HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 148 • NUMBER 088 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, October 5, 2016

Speaker: The Honourable Geoff Regan

CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, October 5, 2016

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayer

● (1405)

[*Translation*]

The Speaker: It being Wednesday, we will now have the singing of the national anthem led by the hon. member for Edmonton Centre.

[*Members sang the national anthem*]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*Translation*]

SOFTWOOD LUMBER

Mrs. Marilène Gill (Manicouagan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Quebec regions have not forgotten the softwood lumber dispute. Families that lost jobs will never forget it, nor will business owners who had to close up shop. The Americans slapped billions of dollars in duties on those businesses because the federal government could not persuade them that our industry is entirely legitimate.

Ten years ago, Canada caved and signed an agreement that was bad for Quebec. Nothing has changed since. The Liberals, like the Conservatives, have done nothing to get the Quebec industry the recognition it deserves, so we will be under attack again as of next Wednesday, and Quebec families will once again pay the price. In Quebec's view, there is a simple solution: free trade.

All the government needs to do is enforce NAFTA.

* * *

REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. William Amos (Pontiac, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on October 3, a socio-economic forum was held in Maniwaki for the riding of Pontiac.

It has become clear that the development of our rural regions in the Outaouais depends largely on the prosperity of the cities of Ottawa and Gatineau, but the converse is also true. The national capital urban area benefits just as much from the economic development of the surrounding rural regions.

Rural folks in the Pontiac are proposing new mechanisms to ensure their prosperity, and they support the return of the rural secretariat, an institution that was abolished by the former Harper government. This secretariat would ensure that the concerns of rural areas are taken into account in each federal government department, including issues related to the socio-economic development of our small towns.

By taking this step, we could then come up with solutions adapted to their reality and better resolve issues like Internet access, the exodus of young people, tourism development, and the social isolation of seniors. I appreciate our government's efforts when it comes to our rural regions, and I hope we can continue in this direction.

* * *

[*English*]

CHILLIWACK BOWLS OF HOPE SOCIETY

Mr. Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to salute the Chilliwack Bowls of Hope Society. Since 2005, each school day the society has provided soup and other hot lunch items, along with milk and fruit, to school children in need, free of charge. Today, with the support of the Chilliwack Community Correctional Centre, they feed over 670 children in 18 schools within the Chilliwack school district. That is over 10,000 fresh meals served every month.

Last Friday I toured the Bowls of Hope kitchen and then went out for a meal delivery run to several local schools. I witnessed first hand the important work they do.

Whether it is The Local Harvest Market donating fresh produce, the Mertin Auto Group donating their vans, or service groups, like the Rotary Club of Chilliwack Fraser, raising funds, I thank all the community partners, the staff, and the many volunteers who work together to make sure that this program is such a success in helping to ensure that no child in Chilliwack goes hungry.

* * *

90TH BIRTHDAY WISHES

Mr. Peter Fonseca (Mississauga East—Cooksville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to congratulate Ignat Kaneff on his 90th birthday. Born in 1926 in Gorno Ablanovo, Bulgaria, Mr. Kaneff arrived in Canada in 1951 and transformed himself into a very successful philanthropist and builder.

Just recently, Mr. Kaneff achieved the Order of Ontario, the highest recognition in the province. Mr. Kaneff has been, and continues to be, a strong voice for the Bulgarian community. For the past 40 years, he has organized local charity events that have raised millions of dollars for Community Living Mississauga, an organization that supports individuals who have an intellectual disability.

Mr. Kaneff has been a strong community leader and a friend, and I want to take this time to wish him a very happy birthday. Here is hoping for many, many more.

* * *

[*Translation*]

KEVIN STEEN

Mr. Matthew Dubé (Beloeil—Chambly, NDP): Mr. Speaker, history was made on August 29, when Kevin Steen, better known as Kevin Owens, won the WWE Universal Championship. Congratulations to this wrestler from Marieville in my riding from me and my constituents.

Kevin is a wrestling legend among many from Quebec and Canada, including Pat Patterson, Maurice "Mad Dog" Vachon, Bret Hart, Chris Jericho, and of course, his coach, Jacques Rougeau. As Quebec wrestling historian Patric Laprade said so well, Owens' success is the result of perseverance and temerity.

[*English*]

It would be easy to make jokes comparing the spectacle of pro wrestling with the spectacle of politics. Let me just say that *Monday Night Raw* is now the Kevin Owens show, and my constituents and I could not be prouder that the best in the business comes from Marieville, in my riding. We wish him all the best as he continues to have a successful career.

Fight, Owens, fight.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FESTIVAL OF COLOURS IN RIGAUD

Mr. Peter Schiefke (Vaudreuil—Soulanges, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I would like to highlight the 2016 Festival of Colours in Rigaud, which will be held from October 8 to 10.

Every year, thanks to the hard work of Christiane Lévesque and her team, the City of Rigaud, and many volunteers, the festival becomes more popular, showcases the region's fall colours, and welcomes everyone to share the celebrations.

I invite the people of Vaudreuil—Soulanges to join me and my family in celebrating the patchwork of colours that autumn brings to our magnificent countryside. We will be attending the festival on October 8 to watch the entertainment, hike up Rigaud Mountain, savour regional foods, and talk to the people in our community.

Mayor Hans Gruenwald Jr. is right when he says that Rigaud is the place to be.

● (1410)

[*English*]

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, "a betrayal"; that is how Saskatchewan Premier Brad Wall has described the Prime Minister's disgraceful carbon tax ultimatum, issued at the very moment that Canada's premiers were already meeting to discuss climate change strategies.

While the provinces are working hard to co-operate and collaborate on strategies to fight climate change, the Prime Minister prefers to issue unilateral ultimatums in an area of clear provincial jurisdiction.

As we have already seen, the Liberals' continued hostility toward the energy industry has already cost thousands of jobs across the country.

In my own riding of Regina—Qu'Appelle, dozens of workers at EVRAZ Regina were laid off this August from their jobs manufacturing steel pipe for energy pipelines. Now thousands more jobs will be threatened across Saskatchewan and the country. Worse, the Prime Minister is promising that he will unilaterally impose a Saskatchewan-specific tax.

Make no mistake, the Prime Minister's Ottawa-knows-best scheme of proposing a massive carbon tax is a cold-hearted attack on working families.

I call on the member for Wascana to do the right thing. He should stand with his premier, with his province, and quit the Liberal caucus —

The Speaker: The hon. member for Brampton South.

* * *

HOMELESSNESS AND MENTAL HEALTH

Ms. Sonia Sidhu (Brampton South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this coming Monday, when we are back in our ridings, will mark World Homeless Day. As members may know, October 10 is also World Mental Health Day.

The link between these two days is, sadly, well-established in the challenging, invisible experience of men and woman who are in and out of shelters, who live on the streets, and who live in their cars.

To better understand the experiences of those facing these challenges, I hope we will all work together to support measures to ensure adequate housing for all and a better understanding of mental health.

I applaud the work of the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, the Minister of Health, and the Minister of Veterans Affairs on these issues. However, we all know that we can, we must, and we will do more.

I will be going back to Brampton South to work on this issue with partners at all levels. I hope all members will do the same for those who are invisible in our society.

TORONTO BLUE JAYS

Mr. Chris Bittle (St. Catharines, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, almost 23 years ago, we held our breath as a nation. It was the bottom of the ninth as Joe Carter stepped up to the plate. The late Tom Cheek captured this historic moment perfectly when he remarked, "Touch 'em all, Joe".

Though last night was not the World Series, it was do or die for the Blue Jays: win and continue to the post-season, or lose and hit the golf course.

Last night I joined with friends and colleagues from all parties, united in our support for the Blue Jays. With a Canadian, Russell Martin, behind the plate calling the game, the pitching staff delivered and forced the game into extra innings.

Once again we held our breath with each pitch.

Edwin Encarnacion stepped up to the plate in the 10th inning. Though he did not get a bat flip, in the 11th inning we saw him take the parrot for a walk, adding to one of the greatest moments in this franchise's 40-year history.

I think I can speak for everyone in this House when I congratulate the Blue Jays, who are now headed to renew their fierce rivalry with Texas. An entire nation is behind them.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Hon. Michelle Rempel (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, corporate advocacy, when done right, is a great thing. It raises attention on issues, it spurs philanthropy, and it makes people's lives better.

Then there are times when it goes wrong.

Instead of tweeting support for environmental action or something issues-based, Telus issued a partisan tweet to the Prime Minister and the environment minister supporting their tax announcement.

The reality is that Telus likely is not going to be the one to pay for the increased cost to operate its business. Its customers likely are, by paying more for its products and services, and Telus's employees will effectively experience a pay cut when this tax on everything hits them.

Many Telus customers who are out of work in Alberta may have a harder time trying to make payments for Telus services. All of these folks will find this very rich, coming from a company that routinely lobbies the federal government for interventions in sustaining regulations that support its bottom line.

To Telus management, the inconvenient truth is that for your customers, your employees, my constituents, and all Canadians, for all of them, you have made the future a lot less friendly by blindly supporting this tax.

* * *

● (1415)

TORONTO BLUE JAYS

Mr. Michael Levitt (York Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last night was our moment.

162 games and here we did lie. A one game playoff versus Baltimore, the ultimate do or die.

50,000 fans at the Rogers Centre cheering on the team. Each one of them believing in this post-season dream.

Back and forth we went in this epic game. Jays fans across the country being driven insane.

At first we had a lead and then sadly no more. All tied at 2-2 as the crowd continued to roar.

And then opportunity raised its head in the 11th inning. Men on first and third, a real shot at winning.

Edwin our hero strode proudly to the plate. The swagger of a man who, with destiny, had a date.

One crack of the bat and we all knew it was done. Not just a hit but a monster home run.

It's Our Moment we're heading to Texas we all did scream. Good luck to the Blue Jays, Canada's baseball team.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ANNA LABERGE

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan (Châteauguay—Lacolle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this being Women's History Month, I want to pay tribute to a remarkable woman from the Châteauguay region, the late Anna Laberge.

Born in 1882 in Beauharnois, Anna began her career as a teacher. She then went on to serve her local communities by becoming a midwife. She moved to Châteauguay in 1930, where she continued her career in health as a laboratory technician, despite suffering from tuberculosis.

Anna was described as an independent spirit. She was a nature lover and had a penchant for teaching. She dabbled in archeology and genealogy and funded charity missions, even when it meant doing without herself.

Anna Laberge lived an inspiring life until her death at age 98. Châteauguay is proud to name its hospital after her to honour her memory.

* * *

[*English*]

INTERNATIONAL DAY OF THE GIRL

Mrs. Karen Vecchio (Elgin—Middlesex—London, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize International Day of the Girl, which will be coming up on October 11. This year's theme is "Girls' Progress = Goals Progress" and will focus on a call to join global efforts to end discrimination against girls.

As a member of the status of women committee and as the critic for families, children, and social development, I recognize the struggles that girls face in Canada and all over the world. The strength and determination of girls to break through boundaries and to succeed, even when the odds are stacked against them, is an inspiration to us all.

As a mother of two girls of my own, I have seen first hand the potential that every girl has and the need to support them through equal opportunities and empowerment.

In 2011, the current Leader of the Opposition led the international campaign to create the International Day of the Girl, and as Conservatives we hope to continue her amazing work on this file. Join me in celebrating the International Day of the Girl.

* * *

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Ms. Pam Damoff (Oakville North—Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome the Moose Hide Campaign to Ottawa. Its members are holding their national gathering here to raise awareness about the role men can play in ending violence against indigenous women and children.

Our Standing Committee on the Status of Women is currently studying violence against young women and girls, and has heard how critical it is that we engage men and boys in our strategy to end gender-based violence.

In my riding of Oakville North—Burlington, SAVIS of Halton founded the Male Ally Network, or M.A.N. project, a network of men who are committed to ending violence against women and children. Owen Millar, a young hockey player from my riding, encouraged his team members to wear purple jerseys for a month to show their support for Halton Women's Place.

Along with groups like the Moose Hide Campaign, this is exactly the kind of leadership we need from men and boys.

* * *

● (1420)

INTERNATIONAL DAY OF THE GIRL

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Mr. Speaker, October 11 is International Day of the Girl. It is a day to reflect on our shared commitment to ensuring a world free of discrimination for young women and girls. It is also an opportunity to celebrate the young leaders who are actively shaping our communities.

Today, we are fortunate to have one of these incredible young people here on Parliament Hill. Jada Malott is a grade 7 student from St. John Vianney Catholic Elementary School in Windsor. A passionate activist and public speaker, she has led a letter-writing campaign urging the Prime Minister not to ratify the TPP. I am so inspired by young leaders like Jada who are engaged in our democracy and who encourage their peers to be active citizens.

As one of 88 women elected to Parliament, I think about what it will take to achieve gender equity in this place. I am convinced that we must do more to encourage young women and girls to run for public office and to overcome any barriers preventing them from following their dreams. It is my strong prediction that Jada will one day hold a seat in the House and will fight for all Canadians with the passion she is fighting the TPP.

REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have quietly introduced a bill that lays the groundwork for them to expand the size of their tax-and-spend government. Bill C-24 is asking us to approve the future employment of three mystery cabinet ministers, but worse yet, Bill C-24 would eliminate all regional development ministers. It reminds Canadians that under the Liberal government, they no longer have any economic development ministers to represent and fight for their regions' interests.

No, no, the Prime Minister is leaving all regional development in the hands of—wait for it—the innovation minister from the outskirts of Toronto. Now we have the minister for Atlantic Canada from Mississauga, the minister for Quebec development from Mississauga, and the minister for western development from Mississauga.

Canadians deserve transparency and accountability from the government. Bill C-24 would achieve neither of these things.

* * *

WORLD TEACHERS' DAY

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (London North Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise and mark World Teachers' Day. This day of recognition is an initiative put forward by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, or UNESCO, and is held annually on October 5. The purpose of this day is appreciating, assessing, and improving the educators of the world.

[*Translation*]

This year's theme, “Valuing teachers, improving their status”, compels us to examine and resolve the problems that directly affect teachers, the people to whom we entrust our children's education. That really is something we need to think about because, all too often, the people who have dedicated themselves to this profession in Canada do not get the same level of respect as their counterparts elsewhere in the world.

[*English*]

Thank goodness for French teachers.

To the teachers in my community of London North Centre, I thank them for all that they do. I also commend the more than 40 members of the Liberal caucus who are teachers. We are a team committed to education and educators.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[*Translation*]

TAXATION

Hon. Denis Lebel (Lac-Saint-Jean, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are pessimistic about the Prime Minister's announcement. He tried to sugar-coat it by renaming his new tax, but everyone knows it is a carbon tax. This is pretty bad news for taxpayers, who are already paying enough.

Will the Prime Minister promise Canadians that the cost of groceries, gas, and heating will not go up because of his new carbon tax? Can he give them that guarantee today?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians know that we need to grow the economy and create good jobs while protecting the environment. That is exactly what we have been working on since coming to power.

I want to make it clear to the hon. member that our approach is neutral. It will be up to the provinces to decide how to redistribute that money to the people.

Hon. Denis Lebel (Lac-Saint-Jean, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday on CBC, we heard about how the price of gas and heating oil will go up 11¢ a litre and 14¢ a litre, respectively. The government cannot make any promises about prices not going up.

[*English*]

A tax on carbon means more money taken out of the pockets of Canadians. The Prime Minister is trying to sugar-coat the reality by saying it is "carbon pricing", but Canadians are not fooled. This is a new tax.

This is bad news for Canadians. They already pay their share of taxes. Will the Prime Minister guarantee Canadians today that the price of their groceries, gas, or heating will not go up because of this new tax?

● (1425)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians need economic growth and good jobs at the same time as we protect the environment. That is exactly what this government is showing leadership in doing, which was lacking for far too long from the previous government.

What we are also guaranteeing is that this tax—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau: This price on carbon will be—

The Speaker: Order, please. I know members are anxious to applaud the Prime Minister, but they should wait until he finishes his response.

The Right Hon. Prime Minister has the floor.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, we have guaranteed that this price on carbon will be revenue neutral for the federal government, and it will be up to the provinces to determine how they choose to reimburse their citizens for this progress on the environment and the economy.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Denis Lebel (Lac-Saint-Jean, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we support the Paris agreement. In fact, we agree that it is a tax, but we do not believe it should be imposed on Canadians.

The very idea of imposing a tax is very Liberal. The Liberals want more money so they can make the government even bigger, and then prove how good they are by giving Canadians their money back.

Why not just leave that money in their pockets in the first place?

Will the Prime Minister guarantee to the House today that the cost of living will not go up as a result of his new carbon tax?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians know that we are going to create economic growth by creating new jobs in many sectors across the country.

We are going to give the provinces the capacity to help those who need it. The federal government helped those in need by lowering taxes for the middle class, while increasing taxes on the wealthiest 1% of Canadians.

That is the kind of thing Canadians expect of their government. It is unfortunate that, once again, the members of the Conservative Party do not understand how to either grow the economy or protect the environment.

[*English*]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister accidentally told the truth, that this is a tax. He should listen to the director general of the Windsor mission, who said, "People have actually come in with their hydro bill in one hand and said 'If you can help me with food, then I can pay for some of this hydro bill before it gets cut off.'"

The Liberal Green Energy Act has hammered Ontario's poor with skyrocketing electricity prices. Now the federal Liberal carbon tax will do the same to heating, gas, and grocery bills. Why is the Prime Minister forcing the poor to choose between heating their homes and feeding their families?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I find that a bit much coming from the party that voted against the lowering of taxes on the middle class by raising them on the wealthiest 1%, a party that continues to think it is better to send child benefit cheques to millionaires than to increase those cheques for the lowest income families.

The fact is this government is focused on helping the middle class and on those working so hard to join the middle class, and we will remain so, despite the fearmongering from the other side.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what Kathleen Wynne said about the Liberal Green Energy Act.

Yet while the poor have hit the food bank, Liberals insiders have hit the jackpot, including former Liberal Party president, Mike Crawley, whose company got a half-billion-dollar green energy contract. The federal Liberals have a similar, regressive tax that will raise heat, gas, and grocery bills and give billionaire insiders green handouts to pay for it.

Why is the Prime Minister taking from the have-nots to give to the have-yachts?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Again, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite are demonstrating how completely disconnected they are from the reality of Canadians.

Canadians know that the way to build a strong economy and good jobs for the middle class, and those working hard to join it, is by being smart about the environment and by protecting it. The fact is, making sure that we are able to help the most vulnerable, to grow the economy, and to support Canadian families is at the heart of everything this government does and is at the heart of everything that party betrayed when it was in government.

* * *

● (1430)

[*Translation*]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Outremont, NDP): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Prime Minister could not deny having broken his promise to present new targets, opting instead to adopt Stephen Harper's targets, which he once described as catastrophic.

Today we are voting to ratify the Paris agreement, but the government's motion is missing a key requirement of the agreement, which is to set economy-wide emissions targets in absolute terms.

Will the Prime Minister agree to add this key component?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the NDP always likes to talk about targets and goals without ever talking about plans to achieve them or tangible things we need to do in order to protect the environment while creating economic growth.

The NDP likes to talk about the environment, but it does not know how to create jobs for the middle class or help businesses succeed in a new world. That is why we are doing something tangible to show that Canada is serious about reducing emissions and creating economic growth that helps everyone. The members opposite are unable to do that.

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Outremont, NDP): Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more tangible than targets and goals and that is exactly what is required by the Paris agreement and what is missing from the Liberals' motion.

[*English*]

The government motion to ratify the Paris agreement does not mention anything about working with or consulting with indigenous communities. If it is a mistake, let us fix it together.

Will the Prime Minister accept our amendment to include working with indigenous communities in our efforts to fight climate change?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, from the very beginning of this government's mandate, we have been working hand-in-hand with indigenous communities, understanding the true reconciliation, the nation-to-nation partnership that is necessary with indigenous peoples.

Indeed, when we gathered for the first federal-provincial-territorial meeting in Ottawa, we included indigenous leaders. We did the same again in Vancouver.

We will work together with indigenous leadership on all important files, especially around climate change.

HEALTH

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Outremont, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I guess that was a yes. The Liberal platform mentions working with provinces 35 times, and that approach was appealing to Canadians after a decade of the antagonistic Stephen Harper form of federalism, but without even sitting down with the provinces, the Liberal government adopted Stephen Harper's cuts to health care transfers.

Before the election, whenever the Prime Minister was specifically asked about Harper's health care cuts, he said he would not make any changes without first talking to the provinces.

What happened to that promise?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Indeed, Mr. Speaker, as the member highlights, for 10 years Mr. Harper did not engage with his provincial leadership, did not work with the provinces, and indeed, the lack of leadership from the federal government on the important issue of health care was alarming for provinces and for Canadians.

That is why we are so pleased to have our Health minister work closely with her counterparts in the provinces to make sure that we have a health system that respects the Canada Health Act and responds to the needs of Canadians, now and in the future.

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Outremont, NDP): Mr. Speaker, he did not say it, but he does not have to imitate it.

[*Translation*]

The provinces and territories were surprised to learn that the Prime Minister refused to even respond to their request to meet and discuss the health transfers. They are now making a simple request: delay the Harper cuts by one year and retain the 6% increase for one more year.

Will the Prime Minister agree, yes or no? The question is simple, and we want a straight answer for once.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, health ministers across the country will be meeting in a few weeks to discuss how we can improve and protect our health system everywhere in Canada. It is important that the ministers be able to do their job. We believe in government by cabinet, and I have great confidence in my Minister of Health.

[*English*]

TAXATION

Hon. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister falsely promised the Canadian middle class a family tax cut. Earlier this week, he dropped a bombshell on Canadians by imposing a massive carbon tax on them. This tax grab has not only completely wiped out the Prime Minister's so-called middle-class tax cut, it will seriously impact low- and middle-income Canadians through higher gas, heating, and electricity bills.

My question is for the Prime Minister. Why the attack on working Canadians, and why the betrayal of his promise to lower taxes for Canadian families?

● (1435)

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it was great to be negotiating the Paris agreement with the member opposite. I am very excited to see how he is going to vote on it today.

In an interview with CP yesterday, the Conservative environment critic lauded the B.C. Liberal government for using a price on carbon pollution to cut income taxes and other taxes. Then he said the problem is that other provinces are not committed to acting responsibly. I am delighted that he has endorsed the B.C. Liberal government's approach. Given that B.C., Alberta, Ontario, and Quebec already have a price on carbon pollution, could he let us know what province he does not trust?

Hon. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals do not trust any of the provinces or territories.

The Prime Minister has no idea how badly this carbon tax will impact hard-working Canadians. Northerners, farmers, the unemployed, and seniors on fixed incomes just cannot afford this, yet he still believes the only way to protect the environment is to increase taxes on these Canadians, the most vulnerable.

Does the Prime Minister not realize that misguided tax increases actually hurt Canadian families who struggle to pay their bills every single month?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to take this opportunity to repeat some of our commitments, as the hon. member kindly made an allusion to seniors' issues.

We have signalled in the past few months how important seniors' issues are to our government. For instance, we have increased the guaranteed income supplement by up to $950 dollars per year, which is going to take 13,000 seniors out of poverty. We have also cancelled the change in the age of eligibility for old age security, which will prevent 100,000 seniors from falling into poverty.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the worst thing for Canadians, our seniors, and all Canadian workers is the invention and introduction of a new tax. That is exactly what the Prime Minister announced last Monday in the House of Commons, even though he should have been working with the provinces and even though three environment ministers walked out of the meeting.

Can the Prime Minister rise and acknowledge that inventing and imposing a new tax is the worst thing for Canadians? Why is he taking money out of taxpayers' pockets?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government is determined to create a cleaner and more innovative economy, one that reduces emissions and protects our environment while creating well-paid jobs for the middle class and for those who work hard to join it.

After decades of inaction and years of wasted opportunities, we are finally taking the action needed to protect our planet for our children and grandchildren.

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, once again, those are fine words, but the reality is quite different. The government is taking the wrong path.

A new tax is the worst thing that can happen to our job creators, our SMEs, and others who know what it means to create real jobs, and yet that is precisely the wrong path that this government is taking.

Will the government acknowledge one thing? Imposing a tax is definitely not the way to go about creating jobs. Have you ever seen any jobs created because of a tax? We have not.

The Speaker: I think the hon. member knows that the Speaker does not answer questions during question period. I assume he was asking the minister that question.

The hon. Minister of Environment.

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, carbon pricing uses the market to drive clean investment decisions. It encourages innovation and helps reduce emissions.

As to the specifics of the member's question, we are listening to job creators, such as Loblaws, Canadian Tire, the big banks, Suncor, Enbridge, and Shell, who all support our decision to put a price on carbon.

[*English*]

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my friend Susan lives in Guelph, Ontario. She is a divorced mom. She has two kids, both in university, and she has noticed that hydro has gone up. She admits to me that she is a bit cash-strapped right now. She knows she has to get through the next four years while the girls are in university. She wants to keep the house, because they need it in order for them to go to school, but now she hears about some new taxes. She is concerned and does not understand why the government does not realize what her situation is, because if it did, it would never raise her taxes.

What does the minister have to say to my friend Susan?

● (1440)

Mr. François-Philippe Champagne (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we do care for Canadians. That is why the first thing this government did was reduce taxes for middle-class Canadians. Nine million Canadians today pay less taxes because of this government. We went on to introduce the Canada child benefit, which is helping Canadian families. We then went on to enhance the Canada pension plan, or CPP, which is going to help Canadians now and in the future.

This is a government that is working for middle-class families, and we will continue to do so.

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, another friend of mine, Marie, has three boys—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Hon. Lisa Raitt: Are you kidding me? You're laughing.

Mr. Speaker, my friend, Marie, has three boys. Her husband just went on disability. They have a hard time making ends meet. She is trying to deal with it as best she can, but the money is just not there. Now she hears about more taxes.

The reality is that the van has to be filled up to take the boys to hockey, so which one of the boys does not get to play hockey next year is the question. She does not understand why the government does not realize she has a tough situation, because if it did, it would not raise her taxes.

What comfort does the government have to give her?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for her passion, which enables me to give specific details on the Canada child benefit. This is the most significant social policy innovation in a generation. It is going to take the families of 500,000 people in Canada, 300,000 of them children, out of poverty. It will lead to the largest reduction in child poverty ever in our history, which will lead to the lowest level of child poverty ever known in our nation.

* * *

[*Translation*]

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Mr. Romeo Saganash (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, NDP): Mr. Speaker, at the time, the Minister of Justice was on the same side as the Assembly of First Nations in the fight to put an end to systemic discrimination against first nations children.

One has to wonder what happened between October 19 and 20, 2015, because the minister is now unrecognizable. I am giving her another chance to do something other than adopt the old, woefully unacceptable plan presented by Stephen Harper.

Can the minister tell us whether her government intends to fulfill its legal obligation to first nations children?

Hon. Carolyn Bennett (Minister of Indigenous and Northern Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada is committed to reviewing the services offered to children and families on reserves and working with first nations to reform those services.

We know that the system is broken, as illustrated by the damning report issued by the British Columbia Representative for Children and Youth. We must take into account the comments of young people when transforming the system and incorporate their experiences into any new approach.

[*English*]

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, according to Cindy Blackstock, the Liberal government short-changes first nations students by $130 million this year in foster care under Harper's plan.

On education, the Prime Minister promised $2.6 billion over four years to first nations students. An INAC document showed the minister was given the plan to follow through on this promise, but the Liberals once again decided to pull the football out from under first nations children. They stretched that promise past the next election, shortchanging children by $800 million.

When it comes to priorities, why squeeze money from children suffering under this broken system?

Hon. Carolyn Bennett (Minister of Indigenous and Northern Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member will recognize that the document was dated the day after we were sworn in.

First nations deserve the best start in life, and this begins with properly funding education. That is why budget 2016 provided $3.7 billion over five years for kindergarten to grade 12 first nations, which includes providing $824.1 million to implement first nations-led transformation in education and 118 school-related infrastructure programs.

We will work nation to nation to ensure the goals set by first nations are achieved and first nations-led initiatives are supported.

● (1445)

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government seems to have forgotten the reality for remote, indigenous, and rural communities. Their food comes in by boat, by plane, and by ice road, and many of the communities use diesel-powered generators to keep the lights on. Communities that can least afford it are the ones that are going to be most impacted by this carbon tax.

How can the government justify raising the high cost of living that is already there for our rural and remote communities?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased with the work that our government has done with indigenous people, with northern peoples. On Monday, I had the opportunity to hear representatives from the Inuit organization as well as other indigenous and Métis organizations.

We are committed to working with our northern peoples, with indigenous peoples, because they are the most impacted by climate change. That is why we are very excited today that we are actually taking action. I expect that the party opposite, which is so concerned about the plight of indigenous and northern people, will support the Paris agreement in tonight's vote.

Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals talk about improving the lives of indigenous Canadians, but their actions are telling a very different story. They do not realize that food costs are already double in the north. A loaf of bread and a litre of milk cost double what we pay down here. This new tax is going to find its way into everything they buy every day.

I have a more simple question. Have the Liberals done their homework, and will they table the costs that this will create for every indigenous community in this country?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have heard very poignantly about the high cost of living in the north.

Just this week we heard from indigenous leaders, from Inuit leaders, who talked about how we need to tackle climate change, how we need to take action to protect their future, and how we need to be mindful of the circumstances in the north. Our government has made the commitment.

If the party members opposite would like to read the Vancouver declaration, which we are supporting in tonight's vote, they would see it is very clear that we recognize the conditions of indigenous people and northern people. Once again, I hope they will support tonight's motion and vote in favour of the Paris agreement and the Vancouver declaration.

Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, industries like Entropex in my riding are closing, and others like CF Industries are already cancelling their expansions as a result of the Ontario Liberal carbon tax. Nova Chemicals is considering moving a $2 billion polyethylene project to the gulf coast where there are no job-killing carbon taxes. This additional federal carbon tax and the uncertainty around it will keep new businesses from choosing to do business here.

When will the Liberals stop taking jobs away from everyday Canadians?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member opposite for her passion in supporting business. If she really wants to support business, she should understand that the environment and the economy come together, and that is what we are doing.

Let us go back to job creators—job creators like the Royal Bank, Tembec, Loblaws, Desjardins, Telus, the Aluminum Association of Canada, as well as other businesses. They have supported our plan to put a price on pollution because they recognize that is how we are going to create good jobs, how we are going to foster innovation, and how we are going to create the economy of the future.

Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, jobs in my riding are being put at risk by the Liberal carbon tax. More than a third of families in my riding depend on jobs in the energy industry to put food on their table.

What does the Prime Minister have to say to hard-working mums and dads who are seeing their neighbours' jobs eliminated and thinking they are next?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, I would like to emphasize that our government understands that the only way to grow the economy is to do it in a sustainable way.

That is why we are moving forward on what Canadians expect, a climate plan, while at the same time positioning ourselves so that we grow our economy, create clean jobs, and prepare ourselves for the future.

Once again, do not listen to me; listen to the—

Some hon. member: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Members know that they should listen and not make noise when someone is speaking, even if they say that. Order.

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Mr. Speaker, how about the parties opposite listen to the job creators they care so much about?

Job creators are calling on Canada to put a price on carbon emissions, as most of the world's biggest economies are doing. It is the most economically effective way to reduce emissions and stimulate clean innovation, and will be critical to Canada's success in a changing global economy.

● (1450)

[*Translation*]

SOFTWOOD LUMBER

Ms. Karine Trudel (Jonquière, NDP): Mr. Speaker, there are only seven days left before the deadline and there is still no softwood lumber agreement in sight. Yesterday, the Minister of International Trade was unable to tell us whether the government was working on a plan B to support the forestry industry.

Forestry workers, whose jobs are in jeopardy, are wondering whether the government will support them.

In the event of a dispute will the government support the industry, for example, by establishing an emergency loan guarantee program? Yes or no?

Mr. David Lametti (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for her question.

All options will be considered. For months, there has been unprecedented co-operation with producers, industry workers, and the provinces and territories. We will continue to work closely with them.

Even today, the minister is in Toronto meeting with her American counterpart, Michael Froman, and forestry industry representatives from across the country.

* * *

[*English*]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have travelled the country, and everywhere I go Canadians are speaking out against the TPP.

After having her letters repeatedly ignored, today, 12-year-old Jada Malott has travelled from Windsor to bring her message right to the Prime Minister. She represents the generation that will have to live with the consequences of ratifying this bad deal: lost jobs, higher drug costs, and ISDS rules that will threaten our environmental laws.

Why does the Prime Minister refuse to listen to Canadians like Jada, who do not want to pay for this bad deal?

Mr. David Lametti (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I salute the hon. member's young friend for her implication in Canadian politics.

I would say, as regards the TPP, that we have heard, we are consulting, and we are still consulting as a government. We have heard a number of different opinions that vary from strong support to strong critique.

When we are in a position to move forward on that file, the government will ask the House to ratify anything or approve anything that we do. However, for the time being, we have not yet made a decision on that.

[*Translation*]

HEALTH

Ms. Julie Dabrusin (Toronto—Danforth, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this summer I spent a lot of time talking to my constituents at farmers' markets and community activities all over my riding.

One of the concerns they raised most often was about how junk foods and sugary drinks are marketed to children. I believe Quebec already has a law to address this health issue.

Can the Minister of Health tell the House what her department is doing to stop this practice?

Hon. Jane Philpott (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Toronto—Danforth for her question.

Our government is committed to helping families make better food choices. We will introduce new restrictions on the commercial marketing of unhealthy food and beverages to children. That is in addition to our commitment to improve labelling and bring in legislation to eliminate trans fats and reduce salt in processed foods.

* * *

[*English*]

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Hon. Michelle Rempel (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the United Nations is not referring Yazidi refugees to Canada, but the government is blindly relying on it to provide names for its refugee initiative. At last count, only a few dozen Yazidis have come to Canada.

Moreover, Operation Ezra has many Yazidi families identified and waiting to come to Canada, and the minister keeps promising them in phone calls that they will processed, but none have been.

It is our moral duty to help the Yazidi victims of genocide. Why is the government ignoring it?

Hon. John McCallum (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am certainly proud of what our government has achieved in admitting more than 30,000 Syrian refugees in the space of less than a year.

In terms of the Yazidis, my department will be conducting a mission to northern Iraq, where officials will interview potential Syrian refugees, and they will scope out the situation involving the Yazidis. We are on that job, and we certainly take it very seriously.

● (1455)

Hon. Michelle Rempel (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, out of those 30,000 refugees, nine cases were Yazidis, and that is unacceptable.

Nadia Murad came to Canada to beg our government for help. She has called for help for Yazidis who are also being discriminated against by UN agents in refugee camps in Greece and Turkey.

My question is for the Prime Minister. When he asked Nadia Murad for a photo opportunity in New York last week, what was it like to look into her eyes, see that haunted look, and tell her why he was not helping the Yazidi people?

Hon. John McCallum (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we do not know how many Yazidi refugees have come to Canada, because when refugees come to Canada, we do not ask them their ethnicity or their religion. We do not discriminate by religion or ethnicity.

What I do know is that we have admitted more than 30,000 Syrian refugees and we are taking concrete steps to pursue options in terms of the Yazidi refugees.

* * *

[*Translation*]

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. Alupa Clarke (Beauport—Limoilou, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday evening I had a visit from Claude Lalancette, a veteran who fought bravely for us overseas. He was in tears, and he is clearly in a very serious situation.

He has been on a hunger strike for two days and has slept outside for two nights. The first was at the National War Memorial here in Ottawa, and the second was in front of Parliament itself. This situation concerns all members of the House.

What is the Prime Minister going to do for Mr. Lalancette right now?

[*English*]

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs and Associate Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we take the health of members of the Canadian Forces and veterans very seriously. This is at the top of our list.

I cannot comment on specific cases. The member will understand that is the case. However, we do have a range of programs that are in place, and I would encourage any soldiers who feel they need that program or support from Veteran Affairs to reach out.

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, veteran Claude Lalancette restarted his hunger strike on the steps of Parliament Hill. This veteran has served our country proudly and has had to resort to repeated hunger strikes to get help.

After his first hunger strike, the Liberals promised him a committee of veterans, civilians, and experts; then only days later, they reneged on that promise.

In his own words he feels misused and misled, stating “They only used me for a photo op”.

Is the Prime Minister aware that three of his ministers made a promise to Mr. Lalancette that they had no intention of keeping?

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs and Associate Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, those ministers met with Mr. Lalancette in good faith, and they offered him the opportunity to testify before committee as a witness. That is what he has been offered and he agreed to that.

Now there are issues that require extra work and extra diligence, and the department is involved—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order. Members know the Standing Orders require that we not interrupt other members when they are speaking.

The hon. parliamentary secretary has the floor.

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: Mr. Speaker, the ministers offered him an opportunity to testify before committee. That has been negotiated with the committee involved, and it will happen in the near future.

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals promised to end Harper's legal battles that discriminated against first nations. It has been seven years since the Supreme Court granted five Nuu-chah-nulth first nations the right to catch and sell fish.

However, lawyers for the Minister of Justice continue to argue that these aboriginal rights should be restricted and minimized.

Now the hereditary chiefs have taken unprecedented action, dismissed government officials, and told the Prime Minister he is no longer welcome on their lands. Will the Liberals finally act and honour their promise to negotiate fairly?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Serge Cormier (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have been seeking a renewed relationship with first nations since day one. The minister is aware of this matter. We recently met with first nations representatives to discuss it. We are determined to remain engaged with first nations.

* * *

[*English*]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Ms. Niki Ashton (Churchill—Keewatinook Aski, NDP): Mr. Speaker, another promise made, another promise broken. Over 3,000 mothers were denied sickness benefits under the Harper government, but during the election campaign, the Liberals promised they would drop all federal opposition to their class action lawsuit. These women have waited and waited and waited, and had nothing from the government.

Instead of spending millions fighting them in court, when will the government give these women the benefits they deserve?

● (1500)

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the member for giving me the opportunity to say how concerned all members of the House are by the difficult circumstances some of our families find themselves in. I will have an important announcement to make on that matter soon. I just want to repeat that in the campaign, our government promised that it would be looking into EI special benefits, including maternity, parental, and compassionate care benefits.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Mr. Speaker, brutal incarceration, torture, and executions are among the regular practices of the Chinese government. China now has its eyes on the UN's top peacekeeping job. It wants to take control of UN peacekeeping and rewrite the rules of the game.

Will the Prime Minister be supporting his favourite dictatorship's bid to take control of UN peacekeeping and, ultimately, command of Canadian troops?

Hon. Stéphane Dion (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in fact, it is because we are re-engaging with China that we have an opportunity to make progress on human rights in China. Every human being has the same dignity and we need to be there to speak about universal human rights in China. The Prime Minister never misses an opportunity to do that, and neither do I, because it is the only approach to make progress.

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's hand-picked ambassador to the UN has made no secret that he is willing to play politics to gain a UN Security Council seat. The centrepiece to this horse-trading, of course, is our 600 Canadian troops. China wants to take control of all UN peacekeepers. China's abysmal human rights record and its sabre-rattling in the South China Sea show that it is no partner for peace.

Is a Security Council seat worth putting our troops under the command of the Chinese dictatorship?

Hon. Stéphane Dion (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleague has that completely wrong, because the seat on the Security Council is a tool for our goal, and the goal is to have Canada fighting for inclusive growth everywhere, peace everywhere, and human rights everywhere. The seat on the UN Security Council is a tool for this goal, and it is great for Canada to have such a goal under the leadership of the Prime Minister.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that response is troubling and unbelievable. It is hard to imagine that China, a nation that bullies everyone around it, might wind up in charge of UN peacekeepers, forces meant to maintain peace around the world.

If China's efforts to win that coveted position are successful, all peacekeeping and civilian protection operations will be left up to the country with the worst human rights record. It is absurd.

Do the Liberals support China's bid?

Hon. Stéphane Dion (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada's goal is to ensure that peacekeeping operations are carried out in a manner that protects civilians, which is why we want to be involved. For too long, Canada remained on the sidelines.

If we want those operations to better protect people and promote peace, Canada must be there on its own terms and conditions. That is what we will do, along with the minister responsible for the Canadian Armed Forces.

We are committed to ensuring that our troops are only deployed under conditions that correspond to our values and convictions.

[*English*]

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Mr. Ken McDonald (Avalon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, recognizing Canada's past contributions to peace and the dedication of the men and women who gave their lives to serve our country is a critical part of our heritage. Can the Minister of Canadian Heritage please give the House details on the recently announced funding for a project honouring those who bravely fought in the Battle of Beaumont-Hamel?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this year we are commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Beaumont-Hamel in France. Our government is committed to honouring the soldiers of the Royal Newfoundland Regiment who were killed in this brutal battle in the First World War. For this reason, we are investing $1 million in The Rooms, a beautiful museum in St. John's. Through online and on-site exhibitions, we will have the opportunity to learn more about the valour and the courage displayed by the young men of Newfoundland and Labrador in this—

● (1505)

The Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for York—Simcoe.

* * *

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Hon. Peter Van Loan (York—Simcoe, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after a year in office words are no longer enough. Canadians are judging the current government on results, or their absence. Of the over 40,000 Canadians deployed to Afghanistan, 158 made the ultimate sacrifice, including three brave young men from my riding of York—Simcoe. We have a solemn obligation to remember them and their service to our country.

Last winter the veterans affairs minister denied he was cancelling plans for a memorial to those who served in the Afghanistan mission. He said, “rest assured it will be done.” It has been a year now. Where is the Afghanistan war memorial?

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs and Associate Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to let the members of the House know that just this morning at the veterans stakeholders' meeting, the stakeholders were briefed about the options available for an Afghanistan monument. The discussions are under way, and we will move forward as quickly as possible.

[*Translation*]

YOUTH

Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach (Salaberry—Suroît, NDP): Mr. Speaker, later today we will be voting on the ratification of the Paris agreement, and I cannot help but wonder about Liberal efforts to help our young people.

The Prime Minister promised 5,000 green jobs for young people, but fewer than a third that many have been created. The Liberals promised an EI premium holiday for employers that hire young people, but that measure was not even included in the budget. The youth unemployment rate is still too high.

My question is for the Minister of Youth, who also happens to be the Prime Minister. How does he plan to create green jobs and address youth unemployment?

[*English*]

Hon. MaryAnn Mihychuk (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for the question, because it gives me an opportunity to indicate that the number of green jobs under the Canada summer jobs program was well over 2,000, and counting as we do a survey. As well, by providing significant opportunities for young people to gain post-secondary education through our increased grants and our work with them to enhance co-ops and work placements, young people in Canada will finally have a chance to get into the workforce as we need them to.

* * *

STATUS OF WOMEN

Mrs. Salma Zahid (Scarborough Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, gender-based violence remains a tragic reality for many women and girls in Canada. Statistics show that women continue to be at high risk of being victims of certain forms of violence. Experiencing violence has significant health and social impacts on the abused and their families, and it remains a significant barrier to achieving gender equality.

Could the Minister of Status of Women please tell us what action the government is taking to address this issue?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Status of Women, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Scarborough Centre for her question and advocacy. Undeniably, the foundation of gender equality is the ability to live, grow, and thrive free from violence. That is why this government takes gender-based violence so seriously, and why developing a coordinated federal gender-based violence strategy is so important.

Over the summer, I met with colleagues, advocates, and survivors like Paul Lacerte and his daughter Raven, who are the founders of the Moose Hide Campaign, who generously shared their ideas and experiences. We cannot rest until all women and girls have the ability to succeed and thrive.

* * *

LABOUR

Mr. Bev Shipley (Lambton—Kent—Middlesex, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Arva Flour Mill is a small family business without a workplace accident in 197 years. The minister said she was working with the community and the owner. There has been no contact with the owner or the community. The minister said small business has the right to compete and do well. However, it cannot compete and do well if she shuts it down. Will the minister do her job, grant an exemption from the federal labour code, and save the mill?

Hon. MaryAnn Mihychuk (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the goal of the labour department is to ensure that Canadians have a safe workplace and can all come home safe and sound. The goal was to ensure that all workplaces are safe. The Arva Flour Mill was inspected by a labour department inspector and found to be deficient in a number of areas. The owners of the mill are working with inspectors and others to rectify the situation.

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Hon. Hunter Tootoo (Nunavut, Ind.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Indigenous and Northern Affairs.

The government has kept its promise and launched a much needed and long overdue national inquiry into missing and murdered indigenous women. The minister has appointed a commission to lead this inquiry, and although all of its members are extremely qualified, Inuit organizations have said they are concerned by the lack of Inuk representation.

The minister has committed to including the Inuit perspective. Could she explain exactly how the Inuit perspective is going to be considered?

● (1510)

Hon. Carolyn Bennett (Minister of Indigenous and Northern Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for the question and his advocacy on this.

We have every confidence that the independent commissioners have the background, characteristics, and experience necessary to lead this inquiry and to incorporate the distinct voices of Inuit people. One of the commissioners was raised in Igloolik, speaks fluent Inuktitut, and will bring an important perspective to this commission.

The commission has the power to create regional advisory committees to support cultural differences and distinctions-based approaches, including an Inuit advisory committee.

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members the presence in the gallery of Leonard "Red" Kelly.

Mr. Kelly is the winner of eight Stanley Cups, was elected to the Hockey Hall of Fame, and was member of Parliament from 1962 to 1965 for the riding of York West while playing for the Toronto Maple Leafs.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: I would also like to draw to the attention of hon. members the presence in the gallery of Mr. Andrew Percy, Minister for Local Growth and the Northern Powerhouse of the United Kingdom.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PAY EQUITY

Hon. MaryAnn Mihychuk (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 109, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to the Special Committee on Pay Equity's report entitled "It's Time to Act".

* * *

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

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

* * *

[*Translation*]

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

Hon. Denis Paradis (Brome—Missisquoi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1), I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the report of the delegation of the Canada-France Interparliamentary Association respecting its participation in a mission to France, from July 11 to 14, 2016.

* * *

[*English*]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Hon. Kevin Sorenson (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the following report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, the 15th report, entitled "Report 2: Detecting and Preventing Fraud in the Citizenship Program" of the spring 2016 reports of the Auditor General of Canada.

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

[*Translation*]

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj (Etobicoke Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the sixth report of the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration entitled "Distress Call: How Canada's Immigration Program Can Respond to Reach the Displaced and Most Vulnerable".

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

● (1515)

[*English*]

Hon. Michelle Rempel (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative members of the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration are deeply ashamed of this toothless report that seeks to absolve the government of its responsibility to help victims of genocide, and as such, we offer supplementary recommendations to this report and implore the immigration minister to take action.

* * *

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL STRATEGY ON ADVERTISING TO CHILDREN ACT

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-313, An Act concerning the development of a national strategy respecting advertising to children and amending the Broadcasting Act (regulations).

He said: Mr. Speaker, many other countries have banned advertising that targets children, but in Canada, Quebec is the only province that, in 1981, passed legislation banning advertising to children and the results have been good. That is the purpose of my bill.

[*English*]

The average Canadian child is exposed to over 20,000 ads a year, and 90% of the food that is marketed to children and youth is unhealthy. Our children are our future. That is why I have developed the bill, working with the Centre for Health Science and Law. The bill is ready to go. The government should just support it because we have done the work for the government.

I hope all members will support this important action to protect our children.

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

Hon. Thomas Mulcair: Mr. Speaker, in a moment I will be seeking unanimous consent for an important motion based on the e-petition sponsored by the hon. member for Pierrefonds—Dollard that asks that we, the House of Commons, condemn all forms of Islamophobia.

[*Translation*]

It is a non-partisan petition signed by more than 66,000 Canadians.

[*English*]

Following discussions, with all parties in the House, I believe you would find consent, Mr. Speaker, for the following motion that the House join the more than 66,000 Canadian supporters of House of Commons petition e-411 in condemning all forms of Islamophobia.

[*Translation*]

The Speaker: Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the House to move the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

* * *

[*English*]

PETITIONS

JUSTICE

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am presenting 10 more petitions today in support of Cassie and Molly's law. A Statistics Canada study shows that over 60,000 pregnant women were victims of domestic violence in Canada between 2004 and 2009. The Native Women's Association of Canada is fully endorsing Bill C-225, protecting pregnant women and their preborn children, indicating that at least 18 of the missing and murdered aboriginal women and girls were pregnant.

Canadians know a national strategy combatting violence against women will need this law included to be truly comprehensive in addressing violence against women.

IRAN

Mr. Dave Van Kesteren (Chatham-Kent—Leamington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I too have a couple of petitions.

The first petition calls on the Government of Canada to maintain the listing of the Islamic Republic of Iran as a state sponsor of terrorism, pursuant to section 6.1 of the State Immunity Act, for as long as the Iranian regime continues to sponsor terrorism.

● (1520)

JUSTICE

Mr. Dave Van Kesteren (Chatham-Kent—Leamington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the second petition calls upon the House of Commons to pass legislation that would recognize preborn children as separate victims when they are injured or killed during the commission of an offence against their mothers, allowing two charges to be laid against the offender instead of just one.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition to end violence against women, signed by many residents of Vancouver Kingsway. They point out that 60% of women with disabilities in Canada are likely to experience some form of violence in their lifetimes, that indigenous women in Canada are seven times more likely to be murdered than non-indigenous women, and that women were 11 times more likely than men to be the victims of sexual offences.

These people call on the Government of Canada to create a coordinated, comprehensive national action plan to address violence against women.

PALLIATIVE CARE

Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour of presenting two petitions, both dealing with the same subject matter.

The petitioners are saying that it is impossible for a person to give informed consent to assisted suicide or euthanasia if appropriate palliative care is unavailable to them. Therefore, the petitioners are calling on Parliament to establish a national strategy on palliative care.

TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present, on behalf of citizens of Nanaimo—Ladysmith, petitions indicating their opposition to the signing of the trans-Pacific partnership. They are concerned that it could cost tens of thousands of Canadian jobs, could lead to growing income inequality, increase the cost of pharmaceuticals, ease the path for foreign takeovers, potentially stifle innovation, and interfere with Canadian regulators' ability to regulate in the public interest.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition signed by Canadians from Coaldale, Alberta. The petitioners are concerned about the accessibility and impact of violence and degrading sexually explicit material online and its impact on public health, especially the well-being of men and women. As such, these petitioners are calling on the House of Commons to support my motion, Motion No. 47.

Mr. Arif Virani: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, with respect to petition e-411 and the effort by the member for Outremont, I find it incredible that anyone in the House would actually oppose a petition signed by—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: This is debate. The hon. member can raise that perhaps during debate, but not during the presentation of petitions.

The hon. member for Dufferin—Caledon.

ELECTORAL REFORM

Mr. David Tilson (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by quite a few residents from my riding of Dufferin—Caledon, who are concerned that no fundamental change as to how members of Parliament are elected should be made unilaterally by the very individuals potentially seeking election or re-election. They are asking the House of Commons to pass a motion affirming the need for a national referendum on any proposed change to Canada's current method of electing members of Parliament before that proposal is implemented into law.

[*Translation*]

STATUS OF WOMEN

Mr. François Choquette (Drummond, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition signed by dozens of people in the Drummond area, who are calling on the government to do more to advance pay equity.

The petitioners note that, given that pay equity has not been achieved in our society, the government should take action to close the income gap between men and women in Canada.

They are calling on the Government of Canada to pass pay equity legislation to close the wage gap between men and women and to reduce social inequality in the country.

[*English*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

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

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all notices of motions for the production of papers also be allowed to stand at this time.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

● (1525)

[*English*]

WAYS AND MEANS

INCOME TAX ACT

Hon. Scott Brison (for the Minister of Finance) moved that a ways and means motion to amend the Income Tax Act, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: Call in the members.

● (1530)

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

(Division No. 116)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra
Anandasangaree
Amos
Angus
Arseneault
Ashton
Badawey
Bains
Beech
Benson
Bittle
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Brosseau
Cannings
Carr
Champagne
Chen
Christopherson
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Di Iorio
Donnelly
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dusseault
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Joly
Jowhari
Kang
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Laverdière
Lefebvre
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
Mathyssen
McCallum
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Monsef
Morrissey
Murray
Nassif
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Quach
Ramsey
Rioux
Rodriguez
Ruimy
Saganash
Sajjan
Sangha
Sarai
Schulte
Arya
Aubin
Bagnell
Baylis
Bennett
Bibeau
Blair
Boissonnault
Boulerice
Bratina
Brison
Caesar-Chavannes
Caron
Chagger
Chan
Choquette
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhillon
Dion
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fisher
Foote
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hardcastle
Harvey
Housefather
Hutchings
Johns
Jordan
Julian
Khalid
Kwan
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Lemieux
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)
Moore
Mulcair
Nantel
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Qualtrough
Rankin
Robillard
Rota
Rusnak
Saini
Samson
Sansoucy
Schiefke
Serré

Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Stetski
Tabbara
Tassi
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Zahid– — 197

Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann
Stewart
Tan
Tootoo
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wilson-Raybould
Young

NAYS

Members

Albas
Allison
Arnold
Bernier
Bezan
Block
Brassard
Calkins
Chong
Cooper
Diotte
Dreeshen
Falk
Finley
Généreux
Gladu
Gourde
Hoback
Kelly
Kitchen
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Leitch
MacKenzie
McColeman
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Raitt
Ritz
Scheer
Shields
Sopuck
Stanton
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga

Albrecht
Anderson
Bergen
Berthold
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boucher
Brown
Carrie
Clarke
Deltell
Doherty
Eglinski
Fast
Gallant
Genuis
Godin
Harder
Jeneroux
Kent
Lake
Lebel
Lobb
Maguire
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Nicholson
O'Toole
Poilievre
Rempel
Saroya
Schmale
Shipley
Sorenson
Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Van Loan
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Wong
Zimmer– — 82

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

● (1535)

PARIS AGREEMENT

The House resumed from October 4 consideration of the motion, of the amendment, and of the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. John Oliver (Oakville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time today with the member for Mississauga East—Cooksville.

I rise today to speak in favour of the Paris agreement and the government's motion for Canada to participate in this global attempt to reduce climate change.

On December 12, 2015, Canada and 194 other countries reached the Paris agreement, an ambitious and balanced plan to fight climate change. The new agreement would strengthen efforts to limit the global average temperature rise to well below 2° Celsius and to pursue further efforts to limit the increase to 1.5° Celsius. In addition, the Paris agreement aims to foster climate resilience and to lower greenhouse gas development.

There has been much said in the House, on a national level, about the benefits and risks of the Paris agreement. I thought I would bring the discussion to a sub-national level and focus on the role of local municipal governments, the roles of public and private corporations, and the role of civil society using the lens of my community of Oakville. It will require all of us working together to achieve the aims of this agreement, and my community of Oakville is an exemplar of the co-operation that will be required.

Oakville's vision is to be the most livable town in Canada. The town's 2005 environmental strategic plan recognizes that our quality of life rests on the quality of our environment and on our respect for our natural and cultural heritage.

In 2015 the town achieved milestone 5 of the ICLEI Federation of Canadian Municipalities partners GHG reduction program. This capstone achievement reflected the town's accomplishment of the target of a 20% reduction in corporate GHG emissions by 2014 from 2004. Oakville is only one of 30 Canadian municipalities to have achieved a milestone 5 level.

Council has now reset the energy and GHG reduction targets to ensure that the town is continuing to achieve measurable results. An example of this plan is the i-Tree 2016 study of Oakville's urban forest. There are two million trees in Oakville. Oakville's urban forest canopy coverage is about 28%. In Oakville, the total value of annual home energy savings provided by the tree canopy is $1,800,000. As a result of these energy savings, about 2,200 tonnes of carbon emissions are avoided each year, with an annual carbon value of $172,000.

Oakville's trees sequester about 5,900 tonnes of carbon each year, with an associated annual carbon value of $460,000. Oakville's tree root systems store approximately 148,000 tonnes of carbon, with an associated carbon value of $11.5 million.

We can grow our tree canopy by 50% in years to come.

With over 185 kilometres of on- and off-road cycling paths, over 300 kilometres of trails, 1,420 hectares of parkland, 31 waterfront parks, and more than 200 parks with playgrounds and sports fields, Oakville has recreational opportunities for everyone.

While our local tree canopy expansion plan will contribute to Canada's Paris agreement commitments, it will also continue to provide a superb living environment for residents. These are win-win carbon reduction strategies.

Oakville council has confirmed its commitment to support efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions globally by harmonizing specific town reduction targets to match global targets.

The largest public corporation in Oakville is Halton Healthcare. The new Oakville Trafalgar Memorial Hospital is a thoughtfully designed, state-of-the-art centre of health care excellence. Although eight storeys tall and 1.6 million square feet in size, OTMH is highly energy efficient, incorporating many innovative technologies to reduce its carbon footprint. The energy efficient design measures put in place avoid electrical consumption of 16,700,000 kWh annually, enough energy to supply 1,850 homes in Oakville with electricity annually. It is saving dollars and reducing GHG emissions.

The new building, built to LEED® Silver standards, has been recognized by the high performance new construction incentive program for achieving a tier 3 level of more than 50% in energy savings. Construction of the new OTMH included a 500 kilowatt solar array, which was donated as a gift to the hospital by Hatch Industries.

To date Halton Healthcare has received energy payments totalling $154,000 while saving approximately 290 tonnes annually in GHG emissions compared to natural gas powered generation. These are win-win carbon reduction strategies.

● (1540)

The largest private corporation in Oakville is Ford of Canada. Ford is part of an automotive industry that is in active transition to a low-carbon economy. The auto manufacturing sector is a key driver for Canada's economy, contributing significantly to our nation's manufacturing GDP, and providing tens of thousands of direct and indirect high-paying jobs.

Auto manufacturing is highly energy efficient, emitting less than 1% of industrial GHG emissions in Ontario, and half of the GHG emissions per vehicle compared to European auto manufacturing, which is an important consideration as we move forward with globally competitive carbon-reduction targets.

Auto is one of the largest green-tech sectors in the world, investing more than $200 billion U.S. in fuel efficiency and green tech through to 2025. Another $100 billion U.S. is being invested in electric vehicle development. Many of the innovative energy-efficiency strategies are being designed and tested right here in Canada.

Through an unprecedented year-over-year improvement plan, the 2025 model year vehicles—our cars—are projected to consume 50% less fuel than the 2008 vehicles. Post-2011, this will result in an estimated cumulative reduction of 266 million tonnes of carbon dioxide emissions.

To assist the industry, policies that educate and increase consumer demand for these new vehicle technologies will be critical to ensure the adoption of alternative energy and electric vehicle choices.

As a cautionary note, as we push forward with the Paris agreement, let us remember that auto manufacturing is highly trade-exposed. That is why the design of the pan-Canada framework for climate change, avoiding layering of subnational regulations under federal regulations, is critically important to the competitiveness of Canada's auto manufacturing and, ultimately, the achievement of Canada's economic and environmental objectives.

Care must be taken to maintain and grow Canada's manufacturing footprint to avoid the migration of many thousands of jobs through carbon leakage to other jurisdictions that have weaker climate policy commitments. With care, this can be a win-win agreement for auto.

Finally, I will address the role of civil society.

In my community of Oakville, I found more than 40 environmental groups and agencies with which residents of Oakville are directly involved, most with a focus on climate change. Hundreds of Oakville residents are engaged in making a difference globally by making change happen locally.

At a climate change consultation I hosted in August, more than 150 Oakvillians came out to talk with me and their neighbours about their concerns. We had 10 table topics, including many specific to the Paris agreement, such as international co-operation and commitments, and carbon pricing. Attendees supported the Paris agreement. Some wished it went further, faster, and are prepared for disruptive economic consequences; others support the direction, but want to ensure that our economy and jobs transition smoothly to a less carbon-dependent economy. However, they all want positive action.

I believe every Oakvillian wants to ensure that we conserve our environment, to leave as rich and sustainable an environment for our children as we inherited from our predecessors. I believe, based on the decisions and commitments of our town council and our public and private enterprises, and based on Oakville residents' engagement with civic groups and feedback from my consultations, that the vast majority of Oakvillians support the Paris agreement and want this government and this House of Parliament to proceed to join in the global fight against climate change.

I do not think our children and grandchildren will be concerned with which political party we represented in 2016. They would want to know why we did not act when we could to guarantee them drinkable water, breathable air, and a living environment.

I will be supporting this agreement.

● (1545)

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member for Oakville must be familiar with the Ontario Liberal gas plant scandal, where an entire plant was relocated to save seats in the legislature. Would the member opposite be able to share with the House the number of tonnes of carbon that transfer would have put into the atmosphere, and whether or not we will see this type of activity federally as well?

Mr. John Oliver: Mr. Speaker, I think the most important thing to remember is that Ontario has already moved forward with the cessation of coal-fired producing plants. We are already seeing a dramatic decrease in smog days in Toronto and in my riding of Oakville.

I think everybody in Canada agrees that we need to move forward with a carbon-pricing model. It is the most effective policy measure to drive climate action and the transformation of global energy systems toward cleaner alternatives. As I said, people in Oakville support this direction.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Bécancour—Nicolet—Saurel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the hon. member's speech.

He mentioned the Paris agreement, yet it seems to me that we are far short of what this agreement requires. For example, in Paris, the reference year was 1990. Beginning in the 1990s, Quebec reached difficult targets, such as a 28% reduction by aluminum plants and a 78% reduction by lumber producers and various forestry industries. Now we are going to use 2006 as the reference year. That is the same target set by the Conservatives. It is low, very low.

Should we not be following the lead set by most other countries and use 1990 as the reference year, rather than the year we are discussing today?

[*English*]

Mr. John Oliver: Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a tension here. The NDP and others seem to want to see disruptive change. They want a change so fast on climate that job losses and economic losses could occur. The Conservatives, on the other hand, seem to not want to make any changes.

I think we have found a very balanced solution here to move forward with carbon pricing, to move forward with an economy that is less carbon intensive and carbon dependent, and at the same time make sure that, as we transition, we hold jobs and keep a strong economy moving forward. That is the plan Canadians want us to implement.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in particular, I take note of how the member concluded his comments and his speech, speaking about future generations. We have heard a lot in this House over the last few days about the various different stakeholders and people who will be affected by this.

One particular group that I find we are continually neglecting in this discussion is the future generation. We have heard members opposite ask questions about what to say to the seniors in their ridings who are going to be affected by a price on carbon.

My question for my hon. colleague is, what do we say to future generations if we do not do this? How important is it that we get this right, now, so that future generations do not have to deal with it?

● (1550)

Mr. John Oliver: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to have that conversation. I have children in all age groups right now.

I do not want to be having this conversation with them in 10, 15, or 20 years' time. I do not want to be having that conversation with my grandchildren. I do not think any member in this House wants to have a conversation about why we failed to address the problem of climate change when we had a chance to make a difference.

That is why it is so important that we proceed in this direction. That is why it is important that the Paris agreement and the Vancouver declaration be implemented. We owe this to future generations as much as we owe it to ourselves.

Mr. Peter Fonseca (Mississauga East—Cooksville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to have a few minutes to speak on such an important topic. Climate change is the most serious threat that poses imminent, dangerous consequences to our communities, families, and economy.

The debate on whether this threat exists is over. Rapid change in climate is real. We have seen the damage it has caused over the past decade. Deadly storms, odd weather patterns, and the rapidly melting polar ice caps have produced a significant human and economic impact. This is a very real and present danger. It is a danger that is of paramount concern to all Canadians. This was demonstrated to me at a town hall meeting on climate change that I hosted with my fellow Mississauga MPs this summer. The over-capacity crowd at the town hall made it clear that people are looking to their government to take steps, to take leadership to change our current course. Leadership on this file over the past 10 years under the previous government's regime saw little to no action.

As a result, our reputation around the world was badly damaged. We made a promise, during last year's general election, to change course on climate change. We promised to stop the cycle of setting arbitrary, unreasoned targets.

We have worked with our provincial, territorial, and indigenous partners to achieve realistic targets. Since taking office, our government has taken steps to work with our partners, to establish realistic solutions, consistent with international obligations, that work toward growing the economy and protecting our planet for my children and all our children.

By signing onto the Paris agreement last October, just after we formed government, we emphatically signalled to the world that Canada is here to help.

I am very glad to be able to contribute to the debate today.

As we come to accept the reality of the extent of this climate disorder and start to take steps to curtail the current trend, let us double our efforts and reinforce our actions on the conditions that we must improve.

Already, global temperatures are one degree above pre-industrial levels, and rising. I mention pre-industrial, as this factor of industrialization significantly adds to the seriousness of the time we are at with climate change.

In addition, specific factors in our country substantially contribute to this disorder; namely, our geography and our climate. Our broad weather latitudes demand considerable fuel to warm us in winter and to cool us in summer. Our coast-to-coast-to-coast geography represents immense transportation requirements of fuel. Canada's reliance upon such primary industries as resource extraction and manufacturing adds further to the complications of our climate disorder.

The worldly repercussions of this disorder caused UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon to declare that we are in a race against time. The rate at which temperatures are rising exceeds the capacity of our ecosystems to adapt naturally, so that our food production and our economic development are now threatened.

Here in Ontario, suddenly, climate changes or prolonged periods of drought and heat waves have had threatening consequences on our farmers. This summer alone, the weather has had devastating impacts upon our farmers' crops, their livelihood, and ultimately, our food source.

Even in my urban riding, extreme weather has taken its toll. In July 2013, the city of Mississauga was hammered by a flash flood of over 123 millimetres of rainfall in just a couple of hours. The result was mass flooding and power outages for many residents, causing extensive damage to their homes. They called it the 50-year storm—once in a lifetime. The sad thing is that we have had three so-called 50-year storms in the last 10 years.

Another example of this extreme weather was the severe ice storm that struck southern Ontario, Quebec, and the Maritimes in December 2013, when roads and trees were covered with 30 millimetres of ice, sending broken branches onto power lines and causing thousands of people to be without power for days and weeks following.

● (1555)

The Paris agreement on climate change awaits final ratification. I stand today to support its ratification. In signing this agreement initially in April on our behalf, our Prime Minister indicated that climate change would test our intelligence, our compassion, and our will, but we firmly believe that we are equal to these challenges. For Canada, this agreement would mean that our government is providing national leadership by working with provinces and territories to take action on climate change. We as a government realize that economic growth and implementing climate protection policies go hand in hand.

The Conference Board of Canada acknowledges Canada has a long way to go. Indeed, that is an accurate assessment for this vast and complex country. With our country's extensive geographic differences, significant adjustments in our technology and economy and attitude will be required. This government has promised to protect the environment and grow the economy. Vital to this is providing leadership, along with collaborating with our provincial and territorial partners to develop balanced solutions in establishing plans that are amenable to our partners in Confederation. Our government is providing this leadership. Appropriate federal funding and flexibility will be afforded to our territorial and provincial partners so they can design policies to meet the climate commitments we have made as a country, and so they can also keep in mind the economic requirements of their respective areas.

As our Prime Minister stated two days ago in his address to the House, “Because pollution crosses borders, all provinces must do their part.” New investments in green infrastructure, clean-tech manufacturing, and innovation, and incentives for clean investments are just a sample of the climate change assistance our government promised to its voters. In anticipation of the requirements of the Paris agreement and with awareness of the unique and demanding climate issues in this country, the 2016 budget provides full allocations for a framework that endorses and shapes a cleaner, more sustainable environment. As well, that same budget addresses the special economic requirements of the country as it adjusts to the intricacies of climate change.

Already, provinces and territories have envisioned a carbon-restricted future in some of their budgets, projects, and future plans. Some of our provinces have made an early start to their commitments by initiating their plans for carbon pricing appropriate to their own geographic and economic needs. It is promising to see the encouragement of electric and hybrid vehicles here in Ontario, for example. Even in my riding of Mississauga East—Cooksville, a constituent I met last week was telling me that he takes trees that have fallen due to the weather or that have been cut down because they are diseased, and reuses them for things like furniture, etc.

Forward thinking on counteracting carbon use was on the agenda of the Premier of Saskatchewan when he went to Paris in April with our delegates. He sought to promote carbon capture and storage technology. That is also really pioneering for that province. The world awaits such forward, intelligent thinking that is required in inventing technology for the impending non carbon age and in making the required economic adjustments and alterations in this upcoming era.

With the announcement two days ago of our new carbon plan, the potential is there for this to help our middle class and job creation, and to help our businesses be more competitive on the world stage. If we take the appropriate approach, keeping in mind our provincial counterparts' priorities, by working together we can achieve the results we want.

Canada already has an excellent reputation in the world when it comes to a technological zone for such forward thinking and inventions. We invented the Canadarm, for example. The innovative, flexible, hard-working, compassionate, never-give-up attitude of Canadians puts us in the right place to take on climate change.

We can do our part the Canadian way conscientiously, superlatively, and compassionately. Let us support the ratification of the Paris agreement. We need to do our part, and we will.

● (1600)

Mrs. Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague mentioned Saskatchewan and the very innovative work done there when it comes to carbon capture sequestration.

I know that the Minister of Environment from Saskatchewan is a member of the subcommittee on clean technology, innovation, and jobs, which headed to Montreal to discuss the documents' review and make recommendations to the Prime Minister on how to move forward when it comes to tackling greenhouse emissions.

In response to the Prime Minister's unilateral decision to impose a carbon tax, what would the members say to the Premier of Saskatchewan and that minister who went to Montreal to continue the good work of the first ministers?

Mr. Peter Fonseca: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Environment is in Montreal, meeting with our provincial and territorial partners.

There are a number of working groups ongoing that are working towards our goal. This is a pan-Canadian goal. It is an incremental goal, starting now and putting down a benchmark and working together on carbon capture and these technologies and new clean-tech jobs.

I commend Saskatchewan for working so hard on this. It is coming together. This is all part of the model to getting us to where we want to be in the future.

To the Premier of Saskatchewan, to the minister, and to that working group, continue to double down on our efforts and reinforce what we are doing, because we are headed in the right direction.

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that I am in favour of the Paris agreement.

I was glad that the Canadian government accepted the necessary temperature targets of between 1.5º and 2º Celsius to keep our earth below those temperature increases. It is a real concern in my riding of South Okanagan—West Kootenay, where we are facing depleting water resources, increasing irrigation needs, and increasing forest fires. All of those things are of great concern.

However, I am concerned about how the government is planning to tackle this. How is it actually going to get to these temperature targets?

In particular, the Liberals took the NDP platform on ending subsidies to the fossil fuel industry as a really important part of their own platform. Since then, they have done nothing. What are the government's plans to end those subsidies to the fossil fuel industry and turn them into subsidies for clean tech and green technology?

Mr. Peter Fonseca: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is quite right. I have heard from farmers about how their crops have been devastated by the hot weather and some of these droughts. It is causing turmoil when we talk about business.

The member also talked about planning, and that is exactly correct. We have brought forward a plan with targets that balance our environment and the economy. Working to help farmers over these years as we look to put on a cap-and-trade type model or a price on carbon pollution is something we can do in lockstep with our communities and provinces and territories, which have done a lot of the heavy lifting already.

We are providing leadership through the Paris agreement to make sure that all of this works. For too long we were stagnant and not doing anything. We had 10 years of being really adrift. Now we have a plan and are moving forward.

● (1605)

Mr. Mark Warawa (Langley—Aldergrove, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a real honour to represent my constituency of Langley—Aldergrove and to speak before you, a member of Parliament who is so well respected. I will be sharing my time with the member for Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek.

I was honoured in the last Parliament to be the parliamentary secretary to the minister of the environment—actually five different ministers—and then to be chair of the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development. That is because the environment is so important to me and my community. We need to move forward and clean up some previous environmental practices, which is one of the first things we did when I became the parliamentary secretary in 2006. The Sydney tar ponds was one of the most overstudied and well-known contaminated sites. I was honoured to present the funding and then to see the finished product, the cleaning up of the city tar ponds. The previous government was committed to a sustainable environment.

I was also honoured to work with a former Liberal MP, John Godfrey, on the Sustainable Development Act, working across party lines for a cleaner environment. Over my political career, I have found that the more we work together, the more we can move ahead. It is almost like oars in a boat: if everyone is rowing in the same direction, great progress can be made. But if everyone is rowing in different directions, they will end up turning around in circles. In dealing with the environment, it is so important that we put aside politics, keep our promises, and move forward.

Today's motion is that the House support the government's decision to ratify the Paris agreement under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, signed by Canada in New York on April 22, 2016. We support that. The 30% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2030 was a plan the previous government committed to. We were on track to meet those targets. The fact is that with the growing economy under the previous government and the growth in jobs, we were at the same time reducing greenhouse gas emissions and dramatically reducing pollutants that were causing health problems. We were getting it done, growing the economy and reducing greenhouse gas emissions and pollutants.

The second half of the motion calls on the House to support the March 3, 2016 Vancouver declaration calling on the federal government, the provinces, and the territories to work together to develop a pan-Canadian framework on clean growth and climate change. That is where I have great difficulty, where I think the government has taken the whole process off the rails so to speak.

On Monday, the Prime Minister announced in a very dictatorial the way it was going to be. I harken back to the promises made during the election when the Prime Minister said that he was committed to working with the provinces. However, on Monday, we saw that all come to a screeching halt. He promised that he would not impose a climate change plan on the provinces. He called that nonsensical, but on Monday he deviated from that and told the provinces, "This is what thou shalt do".

We have to work with one another. We have to show respect for one another. I have found great success over the years in working with different environmental groups. In my riding of Langley, there is a group called LEPS, Langley Environmental Partners Society. It is successful in working in a non-partisan way with anyone interested in improving the environment. Over the last 11 years, we have planted together 1,000 trees a year. It has helped me distribute these 1,000 trees a year, thus more than 11,000 trees handed out in the riding in total. Trees are good. I love it when we come together as a community in partnering and working together on the environment.

● (1610)

A healthy environment is not just for this generation but for future generations too. We have a responsibility to show respect, work arm-in-arm with one another, and improve that. That is not what is happening with the action of the government. I hope that the government will pause and that it will consider changing course.

I just heard from the Liberal member across the way. I encourage him to rethink his thoughts. He told the Premier of Saskatchewan to double down. What does that mean? The Prime Minister said it is because of the lack of leadership being seen from the provinces that he has had to force this on them. Then we have members of his caucus saying, "Premiers, you need to double down". That is not working together on a common cause. The target of a 30% reduction by 2030 is achievable if we work together.

Canadians have said they would trust the new government to come up with a plan that would help us achieve that target, that 30% reduction by 2030, but the government also promised no new taxes. The Prime Minister even admitted today during question period that it is a tax. It is a new tax on Canadians, and how will that new tax affect Canadians? Will it reduce greenhouse gas emissions? The previous government was able to reduce taxes and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The Liberal plan is to increase taxes and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

We can learn from past practices of what works and what does not. The previous Liberal government made aspirational commitments and emissions went up. Taxes went up; emissions went up. That is not the Conservative way, in which we reduced taxes and reduced greenhouse gas emissions.

The plan has been proven not to work, but how does that plan affect Canadians? I have a number of seniors who have retired and are on fixed incomes in the riding of Langley—Aldergrove. I am hearing from them already since the Prime Minister made his proclamation that thou shalt and that there would be a carbon tax, a new tax on everything. What does that mean? It means the government is advising seniors that they need to get another sweater, a little bit thicker sweater because they will have to turn down their thermostats. Their natural gas heating will go up and of course their food will cost more because it is transported from within or outside of communities. To drive to the doctor, to physiotherapy or home care, everything will go up: food, transportation, heating. It is endless, the cost of all goods.

What have the Liberals told Canadian seniors? I am honoured to be the critic for seniors. I have asked the Liberals to please appoint a minister for seniors and to please establish a national seniors strategy, because right now one in six Canadians is a senior. There are more seniors than youth in Canada right now, and that is changing very quickly. In six years it will be one in five. In 13 years it will be one in four. There is a major demographic shift and it is happening in a very short period of time and the government is not ready. What is its plan? It will increase the taxes on everything on every Canadian, particularly the Canadians who are on fixed incomes. The solution to that is that the government will give them an extra $70 a month. That is for those who are single. If they are living together, they get nothing extra but they will have to get a thicker sweater so that they can survive those winters.

Fortunately in Langley we have very mild winters, but much of Canada is very cold in the winter. Is that the solution of the government, to get a thicker sweater or an extra sweater? It shows disrespect for Canadian seniors. It shows disrespect for the provinces. It is not a plan. A tax is not a plan. I hope the government will reconsider what it is doing because it is not right.

● (1615)

Mr. Adam Vaughan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Intergovernmental Affairs), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest both to the member's speech and also to the Prime Minister's presentation on this issue. I do not recall a single penny accruing to the federal government out of anything the Prime Minister said with regard to the announcement that was made.

I am also fully aware, and I hope the member is as well, that the consultations and the conversations and the dialogue with provinces have been going on since the day we took office. It continues now and it will continue into the future as we find a way to deal with climate change.

In what part of the Prime Minister's remarks did he hear and identify that the federal government was collecting revenue off the proposition of putting a price on pollution? Can he point to a single sentence that shows that the federal government would collect anything on a proposal that has been tabled?

Mr. Mark Warawa: Mr. Speaker, if the member looks at what the Prime Minister said when he met with the premiers and with the different ministers, he told them that this was the way it was going to be, that they would have a carbon tax and that they must increase the cost of every good on every Canadian. Brad Wall said, "The level of disrespect shown by the Prime Minister and his government today is stunning".

Does that build bridges? Does that move us together? Is that slowing down, consulting, and showing respect for all levels of government? It is important that the government reconsider its approach, because if we do not show respect to one another we do not get respect. Therefore, I encourage the government to reconsider.

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my colleague mentioned in his speech the decline in carbon dioxide emissions in Canada while his government was in power in the 2008 to 2010 era. Everyone knows that those emissions only went down because the economy tanked in 2008 and Ontario took coal-fired plants off the grid. I wonder why his government cut funding for climate action, and why his government failed to act when it was in power.

Mr. Mark Warawa: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question. However, I think there is great mischief at work in that question because it is far from the facts.

We became government in 2006 and remained in government until 2015. The economy experienced great difficulties in 2008 and on, but it grew 35% while we were in government. It did not tank. Rather, it grew because of strong Conservative fiscal management. However, during that 35% growth in the economy, emissions went down. Therefore, the policies of working together are effective and do reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The pollutants that we breathe, which cause serious health problems, were also reduced by working with our international partners and all levels of government.

I hope the government does not try to ignore the effective policies that we had, because they worked. We can see it in the facts. I hope the NDP will reconsider its approach also.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Before resuming debate, it is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Salaberry—Suroît, Dairy Industry; the hon. member for Windsor West, Telecommunications Industry; the hon. member for Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, Indigenous Affairs.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek.

● (1620)

Mrs. Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as we draw near the end of the time allotted for this debate, I would like to begin my remarks by noting that as the Prime Minister stood in this place on Monday and announced his $40-billion carbon tax, provincial representatives walked out of an environmental ministers' conference in Montreal, shocked to hear of this unilateral action from the media. If Canadians needed any further evidence that sunny ways are over, that was it. While I believe that all of us should do our part to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, we have to be realistic and understand that a one-size-fits-all approach cannot work in Canada.

I also believe that Canadians pay enough in taxes. As a member who represents a constituency with energy-intensive industries like mining, agriculture, and manufacturing, I am concerned that this new Liberal levy for the environment will be little more than a transfer of wealth from western Canada to Ottawa via some kind of new taxation.

The Prime Minister's contention that this initiative will be revenue neutral is hard to believe. It is hard to believe that a policy that will increase the federal government's accounts receivable by over $40 billion each year can be revenue neutral. This will become the second-largest source of federal revenue going forward, putting it ahead of the sales tax, the corporate income tax, the customs import duties, employment insurance premium revenues, and crown corporation revenues. Canada has entered an era of long-term deficit spending with no plan to return the country to balance. The temptation for the current government in particular to put these carbon revenues into general revenues will be strong.

Emissions have no borders. Canada should participate in international initiatives to reduce GHG emissions. It is in our best interest when our neighbours are environmentally responsible and the reverse is certainly true. It needs to be repeated that when a manufacturing plant moves 30 kilometres down the road to a jurisdiction that has lower costs for energy, nothing is gained. All that occurs is job losses.

Greenhouse gas emissions are an international issue. Therefore, attempts to reduce them must involve all emitters, not just those in Canada. Pollution can be exported. Many developing countries would be happy to inherit the energy-intensive factories that will no longer be economically viable here in Canada with a new carbon tax. It goes without saying that Canada's environmental laws and their enforcement are much more stringent than those of nearly any other country. A factory moving overseas where oversight is less stringent can actually be detrimental to the international fight against greenhouse gas emissions.

Canada competes on just about everything. Canadian railways compete with U.S. railroads and U.S. trucking. Airlines, which already lose five million passengers per year to border airports, compete with international carriers. While President Obama committed the United States to the Paris conference targets, it's another thing for an outgoing president to act on that commitment.

A downtown-Toronto condo dweller will have a lower carbon footprint than someone living in Iqaluit or the producer from the Prairies. A small technology company in Montreal will have a lower carbon footprint than a trucking company that hauls automobile parts across the Ambassador Bridge. A homeowner living in the temperate climate of Victoria will undoubtedly need less natural gas or heating oil to warm his or her home in the winter than someone living in Saskatoon. Our federation is designed to accommodate the different realities of our regions.

When Canada agreed along with Mexico and the United States that 50% of its electricity would come from renewable sources by 2025, a standard that we surpass today, the Prime Minister was basking in the legacy of provincial investments in hydro power. However, the Prime Minister should not boast on the international stage that Canada is a leader in green power generation, given that under his made-up term of social licence it would be impossible presently to build these large-scale facilities that provide base load power to our cities.

For any environmental policy to last and to be effective, it needs to have buy-in from all who are involved. If environmental policy is built on a platform of animosity between the federal government and the provinces, that policy will be doomed to fail.

● (1625)

The Premier of Saskatchewan does not support this ill-conceived plan to raise taxes. The premiers of Newfoundland and Labrador, Nova Scotia, and the three northern territories also have serious doubts. As the fine print of the minister's plan is released, I am sure we will see more provinces question this massively expensive experiment in economic and social planning.

For a policy the Prime Minister claims was built on unanimous accord at a first ministers' meeting, there is a lot of discord in regard to what was agreed to in Vancouver. This sledgehammer approach taken by the Prime Minister is disrespectful to both the provinces and their elected representatives, who are all contributing to Canada's economic prosperity. Is this the new era of co-operative federalism the Prime Minister has been so keen to champion?

I am curious about what the penalty will be should Saskatchewan not meet the standard set by the Prime Minister. Typically, when the federal government wants to partner with the provinces on something, the federal government puts in at least some amount of funding to get things started. I cannot help but think that the Prime Minister has decided to redesign our entire economy and put the odds against the three prairie provinces.

This carbon tax will not impact Canadians uniformly. Saskatchewan does not have the geography required for large-scale hydro dams, nor do we have the population size or density, for that matter, to make the economics of nuclear power viable. To my knowledge, combines do not run on solar power. In any year with lower than expected crop yields or low commodity prices, this new tax will have a far greater impact on my region than on any urban area.

The Prime Minister, his environment minister, and countless MPs here have repeated that putting a high tax on carbon is good for the economy and good for innovation. This statement must be challenged.

At its most basic level, this new tax is an additional cost for businesses and consumers. In any business, any additional cost is detrimental. What this new tax will do is make Canada's energy-intensive industries, like farming and mining, less competitive than those of other countries. The contention that increasing costs for businesses will make them more innovative is very naive. Every business, regardless of its sector, seeks to reduce the cost of inputs relative to its overall outputs.

I would like to conclude by pointing out the incredible inconsistency the Liberals are showing with this new $40 billion tax.

The Liberal government is actively supporting, through subsidies, the manufacturing of new aircraft and vehicles, which are two sectors that contribute the most to Canada's overall emissions. At the same time, the mining energy that produces the fuel to power these planes and cars is being ignored, and even worse, targeted.

For many years, as Ontario and Quebec were net recipients of equalization, it was British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Newfoundland and Labrador that financially supported our federation through a strong mining sector. Now, as commodity prices are lower, Ottawa is about to add to the pain that workers out west and out east in Newfoundland are experiencing.

The Prime Minister needs to reopen the dialogue with all premiers in order to develop and implement a greenhouse gas emissions reduction plan that will actually work, as they are best positioned to understand the economic realities of their provinces. Going in alone, as the Prime Minister is doing, will ensure failure.

Mr. Adam Vaughan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Intergovernmental Affairs), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened to the member opposite's statements and concerns, and I am not going to comment on the Premier of Alberta, who has welcomed this initiative. We now find out that the “P” in NDP stands for pipelines, apparently.

The newly minted Conservative Premier of Manitoba has said that they are working very hard on a plan that they think will excite Manitobans, and they look forward to further discussions with the federal government on the issues. They understand the new spirit of federalism that has taken hold, and they are working very hard.

I recognize that one or two premiers are struggling with this, and we have built a timetable into the process to make sure that we get as close to unanimity as possible.

I am also taken by the member's fascination with my riding and the condominiums of downtown Toronto. She is aware, of course, that not all residents of this country will experience climate change in the same way, nor will they experience the pollution that climate change generates in the lungs of children and families that live in those condominiums. I note that she routinely supports the island airport and routinely supports jets there. Jets, particularly short haul, are the highest single source of per capita greenhouse gases in this country.

If the member has such concern for the residents of different parts of this country, I wonder if she can put aside her regional focus and broaden her understanding of things like communities that live in condominiums, or in the far north, and actually come up with a collaborative process that succeeds in reducing greenhouse gases while transforming the economy while moving this forward.

Does the member have any ideas she can add that will cut greenhouse gases, while we build a new economy, and that will help the residents of my riding who happen to live in condominiums, which she routinely disdains and casts doubt and aspersions towards?

● (1630)

Mrs. Kelly Block: Mr. Speaker, of course, I, and the Conservative caucus, do not oppose taking action on climate change. In fact, your government is using the very targets we set.

What I do not support is the government running roughshod over provincial and territorial rights. The provinces signed the Vancouver declaration, because they believed that it called for a collaborative and flexible approach. That is what I highlighted in my speech today. However, the government has already said that it intends to impose a national carbon tax, before the provinces could even draft plans to reduce their emissions and before the subcommittees could even come back and agree on language to make their recommendations to the Prime Minister.

If the government is interpreting the Vancouver declaration as a mandate to act unilaterally, then we cannot support it.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Before I go to the next question, I just want to remind the member that I am sure when she said "your government" she did not mean the Speaker's government. She was talking about the hon. member. I just want to clarify that.

The hon. member for Drummond.

[*Translation*]

Mr. François Choquette (Drummond, NDP): Mr. Speaker, before I ask my question, I would like to provide some background, if I may, so that everyone understands where we are coming from.

The Kyoto protocol used 1990 as the reference year so that meaningful action would be taken to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The Conservatives, however, decided to use 2005 as the reference year, which was a huge step backwards, and their targets were weak to begin with: a 30% reduction by 2030.

When the Liberals went to Paris, they said they would be much more ambitious than the Conservatives. They even wanted to limit the maximum global temperature increase to 1.5°C, which is a very good thing, I might add.

However, when it comes time to actually do something, where are the concrete measures to begin the shift towards green energy and to create jobs in a low-carbon economy?

Would my colleague agree that the Liberal is not what could be considered a real, practical plan to combat climate change?

[*English*]

Mrs. Kelly Block: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives have always taken the approach that a global problem requires a global solution. Canada was among the first countries to take a strong stand on the fact that for a climate change agreement to work, it had to include the world's largest emitters, and it required a plan. The Liberal government signed Kyoto without ever having a plan or the political will to meet its objectives. It demonstrated that again this week when it introduced its unilateral carbon tax.

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Victoria.

Because climate change is the challenge of our time, I stand in support of ratifying the Paris agreement. Here is why action is so badly needed. Climate change impacts are already being felt in my riding. We already see hotter water harming chum, chinook, and coho salmon returns on the Englishman, Cowichan, and Nanaimo rivers and at Mill Creek. Salmon are also harmed by drier rivers resulting from reduced snow pack.

Two decades of pine beetle infestation in our province have led to dozens of mill closures and tens of thousands of job losses. Ocean acidity has increased 30% and is expected to increase up to 150% by the end of the century. Worldwide, since 1975, oceans have absorbed 90% of the excess heat from global climate change.

This has already had big economic costs for us. B.C.'s $2.2 billion fishery and aquaculture sector, with its 14,000 jobs, is at risk. Worldwide, fisheries stand to lose $10 billion of their annual revenue. Climate-change-caused ocean acidification killed 10 million scallops just north of my riding. That was three years' worth of production, and the CEO of Island Scallops Ltd. said:

> I'm not sure we are going to stay alive and I'm not sure the oyster industry is going to stay alive.

Power generation is affected too. In 2009, we saw the lowest water inflows in 46 years at Vancouver Island power plants.

Forest fires cost British Columbia $877 million over the last five years.

Drought, disease, and pests threaten food security on Vancouver Island, which already imports 95% of its food.

The good news is that acting on global climate change can boost small business and good local jobs. Climate action is a win-win for our local economy and our global environment. We are already innovating and cutting greenhouse gas emissions in my riding and are adding good-paying, sustainable jobs.

Nanaimo Harmac Pacific mill is energy self-sufficient and uses biofuels, including wood waste, to generate 55 megawatts of power.

The Greater Nanaimo Pollution Control Centre captures methane to convert to electricity, and it is powering 300 homes.

Nanaimo is home to Canadian Electric Vehicles, which for 25 years has been making industrial vehicles, from electric trucks to Zambonis to electric bobcats.

Two groups are right now building energy conservation affordable housing in Nanaimo. Low energy use equals low operating costs equals greater affordability.

Vancouver Island University carpentry students dedicated 5,000 hours of volunteer time to building Habitat for Humanity's most recent build.

Nanaimo Aboriginal Centre is building affordable housing right now using passive energy designs, which use 80% less power than normal.

This is good news countrywide. Canada's green-building sector has $128 billion in gross annual output, and it employs more direct full-time workers than the forestry, mining, and oil and gas industries combined. We need our government to support local initiatives and remove barriers to innovation right here at home.

We have the know-how here in our communities. We want climate leadership that supports, and does not impede, cutting greenhouse gas emissions right here on our coast.

I talked with Nanaimo renewable energy entrepreneurs at the Vancouver Island Economic Alliance Summit a few years back. They said that the Harper government and our B.C. government put up more barriers to their industry than anywhere they know in the world. They are both manufacturing and selling outside our community and outside our province. That is a lose-lose for the environment and the economy.

Canada cannot afford to stand on the sidelines when it comes to tackling climate change and transitioning to a cleaner, greener economy. With 50,000 people employed directly in more than 800 clean-tech firms, Canada could be a global leader, but it needs federal government financing and policy support.

● (1635)

It is time we had a truly balanced, sustainable approach to developing our energy resources in Canada. This means creating lasting, sustainable prosperity while making Canada a global leader in the clean technology sector of tomorrow.

The bad news is that it feels as if the Liberals are repeating their old pattern of breaking promises. In the early 90s, I was involved through the environmental NGO community with a group called the Economic Instruments Collaborative. We were working with the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers, TransAlta, and Lafarge cement. These were the biggest polluters in Canada. We were working together to try to design economic instruments to deal with air quality problems, one of which was global climate change. The Liberals at that time had been elected in 1993 on a platform to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 20% by 2005. Instead, the Liberals ignored the collaborative regulatory design on which we had worked together and had achieved this amazing consensus between disparate groups. They chose not to implement that. Instead, emissions increased by over 30%. By 2005, to our shame, the United Nations reported Canada's pollution had increased more than any other signatory to Kyoto.

Therefore, while the New Democrats support the ratification of the Paris agreement, we are concerned that the Liberals have shown no plan and no real effort toward achieving its targets.

Canadians elected the Liberal government on the promise to establish national emission-reduction targets. That was in the Liberals' platform. Now in government, they are backtracking to what they used to call “catastrophic” Harper targets, and Canada is still without a national greenhouse gas reduction plan. All spring, Liberals in the House kept telling us we have committees. However, committees do not reduce emissions.

Carbon pricing will not guarantee a greenhouse gas reduction either, and it will not meet the Paris targets. Carbon pricing without emission reductions leaves it to the market to decide how much pollution we get; and leaving it to the market is how we got into this mess in the first place.

Conservatives compounded the mess. There is no question. They disgracefully put Canada on the climate fossil map, as the first signatory to withdraw from Kyoto. They defunded the National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy, a group we sorely need right now. They failed to monitor or regulate emissions from the fossil fuel industry. Also, they continued to give their corporate fossil friends billions in annual tax breaks.

Liberal decisions are not looking very climate friendly right now either. Approving the Pacific NorthWest liquid natural gas project is inconsistent with the federal government's commitment to lead on climate change and clean innovation. At 10 million tonnes, it will be one of the largest carbon polluters in the country. There was no meaningful consultation and accommodation with indigenous communities. That feels to us like the Site C dam problem as well. This summer, at the site of the proposed dam, indigenous leaders showed me B.C. Hydro pulverizing old growth forests and mulching a carbon sink during reservoir preparation, and this is all to power further fossil fuel production. It is an embarrassment for us.

We are looking for real climate action. We are looking for ratification of the Paris accord, but we need regulation, reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, and support for innovation to create sustainable jobs.

As legislators in the House, we have a sacred duty to future generations, to the people, to the animals, to make it right for our planet, and for the first time in Canadian history, to actually lead on climate change.

● (1640)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what we witnessed this week started off with the Prime Minister indicating very clearly to all Canadians that the government is listening and understands that, to move forward, we need to act on our environment and take the economy into consideration. The Paris agreement and many discussions that have taken place with our provincial and territorial leaders, indigenous peoples, and so many others, have ultimately led to what the Prime Minister introduced to the House.

Carbon taxing of pollution has been taking place in many other jurisdictions, including here in Canada today. Does the New Democratic Party have a position on what sort of price it would like to see when it comes to a carbon taxing policy on pollution?

● (1645)

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson: Mr. Speaker, I believe the member was in the House the three times that New Democrats brought climate change legislation to the House. Twice it was passed in the House, and one time it was stopped in the Senate.

The member knows our commitment to actual, measurable, enforceable emission reductions that would help climate change. I do not think either of the parties across the House, whether New Democrat or Liberal, believes that a price on carbon alone will deal produce the reductions we need. We are in trouble in this country, coastal communities especially. We need emission reductions fast, and we need the government to take strong leadership.

As the member knows, it was a cap-and-trade program on which we campaigned. I was very involved with the success of cap and trade in reducing emissions causing acid rain. We know that it works to get emissions down to a reliable, measurable level, but it also gives industry the flexibility to work together. That is a way to price carbon while ratcheting emissions down. Until we see the government's plan to actually act on emission reductions, we will continue to ask these questions in the House.

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as an ecologist I am quite familiar with a lot of the predictions and projections around the increase in climate change over the next few decades. One of the clearest projections in British Columbia especially, as my colleague mentioned, was the warming of our rivers. Just last year in my riding in the Okanagan Valley we were predicted to get a record run of sockeye salmon, over 400,000 fish. Almost all of them—all but 10,000—died in the pools of the Columbia River because the water was too warm.

We hear a lot on the price of action, especially from the Conservatives. I want to know what the price of inaction is, especially with regard to salmon.

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson: Mr. Speaker, my colleague and I share a salmon connection—I on the coast and my colleague in the interior. This is such a valuable industry for our province. Our province was built on salmon. We are salmon people and we have a very strong commitment around the indigenous relationship in British Columbia to stand up in every way we can for salmon. This is a 100% federal responsibility.

Sockeye salmon at our latitude, which are already at their southern range, are threatened with extinction by 2050, and maybe all species of salmon, beyond sockeye, by 2100. It would be a disaster economically and environmentally. We cannot let that happen.

What is happening is that, as rivers get hotter, the salmon either cannot go up to spawn, or else they wait in the hope for cooler water at which point they get preyed on by seals and other animals.

When we lose our salmon population, not only are there human impacts, but the endangered orca whale that is resident in the southern Strait of Georgia, also known as the Salish Sea, is losing its primary food. Therefore we have a commitment as the federal government, a deep responsibility to protect the Chinook salmon on which the endangered orca rely. It is a mammal identified as a species at risk, and we have a strong responsibility to act. Reducing greenhouse gas emissions is the best way for us to do that.

Mr. Murray Rankin (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I support the ratification of the Paris agreement. I support aggressive action to cut carbon pollution and to create clean energy jobs. In fact, I ran to represent Victoria here in Parliament, in large part, because I just could not stand on the sidelines any longer, as the Conservative government drove our country further down the road toward the enormous economic, social, and environmental costs of climate change.

Never before has one generation handed such a hefty bill to the next. We owe it to young Canadians to do everything in our power to reduce that bill. The next generation deserves a healthy environment and a prosperous, resilient, sustainable low-carbon economy.

I am proud to support the ratification of the Paris agreement, but I fear that the targets now shared by the Liberals and the Conservatives, as well as the recent decisions of the government with regard to Site C and the Pacific NorthWest LNG proposal, are simply inconsistent with our obligations to that international agreement, to indigenous peoples, and to young Canadians, who will bear the burden of our inaction.

We meet today as the people of Haiti are digging out from the destruction of yet another hurricane, Hurricane Matthew, and millions of Americans are evacuating their homes on the eastern seaboard as the storm approaches. In Florida, a state of emergency has been declared. Families are stocking up on gasoline and bottled water, and shop owners are boarding up their businesses as we speak today.

This is just one storm, but it illustrates a trend Canadians are seeing across our country and around the globe. A changing climate is bringing more extreme weather, more ice and wind storms, more fires, and more floods. The Calgary floods, for example, cost Canadians $6 billion, and only a third of that was covered by insurance, leaving families and governments to pick up the tab. The Fort McMurray fire destroyed 2,400 homes and became the costliest disaster that insurers in Canada have ever seen.

Canadians know that climate change is not coming; it is here. If we do not take aggressive action, the costs are just going to keep climbing. The Liberals' plan to go back to Stephen Harper's plan, Stephen Harper's targets, and Stephen Harper's timeline is deeply disappointing to my community in Victoria and, indeed, to many Canadians who care deeply about the future of our planet.

Five years ago, the National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy wrote a major report. It forecast that climate change will cost Canadians $5 billion each year by 2020. That is about the cost of the Calgary floods each year.

We owe it to look down the road, not look at the short-term vista only, and to think about what we are doing to our children's and grandchildren's futures. I had the opportunity to meet last night with David Suzuki to talk about the carbon pricing that the Liberals have put on the table, and I can say that he was as deeply disappointed as the people in my riding are with what this plan would actually accomplish.

By the middle of this century, that bill I mentioned that the round table talked about is expected to grow to $20 billion a year and $40 billion in the worst case. That is the equivalent of several Calgary floods and Fort McMurray fires each year. That means more damage from storm surges, particularly in Atlantic Canada, as sea levels rise and as the Greenland ice cap melts. A drop in air quality means more hospital visits in Toronto, Montreal, Calgary, and Vancouver. There is not a single member in the chamber who wants to see that happen, so let us talk plainly about what needs to happen next.

To avert catastrophic climate damage, we need to reduce the pollution that we pump into the air each year. The more we cut pollution, the lower the bill for future generations. It is really that simple. That pollution is measured in megatonnes or millions of tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent.

● (1650)

In 1990, Canada emitted 613 megatonnes. A Liberal government then signed the Kyoto protocol, promising to reduce emissions by 6% by 2012, but by 2012, our carbon pollution had actually gone up from 613 megatonnes to 710. By 2014, according to Environment Canada, our emissions reached 732 megatonnes, 20% higher than when we signed on to Kyoto.

The fact that pollution keeps going up has never stopped governments from making promises. At another summit, this time in Copenhagen, the last government pledged to reduce Canada's emissions to 611 megatonnes by 2020, effectively bringing them back to where they were in 1990. Are we on track? Environment Canada projects that carbon pollution will get worse between now and 2020. According to its data, we will miss our target by 116 million tonnes. Let us not forget that the target, the one chosen by the Conservatives and then xeroxed by the Liberals on the way to Paris, is not nearly enough to save future generations from the enormous costs I spoke of earlier.

The best science shows that a tipping point will be reached if our planet heats up more than 2° above the pre-industrial level. Once we cross that tipping point, the damage to ecosystems and to our economy could be catastrophic and irreversible. That is why article 2 of the Paris accord calls for nations to work together to hold temperature increases to “well below that 2° red line”, and ideally to 1.5°. That is the goal of the Paris agreement and what I stand here to support.

The hard truth is that the targets set by Stephen Harper and now supported by the Liberals will not meet that goal. In fact, they knowingly undermine it. One virtue of the Liberals and Conservatives sharing the same climate goals is that it simplifies the math, because Mr. Harper's targets were already part of the calculation made by the UN Climate Secretariat last year before the Paris accord.

It does not have to be that way. The Americans and the Europeans are on track to meet the Copenhagen targets. They are cutting their pollution. Their economies are not stagnant. The American economy is growing.

We have a choice. Adapting to climate change is the defining challenge of our time. We can buckle underneath it. We can let it slam the brakes on our economy and tear down our infrastructure and damage our health, or we can rise to meet a challenge that will organize and measure the very best of our energies and skills as Canadians. We in the NDP intend to see Canada rise to this challenge. We have always done it before and we will do it again.

● (1655)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it pleases me that we are getting closer to what will be a positive message to all Canadians when it comes time to vote on the Paris agreement. It addresses an accumulation of a number of things from Canadians in every region of the country. We understand how important the issue of climate change is to Canadians.

We disagree with some of the things that have been said, particularly by members of the Conservative Party.

Our Prime Minister has taken a national leadership role and has put something tangible in place. Do the New Democrats believe, as we do, that the revenues to be generated would be provided back to the provinces? Do those members believe that Ottawa's role is one of leadership and ensuring that all jurisdictions in Canada have some form of carbon reduction in place, which we have been talking so much about over the last few days?

Mr. Murray Rankin: Mr. Speaker, we do believe that under the Constitution there is a strong role for the federal government to show the leadership that Canadians have been demanding. We have seen local governments take the lead. The City of Nelson has a program for the installation of solar panels, whereby the individual consumers who install them will receive a lower price on that utility and save as a result. In the city of Hinton, Alberta, geothermal is taking off.

I do believe that the clean energy future we are talking about will start at the federal level, through its leadership. However, it also has to be acknowledged that is happening in the provinces and at the local level.

If the government is serious, the provinces should be able to make this a revenue neutral initiative. I think it is important that the revenues levied are not seen as a mere tax—they should not be, and were not seen as such in the British Columbian context, and need not be in this one either—and the provinces need to be allowed to retain the revenues, but only as a step to do what needs to be done, and much more aggressively than the Liberals are talking about with their initial $10 a tonne price, which will of course do nothing.

● (1700)

[*Translation*]

Mr. François Choquette (Drummond, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I listened closely to my colleague's speech. He is passionate about improving the environment and creating a better future for coming generations, and he is dedicated to making that happen.

There are two possible approaches here. As the Liberals like to say, we could go the Conservative route and do nothing, or we could go with the New Democrats' approach. The NDP has a plan and has already introduced a bill on accountability with respect to dangerous climate change. Jack Layton's bill was introduced twice in the House of Commons.

Jack Layton had very high ambitions. He wanted to reduce climate change to 80% below 1990 levels—not 2005 levels, which makes no sense—by 2050. That is proof positive the NDP really wants to make progress.

The Liberals have plenty of nice things to say, but they do not actually do much. We need to take meaningful steps now. According to the now-defunct National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy, which lasted until the Liberals killed it, not tackling climate change right now will cost us $50 billion a year.

Does my colleague agree that, if we invest in fighting climate change now, future generations will benefit for a long time to come?

[*English*]

Mr. Murray Rankin: Mr. Speaker, I want to salute the passion my colleague from Drummond has shown for the environment since I met him in this place. I can only confirm what he has said. We did bring a bill forward. It was a real bill. To the everlasting shame of Parliament, that bill was defeated by unelected, unaccountable senators. That is something we should all be ashamed about.

The Liberals do not appear to have a plan. They have aspirations, and I salute those aspirations, but the time has come to have a real plan of action to actually do something that would be meaningful, not simply talk about it, as we did with Kyoto, but roll up our sleeves and work with the provinces, local governments, NGOs, and industry to bring about the future our children and grandchildren deserve.

Hon. Jim Carr (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Vaudreuil—Soulanges.

I thank the right hon. member for Papineau for his motion.

I suspect that when most of us look back on our time in the House, we may well point to this motion as one of the most consequential votes of our careers. This is one of those rare moments when what is before us transcends parties and has implications for decades to come. The motion is about how this country will respond to the great challenge of our time, and how we will honour the principles of Paris.

Since coming to office, our government has been guided by some important principles: that environmental responsibility goes hand-in-hand with economic prosperity, that engagement is better than estrangement, that Canada works best when Canadians work together, and that no relationship is more important than the one with indigenous peoples.

These values have guided our actions and informed our policies. The motion before us today reflects those same values. The Paris agreement highlights the urgency of our environmental responsibility while pointing us toward new economic opportunities, and it speaks to the necessity of co-operation toward a common goal.

The agreement also reflects a compelling reality that while the transition to a lower carbon future might be long, the trajectory is clear, that we simply cannot continue along the present course but are at a pivotal moment, a time when the world truly begins the historic adjustment toward more renewable sources of energy.

Our government understands the imperatives of this moment. We are committed to making Canada a leader in the new clean energy economy of the future, and our actions have reflected that commitment.

We began by signing the Paris agreement. We became one of the founding members of the mission innovation agreement, the ambitious global agreement to double government investment in clean technology. We have signed a far-reaching agreement with our North American partners on climate, clean energy and the environment, and may I say with some local pride that much of that work was done in my home city of Winnipeg.

Our first budget invested $1 billion in clean energy and technology; $2 billion in a low-carbon fund to work with the provinces; more than $100 million in energy efficiency; and billions more in public transit and evergreen infrastructure, including charging stations for electric vehicles and fuelling stations for alternatively fuelled vehicles.

Now we have set a benchmark for pricing carbon pollution starting at $10 per tonne in 2018 and rising by $10 each year to $50 per tonne by 2022. This will help Canada meet its climate change targets while providing greater certainty to Canadian businesses.

Our government has been moved and inspired by the perspective of indigenous people, a perspective that reminds us of our responsibility to those who have come before and those who will follow, of our enduring relationship to the land and the water and the air. It is also a perspective that places a great deal of emphasis on relationships. As Grand Chief Perry Bellegarde has said so well, “Before you build anything, build positive, respectful relationships”.

This, too, has been reflected in how we have developed and implemented public policy. We have reached out to tap the common sense of Canadians on how best to move us along the continuum toward a lower carbon economy; and it is a continuum, because while it is exciting to think about the clean energy, low-carbon economy of the future, we are not there yet, and we will not be there for years to come.

Even in light of the Paris agreement, as the world continues to transition to renewable sources of energy, the demand for fossil fuels will continue to rise. By 2040, a growing middle class in developing regions, such as Asia, will be consuming more barrels of oil every day, and to meet that demand, the world will have to make trillions of dollars in investments.

● (1705)

At the same time, the percentage of natural gas in the global energy mix is likely to increase as a natural transition fuel, cleaner than coal or oil, and more accessible than many renewables. For a country like ours, which is rich in both of these resources, this has profound implications.

We could simply say that we are going to shut down the oil sands and natural gas production and let others meet this global demand, let others have the jobs and reap the benefits. This is certainly one option, or we could say, let us use this period of increasing demand to our advantage. Let us build the infrastructure to get our energy to global markets sustainably and use the revenues to fund Canada's transition to cleaner forms of energy.

In other words, let us leverage the fossil fuel resources we have today to deliver clean energy solutions for tomorrow, which is why the Prime Minister has said that the choice between pipelines and wind turbines is a false one. We need both.

Provinces such as Alberta are demonstrating that a forward-thinking energy-producing jurisdiction can also be a leader in combatting climate change. That is the way forward for Canada. That is our vision for the future, to use the coming decades to meet rising global demand for oil and gas while funding the next generation of renewable energy.

That is only possible if we receive full value for our resources, and that is why our government has been clear that one of our key responsibilities is to help get our resources to market in an environmentally responsible way.

The problem is that Canadians lost faith in how major resource projects were assessed. Our challenge is to restore that trust, and that is what we are working hard to achieve. We have expanded consultations to build an environmental review process that carries the confidence of Canadians. We are meaningfully engaging with indigenous communities. We will initiate a modernization of the National Energy Board. We established an interim strategy with principles to give proponents certainty and the process transparency.

Will all of these efforts lead to unanimity on any particular project? Not only do I doubt it, I know it will not.

We understand that there are strongly held views on all sides, which is why it is so important that Canadians have the opportunity to be heard. At the end of the day, Canadians will be able to say, whether they agree with the decision or not, that the process was fair, the evidence was weighed, and their voices were heard.

Today's motion is consistent with our government's long-term plan to help combat climate change, build up our clean technologies, restore Canadians' trust in how we go about evaluating major resource projects, and get our energy to global markets. It advances good-paying, clean economy jobs for Canadians, and positions us at the forefront of what is both the great challenge and opportunity of our time, the transition to a lower carbon future.

There is a Chinese proverb that says, "The best time to plant a tree was 20 years ago. The second-best time is now." The best time to have been serious about climate change may have been years ago, but the second-best time is now.

● (1710)

Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC): Mr. Speaker, speaking of planting trees, I am proud to say that I did plant well over 1,700 trees and it was more than 20 years ago. Those trees are well on their way now.

All through the conversation today, we have been hearing comments like "their voices will be heard" and "we are working together". I wonder how we can actually believe that, when three of the premiers walked out of the meeting in which climate change was being discussed and this prospect of having the hammer brought down upon the provinces was outlined.

How can we call that working together? How can we call that working collaboratively?

Hon. Jim Carr: Mr. Speaker, in 2007, the Progressive Conservative government of Alberta made a decision to put a price on carbon. British Columbia has put a price on carbon. The Conservative government of Manitoba says it is going to put a price on carbon. Ontario and Quebec have put a price on carbon.

The government believes in putting a price on carbon. The New Democratic opposition believes in putting a price on carbon, and so does the Bloc Québécois. That only leaves the Conservative opposition in the House that refuses to believe that we should put a price on carbon.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Order, please. I am sure that the hon. minister appreciates the coaching that he is getting from across the aisle, but it does go against the rules. I just want to remind the members that it cannot be done.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for South Okanagan—West Kootenay.

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of accompanying the minister to the clean energy ministerial meetings in San Francisco this spring. It was a very positive meeting. There were attendees from, I believe, 27 countries from all over the world. He mentioned mission innovation. One remarkable moment I remember was when George Shultz, the former secretary of state with Ronald Reagan, someone who probably would not vote NDP if he lived in Canada, exhorted the world leaders there to put a $200-a-tonne price on carbon.

The other message that was repeated again and again was that we have to stop subsidizing the fossil fuel industries.

When is the minister's government going to do just that, as it promised during the election campaign?

Hon. Jim Carr: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for his participation in the clean energy ministerial meeting in San Francisco. I was very happy that he attended with us and was able to experience first-hand the way in which much of the world is viewing Canada as leaders in the world, and particularly our involvement in the North American accord. To have both the critic, the member for Portage—Lisgar, and my hon. friend with the government was important. To make a statement in many of these international fora, it is important that Canada speak with one voice, or at least, listen with many ears. Therefore, I appreciated that.

The subsidy to fossil fuels is a G20 commitment, of which Canada is a part, over time. The government will take that decision when it believes the economic conditions are right for that particular policy, which is shared by at least 20 nations around the world.

● (1715)

Mr. Dan Vandal (Saint Boniface—Saint Vital, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister is aware that way back in 2008, under the former Harper Conservative government, in the Speech from the Throne, the government did indeed commit to implementing a price on carbon. The then Conservative minister for the environment said, "Carbon trading and the establishment of a market price on carbon are key parts of our Turning the Corner plan". He further said that they would like to force industry to reduce its greenhouse emissions, set up a carbon emission trading market, and establish a market price on carbon.

Of course, like much of the plans under the former government, it went nowhere.

I wonder if the minister is aware that back in 2008 this was the position of the Conservative government.

Hon. Jim Carr: Mr. Speaker, I am very impressed with my hon. friend's research. I am glad to be reminded of that.

He also could have quoted Preston Manning, who said exactly the same thing. Mr. Manning talked about how unusual it was that Conservatives do not understand that markets were the best mechanism to deal with an issue such as climate change. There are many examples of Conservatives, and conservative thinkers, who agree that carbon pricing is a sensible way, not the only way, one of many ways, to tackle climate change.

Mr. Peter Schiefke (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Youth), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour for me to speak in favour of the ratification of the historic Paris agreement. It is one that sets the stage for the world to come together to meet the challenges posed by climate change and displays a level of leadership on this file not seen for far too long.

As someone who has spent a good portion of his life working in the climate field and educating Canadians on the science and solutions to the climate crisis, I am proud to count myself among the members of this government who are working towards meeting this multi-generational challenge.

I am proud, because this government understands that the Paris agreement, although historic, is simply the beginning of something much larger. Indeed, it was among the first key steps in this government's plan to meet this challenge, and many steps have been taken since then by our government under the leadership of our Prime Minister, our Minister of Environment and Climate Change, and our Minister of Natural Resources.

The data is in, and the facts speak for themselves. Here in Canada, we are already seeing the impacts of climate change and a changing climate. We are seeing thawing permafrost, coastal erosion, the arrival of new diseases, as well as more frequent extreme events, such as flooding, droughts, and heat waves.

Homeowners in flood-prone areas have already borne serious losses, as we have seen from events in Alberta, Toronto, and elsewhere. The 2016 parliamentary budget officer's report tells us that Canadian insurers have paid at least $1 billion per year in claims for losses resulting from weather events in the last six years alone. Seniors are also living with increased heat-advisory days. Young Canadians are experiencing increased asthma diagnoses. Canadians in general are experiencing the hardships posed by a changing climate. The examples go on and on.

The changes in climate we are seeing now are the result of past and present emissions, and are already locked in. Therefore, even if we were to cut our emissions to zero tomorrow, the climate would continue to change because of the lag between our actions and the lifespan of those emissions in the atmosphere. That is one of the main reasons why action is urgent.

Six months ago, we began, as we promised Canadians we would, by consulting them. With the momentum of the Paris climate agreement talks, our government began these consultations by meeting with provinces and territories. Together we released the Vancouver declaration and, with it, launched a national conversation about how Canada should address the climate crisis.

Our government understands the importance of meeting the international commitments that we made in Paris. We also know that leading our country through a transition to a stronger, more resilient, low-carbon economy will ultimately improve our quality of life here in Canada. As such, early on in our mandate, a concrete plan for a pan-Canadian framework on clean growth and climate change began to be developed. It is a framework that was reflected in our first budget, I might add, and one that outlines investments in green infrastructure, green jobs, science and technologies, and much more. Further, it outlined direct investments in adaptation and mitigation, and this latter point is especially important, particularly for those communities most at risk in the northern regions of our country.

While strong mitigation actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions can help us avoid unmanageable situations in the future, strong adaptation measures will ensure that we manage the unavoidable impacts we are currently facing and will continue to face moving forward. Adaptation and mitigation are not either-or choices. Both are equally important and demand action.

There is already considerable work under way all across the country to adapt to the changing climate. In budget 2016, our government committed $129 million to build the science base to inform decision-making to protect the health and well-being of Canadians, to build resilience in the north and in our indigenous communities, and to ensure and enhance the competitiveness of key economic sectors. We have also made significant commitments to renewing Canada's infrastructure and protecting Canada's communities from the impacts of climate change.

Adaptation is not just about newer, bigger, or stronger physical infrastructure. It is also about how we as Canadians live resilient lives and live in resilient communities. It is the decisions we make about where and how we live, how we run our businesses, and how we support our neighbours. It is also about relationships with indigenous peoples. Indigenous communities have strongly expressed to us that climate change threatens their very physical, cultural, and social well-being, and even survival.

● (1720)

It is clear that climate change impacts touch every region and sector of our country, including the north. Our government is working alongside Inuit governments, the United States, Sweden, and Finland to finalize a governance model focusing on the resilience of the Arctic states, indigenous peoples and communities, and the ecosystems on which they depend.

The federal government is once again a partner. We are working with all orders of government, including indigenous peoples, the private and not-profit sectors, and academia, strengthening our ability to make prudent decisions because our government recognizes that by mobilizing other governments, stakeholders, and Canadians to tackle this challenge, we are protecting our people, our communities, our assets, our economy, and our environment from the inevitable impacts otherwise.

Indeed, our government also recognizes that adapting to climate change comes with a host of other significant benefits, including things like cleaner air, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, enhanced biodiversity, more vibrant public spaces, and a strengthened social fabric. Our government is committed to working with all Canadians to make Canada stronger, more resilient, and more prosperous. In addition to these historic steps that we have already taken, the latest step of putting a price on carbon is crucial and one that would help Canada meet its commitments outlined in the Paris agreement.

[*Translation*]

That will help our government to build a cleaner and more innovative economy where there are fewer greenhouse gas emissions, the environment is protected, and high-paying jobs are created for the middle class and those working hard to join it.

A floor price on carbon, such as the one that was announced, will help Canada reach its targets for greenhouse gas emissions while providing businesses with greater stability and improved predictability. After decades of inaction, after years of missed opportunities, we will finally take the measures necessary to protect our planet for our children and grandchildren.

We are focused on real, concrete, and sustainable measures to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and grow our economy. Our approach will ensure that all Canadian jurisdictions put a price on carbon pollution by 2018.

Eighty percent of Canadians already live in a jurisdiction where there is a price on carbon. However, other measures are necessary. It is important to put a price on carbon across the country. Every province and territory will have the opportunity to decide how to implement carbon pricing, whether it be by putting a direct price on carbon pollution or adopting a cap-and-trade system.

Setting a price for carbon pollution will give Canada a significant advantage while we build a clean-growth economy and it will help our businesses to become more innovative and competitive.

Canadians know that putting a price on pollution will promote innovation and the creation of new, stimulating employment opportunities for Canada's middle class. The people of my riding of Vaudreuil—Soulanges and Canadians across the country know that reducing our greenhouse gas emissions will make our economy more competitive and help grow it in a sustainable way.

● (1725)

[*English*]

Let us just take a moment to ask and even answer some of the key questions that may be posed regarding the ratification of the Paris agreement and our plan to meet the challenges of climate change and our commitments set forth in the Paris agreement. In the process, it may allow me to debunk some of the assertions that have been put forth by some hon. members of Her Majesty's loyal opposition.

First, would this plan take the money out of provinces? The answer is no. No matter how hard the opposition members try to say otherwise, the money and all revenues received from the price on carbon would be given back to each province, and the provinces would decide how these funds should be spent.

Second, would this help us reach our GHG reduction goals? The answer simply put is yes. Pricing pollution is one of the most efficient ways to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to reach our objective to protect the environment and create a clean-growth economy.

Third, would ratification of the agreement and our plan to meet our obligations under it create opportunities for Canadians? The answer is yes. Through market incentives created by putting a price on carbon, our investments in green infrastructure, public transportation, and science and technologies will help us realize new and exciting job prospects for well-paying jobs and grow the economy and help the middle class and those working hard to join it.

In conclusion, I just want to add the following. In addition to the economic opportunities and health and security benefits just presented, this is simply what we as members of Parliament have been called here to do. Canadians have been calling for action on climate. The majority of Canadians support putting a price on carbon. They understand that the implications of inaction far outweigh the implications of action—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Order, please.

Questions and comments. The hon. member for Winnipeg North.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I believe the member was providing some most interesting concluding thoughts. Perhaps he could share those concluding thoughts with the House.

Mr. Peter Schiefke: Mr. Speaker, that is a wonderful question. I thank him for providing me with an opportunity to conclude my remarks in responding to that question.

Canadians understand that the implications of inaction far outweigh the implications of action. That holds true for current and future generations of Canadians. We owe it to them to be sure, and to all of those who came before us and made the hard choices that were necessary to build a strong Canada that we can all be proud of.

For these reasons, and more, I wholeheartedly support the ratification of the Paris agreement, and I encourage all hon. members of the House to support it as well.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alupa Clarke (Beauport—Limoilou, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague from Vaudreuil—Soulanges on his speech. I have a question for him.

I think my colleague is well aware that many Canadian municipalities, especially in rural areas, sadly have no public transit to speak of. Nonetheless, countless workers have to put gas in their cars to get to work.

What does his government intend to do for the workers who will be unable to afford rising gas prices resulting from the carbon tax? What does his government intend to do to help these people get to work?

Mr. Peter Schiefke: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for the question.

First, our government is making record investments in public transit, including through our budget 2016-17. This will give many cities such as Montreal, Toronto, and Vancouver the opportunity to develop public transit systems that are accessible to people currently without access.

Second, through our budget, we are going to invest in science and technology to promote the manufacture of electric vehicles so that people have a less expensive way to get to work.

● (1730)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): It being 5:30 p.m., pursuant to order made Tuesday, October 4, 2016, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of Motion No. 8 under government business.

[*English*]

The question is on the subamendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the subamendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those in favour of the subamendment will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Call in the members.

● (1810)

[*Translation*]

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

(Division No. 117)

YEAS

Members

Angus
Aubin
Beaulieu
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boulerice
Brosseau
Caron
Christopherson
Donnelly
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Fortin
Gill
Johns
Kwan
Malcolmson
Mathyssen
Mulcair
Pauzé
Quach
Rankin
Sansoucy
Stewart
Trudel– — 45
Ashton
Barsalou-Duval
Benson
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Cannings
Choquette
Davies
Dubé
Dusseault
Garrison
Hardcastle
Julian
Laverdière
Masse (Windsor West)
Moore
Nantel
Plamondon
Ramsey
Saganash
Stetski
Thériault

NAYS

Members

Albas
Alghabra
Allison
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Badawey
Bains
Beech
Bergen
Berthold
Bibeau
Albrecht
Alleslev
Amos
Arnold
Arya
Bagnell
Baylis
Bennett
Bernier
Bezan
Bittle
Blair
Block
Bossio
Brassard
Breton
Brown
Calkins
Carrie
Champagne
Chen
Clarke
Cormier
Dabrusin
Deltell
Dhillon
Dion
Doherty
Drouin
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Eglinski
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fast
Fillmore
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garneau
Genuis
Gladu
Goodale
Gourde
Hajdu
Hardie
Hehr
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Joly
Jowhari
Kelly
Khalid
Kitchen
Lametti
Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leitch
Leslie
Lightbound
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
Maguire
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCallum
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)
Monsef
Morrissey
Nassif
Nicholson
Oliphant
O'Regan
Ouellette
Paul-Hus
Philpott
Poilievre
Qualtrough
Rempel
Ritz
Rodriguez
Ruimy
Saini
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boissonnault
Boucher
Bratina
Brison
Caesar-Chavannes
Carr
Chagger
Chan
Chong
Cooper
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Di Iorio
Diotte
Dreeshen
Dubourg
Duguid
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Falk
Fergus
Finley
Fisher
Foote
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Gallant
Généreux
Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Graham
Harder
Harvey
Hoback
Housefather
Hutchings
Jeneroux
Jordan
Kang
Kent
Khera
Lake
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lebel
Lefebvre
Lemieux
Levitt
Lobb
Long
Ludwig
MacKenzie
Maloney
McColeman
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Morrissey
Murray
Nassif
Nault
Nicholson
Nuttall
Oliphant
Oliver
O'Regan
O'Toole
Ouellette
Paradis
Paul-Hus
Petitpas Taylor
Philpott
Picard
Poilievre
Poissant
Qualtrough
Raitt
Rempel
Rioux
Ritz
Robillard
Rodriguez
Rota
Ruimy
Rusnak
Saini
Sajjan

Samson
Sarai
Scheer
Schmale
Serré
Shanahan
Shields
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Sorbara
Stanton
Stubbs
Tabbara
Tassi
Tootoo
Trudeau
Van Loan
Vandenbeld
Vecchio
Virani
Warawa
Waugh
Wilkinson
Wong
Young
Zahid
Sangha
Saroya
Schiefke
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Shipley
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sopuck
Spengemann
Strahl
Sweet
Tan
Tilson
Trost
Van Kesteren
Vandal
Vaughan
Viersen
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewskyj
Yurdiga
Zimmer– — 240

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the amendment to the amendment lost.

[*English*]

The next question is on the amendment. The question is as follows. Shall I dispense?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: No.

[*Chair read text of amendment to House*]

The Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (1820)

[*Translation*]

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

(Division No. 118)

YEAS

Members

Albas
Allison
Albrecht
Arnold
Bergen
Berthold
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boucher
Brown
Carrie
Clarke
Deltell
Doherty
Eglinski
Fast
Gallant
Genuis
Gourde
Hoback
Kelly
Kitchen
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Leitch
MacKenzie
McColeman
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Raitt
Ritz
Scheer
Shields
Sopuck
Strahl
Sweet
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga
Bernier
Bezan
Block
Brassard
Calkins
Chong
Cooper
Diotte
Dreeshen
Falk
Finley
Généreux
Gladu
Harder
Jeneroux
Kent
Lake
Lebel
Lobb
Maguire
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Nicholson
O'Toole
Poilievre
Rempel
Saroya
Schmale
Shipley
Stanton
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Loan
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Wong
Zimmer– — 78

NAYS

Members

Alghabra
Amos
Angus
Arya
Aubin
Bagnell
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bennett
Bibeau
Blair
Boissonnault
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Brosseau
Cannings
Carr
Champagne
Chen
Christopherson
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Di Iorio
Donnelly
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dusseault
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Badawey
Bains
Baylis
Beech
Benson
Bittle
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boulerice
Bratina
Brison
Caesar-Chavannes
Caron
Chagger
Chan
Choquette
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhillon
Dion
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fisher
Foote
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Gill
Goodale

Gould
Hajdu
Hardie
Hehr
Housefather
Hutchings
Johns
Jordan
Julian
Khalid
Kwan
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Lemieux
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)
Mathyssen
McCallum
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Monsef
Morrissey
Murray
Nassif
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Qualtrough
Rankin
Robillard
Rota
Rusnak
Saini
Samson
Sansoucy
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann
Stewart
Tan
Thériault
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Zahid– — 207

Graham
Hardcastle
Harvey
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Joly
Jowhari
Kang
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Laverdière
Lefebvre
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
Malcolmson
Marcil
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)
Moore
Mulcair
Nantel
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Pauzé
Philpott
Plamondon
Quach
Ramsey
Rioux
Rodriguez
Ruimy
Saganash
Sajjan
Sangha
Sarai
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Stetski
Tabbara
Tassi
Tootoo
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wilson-Raybould
Young

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the amendment lost

The next question is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed

Some hon. members: No.

● (1825)

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

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

(Division No. 119)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra
Amos
Angus
Arya
Aubin
Bagnell
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bennett
Bibeau
Blair
Boissonnault
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Brosseau
Cannings
Carr
Champagne
Chen
Christopherson
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Di Iorio
Donnelly
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dusseault
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hajdu
Hardie
Hehr
Housefather
Hutchings
Johns
Jordan
Julian
Khalid
Kwan
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Lemieux
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)
Mathyssen
McCallum

Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Badawey
Bains
Baylis
Beech
Benson
Bittle
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boulerice
Bratina
Brison
Caesar-Chavannes
Caron
Chagger
Chan
Choquette
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhillon
Dion
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fisher
Foote
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Gill
Goodale
Graham
Hardcastle
Harvey
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Joly
Jowhari
Kang
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Laverdière
Lefebvre
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
Malcolmson
Marcil
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon

McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Monsef
Morrissey
Murray
Nassif
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Qualtrough
Rankin
Robillard
Rota
Rusnak
Saini
Samson
Sansoucy
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann
Stewart
Tan
Thériault
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Zahid– — 207

McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)
Moore
Mulcair
Nantel
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Pauzé
Philpott
Plamondon
Quach
Ramsey
Rioux
Rodriguez
Ruimy
Saganash
Sajjan
Sangha
Sarai
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Stetski
Tabbara
Tassi
Tootoo
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wilson-Raybould
Young

NAYS

Members

Albas
Allison
Arnold
Bernier
Bezan
Block
Brassard
Calkins
Chong
Cooper
Diotte
Dreeshen
Falk
Finley
Généreux
Gladu
Harder
Jeneroux
Kent
Lake
Lebel
Lobb
Maguire
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Nicholson
O'Toole
Poilievre
Rempel
Saroya
Schmale
Shipley
Sorenson
Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Van Loan
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh

Albrecht
Anderson
Bergen
Berthold
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boucher
Brown
Carrie
Clarke
Deltell
Doherty
Eglinski
Fast
Gallant
Genuis
Gourde
Hoback
Kelly
Kitchen
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Leitch
MacKenzie
McColeman
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Raitt
Ritz
Scheer
Shields
Sopuck
Stanton
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Wong
Yurdiga
Zimmer– — 81

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

● (1830)

[*English*]

MODERNIZING ANIMAL PROTECTIONS ACT

The House resumed from September 28 consideration of the motion that Bill C-246, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Fisheries Act, the Textile Labelling Act, the Wild Animal and Plant Protection and Regulation of International and Interprovincial Trade Act and the Canada Consumer Product Safety Act (animal protection), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-246 under private members' business.

● (1835)

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

(Division No. 120)

YEAS

Members

Amos
Angus
Aubin
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Benson
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boulerice
Brosseau
Caron
Christopherson
Damoff
Donnelly
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
Ellis
Eyolfson
Fortin
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Gould
Hardie
Hussen
Julian
Lametti
Lightbound
Maloney
Mathyssen
McKay
Mendès
Mulcair
Oliphant
Ouellette
Pauzé
Ramsey
Rempel
Saganash
Schiefke
Sikand

Anandasangaree
Ashton
Badawey
Baylis
Beech
Bittle
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Cannings
Choquette
Dabrusin
Davies
Dubé
Dusseault
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fergus
Fry
Garrison
Gill
Hardcastle
Holland
Johns
Kwan
Laverdière
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Moore
Nantel
Oliver
Paradis
Quach
Rankin
Ruimy
Sansoucy
Schulte
Stewart

Tabbara
Trudel
Virani
Thériault
Vandal
Webber– — 84

NAYS

Members

Albas
Alghabra
Allison
Arnold
Arya
Bains
Bergen
Berthold
Bibeau
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boissonnault
Boucher
Bratina
Brison
Caesar-Chavannes
Carr
Chagger
Chan
Chong
Cooper
Cuzner
Dhaliwal
Di Iorio
Diotte
Dreeshen
Dubourg
Duguid
Eglinski
Eyking
Fast
Finley
Fisher
Foote
Fraser (West Nova)
Gallant
Généreux
Gladu
Goodale
Graham
Harder
Hehr
Housefather
Iacono
Joly
Kang
Kent
Khera
Lake
Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leitch
Leslie
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
Maguire
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
McCallum
McColeman
McDonald
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)
Monsef
Morrissey
Nassif
Nicholson
O'Toole
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Raitt
Ritz
Rodriguez
Albrecht
Alleslev
Anderson
Arseneault
Bagnell
Bennett
Bernier
Bezan
Blair
Block
Bossio
Brassard
Breton
Brown
Calkins
Carrie
Champagne
Chen
Clarke
Cormier
Deltell
Dhillon
Dion
Doherty
Drouin
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
El-Khoury
Falk
Fillmore
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Garneau
Genuis
Goldsmith-Jones
Gourde
Hajdu
Harvey
Hoback
Hutchings
Jeneroux
Jordan
Kelly
Khalid
Kitchen
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lebel
Lefebvre
Lemieux
Lobb
Long
Ludwig
MacKenzie
Marcil
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Mendicino
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Murray
Nault
O'Regan
Paul-Hus
Philpott
Poilievre
Qualtrough
Rioux
Robillard
Rota
Rusnak
Sajjan
Sangha
Saroya
Schmale
Sgro
Sheehan
Shipley
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sohi
Sorbara
Spengemann
Stetski
Stubbs
Tan
Tilson
Trost
Van Kesteren
Vandenbeld
Vecchio
Wagantall
Warkentin
Wilson-Raybould
Young
Zahid
Saini
Samson
Sarai
Scheer
Serré
Shanahan
Shields
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Simms
Sopuck
Sorenson
Stanton
Strahl
Sweet
Tassi
Tootoo
Trudeau
Van Loan
Vaughan
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Wong
Yurdiga
Zimmer– — 198

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

* * *

● (1840)

[*Translation*]

TAMIL HERITAGE MONTH

The House resumed from September 29 consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on Motion No. 24, under private members' business, in the name of the member for Scarborough—Rouge Park.

● (1845)

[*English*]

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

(Division No. 121)

YEAS

Members

Albas
Alghabra
Allison
Anandasangaree
Angus
Arseneault
Ashton
Badawey
Bains
Baylis
Beech
Benson
Bernier
Bezan
Bittle
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Block
Bossio
Boudrias
Brassard
Breton
Albrecht
Alleslev
Amos
Anderson
Arnold
Arya
Aubin
Bagnell
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bennett
Bergen
Berthold
Bibeau
Blair
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boissonnault
Boucher
Boutin-Sweet
Bratina
Brison

Brosseau
Caesar-Chavannes
Cannings
Carrie
Champagne
Chen
Choquette
Clarke
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhaliwal
Di Iorio
Diotte
Donnelly
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Falk
Fergus
Finley
Fisher
Foote
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Genuis
Gill
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Graham
Hardcastle
Hardie
Hehr
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Johns
Jordan
Julian
Kelly
Khalid
Kitchen
Lake
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Laverdière
Lebouthillier
Leitch
Leslie
Lightbound
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
Maguire
Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)
Mathyssen
McCallum
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Monsef
Morrissey
Murray
Nassif
Nicholson
Oliphant
O'Regan
Ouellette
Paul-Hus
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poilievre
Brown
Calkins
Carr
Chagger
Chan
Chong
Christopherson
Cooper
Cuzner
Damoff
Deltell
Dhillon
Dion
Doherty
Dreeshen
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dusseault
Eglinski
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fast
Fillmore
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Généreux
Gerretsen
Gladu
Goodale
Gourde
Hajdu
Harder
Harvey
Hoback
Housefather
Hutchings
Jeneroux
Joly
Jowhari
Kang
Kent
Khera
Kwan
Lametti
Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebel
Lefebvre
Lemieux
Levitt
Lobb
Long
Ludwig
MacKenzie
Malcolmson
Marcil
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McColeman
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)
Moore
Mulcair
Nantel
Nault
Nuttall
Oliver
O'Toole
Paradis
Pauzé
Philpott
Plamondon
Poissant
Quach
Raitt
Rankin
Rioux
Robillard
Rota
Rusnak
Saini
Samson
Sansoucy
Saroya
Schiefke
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Shipley
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sopuck
Sorenson
Stanton
Stewart
Stubbs
Tabbara
Tassi
Tootoo
Trudeau
Van Kesteren
Vandal
Vaughan
Viersen
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewskyj
Yurdiga
Zimmer– — 283
Qualtrough
Ramsey
Rempel
Ritz
Rodriguez
Ruimy
Saganash
Sajjan
Sangha
Sarai
Scheer
Schmale
Serré
Shanahan
Shields
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Sorbara
Spengemann
Stetski
Strahl
Sweet
Tan
Thériault
Trost
Trudel
Van Loan
Vandenbeld
Vecchio
Virani
Warawa
Waugh
Wilkinson
Wong
Young
Zahid

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND GOVERNMENT SERVICES ACT

The House resumed from September 30 consideration of the motion that Bill C-227, An Act to amend the Department of Public Works and Government Services Act (community benefit), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-227, under private members' business.

● (1855)

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

(Division No. 122)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra
Amos
Angus
Arya
Aubin
Bagnell
Baylis
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Badawey
Bains
Beech

Bennett
Bibeau
Blair
Boissonnault
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Brosseau
Cannings
Chagger
Chan
Choquette
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhillon
Dion
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fisher
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hajdu
Hardie
Hehr
Housefather
Hutchings
Johns
Jordan
Julian
Khalid
Kwan
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Lemieux
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Mathyssen
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)
Monsef
Moore
Mulcair
Nantel
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Quach
Ramsey
Rioux
Rodriguez
Ruimy
Saganash
Sajjan
Sangha
Sarai
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Benson
Bittle
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Bratina
Brison
Caesar-Chavannes
Carr
Champagne
Chen
Christopherson
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Di Iorio
Donnelly
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dusseault
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Finnigan
Foote
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hardcastle
Harvey
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Joly
Jowhari
Kang
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Laverdière
Lefebvre
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
McCallum
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Morrissey
Murray
Nassif
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Philpott
Poissant
Qualtrough
Rankin
Robillard
Rota
Rusnak
Saini
Samson
Sansoucy
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann
Stetski
Tabbara
Tassi
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Zahid– — 195

Stewart
Tan
Tootoo
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wilson-Raybould
Young

NAYS

Members

Albas
Allison
Arnold
Beaulieu
Bernier
Bezan
Block
Boudrias
Brown
Carrie
Clarke
Deltell
Doherty
Eglinski
Fast
Fortin
Généreux
Gill
Gourde
Hoback
Kent
Lake
Lebel
Lobb
Maguire
McColeman
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Plamondon
Raitt
Ritz
Scheer
Shields
Sopuck
Stanton
Stubbs
Thériault
Trost
Van Loan
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Wong
Zimmer– — 89

Albrecht
Anderson
Barsalou-Duval
Bergen
Berthold
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boucher
Brassard
Calkins
Chong
Cooper
Diotte
Dreeshen
Falk
Finley
Gallant
Genuis
Gladu
Harder
Kelly
Kitchen
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Leitch
MacKenzie
Marcil
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Nicholson
O'Toole
Pauzé
Poilievre
Rempel
Saroya
Schmale
Shipley
Sorenson
Strahl
Sweet
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Accordingly, the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities.

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

* * *

[*Translation*]

FIGHT AGAINST FOOD WASTE ACT

The House resumed from October 4 consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-231 under private members' business.

● (1905)

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

(Division No. 123)

YEAS

Members

Angus
Aubin
Beaulieu
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boucher
Boutin-Sweet
Cannings
Christopherson
Donnelly
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Ellis
Eyking
Fortin
Garrison
Gerretsen
Gourde
Hardcastle
Harvey
Jordan
Kwan
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
Moore
Nantel
Pauzé
Quach
Rankin
Sansoucy
Stewart
Trudel– — 59

Ashton
Barsalou-Duval
Benson
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boudrias
Brosseau
Choquette
Davies
Dubé
Dusseault
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fraser (Central Nova)
Généreux
Gill
Graham
Hardie
Johns
Julian
Laverdière
Marcil
Mathyssen
Mulcair
Paradis
Plamondon
Ramsey
Saganash
Stetski
Thériault

NAYS

Members

Albas
Alghabra
Allison
Anandasangaree
Arnold
Arya
Bagnell
Baylis
Bennett
Bernier
Bezan
Bittle
Block
Bossio
Bratina
Brison
Caesar-Chavannes
Carr
Chagger
Chan
Chong
Cooper
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Di Iorio
Diotte
Dreeshen
Dubourg
Duguid
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Falk
Fergus
Finley
Fisher
Fragiskatos

Albrecht
Alleslev
Amos
Anderson
Arseneault
Badawey
Bains
Beech
Bergen
Berthold
Bibeau
Blair
Boissonnault
Brassard
Breton
Brown
Calkins
Carrie
Champagne
Chen
Clarke
Cormier
Dabrusin
Deltell
Dhillon
Dion
Doherty
Drouin
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Eglinski
El-Khoury
Fast
Fillmore
Finnigan
Foote
Fraser (West Nova)

Fry
Gallant
Genuis
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Harder
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Jowhari
Kelly
Khalid
Kitchen
Lametti
Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leitch
Leslie
Lightbound
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
Maguire
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCallum
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)
Monsef
Morrissey
Nassif
Nicholson
Oliphant
O'Regan
Ouellette
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Rempel
Ritz
Rodriguez
Ruimy
Saini
Samson
Sarai
Scheer
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Shipley
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Spengemann
Strahl
Sweet
Tan
Tilson
Trost
Van Kesteren
Vandal
Vecchio
Virani
Warawa
Waugh
Wilkinson
Wong
Young
Zahid

Fuhr
Garneau
Gladu
Goodale
Hajdu
Hehr
Housefather
Hutchings
Joly
Kang
Kent
Khera
Lake
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lebel
Lefebvre
Lemieux
Levitt
Lobb
Long
Ludwig
MacKenzie
Maloney

McColeman
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)

Murray
Nault
Nuttall
Oliver
O'Toole
Paul-Hus
Philpott
Poilievre
Raitt
Rioux
Robillard
Rota
Rusnak
Sajjan
Sangha
Saroya
Schmale
Serré
Shanahan
Shields
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sopuck
Sorenson
Stanton
Stubbs
Tabbara
Tassi
Tootoo
Trudeau
Van Loan
Vandenbeld
Viersen
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewskyj
Yurdiga
Zimmer– — 220

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: I wish to inform the House that because of the delay, there will be no private members' business hour today. Accordingly, the order will be rescheduled for another sitting.

I would remind hon. members that the use of smart phones for photography in the House is frowned upon.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

* * *

● (1910)

[*Translation*]

DAIRY INDUSTRY

Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach (Salaberry—Suroît, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House to continue the debate on diafiltered milk.

In Canada, and especially in my riding, Salaberry—Suroît, the dairy industry is very important. It contributes a total of $3.6 billion in taxes to all three levels of government every year. It also sustains about 215,000 full-time jobs across the country.

Our dairy farms play an important role in stimulating our rural regions both economically and socially. Let us remember that one out of every eight jobs is in the agri-food industry. The 1,100 dairy farms in my region, Montérégie, account for about 10,000 direct and indirect jobs. The dairy industry as a whole contributes about $1.4 billion to Canada's GDP.

Diafiltered milk crossing our border has cost the average farm a little over $16,000 in the past year alone. Farmers' concerns are being exacerbated by the Liberal government's lack of clarity about its plans for diafiltered milk, its failure to take action in the year since it came to power, and its concessions during the European Union free trade agreement and trans-Pacific partnership negotiations.

These new agreements pose the risk of other milk proteins entering the Canadian market without tariffs being imposed, as is currently the case for milk proteins from the United States, which are coming into Canada and competing with our dairy products. This is really hurting our dairy producers.

It has been two and a half years since farmers first raised the issue of diafiltered milk crossing our borders. During the last election campaign, the Liberals promised to take action and come up with a solution within the first six months of their term. However, it has been nearly a year, almost to the day, since the last election, and there has been absolutely no progress on this issue.

The cheese standards set by the federal government are still not being followed. The diafiltered milk that is crossing our borders is considered a protein concentrate by the Canada Border Services Agency and is therefore not subject to customs duties. That is why it is having such a negative impact on our dairy producers. However, it is considered as milk once it gets to the Canadian Food Inspection Agency. It is the same product and the same government, and yet the product has two distinct identities in the eyes of the two departments. Houston, we have a problem.

According to one study commissioned by Agropur, 4,500 to 6,000 farms could disappear in the near future and 40% of processing could move to other countries if supply management were to be sacrificed for the sake of the largest free trade agreement to date.

Last week, the Minister of Agriculture told a Senate committee that the ingredient strategy alone was not the solution to the diafiltered milk problem.

Can the minister provide more details about her strategy and, more importantly, give us a timeline for the implementation of this strategy?

The producers have been waiting for a response from the government for a year now. There were many consultations, many meetings, and many questions, but they are still waiting.

There is increasing evidence confirming that the European Commission is expanding discussions on the agreement in various forums in anticipation of the October 27 EU-Canada Summit, where the comprehensive economic and trade agreement is expected to be signed by senior officials.

Once the agreement is signed, the EU Parliament will have to ratify it before it is provisionally put into effect. In that context, the government needs to announce its compensation program for the producers, at least for the CETA component, by the time the agreement is ratified.

Can the government clarify its intentions on this?

● (1915)

Mr. Jean-Claude Poissant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for allowing me to answer the question on the very serious issue of diafiltered milk.

To begin with, I would like to say that, as a dairy producer, I am proud of the fact that Canada can count on such a strong and vibrant dairy sector. We will repeat what we have always said: supply management is an important pillar of our agriculture sector. Those on this side of the House support Canada's supply management system, unlike others who would like to abolish it. We support dairy producers and their families, and we support the entire dairy industry.

As promised, we met with many producers across the country, and we truly understand the concerns they shared with us. My son, who took over the family farm, never misses an opportunity to remind me of the challenges that dairy producers face.

In recent months, we have shown that we are listening to the dairy industry and that we are doing everything we can to find a long-term sustainable solution. During our consultations, we met with industry representatives, producers, processors, and regional and national agricultural associations across the country. I would like to thank all those who participated because this process was done in a spirit of co-operation, which made it possible to maximize results and have productive and constructive discussions. We heard from many people and we will continue to gather the views of as many stakeholders as possible. The comments that have been made will help us implement a modernization strategy that will be good for the entire industry.

All we want is to improve the position of all Canadian dairy producers and ensure that this industry, to which I dedicated my life, can continue to grow and prosper in an ever-changing global economy.

I can assure my colleagues that we are doing everything we can to meet the industry's unique challenges in order to ensure that producers are able to seize every opportunity and achieve the best results possible. Canadian producers and their families, as well as the entire dairy industry, can count on the government to act in their best interests.

Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach: Mr. Speaker, once again, that sounded nice, but it was a little short on detail.

In four minutes, the Liberals were unable to give me any details about the solution or tell me what timelines they are working with to implement that solution and keep Canada's dairy industry strong. While the Liberals hem and haw, farmers are losing money. That has to stop.

We still do not know anything about compensation. The parliamentary secretary did not even mention compensation for supply management. The issue is being avoided at all of Canada's ongoing international trade agreement negotiations, such as with the European Union and the TPP.

Here again are my two questions. With respect to diafiltered milk, what is the solution, and what is the timeline? What compensation is the government promising, and when will farmers receive it?

Mr. Jean-Claude Poissant: Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to point out that in anticipation of Canadian ratification of CETA, we intend to come up with a plan to help the dairy industry, so that our producers can adjust to meet their new obligations under the agreement. Our government understands the importance of providing transition support to sectors under supply management, and we have taken into account the ideas we heard from across the industry.

Our government is confident that the dairy sector can remain competitive and tackle emerging trade issues. Producers are creative and hard-working and will help the industry find ways to do so. We will continue to work with the sector so that it can overcome current challenges and make the most of the opportunities that are out there.

I am firmly of the view that our collaborative efforts and our investments in innovation will place Canada's dairy industry in a position of strength so that it can reach its full potential as a major economic player.

● (1920)

[*English*]

TELECOMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to continue debate with regard to the important issue of telecommunications in Canada. In particular, I raise concerns about concentration, competition, jobs, and consumers, as basically 90% of our telecommunications industry is dominated by three major players.

One concern I raised was Manitoba Telecom Services being bought up by BCE, which was a venture worth approximately $4 billion.

One thing we are worried about in this situation is how it could reduce competition and affect services and prices for consumers. We have seen in the past that competition has decreased prices. We are worried about this situation allowing an increase in prices.

Right now, nearly 70% of Canadians have smart phones. We have been moving to smart phones and wireless technology and away from land lines. This is a significant cultural shift for this country. The top activities on mobile devices are texting, done by 93% of users; taking photos and videos, done by 91% of users; browsing the Internet, done by 82% of users; calendar functionality, used by 77% of users; and applications, used by 77% of users.

What we need is competition and reliable service.

There are issues that significantly affect us and our families day to day.

I ask the minister a simple question: How is the takeover by BCE going to improve competition not only in Manitoba but in the rest of Canada, given that the smart phone or mobile device is so essential to our daily activities?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Greg Fergus (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to respond to comments made earlier by the hon. member for Windsor West, with whom I work closely on the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology.

The government has a keen interest in the telecommunications sector. We consider it to be an essential platform for innovation and a leading factor in the growth of our digital economy. Many areas of government contribute to the policies and regulations for the wireless telecommunications sector.

The Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development is responsible for the Telecommunications Act, which sets the overall direction for telecommunications policy, and the Radiocommunication Act, which sets policies related to the allocation, transfer, and use of spectrum frequencies, the airwaves used by wireless providers.

When it comes to the wireless spectrum, the government will continue its efforts to make additional spectrum available to wireless providers to support competition, choice and availability of services, and a strong investment environment for telecommunications services.

Spectrum transactions that require regulatory approval, such as spectrum licence transfers, will be considered accordingly, and any licence transfer requests will be treated on a case-by-case basis. I can assure the House that any decisions relating to spectrum will be made in the context of the mandate objectives that I have just highlighted.

Additionally, the CRTC is responsible for regulating and supervising Canada's communications system, both broadcasting and telecommunications, in the public interest. The CRTC has taken a number of actions to support wireless consumers, such as creating a national, mandatory code of conduct for wireless service providers and regulating wholesale roaming rates, meaning the rates that large incumbent carriers charge smaller providers when customers roam on their networks.

Finally, the Competition Bureau ensures that Canadian businesses and consumers prosper in a competitive and innovative marketplace. The bureau administers the provisions of the Competition Act, including reviewing mergers to determine whether they are likely to result in substantial lessening or prevention of competition, along with investigating allegations of price-fixing, false or misleading representations, abuse of dominance, and other anti-competitive activities.

The Competition Bureau is currently reviewing the proposed acquisition of Manitoba Telecom Services by BCE, in order to determine whether the transaction is likely to substantially lessen or prevent competition. As part of the Bureau's usual approach in examining a merger, it consults with a wide range of industry participants to obtain their views regarding the competitive implications of a proposed transaction.

I would like to close by reiterating that the government will work to support competition, choice, and availability of telecommunications services for Canadians. We are also committed to fostering a strong investment climate for this essential sector of our economy.

● (1925)

[*English*]

Mr. Brian Masse: Mr. Speaker, I think the question that has to be raised for Canadians at this point in time is whether a smart phone or mobile device is really an essential service to them and their families. With that, how can they afford it in their daily lives? How can they count on the reliability of the product and the service?

Our phones today are mobile devices. There are moments where we get calls about emergencies. There are moments where we will call out during emergency situations. Many Canadians do banking online. Many Canadians use the device to communicate, learn, and do educational and other projects for school. There are many ways that the phone has been integrated into our overall life.

Canadians have to ask themselves whether or not we need stronger government policies to ensure that this really is an essential service, such that it is going to require a greater hand on the lever to make sure consumers are protected and well serviced at a fair and appropriate price, and that privacy is protected. With all these device elements caught up in one entire situation, it is about time that consumers came first in terms of price and also in terms of rights.

Mr. Greg Fergus: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Windsor West raises very good questions as to whether or not smart phones should be considered essential services. I know we are also taking a look at the question of whether broadband should be considered an essential service. It is a big issue for many people in rural communities.

On the latter question, we know that the CRTC is examining that right now. We are waiting for its decision. I will not attempt to prejudge, as it is going through hearings on that.

To the former question though, this is something we have to discuss. To what level are we able to discuss it? There are important public policy questions that come into play as to whether or not, if we do consider it an essential service, we would still get the same kind of competitive pricing that the hon. member was talking about. If we look back to what happened when we considered basic telephone service an essential service, there were minimum fees that were attached and applied to all personal accounts across the country. That might mitigate against the honourable ends that my hon. colleague is trying to achieve.

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I follow up on a question I asked a while ago, I think members will understand why it is really important that we get clarity and see leadership from the government. This was a question I asked on May 16 to the Minister of Indigenous and Northern Affairs. I asked her if she could clarify, as part of the government's implementation of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, if they would have a veto over job-creating projects.

We have a current duty to consult and accommodate, and the language of the UN declaration is "free, prior and informed consent". That is significantly different language and it is very new to the Canadian landscape. An article in the *The Globe and Mail* read:

> At stake is what power First Nations and other aboriginal communities will exercise in decisions over whether projects such as mines, pipelines, hydroelectric dams and transmission lines get approved and built.

We could add a number of things that would also be included, such as tourism, construction of roads, sewage systems, schools, airport expansions, hospitals, and much more.

We tried to ask the government to clarify on numerous occasions what the difference is. We did that in committee and in the chamber. Indeed, the media has also been asking that question.

Our committee asked the Minister of Indigenous Affairs on March 10. We did not get a clear answer. We asked the Minister of Natural Resources on April 21, and we did not get a clear answer. The committee did not get a clear answer from the Minister of Environment either on May 12. As recently as Sunday, the natural resources minister refused to answer Evan Soloman's yes-or-no question regarding the wording of a veto.

The Prime Minister actually took a clear stance when he was trying to win an election. It was during an APTN virtual town hall. He was asked if "no" would mean "no" under his government. He responded, "Absolutely". By February, the APTN reported he was backing away from his pledge. In May, the Minister of Justice said the government would adopt UNDRIP without qualification, but recently she said this was "simplistic", "unworkable", and can't be done word for word.

The Prime Minister and his government have created confusion. They have left communities in the dark and industries in the dark. To be quite frank, this is not fair to anyone.

This week I spent some time at the Pipeline Gridlock Conference in Calgary. The Canadian aboriginal business leaders were looking to improve dialogue on pipelines and ways to support approval. There was really mass confusion, so I am hoping tonight that I am going to have a response that is going to very clearly articulate the difference between "consult and accommodate" and "free, prior and informed consent", and if indeed this means veto, yes or no.

● (1930)

Mr. Randy Boissonnault (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased this evening to rise to respond to the question by the hon. member for Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, here on traditional Algonquin territory.

As stated in the mandate letter to each and every minister of this government, no relationship is more important to the Prime Minister or to Canada than the one with first nations, the Métis nation, and Inuit people. It is time for a renewed, nation-to-nation, government-to-government, and Inuit-to-crown relationship with indigenous people based on recognition of rights, respect, co-operation, and partnership.

The member points to a very significant step that was taken this year, an important commitment kept by this government. The Minister of Indigenous and Northern Affairs announced Canada's full support, without qualification, of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. She confirmed that the government would adopt and implement it in accordance with the Canadian Constitution. The government will implement it in full partnership with first nations, Métis, and Inuit people.

As National Chief Bellegarde has made clear, this is about "collaboration and working together." With respect to the member's question about a veto, the National Chief was also quite clear that a "Veto is not utilized in free, prior, and informed consent in the UN Declaration."

I would also point out that the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers and the Mining Association of Canada have also welcomed the adoption of the United Nations declaration. Pierre Gratton, the president and CEO of the Mining Association of Canada, said this about Canada's adoption of the declaration: "We've been historically seen as a leader but then we had this funny situation at the UN where we were a dissenter on something that was so important to indigenous peoples worldwide."

We agree.

Contrary to what is implied by the member's question, the full support of the United Nations declaration will lead to less confusion. The government's new approach and commitment to a renewed relationship with indigenous people will mean greater opportunity for investment, clarity for all concerned with regard to development projects, strong protection of the environment, and recognition of the rights of indigenous people. These are the kinds of benefits a new relationship can deliver.

To quote the hon. Minister of Indigenous and Northern Affairs:

> ...implementing UNDRIP should not be scary.... Recognition of elements of the declaration began 250 years ago with the Royal Proclamation, which was about sharing the land fairly. UNDRIP reflects the spirit and intent of our treaties.

With our commitment to full adoption and implementation of the UN declaration, we are continuing the vital work of reconciliation.

● (1935)

Mrs. Cathy McLeod: Mr. Speaker, I think the confusion continues. We have the Minister of Indigenous and Northern Affairs proudly going to the UN and proclaiming that the Liberals are going to implement the UN declaration without reservation. We have the justice minister who then says, "Sorry, it's a little bit unworkable and a little bit simplistic, and so it's not really going to work".

Perhaps National Chief Bellegarde would not use the word "veto", but we can imagine when we go into communities across this country that they have significant expectations about what this will mean. To be quite frank, they are not getting important messages from the government on how we are going to move forward and what the difference is going to be between consultation and accommodation, and on free, prior, and informed consent. Moreover, industry does not know either.

Therefore, I think the government has a tremendous amount of work to do. I ask the parliamentary secretary again to please try to clarify right now what this difference is going to mean for communities across this country.

Mr. Randy Boissonnault: Mr. Speaker, as I said, the Government of Canada does not see any agreements or working relationships with indigenous people as impediments to resource development in Canada. These elements are complementary and part of a properly functioning, balanced, fair, and progressive society.

This is about government, indigenous communities, and industry striving toward consensus. The government is proud to move forward with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

We are deeply committed to working in full partnership with first nations, Inuit, and the Métis nation, as well as with provinces and territories on how best to fully implement the United Nations declaration within the framework of our Constitution.

This is another step forward in renewing the relationship between the crown and indigenous people in Canada, one based on the recognition of rights, respect, co-operation, and partnership.

The Deputy Speaker: The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 7:37 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Wednesday, October 5, 2016

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

ORAL QUESTIONS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS