has the government chosen to secretly encourage a perverse policy initiative by the Supreme Court while it refuses to publicly state where it stands on this important issue?

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member wants me to table the factum that was presented to the court, I am quite willing to do so. We have argued against this case in court. Unlike the hon. member we did not stand in the House and denounce the justices of the Supreme Court, their lordships, as he has done in a totally disrespectful way.

* * *

[Translation]

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, over eight years, the Minister of Canadian Heritage has awarded \$3.8 million in funding to Éditions Brimar, primarily to publish cookbooks that are curiously similar from one year to the next.

How can the Minister of Canadian Heritage justify such generosity for the reprinting of cookbooks that are, for all intents and purposes, the same year after year? This smacks of the Groupaction report affair. This smells like reheated leftovers, no pun intended.

Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I really wondered when I heard the representative of the Government of Quebec say that Canadian cuisine was not part of our culture.

If we want to ensure the survival of publishing companies, much of whose money goes into direct employment in the Province of Quebec, it is obvious that the companies must also be able to make these very interesting books available to anyone interested in the culinary arts.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, when it comes to re-releasing the same cookbook year after year, receiving a grant to do so, and having that book printed in China or the United States, I would ask the minister if she considers this a worthwhile investment in job development, when everything is being done out of the country.

Has Éditions Brimar not found a winning recipe for making money with Canadian Heritage?

Oral Questions

Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): I would be surprised at that, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. member wants to discuss this, I am prepared to call a round table discussion with all the publishing houses in order to find out whether or not they believe in the policy we have established.

It is a well-known fact that we are currently making cultural investments in excess of \$1 billion in Quebec. I know that this is about 25% more than what the Government of Quebec is doing. I believe that artists, writers and publishing houses support Canada's policy on cultural investment in Quebec, including your—

The Speaker: The hon. member for St. Albert.

* * *

[English]

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago Canadians were outraged to find out that Clifford Olson, Paul Bernardo and other hardened criminals were given the right to vote. Notwithstanding what the House leader just told us about opposing that case, the point is that the government paid the criminals to fight the case in the first place.

I want to know from the Minister of Canadian Heritage, who finances this program, why she would even allow taxpayers' money to be used in this way?

Hon. Martin Cauchon (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, essentially the organization that decided to finance the lawsuit was an independent, arm's length organization in order to avoid any political interference.

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it was not an independent organization. It was paid for by the Government of Canada and the taxpayers of Canada. It should stop now. I want to know if the government will stop this program right now.

Hon. Martin Cauchon (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we do not control it. People apply, develop the criteria and make their own decisions. We do not get involved in the process.

* * *

[Translation]

BUDGET SURPLUS

Ms. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal leadership race has started to loosen tongues. This time it was the Minister of Industry who stated that the government had put too much money toward the debt, thereby depriving the health care system of resources it sorely needed, in addition to preventing a public debate on the use of considerable sums of money.

Like his predecessor, the current Minister of Finance is deaf to our appeals, and similar appeals from the Auditor General. Will he be more receptive to the comments made by his colleague, the Minister of Industry?

• (1435)

Hon. John Manley (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our accounts are determined in an

annual system, in other words, at the end of the year, the books are closed. A few months later, the Auditor General gives us the year-end figures. I do not see how we could go back to the previous year and spend more money.

The accounts are closed. After March 31, that is it.

Ms. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Romanow commission is about to release its report on the health care system. When will the Minister of Finance acknowledge that the real problem with the health care system is the financial withdrawal of the federal government, which now contributes only 14 cents of every dollar spent on health care in Canada?

When will he acknowledge this?

Hon. John Manley (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, why does the member insist on using the wrong figures? She has it wrong. She is not including tax credits. She is not taking into account equalization payments. In her figures on provincial spending, she is including all social spending, including education.

Is she including education as a federal government responsibility? Her figures are completely wrong.

* * *

[English]

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. Gerry Ritz (Battlefords—Lloydminster, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, Media/I.D.A. Vision Inc., owned by the Liberal's favourite chalet host, Claude Boulay, has received \$42 million, in brand new money, in contracts, after the Minister of Public Works claimed that he would to clean up the system six months ago.

Since Media/I.D.A. was one of the well known middle men in the sponsorship mess in the first place, why do we see even fatter contracts going to the same company now?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, despite the loose allegations that are sometimes thrown back and forth across the floor of the House of Commons, the fact remains that neither my officials nor the Auditor General found any evidence upon which to make a reference of the matter, referred to by this hon. gentleman, to the RCMP.

Mr. Gerry Ritz (Battlefords—Lloydminster, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, nothing has changed. Nothing but smoke and mirrors there.

Since the sponsorship program ended, the money going through these companies has actually been ratcheted up, kicked into a higher gear.

Does the minister have any proof at all that taxpayers are getting any value for their money, or will he admit now that all he has done is funnel the money through the back door after the opposition slammed the front door?

Oral Questions

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman can try as he might to create misinformation or disinformation but the fact remains that wherever a firm was involved in questionable transactions that resulted in a reference to the RCMP, the business flow stopped to that firm, plus any outstanding moneys were held back. Indeed, the Government of Canada is holding back \$3.9 million to make sure that the taxpayers of the country are kept whole.

* * *

SECURITIES INDUSTRY

Mr. Roy Cullen (Etobicoke North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the post-Enron and post-WorldCom world, Canada is not immune. A number of respected business leaders in Canada have called for legislation similar to the Sarbanes-Oxley legislation in the U.S.A., while others are calling for a less interventionist approach.

[Translation]

My question is for the Minister of Finance. Should Canadian investors have faith in corporate governance in Canada?

[English]

Is the minister planning any initiatives in the area of corporate governance? When will he begin consulting with Canadians generally and Canadian parliamentarians specifically on this important topic?

Hon. John Manley (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, public confidence in capital markets and public companies is obviously critical to a well functioning economy. I am very pleased with the cooperation that has been demonstrated to date by federal and provincial regulators and the private sector to implement an appropriate Canadian response to the issues highlighted by several recent U.S. corporate scandals.

The government is reviewing legislation to ensure that governance standards remain of the highest order. It is also reviewing the criminal law framework and the effectiveness of enforcement related to corporate fraud.

* * *

● (1440)

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Joe Comartin (Windsor—St. Clair, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of the Environment has burned many bridges in the handling of the Kyoto file. His provincial counterparts have postponed and cancelled meetings, clearly signifying the minister has lost all credibility with them.

In order to preserve our international reputation, protect our environment and our health, will the Prime Minister show true leadership by taking upon himself the Kyoto file?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. member that the Prime Minister takes a close and personal interest in the Kyoto file.

Furthermore, I can assure him that we do at the present time have some provinces jockeying for position. However I believe those provinces will recognize the importance of working together, as we have done for the past 5 years since Kyoto and the past 10 years since Rio.

* * *

AIRLINE INDUSTRY

Mrs. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP): Mr. Speaker, a Transport Canada management working group has presented a report recommending that the federal government eliminate 55 aviation safety inspectors. The international civil aviation organization has already denounced Transport Canada's current inspection regime saying that it is understaffed and overwhelmed.

Will the transport minister assure Canadians that he will not eliminate any aviation safety inspectors and instead increase the number of inspectors to reduce the current shortage which threatens the safety of the flying public?

Hon. David Collette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the answer is, yes.

* * *

TELEMARKETING

Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester, PC): Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a letter from the government of the State of Washington confirming that the telemarketing schemes from Canadian prisons contravenes several Washington statutes.

The Solicitor General of Canada recently told the House that the prison telemarketing schemes had only been suspended and were under review. The Washington authorities have requested, and I quote, "to ensure no further acts of this nature occur".

Will the minister comply with this request to permanently stop this embarrassing telemarketing scheme that targeted citizens of Washington and Idaho?

Hon. Wayne Easter (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member admitted himself, I already said in the House that the telemarketing schemes have indeed been suspended and a review is taking place. That review is being analysed.

I thank the hon. member for the additional information he has provided this afternoon.

Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester, PC): Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that it appears Canada's top cop was breaking the law.

In 1997 the Prime Minister met with the President of the United States to discuss cross-border deceptive telemarketing. In 2001 the Solicitor General met with Attorney General John Ashcroft to discuss the very same thing.

How can the Prime Minister and the Solicitor General commit to fighting cross-border telemarketing and then turn around and run a program doing exactly the same thing out of a prison in Dorchester, New Brunswick?

Who within the Canadian government approved of this cross-border program? Who is it? Is it the minister or the deputy minister? Who approves international affairs?

Hon. Wayne Easter (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member knows very well that the government is very committed to fighting cross-border crime. In budget 2001 we put in place a number of expenditures that went to better policing and better protection against cross-border crime. We will continue to do more as time goes on.

* * *

AIRLINE INDUSTRY

Mr. James Moore (Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, taxes and fees account for up to 40% of the price of tickets for flying in Canada. Because of the Liberal government, Canadian travellers are the highest taxed air travellers on the planet.

What do we get for it? The government likes to boast about increased air security but the fact is that Peter St. John, who is an expert in terrorism, said that Canada was “at the bottom of the pile amongst western states” in air security.

The evidence is everywhere. When will the government cut or eliminate the air tax?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the quote from the individual cited is completely inaccurate. The fact is that we have a very good air security system. It was good before September 11, 2001. It is even better as a result.

Who does my hon. colleague propose to pay for these air security measures, the general taxpayer or the user? His party supports user charges on every other aspect of airline and airport policy but not on this.

However, as the Minister of Finance has said, the whole matter is under review.

Mr. James Moore (Port Moody—Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, yes, the whole matter is under review. The transport minister told the House that we would have a review of the air tax and that it would be tabled in the House in September.

We are now in the fourth week of November and the review has still not been tabled in the House. Where is it?

We have WestJet, Jazz, Tango and Pacific Coastal, you just name the air carrier, Minister of Transport, and they are cutting back services because of your bad job of defending the air industry.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

• (1445)

The Speaker: Order, please. I know the hon. member admires the Minister of Transport very much but he has to address his questions to the Chair, not to the minister.

Mr. James Moore: Mr. Speaker, you name the region, Atlantic Canada, the north, British Columbia or Saskatchewan. Every single region in the country is seeing a loss of air service because of the government's high taxing of air travel. It is a fact, Minister of Transport.

Oral Questions

When will the government review the air tax and lower it? When will the transport minister defend the airline industry?

Hon. John Manley (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us be very clear on what the hon. member is asking for. First, he does not acknowledge that \$70 million of expense was transferred from the carriers to the government when the assumption of the responsibility for security occurred.

Second, what he is saying is that people who do not use air service should pay for those who do. It is a different approach. I am not saying that it is illegitimate but we do not agree with it.

We think that people who fly should pay the expense of the additional security measures that are being implemented. We said that we would review the charge and we are doing it.

* * *

[Translation]

SOFTWOOD LUMBER

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Neigette-et-la Mitis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in addition to having to deal with the crisis in their industry, softwood lumber workers in Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean are having to cope with the inflexibility of the employment insurance program. In March 2002, the Bloc Québécois called for a special targeted program that would include greater flexibility in the EI rules for these workers.

The workers of Saint-Fulgence are reaching the end of their benefits. Does the Minister of Human Resources Development intend to extend the benefit period, as these workers have been asking her to do for the past three months?

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will know that we do have a specific program for workers in the softwood lumber industry. The government announced \$246 million directly in support of the trade dispute there because we are concerned about the workers and communities that may have to deal with this trade dispute for a long period of time.

Specifically, \$71 million is going to those workers through my department, providing them with opportunities for increased training and different solutions that will assist them through this difficult time.

[Translation]

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Neigette-et-la Mitis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister ought to find out the details of the program she announced. There are two things: retraining workers, and what she has given the workers, which is a premium for moving away.

In Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean 500 jobs have been lost as a result of the softwood lumber crisis. The sawmill workers at Saint-Fulgence have written the minister and she has turned a deaf ear to their requests.

Oral Questions

To repeat my question, does she plan to extend EI benefits for these workers, as they are asking her to do?

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on the contrary. Many of those in the softwood lumber industry recommended that we provide additional opportunities so that they could upgrade the skills and capacities of their employees.

We know that the softwood lumber industry is a high tech industry, like so many others, and there is an advantage to the workers to have the opportunities to develop their skills through the course of this dispute.

* * *

CANADA-U.S. SECURITY MEASURES

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, despite the government's ridiculous assertions that everything is okay with our security, the Americans obviously do not agree. Canadians who travel to the United States are now being re-examined at mobile border patrol checkpoints up to 40 kilometres from the border, much like the Mexican border.

If Canadian security is so good, could the minister explain why the Americans continue to target Canadians with ever increasing security measures?

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's question is somewhat imprecise and I would ask her to rephrase it in a supplementary.

With respect to airline security, it is true that with respect to clearance and preclearance by U.S. customs at Canadian airports, there is an extra level of security on a random basis at the gate. Perhaps that is what she is referring to. That is something that we agreed to with the Americans.

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it is unbelievable that the Minister of Transport does not realize that Canadians are being re-examined after they are already examined at the border and are already in the United States, much like the Americans do with the Mexicans.

Why are the Americans re-checking Canadians after they have gone through an initial checkpoint at the border? Why are they re-checking Canadians? They do not trust the Canadians to look after the security.

• (1450)

Hon. Elinor Caplan (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I invite the hon. member to visit a border crossing. What she will find is that when people come into Canada they are checked by Canadian customs and immigration. When they go into the United States, they are checked by American customs and immigration. If there is an additional check, it is not because of any action of the Canadians. The fact is that if she visits the border she will see how it works.

ORGANIZED CRIME

Mr. Dan McTeague (Pickering—Ajax—Uxbridge, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, marijuana grow houses are increasing at a rapid rate throughout Canada. It turns out that it is obviously a very lucrative opportunity for organized crime.

There are estimated to be over 10,000 grow houses in the GTA alone. In the last year we have identified 126 across Durham region, of which 70 were in my riding.

Aside from the serious threat to public safety, peace officers and firefighters, could the Solicitor General indicate to the House, given all the electricity that is lost and other concerns, whether he has a process for this?

Hon. Wayne Easter (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to congratulate the men and women of the police forces across Canada for their important work in this area.

Big sweeps by the RCMP and its police partners, such as the one that took place last week, clearly show that co-ordinated police efforts do in fact pay off, but we do need to do more. That is why the RCMP has appointed a national marijuana grow operations coordinator to build on our efforts to fight organized crime and drug trafficking right across Canada.

* * *

ETHICS COUNSELLOR

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday the first annual report of the ethics counsellor was tabled in the House. After eight years in office, there is a surprise.

The Prime Minister had asked for this report by September 30 but it was only tabled on November 20. Why did we have to wait an extra two months after eight years for a report that says nothing new?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there was no requirement for the tabling of any document at all. I asked the ethics counsellor to prepare a report for this fall. We expected that to be tabled in September but it was a few weeks later. However it was the first time he was asked and he delivered on the requirement of the government.

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, we wonder if the Prime Minister, who was to receive this report on September 30, sent it back for reworking. It is unbelievable that this bland report was submitted to the Prime Minister late. It says nothing that we did not already know.

What was taken out of the report before we were given the sanitized version?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the document was tabled as soon as I received it. It is very surprising that the hon. member now says that there was no need for a report when he was asking for one.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

FERRIES

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, after its incompetence resulted in the cancellation of the 2002 season of the Trois-Pistoles—Les Escoumins ferry service, Transport Canada has been dragging its feet for six months now and has yet to announce that the Escoumins wharf will be repaired, thereby threatening the very survival of the ferry service.

Does the Minister of Transport realize that if he does not confirm his funding commitment before December 15, the 2003 season will be jeopardized? The time for studies is over; now we need to get the ferry service back up and running.

Hon. David Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have already answered this question. There will be improvements made to the Trois-Pistoles harbour and the service will resume next summer.

* * *

[English]

SOFTWOOD LUMBER

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today the executive director of the Coalition for Fair Lumber Imports, the lobby organization that has sued the Government of Canada and industries, alleging that we are subsidizing softwood, is now alleging that the Government of Canada is in fact dragging its feet and it is not interested in a negotiated settlement despite the fact, they are claiming, that our American counterpart wants to have a negotiated settlement.

I want to ask the Minister for International Trade if he could respond to these allegations and tell the House whether or not the government is prepared to go through a fair process.

Hon. Pierre Pettigrew (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for this very pertinent question and a very important one. Canada has always been open to negotiations with the United States over softwood lumber, but we want to do this only on a fair and reasonable basis and I believe that no deal is better than a bad deal.

Right now we are waiting for the Department of Commerce to bring forward its own proposed resolution to this issue. Mr. Aldonas is working on it, but the United States coalition for lumber has only itself to blame at this moment. Its own strategy is turning and back—

* * *

● (1455)

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

Mr. Jim Pankiw (Saskatoon—Humboldt, Ind.): Mr. Speaker, despite public demands that equality of opportunity and merit replace race based hiring, Saskatoon Police Services is imposing a racist recruiting system. This mimics the RCMP.

Access to information reveals that in order to meet racial quotas, the RCMP pass mark for target group recruits is 21 points lower than the non-target group's.

How does the Solicitor General justify a racist hiring scheme to non-target group recruits, who are denied an RCMP career simply because they are the wrong skin colour?

Hon. Wayne Easter (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I reject the allegation in the member's question. That kind of attitude of that member is not the attitude that should be shown in the House. I am pleased with the way the RCMP does its hiring.

* * *

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Loyola Hearn (St. John's West, PC): Mr. Speaker, the Department of Human Resources Development has outreach offices scattered around the country providing a great service.

Right now in the Avalon Peninsula of Newfoundland, the minister's staff is cutting back services in three of the offices to save a measly \$30,000.

How can the minister justify this when her department is spending \$16 million to replace computers that are perfectly good?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is making reference to our employee base and I have said earlier in the House that we use term employees from time to time to deal with the peaks and valleys of the cycle.

We do have obligations and responsibilities to our budgetary numbers as well. As such, we have to make decisions that will allow us to continue to provide good service with the staff that we can afford to employ.

* * *

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mrs. Betty Hinton (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, since the government is prepared to finance prisoners' legal action, I have a question I would like to ask.

It has been three weeks since the Minister of Veterans Affairs gave me his standard response to Lieutenant-Colonel Al Trotter's dilemma. It is always the same. He cannot talk about it because he cannot discuss specific cases, it is being reviewed, et cetera.

I have good news for the minister. Mr. Trotter has given the minister his permission to talk about it in public. It is already a very public issue. Is Mr. Trotter going to get the right response from the government, yes or no?

Hon. Rey Pagtakhan (Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, to the identical question asked by the same member, my answer remains the same. It is a very heart-rending issue for all of us. That is why I have asked the department to look for a fair and just answer to this very heart-rending issue. When the answer is ready, we will inform the House.

Points of Order

[Translation]

CHILD POVERTY

Ms. Diane Bourgeois (Terrebonne—Blainville, BQ): Mr. Speaker, twelve years after a unanimous vote in the House to eliminate child poverty, there are still a million poor children in Canada today. We know that if there are poor children, it is because there are poor parents.

If the government wants to really do something to help poor children, what is it waiting for to increase funding for social housing and to make the rules for employment insurance more flexible?

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on the contrary, the government has taken action on the issue of child poverty and there is more that we will do.

I am pleased to refer the hon. member to a recent report by Campaign 2000, a group that integrates stakeholders focused on children and their circumstances. They have identified that for the fourth consecutive year the level of child poverty in Canada has reduced. This is as a result of programs like the national child benefit and our contributions to the provinces and territories for early childhood development.

We will do more, and the hon. member need only read our Speech from the Throne to see our commitment there.

* * *

● (1500)

PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Ms. Wendy Lill (Dartmouth, NDP): Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the entire House voted in favour of the NDP motion calling for the Department of Finance to withdraw proposed amendments to the Income Tax Act respecting the disability tax credit.

The minister avoided the vote then and now tells the House, when asked if he has withdrawn the amendment, that he is going to consult.

That is not good enough and I can tell by the faces of the members on his side of the House that it is not good enough.

Will the minister respect the unanimous decision and democratic will of the House of Commons and withdraw the amendment, yes or no? Is he willing to make a stand on the total democratic—

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Finance.

Hon. John Manley (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this was asked earlier today.

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC): Mr. Speaker, how can the Minister of Finance justify this contemptuous treatment of a unanimous vote of the House of Commons? How can he justify turning his back on the vote of his members and of all of the members? Why is he bigger than the House of Commons?

Hon. John Manley (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, size is always a matter of perspective, I remind the hon. member.

I would say to him that I am not rejecting it. I have said that we will take the resolution based upon what it said. We will review the

change. I remind the members of what was at stake here, which was a question of whether certain dietary restrictions gave rise to the disability tax credit. We think, and we think most members agree, that the credit should go to the people who most need it and not to those who do not.

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members the presence in the gallery of the Hon. Gordon Hogg, Minister of Children and Family Development, from the British Columbia Legislature.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

TAX CONVENTIONS IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2002

The House resumed from November 22 consideration of the motion that Bill S-2, An Act to implement an agreement, conventions and protocols concluded between Canada and Kuwait, Mongolia, the United Arab Emirates, Moldova, Norway, Belgium and Italy for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion and to amend the enacted text of three tax treaties, be concurred in at report stage.

The Speaker: It being 3:00 p.m., the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion to concur in Bill S-2.

Call in the members.

[English]

Mr. Dale Johnston: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There have been discussions amongst the parties. I think if you seek it you will find unanimous consent to dispose of this motion on division.

The Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried on division.

(Motion agreed to)

● (1505)

The Speaker: The Chair has a number of points of order. The hon. member for Acadie—Bathurst.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, last week on Tuesday, November 19, Parliament voted to withdraw the proposal changing the disability tax credit, which was released on August 30, 2002.

Parliament voted unanimously, with 100% of the members who were in the House of Commons voting to withdraw the proposal.

Points of Order

Today I was sad to hear that the Minister of Finance has decided to duck out at the last vote that we had and just walk away. Then he turned around today and said that now he is going to consult. That would go against the motion that was put in the House and the democracy that we believe in. The decision was taken, with 234 members of Parliament against nil. Has the Minister of Finance become nil now? Is that his new name? It is unacceptable that a minister would turn around on a mandate from Parliament.

I would like the Speaker to rule on this, that with a mandate of Parliament that work will be withdrawn. All the Liberals who were in the House of Commons have expressed themselves and they all voted in favour to withdraw that work. We have disabled people in our country who are waiting for some action from the government.

When we asked the government to look at people who were being fined, big corporations, the government was fast on its feet to say “no, no, it is not the business of Parliament, it is the government’s.” Here we have something that is very clear. This is the business of Parliament. We made a decision. I would like you to rule on it, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: The hon. member, I am sure, is raising a grievance, but I do not know how the Speaker is supposed to rule on the effect of motions adopted by the House unless they deal with some procedure in the House itself. I am unaware of some procedure that is before the House in relation to this matter and on which the Chair could possibly be involved.

The hon. member has made his point. I think he made a point during question period, but I am not sure on what authority he is relying for the Chair to assist him in the circumstances he has outlined at the moment. In the circumstances I am not sure there is anything the Chair can do.

I see that the Minister of Finance is rising to speak to the point of order. I will hear him on the point if he wishes.

Hon. John Manley (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if I understood what you were saying, you are quite right. Nothing was tabled in the House to withdraw. A press release that was put out by the Department of Finance dealing very specifically with a case that was determined by the Federal Court of Appeal.

From my understanding, in discussion with representatives of various persons concerned with this, the issue really is how we can ensure that the disability tax credit is extended to all those for whom it should be available.

There is an issue around the Hamilton case. If the hon. member will be fair, he will recognize that there may be some implications to the Hamilton case that ought to be taken into account. Quite frankly, it was of concern to me that the proposed amendment, which was offered in response to the Hamilton case, may have gone too far. That is why I indicated to our members that it was fine with me if they wished to vote for the resolution.

However, I think—

Mr. Yvon Godin: Why did you walk out?

Hon. John Manley: They do not want to hear what I have to say, Mr. Speaker, and that is unfair.

However to be fair, it is important that we take the time to consider the matter carefully. Taking the recommendations of the House, we will produce something that changes what was issued before, but I have not tabled an amendment so I have nothing to withdraw.

I have undertaken to the House, to members and to groups in the disabled community that I will hear them out, will consider the matter very carefully and will take action that is appropriate.

• (1510)

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Calgary Centre, PC): Mr. Speaker, you raise a very real question as to what the authorities are here, but there is no doubt that there is a very significant problem. It has to do with whether debates and votes in the House have any utility or are simply an exercise in futility. There could be no mistaking the intention of the House on this matter.

The minister is now trying to narrow down the interpretation of the language to a particular case. That is not the language on which the House of Commons voted. The House of Commons voted, calling upon the government to withdraw the proposed changes to the disability tax credit released on August 30. That has implications beyond one specific measure, despite what the Minister of Finance is trying to suggest.

We have a difficulty here where there may not be authorities in the hands of the Speaker, but the Speaker has an overall responsibility to ensure that the House functions effectively. I think what the hon. member for Acadie—Bathurst is asking, what many of us would ask, is that the Speaker consider how we can come to a situation where votes that are taken in the House, particularly votes that have the support which this unanimous vote had on this matter, are treated with respect by the government and not simply cavalierly dismissed.

The Speaker: The Chair will want to make it very clear that the motion that was adopted by the House on November 19 states “That this House call upon the government to”, and it lists a series of things such as develop a comprehensive program and so on. I will not read the entire resolution but it is a call on the government to do this. I have not heard the minister say that he would not do it. I have not heard the minister say that he is doing any of it yet. The call was made. Surely it is reasonable for some time to elapse for the minister to make his decision.

The call has been issued by the House and we are awaiting a response. Until we get a response on all the matters, the House will have to wait. It is not something that said that the minister will do this tomorrow. It was a call upon the government to do this, and with great respect, parliamentary tradition would certainly allow reasonable time for the government to formulate a response to some call from the House.

In the circumstances I believe that is what we have before us and I accordingly do not find there is a valid point of order at this time. Hon. members may wish to raise it on another day. The fact is that there was a call issued, there has not been a response brought to the House yet, and given the date of it, I cannot say that I am surprised. Heavens, if you send a letter to the minister, you will wait longer than a week and a half for a reply. We all know that.

Privilege

In the circumstances, I think that it is reasonable to leave this matter for the time being and I am sure we will hear from the hon. member for Acadie—Bathurst another time.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

STANDING COMMITTEE ON ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS, NORTHERN
DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Joe Comartin (Windsor—St. Clair, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as you are aware this question of privilege was raised by the whip for the NDP, the member for Acadie—Bathurst, and responded to by the member for Nickel Belt, who is the chair of the aboriginal affairs and natural resources committee.

This question of privilege is a result of a process that the chair kicked into place at a meeting last week, as a result of a motion brought by myself asking the committee to pass a resolution which would have had the effect of compelling a witness to attend before the committee to testify on a bill which the committee was considering.

I was speaking to the motion seeking resolution for the summons to be issued and was interrupted by the chair. He indicated that he would cut off any further right on my part to speak. I continued to speak and he then allowed a point of order from the parliamentary secretary to put the question on the resolution.

The precedent that I would like to draw to your attention that governs this type of situation is that of the meeting of the industry committee on Tuesday, March 23, 1999.

● (1515)

The Bloc member for Mercier moved a motion. There was a very brief discussion. The chair I think stepped out of the chair and was replaced by the member for Essex who suspended the meeting, which is in accordance with Marleau and Montpetit. I draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to page 857 if you wish to consider that. It was in accordance with the statements in that part of the text.

In a subsequent meeting, I believe the following day, the government member for Hamilton West moved a motion setting time limits on debate on any motions or discussion pertaining to that bill. After debate the question was put and it was passed.

That is not the procedure that was followed here. The chairman of the committee simply allowed, improperly I would submit, the request for a point of order which then turned into the question being put on the main motion, the motion I had brought forward. It is important to appreciate that at that point I had spoken less than 10 minutes. I would estimate that I spoke somewhere between five and seven minutes, and I still had a number of points that I wanted to make.

The other thing I would ask you to take into account, Mr. Speaker, is that it had been indicated in previous meetings that this witness would attend. If the blues are considered, the chairman indicated he agreed with me that this individual might be the most important witness that the committee needed to hear with regard to the bill under consideration. In spite of that and in effect by allowing the procedure to go ahead, he cut off any further debate on my part to convince the rest of the committee of the importance of that party

coming before the committee and in spite of the fact that it was crucial for that party to give testimony before the committee. I believe he agrees with me.

I want to again draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that at that point on the motion in that committee we were not faced with any time limits. The committee had not agreed to any time limits and had not imposed any time limits on members of the committee.

I quote from page 857 of Montpetit and Marleau:

On occasion, committees place strict limits on the amount of time during which a given item will be considered.

That did not occur here. It is my position that anyone speaking to that motion would have had unlimited time to speak to it.

As I said, this was not a situation where I had used an unreasonable amount of time. It was not a question where the committee was being thwarted in its actions. I had spoken less than 10 minutes on what was a very important motion with regard to the issue of this witness appearing before us, who, it had been understood, was in fact going to appear before us.

On that basis, Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to consider the privilege motion and make a ruling that the procedure followed both by the chair and, in effect, by the committee was improper and not in keeping with the procedures of committees or of the House.

● (1520)

Hon. Don Boudria (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is not a proper point of privilege. First, no notice has been given by the member to refer the issue to the committee procedure as would be a prerequisite had this been done properly. Second, the bill in question is not before the House, so the question of privilege is in itself out of order because we are not at that particular time yet. Third, the committee is meeting, if I understand it correctly, 10 minutes from now to discuss the point that the hon. member wishes to raise in committee.

Additionally, I understand the committee work being done was programmed. In other words, the committee had agreed to a particular program, including witnesses it would hear, time thereof, the date that the bill was reported, and the committee had adopted the program. It is the equivalent of mutual agreement on the part of everyone to time allocation of the initiative. That was done, voted on and accepted by the committee. I understand in addition to that, the chair granted an additional courtesy to the hon. member, notwithstanding the program and motion to which the committee had agreed.

Finally, whether the vote was to take place was agreed to by the committee by a vote of seven to one.

It is a one clause bill. I do not want to get into the substance of the issue. To summarize it, in my view the bill was handled properly at committee, by agreement of the committee, programmed by the committee. It is improperly before the House with regard to timing. It is still before the committee and no proper notice has been given as part of the plea of the hon. member to refer the issue to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs. The entire thing is improperly done.

Government Orders

The Speaker: I think the government House leader will recognize this is the third time the Chair has heard submissions on this very point. It was raised initially last week by the member for Acadie—Bathurst because the hon. member for Windsor—St. Clair could not be here at that time to present the matter. Since it was a question of privilege he felt it had to be raised urgently.

Subsequently, yesterday I then heard the hon. member for Nickel Belt who presented his arguments on the matter. Now today we hear from the horse's mouth, as it were, the member who initially raised the matter, the member for Windsor—St. Clair, and we have heard now from the government House leader. I thank all hon. members for their submissions.

The Chair will continue to take the matter under advisement. I hope I do not hear more submissions on it before I can render a decision. I delayed decision making on this issue until all hon. members involved had made their pitches, as it were. The pitches having been made, the Chair will consider the matter and get back to the House in due course.

Mr. Jim Pankiw: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. During today's question period the Solicitor General responded to my question by saying he rejected the premise of it. However, the premise of my question was based on an access to information request that I made to the RCMP, for which he is responsible and for which it provided information to me which proves that it has taken racial inventories, set racial quotas, engaged in racial profiling, discriminated—

The Speaker: I am afraid the hon. member is engaging in debate. It is not uncommon to have the premises of questions rejected and, indeed, the premises of answers rejected. The hon. member will have to make his argument at another place and another time. It is not a point of order. I am afraid the hon. member is out of order on this one.

Mr. Jim Pankiw: The point, Mr. Speaker, is that I have the document right here that reveals what I am saying and proves it. I want to table it.

The Speaker: The hon. member wishes to table a document. Is there consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions with all parties and I request the unanimous consent of the House to move that the first report of the Standing Joint Committee on the Scrutiny of Regulations presented to the House on Thursday, November 21 be concurred in.

• (1525)

The Speaker: Does the hon. member for Surrey Central have the unanimous of the House to propose the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

KYOTO PROTOCOL

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, it was nice to have that little break. We have so much to talk about.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether you were rivetted to your television set for the first part, but perhaps you would like me to give you an update.

There probably are members here who do want a little update on what was covered this morning. I can tell that members very actively want that. Some people were taking notes this morning and they may want to make sure that they got everything.

I wish this were a joke, but it is not. This is probably the most important issue that Canadians have faced in a long time. It is an issue that will affect every man, woman and child in this country. I fervently believe that to be true.

When I go back to my constituency, in the province that I come from there is something that had as big an impact on the people there as I believe Kyoto will have on all Canadians. I believe the impact will be the greatest on the people in Ontario, but I still would like to let them know what it was like for the west in 1980-81 when the national energy program was introduced.

There is not anyone who will forget those days. They will not forget how 30% in the city I come from lost their businesses, lost their homes, lost their very livelihood. In fact some lost their lives because they could not bear what had happened to them and what had happened to their very livelihood.

There were streets where seven, eight and nine houses were seized by Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation or the banks because people could not make their payments. These were young families who were trying to get started. These were people who worked in the oil and gas industry. Because of the national energy program devised here in Ottawa and imposed upon those people, all of a sudden their jobs were gone. It was instant. It was in 30 days that it all happened. That memory is so strong. Everybody there remembers it.

Government Orders

Kyoto has the potential to do exactly the same thing, only this time it could do it to all of Canada. It will start here in Ontario. Ontario's manufacturing sector will be affected and people do not see it coming. The people in western Canada did not see the national energy program coming either. Their politicians did not warn them. The press did not warn them. They did not know what the cost would be.

There are penalties when we sign on to Kyoto. There are penalties that no one will be able to get out of once we implement that international treaty called the Kyoto protocol.

Let us not kid ourselves about it. It is fine in this place to make a joke here and there and to find it amusing. Certainly some of the members across the way find a lot of things amusing, but let us not ever forget how serious the issue is that we are debating in the House and how much it can affect every single Canadian.

The members of the governing party say that they have consulted. They have consulted all right. They have consulted with their special interest groups, with those groups that are on the dole that have to agree with the government. They have consulted with their party members here and there, their fundraisers. They have consulted with their hacks and flacks across the country, but they have not consulted with the person out there on the street.

They have not consulted, as I have said so many times, with those people on fixed incomes, the seniors who are growing in numbers due to our demographics. They have not talked to the father and mother with two kids. They have not talked to those single moms who are now so common in all of our constituencies. They have not talked to those people as to what it will cost them.

• (1530)

What will be their transportation costs? What will be their costs of power when we implement Kyoto? That is what is really important.

As well, we reviewed this morning the Liberal record on a number of environmental issues. My main example was the Fraser Valley and just how inadequate the government's action has been. What the federal government has let happen there is a disgrace.

Washington State is approving power plants 500 yards away from the border and they are blowing emissions right into the Fraser Valley. We are getting the pollution. They are using our aquifers. We are getting their sewage. We are not getting any of the benefits of the jobs. Of course California is getting a clean shake with clean energy, and the power lines will go right down the main street of Abbotsford. That is how the government handles environmental issues.

We also reviewed sewage being dumped into the ocean right in the Minister of the Environment's riding. No worse example could be set. We talked about the cars parked out front with their motors running and just what sort of an example that was setting. We have gone through that.

Just for your benefit, Mr. Speaker, so you can get back to the television to watch the rest of this, I just wanted to give you a review. That is what we covered this morning. Of course we covered the environmental plan that we have.

I want to review the original plan that was put to the provinces. They were asked to deal with it. It was said that they would be part of it and would cooperate with it.

To help everyone know where I am going here, first I will talk about the climate change draft plan. What I want to talk about later, in a few days, is the new plan, which is really just the old plan in a different folder. We need to talk about that because it is important that we deal with what the government is putting forward as its plan.

I apologize if this is not as riveting as our party's plan and what we would do. We talked about the exciting things we could do in the forms of alternate energy, research and conservation. Everyone enjoyed my talk this morning about the light bulb and promoting energy efficiency. All of those are part of a vision that any government should have for the environment.

I want to review this plan as fairly as I can. I have broken it down. This is an abbreviation of the plan. I have done a little more work on the newest plan, the one the government was supposed to meet on with the provinces on November 21, but that got cancelled, and the one that they were supposed to meet on this Friday in Toronto, but that has been cancelled as well. That is part of the cooperation that has gone on between the provinces and the federal government.

The government appears to be trying to divide and conquer. The Prime Minister is meeting with those premiers to whom he feels he can make an offer that cannot be turned down. That is very much like what happened when the national energy program was brought in. Again, it was a divide and conquer strategy. It worked rather well. The only thing is it devastated one part of the country. This divide and conquer strategy might work too. If it does, it will devastate the entire country this time, from the standpoint of both environment and what it is trying to accomplish.

Let us examine the program. I started yesterday but ran out of time. It is important that we have consistency when we are evaluating this and that we do it adequately and completely.

This was presented to the provinces on October 28. We need to examine it in some depth here.

• (1535)

I apologize for getting into the real technical part of this but it is necessary. When we evaluate the general points of what the government is assuming and basing the plan on, we must look at certain words it uses. It is a typical bureaucratic document where what we see and read between the lines gives us the picture. I will interpret for the House and for the people of Canada what the document is really saying. That is what this is all about.

I was asked during question period what this was all about. This is about telling Canadians they have something to look at, to wake up because it will affect them all. This has a major impact on their lives, not just on big business, or some far away place. This has a huge impact on them and every man, woman and child. My children and grandchildren, this has an impact on them. That is what this is all about, so let us not lose sight of that.

Government Orders

When we look at the general points in the document we come up with a fact that the government keeps saying. It says in the new document and the old document that the science is clear. Well, if we look at the authorities on which this science is based, the IPCC, the 200 scientists, climatologists, and the 40 models, they say that the science is not clear. These are the people the government is trusting and basing its information on.

I will be quoting from a number of these models and members will get the idea and understand how unclear the science is. If I were to go through all the science we would be here for another 10 or 12 days just for me to summarize the extent of the science. It is very complex.

There were 4,000 models that have now been broken down to 40 models. The science deals with ice cores, soil samples, samples from the bottom of the ocean and all of the research that has been done. It deals with what has happened out in the stratosphere. It deals with 23 years of satellite imaging. All of that is part of the science. The government continues to say the science is clear. That is an untruth; the science is not clear. I would argue and our party would argue to be cautious. Let us do something because the science indicates that there has been a change and maybe we are a part of that, and we can do something about it.

The document then says that we can establish a competitive edge by joining the rest of the industrial world. That is an interesting comment. I guess that means that the U.S. and Australia are not industrial countries. I guess that means that China, India, Mexico, Brazil, Chile and Argentina have no industry.

Join the industrial world by signing Kyoto? Many of the industrialized and developing countries are not part of Kyoto. Was this written to deceive? Was this written so that Canadians would not understand what Kyoto was about? It says in the document we should sign Kyoto to join the industrial world. Well, 85% of our trade and one in four jobs in this country are dependent upon the U.S. The U.S. is not an industrial country? The U.S. is not part of the industrial world? Who would possibly believe that? I do not think a Liberal would even believe that and that is a real stretch.

• (1540)

The U.S. may join Kyoto in the future? I wonder what crystal ball that came out of. The U.S. will meet its Kyoto targets and beat it. About 39 states already have plans implemented. It will join Kyoto? It will buy credits from somewhere? It would do that? Why would it do that? Americans are not stupid. Some people think they are. Certainly some members of the Prime Minister's staff have names for them, but I do not think we would agree that they are. We would call them an industrial country and pretty smart wheelers and dealers. So where does that come from?

It says that cost impacts will be modest and will be offset by investments in technology. What does the government not understand about modelling? There are forwarding models. What one puts in them determines what one gets out of them. The government put in 3¢ a barrel of oil. It put in \$10 to buy a tonne of carbon credits. It put in the figures it wanted to put in and it got out what it wanted to get out. That is how modeling works. What one puts in is what one gets out. If one puts the wrong figures in, one gets the wrong answers out.

An hon. member: No problem.

Mr. Bob Mills: There is no problem. I agree with the hon. member on that one.

So we will have to discuss the modelling in detail because the government does not understand it. We will have to talk about these 40 models and the inputs. What inputs did it use to get its predictions?

The government says that innovation and technology are the keys to growing the economy while reducing the emissions. Innovation and technology are exactly what will reduce the emissions, and that is exactly what we should be promoting, but we are not. We will make companies buy credits, send money off shore so they will not have that money to provide jobs, research and development here.

What does the government not understand about that? We must buy that technology back because we are sending our people away. We send 22,000 graduates away from this country every year who have master's degrees and Ph.Ds. We lose 22,000 of them a year. Why do we lose them? Because there are no jobs here. There are no jobs for those high tech people here.

Members of my own family are an example of that. They have done well and I am proud of them, but two of them cannot work in Canada because they did not get offered jobs here. Our daughter had 19 countries after her. She got a signing bonus to work in Germany. We are missing out. She did not have a job offer in Canada. We are not even into that. Fortunately I got to see her last Friday when she was a guest speaker at a convention in Ottawa bringing foreign information to bring us up to date. What kind of a deal is that? That does not upset me as a father? That does not upset me as a Canadian and a member of Parliament? Members better believe it does.

The government should not say that innovation and technology is the key unless it will put its money where its mouth is and develop these secondary education systems, support our students, and provide them with jobs when they finish. It should not just say that. We are good at patting our chest and saying things, but we do not put our money where our mouth is. It would be a lot better to invest in that, than those other things the government invests in.

We must ensure a strong over-all investment climate. Let us think about that one for a minute. The government says that we will sign Kyoto, we will have targets, and that it will cause us all kinds of new regulations and rules. It will tax us more. We will pay more for energy and fuel, and that will encourage investment? I do not know many investors who will go for that deal. Investors want security. Investors want to know what they are investing in and they want to know what the rules are before they invest.

Government Orders

● (1545)

The investment freeze that many companies are now saying represents about 10% of the potential investment in the country that is not coming here anymore. It is not coming here because if one is investing one wants to know what the rules are. The rules are not clear in this country and that is what is wrong. When it says Kyoto will ensure a strong overall investment climate, I have big problems.

The government says it has held extensive consultations. It says that page after page. It does not mean that. It has not consulted. Canadians do not know. The premiers are not coming on Friday to Toronto because they have not been part of it. They have not been consulted.

Canadians do not know because they have not been consulted. Industry is not part of it because they have not been asked to be part of it. When it says consultations, there are big problems.

It talks about the fundamentals of the approach being national engagement. It is good with words. National engagement, we will involve everyone.

I do not know anybody who feels they have been involved. It has been mishandled from day one. It says we will have a made in Canada plan, evergreen, step by step, in partnership. That almost brings tears to my eyes. I could say, wow, that is really something. It goes on to say, no undue burden on any sector or region and the risk will be managed and fairly shared. I wonder about anybody watching this or thinking about this in Quebec. I wonder how much Quebec can trust the federal government to treat it equally and fairly when the government seized the sinks for agriculture and forestry.

I cannot believe that any Quebec politician would believe that in fact that is what will happen, that the federal government will treat it fairly. No, the federal government will take everything it can because it is scrambling for 240 megatonnes of emission credits. It will not do that and Quebecers should know better than anybody about the federal government's intrusion into their areas. That is why Quebec has separate immigration policies, tax policies and legal system, because it does not trust the feds.

Quebeckers should look at this and ask, is the federal government going to commit us to all of this, and can we trust it? I do not know too many people around who would say they trust everything the government tells them to be true. I would be surprised, as Quebecers find out about this, if the government sticks with this.

I told the story this morning about the cab driver in Halifax a couple of weeks ago. The cab driver asked if I was with the federal government and I said I was. He said we are about to hit them at the very time they are getting back on their feet. He said they were finally busy, building apartment buildings and finally achieving something and we are going to impose Kyoto on them. He said that would shut down the oil and gas industry which they believe could be the future. That is what they are saying in Atlantic Canada.

I have quotes from the premiers of every province. I have quotes that I want to go through from the energy and the environment ministers.

An hon. member: What about Manitoba?

Mr. Bob Mills: The member just asked about Manitoba. I love the environment minister from Manitoba. He is a real piece of work, that guy. He is there saying let us sign Kyoto. All he wants is to be sure the feds develop Manitoba's hydroelectricity and run transmission lines to Sault Ste. Marie so the province will have a guaranteed source of income forever. Manitoba wants to become the hydro centre of Canada, have the feds pay for it, and for that Manitoba will sign Kyoto.

● (1550)

Well, that is really good for the environment. That is a real commitment. It is about money. That is where that environment minister is coming from and he accuses others of the same sort of thing.

Let us go on. This says that Kyoto is only the first step and will not have much impact on climate change. Did everyone hear that? Kyoto is the first step and will not have much impact on climate change. The Prime Minister said a couple of days ago that in fact we will notice no change in our environment. The environment minister at the University of Calgary a few weeks back was asked whether we would stop having droughts, floods and ice storms. He said that in about 100 years we probably would not notice much change in the environment.

We are being asked to take a 30% economic hit on every man, woman and child, and it is not going to make any difference to the environment. Little Johnny will still have asthma. There will still be the health problems. This is about CO₂, climate change and global warming. It is not about pollution. We must get that message across, and if I have to stand here until Christmas to get it across, I will do it. That is how much I believe it.

It says that Canadians' participation is necessary. Well, I guess so. If we will have 80 kilometre an hour speed limits and not allow any speeding, because that obviously would use less fuel, we will need some commitment or else a heck of a lot of police. If truck drivers will not be braking or accelerating as fast, we will sure need a lot of commitment. If businesses literally will be laying off 30% of their staff, we will need to have commitment.

There will be a need for a lot of commitment. When it says that we need Canadians' participation and commitment, we are asking people to change their whole way of life. We are saying that they must cut their carbon use by 20%. It says right in the report that is their commitment. Twenty per cent is a major reduction in the use of carbon.

I can hardly bring myself to deal with the section of the report that deals with modelling, because I do want to spend a lot more time on the IPCC modelling. It is very important that we talk about the 40 models.

Government Orders

I know there is one member across the way who is waiting. He probably has had to delay his town hall meeting so he could find out about this modelling because he is very interested. I think he even wants to be a model in another career. I do not think he is going to make it but I would not want to be the one to mention that to him. We will deal with the modelling that has gone on a little later, because I want to talk about the IPCC modelling which probably is not nearly as interesting as other types of modelling.

On investment and new markets, obviously the government and the environment minister think that all of a sudden all of these new companies will spring up because we have signed on to Kyoto. What the minister does not know, or I do not think he knows, is that places like Denmark and Germany are leading in this technology. Because we signed on in 1992—and we sign everything—and we then signed the Kyoto accord in 1997, we have not encouraged industry to become innovative.

•(1555)

Compared to some of the other places, we have not done much to really develop this. We are not the leading edge, which we should and could be. We need to see a government commitment before that will happen.

I like this one. We need to talk further about fair and competitive taxes. I have talked to many industries, many companies and many Canadians about taxes. I have never heard anybody say that we have fair and competitive taxes. We do not even come up to the standards of the poorest state in the U.S. in terms of what we get for our tax dollar and how much tax we pay.

I remember being at the OECD in Paris a few years back and asking what is wrong with Canada. Why is our dollar so low? Why are we not achieving anything? Why are we going down instead of up? It was made very clear what the reasons were. First, we have a government without a vision. We have a government that does not know where it is going. It jumps from pillar to post and does not show any leadership. The second reason was that our taxes are too high. The third reason was that we have too much debt.

Those were the reasons the OECD gave for Canada having so much trouble, why our dollar is so low and why we are having difficulty. We need to examine that if we really want to talk about fair and competitive taxes. When our number one business partner, the U.S., where 85% of our trade goes, is not part of an agreement that we are part of, we had better believe that we are not giving ourselves a competitive advantage.

Mexico is not on side. None of the South American countries are on side. All of these countries have opted out. Australia is not part of it. China and India are not part of it.

It does not give us a competitive advantage, by taxing our businesses, by making them do things that others do not. That is not a competitive advantage. That cannot be used as an investment strategy. Uncertainty cannot be a reason that companies will invest in a country. It has never worked that way and nobody would buy into that argument.

It goes on to talk about risk management, that we will work with industry to reduce uncertainties, limit risks and impact on competitiveness. That is really great. The way to do that is to give

them an implementation plan: industries will have to have these targets; they will have to achieve this amount of emissions and this is what it will cost. That will help them decide either to stay here or to leave so they can survive or not survive but they will know. However, by not telling them of any implementation plan, by not telling them of any cost, by not showing anything, how will we keep those businesses? How will we hold them if there is not a competitive environment to be in?

We will build in contingencies to limit the risk. I translate that to be government giving guarantees, I suppose like Bombardier. I guess we are going to do that right across the country. We limit the risk and we build in contingencies to limit the risk.

The problem I have with that is, where does the money come from? Why should I as government be involved in businesses and guarantee them against risk? How would that work? The communist countries tried that, the east bloc countries tried it. They tried to guarantee businesses to keep people in business who were not competitive and we saw how far they got. We see where they are today. Today the only advantage they have is that they are out of business and now will be able to sell credits to us. Maybe they will have another source of money. Maybe they knew more than we thought they did.

•(1600)

We will work in conjunction with the U.S. Do we not like this one? I guess we will. I guess we have to. If it has 85% of our trade, and one in four jobs depend upon it, we had better work with the U.S. and we had better not start calling the Americans morons because they do not take that very well. If someone from another country called our Prime Minister something like that, I would sure be on that person's case. It would sure make me mad. If we were to say it internally, that is one thing, and it is fine over there for them to say it, but boy, we had better not say it. How are we going to work with these guys when we start treating them like that?

It says that we will keep open Canada's long term undertaking under the protocol and no commitments to the second commitment period. That sure sounds like a good, solid environmental commitment. We will be part of phase one but we will not commit to phase two.

The environment minister said that nothing much will happen in phase one. That will deal with 5% of the problem. Ninety-five per cent of the problem will wait for phases two, three, four and five down the road. We are not committed to phases two, three, four or five. Is this saying that we are not committed to doing anything?

That is not what Canadians are saying. Canadians are saying, "Fix the pollution problem. Deal with global warming. Have a plan that will work. Tell us what it is, tell us what it will cost and we will get behind it, but do not tell us that you are not going to tell us anything". That is what they want to hear. That is the purpose of debating this issue in the House, making sure that Canadians connect with this issue.

Government Orders

We need to talk about these targets because in the next document it deals with them a little bit further. We need to start off by making it very clear, and this will allow me to develop the numbers. The actions that are under way will cover 80 megatonnes. We dealt with some of those actions this morning.

It is pretty scary, the actions the government says it will take credit for. It is pretty scary that it might even believe some of its own propaganda, that it might actually agree that it will have these emissions credits for things it is doing now. They are things like everybody will drive the speed limit, things like 20% of the homes will be retrofitted, things like training truck drivers to drive slower and so on. It is taking credits for things like that. Of course it is taking 30 megatonne credits for sinks, and we will talk about that as well.

Then it talks about actions for the future, 100 megatonnes. The government does not have a clue where it will get those from.

We will review and analyze the second report province by province. As we analyze each province, we will see what is expected of those provinces and why not a single environment minister, including those from Manitoba and Quebec, will meet with the government on Friday. They will not meet because there is no way they could agree to the stuff the government is putting forward.

Then of course there is that nagging 60 megatonnes that we really have no plan for at all. We have no idea where we might find it. At one point the environment minister went so far as to say that maybe we cannot achieve our total targets and maybe we will just never get to the 60 megatonnes.

The truth is there are penalties if we sign Kyoto. Kyoto says that according to the Marrakesh accords, nations who ratify but who do not meet their targets in round one by 2012 are to be penalized another 30%. That could not be much clearer. There are penalties if we do not keep up to these commitments. When the environment minister, the natural resources minister and the Prime Minister say that maybe we will not make our targets, then Kyoto is saying there are penalties. We can get out of those penalties. It is easy. Buy the credits from someone else.

In other words, in 2012 when we have not achieved the targets, and no one says we can hit those targets, does that mean there will be a proposal that we spend billions of dollars to buy credits so as not to be penalized by Kyoto? That is how most people would read it. Everybody agrees, the economists, the business community and the provinces, that we cannot meet those unrealistic targets in that timeframe.

What does the government not understand about that? We cannot meet the targets within that timeframe. The provinces are saying to extend the timeframe to something they can achieve. Nobody is saying to do nothing. Everybody is saying, "Let us do something, but let us do something that we can achieve. Let us be honest for once. Let us not sign this international agreement, which is totally dishonest because we cannot get to those targets, and let us do something with realistic targets and with a genuine plan".

I will follow up further on that because the government has developed that a little further by province. As we review the next document, I apologize for how many days it will take but it is a

rather wordy document. We will have to analyze it in depth. It is important that Canadians understand it because the government has no intention of letting Canadians find out about it.

• (1605)

Let us look briefly at what the government says are the actions that it is taking right now. Here is its action plan. It has invested \$1.6 billion since 1998. In what? What have we saved? Where is the beef? Where are the savings? One point six billion dollars should buy us something.

The government can argue that it has given money to the municipalities. Yes, it has. Two hundred and fifty million dollars went to the FCM to develop grain projects, which are very good in many places, and it has helped the municipalities to build infrastructure. However, does anyone know what they had to give in return? They had to give a guarantee to support Kyoto. The municipalities have that money but it has been made very clear to them that there is a price.

Why do people think so many of the municipalities supported and told the government to ratify Kyoto? It is because they had projects approved. When they are asked about that, they say that is not true at all. They say that it has been totally fabricated. All I know is that \$250 million in projects were approved and that where they were approved those councils sent back letters saying to ratify Kyoto. Draw your own conclusions, Mr. Speaker.

What about David Suzuki? What about the Pembina Institute? I have faced many of those people now in debates across the country. They are so righteous and care so much but every one of them raises money with a tax credit. Every one of them is on the dole to the government for tax credits. Why are they supporting Kyoto so strongly? The government pays them to support it. I do not need to say any more. It goes on and on.

People who are out there working for a living, the taxpayers, they are the ones paying the bills. They are the ones who really matter. They are the ones at the grassroots level. They are the ones who should be asking what they received for \$1.6 billion.

The government says that it has action plan 2000. It is expected to lead to a 50 megatonne reduction by 2010. I have tried to find out a lot about action plan 2000. It is a great piece of paper and it has a lot of good ideas in it, but when the Auditor General examines it I think it will be like the rest of the Auditor General's report, which I have read a couple of times into the record, it is talk and more talk but no action.

The Auditor General said in her report that we have an environmental legacy that we are leaving to our children and grandchildren. She also said that we have a failing grade on the environment.

I think that is exactly what we are finding and it is exactly what we will find when we start to search out where these funds have gone. What friends and relations have received these funds from the government? We have lots of examples of that.

Government Orders

This is the best one and we have reviewed this a few times: 30 megatonnes from agriculture and forestry sinks. Is that not great? Do not give it to the farmers and the foresters. Do not give it to the provinces. The feds will claim it. That is really great. As if that will really help national unity. That will really help the farmers and foresters of Quebec. They will be really happy when they find out that this is a grab by the federal government of provincial jurisdiction. It is a direct grab from them. They are lying to the provinces.

Mr. Geoff Regan: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I realize that the hon. member is on about his fourth round of the same arguments over and over—

An hon. member: Just starting.

Mr. Geoff Regan: —and just starting, as a colleague says, to repeat himself over and over, but that is not my point.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS, NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Geoff Regan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among the parties and I think you would find unanimous consent for the following motion. I move:

That the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs, Northern Development and Natural Resources be authorized to travel from place to place within Canada during its consideration of the First Nations Governance Act, and that the necessary staff accompany the committee.

• (1610)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): Is there unanimous consent to table the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): Does the House give its unanimous consent to the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

KYOTO PROTOCOL

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I will just remind the member that this is new material, that this has not been read into the record. Therefore I will carry on from where I left off. It would be good if the member would listen and keep his notes up to date so that he knows when we are dealing with new material or when we are simply making a point.

Let us talk about the 100 megatonnes, the future, and where the government will get this from.

The government says that it will have targeted measures on individuals and consumers. Like everything else, we have to translate here because it is a different language.

We are going to have targeted measures on individuals and consumers. I think that means tax. I think that means that when consumers use gas, use power or something else they will be paying for it. Those will be targeted all right. We will have to target transportation, electricity, agriculture and manufacturing. We will have to hit the industry in Ontario because it is producing and emitting CO₂. What do we not understand? If we manufacture something and we use energy to do it, and everything takes energy, we will release CO₂ and we will have targeted measures against us.

At least we have the right to know what those targeted measures are. The government says that there will be targeted measures to support individual actions by consumers. That is tax.

The government further says that there will be a comprehensive approach to industrial emissions, including domestic emissions trading, technology and infrastructure, investment targeted measures. Notice how it keeps sneaking in targeted measures.

If the government knows what those targeted measures are, why do we not know what they are? Why do the provinces not know what they are? Why does industry not know what they are? What is the government hiding? If everybody is going to be so happy and cooperative and working together on targeted measures, why hide them? The government should be putting them on the front page of every paper because everyone will be so happy to have these targeted measures.

The point is that the government should let Canadians know what this stuff is saying. The government says that it will have direct government participation in international credit markets. That has been translated to say that it will buy international carbon credits. Now we are going to have the federal government sending money to wherever to buy those credits to sell to our companies, or give the credits to them, and we are going to be out that money. That money will be gone.

When that money is gone, it means less research and development, lost jobs and lost productivity. Who wants to get into that bureaucracy? Obviously the countries we have to go to are Russia and East Bloc countries. I suppose in the second round we could go to African and Asian countries and send them money. They want money.

Like Mr. Putin said in Johannesburg, "Don't you guys come to me and expect our credits for millions. They are worth billions. If you're not talking billions, don't come to us". Of course the Dutch government has already gone with millions and hundreds of millions of dollars to buy credits. The Dutch government figured that it would be good to get in on the ground floor before the price rose. It was probably smart that it bought those credits. I think it spent \$300 million on them just as a first bid.

Government Orders

The price has gone up from \$10 to \$38. Some people think the price will hit \$500. Our government is using the price tag of \$10. How realistic is that? Who knows? Certainly no one knows and certainly the government modellers do not know. No one knows until this whole thing starts to work.

We must remember that Kyoto cannot be ratified yet because 37% of the emissions in the world are covered so far by countries that have ratified.

•(1615)

The agreement only comes into effect when 55 countries representing 55% of the emissions of the world ratify. Where are we at with that ratification proposal? Where we are at is that 37% have signed on now. The Russians represent 17%. Canada is 2%. Does anyone care whether we sign on or not? I am afraid not. Who do they want to sign on and ratify? The Russians. Mr. Putin said that the Russians may sign on in May or in the spring sometime provided billions of dollars of international credits are paid for in advance.

Where does this money go when it goes to Russia? I wonder how many people in the House think it goes toward helping granny in Russia who is trying to find bread to feed herself. I have seen the bread lines there. I wonder how many people think it is going to help the moms and dads and the kids in Russia. I wonder how many people think it will build clean energy, clean power plants and clean industrial plants so Russia can compete with us. How many people think that will happen?

Do members know where the money will go? It may go to the military, more likely to corruption and more likely to Swiss bank accounts. Maybe we could get a deal if we sent it directly to Switzerland instead of via Russia. Maybe we could make a better deal on it and not send quite so much.

Is that what the government is talking about when it says that it is going to buy international credits? I think so. That is how I interpret it. I do not know how else someone could interpret it. How does that help the environment? How does that help the people in Russia? How does that help us as Canadians? How does that help us to achieve cleaner air and less global warming? I do not know the answer to that. I have no idea how someone could answer those questions at a town hall meeting.

It is quite a bit of fun to think of possible future actions. By having partnership initiatives we will save 20 megatonnes; technological investments of 10 megatonnes; provincial actions, 20 megatonnes; municipal reductions of 10 megatonnes; consumer challenges of 7 megatonnes; as well as credits for clean energy exports. I had better stop here.

Credits for clean energy exports of 70 megatonnes. Clean energy credits have been ruled out by everybody. We are never going to get clean energy credits for anything because if we get them, then Russia has to get them from Europe. All Russian natural gas goes to industrial plants and homes in Europe. Our natural gas goes to a country that is not even part of Kyoto. At least Russia might be part of Kyoto when it gets its credits. The Europeans have said to forget it. Do we think they are a bunch of dummies to give Russia a bunch more credits that they will then have to buy back from it? The Europeans are not stupid.

The government in this country has the audacity to put in its plan clean credits for energy exports. How does it do that? How can it put that in the plan when it knows it will never get those credits? We must remember that there are penalties if a country does not achieve its targets. Those penalties are 30% above what the target is.

Why would a country sign on when it knows it will handicap the people of 2012, my children and my grandchildren who the Liberals claim they really care about? Why would we ever sign something that would inhibit them like that? I think we will put a black mark through that one because it is a non-starter and yet it is in here.

•(1620)

Then there is a preferred mix of instruments. I do not know whether the Liberals are planning to start a band or whatever, but innovation and technology, partnership programs, infrastructure, emissions trading, tax initiatives and smart regulations, I do not know what those instruments are. I do not know how to play them. Smart regulations? Should every regulation not be a smart one? The Liberals are saying that they have stupid regulations, but these ones will be smart ones.

We like the one on tax initiatives. We sure know that would not be unfair to anyone. We sure know who would get those tax initiatives and those tax breaks. We already see that.

We have discussed emissions trading.

With respect to infrastructure, yes, we need lots of infrastructure. Truck drivers are driving over bridges right now that were built in the 1950s. Bridges are collapsing. I have talked to a number of truck drivers over the course of my time here and they have said the government does not do anything about infrastructure. The government spends about 3% of the gasoline tax on infrastructure and the rest goes into general revenue. That is how the Liberals do business.

The government says it will use initiatives and it will build infrastructure. Where will the money come from to do that? From taxes. We know that is the answer, yet it does not say that anywhere here.

With respect to transportation, this is quite good too. Under the action plan, we already have 9.4 megatonnes for things we are doing now. I think that means that the minister's car he drives now is fuel efficient, so we count that. I think that is what that means. The fact that the other ministers leave their cars running outside all day does not count. We have one minister, and I was told today there is one more, or maybe two who have fuel efficient cars. While our House leader was serving as our interim leader, he applied for an energy efficient car and it has not arrived to this day. That is commitment.

Government Orders

Through transportation, 12 megatonnes will be reduced from somewhere but that has not been pointed out from where. There will be more intense negotiations with manufacturers and possible legislation to improve fuel efficiency in new vehicles by 25%. What happens with an automobile manufacturer in Ontario when the government says that it needs to have new fuel efficiency to save 25% by 2010? That means the whole factory needs to be retooled. If an investor, the options will be to retool or to move.

Is the Canadian market big enough that companies like General Motors, Ford and so on will retool or will they move to the U.S., to Mexico or the southern states? Where will they go if they have to build a new plant? That is a real threat to Ontario and Quebec where cars are manufactured. The reality is that these companies will be forced, if we have these regulations for a small market like ours, to possibly move. I talked this over with General Motors and it did not deny it.

Again we come back to how it affects the average person. The guy in Hamilton will say that he works at that Ford plant. He never thought this thing would hurt him. He thought it would have no effect on him. He thought it was some international thing. The government said it would not affect him at all. If we accomplish one thing in this debate, it is to let Canadians know that it does affect them, that it will have an impact on them and that it will cost them potentially even their jobs.

We go on to federal assistance and initiatives to increase use of urban transit which will be seven megatonnes. That is good. I do not see much problem with that. We should use more urban transit. If I lived in cities like Toronto, Vancouver or Montreal, if I could I would probably try to use urban transit rather than fight traffic, fight parking, et cetera. However in a lot of Canada urban transit will not be possible and really will not help us very much.

• (1625)

This is something to note. Just before question period a member disputed the fact that there were more cars outside and that not many had run more than five or six minutes. At this moment, 13 cars outside are running. Maybe we should keep a tab on this. We could probably run out and check every hour or two. I wonder how many of them would leave and I wonder how many of them would be turned off if we started a little survey? Every half hour we could go out and check the number of cars and how many are running. That might be fairly interesting. I will keep the House posted as to how many cars are outside running, setting an example for Canadian people on conservation of energy and releasing less CO₂. That would be an interesting survey which would keep our viewers excited. I know many Liberal members over there are just riveted on learning what their cabinet minister colleagues are doing.

Mr. Darrel Stinson: Where are they? They ran out to shut the cars off.

Mr. Bob Mills: “Consider setting a national target of having 35% of the gasoline with 10% ethanol or at least 5% fossil free by 2010”. How much will that save? It will save .9 megatonnes. We have 70 megatonnes that we are claiming from a false credit for clean energy,

but we will save .9 megatonnes by using ethanol. Obviously let us use it if it is cheaper to produce. However there are many questions about that. Let us do what we can to have cleaner burning cars. No one would disagree with that. I think we could get the automobile companies on side.

General Motors is working on half-ton trucks that run on hydrogen. We will be using all hydrogen in the future. We will not be using carbon fuels. It is a waste of our carbon based fuels to burn them in cars, buses, trains, et cetera. We should be using alternate energy but we are not there yet because the technology is not there. However we are getting there and we should work toward that instead of investing in something dumb like Kyoto.

“Consider a target of 500 litres of bio-diesel”. I do not know what that means. Bio-diesel is being used by the City of Toronto. I think it is being used by Brantford. There Some cities have put their city vehicles onto bio-diesel. They are bringing in soybean oil from the U.S. to mix with diesel and it is 20% less polluting. In that 20% they use a mix of 20:80 diesel and soy and that works. We could use canola. However it costs energy to produce those things and it also costs energy to squeeze them and purify them so they can be mixed with the diesel. It is not a straight win-win situation. It has some costs.

“Consider setting performance targets and best practices for all modes of transportation”. Well, performance targets sounds pretty good too. That gets down again to driving slowly and I am not sure how that will work. I would love to see the government's plan for my area which has highway 2, a busy highway. I would love to see its plan for the 401, 403, 407 and how it would get those people to drive 80 kilometres an hour. I just do not know what the government would do. Will there be cameras on every corner? Will thousands more police be hired? What will the government do to make this happen?

“Consumer awareness to improve fuel efficiency”. I guess that means slow down, do not accelerate too fast and when going down a hill turn the car off. “Improve the off-road vehicle fuel efficiency”. That sounds okay too. All these things sound okay, and as one member points out, I guess we drive in the ditch.

Government Orders

•(1630)

“Improve intramodal freight opportunities”. This is the very government that has moved a lot of railways out. I think of Mr. Lee Morrison who fought rail abandonment, and I know his successor has fought it as well. I know our agriculture committee has fought this sort of thing. The government is not committed to more rail or better rail transportation.

The CNR today announced a 1,000 job lay-off. Those are Canadians who lost their jobs today. Think of the number of pink slips there will be when we implement Kyoto? What is the hurry? Let us have reasonable targets. Let us have reasonable time to achieve those.

We now get into buildings. There are actions under way to improve buildings. Yes, the government is trying to insulate them better. Some are using solar collectors on the roofs. There are things being done. That is about four megatonnes.

“Accelerate home energy evaluations, retrofitting programs, improve standards and improve consumer awareness”. Again, I do not think that too many of us in the House, certainly on this side, would not agree that if we can build a house which is more fuel efficient and is competitive in the marketplace, then let us go for it. If triple-pane windows are the way to go, then let us go for it. Let us convince people. Let us show them that this is the better way to go. However let us not price houses out of range for that mom, dad and kids who want to buy their first home. Let us not price them out of the range where they can never afford to have a house. Let us be reasonable about how we approach this.

When we talk this way, we are talking about increasing the cost of everything that we do. There is a point at which we cannot keep increasing that cost. We need to then look at technology to solve the problems. Technology is the solution. Solar, wind, a combination of that and ultimately hydrogen generators are the way to go. That is the future, but it is not here yet. It is not here until 2030, 2040 or 2050. That is what scientists, engineers and corporations say.

The one important part about Kyoto is that it has brought it to everyone's attention. That is good. It is good that we are talking about it and it is good we are trying to become more informed about it.

Another point is “Consider requiring all new homes to be built by R-2000 standards”. Think about what that means totally.

“Target all new buildings to be built to a minimum of 25% better than the national energy code by 2010”. I wonder how many new buildings that might affect. How much investment might that affect? It would be nice to have answers to those questions before we commit to this sort of thing. How can we commit to these kinds of expenses until we know what the real costs are?

What will we do to large industry emitters? We are going to establish over all targets through consultation. What kind of consultation? I used a quote from SaskPower this morning. It said that it would have to increase its rates 25%. IPSCO steel said that if it did that, it would leave the country. I guess that is consultation. One party said this and the other party said that and that is it. How will it impact the people

of Regina? What will happen to those jobs in Regina? That is a huge industry for that city. That province needs that industry.

•(1635)

Before we go off half-cocked with the Kyoto protocol, would it not be better to have research into what else we might do, what other sources of energy, what other means of conservation we might have? Maybe one answer is to put new light bulbs that are 75% more efficient in people's houses. Maybe that is an answer. There are solutions and I think we need to start looking at them.

So we are going to consult. That is what the government says. It has not done it yet. The provinces say no, industry says no, Canadians say no, but now they are committing. Is this worth the paper it is written on? That is the question.

Regarding the 279 megatonne permit allocation and emissions trading, I have no idea what that means except cost, cost, cost. How are we going to manage domestic emissions trading? I sat in on a presentation on emissions trading. I actually took the course on how emissions trading will work. I am afraid to say, if I were making notes, and I did make some notes, that there is one word that would describe it: bureaucracy.

I was straightened out by a fellow from Great Britain who was brought here by the government to show us its system of emissions trading to try to put some smarts into my head so I could understand it. At the end of that presentation, the word I would use to describe it, from what he told me, is bureaucracy. It takes a huge bureaucracy to set up this whole emissions trading scheme. Is that what we want in this country, more bureaucracy and more waste of taxpayer money? I do not think so. Again, I think there is a better way.

Who are these large industries that we are going after? We reviewed in our pie chart this morning who they are. Remember that the industries that are the biggest emitters are the large manufacturers, the power plants and the oil and gas industry. That is who we have to hit with these permits. That is what we have to do. The government goes on to discuss, regarding large industry emitters, cost shared strategies. Does anyone smell government money there? Does anyone smell government getting into business there? That is what I see. I do not want government in business. Whenever government gets into business we have all the problems that the Prime Minister and his crew have had because they got into business.

It also claims that it is going to work with industry to manage the risks, as if the government could understand business well enough to know what the risks are. The biggest risk is going to be the unknown: not knowing what Kyoto is going to do to us. That is the biggest risk that we might have. If I were a large industry in the country right now, I would be really worried, and the large industries are. The Canadian Manufacturers' Association is really worried. The oil and gas industry is really worried. The Canadian Chamber of Commerce is really worried. Why are they worried? They are worried because of the unknown. They do not understand why we are the only country in the Americas to sign on to an agreement like Kyoto.

The provinces are worried. All of the provinces are worried. That is why none of the provinces will be showing up on Friday. They are all worried. Each one is worried about the jobs in its province. Each province is worried about its economy. Each province is worried about its tax base. They are all worried because of the unknown.

Why is there so much that is unknown? Because the government will not tell us the costs, it will not tell us its plan, and it will not tell us how it will implement it, that is why. I think it probably does not know the answer to those questions.

●(1640)

Hon. Don Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I apologize for interrupting the speaker. I know he was just about to conclude his remarks, but in view of the great interest in this debate, I seek the unanimous consent of the House that we continue to sit until 10 p.m. this day in order to consider Government Business No. 9, in other words, to continue speaking on Kyoto. I seek unanimous consent.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): Is there unanimous consent to table the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Bob Mills: Mr. Speaker, let me just get back to large emitters. These are the ones we need to talk about. The large industrial emitters are the ones we are going to target first. The government says we will. We are going to talk about manufacturers. We are going to talk about probably one in three or one in four jobs in this province.

I just wonder how the members are going to be able to go back to their ridings and say that they did not really understand what Kyoto would do, that they did not really understand that so many jobs would be lost and so much of the economy would be damaged or that the price of gasoline was going to go up, that they did not know any of that.

So when we talk about this, members should take particular note of this and all of these questions that are being raised. This is why we are here. This is why we are debating this issue today, why we did yesterday and why we will in the future.

Points of Order

●(1645)

POINTS OF ORDER

KYOTO PROTOCOL RATIFICATION MOTION

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay—Columbia, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. On Monday my leader raised three points of order concerning the motion of the government on the Order Paper and now currently being debated in which the House is being asked by the government to call upon it to ratify the Kyoto protocol.

I have some new information. The last point of order raised by my leader was with regard to the customary practice of the House that when such a resolution is brought to the House seeking the House's approval to the government ratifying a treaty, the government has to lay the text of the treaty itself before the House prior to any debate commencing on such a resolution.

In your ruling you noted that there had been, from both sides of the House, a "dearth of citations of Canadian practice in this regard". On this point of order, Mr. Speaker, I want to be able to bring those authorities to your attention. This will assist you and all hon. members in ensuring that this point of order has been fully canvassed and properly dealt with. In addition, Mr. Speaker, you indicated in your ruling that the British practice he cited to you would not apply "since we are not by this motion implementing this accord". I would like to deal with the latter point first.

I of course agree with the Chair completely that the motion that is before us is not one to implement the treaty. Implementation can only be effected by legislation. What is being asked by this motion is that the House approve the government proceeding to ratification. However, the British practice my leader cited to you was precisely in relation to that sort of resolution: a practice in Britain whereby the executive would ask Parliament to approve the ratification of a treaty. That is precisely the type of resolution the government has brought forward by this motion on Kyoto. Such British practice is applicable, although the ultimate decision as to whether it should apply in this case, which I will deal with now, will be your decision. I did want, however, with all respect, to clarify that point.

In fact the tradition and practice of the executive bringing before the House a motion asking the House to approve the ratification of a treaty by the executive has a firm history and foundation with a precise procedure associated with it.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, up to the commencement of the first world war, in international relations Canada was less than a fully self-governing nation. Canada was still regarded as being part of the British Empire with treaty-making power continuing to vest in the British Crown on the advice of the British government and to be carried out on behalf of the entire empire. Therefore, treaty making was regarded as an empire-wide function.

Section 132 of the Constitution Act, 1867, in fact contemplated this empire treaty-making function by providing that the Parliament of Canada was given the legislative power to implement in Canada the terms of such empire treaties.

Points of Order

However, as a result of Canada's participation and the extreme sacrifice made by the members of the Canadian armed forces in the first world war, the then Canadian Prime Minister Robert Borden insisted that Canada sign the Versailles Treaty that ended the war as a separate signatory and not just as a colony within the British Empire. This resulted in Canada acquiring the capacity to enter into treaties in its own name. The legal power to do so became vested in the Canadian Crown acting on the advice of Canadian ministers.

Following on that development, the father of the modern Liberal Party, Prime Minister Mackenzie King, placed considerable emphasis on Parliament as the primary forum for debating and deciding on Canada's external affairs. For instance, on the question of overseas military involvement by Canada, King, in a debate in this House on February 1, 1923, declared:

It is for Parliament to decide whether or not we should participate in wars in different parts of the world, and it is neither right nor proper for any individual nor for any groups of individuals to take any step which in any way might limit the rights of Parliament in a matter which is of such great concern to all the people of our country.

● (1650)

This culminated in June 1926 with Prime Minister King moving a motion which was unanimously adopted by the House, the key part of which read:

—before His Majesty's Canadian minister's advise ratification of a treaty or convention affecting Canada...the approval of the parliament of Canada should be secured.

From this, the firm practice developed that major treaties before ratification were referred to Parliament with this device, the identical device being employed by the government by way of the motion before us.

In all of the cases that we have been able to ascertain so far when this practice was followed, before the House dealt with the motion the actual text of the treaty in question was tabled in the House.

This firm practice of tabling a treaty prior to debate on the motion was applied in the following cases: Treaty for the Renunciation of War in 1929; North Atlantic Treaty in 1949; Charter of the United Nations in 1945; treaties of peace with Italy, Romania, Hungary and Finland in 1947; and the Auto Pact in 1966.

I could cite more examples but this list is sufficient to show that this was the firm and customary practice of this House whenever the government sought such approval for the ratification of a treaty. It would appear that the Auto Pact I referred to was the last time a motion asking the House to call upon the government to ratify a treaty was utilized and the firm customary practice requiring that the text of the treaty be laid before the House prior to debate on the motion was followed. This clearly establishes this firm customary practice of this House when dealing with such motions as the one before us on Kyoto.

There is the other issue raised in this matter concerning the British practice that the Leader of the Opposition cited to the effect that part of the practice was to allow a period of time to expire between the time the text of the treaty was laid before the House and debate on the motion commence. In the specific cases cited, the treaty was laid before the House well in advance of the debate.

In the case of the North Atlantic treaty, it was tabled in the House by Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent, on March 18, 1949, with the debate taking place on April 4, 1949, 16 days later. In the case of the Charter of the United Nations, the text of the charter was tabled in the House on September 7, 1945, and debated in the House from October 16-19, 1945, nearly six weeks later. In the case of the peace treaties after the second world war, they were tabled February 10, 1947, and debated June 30, 1947, more than four months later. In the case of the Auto Pact, the text of the treaty was laid before the House on February 24, 1965 and not debated until May 6, 1966, a year and three months later.

The customary practice of the House has been to allow at least some reasonable period of time to occur before the debate on the motion would commence. My leader had cited the British practice of allowing 21 days and it was from this practice that the Canadian practice clearly evolved.

In any case, although perhaps no precise number of days are required to expire from the time the treaty is tabled to the time the motion on it can be debated, there is no doubt that some period of time has to expire.

The government has chosen to utilize the firm practice as originated by Prime Minister Mackenzie King in the 1920s. If it is going to utilize this procedure then it has to be required to follow the correct procedural preconditions before debate on such a motion can commence. The motion that is now being debated has not been properly brought to this House due to the failure to follow clear procedural steps governed by the customary practice of this House.

Given that debate has already commenced on the motion I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that you should accordingly suspend any further debate on the motion until the text of the Kyoto protocol has been properly laid before the House, and a reasonable time has expired between the time it is so tabled and the debate on the motion is allowed to resume.

● (1655)

Mr. Geoff Regan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Ponsonby procedure, to which the member referred yesterday, has never been adopted in the House.

My hon. colleague from Red Deer suggests I have been talking too much. I think that he ought to be concerned about being afflicted with the same affliction I have if he does not conclude within the near future.

I have to wonder whether or not the member for Kootenay—Columbia is suggesting that he has not had the opportunity to examine the protocol or has not had access to it. It seems to me that if that is not the case, then what he is really doing is engaging in procedural wrangling to avoid the real debate and prevent us from discussing this issue which is of great interest and importance to Canadians.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): I am advised that there are some new elements that the hon. member for Kootenay—Columbia has submitted to the House. They will be reviewed by the Speaker who will bring down a ruling as soon as possible.

Government Orders

Mr. Jim Abbott: Mr. Speaker, in light of that I wonder if it would not be wise to suspend debate until this decision has been made.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélair): The Deputy Speaker has ruled that debate must go ahead. I am advised the Speaker himself will come back as soon as possible, and before a vote, with his ruling on this important matter.

* * *

KYOTO PROTOCOL

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Canadian Alliance): Mr. Speaker, I will not review what I have said because everyone's attention span over there should be long enough to have handled it. I will carry on. The parliamentary secretary asked me to start from the very beginning but that would be starting from yesterday and that would probably be too much. The whole group here would not like that to happen. I will carry on and in a few days I will review where I have been.

I have barely started with new material and I am trying to keep new material coming so that it rivets members on the other side. It will enable them to carry it back to their members and tell them that Kyoto is something we cannot sign at this point in time. We need a better made in Canada plan. To provide them with that this evaluation is essential and I must carry on.

The next point that the government has put a lot of time into is domestic emissions trading. I have attended canned presentations put on by bureaucrats. The only problem was that as soon as someone started asking questions they would have to get back with answers. They gave a nice PowerPoint presentation but questions could not be asked because they did not know the answers. They said it was not developed enough to understand. The people selling domestic emissions trading did not understand it. I guess that is okay in the Liberal way of things but as a businessman I do not want to sign on to something that I do not know how it will work or what the rules will be.

The bureaucrats said that domestic emissions trading would account for an estimated 55 megatonnes reduction. What are we missing here? Mr. Speaker, I imagine you are in a fog as much as I am. A dirty company will be forced to buy credits from a cleaner company with credits. I do not understand how that will fix the environment. The only way it can fix the environment is if that dirty company goes bankrupt. I guess that is the idea. Only clean companies will be left and the dirty companies will either have the incentive to get better or go out of business.

What happens to jobs in the meantime? Is there not a better way of dealing with this? Is there not a better way of encouraging technological advancement than forcing people out of business? Will there not be a lot of deals, particularly when we read the earlier section about how government will get involved in guarantees and all of that? Does that not smell like government involvement in business at a level that we never want government involved in? That is what it says to me. I cannot read it any other way. The government is talking about saving 55 megatonnes. I do not understand that. When we transfer from a dirty company to a clean company, how

does that fix anything, whether it is domestic or international? Here the government is talking domestic.

About 279 free permits are to be allocated on historic intensity improvement performance or taking technological opportunity into account. We will give 279 permits. What is magic about that number I wonder. We will out 279 free permits for stuff people have done before. That is how the government attempted to get the Quebec government on side. That is how it attempted to get Ontario on side. It is working on Mr. Eves and hoping he will say a few deals could be made under the table. Do we trust those deals? Do we trust that kind of wheeling and dealing?

• (1700)

I thought we were talking about a commitment to the environment. I did not know we were talking about wheeling and dealing, splitting one premier from another premier, creating all kinds of disunity in our country. I did not know that was what it was about. I did not know that it was good for the country to have one part of the country hate the other part. I thought this was something about unity.

I am a proud Canadian. As I travel around this world I am proud to say I am a Canadian. I have taken tour groups to every part of this world and I am proud to have that Canadian flag. When I see a government proposing something like this, to split people and provinces apart, to wheel and deal with provinces, that really concerns me big time.

There will be 279 friends who will get free permits. I do not know where that number came from but the government will give those away to people who have done good things. Maybe the good things are raising funds for the party. Maybe the good things are being a president or a former candidate. Maybe those are the good deals. Industry would have to purchase permits for additional emissions. So the 279 good guys get them free, but others have to buy them. That is pretty obvious and clear. People will say that they will try to be one of the good guys and support the government so that they can be one of those 279.

This thing is divisive. It is divisive for provinces and industries. It will make one industry hate the other. It will put one industry out of business while promoting another and those people will be affected down at the grassroots level, people who need that income to buy groceries. That is who the government is playing with, with these emissions credits.

The permit price is estimated to be \$10 per tonne. The government picks \$10 and says it will put it into its model. The present price is around \$38. It changes every hour and every day. Many estimate that once this European emissions trading really begins on January 1, the price of that carbon will skyrocket. If that is the case then everything on which the government has calculated will not be there.

It talks about implementation through covenants and regulations. It says that coverage would include electricity from coal, oil and gas industries, mining, pulp and paper, petroleum refining, chemicals, iron and steel, smelting and refining, cement, lime and glass. Those are the industries that will be targeted first.

Government Orders

Let us just examine across this country who will be affected by that. Everyone should listen carefully because this is who will be affected and who will lose their jobs, or have their jobs threatened by signing Kyoto. People in the coal, oil and gas industries; mining; pulp and paper; petroleum refining; chemical industry; iron and steel; smelting and refining; cement; and lime and glass will be targeted. If they are not one of the 279 preferred ones they will get nailed, and if they get nailed they will have to buy emissions, lay people off, and have their businesses affected.

What do people not understand? By producing this kind of a document, even though it lacks any kind of detail of costing and so on, it does give a hint of what it means. Now, after many hours, we finally get a chance to see which industries will be targeted first.

• (1705)

We should probably repeat that list because there are many members here who will have one or more of those companies or industries in their riding. All these industries, the coal, oil and gas, mining, pulp and paper, petroleum refining, chemical, iron and steel, smelting and refining, cement, lime and glass, will be the first industries to be hit by the Kyoto protocol. They will be the first ones that will need to buy emissions. How many Canadians out there will be hit by that?

This has been the only opportunity to talk about those industries, because we better believe the government has not told the industries out there or the people working in those industries that they are being targeted. They do not know that they are, but now we know they are because it is right there in black and white.

The government says that companies will have access to domestic offsets. Companies will be able to invest in sink and landfill gas capture, and then of course the international credits. I do not know about landfill gas trapping but there is a lot of gas around. I could remind some of our members that we should probably check how many cars are running out front.

An hon. member: There are only 12 running.

Mr. Bob Mills: Oh, so now there are 12. There were 13 out there. It is good that there are only 12 running.

Just to bring you up to date, Madam Speaker, we have a little pool running here in the House to see how many ministers' cars are running out front at any given time of the day. We were told that there were only five or six and that they were only there for five or six minutes. Maybe tomorrow we could keep track of licence plates and we could actually bring those into the House and find out how long the cars have been running. Maybe we could get some help from our security people just to keep track of how many cars are running for how many hours per day. We will then get an idea of the ministers' commitment to the environment. I think it is a good little pool that Canadians probably will catch on to. Over the next few days and weeks leading up to Christmas they would probably like to have that information. We would be more than glad to provide it, with your permission, Madam Speaker.

I want to welcome you back, Madam Speaker. It is good to have you here. I will not be able to bring you totally up to date from 10 o'clock this morning. I could send you some notes but of course you

have access to *Hansard*. I am pleased to see you back and becoming informed on the subject of Kyoto.

I hope, Madam Speaker, that you do not have any coal, oil and gas, mining, pulp and paper, petroleum refining, chemical, iron and steel, smelting and refining, cement, lime or glass industries in your constituency, because if you do, they will be the first group targeted under these emissions. You might just want to let them know that they should probably find out a little more about the Kyoto accord and how it might impact them. They may just be able to buy some landfill gas to help them offset these emissions.

We need to again talk about sinks because sinks are mentioned so often in all of these presentations. This was the thing that we won. Our big victory in Bonn was that we won on sinks. What the Europeans did for us was give us the throw-away when it came to sinks. In this report we are including sinks and landfills. I think they fit rather well together.

We are saying that there is a real development of a measurement and inventory tools to qualify for credits and promotion of agricultural sinks. I wonder what that spells out. I think that says that we will have a bureaucracy built that will keep track, tabulate and do an inventory on all the sinks in this country.

• (1710)

I think that should absorb some of the people from the coal, oil and gas, mining, pulp and paper industries, et cetera who will be unemployed. Maybe they can go out and become tree counters and decide how much CO₂ the trees are absorbing. Perhaps they could check out the grasslands and the fields and so on to see just how these sinks are working. Everyone had better believe that no one else knows and certainly the government does not.

This plan will enable sinks and landfill gas capture to be sold as an offset into industrial emissions trading. What is it that I do not understand about this whole thing? We are going to start buying these credits for this gas being given up. How does that help the environment? How does that work? I do not understand. The gases are being given off and we are going to take credit for those. What is it about that? It is just words, words and confusion.

We are going to consider increasing forestry sinks in cooperation with the provinces. I guess the government had better cooperate with the provinces. Who is responsible for forestry and agriculture?

Some hon. members: The provinces.

Mr. Bob Mills: The provinces. In the same report the feds say that they are going to take credit for the sinks for forestry and agriculture.

An hon. member: And the provinces get nothing.

Mr. Bob Mills: The provinces do not get it. The farmers do not get it. The foresters do not get it. What does the government not get about this? The government then is into a grab in the area of the provinces.

Government Orders

The members from Quebec have to realize that the feds are lying. Once we ratify there will be penalties. The member from the Bloc is a good friend of mine. I respect him. He cares about the environment. He is on our environment committee. He does a great job on that committee. However he has to understand that the federal government is grabbing something that belongs to the provinces.

By going ahead with the ratification, we are giving the government a blank cheque, which it will cash. When it cashes it, we will never get an implementation plan that will consider the provinces. That is why the premiers are not meeting and that is why the environment ministers are not meeting with the federal government on Friday. It is because it is a grab. The members from Quebec have to understand that.

The next point is investment in renewable energy and innovative technology. The government has finally come to something that perhaps makes some sense. Let us examine that and see what it means by that. First, it says it is doing 12 megatonnes already. It says it is already doing something, and that is 12 megatonnes.

It says that it will target 10% of new electricity generation from green sources. It is saying that 10% of our power in this country has to come from green energy. Alberta and Quebec are the only two provinces moving toward that goal, and, of course, they are doing that by introducing wind power and electricity generated from water, hydroelectricity. All those things are achieving that green energy.

However the government says that any new projects must be 10% green. The provinces that do not have hydro will be hit pretty hard by that. It will be pretty hard on some provinces that may not have the economics to make it happen. It will be hard on Saskatchewan when SaskPower is saying that it cannot convert its coal generation plants that quickly to some other form. What will we do, turn the lights out? It is already having economic problems.

• (1715)

It also hits Atlantic Canada pretty hard because it is just about to have a huge resource base in the area of oil and gas and mining.

I will go back to that cab driver in Halifax who said to me that Atlantic Canadians were just finally getting on their feet and the federal government was going to whack them again. This time it will be Kyoto. This is another lost promise and a lost opportunity for Atlantic Canada.

Yes, we can achieve that. We can achieve much better than that but we need to have a plan. We need to have a plan that has worked, that is in the right time and that will work as the technology develops.

We are going to partner in clean coal technology projects. That is interesting because one clean coal technology project, a pilot plant, which has been in the planning for 10 years, will be coming on stream in 2008. This does not happen very fast. It takes 10 years from the time the government decides to go ahead with a project until it actually comes on stream.

Clean coal technology is there. It is in Europe and in the U.S. and, yes, Canada should use clean coal technology. The government is saying that could save us 4.5 megatonnes.

The government says that we should partner in a proposal for a CO₂ pipeline system. I think that refers to the taking of CO₂ and sequestering it in the ground. A lot of research is being done on that. It is being done in Texas and in other parts of the world. Russia even tried a project of sequestration of CO₂. Canada is getting into that and that is good; that is 2.2 megatonnes. Look at how much we have to do to save megatonnes. It is not that easy. When we have to hit 260 megatonnes it is not that easy to all of a sudden get rid of those 240 megatonnes. How do we do it? That is the very point.

I did not mention that clean coal technology would save 4.5 megatonnes. If 10% of our energy was from green sources we could save 3.9 megatonnes. Even if it were 50% it is still not very much. If members will remember, we were getting 30 megatonnes for our sinks even though we did not know what they were.

I must again remind the members from Quebec that just having green energy is not the whole solution to the megatonne problem. There are a whole bunch of other things. People give off CO₂ through driving cars, riding in trains, riding in buses, and all kinds of manufacturing. Manufacturers produce a lot of CO₂. What the people in Ontario must understand is that they will get hit because they will have to reduce their output of CO₂ by 20%. It is just that simple.

The government says that we must consider investment in the next generation technology for low cost nuclear power. Did that one sneak through somewhere? I do not know what people think about that, but the Canadian government has always been committed to nuclear power. We in fact have kept that industry alive for a long time.

Yes, I have met with people from the nuclear industry and they feel they can cut costs. Right now, however, the nuclear industry is about eight times more expensive than the coal fired generation plant. Now we have another cost. Maybe the nuclear industry can improve on that. Maybe it can be brought down closer to conventional. However the industry does not think it can do that right away.

What about the issue of waste from nuclear power plants? What about building nuclear power plants on faults? What about all the environmental problems. I would really like to know if the Suzuki Foundation, Greenpeace, the Sierra Club and the World Wildlife Fund all support nuclear energy. I assume that they do because they support Kyoto and they support the government's plan. I think from now on we must assume that those agencies all support nuclear power.

Government Orders

●(1720)

I am not aware that our party supports holus-bolus nuclear power plants. I know the government does because it finances it. I guess all the environmental groups support nuclear power. I wonder if they will be cut off from their international roots because Greenpeace and the Sierra Club certainly oppose it in the U.S. and Europe.

The Canadian groups support it because they support the government and the ratification of Kyoto. What other assumption could we draw? I have to assume that. We could ask them about old growth forests. They do not absorb as much CO₂. The environmental groups cannot have it both ways.

I repeat for those who were not here yesterday that I am an environmentalist. I am proud to be an environmentalist. I want to preserve the environment. That is what my training would show.

Let us talk about the other actions. I think we hit a pretty important one there. It is an awfully important thing to look at when we discuss it with these various groups.

What about other actions? One would be to expand Canadian industry programs for energy conservation, 0.7 tonnes. We will have industry programs. I am not sure what they are. We will reduce flaring and venting of waste gases on a voluntary basis by four megatonnes.

I would like to see us stop all venting and burning of waste gases. I talked earlier about how it bothers me to see those flares burning into the air, hundreds of them, when I know there is technology that is being used around the world. Little tiny plants are put beside the wells to capture the energy. They are cogeneration plants. That electricity is fed into the grid. It works, so let us use it. How much does it cost? I am not sure of the figures, but I have been told it costs \$30,000 to \$50,000 for one of these units. That would probably be made back in a matter of months, not years, from selling power into the grid.

Why is it not done? I do not know. Maybe more government pressure is needed to do it, but they are doing a lot of that now on a voluntary basis.

The Canadian government will purchase a minimum of 10 megatonnes of credits from the international market. That keeps sneaking in here.

We discussed this earlier. That means the government is going to buy them and serve as banker. It is going to distribute them among Canadian companies, I assume for sale. Think of the bureaucracy that would be needed to handle that item. Why are we doing that? Why would we want to set up an international agency to buy credits to redistribute through the country? How would that benefit Canadians?

The next point is really important. It is why this debate is important and why we should be here until Christmas. The government challenges individual Canadians to reduce emissions by one tonne per person and encourages them to operate their homes more efficiently, buy more fuel efficient vehicles, reduce car usage by 10% and retrofit their homes.

An hon. member: The cabinet cars are outside.

Mr. Bob Mills: There are 12 cars outside right now. They have been running most of the day. There were 13 but I guess one left. There were 19 in the earlier survey.

We all are going to reduce our emissions by one tonne. The average for a Canadian person, man, woman and child, is five tonnes. We are being asked to reduce it by 20%. Do Canadians know that? Do Canadians really understand what kind of a commitment that would be? How would we do it?

●(1725)

First of all, we breathe. We breathe out CO₂. Maybe the government will propose that we should only breathe every second time which would reduce CO₂ emissions. I do not think many people would be able to achieve that.

What will we do? The government says that we will use our cars 10% less. How will we administer that? What about the guy that uses his car more? Will we have car police? Will we have meters on our cars and inspectors? Maybe they will say, "You can only drive this many kilometres. You went over so we are going to tax you". I do not think we will do that.

The easiest place to do it would be at the gas pumps. The easiest way to handle it is by raising the price of gas. The Europeans have often said, "Why are you guys paying 60¢ or 70¢ a litre for gas? Why is it so cheap?" The only way to achieve a reduction of CO₂ from automobiles is by making gas \$2.50 a litre. If we made it \$2.50 a litre we would reduce the use. We would reduce it by 10%. I expect that we would reduce it by more than 10%. Are Canadians ready for that kind of a decision?

Canadians need to discuss it. Canadians need to understand Kyoto. Canadians need to know whether they want to commit themselves to that sort of a reduction. It should not just happen because the Prime Minister says, "I do not even have to talk to the House. I do not even have to consult with members. I do not even have to listen. I can simply ratify this without any consultation at all. In fact, I do not have to listen to the provinces. I do not have to listen to industry. I do not have to listen to anybody because I can ratify this agreement on my own. I do not even have to care because I am not going to be here. Those rotten Liberals ran me out of my job, so let the next guy worry about it".

The next guy had better be worried about this piece of paper because it says that Kyoto has penalties. If and when the future prime minister returns to the House he will be reminded again that there are commitments. The day that we ratify the agreement we are stuck with it and there are penalties, big penalties. The members across the way who are going to vote for this or defeat this have been threatened with an election. Is that not blackmail? That is nothing more than simple blackmail.

Now we come to the real crunch. All of us in Canada are expected to reduce our emissions by 20%, reduce our use of cars, reduce our use of electricity, reduce our use of any kind of power, reduce our manufacturing, reduce our use of consumable goods. We are all going to reduce those by 20%. What will that do to our country? What will that do to our economy? What will that do to our jobs? What will it do to our children and our grandchildren? What will it do to them?

A reduction of 20% is pretty darned critical and will have a major effect on Canada. We will buy more fuel efficient vehicles. I know a lot of Canadians who are having difficulty buying a vehicle let alone buying a fuel efficient vehicle that costs more money at this point in time. They will have trouble.

Who am I talking about? I am not talking about the Liberal cabinet ministers whose cars are running out front. I am talking about the moms and dads trying to take their kids to a hockey game. I am talking about the single moms. I am talking about those people out there. That is who we should be concerned about. That is who we should be talking about when we talk about these more expensive vehicles and about reducing consumption.

• (1730)

Retrofitting homes is a great idea. Greenpeace says it would cost \$12,000 per home, but the manufacturers and the home builders say it would cost \$30,000 per home. It would be somewhere in between.

I built an energy efficient home 11 years ago. I put in triple pane glass and double insulation. I have the facility to put in a solar collector on the roof of my garage, because I believe in that stuff. I know what that cost me. I can guarantee it did not cost me \$30,000. It cost me considerably more to make that fuel efficient house. That was 11 years ago. Prices may have been reduced since then for insulation, triple pane glass and so on, but I do not think so. I do not know of much else that has been reduced in price.

What will it mean to Canadians? That is the question we have to continually ask.

Mr. David Anderson: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

It is getting lonely in here again. I think I would like to see you call for quorum.

It is important that members hear this. What the member for Red Deer has to say is very important. It would be good if the members would come in, listen to what he has to say, continue to take notes and continue to learn from him.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): There is quorum in the House. The hon. member for Red Deer may continue.

Mr. Bob Mills: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It was nice to have a little break and a glass of water. I appreciate that. I know, Madam Speaker, that your heart is with us and that you want us to get this information out to Canadians so that they have a chance to learn more about Kyoto.

That is what democracy is all about. In some countries if we were to do this sort of thing, I would have been hauled off long ago and imprisoned as a political prisoner. Maybe I should be careful when I go past those running cars out there and hope they are not running too fast after me.

Government Orders

We are talking about Canadians and the things being said in this report. It is saying that they must cut by 20% their use of all the things that make our standard of living what it is. That is a huge commitment.

I have travelled across the country doing townhall meetings on this subject and I usually ask Canadians, "Do you think Kyoto affects you?" At the beginning of the presentation they usually say, "No, I don't think so. I don't think it's going to affect me. I want to fix the environment. I'm worried about health".

All of us are worried about health. Kyoto is not about health. It is about CO₂ and climate change. Yes, we should do something about it. Yes, there is a better way. The better way that I talked about this morning is the way we should go. We should be doing conservation, transitional fuels and alternate energy. Those are all important areas and I will have a chance to talk further about those when I talk about modelling. We must discuss modelling. I have three books I want to review just to describe the modelling process because it is that important. Everybody must understand this issue.

Municipalities are expected to reduce 10 megatonnes through land planning, waste diversion, investments in renewable energies and sinks. Municipalities are expected to do that. I guess the decree will come down from almighty planet Ottawa saying, "You shall do the following things". That sounds very good, but if I were a municipality anywhere in Canada, I would be asking if the funds are coming to help me do that, or is this just another effort to transfer the costs from the top to the bottom and let the little guy pay for it? It is telling municipalities and provinces that this is what they must do, but it does not transfer any money.

It is sort of like health care. It is rather fitting that the government would choose to bring health care out the same week as Kyoto. I am sure it is not trying to confuse the issue at all. The federal government got the provinces involved. I would like all Bloc members to think about this. The federal government brought all the provinces on side with health care by offering them a fifty-fifty cost sharing. That was a good deal. The provinces said they could not afford all that health care so the feds would pay 50% and the provinces pay 50%.

As the Romanow report will point out, about 11% of health care is paid for by the feds and the rest is the responsibility of the provinces. What do members in the House not understand about the feds and their sharing programs? They will get people on side and then they cut their heads off, and that is exactly what they have done with health care. That is exactly what they will do with the environment.

Government Orders

The government says it will strengthen the understanding of science and likely impacts. Is that not refreshing? Finally, on the last pages of this document, it is saying that it will strengthen the understanding of science. My God, we will put this whole thing into science. We will look to the scientists to tell us if what we are doing will make a difference. I wonder if that should not have been at the start instead of at the end. One would surely think so. One would think that when it talks about these wonderful models that it has that it would have talked about this whole science thing a little bit earlier.

● (1735)

It talks about establishing regular monitoring, reporting and regulatory structures. That would be typical of Ottawa to come up with. That is bureaucracy. What does the government not understand? There must have been a lot of European influence here. Many countries of the world seem to like bureaucracy. Everybody wants to work for the government. It is a good job. It is a guaranteed job. Nobody ever gets fired. People can keep building a pyramid, get other people under them and they will never lose their job. It sounds good.

When I call Kyoto a Eurocentric, bureaucratic nightmare, that is exactly what we have just reviewed. We have talked about something that is pretty good for Europe, but not worth a darn for a country in the Americas. We have talked about bureaucracy that is beyond all belief, from tree counters to regulators, monitors, reporters and structural setups to monitor everything that every Canadian does including how they drive their car. This is nothing but bureaucracy. It is about waste and bureaucracy.

There is a much better way. There is a way based on technology, advancement, and getting people involved. We do not need bureaucrats counting trees. What we need are people to understand what they can do to help the environment.

I will stop reviewing the report at this point. I have read the highlights and there is a lot more. Now I will review the second report in much more detail. This was just a brief overview of the first report and I have been working hard. I have about 80 or 90 pages of review instead of this brief five or six page review of the first report. I will review the second report in detail so that the House can understand all parts of it. There is a lot more detail required.

This report was prepared for the October 28 joint ministers meeting. There was another meeting set for November 21 for plan 2, the one we have not reviewed yet but we will get to it. Plan 2 was for the meeting of November 21 but it was cancelled, postponed. Then it was worked on a bit more and turned from a stapled copy into a more expensive copy, which includes all the changes that were made, and that was for this Friday in Toronto.

I planned to be in Toronto this Friday to talk to the environment ministers and the energy ministers. I was worried about that because then I would not have been able to be in the House and I did not think you, Madam Speaker, would let me do it on a conference call. I was worried that I might have to stop speaking, but that has now been cancelled because the provinces say the government has nothing to offer them. It has nothing new. It has not consulted any more. It has not done anything.

What is the Prime Minister doing? He is trying to pick the premiers off one at a time. Yesterday he met with Mr. Eves from Ontario to try to bribe him. Wink, wink, nod, nod, "Maybe we'll give you something later."

Today he is meeting with Mr. Campbell who is in Ottawa. Wink, wink, nod, nod, "Maybe we'll let you develop your offshore oil and gas without any problems environmentally." I wonder how David Suzuki likes that one, that the Prime Minister is starting to make a behind the scenes deal with the Premier of B.C. I expect that David Suzuki is not happy right now with Mr. Campbell.

● (1740)

That is how the government operates, trying to make deals under the table. Does the House know who the government has forgotten in this whole thing? It has forgotten the people.

It is not about premiers, cabinet ministers, or members of Parliament. It is about every single person out there who is a consumer. It is about people who drive cars. It is about people who live in houses, who buy groceries. It is about people who do not understand what Kyoto means to them. That is why we must keep talking. That is why we must keep the message going out there, because it is those people who will be affected.

We should look at where we are at now. The premiers are not meeting. The Prime Minister refused to meet with them except in little, sneak visits to the capital. The provincial environment and energy ministers are fed up with the federal government and they have cancelled their meeting. We now have a real problem.

We have a Prime Minister who says there will be a vote in the House on ratification. He does not have to listen to anything we say. I suppose he could say that this is all falling on deaf ears, but I do not think so. There are some Canadians out there who are starting to pay attention. If we in the Canadian Alliance and the Conservative Party are that concerned about this issue, then maybe there is something there we should look at. That is the purpose of this whole thing.

We need to take a look at the member for LaSalle—Émard who peeked in occasionally today and we need to ensure that his position is clear. I will review again as I did yesterday what his position is up to this point. His position has been clear. He said that Kyoto is good, but it might not be so good, but we should ratify it, but maybe we should not, but if we do, we could, but if we do not, we will not, and we will not hurt anyone, and all parts of the country will be treated equally. He said that we will only move as fast as we can and would and should, and maybe we will but he does not know for sure and we will see how it goes. That is his position.

Government Orders

He needs to be clear because he said in Toronto that Canadians are entitled to know exactly what the government's plans are. He did not think we can spend the next number of years working that plan out. That is the position of the member for LaSalle—Émard. He is saying that we must know that. He has also said that maybe he would have to vote for ratification in the House but that would not mean anything because he would take a hard look and if it was going to hurt our economy, it would not be implemented.

What does ratification mean? Ratification means that according to the Marrakesh accord nations that ratify Kyoto but do not meet their targets in round one by 2012 are penalized another 30% in emissions cuts, and in addition such nations cannot sell carbon credits in round two. In the case of compliance with emissions targets, annex I parties, that is us, are granted 100 days after the expert review of their final annual emissions inventory as finished to make up any shortfall in compliance, mainly through emissions trading. That means if a country does not hit its targets it can buy its way out by sending money to other countries.

If the Prime Minister and any future prime ministers do not understand that commitment, we should be saying it over and over again because that is a critical point.

There are penalties to ratifying Kyoto. Members who have been told to ratify this for the Gipper because he will not be around long, and that yes, he is kind of out of date, and to ratify because it will be his legacy, should remember what the Kyoto accord says. It says that once we ratify and sign on the dotted line there are penalties.

Industry, economists, scientists and everyone says that we cannot hit those targets. We cannot do it. We know that the parliamentarians of 2012 will be buying emissions to make up the credit targets that we did not hit.

• (1745)

We are already saddling future generations with a debt. We already have \$540 billion in debt. That is \$40 billion a year that everyone in Canada is being saddled with. What is a billion dollars? A lot of people do not know what a billion dollars is, but let us put this into perspective. We are saddling future generations with this environmental treaty. We are saddling them with a debt. That debt amounts to: \$12 billion, give or take, for education; \$15 billion or \$18 billion for health care; \$10 billion to \$11 billion for the military; \$9 billion for Indian affairs; \$22 billion for social services; and \$40 billion for interest payments. That is what we are leaving our children and our grandchildren.

So when Liberals stand up and say they care about our children and our grandchildren and about the environment, what they are saying is that they are leaving them with that debt. They are leaving them with an agreement that we know we cannot achieve and will penalize us and will cost billions of dollars when that day comes. The last thing I would want to do is to be able to say in 2012, "We told you so". I would hate to have to say that. That does not bring me any pleasure at all because it is my kids and my grandchildren this is going to affect.

Again, simply standing in the House and saying how great we are really does not do much for me when it comes to what the Liberals are proposing and what they are about to do.

So what is the answer? Obviously we are asking the member for LaSalle—Émard to take some leadership, to really be honest, to really examine this, to know that there are penalties and to vote accordingly. We are asking the members from the Bloc to really think about the power grab that the federal government is going to do here with ratification. We are asking the backbench Liberals to think about how it affects their individual constituents. I do not think there is much hope with the NDP, so I will not bother addressing them. I just hope that people will think about those things.

Just to summarize this portion, I think what we have to do is again repeat some of these consequences: the loss of hundreds of thousands of jobs; \$25 billion to \$45 billion less in economic activity in this country; and we will not reduce the smog, the acid rain and the pollution in an appreciable amount by signing on to Kyoto. Even the minister said the difference it will make to the environment will be minuscule. It may double the amount we pay for gas, for electricity and for home heating. It has the potential to do that. It will reduce investment because of the investment freeze in our country. It will require the formation of a whole new level, a whole new bureaucracy, just to administer, which we have talked about in detail in reviewing this report. It will put us at a huge economic disadvantage to our major trading partner, the United States. It will subsidize some of the biggest polluting countries in the world, those with dirty industries. We are going to send them money. How does that help the environment?

The government has no idea of how it is going to implement this plan. When it signed the accord in 1997 it had no idea of how it might implement and how it might carry out this plan.

It is important that we review exactly where we are now. There are some other issues, and I guess I would call them side issues, that I want to deal with. This is part of a scientific presentation. This is probably a fitting time to do this. The members are very alert at this point and very keen on getting into some of this.

The key abatement strategy the government has put forward at some of the meetings we have had is to use less fuel. It wants to start a major advertising campaign. We should remember that the Liberals have spent \$10 million in this last month in advertising on how good Kyoto is for us. That is \$10 million.

• (1750)

An hon. member: During the Grey Cup.

Government Orders

Mr. Bob Mills: Right during the Grey Cup they spent that money to tell us how good Kyoto is and how important. Now they will spend money on advertising to Canadians that we must use less fuel, we must use different fuel and we must capture all of the flue gases from industry. Some of these we would agree with. We are going to use sinks, but the federal government will take credit for them even though they are under provincial jurisdiction.

Generally speaking, what the Liberals really are saying is that they will use Kyoto as an excuse to deal with some environmental issues. Would it not be better to simply say that they will have two plans? They could have a plan that deals with pollution and they could force, if they have to, companies to put in scrubbers and all kinds of things to remove sulphur dioxide, nitrous oxide, particulate matter, mercury and all of those things that are pollution. They could clean up industry if they wanted. It is good business for the Liberals to do that and industry would participate.

On the other side, let us take a long term view of how we can deal with climate change, how we can deal with reducing CO₂. The reality is that as we get into alternate energy, we will in fact reduce CO₂ emissions. On that day in 2040 or 2050 when we are not dependent on fossil fuels and are using alternate energy, and some scientists have now started writing about this, we might well have a CO₂ shortage, which will then inhibit plant growth on earth. That is a whole other side of this whole issue that is far out there. The Liberals cannot predict the next week, let alone 100 years from now, although the government believes it can.

The Kyoto treaty participants are significant. There are all of those developed countries that are part of this agreement, but the critical part is all those countries in the developing world that between now and 2012 are not part of Kyoto. All those countries that are not part of this original Kyoto treaty will continue to do what they are doing. If any members have been to those countries they will know that the level of pollution, the level of CO₂, is far in excess of anything we would have here in Canada. That is a problem.

A lot of people asked this question and so I will review a few of these things. We find now that about 95 countries have ratified, and I mentioned this figure before, representing 37.1% of the emissions. We must remember that for Kyoto to come into effect, there must be 55 countries representing 55% of the emissions.

I will just interrupt myself here for a moment because I know our viewers are waiting for this. As of now, there are five ministers' cars running outside Centre Block, so we have gone from 19 to 13 to 12 to 5. I wonder if the time of day has anything to do with that. Tomorrow we will monitor this, and I know that you, Madam Speaker, will want to know how many ministers' cars are sitting out there running with no one in them because the ministers do not want to get into cold cars. Commitment to Kyoto, that is what it is all about. It is commitment. We need Canadians to be committed for it to work. We need cabinet ministers to show some commitment as well. We will start keeping track of which ministers they are and if the Prime Minister is also out there with his car running, and how many cars. He has about five or six because he is more important than everyone else here.

An hon. member: Gas guzzlers.

Mr. Bob Mills: They are not small and energy efficient cars either, and that is another point.

• (1755)

We have to keep this in mind because a lot of Canadians are asking when this will come into effect. We are at 37% right now. Some 90 countries have ratified, but some of them do not have any emissions at all. Caribbean countries have ratified, but it is easy for them to ratify because there are no targets so they just have to sign on the dotted line. Those 90 countries represent 37% of the emissions. We must remember that Canada represents 2% of the emissions and Russia 17% of the emissions. If Canada signed on, it would not matter. It would really matter if the Russians signed on, as they say they might if there is enough money in it for them. That would take it to the 55%, the critical number, and at that point, I repeat, the penalties begin. The clock starts ticking. That is when Canadians would start to see the repercussions of ratifying Kyoto. That is when we would start paying our dues.

Madam Speaker, I know that you would like me to read the entire Kyoto accord into the record. I do not know if I will have time for that because it is a fairly long document. I do have it here if members would like me to read it in.

An hon. member: Maybe tomorrow.

Mr. Bob Mills: Maybe I will do that tomorrow or later on.

The important point is that section C of the Kyoto accord states that by 2005 a country must show substantial reductions in CO₂. That is what we are talking about ratifying. Where is Canada in this regard? In 1999 Canada was 15% over CO₂ emissions from 1990 levels. In 2000 we were 20% over in CO₂ emissions. Today we are 23% over in CO₂ emissions.

I do not know what the government does not understand about "substantial reductions by 2005". If we do not do it, the European Union has said, WTO penalties may be brought forward on countries. If it succeeds in doing that, we will be first, saying "pick us, pick us, we ratified, so pick us". We ratified, so penalize us. Hurt our trade so that we will not have as many jobs and people will not have as much security in their manufacturing jobs. That is the kind of stupidity that the Prime Minister and future prime minister do not seem to understand. There are penalties involved in signing this thing. We cannot just sign it, walk away and forget about it.

Kyoto is critical. Our major trading partner, the U.S., is out. Europe is in but even it is having trouble getting to its targets. It is starting to worry. A meeting was held earlier this year where some countries were told they were going to have real trouble. Britain was told it would have trouble. In fact, in the parliaments of those countries debates were held about getting out of Kyoto. Those are the Europeans who designed this thing and who really do not have hardly any targets compared to ours.

Government Orders

Japan basically has said that it does not want those penalties in there. That was its argument in Marrakesh. It does not want so many harsh penalties in because countries will opt out. Countries will not sign on. Maybe Japan feels so strongly about this because it has the name Kyoto on it.

So as for examining the costs of Kyoto, there is no one estimate. There is nothing in the modelling that will tell us what it is going to cost. The bottom line is that nobody really knows what the cost will be. No one really knows what the target is. No one really knows what the policies are. All those penalties and all those costs will be determined by the targets, industry by industry, and I read out those industries earlier.

An hon. member: What about the social costs, losing jobs?

Mr. Bob Mills: A member asks what the social costs will be. What are the social costs for people when they realize that they have to change their entire way of life?

• (1800)

We are asking them to undergo a massive change in how they do things. Will we say no, that they cannot drive little Johnny to hockey on the other side of the city because they cannot use expensive gas to do that? Will we take them out of those hockey programs? Will we tell seniors who get special treatment from doctors on the other side of the city that they cannot do that any more because we have signed Kyoto and we have to hit our targets?

We have to ask these questions. We have to discuss what the implications are before we simply sign this agreement. As far as international permits and credits, that is a huge unknown. No one can really put costs on that.

As for the range of social costs, the figures the government has used in its models are \$150 million to \$12 billion annually. That is what these models are about. It uses this kind of range, \$150 million to \$12 billion. That is a pretty good range. Then the additional costs that could be involved have not been calculated into that.

The government talks about all these rolling targets. It talks about tolls on roads. Who will pay for those? It says that if we put tolls on major highways and enforce the current speed limits, we could save 4.1 megatonnes. Think about that for a minute. We will put tolls on roads and enforce speed limits. It is not quite that easy to do those things. That again takes infrastructure, it takes police and all kinds of things to save 4.1 megatonnes.

We can expand the public transit and save 3.4 megatonnes and so on and so forth. These things are hard to achieve. These targets are not easy. We should not be forced into Kyoto until we are ready and have the commitment from the provinces and the Canadian people. Until we have those things, how can we do it?

Some of the big unknowns are the costs of the targeted measures, the effectiveness and feasibility and the willingness of Canadians to cooperate. Who can predict that? The availability of permits, the sensitivity of costs to the policies of the government, the role of the modelling assumptions are questions that we need to ask.

I think we can examine the willingness to cooperate. I think most Canadians are concerned about their environment and most would

want to do something, but Canadians have to know that what they do will make a difference. If we are to make this sacrifice and take this big economic hit, we have to know that it will be worthwhile. If it will not make a difference because the developing world is not part of it or we will have businesses move out of this country, we have to know that as well.

We could go through many of these things and talk about them in depth, but I have a lot of other areas to which I want to get. I will go through this deck of material fairly quickly because I know the members over there who have been keeping track of all this have had a pretty long day.

We know the federal government does not understand any of these issues. It really does not have answers, so asking it questions really does not make much difference.

The final point comes from a question that I am asked an awful lot of times, and that is that this is the same as the free trade argument. Those rotten Conservatives did not give us any information and they forced the whole thing on us. I want to review very briefly what we had in 1988.

We had an exact text of the policy. We had at least three independent cost estimates. We had two commissions into the labour market adjustment policies. We had all major federal governments prepare a report. Then we had a national election on the issue. That was pretty fair consultation.

• (1805)

This government opposed free trade. It said it was the worst thing possible and it would rescind it as soon as it formed the government. That is like the GST and all these other things it promised. However there is no comparison between these two.

The government says that we do not have to listen to the debate in the House. We can ratify it without coming to the House. That is quite a different attitude. I would be the last one to defend Mr. Mulroney and what he did. However no Liberal or supporter of Kyoto should compare the Kyoto debate to the free trade debate. It was a pretty different argument and it was handled in a pretty different way from this argument.

This is being rushed through this place because the government wants to say that the House supported it. Then it wants to ratify it, the Prime Minister can get out of town and the chips will fall where they may. That is not a very healthy approach to something that will affect every man, woman and child in Canada.

I want to talk about the costs and get into a little more detail before we review the third plan and talk about modelling. It is kind of late in the day to really get started with some of those complex issues but it is important that we probably finish our discussion today on what some of these costs will be. Tomorrow we can get into modelling and the 40 models of the IPCC. I know everyone has been just sitting on the edge of their seats waiting for us to discuss that.

Let us look at some quotes on the costs. The first one that I will quote is from Mr. Jeff Rubin, CIBC, Chief Economist. He said:

No wonder Alberta sees Kyoto as a life and death issue. Particularly when investment is free to migrate to developing countries with huge tar sand deposits like Venezuela that are not bound by Kyoto-mandated GHG reductions.

Government Orders

That is an important statement coming from the chief economist of a major bank in Canada. We are cooking that up in the House here. A chief economist put that in writing and sent it to a national newspaper.

On this side of the House we believe that Diane Francis has credibility. She said:

—the Protocol is a flawed deal that will damage Canada and not even contribute much toward cleaning up the environment...how can Kyoto clean up the environment when countries like China, India and Brazil are exempt from emission controls?

We have been asking that question all day. How can we be part of it and how will it help the environment when that is the situation?

Let us quote Saint John, New Brunswick, Board of Trade president, Dianna Barton, from the *Canadian Press* of October 10. She said:

We are a trading province. We do a lot of exports. If we are not competitive in energy costs this will increase our product costs with our trading partners.

Is that not what the cab driver was telling me in Halifax? He said that they finally had a chance to make it, to get on their feet and provide their own source of resources and that we were going to shut them off with Kyoto. That is exactly what this lady from Saint John has said.

I go on to quote the Nova Scotia premier:

If you have an unknown cost impact then it is very difficult for anybody to assess the viability of any project. Until we have a plan there will be no certainty.

That is exactly what we have been saying. How can we do this to Canadians when we do not have a plan and when we do not have any certainty? How will we keep people investing in our industry? How will we keep people providing jobs when we do not have any certainty? Those are the questions.

●(1810)

Perhaps if I stood here for days and just repeated two or three questions over and over again, maybe the government would get it. I do not know. I just hope that in trying to bring up these substantial items they are getting through.

Let me quote Geoffrey Ballard, geophysicist and Canadian father of the fuel cell. Remember, this guy now makes his money from fuel cells. On October 8, 2002 in the *National Post* he said:

I believe no developed nation, which has seriously studied the environmental issues that confront us, can in good conscience sign this protocol. I believe implementing the Kyoto Protocol would be a huge step backwards.

This is a geophysicist, a guy who has developed a fuel cell, who has put Canada on the map and who should benefit from signing Kyoto. He is saying that Kyoto is the worst thing we could sign. That has to be a credible condemnation of what Kyoto is all about.

We will be going backward in signing Kyoto. We will not be going forward. We are not moving where we should be into conservation, into transitional fuels and ultimately into alternate energy. Our party stands for that. We recognize that Kyoto has some good points but we would not ratify it because of the penalties that would be imposed. We would come up with a conservation plan into which all levels of government, the Canadian people and Canadian industry could buy.

We would look at transitional fuels. We would look at everything from biofuels to biogas to all those things. We would look at implementing them economically to help our economy and to help us get to the alternate energy sources. We expect to be there by 2030, 2040, 2050, in that time range. Then we would put our money into that alternate energy. We would do everything we could to develop wind farms. We would use the Queen Charlotte Islands. It is a perfect place for a wind farm and we would develop that.

Wind farms work on the principle that the land heats during the day, cools at night and the wind blows 24 hours a day. It is a simple science principle. It is one that the Danish and the Germans have figured out. They know that by building windmills that do not have gears and moving parts and that move with just the slightest bit of wind, they can create energy and that energy can be used.

We have solar possibilities. There are huge solar collectors, like the ones that are used on the space station, that could be put into space. They could collect energy that would then drive generators on earth. That is the future. The future of that is even greater because we could give developing countries a source of power that they have never had before. That is exciting.

It was exciting to talk to someone in Tibet who had power for the first time. It was exciting that they were so proud of the tiny solar collector. One lady said that she had a light, a photovoltaic cell, a solar collector and that she had light. For the first time they have light. It is pretty exciting that we can take this new technology and help people like that to have light and energy with which to cook their food.

●(1815)

A reporter asked me during question period if I had said yak dung. Yes, yak dung is what people in Tibet have been using for thousands of years to cook their food. The fumes given off by that have caused serious eye problems in many of their children. They do not have to do that any more. They have solar collectors. That is pretty exciting.

That technology has implications for developing countries. It has implications for Canadians. It has implications for the world.

Another member brought me information on another geothermal town in her constituency in B.C. I will find that and be sure to introduce it tomorrow. I cannot put my fingers on it right now.

I am so proud of the town in my riding which built its whole recreation unit on geothermal technology. I mentioned this earlier. The extra geothermal plant cost \$200,000. Think about that small town making a decision to spend an extra \$200,000 of taxpayer money to implement this new technology.

Government Orders

Who in Sylvan Lake, Alberta understood geothermal energy? I do not think too many. Those people took a gamble and said, "We are going to spend \$200,000 of taxpayer money". I am sure there were people who said those guys were crazy, but they went ahead and did it. Today they are saving \$80,000 per year in energy costs. They do not use gas and they do not use electricity. They use geothermal energy. The mayor said that the plant will be paid for in two and a half years. When I visited the plant two weeks ago, he told me it will be paid for in under two years.

That is the kind of thing that Canadians would do. That is the kind of vision the government needs, not signing a Kyoto protocol that sends millions or billions of dollars to Russia so it can develop those sorts of things. That is the bottom line.

To lead into our discussion of models, I have to keep repeating this because I know some members do not understand it. It is what we put in that determines what we get out of a model. The IPCC took 200 scientists from around the world to come up with these models. They basically said, "Okay, here are some of the things".

● (1820)

The first thing was to not include clouds in the models. Then they realized that greenhouse gases are 97% clouds, water vapour. The first models that were done did not have water vapour in them. They showed results that were unbelievable and obviously we are about to fry any time soon. Then they decided that was not a good model to build and they put in clouds. The government in its wisdom has reduced the amount of cloud effect that it has put into the models. How can it do that? The clouds are the clouds are the clouds. It is 97% and it is not going to change much. Why is it doing fooling around with reality? That is what is being done.

When we discuss these models, the government is really wise.

An hon. member: Oh, oh.

Mr. Bob Mills: The member hears the word model and he tries to audition for the model contest. I hate to keep telling him that he does not qualify. There is no way. Maybe if he comes back in another life he may qualify, but not this time.

An hon. member: There are countries smaller than he is.

Mr. Bob Mills: I would not normally repeat this, but as one member mentioned, there are countries smaller than the member. He and I are friends I think, so I can say that nasty comment to him.

When we look at these models it is what we put in. The member understands computers; I know he is kind of married to one. He loves computers and he loves looking at models.

It is what we put in. The government has put in 3¢ a barrel for oil and 13¢ a barrel for oil sands. Those are the kinds of figures the government is using. The figures it is using are totally inaccurate. They are totally wrong, yet it continues to use the figures saying this is what it is going to be. If the government uses those kinds of inputs, it is fair enough that it can say it will have little impact on Canadians, that it will have little effect on business, that it will have little effect on jobs and that it really will not matter much.

Unfortunately the reality is that we cannot do that. We have to deal with the reality of what carbon is going to cost, what it is going to

cost to produce that oil. We have to remember that there are penalties. The penalties are that once the Kyoto protocol is signed, we are then subject to a 30% penalty in 2012. We are also talking about the European Union and what they are proposing with the WTO. There are penalties in signing and ratifying Kyoto.

● (1825)

We have tried to point this out to the present Prime Minister and the future prime minister as he has attended the House. They cannot say, and no one here can say, that by ratifying Kyoto we will look at it later on and we may not go any further. We cannot do that. Once we ratify it we are subject to those implications once it reaches 55% of the countries with 55% of the emissions.

The day Russia signs on, it will hit that. Russia is the key to this thing going ahead. In order to do that, it will have to be promised lots of money for its credits. That is the bottom line. That is where it is at. It is about money. It is about the transfer of money. It is not very much about the environment.

There is another point we need to make and which we need to talk about. As we have said so many times, and it is a good way to close, Kyoto is about CO₂. Kyoto is about greenhouse gases. Kyoto is about climate change. It is not about pollution. It is not about nitrous oxide. It is not about sulphur dioxide. It is not about particulate matter. It is not about those things. Most Canadians believe it is about pollution. It is not.

The deceit of the government, the way it has misled Canadians on this file will come back to bite it big time. I think you know this, Madam Speaker. You have listened to the facts very attentively. Many other members have.

Madam Speaker, you would probably take me up on my offer to come to your riding for a town hall meeting to talk about Kyoto. I would be happy to debate anybody on Kyoto using the facts and figures that are there. Madam Speaker, I think the people in your riding would thank you for telling them the facts about Kyoto.

You are kind of insulated with the vote. That will help a lot too. I think there will be a number of members who may well decide not to be here for that vote simply because of the implications down the road.

The most important thing is that we have a chance. This is our only chance to let Canadians know what Kyoto is. Remember the four questions that most Canadians across the country are asking. They are asking, what is Kyoto? What does it do to me; how does it affect me? Does it help the environment? Then they are asking, is there a better way to do this?

Government Orders

Today we have had the opportunity to talk about the better way. Yes, there is a better way. Yes, there is a way that does not commit us to this international bureaucratic nightmare. That better way is to put our trust in technology, to encourage it in research and development, in our young people and their entrepreneurship, in our business people and what they can accomplish. Let us have a made in Canada policy, one that we can live with, one that will not damage us, one that will not have the implications that Kyoto will have.

Rather than get into our modelling and all of that, let us think about this. Everybody can think about this. The members across the way can think about this. What about that person on a fixed income? What about that husband and wife with their kids? What about the

farmers? What about the ranchers? What about the foresters? What about all of those people who are trying to make a living? What about all of those people who have been unemployed because of the softwood lumber situation? What about those people who are looking at another hit? What about them?

• (1830)

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Bakopanos): Order. It being 6:30 p.m., the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 6:30 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Tuesday, November 26, 2002

NOTICE PAPER

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Order in Council Appointments	
Mr. Regan	1871
Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Regan	1871
Committees of the House	
Public Accounts	
Mr. Williams	1871
Petitions	
Religious Freedom	
Mr. Stinson	1871
Border Security	
Mr. Masse	1871
Stem Cell Research	
Mr. Masse	1871
Child Pornography	
Mr. Masse	1871
Mr. Strahl	1872
Stem Cell Research	
Mr. McGuire	1872
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Regan	1872

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Kyoto Protocol	
Motion	1872
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	1872

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

World Oyster Opening	
Mr. McGuire	1898
Firearms Registry	
Mr. Gouk	1898
Queen's Jubilee Medal	
Mr. Macklin	1898
Zimbabwe	
Mr. Cotler	1899
Royal Victorian Order	
Mr. Scott	1899
Agriculture	
Mrs. Skelton	1899
Terrorism	
Ms. Neville	1899
Claire Varin	
Ms. Dalphond-Guiral	1899

M.A.C Aids Fund	
Ms. Thibeault	1900
Kyoto Protocol	
Mr. Strahl	1900
HIV-AIDS	
Ms. Bennett	1900
Canadian Forces	
Mr. Stoffer	1900
Member for LaSalle—Émard	
Mr. Guimond	1901
John McCrae Secondary School Students	
Mr. Pratt	1901
Violence against Women	
Mrs. Wayne	1901
Prince Edward Island Music Awards	
Mr. Murphy	1901
Freedom of Speech	
Mr. Mayfield	1901

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Canada-U.S. Relations	
Mr. Harper	1902
Mr. Chrétien	1902
Mr. Harper	1902
Mr. Chrétien	1902
Mr. Harper	1902
Mr. Chrétien	1902
The environment	
Mr. Kenney	1902
Mr. Chrétien	1902
Mr. Kenney	1902
Mr. Chrétien	1903
Mr. Duceppe	1903
Mr. Chrétien	1903
Mr. Duceppe	1903
Mr. Chrétien	1903
Mr. Bigras	1903
Mr. Chrétien	1903
Mr. Bigras	1903
Mr. Chrétien	1903
Persons with Disabilities	
Mr. Proctor	1903
Mr. Manley	1903
Mr. Proctor	1903
Mr. Manley	1903
The Environment	
Mr. Clark	1904
Mr. Chrétien	1904

Mr. Clark	1904	Mr. Collenette	1908
Mr. Chrétien	1904	Ms. Meredith	1908
Canada Elections Act		Ms. Caplan	1908
Mr. Toews	1904	Organized Crime	
Mr. Boudria	1904	Mr. McTeague	1908
Mr. Toews	1904	Mr. Easter	1908
Mr. Boudria	1904	Ethics Counsellor	
Government Contracts		Mr. Epp	1908
Mr. Gauthier	1904	Mr. Chrétien	1908
Ms. Copps	1904	Mr. Epp	1908
Mr. Gauthier	1904	Mr. Chrétien	1908
Ms. Copps	1905	Ferries	
Canada Elections Act		Mr. Crête	1909
Mr. Williams	1905	Mr. Collenette	1909
Mr. Cauchon	1905	Softwood Lumber	
Mr. Williams	1905	Mr. Harb	1909
Mr. Cauchon	1905	Mr. Pettigrew	1909
Budget Surplus		Royal Canadian Mounted Police	
Ms. Picard	1905	Mr. Pankiw	1909
Mr. Manley	1905	Mr. Easter	1909
Ms. Picard	1905	Human Resources Development	
Mr. Manley	1905	Mr. Hearn	1909
Government Contracts		Mrs. Stewart	1909
Mr. Ritz	1905	Veterans Affairs	
Mr. Goodale	1905	Mrs. Hinton	1909
Mr. Ritz	1905	Mr. Pagtakhan	1909
Mr. Goodale	1906	Child Poverty	
Securities Industry		Ms. Bourgeois	1910
Mr. Cullen	1906	Mrs. Stewart	1910
Mr. Manley	1906	Persons with Disabilities	
The Environment		Ms. Lill	1910
Mr. Comartin	1906	Mr. Manley	1910
Mr. Anderson (Victoria)	1906	Mr. Clark	1910
Airline Industry		Mr. Manley	1910
Mrs. Desjarlais	1906	Presence in Gallery	
Mr. Collenette	1906	The Speaker	1910
Telemarketing			
Mr. Casey	1906		
Mr. Easter	1906		
Mr. Casey	1906		
Mr. Easter	1907		
Airline Industry			
Mr. Moore	1907		
Mr. Collenette	1907		
Mr. Moore	1907		
Mr. Manley	1907		
Softwood Lumber			
Mrs. Tremblay	1907		
Mrs. Stewart	1907		
Mrs. Tremblay	1907		
Mrs. Stewart	1908		
Canada-U.S. Security Measures			
Ms. Meredith	1908		
		GOVERNMENT ORDERS	
		Tax Conventions Implementation Act, 2002	
		Bill S-2. Motion for concurrence	1910
		The Speaker	1910
		(Motion agreed to)	1910
		Points of Order	
		Oral Question Period	
		Mr. Godin	1910
		Mr. Manley	1911
		Mr. Clark	1911
		Privilege	
		Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs, Northern Development and Natural Resources	
		Mr. Comartin	1912
		Mr. Boudria	1912

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Committees of the House

Scrutiny of Regulations

Mr. Grewal 1913
Motion for concurrence 1913
(Motion agreed to) 1913

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Kyoto Protocol

Motion 1913
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)..... 1913

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Committees of the House

Aboriginal Affairs, Northern Development and Natural Resources

Mr. Regan 1919

Motion 1919
(Motion agreed to) 1919

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Kyoto Protocol

Motion 1919
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)..... 1919

Points of Order

Kyoto Protocol Ratification Motion

Mr. Abbott 1923
Mr. Regan 1924

Kyoto Protocol

Motion 1925
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)..... 1925

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**1782711
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Communication Canada - Publishing
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :

Communication Canada - Édition
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S9

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:

Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique « Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire » à l'adresse suivante :

<http://www.parl.gc.ca>

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Additional copies may be obtained from Communication Canada - Canadian Government Publishing, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S9

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Communication Canada - Édition, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S9

**On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à : Communication Canada - Édition
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S9**