



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 148 • NUMBER 271 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Monday, March 19, 2018

Speaker: The Honourable Geoff Regan

CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, March 19, 2018

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayer

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

•(1105)

[*English*]

LATIN AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH ACT

Hon. Peter Kent (Thornhill, CPC) moved that Bill S-218, an act respecting Latin American heritage month, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to speak in support of Bill S-218. However, as much as I am honoured to sponsor this proposed legislation, which recognizes the many significant contributions to Canada's social, economic, and political fabric by Canada's Latin American community, I do so with a measure of sadness, because this legislation was conceived and lovingly fashioned by our late colleague, the hon. Senator Tobias Enverga. Before I address the specifics of the legislation and the overwhelming logic behind it, I would like to speak to Senator Enverga's memory.

Senator Tobias Enverga, known to his friends as “Jun”, was the first Canadian of Filipino descent to be appointed to the Senate. Born in the Philippines, he represented Ontario in the upper house after his appointment in 2012. His was a proud and very positive voice not only for the Filipino community, but also for a host of others in the greater Toronto area and across the country.

Senator Enverga was a passionate champion of multiculturalism. He believed that Canada's wonderful, ever-developing diversity to be our country's greatest strength. He was respected by Senate and House colleagues alike for his kindness, his warm sense of humour, and his unparalleled work ethic. He was a tireless advocate for people with disabilities. He served as a Catholic School Board trustee in Toronto and became known in the Toronto region for launching the Philippine Canadian Charitable Foundation. He was co-chair of the Canada-Philippines Interparliamentary Group and inaugurated the annual Filipino Independence Day flag raising on Parliament Hill.

During his years in the Senate, Tobias was a member of several standing committees and participated in a variety of important studies on issues ranging from first nations northern housing to

maritime search and rescue operations. As well, he was an executive member of the ParlAmericas group and invested his energy in forging closer ties with parliamentarians throughout Latin America, helping them to strengthen democracy and governance through political dialogue and parliamentary co-operation. It was Senator Enverga's work with ParlAmericas that moved him to propose the bill that is before the House today.

Senator Enverga died Thursday, November 16, while on parliamentary business in Colombia. Despite his tragic and untimely passing, Senator Enverga's Latin American heritage month bill does live on. It was passed in the other place a couple of weeks later, and it was sent to us in this House.

When Senator Enverga first spoke to Bill S-218, he reminded colleagues that he came to Canada as an immigrant, one of many in the upper chamber fortunate to have been welcomed to Canada. He referred to the spectrum of celebrations held across Canada by communities of various national, ethnic, and linguistic origins. He highlighted the two decades-plus annual celebration of Black History Month, recognized by the House in 1995 and by the Senate 13 years later. He explained that the designation of Black History Month has done much to educate and to familiarize Canadians with the stories and the history of an important demographic too often absent in school curricula previously. He mentioned as well Asian Heritage Month, passed and proclaimed in 2002 and marked annually ever since, when non-Asian Canadians learn of and experience the sounds, entertainment, and tastes of Asia, and the contribution that Asian Canadians have brought to Canadian society. Senator Enverga argued that those are just two wonderful examples of designated heritage months to which he believed a Latin American heritage month should be added.

Some of my colleagues in the House may remember that Senator Enverga introduced a bill in the 41st Parliament, Bill S-228, to create a Hispanic heritage month, matching such designation by the Province of Ontario and by the City of Toronto. That bill died in the election of 2015. Senator Enverga, after consultation with the members of the public, reconsidered the reintroduction of that legislation and decided to change the focus in the bill to Latin America as a geographic and linguistic community which would add not only the lusophone and francophone communities but also those of indigenous peoples of the Latin American region.

Private Members' Business

This was not a snap decision. Senator Enverga pondered long and deeply the issues of self-identification of the diverse Latin American community in Canada. He became convinced that a Latin American heritage month would better enhance our understanding of the complexities involved. He also believed it would respect the spirit of the Canadian Multiculturalism Act of 1988.

Latin America is of our hemisphere. The region is generally understood to consist of the entire continent of South America, all of Central America, Mexico, and the islands of the Caribbean, whose people speak a Romance language or have a Romance language among their various national official languages. For the purposes of this bill, Senator Enverga envisaged the widest possible interpretation so that Bill S-218 would cover those who identify as Spanish and Portuguese speakers from South America and Central America, as well as those whose heritage is of the francophone and Hispanic Caribbean Islands.

Using that broad and very inclusive measure, we can see that Canadians of Latin American origin can be found far and wide across our great country from coast to coast to coast. In the absence of absolute census numbers covering that broad and somewhat imprecise measure, we might estimate a probable demographic well above half a million men, women, and children.

What we do know is that the Latin American community is one of the fastest-growing cultural groups in Canada today. Statistics Canada reports that between 1996 and 2001, the number of individuals reporting Latin American origins rose by 32%, at a time when the overall Canadian population grew by only 4%. Again, in terms of actual numbers, demographers can only estimate that between 600,000 and perhaps 1.2 million Latin Americans, again from the broadest possible measure, live among us.

These numbers are particularly interesting given that there was only a very small Latin American population in Canada before the 1960s. It was in the 1960s and 1970s that Canada recorded the first significant migration of Latin Americans. Their motivation sadly in too many cases was to escape social and economic turmoil, dictatorships, and conflict. Most recently, another wave is fleeing Venezuela's corrupt and repressive regimes under first, Hugo Chavez, and now, the brutal Nicolas Maduro. These Latin Americans represented significant loss to the countries that they left, but they have been a boon to Canada. Their education, their skills, and their adaptability have been of great benefit to Canada's labour market, to our economy, and to our culture.

The top three South American countries with the highest populations living in Canada, according to census statistics, are Mexico, Colombia, and El Salvador. The three countries from South America with the smallest populations now living in Canada are Puerto Rico, Panama, and Costa Rica. Most Canadians of Latin American origin live in Ontario, Quebec, British Columbia, or Alberta, with almost half making their homes in Ontario.

Canada's Latin American population is young. Statistics Canada tells us that almost 50% of those with Latin American origins living in Canada are under the age of 25. Seniors make up less than 5% of those reporting Latin American origins, compared with 12% of all other Canadians.

Virtually all Canadians of Latin American origin are functional in one of Canada's two official languages. They are slightly more likely than the rest of our population to have university degrees. Also, Statistics Canada tells us that working-age adults of Latin American origins are somewhat more likely to be employed than the rest of Canada's adult population, fully 64% of adults of Latin American origin.

Latin America as a region is considered the fourth-largest source of immigration to Canada. However, in sharp contrast to the United States, the demographic is not measured or appreciated nearly as much as are their counterparts in the U.S.

• (1110)

That is where Senator Enverga's bill, Bill S-218, stands not only to deepen our appreciation and celebration of our Latin American community, but to more precisely measure the actual numbers and its regional contributions to our economy and culture.

Canada's Latin American population is a vibrant and multicultural community, composed of a range of subgroupings. First-generation artists, musicians, writers, and athletes, as well as leaders in the science, health, and business sectors, have led second and third generations that are adding their talents and skills to the mix.

I know that hon. members enjoy a party. There are any number of events across the country that celebrate the multi-dimensional Latin American community. One perfect example is Toronto's annual Salsa on St. Clair. Last year's party, on a closed-off midtown street, drew hundreds of thousands of people, attracting more musicians, dancers, families, and Latino aficionados than ever before to enjoy the sounds, sights, tastes, dances, and all the colour of the Americas.

Senator Enverga's bill, Bill S-218, would designate the month of October each and every year as Latin American heritage month. Let me explain the logic of this designation. October is a very significant month across Latin America. It is the month that marks the end of the annual season of independence celebrations from Mexico to Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica.

October 12 marks *Día de las Culturas*, the day of the cultures, in Costa Rica; *Día de la Resistencia Indígena*, the day of indigenous resistance, in Venezuela; *Día del Respeto a la Diversidad Cultural*, the day of respect for cultural diversity, in Argentina; *Día de las Américas*, the day of the Americas, in Uruguay; and the feast day of Our Lady of Aparecida, the appearance, and *Dia das Crianças*, children's day, in Brazil.

Puerto Rico and Chile also wrap up their independence celebrations coming up to October, and many other countries, including Mexico, end October with the three-day celebration of *Día de Muertos*, the Day of the Dead, a celebration of ancestors.

Of course, we cannot forget the Hispanic influences in Senator Enverga's own country of origin. Canada's large and vibrant Filipino community, although fiercely proud of the independence won from Spain, which we celebrate every year in my riding of Thornhill, still observes All Saints' Day, the Day of the Dead, and many other cultural legacies of colonial days maintained among their newer national traditions.

Private Members' Business

When Senator Enverga originally approached me to ask that I sponsor his bill in the House, he explained that, as a former minister of state for the Americas, I understood the wonderful mix and complexity of Canada's communities composed of those among us who originated from Latin America, and I would be able to put voice to the message that led to the passage of Bill S-218 in the other place.

I hope that I have communicated the senator's worthy dream. I believe that declaring the month of October to be Latin American heritage month would fulfill a wonderful opportunity to celebrate another dimension of our uniquely Canadian multicultural society. I urge members of all parties in the House to support Bill S-218.

•(1115)

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I too would like to recognize and pay respect to Senator Tobias Enverga for introducing this bill, and I would like to thank the member for sponsoring it. It is incredibly important.

In his speech, Senator Enverga recognized the importance of Asian Heritage Month and Black History Month, looking at the rich colour, vibrancy, and culture of those groups, and now he has introduced Latin American heritage month, which includes the Caribbean, where I am from. As mentioned, I came here in the 1970s, so I can attest to a lot of the things my hon. colleague talked about.

As it is the fastest growing group in Canada, I am wondering if my hon. colleague could speak to how important it is for Canadians across the country to learn about and understand multiculturalism, and the intersectionality, heritage, and history of this group in our Canadian context.

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for telling us about her fond remembrance of Senator Enverga.

The heritage months that have been recognized by the Parliament of Canada, by the upper house and this House, have at their heart, I believe, the unspoken intent of intercultural recognition, acceptance, and the celebration of Canada's wonderful diversity. They provide an occasion, on an annual basis, for subsequent generations to maintain that memory when there may be a tendency, in this case for those of Latin American heritage, to lose some contact with their language and culture.

We passed a bill just recently for Jewish Heritage Month. Canadians of Latin American origin, like those of black origin or Asian origin, do celebrate and maintain all of the best of their individual cultures and languages, as well as share them to enable all Canadians to join in the celebrations, in this case celebrations that would take place during the month of October.

•(1120)

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Latin American community has contributed greatly to Canada, not just as immigrants, but also as temporary foreign workers. Many temporary foreign workers, particularly those who are seasonal workers, do not qualify for benefits they pay into, for example employment insurance.

To really honour the community and its contributions to Canada, would the member agree that we should align our government policies to ensure that those who pay into those programs qualify for the benefits and, more to the point, that if they are good enough to work, they are good enough to stay?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for a question that regularly comes to the surface at a time when temporary foreign workers from Central America and South America come north to Canada to assist in the harvesting of crops or to work in the meat-packing industry in western Canada. Too often, they are discriminated against by the uninformed in the communities where they are temporarily employed. Sometimes they live in less than appropriate or comfortable housing conditions.

On any number of occasions in the last 15 years, the House of Commons has considered granting broader rights and benefits to those who, as my colleague just said, are good enough to come to Canada to work but, in too many cases, have not received the subsequent benefits they should have received or the opportunity to perhaps make their residency in Canada permanent, which Latin American students, for example, can now accomplish much more easily than in the past.

Mr. Arif Virani (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage (Multiculturalism), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today in the House to speak to Bill S-218, an act respecting Latin American heritage month, which would recognize the contributions of Latin American communities to Canada and establish October of each year as Latin American heritage month.

As the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage with responsibility for multiculturalism, I am pleased to inform the House that the government supports the bill. In so doing, let me start by paying tribute to the late Senator Tobias Enverga, the author of this bill, a strong senator, a great Filipino Canadian, and a champion of multiculturalism.

[*Translation*]

Canadians of Latin American origin have been part of the Canadian mosaic for decades. This bill recognizes the richness of these Latin American communities and their significant contributions to the social, economic, and political fabric of Canada.

Given the strong and growing presence of individuals of Latin American ancestry, this bill is a meaningful way to remember those contributions, educate the public, and encourage all Canadians to celebrate Latin American culture and traditions.

[*English*]

Formal recognition of Latin American heritage month is significant because it aligns with what all of us know, that in Canada our diversity is indeed our strength, and that as a country we are strengthened in many ways by our shared experiences, by the diversity that inspires both Canada and the world, and by the way in which we treat one another.

Private Members' Business

Official recognition is also consistent with other similar commemorations that reinforce the importance of cultural communities to Canada's identity. A few examples have already been mentioned today. We previously supported the establishment of February as Black History Month, and May as Asian Heritage Month. A new Latin American heritage month in October would complement these other celebrations and recognize the contributions of this important group in Canada.

In 1971, Pierre Trudeau declared multiculturalism as an official policy in this country, the first of its kind anywhere in the world. In 1982, upon the patriation of our Constitution and the enactment of the charter, section 27 was enacted, which includes references to "the preservation and enhancement of the multicultural heritage of Canadians" and the important role this plays in protecting the rights of every citizen.

Recognizing the past and current contributions of Latin Americans who immigrated to Canada and have contributed to this country is in keeping with our country's commitment to an inclusive, multicultural society.

Let me reinforce the fact that our multicultural heritage is a reflection of our commitment to equality and the fundamental freedoms that are grounded in human rights. In 1988, Canada became the first nation to proclaim a Multiculturalism Act. We are celebrating the 30th anniversary of that legislation this year.

This law requires that we promote the multicultural heritage of Canadians. It also requires that we work to ensure that all Canadians are equal in our economic, social, cultural, and political life. However, our government has taken this approach one step further. Formal recognition of Latin American heritage month would directly support Canada's approach to multiculturalism, an approach that seeks to recognize and promote the cultural and racial diversity of Canada, one that acknowledges the freedom of all members of Canadian society to preserve, enhance, and share their cultural heritage.

In going one step further, we have addressed this issue in budget 2018. In the most recent budget, we announced nearly \$50 million in new funding to support programming that empowers communities to combat racism and discrimination: \$23 million has been dedicated to multiculturalism; in addition, \$19 million has been dedicated to the black community, and \$6 million to the collection and dissemination of data on racialized persons. These funds will allow us to craft a new national anti-racism approach and give meaning to the official language contained in the Multiculturalism Act.

Let me return to Bill S-218, the Latin American heritage month bill before us today. The question that immediately comes to mind is, why October? Each year, during the month of October, peoples of Hispanic origin around the world pay tribute to their shared culture through celebrations such as Hispanic day, the day of the cultures, the day of indigenous resistance, and the commemoration of Hispanic Heritage Month in North America. The latter celebrates the presence of Hispanics in North America, starting with the arrival of Christopher Columbus on October 12, 1492.

October is also recognized as Hispanic Heritage Month in the city of Toronto, the province of Ontario, and in the United States. Bill

S-218 underscores the importance of this community to our entire country and builds awareness at the national level.

I would like to say a few words about Latin Americans and who they are exactly. They are my constituents in Parkdale—High Park, who hail from all parts of the Americas in which Spanish or Portuguese is the main language. They are the folks in Toronto who run Salsa on St. Clair, the Argentinian community at Folklorama in Winnipeg, and the Peruvian community at Folkfest in Saskatoon. "Hispanic" is a narrower term, which is defined as "of or connected with Spain or Spanish-speaking countries".

● (1125)

[*Translation*]

When Senator Enverga introduced this bill in the Senate, he explained that he had consulted members of the community and the public and had considered more inclusive and neutral wording. As a result, the bill refers to the geographic linguistic community of Latin America, which includes Portuguese- and French-speaking communities, as well as the indigenous peoples of the region, as opposed to the common but narrower reference to people of Hispanic heritage alone.

Bill S-218 defines Latin America broadly as a group of nations that includes Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela, as well as Puerto Rico, the French West Indies, and other islands.

[*English*]

As pointed out by Senator Enverga, many if not all Latin American countries also have a shared colonial history, stemming from the time when Spain and Portugal were world powers.

The first wave of Latin American immigration to Canada occurred between 1970 and 1973 with the arrival of approximately 68,000 immigrants. Today, Canadians of Latin American origin represent one of the largest non-European ethnic groups in Canada. As referenced earlier in today's debate, they are a constantly growing population, who represent more than 544,000 Canadian individuals and counting.

The majority of Latin Americans in Canada are Catholics, representing more than 60% of the Latin American community. Latin Americans are a diverse group within a diverse nation that we now all call home.

As a government, we are proud to support Bill S-218, which promotes and upholds our diversity and strengthens our multicultural and pluralistic society. At our root, we firmly believe we will only succeed as a nation when we move from simply tolerating differences to truly celebrating differences. Bill S-218 is an important step in allowing us to do just that. I urge my fellow parliamentarians to honour the memory of the late Senator Enverga and support this bill.

Private Members' Business

● (1130)

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in this House today to speak in favour of Bill S-218, an act respecting Latin American heritage month. This bill would enshrine October of every year as Latin American heritage month, in recognition of social, economic, and political contributions that the Latin American community has made to Canada.

Before I speak further to this bill, I would like to recognize that this bill is before us today due to the tireless work of Senator Enverga, whom we were all saddened to lose in November of last year. Senator Enverga was the first Filipino Canadian appointed to the Senate, and he was deeply respected for his advocacy work for persons with disabilities and Canada's multiculturalism. The bill before us today is an example of his dedication to honouring a diverse Canada, and it is a pleasure to continue that work in this House.

Close to 40,000 people in the Lower Mainland have Latin American heritage. The community is vibrant and diverse, and every year there are plenty of wonderful events and activities highlighting and celebrating their culture. This year, from June 27 to July 8, Vancouver will celebrate Latin American Week. Carnival del Sol, a free family-friendly festival, is always one of the biggest attractions. This year will be the 10th annual Carnival del Sol, and will feature close to 400 performers showcasing singers, dancers, bands, and incredible food. Latin American Week will give people the opportunity to attend cooking classes, dancing classes, a fashion show, and plenty of arts and crafts displays highlighting the diversity of Vancouver's Latin American community. From August 23 to September 2, Vancouver will have its 16th annual Latin American Film Festival showcasing contemporary Latin American and Latin Canadian filmmaking. I encourage all Canadians to check similar events in their communities or in communities nearby, as festivals and events like these happen across Canada each year. If there is not one in their community, I invite people to come to Vancouver and check out ours.

I and my New Democratic Party colleagues are proud supporters of Canada's multiculturalism and have long supported celebrating the unique heritage of Canada and Canadians. Our great diversity has allowed Canada to be built through the contributions of many different ethnic and religious groups, and those with Latin American heritage are most certainly among them. Canada's rich cultural mosaic is one of the things that makes Canada what it is today. It is a huge strength that we should all celebrate and be proud of. Events like Vancouver's Latin American Week and Latin American Film Festival put on display for all of us the richness of our society. The opportunity to speak to this and to attend events like those mentioned is one of the many reasons I have been honoured to be the NDP critic for multiculturalism.

The other hat that I wear for the New Democratic Party is that of critic for immigration, refugees, and citizenship. I feel it is important to examine bills like this from that lens as well, because actions speak louder than words. Recognizing Canada's diverse cultures and heritage is important, but it is even more important to recognize how we treat the people of that culture and heritage. According to the 2016 census, over 1.4 million Canadians identified as having Caribbean origin, or Latin, Central, or South American origins.

● (1135)

However, this number does not truly reflect how many individuals with Latin American heritage are in Canada and contributing immensely to Canada's society and economy. While none of Canada's top-10 source countries for new permanent residents are in Latin America, seven of the top-20 countries for temporary foreign workers annually are. Mexico and Jamaica are the top countries of origin for temporary foreign workers in Canada. Additionally, Guatemala, Trinidad and Tobago, Nicaragua, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, and Brazil, held top spots in 2017. These countries alone accounted for almost 37,000 temporary foreign workers in Canada, on positive labour market impact assessments from January to September.

The seasonal agricultural worker program sees an additional 30,000 labourers coming to Canada each year, primarily from Mexico, Jamaica, and other Caribbean countries. People from this program provide vital contributions to Canada, working long hard hours in Canada's agriculture industry to ensure our crops are harvested and sent to market.

I do not believe we can truly recognize the contributions of Latin Americans to Canada without recognizing the immense contributions of Latin Americans who, due to how our immigration system functions, come here every year to provide vital services while lacking a pathway to making Canada their home. While these programs are structured to fill temporary needs, some research has shown that many agricultural workers have been coming to Canada for 10 years or more. Neither the seasonal agricultural worker program nor the agricultural workers stream of the temporary foreign worker program offer a pathway to permanence for these people, and force them to leave their families back home while in Canada.

While doing this incredibly important work in Canada, these workers often find themselves excluded from workplace protections that Canadians take for granted, even if they are paying for them. Workers in the seasonal agricultural worker program are not eligible for employment insurance despite it being deducted from their paycheques, and they are excluded from most aspects of employment standards acts, to name just two issues.

Private Members' Business

If we are to celebrate Latin American heritage in Canada and designate October to be Latin American heritage month, we need to match these words with actions. Let us not just recognize the importance of diversity and the joy of attending beautiful festivals and celebrations, but examine how our policies prevent the people whose heritage we say we appreciate from staying in Canada and calling it their home. Let us use this opportunity to realign our policies to recognize how much we rely on Latin American people in Canada by ensuring that we provide them with the ability to become a Canadian citizen. I have always said that if they are good enough to work here, they are good enough to stay. That approach should be the foundational principle for Canada's immigration policies.

In recognition of the contribution of the Latin American community, let us begin that work. Let us make sure that for all those who come to contribute to Canada in a permanent fashion, in a temporary fashion, and particularly for the temporary foreign workers, that we honour them by ensuring that if they are good enough to work here, they are good enough to stay.

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be able to speak to this important bill recognizing Latin American heritage month here in Canada. As other colleagues have, I want to start by recognizing the incredible work on this particular initiative, and in general, by the late Senator Tobias Enverga. Many good comments have been made about his work. I personally remember him as a person of contagious joy, and that is my enduring impression of him. Yes, there is the important work he did on initiatives like this, but I will remember him as being someone who was so full of goodwill and had an evident rich love for his family. He was always proud to have his family with him at different events. I want to associate myself with the words of my colleagues about Senator Enverga.

I also thank my colleague from Thornhill for the excellent work he has done in this place on this bill. I know issues in Latin America are close to his heart. He has done a great deal of work around human rights issues in Venezuela. Coming out of his work as minister with a particular focus on the Americas, it is very appropriate he has picked up this particular initiative. It is one I know is close to his heart as well.

I have a few comments about heritage months in general. The questions I sometimes get from constituents are "What's this heritage month thing all about?", "Why do we have them?" and "Why are they even necessary?" I want to defend the idea of having heritage months for a number of different reasons.

First of all, these are important points of recognition and appreciation, of acknowledgement of the contributions different cultural communities bring to Canada. Second, just so people understand, there is no associated cost or government spending. It is not a month off work or anything like that. These heritage months are simply a point in time at which we recognize and appreciate contributions.

Also, these heritage months provide a particular opportunity for cultural sharing. Arguably, people from the community named are going to be aware of their own culture and heritage at all times of the year regardless. However, when we have a designated heritage month, that is a point in time for everybody else to pay particular

attention to or recognize, or maybe be reminded that this is an opportunity to learn about and from the particular aspects of a culture and become more aware of it. It is not as practical to say that we should just be aware of all cultures at all times, although in a lot of ways we should. Having these specific points of noting and reminding ourselves is worthwhile as part of that process of ongoing cultural sharing and education.

These heritage months also provide us with an opportunity to note and listen to the experiences of Canadians from diverse backgrounds. In particular, we know Canadians from visible minority backgrounds may experience prejudice others do not, and using these times as an opportunity to reflect on that, be sensitive to that, and learn about the experiences of others is very valuable.

It is not enough to say that one is simply blind to difference. It is important to affirm equal dignity, but it is also important to notice and understand the particular challenges people may face, as well as to work to improve the situation of people in the context of their particular experiences. It requires us to listen to recognize that other people's experiences may not be the same as ours, and may not even be something we observe, because their experiences are their experiences. These heritage months and other such points of acknowledgement are important moments for us to notice those experiences and be very sensitive about listening to what the experiences of others may be that are different from our own.

In particular, Bill S-218 is a bill that calls on us to recognize the contributions of people in Canada from Central and South American backgrounds. Obviously, this is a very diverse region in and of itself. For the most part, we are talking about people who come from a Spanish-speaking background, but also people from a wide variety of different linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

I was reading an article recently in *The Economist* that spoke about Italian speakers in Brazil. This was something I did not know, but certain small linguistic dialects exist in Brazil that may have a close relationship to forms of Italian, German, and of course, many different indigenous languages and backgrounds. That diversity is certainly reflected in the Canadian experience as well. We are enriched by the contributions of the wide diversity of peoples who come here from different backgrounds.

● (1140)

Other colleagues have mentioned the importance of October in terms of a number of different holidays, which were mentioned, and various feasts and celebrations that have their roots in different cultural backgrounds from that part of the world.

Members may know that I am a Catholic. Probably the most recognizable Latin American person in the world today would be Pope Francis who comes from Argentina. I think it is worth reflecting on his work as he is someone whose experience particularly reflects coming from Argentina, seeing the poverty that exists in parts of South America, and being very convicted in bringing our attention to the need to fight for justice and do all we can to help the poor and the marginalized. I think many people, Catholic and non-Catholic, have been greatly inspired by his work and his challenge to all of us to be more sensitive in response to the experiences of those who are struggling and to do all we can to be attentive to the needs of the poor.

Private Members' Business

Another figure I would like to mention, and someone Pope Francis has highlighted, is the late Archbishop of San Salvador, Oscar Romero. Again, he is an example of a leading Catholic figure who spoke out against injustice. He is someone who is moving forward through the process of beatification. Oscar Romero was assassinated in the midst of celebrating mass. He was in the middle of serving a mass for people who were in the church when someone came in and killed him. There was never a conviction for that crime. He was one of those people who was fearless in speaking out on the importance of justice and universal human dignity. He did so in the context of an environment of great political conflict, tension, and oppression of those who are vulnerable. These are figures I want to highlight as people who have been an inspiration to me and who come from this part of the world.

Many people who come to Canada, regardless of where they came from, certainly not all but many, come to escape conditions that were less than ideal where they were, whether that was poverty or some form of political persecution or oppression. We welcome and benefit from the contributions of those who come out of those situations. At the same time, many of those who come will inspire and challenge us to play a greater role as individuals and as a country in our pursuit of justice around the world. I am so glad that many members of Parliament, and certainly our caucus, have been very active on issues of human rights and human dignity in Central and South America. I know that a great deal of that is inspired by people who come here who have connections in some ways to that persecution. They share their stories and talk about what has happened in those contexts. They call on all of us as politicians, whether we come from that background or not, to commit ourselves and be part of that fight against oppression, that fight for justice and human rights.

In conclusion, I want to thank Senator Enverga, as well as the bill's sponsor in this place, for bringing this important bill to our attention. These heritage months are an opportunity for us to recognize the contributions of Canadians from diverse backgrounds, to see these moments of cultural sharing as opportunities for greater cultural understanding, to meditate on the examples of leading figures from these communities, to seek to be taught by their wisdom and by their experiences, and to enjoy the benefits that come from our cultural diversity.

I commend this bill to the consideration of members of the House. I hope all members will vote for the bill.

• (1145)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed listening to my colleagues across the way and on this side of the House talk about what Canada, really and truly, is all about. Our Prime Minister often talks about Canada's greatest strength being our diversity. I have heard that said on many occasions within the House, and I think we would find unanimous support that diversity is one of the things that makes us who we are as Canadians.

We have before us a bill that has come from the other place. The sponsor of the legislation talked about Senator Enverga and made reference to the fact that the late senator was co-chair of the Canada-Philippines parliamentary friendship group. I am the other co-chair and had the opportunity to work with Senator Enverga for a number

of years. When he was first appointed to the Senate he took a very keen interest in the Canada-Philippines friendship group. Therefore, I am not surprised that the late senator brought forward this piece of legislation. I believe he understood the importance of Canada's diversity and how important it is that we recognize and celebrate it.

I had the opportunity, with the senator, to talk a great deal about the Philippines and that special relationship between two countries that we want to see further advanced. We heard comments about issues such as working visas. I would argue there is so much more to relationships between countries than just immigration. We try to expand on that through trade, and there have been a great deal of trade agreements and discussions that have taken place in Latin America.

There are many Latin American countries. I was just trying to make a quick note of some of the countries I am aware of. There is Brazil, Mexico, Colombia, Peru, Venezuela, El Salvador, Panama, and Cuba. These are just some of the countries that make up the Latin American region. That is why the senator captured the essence of the celebration we need to recognize. It goes beyond any one country. In fact, it is a region. It is a region in the world that has ultimately led to so much benefit for Canada as a society.

I have often had the opportunity to talk about what I believe is one of the greatest shows on Earth. It is all about multiculturalism. It takes place two weeks every summer in the city of Winnipeg. We call it Folkorama. The Latin American countries are well represented. I think of the Brazilian pavilion as an example. It is a pavilion of high demand. People want to go and experience Latin American culture and heritage. There is a great display of entertainment in the form of music, dance, the heritage costumes that are showcased, as well as the types of food and alcohol that are consumed. One gets a good sense of how much Latin American culture and heritage is truly appreciated and valued.

I am a big fan of recognizing heritage months and heritage weeks. We in the House have the opportunity to highlight different ethnic or cultural regions around the world in a very positive way. What I have found in my years here, but also in the provincial legislature, is that there is a great deal of goodwill from members on all sides of the House when it comes time to recognize those wonderful, positive attributes of what makes Canada the great country it is, that being our diversity.

• (1150)

The legislation before us would recognize the month of October as the month to give extra attention to a heritage community that has contributed so much to the development of our country. In fact, if we look at the base population, well over a half a billion people call Latin America their home. Over hundreds of years there has been a development of that heritage. Canada took a shortcut. We are a relatively young country, and thousands of individuals have made the decision to come to Canada and call it their home.

I am often afforded the opportunity to speak to people in a number of different cultural settings. One of the things I highlight, especially last year when we celebrated Canada's 150th birthday, is our multicultural attitude, and that makes me proud to be Canadian. We are not that melting pot. Rather, we recognize and value that diversity.

Private Members' Business

I often say to individuals, whether they are from Brazil, the Philippines, India, or anywhere else in the world, that because they have chosen to adopt Canada as their home does not mean they have to forget about their birth country or the country from where their ancestors came. In fact, I encourage those individuals to appreciate and share that heritage with the broader community in Canada.

Folklorama is all about that. It recognizes that individuals who participate in Folklorama share their heritage with a broader community. Over a quarter of a million people participate in those two weeks of activities. More important, what we see, and I will use the Brazilian pavilion as an example, is young people getting involved in showing and expressing their heritage, and sharing that. It does not just occur during those two weeks.

Often those volunteers, the thousands of volunteers who make up Folklorama, concentrate their efforts during those weeks, but it is year long. Activities are held and practices conducted. In fact, individuals are invited to participate in celebrations of multiculturalism around the world. Many of our performers in Folklorama, in the many different pavilions, are invited to participate.

By designating a month, it provides those individuals of that rich and vibrant community to continue to share their heritage with others. That is important to this community. By doing that, I believe we will see an enhancement of activities by Latin American countries during that month. That is a healthy thing.

In Winnipeg, for example, we see that community highlighted through things like Folklorama. By the House of Commons working with the Senate to recognize and to dedicate the month of October for the Latin American community, I believe we will see additional events in celebration of that heritage, showing how Canada has benefited from the community.

I want to share the introducer's comments with regard to Senator Enverga, a great Filipino Canadian who understood the importance of celebrating Canada's diversity.

● (1155)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: There are about four minutes remaining in the time provided for private members' business.

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development.

[*English*]

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I, too, am really proud to stand to speak to this legislation. I would like to recognize my colleague opposite for sponsoring the bill. I would also like to recognize the late Senator Enverga for the legislation, which is critically important.

As mentioned, Latin American month is critically important to recognize the rich colourfulness, experience, and culture of a particular community like we have done with others such as Black History Month and Asian Heritage Month. We recognized the Jewish community not too long ago. This is not just to recognize the experience and culture of those various groups, but also, and I do not

want to put words in the late senator's mouth, to recognize the challenges those groups also face. We cannot be blind in understanding that these various groups face challenges when they come to the country. Therefore, it has to be a holistic and a comprehensive understanding and learning during these months. We could do it throughout the year. The month gives us a catalyst, but throughout the rest of the year, after October, it gives us an opportunity to understand more about each other and to celebrate with each other.

I am really proud to speak to the legislation. As our Prime Minister has said, diversity is our strength but with that strength comes understanding and a willingness to not just be there for part of the celebration but also an understanding of the challenges that are faced as well.

As mentioned, this group is one of the largest growing. In the sixties and seventies, I was part of a group from the Caribbean, coming to Canada in 1975. My parents came to Canada to ensure we had better economic and social standing, especially for us, their children. Also, as an immigrant, it allows me to ensure my children have a better opportunity. Canada has afforded us those great opportunities and we are very thankful for that. The opportunity to celebrate is one that we should not take for granted.

As we talk about these groups within our country and understand the great sense of responsibility they have here, it is also important for us to recognize that as we celebrate these months, it brings us together as communities. It allows us to learn more about each other. Bill S-218 supports our commitment to diversity and inclusion.

As we have seen in budget 2018, it not only looks at things from a gendered lens, it also makes investments in multiculturalism, ensuring we have an anti-racism strategy, investments in the black community, investments in ensuring we have desegregated data. This will ensure that the limited resources we have are able to contribute to looking at the barriers that some of these communities face.

While we are celebrating, we also have to be very cognitive of the fact that we have to make policies and investments to ensure our communities that are facing challenges have the resources they need to overcome those challenges.

I thank the hon. member across the way and the late senator for introducing this very important legislation.

● (1200)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. parliamentary secretary will have six minutes remaining when the House resumes consideration of this motion.

The time provided for the consideration of private members' business has now expired. The order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

THE BUDGET

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF MINISTER OF FINANCE

The House resumed from February 28 consideration of the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government, of the amendment, and of the amendment to the amendment.

Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Rivière-des-Mille-Îles.

I am pleased to speak to budget 2018, which lays out the government's plans to build on its previous budget and invest in our people, our communities, our resources, and give our citizens the best opportunities to drive economic growth going forward.

I was privileged to chair the finance committee as it held pre-budget hearings across Canada in the fall. I want to thank all members on that committee and those from all parties who subbed in, for their work, their research, their witness selection, and their resolve to make recommendations to the government. Not always do members on committees agree, but we did have many good discussions and everybody's heart was on making the best report we could for the government's consideration.

I would like to give special thanks as well to the many witnesses who spent endless hours preparing briefs and the many who appeared before committee. We heard over 300 witnesses in our pre-budget consultations. While travelling across the country during these consultations, we saw Canada's tremendous potential.

Both the federal and all provincial governments have a role to play in assisting businesses and people to give them the best leg up and the best policy format on which to build economic growth.

Not all of our great ideas in the pre-budget consultations or policy suggestions were put into our report or in fact into the budget, but they do provide food for thought for both this budget and for future developments, whether it is policy or budgets in the future.

I certainly want to thank the Minister of Finance and Finance Canada for seriously considering the recommendations we did put forward. Many are woven through the budget proposals that are in the budget itself and will assist in achieving equality and growth, as the budget is titled.

The budget proposes to invest. It looks to make Canada a leader on a number of fronts. It provides a good foundation for our kids and our grandchildren going forward.

In our pre-budget consultations, we heard a lot about investing in science research, which really became to be known as the Naylor report. There was not one stop the finance committee made that the issue was not raised. The witnesses wanted us to expand on research.

I want to quote from the budget itself, because this is one of the most fundamental policies put forward in the budget, "Canada's Fundamental Science Review, led by Dr. David Naylor". It states:

While Canada spends more on higher-education research and development (as a share of gross domestic product) than any other Group of Seven (G7) country, the

The Budget

Review identified a number of challenges that require urgent attention. These include declining funding per researcher and the need to fundamentally shift how, when and where Canada invests—encouraging more global collaboration, fostering more interdisciplinary research, and better supporting research that has the potential to be groundbreaking...In response, the Government is proposing measures to make Canada's research environment more responsive, agile and modern in order to attract the world's best researchers to Canada and take Canadian research to new heights

In the budget, historic investments are proposed to support researchers. This includes more than \$1.7 billion over five years to support the next generation of Canadian researchers through Canada's granting councils and research institutes.

● (1205)

It also includes \$1.3 billion over five years for investments in laboratory equipment and infrastructure that researchers rely on to this day. What we said in our pre-budget report was to use the Naylor report as a framework for the long-term support of science and research. We also added agricultural research into the mix.

I went through that somewhat long explanation because I really think that is where some of Canada's greatest potential is. We have always, as a nation, been good at research and somewhat poor at commercialization. We are innovators, and we need to certainly get on top of the commercialization aspect. That investment will make a difference in our children's future.

Not necessarily in the budget but also announced by the government, and tied to this whole research component, is the announcement of the development of superclusters in a number of areas, ranging from oceans research to agricultural research. That builds on the potential this country has. I think it is another great move.

The budget has, as well, established programs to address the gender wage gap and to make progress toward equality in the workplace. It is another good move to find that potential in terms of getting others into the workforce, bringing more equality, and expanding our workforce and our business community and giving them the opportunity to grow, develop, and strengthen our economy. That is another good move in this budget.

Simply put, the government is investing in Canadians in a responsible way. These growth-generating investments in people, communities, and the economy are being balanced by sound fiscal management. We are investing while at the same time driving down the debt ratio as a percentage of the economy. The government is taking the next steps toward equality and a more competitive, sustainable, and inclusive Canada, where science, curiosity, and innovation are working to drive economic growth.

The Budget

This past week I happened to attend what was called the Globe Forum in Vancouver. The theme was “The Leadership Summit for Sustainable Business”. Over 4,000 people attended, and the thrust of the conference was climate change and economic leadership. I bring this point up in the budget debate because what struck me at the Global Forum was the need to find balance. I also raise it because at that conference, there was a lot of talk about the oil and gas industry and renewable energy.

One of the things that struck me at the conference was the desire to use our current natural resources as we have, in terms of being so fortunate to have oil and gas in this country, while always striving to build better technologies, with less greenhouse gases, etc., and to use those investments and returns to also improve on renewables. Although it is not really a part of this budget, it is part of the government's philosophy that we need to use what we have to build for the future.

I see that I am running out of time, because there is so much to talk about in this budget, especially as it relates to Atlantic Canada. There are improvements in broadband, pre-apprentice training, skills development, and assistance for the regional development agencies, which are extremely important in my area in terms of assisting the business community and communities themselves in gaining economic opportunities and growing business in the future. In fact, last week I announced that the Thompson Potato Company has a new technology that will add value to its potato product as it goes to market.

•(1210)

That is what this budget is all about: strengthening our economy and giving businesses and people the opportunity to grow the economy for the country as a whole and for themselves as businesses.

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, one of the issues in this budget is funding for the Canada summer jobs program.

I had the pleasure of being in that member's part of the country when I visited Prince Edward Island during the last break week. It is a beautiful part of the country. I was very pleased to be able to talk to people about the Canada summer jobs program, the importance of that program, and the negative impact of the Liberals' values test attestation.

I will just share one example with the member. I am sure it is an example he knows. I visited with the leadership of the Atlantic Baptist Housing association. The association's headquarters is in Moncton, on the other side of the Confederation Bridge, but it operates facilities in Prince Edward Island and throughout the region. It is no longer able to access the Canada summer jobs program because of the mean-spirited values test attestation policy. I am sure the member would agree that groups like this that do good work in and around his riding should not be targeted. I am sure he would say that they are not the intended targets.

Does the member think that groups like this in his constituency and elsewhere should be able to access important summer jobs funding, regardless of whether they check the box? Is he supportive of groups in his riding that are doing charitable, non-political, non-

activist work that simply want to have the freedom to do that without having to check a box that goes against their values?

•(1215)

Hon. Wayne Easter: Mr. Speaker, just yesterday morning in my office I was going through some of the proposals that have come forward for the Canada summer jobs program. There are always more proposals than there is money available to assist. However, I want to say how important the Canada summer jobs program is. This government, early on, increased the funding for the Canada summer jobs program so that we could get more young people getting that experience in the workforce and the chance to get a leg up so that when they go to apply for jobs later on, they will have not only an education but experience. What I have seen with Canada summer jobs in my riding is that because of the efforts of this government, this Minister of Finance, and this Prime Minister we are able to add many more people who gain that experience as a result of the Canada summer jobs program than was the case in previous times.

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear, from my colleague on the Liberal side of the House, details about the government's commitment to pay equity legislation. It was over 40 years ago that the first Prime Minister Trudeau promised pay equity and women would be paid equal pay for work of equal value. It never has been legislated by any Conservative or Liberal government.

Given that the NDP successfully encouraged the government to add it to its agenda in a vote in this House two years ago, we really thought that in this budget there would at least be money for implementation. There is nothing. The government did not even take up very strong encouragement by the Canadian Labour Congress to fund, at a minimum, the establishment of a pay equity commission and some of the implementation mechanisms, if not to actually set money aside to pay federal workers fairly and to implement legislation. Why is there zero money for pay equity in this budget?

Hon. Wayne Easter: Mr. Speaker, if there was ever a budget that emphasized women and their potential in the workforce or in being entrepreneurs or researchers, this budget is certainly it. I would just refer the member opposite to page 110 and the things talked about on that page: “helping women-owned businesses grow”; “increasing access to capital” for women; “enhancing data and knowledge” for women entrepreneurs; “improving access to federal business innovation programming”. Those are all our areas.

Last week we had the opportunity to meet with people involved in the skills trades. There is pre-apprenticeship training for women who are involved in those areas. It goes without saying that this budget goes a long way to giving women more opportunities in the economy and in the business world.

[Translation]

Ms. Linda Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to speak to the government investments in science and research provided for in the 2018 budget.

The Budget

[English]

A confident, growing middle class is driving economic growth, creating new jobs, and giving Canadians more opportunities to succeed.

[Translation]

Let us examine how we have come to this point. Less than three years ago, we were dealing with low economic growth and stubbornly high unemployment rates. Our government decided to strengthen the middle class and chose to make investments in order to grow the economy. Canadians know that austerity is no way for a country to achieve prosperity.

Our government is committed to making investments that will strengthen and grow the middle class, investments that will provide a stronger foundation for the future of our children.

[English]

The results are in, and Canada has the fastest growing economy in the G7. The International Monetary Fund has argued that Canada's economic policies should go viral. Government investment in people and communities is delivering greater opportunities for the middle class and for all Canadians.

• (1220)

[Translation]

Since November 2015, the people of Canada have been working hard to grow our economy, helping to create more than 500,000 jobs and driving down the unemployment rate to a historic low.

I can confirm that during the 2015 election campaign, Canadians talked to me about the difficult economic situation then. Almost every household had one person in a precarious employment situation. I can see for myself that the economy in Rivière-des-Mille-Îles is doing much better now. There are good jobs, and the unemployment rate has dropped to a historic low thanks to our government's policies.

Budget 2018 is all about investment rather than austerity, while staying the course on fiscal responsibility and improving fiscal performance.

[English]

Canada is a country of innovators. From pacemakers to peanut butter, walkie-talkies, the Canadarm, and life jackets, in ways grand and small, we Canadians have made the world around us better through our ingenuity. We have always understood that better is possible. Let me say it again: better is always possible. Time after time, we have used curiosity, courage, creativity, and collaboration to create positive change for ourselves and the world. However, progress does not happen without commitment and effort.

[Translation]

Since the recommendations of the fundamental science review, led by David Naylor, were released in 2017, our government has heard the strong and united message from Canada's research community on the importance of investing in the future of Canadian research.

In budget 2018, our government is proposing new investments to support Canadian researchers and innovators. These investments

include increased support for women, under-represented groups, and career researchers.

For one thing, the government is contributing nearly \$1.2 billion over five years to Canadian granting councils to support investigator-led fundamental research. This represents the single largest investment in fundamental research in Canadian history since the granting councils were created. This will provide increased support and training opportunities for about 21,000 researchers, students, and high-quality personnel across Canada.

To complement these investments, the policy objectives will be renewed with a much greater emphasis on international and interdisciplinary research producing quick results, including the creation of a research fund dedicated to supporting these objectives.

[English]

We know that we need to compete globally for top talent. To attract and retain leading researchers at post-secondary institutions across the country, the government is also proposing new funding for the Canada research chairs program. This funding would provide more flexibility to improve the program so it better supports researchers. It could result in additional chairs for research and a sizable increase in funding for early career researchers.

To ensure that Canada's researchers have the tools they need to make scientific breakthroughs and drive innovation, the government is taking a significant step to provide ongoing stable funding to the Canada Foundation for Innovation with investments in research infrastructure.

[Translation]

I am fortunate to be a member of two standing committees, namely the Standing Committee on Official Languages and the Standing Committee on International Trade. During a recent trip to Asia with the Standing Committee on International Trade, we found that the people we encountered were aware of our universities and knew that we had excellent, first-rate research institutions. We must continue to move forward and help our researchers.

Under budget 2018, our government is making an unprecedented investment of nearly \$4 billion to support research and researchers and to provide funding for the tools that Canadian investigators need to ensure their research is successful. Better equipment and laboratories will enable Canadian researchers to make discoveries in areas like new composite materials for aeronautics, a very strong industry in the Lower Laurentians, the auto industry, new diagnostic techniques for childhood diseases, and new methods for cracking the quantum computing challenge.

Through this investment we are also enhancing the work of federal government scientists. Thousands of scientists and a network of federal laboratories reinforce Canada's research capabilities and strengths, particularly through collaborations with businesses and post-secondary institutions.

The Budget

Several SMEs in my riding of Rivière-des-Mille-Îles are already working with universities and researchers to find solutions to practical problems. For example, there is Elastro Proxy, which manufactures hatch seals; Kinova, which manufactures robot arms; and AP&C, which manufactures titanium powder for 3D printing.

However, we must first support fundamental research to explore practical, essential solutions for our SMEs. In budget 2018, our government proposed to renew the federal science program by launching the first phase of an ambitious plan to renew federal laboratories. These coordinated investments will increase collaboration opportunities across the government as a whole and within the research system.

• (1225)

[English]

Finally, in a knowledge-based economy, a government must work to protect the ideas of Canadian innovators and entrepreneurs. Ensuring Canadian intellectual property rules are up to date and reflect the world we live in is fundamental to creating and retaining wealth generated from Canada's research, development, talent, and training.

In budget 2018, our government will be announcing measures to contribute to a new intellectual property strategy to help Canadian companies use their ideas to grow and succeed.

[Translation]

The Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development will announce the details of this strategy in the coming months.

Canadians are known for their innovative spirit, and this spirit has been instrumental in the creation of the industries and jobs responsible for building and growing Canada's middle class. Today, this same innovative drive is responsible for new jobs and good export opportunities in growing industries, all the while helping to transform jobs in existing industries.

[English]

In budget 2017, our government launched the innovation and skills plan, an ambitious effort to make Canada a world-leading centre for innovation, to help create more good well-paying jobs, and help strengthen and grow the middle class.

In budget 2018, our government is taking the next steps to transform Canada's innovation programs, rules, and regulations, making them easier to access and to use. This is expanding support for Canadian companies that want to scale up and take their innovations to the international marketplace.

[Translation]

The innovations of today will create new and exciting job opportunities for the workers of today and will create better job opportunities for our children and grandchildren. I am certain that this budget will generate many economic spinoffs in my riding today and in the years to come.

[English]

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my colleague said that better is always possible.

After reading this budget, I have to agree. We can do so much better indeed, and we will after 2019.

I want to ask a particular question about the deficit figures. There was a commitment in advance of the last election to run three deficits that would not exceed \$10 billion, and then in the fourth year to balance the budget. Of course, that commitment is not often repeated now by the government.

I want to understand. Did the government intend to not honour this commitment at the time it made it, or did it simply change its mind after the election?

[Translation]

Ms. Linda Lapointe: Mr. Speaker, I want to remind my hon. colleague that Canada has by far the best debt-to-GDP ratio in the entire G7.

My colleague spoke about debt, but I am going to talk about the economy. At the time of the 2015 election, there were precarious jobs in my riding, in the Lower Laurentians. When I was going door to door, most people were telling me times were hard.

After just three years, we can already see a difference. There are jobs, and unemployment has never been lower. Major investments are being made in aeronautics, a tremendously strong field with many subcontractors.

It is plain to see that this is a balanced budget that paves the way to a better future.

• (1230)

[English]

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for her speech. It is always good to try to find the good within the not so great to start with.

I think that the government's final decision to admit there is a funding gap between first nations children and non-first nations children is important, and that the gap will then be filled so Canadian kids are given an equal opportunity regardless of who they are. This affects the place where I come from very much, northwestern British Columbia, which has 35% or 38% first nations. The disparity between opportunities for young people is stark, and it manifests in many ways.

The government has committed to filling that gap so that kids have equal opportunity, but it will not tell us what the gap is. There is a commitment to doing something, but without telling us what that commitment will look like is important, because there have been so many broken promises over the years, as members and first nations people know all too well.

My specific question to my friend is, now that the government has committed to filling the gap so it is equal for all, will the government simply tell us what the gap is so we can hold it accountable, and first nations families and all Canadians can know whether it succeeded or failed in keeping this promise?

The Budget

[*Translation*]

Ms. Linda Lapointe: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my hon. colleague for that excellent question. There is certainly a lot of work ahead. My colleague mentioned children, so I will talk about the children in my riding. Earlier, I was explaining to my colleague that the economy is doing better, and there can be no doubt that the Canada child benefit has made a huge difference. There are more than 10,000 children in my riding. Some families receive over \$600 a month. This helps the economy because people have more money left over at the end of the month to pay for extracurricular activities and many other things.

I am also thrilled to hear that the tax-free Canada child benefit is going to be increased.

Mr. Steven MacKinnon (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her excellent speech. In my experience, she is a very passionate advocate of the aerospace industry, particularly in the Lower Laurentians and Quebec.

Could my colleague tell us more about our government's investments and achievements in the aerospace industry under this budget and in general?

Ms. Linda Lapointe: Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his question. The aerospace industry has a strong presence in the greater Montreal area. Many jobs depend on all of the large corporations and contractors, such as Bell Helicopter, Bombardier, and L-3 MAS. We do not hear as much about L-3 MAS, but it is the company that maintains our F-18s. It also maintains the American F-18s in Mirabel, which is next door to my riding.

Since the economy is doing well, all of these contractors received a lot of innovation grants. I attended various press conferences to announce these grants with the Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, since they will impact my riding. Earlier I spoke about AP&C, which manufactures titanium powder for 3D printing for the aerospace industry. There are tremendous opportunities available.

[*English*]

Ms. Rachael Harder (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in Canada, the federal budget has two main purposes: one is that it is a financial accountability record, and second is that it is a vision statement of sorts of our country. I would like to discuss both of these elements in my speech.

With regard to the financial accountability mechanism, when we spend more than we make, it is called a deficit. When it comes to revenue streams or making money, there are only two ways that a government is able to do that. One is that it can develop the natural resources within the country and then get those commodities to market, and, two, it can tax the people who live within the country. These are the two ways that a government has to generate revenue. If it does not do enough of either of these, it results in deficit spending and a debt load incurred by the public in the form of further taxation.

The Liberal government appreciates that model. It appreciates taxing its people to the point where they find it very difficult to live their lives. A Conservative approach would be to develop natural resources such as our oil and gas industry, which is something the

Trans Mountain pipeline would allow us to do and unfortunately the government does not take a stand for. The policies brought forward in the 2018 budget will make life very difficult for Canadians

Budget 2018 could have been great. The Liberals have inherited a great fortune. The world economy is thriving. The Canadian dollar is down, which is excellent for our trade market. Entrepreneurs are working hard and creating jobs. They are doing a phenomenal job. Women and men across the country are taking risks and starting up local companies. A responsible government would take advantage of this and put money aside so that when times get tough there is some money in the bank to take care of the Canadian public. Instead, the government broke its electoral promise. Instead of balancing the budget, or at least bringing it closer to balance, it decided it would incur another \$18 billion worth of deficit.

When asked about the need for deficit spending, the Liberals responded by saying they need to invest in infrastructure. The problem is that when we look at the budget closely, we see they have cut infrastructure spending domestically by \$2.1 billion. In fact, they cut it here, but the Liberals are willing to take \$35 billion and put it into overseas infrastructure to help places like China. It is the Canadian people who will have to foot that bill. We have to ask whether this helps Canadians. The truth is, it does not, at all. The Prime Minister had the audacity to tell veterans that there is not enough money in the budget or in government coffers to help veterans who have served the country faithfully, yet somehow there is enough money to send overseas and invest in infrastructure projects in places like China.

Canadians expect better. The Liberals have said that better is possible. Better is always possible. Canadians expect the government to implement policies that will create jobs. They expect the government to respect the rights and freedoms of Canadians. They expect the government to stand up for victims; to defend families; to advocate for the most vulnerable, including our seniors and those who live with a disability; to invest in health care; and to deliver services with excellence, all while stewarding the taxpayer dollar.

Canadians are hard-working people with great potential which deserves to be realized. It should be the government that facilitates that for the Canadian public. The government had the ability to facilitate that prosperity, but unfortunately it has wasted that opportunity in 2018.

Mr. Speaker, I should mention that I will be splitting my time with the member for Markham—Unionville.

The government has failed to deliver what matters most to Canadians. At a time when the government should be focused on making life more affordable and getting out of the way, it is focused on putting barriers in place for Canadians starting businesses and for investments coming into Canada. It is standing in the way of resource development. The Prime Minister is failing Canadians.

According to an Ipsos Reid poll that was recently released, nearly half of all Canadian families are within \$200 a month of not being able to pay their household bills. That is their mortgage, their car payments, the food on the table, the clothes on their back. They are within \$200 a month of not being able to make ends meet.

The Budget

• (1235)

Why is that? The reason is the current government is making life more expensive. On average, a Canadian family is spending \$840 more per year in taxation than it was under the previous government. That is money that could have been spent on music lessons or sports for their kids, or going on a weekend vacation as a family. That amount, \$840, is significant. Life is being made more expensive.

I am going to talk a little about my riding of Lethbridge. I am very pleased to represent the people of southern Alberta in Lethbridge. One of the things we were looking for in this budget was infrastructure dollars. As I mentioned, those have been cut. Specifically, we could use roads, bridges, and social infrastructure. We are a growing community. Families are vibrant. Things are going well for us, but unfortunately, in this budget, as in previous budgets from the government, we have been left in the cold because of the size of our community. The government places all of its emphasis on large urban centres, and that simply is not us.

Agriculture is a sector within my area that is very strong. It is the sector that keeps us afloat. We are very thankful for our ag producers. Again, in this budget, there was absolutely nothing for the agriculture sector.

When it comes to small businesses, entrepreneurs, women and men who are taking risks, who are creating businesses in order to facilitate job creation in this country, which then allows families to provide for themselves, the government is choosing to punish these women and men who are incredibly hard-working risk-takers. These women and men are no longer going to be able to do income splitting between spouses who co-labour in order to run a business. They are no longer going to be able to do passive investments in a way that makes sense economically. Instead, they are going to be taxed through the roof on a good portion of those passive investments.

That said, I will give credit where credit is due. One thing which took place is that Canadians actually stood up against the government. They spoke out saying that these changes are punishing and inappropriate. The government finally came back, with a Conservative promise I might add, saying that it would reduce the taxes that small businesses have to pay on a yearly basis. It has come down to 9%. That is the promise. I will give the government credit for that.

The federal government must do everything it can to facilitate an environment of economic prosperity, where businesses want to stay, want to grow, and want to create jobs, because this is what sustains us as a society. When it does things like putting in place a federally imposed carbon tax, it actually drives businesses south of the border, which is something that has happened in my region recently. Two fairly decent-sized companies have moved south, simply because the policies look much better down there. This is costing us as Canadians. It is making life less doable.

The last thing I want to talk about with regard to the budget is that in addition to serving as a financial record, it also serves as a vision statement. One of the things the government did is it put a lot of emphasis on women. As Conservatives, we absolutely believe that women are equal and that they deserve equal pay for equal work. If

we were to look at a bar graph, we would see that the pay gap between men and women shrinks to the greatest extent when a Conservative government is in power. We are very proud of that record and will continue to work on that going forward.

What I am hearing from women across this country is that the government has put forward a statement that forces women into the workplace full time and tells them exactly where they need to be putting their time and energy, that it needs to be put into STEM, or it needs to be put into leadership, or it needs to be put into technology. Women would love to have the choice left up to them. They would like the opportunity to choose to work full time or part time. They would like the opportunity to choose to work within the field or the sector that most interests them, that they place value on, rather than the sector or the field that the government places value on.

What happened to a woman's autonomy? What happened to her choice? What happened to creating equal opportunity for men and women to thrive alongside one another, for our society to be robust, for us to pursue the things that we are most passionate about, rather than having a government dictate what those passions should be?

As Conservatives, we support working women and working mothers, whether that work takes place in the office, in the lab, on the farm, or at home. Those women should be celebrated for their choice. They should be celebrated for their passions, their dreams, their abilities, and for the way that they are contributing to society as a whole.

Autonomy must be granted. Freedom must be protected. Choice must be recognized. In this budget, the government failed.

• (1240)

Mr. Darrell Samson (Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in her very passionate speech, the hon. member made some very good arguments. I would like her to expand on something she said.

The member talked about two aspects of not having deficit financing. She talked about bringing revenues in or taxing people. When I look at the previous government's record during its 10 years in power, I see the weakness. When the Conservatives were doing their budget or when the campaign was moving forward, they were saying that they would have no deficit and that they would make some major cuts. However, it takes money to make money.

Our government invested in the people. We brought in the Canada child benefit, which is one of the greatest investments for young families ever put forward. That was a strong investment. We have also invested in veterans, seniors, young families, and women.

I would like the member to tell me, if her government would have no deficit, which programs her government would cut, because there would have to be some major cuts in those areas.

• (1245)

Ms. Rachael Harder: Mr. Speaker, the problem with the hon. member's question is the premise on which it is based, which is that the government has to spend a ton of money in order to create money. That simply is not true. In fact, the government is the worst at being able to steward money in order to generate money.

The Budget

Instead, let us take down the barriers. Let us cut the red tape. Let us put policy in place that would help entrepreneurs start businesses that will invest in our economy, which will attract further investment from other countries, which will help get our nation back on track and create jobs for hard-working women and men across this country so that they can provide for their families. Let us go into our natural resource sectors and develop those. Let us incentivize the development of those instead of standing in the way of pipelines which is preventing a commodity from getting to market, which then means that we do not have the revenue that it could be bringing into our country, which then means that families across this country have to pay for the government's ill choice.

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, over many years, probably decades now, wonderful things have been said in the House about the importance of an issue like pay equity. We have pay equity here in Parliament. Every MP is paid an equal amount regardless of gender, yet we do not have pay equity legislation that exists across the country.

My friend's party, I would argue, has never been a champion for pay equity legislation. The Conservatives had many years in office, both the previous administration and prior ones, but did not move the needle forward. The Liberal government came in with much promise to do something about this for women who, on average, are making 75¢ on the dollar for what a man does for equal work. These are the statistics we have, and my friend can argue alternate facts, but the reality for many women in the workplace right now doing the same job as a man will, on average, is that they will be paid less.

Here is the opportunity for the federal government, who alone has this power, to regulate federally directed industries, telecoms, the banking sector, and other jurisdictions. Now, this allegedly feminist Prime Minister said, "I got this." He put hand on heart and told Canadian women and men that the Liberals were going to do something about it. The natural course two and half years into the government to do this, the vehicle, was the budget. However, not only did the Liberals not do anything to legislate pay equity, they did not even fund a pay equity commission to get to legislating pay equity.

Can we at some point get to a confirmed and unified position in this House that legislation directing federally regulated industries to require equal pay for equal work for men and women become the law in Canada, yes or no?

Ms. Rachael Harder: Mr. Speaker, women and men who work the same job deserve the same pay, full stop. I invite the hon. member to look at the Statistics Canada data and he will see that the graph shows that the wage gap between a man and a woman decreased the most when a Conservative government was in power. I will reiterate that a man and a woman working the same job deserve the exact same pay. We will always take a stand for that.

Mr. Bob Saroya (Markham—Unionville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise in the House today to discuss budget 2018. The Liberals really cannot help themselves can they? Another year goes by of mismanagement of taxpayers' money. This budget has a complete disregard for businesses and hard-working families across the country.

The budget represents big government and little incentive for businessmen and businesswomen to set up shops or continue

operating in Canada. I cannot believe how the Liberals expect our economy to grow when they are creating less competition and scaring business out of our country. The Liberals continue to give with one hand and take with another. Businesses will continue to choose to operate anywhere else but in Canada if the Liberals keep going down this road.

Just as we have seen from the proposed tax changes earlier this fiscal year, Liberals do not do what is best for business in this country. The budget means less money in the pockets of Canadians and more debt on the backs of our children.

I would never manage my family's budget like this, so how can the Liberals justify managing the country's budget like this? This out of control debt and deficit is going to leave our children to pick up the tab. What I see from the budget is missed opportunities. This budget could have been a way to do real good for Canadian families, but instead, the government has continued to rack up the debt.

We know the recipe for job creation: low taxes, open competition, free trade, responsible spending of taxpayers' money. That is what the government should focus on. The government is taxing Canadians to death as it is. This is only going to get worse.

The Conservative caucus demands a real plan to create jobs, fight to keep more money in the pockets of hard-working Canadians, and push the Liberals to live within their means and not borrow billions of dollars the country does not have.

The previous Conservative government lowered taxes a total of 180 times, bringing the tax burden to the lowest level in 50 years. By the end of our mandate, the average family of four was saving almost \$7,000 per year. Contrary to what the Liberals tell us, lower-income and middle-income Canadians benefited the most from our tax plan. I have said this before and I will say it again. We created jobs. During the worst economic downturn since the great recession, Canada had the best job creation and economic growth record among G7 countries. We balanced budgets. After running a targeted stimulus program that created and maintained approximately 200,000 jobs, we kept our promise to balance the budget and left the Liberals with a \$3.2 billion surplus at the end of 2015. We lowered taxes. We reduced taxes to their lowest point in 50 years, with a typical family of four saving almost \$7,000 per year.

There are several issues that I would like to take the next few moments to address.

The Budget

We know that budget 2018 provides for the expansion of tax information sharing with foreign law enforcement authorities in 35 countries, including the United States, the European Union, Brazil, Belgium, France, Israel, Russia, and China. The Liberal government's new information-sharing measures fail to protect Canadians' privacy and civil rights, something the Prime Minister is obligated to do by law. Canadians' confidential information must only be shared with trusted allies. This is problematic. In addition to the out of control spending and double whammy of debt and deficit, now we have a potential privacy issue on our hands.

The second issue I would like to address is health care. There were many disappointments overall in budget 2018 for health. I am deeply concerned about the removal of palliative care from the federal budget and the fact that the government has failed to deliver on the Prime Minister's promise to support home care for Canadians.

• (1250)

Budget 2018 has also failed to support drug treatment centres to address the growing opioid crisis. Spending a billion dollars on the legalization of marijuana does nothing to help parents who are increasingly concerned that their children are being exposed to dangerous opioids.

Budget 2018 restored autism support. This was a result of strong advocacy from the Conservative caucus. However, budget 2018 does not do enough to support Canadians struggling with dementia, PTSD, and other mental health issues. Canada's aging population does not need a \$75 million pilot project in the health minister's home province. They need a real solution to address their actual needs.

The Liberals are not adequately addressing the serious drug addiction problems in Canada, and this was a missed opportunity. I will remain focused on bringing forward solutions that address the health priorities of Canadians, and policies that put people before government.

We cannot throw money at a wall and expect results. The government needs a real plan for Canadians. High debts and revolving deficits are not the solution. The Liberals fail to address the health priorities of Canadians, especially the aging population and those coping with addiction and mental illness. The Prime Minister has all but abandoned his pledge to support our aging population with more home care.

The Prime Minister is spending billions of dollars on foreign pet projects but has no plan to combat the opioid crisis. This is not right. We continue to see inconsistencies and contradictions from the Liberals. The Prime Minister's health care priorities fail to make a difference in the lives of Canadians. In fact, the government is spending nearly a billion dollars to legalize marijuana, and a third as much on addressing the opioid crisis that is killing thousands of Canadians each year. Spending \$80 million to entice Canadians to quit smoking while simultaneously spending almost a billion dollars to legalize marijuana does not make sense.

Budget 2018 was a missed opportunity. The world economy is roaring, but the Liberals are failing to turn this opportunity into results for us.

The third issue I would like to address is Canada's north and the implications it will face as a result of this budget. The Prime Minister is raising taxes on over 90% of middle-class families in the north, and this budget announces new tax hikes on local businesses. I wish the government would be more focused on bringing forward solutions that put hard-working people before the government, but sadly it is not. The Prime Minister's imposed carbon tax will find its way into everything that northerners buy every day. The communities that can least afford it are going to be the most impacted by this reckless decision. The reality is that never has a prime minister spent so much to achieve so little. It is critical that government spending translates into meaningful results on the ground.

Last month, we heard the finance minister speak for 36 minutes to introduce this budget. In that time, Canada's national debt increased by \$1.44 billion. With another \$18 billion in deficit spending this year alone, never has a government spent so much to achieve so little. The numbers do not lie. We need to think about what is best for all Canadians, not just Liberal voters.

As always, I will advocate for low taxes, support for families, and safe communities. The government and this budget are not doing that for Canadians.

• (1255)

Mr. Chandra Arya (Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the temporary February job report showed that 283,000 jobs have been added to the Canadian economy compared to the previous 12 months. More importantly, all of that job growth was full-time work. Also, since we have come to power, there have been 600,000 jobs added to the Canadian economy.

The member referred to personal finances. In my personal life, I do not like credit card debt. However, I like mortgages, because a mortgage allows me to create an asset that will yield returns for a long period of time. With respect to the government, it is not the debt that is important. No rich or developed countries have ever repaid their debts in full because the debt will always go up. The key factor is the debt-to-GDP ratio, which is low and is going lower. It is currently at around 28.5%. Does the member not like the low debt-to-GDP ratio, which is the best in all of the G7 countries?

• (1300)

Mr. Bob Saroya: Mr. Speaker, let us take one thing at a time and start with job creation. When we were in power, we were always side by side with the U.S. Its job creation rate was 8%, and now it is less than 3.5%. We came down to 7% on job creation. A net 200,000 jobs were created in that window. We have the opportunity to do something with the U.S. economy, yet we have failed to show anything meaningful when creating jobs.

The Budget

Let us talk about the debts. When I pulled in this morning, I thought something looked different. I kept walking and realized that the \$5.7-million ice rink was gone, which had only been there for a couple of days. Then there is the \$35 billion for infrastructure in foreign countries. The current government is out of control when it talks about spending taxpayer money. That is the real problem.

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I suppose some Canadians may have been looking for affordable child care or pay equity in this budget, because they were promised that by the Liberals.

However, one of the things Canadians did not anticipate at the time of the last federal election in Canada, although a few of us did, is that we would have Donald Trump as President of the United States. Now that it is the reality, one of the expectations of this budget was that the so-called “plan B” would be unveiled with respect to what would happen if a trade war were to be initiated by our largest trading partner. The budget has an anticipation quality to it. It lays out the plan for the next year. We have seen the threat and then the temporary withdrawal of major tariffs on aluminum and steel by the Trump administration. However, I have not checked Twitter in the last five minutes, so they could be back on the table. We do not know. That is what we are dealing with.

Obviously that is not within the control of the federal government in Canada. However, what is in its control is support for those industries that are particularly threatened by a volatile president sitting in the White House. There is no contemplation with respect to what would happen if NAFTA were to be abrogated or torn up by that president and Canada was only left with the free trade agreement between the two of us.

The lack of planning is the concern. Many thought the budget would present what that plan B would look like. I am wondering if my friend, in the 300 pages of the budget, was able to find what the Liberal plan B is, if our trading relationship were to fundamentally change with our largest trading partner, the U.S.

Mr. Bob Saroya: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is absolutely correct. This budget does not do anything for hard-working Canadians, especially in the steel and aluminum industry. This budget has not been well thought through. There is nothing in the 328 pages that talks about hard-working Canadians. I agree with the hon. member.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Breton (Shefford, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to address my House of Commons colleagues today. I will be sharing my time with the member for Don Valley East.

As we have said, the 2018 budget is the next step in our government's plan to stimulate the economy and benefit the middle class and those working hard to join it.

Thanks to our plan and Canadians' hard work, ingenuity, and creativity, Canada has created hundreds of thousands of jobs since November 2015. The national unemployment rate is about as low as it has ever been in the past 40 years. Since early 2016, Canada's growth has been the strongest in the G7.

Pre-budget consultations with a record 1.5 million people shaped this budget, which gives our government the tools to build a fairer

and more competitive, diversified, and inclusive nation where everyone truly has the same opportunity to succeed.

We are working hard to reward curiosity and foster the creativity we need to innovate and maintain our competitive advantage in an ever more rapidly evolving global economy.

With this budget, we are putting initiatives in place to ensure that the benefits of economic growth are experienced equally by men and women. It is important that Canadians' various experiences be taken into account. That is why we are starting to put gender at the centre of government decisions. For instance, we are going to make substantive efforts to reduce the gender wage gap by introducing fair wage practices in federally regulated sectors and adopting proactive pay equity regimes, the details of which will be revealed later this year.

With regard to EI parental benefits, we are creating a new incentive for the sharing of benefits to support the parental role, adding additional weeks of benefits when parents decide to share the leave.

We are also going to support female-owned businesses to help them expand, find new customers, and increase export opportunities.

Ensuring that every Canadian man and woman has a fair and equitable chance of achieving success is not only the right thing to do, it is also the smart thing to do, and Canada's prosperity depends on it.

As a government, we are determined to help the next generation of Canadians remove the obstacles that have been holding us back for far too long. We know that we cannot continue to grow the middle class if half of us, namely women, is always being held back.

This budget is also for researchers and innovation. Our great country has long been at the forefront of scientific discovery and innovation. Open heart surgery, the Canadarm, and the discovery of insulin are just a few examples that spring to mind.

This budget includes historic investments in the next generation of researchers, which will lead to even more significant breakthroughs that, hopefully, will benefit not only Canadians, but the entire world.

We know that the government has a role to play in helping Canadians develop the skills they need to benefit from current and future economic opportunities. We also know that research contributes to the emergence of a workforce that can seize these opportunities with creativity and confidence. We are investing in training the next generation of researchers, which includes a larger proportion of women, and to provide them support by allocating new funding for fundamental research through the granting councils.

The Budget

●(1305)

To make sure they get the infrastructure and support they need, we are also going to invest more in the research support fund, the Canada research chairs program, the Canada Foundation for Innovation, colleges, and polytechnics.

This budget also lays the groundwork for the digital research infrastructure strategy that is going to be developed to stimulate progress in advanced computing and big data.

Canadians want to make sure economic growth goes hand in hand with environmental protection. They know that their quality of life and their future economic prosperity depend on our commitment to protecting our natural heritage and keeping the environment healthy for future generations.

Furthermore, the extraordinary beauty of our natural surroundings, parks, and wild spaces is central to the Canadian identity. Whether we are building a campfire with our kids, hiking with friends and family, or going for a swim in clean, refreshing water, we all have a stake in protecting the natural environment, which is one of the pillars of our identity.

To that end, we have already allocated billions to the development of the pan-Canadian framework on clean growth and climate change, but we are not stopping there. In budget 2018, we propose further investments to encourage the growth of a sound, sustainable economy. We are going to make historic investments in nature conservation by protecting Canada's ecosystems, landscapes, and biodiversity, as well as our species at risk. We are going to develop the federal carbon pricing system, extend tax support for clean energy, and bring in better rules for regulatory processes and environmental assessments.

We are on the right track. Thanks to our various budgets focused on strengthening and growing the middle class, as well as the hard work, ingenuity, and creativity of Canadians, Canada has created close to 600,000 jobs since November 2015, and the national unemployment rate is almost the lowest it has been in 40 years. Since early 2016, Canada has had the strongest economic growth in the G7. Thanks to this budget, which was designed by Canadians for Canadians, we are addressing the challenge of equality head-on by asking the hard questions and beginning to come up with solutions.

We will continue to redouble our efforts to deliver on our plan to invest in the middle class and those working hard to join it. This plan makes people a priority, builds on Canadians' hard work, and keeps us firmly focused on the future so that our children have a better chance of fulfilling their dream of getting good jobs and contributing to their community.

I listened to and heard what my constituents had to say during the pre-budget consultations that we held in my riding of Shefford, and as a result, I strongly support the budget tabled by my colleague the Minister of Finance. This budget and our previous budgets have made it possible to implement many measures to strengthen the middle class, such as the Canada child benefit and tax cuts that put tens of millions of dollars back in the pockets of families in my riding.

Once again, I am very proud to represent the interests of the people of Shefford, and I will always strive to do more to address their concerns.

●(1310)

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I salute my colleague from Montreal who just spoke. I would like to ask him a simple question.

When he was a candidate in the election, what was the Liberal government's target date for balancing the budget?

Mr. Pierre Breton: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to answer my colleague's question. I am actually the MP for the Eastern Townships, but that's okay as it is not that far from Montreal.

In 2015, Canadians and the constituents of Shefford decided to invest responsibly in Canada. They chose a government on that basis. As I mentioned in my speech, today we are in a positive position. Since November 2015, a total of 600,000 new jobs have been created. Our unemployment rate is the lowest it has been in 40 years, and we have the fastest economic growth in the G7. Our debt-to-GDP ratio is the lowest of all G7 countries and our deficit-to-GDP ratio is low. We are already in an enviable position with a rate of 0.8%, and we are headed to 0.5% or 0.4% in the next few years. Canada's economic position is the envy of the world.

●(1315)

[*English*]

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, for a feminist budget, a gender budget, the budget was sorely lacking in funding for new child care spaces. The International Monetary Fund, the Conference Board of Canada, and the Governor of the Bank of Canada all say that universal, affordable child care as a publicly-funded program will get women to work and will largely pay for itself, as it has in Quebec.

I am concerned that the government's budget, although it has the label of a gender budget and names women many times, has not funded new child care spaces yet in its term. It has had two and a half years to do so, and there was no new funding in this budget to create new child care spaces for women who want to go to work can take their children. It is deeply unaffordable and costs more than rent in some communities.

Could the member please explain why there were no dollars allocated in this budget for this fundamental program for working women?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Breton: Mr. Speaker, this gives me an opportunity to reiterate that gender equality in Canada is an important focus of this budget. Canada has probably never had a budget more focused on gender equality.

I simply want to remind my colleague of three extremely important measures that we have implemented and that will be developed in the coming years. We are investing 1.7 billion to drive the economic advance of women. We want women to start and grow their businesses and to export more from these businesses. This money is earmarked specifically for them, and we are very proud of this.

The Budget

There are women entrepreneurs in my riding working in various sectors, from farming to industry, and they want to see these changes implemented quickly. I also want to remind my colleague of the additional EI benefit weeks for women, which should help ensure a smooth return to work after pregnancy.

[English]

Mr. Chandra Arya (Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for a long time Canada's prosperity and the high standard of living Canadians enjoyed was based basically on natural resources, including forestry resources, minerals and fossil fuels, and to an extent with manufacturing in basic industries like steel and aluminum, and in auto and aviation. However, the future is not in these industries. It is going toward a global-based, knowledge-based economy.

Could the member kindly highlight the investment this budget is making to foster innovation in Canada's economy?

[Translation]

Mr. Pierre Breton: Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague. Indeed, the jobs of the future hinge on Canadians' ability to constantly adapt, innovate, and maintain our competitive advantage over the rest of the world. We are investing an unprecedented \$3 billion to support the next generation of researchers. This is extremely important, and I remind members that an additional \$511 million, on top of the current budget, will be allocated to regional economic development. Regions are important

• (1320)

[English]

Ms. Yasmin Ratansi (Don Valley East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and a pleasure to rise in the House to speak to budget 2018.

Over the past two years, our government has invested in Canadians and in the things that matter most to them.

In 2015, the economy was sluggish and despite the previous Liberal government leaving the Conservatives with a \$13 billion surplus, they had nothing to show for it. They did not invest in the economy and left us with a deficit. Our government decided that investing in people was the best way to boost the economy.

We are now seeing our investments paying off. Our economy has added 500,000 jobs, our unemployment rate is the lowest it has been in 40 years, and the Canadian economy is the fastest growing of all G7 nations. We are following through with our promise to reduce the small business tax rate from 11% to 9%, which will save small business owners an average of \$7,500.

In 2015, Canadians made a choice to discard the failed austerity measures and to vote for a government that provided hope. They were in favour of rejuvenating the economy.

How are our investments helping?

Through budgets 2017 and 2018, our government has made targeted and strategic investments for economic development. I will focus on four of these and talk about the impact on my riding.

The first is our investment in housing. My riding of Don Valley East sits on the perimeter of downtown Toronto. The high demand for housing has driven up rental rates and has made it more difficult for Canadians to live and work in the same area. The government's

investment in housing is a critical step to encourage a stable supply of affordable rental housing for middle-income households. Budget 2018 is investing \$3.75 billion over the next three years in the rental construction financing initiative. This initiative is expected to generate the construction of more than 14,000 new rental units across Canada.

Further, our government's national housing strategy is investing over \$40 billion over the next 10 years to create over 100,000 new units and repair 300,000 housing units across Canada. This means that 530,000 households will benefit from this investment and it will reduce the pressures on many municipalities. As well, 435,000 households will benefit from the maintenance and expansion of community housing in Canada. My riding has a large number of these houses, 68 such projects that will benefit.

Through this investment in affordable housing, we hope to alleviate poverty, as one of the root causes of poverty is the lack of affordable housing. As well, with this investment, we will help seniors, single moms, and people with disabilities to have access to good and affordable housing.

The second area is investments in infrastructure. Budget 2017 committed over \$180 billion in infrastructure investments. Over \$100 million of this are being invested in infrastructure projects in and around Don Valley East. One example is the Eglinton Crosstown LRT that crosses many ridings, including mine. This investment will help connect people, reduce traffic and travel times, and in turn increase productivity and economic opportunities. It will also give families more time to spend with each other in a cleaner, greener environment.

• (1325)

The third area is equality and growth. Budget 2018 is a family-friendly budget that makes significant progress towards equality of opportunity and growth. It does this by taking leadership to address the gender wage gap, supporting equal parenting, and introducing a new entrepreneurship strategy for women.

The Budget

The women's entrepreneurship strategy is a comprehensive approach to addressing critical growth stages and other challenges that women entrepreneurs face. Our investment will help them grow their businesses and remove barriers to success. A study by the Royal Bank of Canada, RBC Economics, estimates that the size of the Canadian government would increase by 4% if there was equal representation of men and women in the workforce. In addition, a McKinsey study shows that, by boosting women's participation in technology and in the workforce, it would add an additional \$150 billion to our economy. These figures are substantial, and it would mean more middle-class jobs and more Canadians who would have the ability to pay their bills and save for retirement.

Canadian women are among the best educated in the world, yet they earn less than men, are less likely to participate in the labour market than men, and are more likely to work part time. A study that I did as chair of the Standing Committee on the Status of Women stands true today. Women earn 30% less than what men earn for doing the same job.

When women have the support and opportunities to fully contribute to Canada's economy, the entire economy does better. One example of our government's policy measure is the Canada child benefit, or CCB, which was introduced in budget 2016. This is making a positive difference for millions of Canadians.

In my riding, there are many women who have to stay at home due to the high cost of child care. The CCB has now made it possible for them to go to work. Over 3.3 million families are receiving more than \$23 billion in annual CCB payments. Last fall, the government proposed to strengthen the CCB by providing an additional \$5.6 billion, starting in July 2018, in support of Canadian families. The CCB is making a large difference in Don Valley East where nearly 10,000 families receive an average annual payment of \$7,500, elevating thousands of children out of poverty. When poverty is alleviated, people are able to contribute more to the economy.

The fourth and last area I would like to talk about is youth. The investment in youth is an important one. As I go around, meeting youth from my constituency youth council, I hear that strong, good jobs for the future are important, especially when they are graduating and have student debt. Our investment in youth initiatives are paying off. Last year the government invested \$725,000 in the Canada summer jobs program in my riding, creating jobs for 262 young people and providing them with 60,000 hours of valuable work.

Last week I had an opportunity to visit STEM Kids Rock in my riding where our government's investment in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics is giving impetus to young women to lead. I was amazed at the creativity and innovative technology these young people demonstrated.

In conclusion, as members can see, the government's investment in equality, housing, and infrastructure are providing the boost needed to keep growing the economy and supporting all Canadians, who form the bedrock of our country.

• (1330)

Mr. Chandra Arya (Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, investment in infrastructure is very important, because this is the investment that was needed for a long period of time. The debt is important to create investment in infrastructure, but the debt has to be at a manageable

level. The Government of Canada has managed very well and has kept the debt-to-GDP rate low. It is committed to keeping it low in the future as well.

Does the member agree that a prudent policy of the Government of Canada is to keep the debt-to-GDP rate low in the medium to long term?

Ms. Yasmin Ratansi: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has a very solid analysis of what a debt-to-GDP ratio should be. As an accountant, I believe this is an important aspect to show that we are on the right track. For example, in 1993 when the Liberal government took over, the IMF called the then-Conservative government's mismanagement, the economic basket case. Canada was the economic basket case. It took prudent management. It was prudent fiscal responsibility that led to our leaving the next government with \$13 billion in surplus. Therefore, the Conservatives can never claim that they are prudent economic managers because according to economists they have never been able to manage the economy.

Mr. Jamie Schmale (Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions regarding my friend opposite's speech, in particular the part where she talked about affordable housing. As we all know, the money for affordable housing starts well past the government's mandate. As well, the member did not mention the reason why people need affordable housing. Many of them are not able to access proper employment to allow them to get out of poverty. The government completely ignores the fact that the best solution for poverty is a job. We have people in Alberta suffering because of the government's inaction to get pipelines built. If the Liberals want to help the steel industry, one way is to build pipelines. We are completely lacking that leadership on that side of the House.

Is a strong economy not something that will get people out of the poverty situation they find themselves in? However, especially here in Ontario, most people were driven into poverty because of bad government decisions especially in regard to electricity. That is putting more and more people into poverty, yet more unemployment is what that government is promoting.

Ms. Yasmin Ratansi: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's good question allows me an opportunity to read something to him, because he said that jobs are required and that he believes a government that came in two years ago is responsible for some of the policies of the previous government. Here is a quote from economists:

Far from unleashing a business-led boom, Harper has in fact presided over the weakest economic era in Canada's postwar history. For example, from 2006 through 2014...Canada experienced the slowest average economic growth since the Great Depression.... Harper wasn't even close to the next-worst prime minister: another Conservative, Brian Mulroney.

The Budget

As Liberals, we do not really need lessons from the other side on how to manage the economy. We made investments in 2006 and that was, interestingly enough, defeated by that government.

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the federal government has been asked by the parliamentary budget officer how it will spend \$186.7 billion in infrastructure money over the next 12 years after the budget showed that about one-quarter of the planned spending for 2016 to 2019 would be moved to future years. The whole basis of the current government's deficit spending was infrastructure to get Canada's economy going, yet that is the area that it is drawing back. What is the rationale for that?

• (1335)

Ms. Yasmin Ratansi: Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that as an accountant I know that when we have to spend money we spend it in tranches. We do not spend lump sums because it is not possible to spend anything lump sum. We have to be good economic managers to know exactly where. Therefore, we have invested \$7 billion, for example, in affordable housing. We have invested in child care. We have invested in various components of the economy and we will keep on doing it in strategic and targeted investments, so that we can get people out of poverty and into well-paying jobs and increase the middle class.

[Translation]

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is with pride and some emotion that I announce that I will be sharing my time with my colleague from Durham.

We are gathered here to go over the government's budget. This is a budget in which, for the third time in a row, the government fails to keep its promises, fails to keep its word to Canadians, and throws caution to the wind when it comes to the sound management of public finances. Never in the history of Canada has a government spent so much to give Canadians so little. Those are the words of our leader, the leader of the opposition, who thankfully will be leading this country in two years.

Two and a half years ago, the Liberal Party was elected on a promise to run small deficits and return to a balanced budget in 2019. Those small deficits were meant to be invested in infrastructure. In my overview, hon. members will see that there is no sign of small deficits, a balanced budget, or infrastructure plans, and the parliamentary budget officer agrees. The deficit is currently \$18 billion. A deficit is a clear indication of overspending. It is proof that expenses are out of control. It is proof that the government is so irresponsible that it is sending the bill to our children and grandchildren.

[English]

When we are a family, we have a budget and, yes, sometimes we will go to the bank and borrow money to buy a house. That is quite normal, but we do not go to the bank to borrow money to buy food. That is exactly what the government is doing. If as a family we are doing that, it is because we have a deep problem. We cannot control our spending and we spend too much.

[Translation]

No head of household can live on a line of credit and max out credit cards indefinitely. That is what this government is doing. Who could forget the tragedy of the 1970s that mired us in skyrocketing debt and chronic deficits? Who could forget that Canada's 15th Prime Minister, he of the same name as our current Prime Minister, introduced deficit spending in a time of peace and economic stability? Like father, like son, unfortunately.

The government has no idea how to manage public spending properly. Eliminating the deficit and balancing the budget are like foreign concepts, even though, two and a half years ago, the Liberals promised they would balance the budget in 2019-20. That promise just might have been motivated by the fact that 2019 is an election year, but at least they had a game plan that people could either support or reject. Voters made informed decisions based on the Liberals' promise to balance the budget in 2019, but what is the forecast for 2019 now? Another deficit. How about for 2020? Another deficit. 2021? Another deficit. 2022? Another deficit. 2023? Another deficit. In this budget, the government has looked as far into the future as it can, and all it sees, all we see, is deficits. The government has no idea when the deficit will be gone. That is irresponsible.

[English]

We cannot accept the fact that the government was elected, with the hope and the confidence of the people of Canada, saying it would get back to zero deficit in 2019, and today, just a year and a half before the election, the Liberals have no plan and no idea at all of how to get back to zero deficit. That is totally irresponsible and it is not fair to the Canadian people who voted for them in the belief that they would get back to zero deficit in 2019. They failed in this promise and that is totally unacceptable.

• (1340)

[Translation]

Under this budget, 90% of middle-class families are paying more taxes today than they were three years ago, when we were in government. That figure comes from the Fraser Institute, whose analysis has determined that families will be paying up to \$2,000 more. That is because this government eliminated tax credits. Astonishingly, it even did away with the public transit tax credit. These people keep saying they support mass transit and green spaces, yet they scrapped the tax credit that we Conservatives had introduced to help public transit users.

The Budget

It is also worrying that not one cent of the \$330 billion spent by the current government has been set aside for the difficult NAFTA negotiations or for responding to competition from the United States, which is both our number one trading partner and our main competitor. We can all see that the U.S. administration is aggressively protectionist, and that is its right. We can disagree with that stance, but these people are acting in the capacity to which they were duly elected. However, our government has failed to set aside a single cent in this budget for tackling these new economic challenges.

Last week, we were treated to the spectacle of the Prime Minister dashing here, there, and everywhere to visit steel and aluminum workers. He put on a fine show, but what are the measures in the budget for countering the Americans' competitive approach? There are none. The same goes for NAFTA. On the whole, we find this budget disappointing.

I am proud to represent the people of Louis-Saint-Laurent and, to put it mildly, the people of the Quebec City region are not very pleased with this budget. Once again, the Liberal candidates, who I ran against during the election two and a half years ago, made several promises that this government still has not kept to our satisfaction.

For example, the National Optics Institute is looking for federal money in order to expand across Canada. The government promised \$25 million, but this is the third budget and the money has not materialized. The Institut nordique du Québec, which seeks to develop the full potential of northern Canada, is also waiting for federal money in order to establish a presence at Laval University, in the Quebec region. However, the Liberals have still not kept this promise.

We can say the same about the expansion of the Port of Québec, a vector for wealth creation and the economy in Quebec City. The Liberals promised to support the port authority in its expansion efforts, known as Québec 2020, but, once again, there is no money after a third budget. That is also the case for the Quebec Bridge, a one-of-a-kind architectural achievement recognized by all as part of the world's engineering heritage. Congratulations. The Liberals stated that the issue of who is to maintain the Quebec bridge was to be resolved in 2016. It is now 2018 and, with 2019 approaching, this issue has not yet been resolved. There is a great deal of disappointment in the Quebec City region.

These fine people will say that Canada's economy is doing well. However, the Liberals inherited an exceptional economic situation from our government. Under our government, Canada was the first G7 country to recover from the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression with the best debt-to-GDP ratio and a balanced budget. The Liberals are extremely lucky that they followed a Conservative government because we left the house in order.

Since the Liberals took office, they have also benefited from a thriving American economy. When the American economy is doing well, it certainly helps because we are an exporting country and 20% of our international trade is with the United States. What is more, the price of oil is two or three times higher than when we were in office. Let us also not forget that the dollar has been low, which is a big help for an exporting country.

The government is therefore doing a very poor job of managing the things it is able to control since it is running deficits and has no idea when it will return to a zero deficit and balance the budget. The strength of the offshore economy is creating wealth in Canada, and the government has no influence over that.

We are angry that, day after day, the government refuses to answer our questions about when it will balance the budget. The parliamentary budget officer is also fed up. In a scathing report tabled last week, he indicated that it was high time that the Liberals came up with a plan to balance the budget.

●(1345)

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I disagree with most of what my colleague and friend across the way said.

We look at it and say to Canada that we are investing our energy in our middle class. We recognize the importance of a healthy middle class, which means a healthier economy. In fact, one of the first things we did in government was reduce the middle class income tax, putting hundreds of millions of dollars of disposable income in the pockets of Canadians. We invested in the poorest of our seniors through the guaranteed income supplement. We lifted tens of thousands of children out of poverty. All of this put money in the pockets of Canadians from coast to coast to coast. Those Canadians spent that money. They are the cultivators of our economy. That is one of the reasons the economy is doing as well as it is.

Can the member tell us if he has any remorse in terms of voting against those tax breaks, voting against supporting our seniors, and voting against taking children out of poverty?

Mr. Gérard Deltell: Mr. Speaker, those who have remorse are those who voted for the Liberals, because they have been destroyed by them. They voted for a party that said that it would get back to a zero deficit, and that is not the case.

Let us talk about facts. The hon. member talked about the fact that we give more money to the middle class. The reality, based on the Fraser Institute, is that 90% of the middle class pays more taxes than when the Conservatives were in office.

Let us talk about facts. The member said that high-income people pay more tax. That is not the case. Based on a Department of Finance report six months ago, the highest ranked people, who have more money in their pockets, paid less in taxes, \$1.2 billion, thanks to this government.

Those are the facts. I can tell the member that I am very proud to be on this side.

Mr. Robert Sopuck (Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Quebec for his usual excellent speech, in which he elucidated in great detail the problems with this Liberal government.

The Budget

I was interested to hear the parliamentary secretary's question. He is a typical Liberal. They think government spending creates wealth and that it is the only thing that will ever lift the middle class. Notice how the Liberals never talk about a climate of business or investment, where real wealth is created. In fact, the business climate in Canada is getting so bad that the CEO of Suncor said that it is not investing any more. I think it is down from \$15 billion in investment in our economy.

Can my hon. friend explain to the Liberals why their economic strategy is so wrong and what we need to do to create wealth?

Mr. Gérard Deltell: Mr. Speaker, on this side of the aisle, we recognize that those who create wealth and jobs are not the government but the middle class, and first and foremost, small business owners. This is where we must place our help. What did this government do? It attacked them last summer and last month with decisions to tax business people more. This is why the Parliamentary Budget Officer concluded in his report released a few days ago that 400 people pay more in taxes. I will get the right number.

[Translation]

In fact, 900 families with an income of less than \$100,000 are now paying \$2,200 more.

[English]

This is the reality of the government. The Liberals have said many times that they want to help the backbone of our economy, which is the small and medium business community, but that report is exactly what they have done. The economy could be so great, better, if it were not for Liberal policies.

• (1350)

Mr. Chandra Arya (Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if the member knows that according to recent articles in both *Forbes* and *U.S. News*, Canada is the best country in the G20 for establishing a business. Also, KPMG's 2016 "Competitive Alternatives" report ranked Canada ahead of all other G7 countries in terms of having the best overall business cost advantage relative to the U.S.

Does the member know that no developed country will ever completely pay back its debt? The key is not the absolute amount of debt but the relative amount of debt compared to the GDP. Is the member not proud that Canada has the lowest debt-to-GDP ratio among all the G7 countries?

Mr. Gérard Deltell: Mr. Speaker, we recognize the strength of people when times are tough instead of when times are easy. Actually, the worldwide situation for the economy is good. When we were in office, the worldwide economy was tough. As a government, we had to address the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression. The Conservative government was the best in the world in getting back on track. That is what the Liberals inherited, and we are very proud of it.

The Deputy Speaker: Before we recognize the hon. member for Durham in resuming debate, there is not quite time for his full 10 minutes, so I will interrupt just before the two o'clock hour. Of course, he will have the remainder of his time when the House next gets back to debate on the question.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Durham.

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise after my colleague, the hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent. He brings both knowledge and passion to this House, and we are very fortunate to have him on the team.

Watching the reckless spending of the Liberal government in its two and half years here, he has raised repeatedly the fact that the Liberal Party of Canada broke its core election promise to Canadians, which was that it would balance the budget over the course of its mandate and never run a deficit of more than \$10 billion. The Prime Minister and the finance minister broke that central promise within a few months of forming government. This budget shows that they have not learned the lesson.

The most troubling quote from the budget delivered a short time ago by the Minister of Finance was near the end of his speech, when he said, "With this budget, we are doubling down on our plan to invest in the middle class and in people working hard to join it."

Now, "the middle class and those working hard to join it" is the trope the Liberals throw out all the time. The Fraser Institute has shown that the middle class is paying more under the Liberal government. In fact, 80% to 90% of middle-class families are paying more. Despite the rhetoric, and we have a Prime Minister who specializes in rhetoric, its record is atrocious. The Liberals are doubling down. It is a quintessential Liberal double-double: deficits and debt. We know that deficits are future taxes. What the government has committed Canada to is a long-term structural deficit, going out to 2030, that will start piling up debt on our children and on Canadian's grandchildren. It will almost double the debt over the projections of the Department of Finance and guarantee more tax increases in the future.

Actually, the semantics of the Liberal government are critical to watch, because it uses language. I was just at the immigration committee, where I heard for the first time the immigration minister use the term "illegal border crossers". He likes to say that they are irregular. Well, his own department is suggesting that Canadians will be spending up to \$3 billion on these irregular crossers, because the Liberals will not fix the safe third country agreement.

In the minister's quote I read, he said that they are going to double down on investments. The word "invest" is used 456 times in this budget. By comparison, the Canadian Armed Forces are mentioned zero times in the budget. It shows the Liberals' priorities. That is the largest department of the federal government. Just this morning, the minister of defence and the Minister of Foreign Affairs committed our Canadian Armed Forces, in an awkward and incomprehensible way, to a mission in Mali, at a time when 162 UN peacekeepers have died in Mali, because it is a combat zone, not a peacekeeping mission.

Statements by Members

The Canadian Armed Forces, our men and women, were mentioned zero times in this budget. However, investment, which is code language for spending, is mentioned 456 times. The Liberals have doubled down on excessive spending, excessive deficits, debt, and higher taxes for Canadians.

I started my remarks with the election promise the Liberals made. The Prime Minister of Canada changed the Liberal Party's view on deficits midway through an election campaign. He had said previously that they were the party of Paul Martin. Then when he wanted to outfox the NDP, he said that they were going to run deficits because we were in a recession. There was no recession. He either did not understand the economy or he misled Canadians.

The Liberals then said that they would not run a deficit of any more than \$10 billion. As I said, they broke that promise within months. Their first two budgets had deficits in the \$20-billion plus range, almost \$30 billion. We are still doubling their projected goal at a time when the economy is doing well. This is not a time one runs massive deficits. As I said, those are future taxes on Canadians, which are going to slow our economy and hurt middle-class families. In a little over two years, they have increased spending by \$58 billion.

• (1355)

It is unparalleled, even compared to the previous Prime Minister Trudeau, who I can mention by name because I am speaking about Pierre Trudeau. It is almost unparalleled to have, in two years, a 20% increase in spending during an economically positive growth period. Are Canadian families 20% better off? My friend from Welland is crying out. I know that the people in Welland are not 20% better off. I know they did not vote for \$30-billion deficits. They did not vote for higher taxes on families, higher taxes on small business, higher taxes through CPP premiums, higher taxes through a carbon tax. In Welland, in Cobourg, and in Kingston, they did not vote for that. They voted for the promise of no more than a \$10-billion deficit.

I would recommend that rather than heckling, some of the Liberal members should go into the coffee shops in their ridings, where people think a double-double is cream and sugar, not double deficits and double spending. The Liberal double-double is coming at a time when the U.S. economy is cutting taxes on small business. The Prime Minister and the finance minister waged a war last year on small business and are increasing a carbon tax at a time when we are already uncompetitive. Shipbuilding in Welland is going to be closing up as a result of the Liberal government.

I hope members do more than heckle here. They should heckle in their caucus. They should say to the Prime Minister to stop this reckless cavalcade of spending, stop raising taxes on small business and on farmers, stop raising taxes on businesses that are creating wealth and jobs. In this budget, where investment is mentioned 456 times, gender 358 times, Canadian Armed Forces, zero, it shows the Liberal government's priorities.

The Speaker: The hon. member for Durham will have three minutes remaining for his speech when the House next undertakes this topic.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

MIKE MACDONALD

Ms. Anita Vandenberg (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to legendary Ottawa comedian, Mike MacDonald, who passed away on Saturday. A renowned stand-up comedian for over 40 years, Mike's unique comedy routines inspired a generation of Canadian comedians.

In addition to appearances in *Just For Laughs*, late night talk shows, hosting the Gemini Awards and the Canadian Comedy Awards, Mike MacDonald also starred in several movies, including, *Three Fugitives*, *The Funny Farm*, and *Mister Nice Guy*.

Raised in an air force family, Mike used his ability to make people laugh to bring joy to the Canadian troops based in Kandahar.

Mike MacDonald also spoke out about his own struggles with mental health, using comedy to help people view mental health in a more positive light and to end the stigma. In fact, he was scheduled to MC a fundraiser for first responders mental health in my riding on Wednesday at Algonquin College.

Mike MacDonald spent his life making us laugh. Even as we mourn his untimely passing, we will always remember Mike MacDonald with a smile.

* * *

• (1400)

NAW-RUZ

Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to recognize the beginning of the Baha'i Naw-Ruz celebration.

Canadians of the Baha'i faith in my community and across Canada will be celebrating Naw-Ruz to mark the beginning of the Baha'i calendar year. Organizations like The Spiritual Assembly of the Baha'is of Oshawa will be hosting celebrations to commemorate this very important event.

Just like New Year's Day, Naw-Ruz is a great opportunity for families and communities to come together in celebration of their culture, and of course their shared values. It also serves as a great reminder of the overwhelming diversity that exists in Canada.

On behalf of my Conservative colleagues, I extend my best wishes to everyone participating in a Naw-Ruz celebration. May the coming new year bring nothing but health and happiness.

Happy Naw-Ruz.

Statements by Members

[Translation]

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. David Lametti (LaSalle—Émard—Verdun, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I attended the St. Patrick's Day parade in Montreal. Although the parade route has had to be changed in recent years as a result of construction, revellers once again lined the route in joy and celebration.

Montreal has celebrated St. Patrick's Day since 1759. A parade has been held every year since 1824, which shows just how deeply Irish culture is entrenched in Montreal. To this day, Montreal's parade is still the largest of its kind in Canada.

[English]

St. Patrick's Day celebrations were brought to Canada by Irish immigrants. This year marks its 195th anniversary. On this special day, I want to take the time to recognize the structural role that the Irish community has played in the foundation of Canada and how much it has contributed to its values and heritage.

* * *

BEV DESJARLAIS

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is with much sadness that I rise today on behalf of my NDP colleagues to pay tribute to a former member of Parliament, a colleague and friend, Bev Desjarlais. Bev passed away on Thursday at 62 years young.

Bev was elected to the House of Commons for the riding of Churchill in 1997, and re-elected in both 2000 and 2004. She was known as a hard-working and dedicated MP who always stood up for her constituents. She later worked for the Department of Veterans Affairs, advocating and working on behalf of all veterans.

I had the honour of having an office across the hall from Bev, and for years she provided me with guidance, advice, and laughs. For any other MP or staffer, she was known as the unofficial Hill social director. Bev could send us to any meeting or event, and we would leave with much more than we arrived with.

Over the last weeks, former and present colleagues had the honour of sharing messages with Bev. Former party leader Ed Broadbent said it best, that he found in Bev a warm, spontaneous, unpredictable, gutsy, caring woman who fought for what she believed. What more could one want?

Indeed, Bev was strong, passionate and had conviction in everything she did. We all learned from Bev Desjarlais and will carry her with us for all of our lives. On behalf of the NDP, I would like to send our condolences to Bev's family, her three sons, Kris, Steven and Patrick, her grandchildren, and brothers and sisters. God bless them for sharing Bev with us and with Canada.

* * *

[Translation]

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Mr. Emmanuel Dubourg (Bourassa, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, International Women's Day was celebrated on March 8, with this year's theme of #MyFeminism. I had the huge privilege of honouring

eight exceptional women in my riding of Bourassa and awarding them certificates of merit.

These women run businesses, community organizations, and seniors' clubs. They advocate for social development and communal harmony, and they work every day towards achieving equality for all.

It is my pleasure to present these women to the House of Commons of Canada: Amina El Khiraoui, Manuella François-Saint-Cyr, Rose-Andrée Hubbard, Isabelle Laurin, Ruth Mibel, Jeanne Françoise Niwemfura, Palmina Panichella, and Rosalia Barbieri.

I would ask all my colleagues to join me in congratulating these eight women on being awarded the MP's medal.

* * *

[English]

CONSERVATION TRUST FUND

Mr. Robert Sopuck (Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as part of its climate and green plan, the Government of Manitoba has invested an incredible \$102 million to create the conservation trust fund. The conservation trust fund will reduce emissions, grow the economy, and invest all revenues back into the province with a made in Manitoba approach.

This allocation is a truly historic endowment that will release an estimated \$5 million annually into the local economy to support projects and programs that conserve and enhance natural resources and increase resilience to drought and floods.

The made in Manitoba approach also acknowledges the importance of conserving Manitoba's vast natural landscape. These investments will play a significant role in the conservation of wetlands and other wildlife habitats.

This made in Manitoba plan also reduces more emissions compared to the federal plan, at a lower cost to individuals and the economy.

I strongly encourage the Liberal government to learn from Manitoba and adopt similar measures that will have real and tangible outcomes for Canada's environment and economy.

* * *

● (1405)

PAY EQUITY

Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Cape Breton—Canso, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand in the House today and speak about a simple but powerful idea, that providing Canadians with the opportunity to realize their full potential is not just the right thing to do but it is the smart thing to do for our economy.

It is unacceptable that in 2018, women in Canada earn 69¢ cents on average for every dollar earned by men.

Statements by Members

That is why I am proud that through budget 2018, our government is announcing it will introduce proactive pay equity legislation, which would apply to about 1.2 million employed Canadians in federally regulated sectors.

Taking action on pay equity will move the dial for women. We know much more is needed, such as the government's investments in early learning and child care, better training and learning financing, enhanced parental leave flexibility, pay transparency, and the continued appointment of skilled and talented women to leadership positions.

We are taking action on the gender wage gap, and I hope my colleagues in the House will continue to support this too.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Mr. Nicola Di Iorio (Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I salute my mother, Giuseppina Di Iorio. One might ask why she is here today.

[Translation]

My mother brought in homemade white lasagna for my colleagues, as she does regularly for the charities she supports. When my mother found out that the opposition members would not have access to our lobby, she promised to come back with a meal for them as well.

Since the House was not sitting on March 8, I want to take this opportunity to highlight the achievements and extraordinary courage of my mother and grandmother, two unsung heroes of our world.

[Member spoke in Italian]

[Translation]

* * *

YANNICK DUMONT

Mr. Alupa Clarke (Beauport—Limoilou, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend Beauport—Limoilou's Yannick Dumont on his incredible athletic performance. He has done Canada proud on the international scene.

On December 16, 2017, he participated in Spartan Race Iceland, the premier world championship obstacle course race, and won the Ultra World Championship 2017 medal. Only about 100 of the world's best athletes take part in this extraordinary competition, and Mr. Dumont bravely and skilfully made it through 21 hours and 45 minutes of obstacles, including 18 hours and 30 minutes of non-stop running, traversing no less than 70 kilometres of mountainous terrain in the cold.

Mr. Dumont is busy preparing for the next international competition, which will take place a few days from now in the largest sports stadium in Paris, France.

On behalf of the people of Beauport—Limoilou, I want to congratulate Mr. Dumont on his courage, his perseverance, his patriotism, and of course all his past and future medals.

Beauport—Limoilou is proud of you, Mr. Dumont.

[English]

WORLDWIDE QUILTING DAY

Hon. MaryAnn Mihychuk (Kildonan—St. Paul, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is Worldwide Quilting Day, and I would like to highlight a group of women who are using their skills to create spectacular pieces of work.

The Material Girls of East St. Paul, led by Fran Howard, is a quilting club that has come together to share its common love of making beautiful works of art. Founded in 1999, the women have worked on many projects, including the East St. Paul centennial quilt. The group often puts its talents on display by participating in quilting shows, three of which it has hosted.

Working together has helped these women share their ideas and technique. Most importantly, it has made quilting more enjoyable through socialization. This combination of both talent and sense of community embodies the people of Kildonan—St. Paul: making the most out of any opportunity in any season.

I encourage these women to keep up their great work. Their positive spirits are impossible not to admire.

* * *

● (1410)

[Translation]

ATHÉNA GERVAIS

Mr. Yves Robillard (Marc-Aurèle-Fortin, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as you know, 14-year-old Athéna Gervais died on March 1, 2018, on the grounds of a high school in Laval, in my riding.

Toxicology testing is still under way, and the results will tell us more about how she died. This tragedy should prompt us, as a society, to ensure the best possible future for our young people by re-examining how we support them and how we regulate beverages with a high alcohol content. Young Athéna could have been any young Canadian. Let's make sure that this never happens again.

My thoughts are with her family, her mother, whom I have had the opportunity to meet, her father, who is with us on the Hill today, her sisters, and all her friends and loved ones. This situation concerns us all, and we need to reflect on it very carefully.

* * *

[English]

CANADA SUMMER JOBS PROGRAM

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Cal Maskery was serving time for violent crime. One day in the depths of despair, he saw Billy Graham preaching on television and he decided to turn his life around.

Cal met his wife, a local volunteer, while still in prison. They got married on the day of his release.

Statements by Members

Cal wanted to help people, so he founded Harvest House Atlantic in Moncton, where he remains the executive director. Harvest House is a community hub for those in need. It now includes an emergency shelter, step-up housing, addictions recovery, and skills training. Harvest House is supported through donations and through some government programs, like the Canada summer jobs program.

However, this year, Harvest House had its application rejected as incomplete because Cal would not sign the values test. This values test and the vote tonight are not about politics or ideology. It is about people like Cal and the communities they serve. It is about addicts who need help. It is about seniors who need housing. It is about young people who set out on a path to lifelong service. It is about charitable organizations that want to serve their communities.

These are the people for whom we are fighting.

* * *

[Translation]

QUEBEC INTELLECTUAL DISABILITY WEEK

Mr. Steven MacKinnon (Gatineau, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the 30th annual Semaine québécoise de la déficience intellectuelle was held from March 11 to 17, 2018.

This week aims to raise awareness about the lives of people with intellectual disabilities and how they contribute to society. Tens of thousands of Quebeckers and Canadians live with an intellectual disability. I had the opportunity to welcome a group from the Association pour l'intégration communautaire en Outaouais, or APICO, and Marie-Eve Mulligan was among them. I recently had the opportunity to visit APICO, and I saw the impact that the organization, its employees, and its volunteers have on the participants' lives.

I want to take this opportunity to acknowledge the amazing work being done by organizations across the country, like APICO in Gatineau, to support and assist people living with intellectual disabilities and their families.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL DAY OF LA FRANCOPHONIE

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, March 20, we will celebrate the International Day of La Francophonie. This will be an opportunity to celebrate the tremendous contribution made by francophone and francophile communities in Canada and around the world.

I rise today, one day early, because I would like to invite all parties in the House to join our initiative. All NDP members will speak only in French during question period tomorrow. We encourage members of the other political parties to do the same. This will be more than symbolic; it will demonstrate our commitment to the francophonie. We will prove that all public policy issues can be discussed and resolved in French. To quote Yves Duteuil:

It is a beautiful language with splendid words
whose history can be traced in its variations...
It is a beautiful language to those who know how to defend it
It offers treasures of untold richness
The words we lacked to be able to understand one another

And the strength required to live in harmony

I am reaching out to all parliamentarians: tomorrow, let's speak French.

[English]

The Speaker: I think we are all happy to see the next person who will speak back and looking well, the hon. member for Cariboo—Prince George.

* * *

● (1415)

MEMBER FOR CARIBOO—PRINCE GEORGE

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say a heartfelt “thank you”. It has been almost two months to the day since my health took an abrupt turn. To say it has been difficult would be an understatement. It has, to say the least, been incredibly humbling.

To my team, to my friends and colleagues from all sides of the House, and indeed, from across the nation, I want to thank them. Their words of encouragement, their cards, the fruit baskets, the flowers, have meant more to me and my family than they may ever know.

To the doctors and nurses at the University Hospital of Northern British Columbia, I am thankful. I am thankful for all the work they do. I have seen the conditions the men and women work in, and we can do better for them.

To my colleagues, we lead busy lives and it is easy to lose sight of what is most important. The work we do in the House and in our ridings has meaning, every meeting, every speech, every event, every text, and every call. It is easy to get caught up in the whirlwind, but without our health, we have nothing. I ask them to stop, take time to reflect, and above all else, I ask them to please take care of themselves.

To my wife, Kelly, and my entire family, their strength when faced with the unimaginable was simply amazing. I thank them for their patience, their love, and support. Words cannot express my love for them.

* * *

2018 WINTER PARALYMPIC GAMES

Mr. Stéphane Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the slogan of the Canadian Paralympic committee for the winter games in Pyeongchang this year was “Greatness is Rare”. It is true, because with only 55 athletes from a population of over 35 million, it is only 0.00000157% of the population of Canadians who make the cut and represent us with Team Canada.

However, it is also false, because greatness was far from rare with Team Canada this year. Our team earned a record 28 medals this year, our best performance ever, and Canadians just missed the podium several times, with nine fourth-place results and five more in the top five.

Oral Questions

We can also believe greatness will be even rarer next time with 20 athletes winning their first-ever Paralympic medals in Pyeongchang. We can say without a doubt that Paralympians represent greatness better than anyone.

[*Translation*]

They are an inspiration. We are all very proud of our athletes who took part in the Paralympic Games.

[*English*]

Go Canada, go.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government has announced that Canadian soldiers will be taking part in a mission to Mali. In his own words, the Prime Minister has acknowledged that this is putting soldiers in harm's way.

Mali is the UN's most dangerous peacekeeping mission it has currently, and the UN is experiencing the worst spate of UN peacekeeping fatalities in the organization's history. The Prime Minister would have been advised by his people as to the nature of the risk to soldiers, as well as the likelihood of casualties in this mission.

Could the Prime Minister inform the House as to what the risk is to soldiers of a fatality?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, two years ago, during the election campaign, we committed to re-engage Canadian soldiers in UN peacekeeping missions. We know that it is something that is important to Canadians, and is important to the world, that we be helping out in the best ways we can. That is why we are happy to respond to a direct request from the UN and from our allies to provide logistical and support helicopters to their mission in Mali.

We will continue to work with the members opposite to determine the best way to move forward on debate in the House. We look forward to talking about that more in the coming days.

• (1420)

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we all want to see stability brought to conflict-ridden regions of this world. However, the reality is that there are 162 fatalities of UN peacekeepers in Mali alone.

Less than two months ago, the UN Security Council was advised by the under-secretary general for peacekeeping operations that the objectives in the Mali mission were in question and it was urged to reassess this mission.

I know the Prime Minister is happy that we are going to Mali, but there is a real and serious threat to our Canadian soldiers. Will those being deployed in this war zone be allowed to actively engage targets?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are committed to contributing in ways that bring the most value to the UN mission in Mali. We believe it is important for Canada to play a role in peace operations around the world.

However, the safety of our men and women in uniform remains paramount during all operations. We always act to mitigate, as best as possible, the level of risk that Canadian Armed Forces personnel face while on operations. The personnel we will deploy on peace operations will be equipped with the appropriate equipment and will receive the necessary training for their assigned missions, although of course we cannot altogether eliminate the risks.

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC): I understand that we cannot mitigate the risk, Mr. Speaker. The question I am asking is this. What is the risk associated with our Canadian soldiers? They deserve to know this. This is the most dangerous mission in the world right now. This is something we are sending Canadian soldiers into without any information at all from the government. It is absolutely deplorable. Canadians deserve to have the answer.

How many soldiers are projected to be lost in this mission?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, unlike the previous government, we have committed to open information and discussions with the members opposite, with all members in the House, on the nature and the moving forward of missions like this.

The previous government chose to wrap itself in the flag and use special forces as photo ops, while not informing the House about anything. What we are going to be doing is remaining open and responsible with all members in the House as we move forward and re-engage in UN peacekeeping missions to support our allies to move forward on peace in the world. That is what Canadians expect and that is what we are going to deliver.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister likes to talk about the previous government, but the previous government always held a debate on sending troops on missions around the world.

The Prime Minister has decided to send our troops on a peacekeeping mission in Mali where there currently is no peace to be had. Mali is a war zone. The Prime Minister seems to be unaware of that fact. He has demonstrated to Canada that safety is not really important to him. He is getting ready to send our troops to Mali, a country at war.

Can the Prime Minister tell us what the chain of command will be for our troops in this war zone?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the safety of our men and women in uniform remains our top priority in every operation. We always take all necessary steps to mitigate as much as possible the operational risks that members of the Canadian Armed Forces might face.

Oral Questions

The personnel being deployed in peacekeeping operations will have the equipment and training they need to see their mission through. We have tremendous confidence in the ability of our armed forces and the positive influence that Canada can have on the world.

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I think the Prime Minister needs his notes because he has no understanding of what we are doing. That is why the decisions he makes behind closed doors should be put to parliamentarians here in the House of Commons so we can ask the right questions.

Right now, we have no doubt that Canadian Armed Forces personnel are capable of carrying out any mission anywhere in the world. That is not the issue. The issue is that, right now, our people are in Mali on a so-called peacekeeping mission even though it is a war zone.

Can the Prime Minister tell us what the rules of engagement are?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, unlike the previous government, we are being completely transparent and are keen to have a good debate here in the House of Commons. We have already approached the opposition to talk about how to hold that debate, and we are pleased that plans will be finalized in the coming weeks.

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government has finally made an announcement about peacekeeping. After two and a half years in power, after repeated calls by the United Nations and our international allies, and after the government's failure to deploy troops to Colombia when that country needed them, we still lack important information such as the start date of the mission and the number of women that will be deployed.

Should two and a half years not have been enough to start putting together the answers to some of these questions? Why this lack of clarity?

• (1425)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we said during the campaign, we want to contribute to international peacekeeping and stabilization missions. We announced our commitment to send an air task force to Mali that will include Chinook and Griffon helicopters. Canadian Armed Forces members will also help with medical evacuations of soldiers and provide logistical support for the mission. We know that Canada's presence is important to maintaining peace and security around the world. We have already approached the opposition about how to proceed with a debate. We look forward to having these conversations.

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we still have no details.

[*English*]

The government made, and repeated, grand promises that Canada would return to UN peacekeeping, but we would not know it from our current contributions. At the end of last month, Canada had just under 40 troops and police officers on UN missions, a record low in the history of Canadian peacekeeping.

Today's announcement likely falls short of meeting the peacekeeping commitments the government made. When will the government reveal exactly how it intends to fulfill the promises it made over two and a half years ago?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): We have to admit, Mr. Speaker, it is a bit of an interesting turn of events when the Conservatives think we are doing too much with our military and the New Democrats do not think we are doing enough.

As I have said, we are pleased that we are moving forward on peace operations with the UN, re-engaging with the UN the way Canadians expect us to, the way we committed to two years ago during the election campaign. I very much look forward to working with opposition members to figure out a way to move forward on debate regarding this mission so that all Canadians can be apprised of what we are doing and how we are doing it.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Mr. Speaker, while Canada is exempt for now from the U.S. President's global tariffs on steel and aluminum imports, the President stated very clearly that he will use the threat of future tariffs to get what he wants in NAFTA renegotiations. Our steel and aluminum industries, forestry, aerospace, paper: what is next? Sixty-four billion dollars could be lost and half a million Canadian jobs are at risk, yet all the Prime Minister has done is pay lip service.

Canadians need to know how many more tariffs or threats of tariffs the government will allow before it takes action.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that allows me to once again say what a pleasure it was for me to be able to spend time with steelworkers and aluminum workers last week across the country. The hard-working steelworkers at Stelco and aluminum workers at Alma have been working hard to continue to deliver. I was very pleased to be able to meet with them to listen to their concerns directly and to reassure them about the path forward we are taking. We have continued to defend the industry in this country and we will continue to do so. Whether it is moving forward on pipelines, whether it is moving forward on protecting our steel, we will continue—

The Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Essex.

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Mr. Speaker, when will the Prime Minister get his head out of the sand? Just last week, President Trump bragged that he made up figures while talking to the Prime Minister about the supposed trade deficit the U.S. has with Canada, and the Prime Minister said that he has full confidence in the President's being straight with him.

Our Prime Minister is not being taken seriously by our largest trading partner and Canadians are worried. Does the Prime Minister still believe that the President is being straight with him? When will the Prime Minister be straight with Canadians and tell them exactly how he plans to protect their jobs?

Oral Questions

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it was a real pleasure to speak with steelworkers in Hamilton about exactly how we were standing up for their jobs.

We have been working with the American administration over the past year to ensure that we are standing up for Canadian jobs, that we are standing up for Canadian interests. We are moving forward in a responsible way to renegotiate NAFTA in ways that will improve it for Canadians, for Canadian workers, and for our partners. We are going to continue to take this approach that is working with the American government, regardless of what the NDP proposes.

* * *

[Translation]

FINANCE

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House have asked the government hundreds of times over the past two years when it will balance the budget.

We have never even come close to getting an answer. We are not the only ones who are fed up. In a scathing report published last week, the parliamentary budget officer indicated that the government has completely lost control of the public purse and has no plan to balance the budget.

Will the Prime Minister reassure Canadians, do as the parliamentary budget officer is asking, and tell us when his government will balance the budget?

● (1430)

Mr. Joël Lightbound (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, two years ago, Canadians had a choice between the Liberal Party's plan and the austerity measures being proposed by the Conservatives with results that we are all familiar with. They include the lowest growth since World War II, the worst growth in exports, and the worst job creation record. The Liberal Party's plan involved investing in infrastructure and communities, giving more to those who need it most in order to stimulate and bolster our economy, and investing in science, and that is what we did in the last budget. That is what we are doing. The results speak for themselves. Over the past two years, 600,000 jobs have been created, most of which are full time.

That is a record we can be proud of.

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, here are the facts: two years and a few months ago, the Prime Minister published his mandate letter to his Minister of Finance. On page 4 of this letter, penned by the Prime Minister himself, he refers to "balancing the budget in 2019/20". These are not my words, they are the words of the Prime Minister himself.

Could the Prime Minister stand up and tell Canadians that he is going to keep the promise he made to them in this letter he wrote himself?

Mr. Joël Lightbound (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned in my previous answer, our plan is working. We are moving forward with this plan to promote growth for Canada. We are doing this responsibly by keeping the ratio of the size of our debt to the size of our economy on a downward track. Canada's debt-to-GDP ratio is the best in the

G7, and it is projected to reach its lowest level since the late 1970s by the end of this term.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, by the end of this term, that is an election promise.

[English]

That is a promise. The Liberals also promised they would eliminate \$3 billion in spending after they did a comprehensive review to find waste. Having done that review over the last two years, the Liberals have come to the conclusion that there is not a single penny in waste that they can cancel. In fact, it gave them ideas on how they could spend even more.

Will the Liberals keep their promise to eliminate \$3 billion in annual spending waste by the end of this term, yes or no?

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are always vigilant, working across government, to ensure the best value for tax dollars, while we make important investments in the interests of Canadians today and in the future.

The innovation review that we led, in fact working with ISED, actually resulted in a more responsive, focused, and targeted approach to innovation writ large across the Government of Canada.

What I will say is we will not do what the Conservatives did, for instance, when they cut 700 pay advisers to save \$70 million on the eve of an election, destroying the pay system for the Canadian—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Carleton.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals claimed that their deficit spending would go to infrastructure, but now the Parliamentary Budget Officer has revealed that a quarter of that money has lapsed and just disappeared into the massive Liberal spending hole. Now there is this:

Budget 2018 provides an incomplete account of the changes to the Government's \$186.7 billion infrastructure spending plan. PBO requested the new plan but it does not exist.

How does the government spend \$186 billion with no plan?

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi (Minister of Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are proud of the relationship we were able to build with the provinces, territories, and municipalities to deliver a historic infrastructure plan.

Under our plan, we have approved more than 4,100 projects with a combined investment of more than \$35 billion. These investments are creating jobs for the middle class, helping us build a stronger economy, moving us to a green economy, as well as improving people's living conditions.

Oral Questions

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let us review the fiscal promises. The Liberals said they would cut \$3 billion in waste. Instead, they found billions of dollars in increased spending. They said that the deficit would be just \$10 billion. It has been double that. They said that the budget would be balanced by 2019. Now they say that will not happen for another 25 years, during which time they will add, or some government will add, half a trillion dollars of deficit. They said the middle class would pay less. Instead, the Fraser Institute said that 80% are paying more.

With all of these broken promises, how can the Canadian people believe anything the Prime Minister says about their money?

Mr. Joël Lightbound (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the member that the first thing we did was we lowered taxes on the middle class and raised them on the wealthiest 1%. The other thing we have done is we have made the Canada child benefit a new and more progressive program to give more to those who need it the most. That has lifted 300,000 kids out of poverty.

What we said to Canadians is that we will succeed where the Conservative government failed. We have grown this economy more than they ever did in the decade that they were in power. We have the fastest growth in the G7, and we will continue on that path.

• (1435)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government said that the deficit would be just \$10 billion. It has been nearly \$20 billion. This year the deficit will be three times the size that the Liberals committed to in their platform, and they are unable to find a single penny in savings necessary to eventually return us to a balanced budget.

Why does the member not just rise now and admit what the Parliamentary Budget Officer has already suggested, and what Canadians already know, which is that the Liberals will never balance Canada's budget?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Joël Lightbound (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we always take a very responsible fiscal approach, one that has been lauded by economists the world over. They all agree that in a slow economy, like the one we inherited from the previous Conservative government, the smart thing to do is to make investments where they are needed, in infrastructure, in our communities, to stimulate growth, to stimulate the economy. That is what we have done, and we are making sure that our debt-to-GDP ratio stays on a downward track.

* * *

REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Ms. Karine Trudel (Jonquière, NDP): Mr. Speaker, aluminum is very important to some of our regions, including the Saguenay, and we are very proud of that fact. Despite President Trump's temporary exemption, workers in our regions are still worried and unsure about the future. Workers are entitled to strong representation and a hard-working government, which is what they are getting from the Government of Quebec.

Will this government implement an action plan immediately?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government worked hard to secure an exemption from steel and aluminum tariffs for Canada. We will keep working hard until the possibility of such tariffs is completely and permanently eliminated. Our priority is to get the best possible outcomes for Canadians and their families.

* * *

[*English*]

PENSIONS

Mr. Scott Duvall (Hamilton Mountain, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is claiming to have made significant commitments to the budget to end pension theft, but this is just not true. There were no answers from the Prime Minister during his PR trip last week about changing the laws to protect workers' pensions. Workers have had enough talk. It is time for action. We can and we must end pension theft now.

When will the government outline a real plan for the protection of workers' pensions, like the one I have already presented in Bill C-384?

Mr. David Lametti (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we have made clear, our heart goes out to those Sears workers. We are taking their advice. We are taking advice from all sides of the House to look into how we can better the situation of pensioners in this country. We made that promise. We will continue to work in that regard, and we will continue to examine any suggestion that comes with it.

* * *

CANADA-INDIA RELATIONS

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the plot surrounding the Atwal scandal continued to thicken even while the House was away, courtesy of Jaspal Atwal himself. He held a press conference where he directly refuted the Liberal government's claims about an Indian conspiracy. Mr. Atwal confirmed that he asked the MP for Surrey Centre for an invitation to the Prime Minister's event. Mr. Atwal confirmed that the Liberal government got him that invite and that he has never spoken to the Indian government.

When will the Prime Minister rise in this House and apologize to India for this diplomatic incident?

Oral Questions

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada's national security agencies are impartial and non-partisan. They are highly professional and competent. We trust them always to promote, protect, and defend the national interests of Canada, and I am confident that they have done that at all times.

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the person at the centre of the Atwal scandal does not believe the Prime Minister's wild conspiracy claims. The Liberal MP for Surrey Centre does not believe the Prime Minister's claims, because he apologized and accepted responsibility. Even the foreign affairs minister does not believe the Prime Minister, because she admitted to apologizing to the Indian government, calling the Atwal invitation "an honest mistake". It appears there are only two people who still believe in the Prime Minister's wild conspiracy theories: the Prime Minister and his national security adviser.

When will the Prime Minister allow the national security adviser to brief the House in the same way they briefed the press gallery?

• (1440)

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the issue with respect to the invitation has been clearly discussed and responded to. The invitation should never have been issued. When it was discovered, it was rescinded, as it should have been.

[Translation]

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, a terrorist convicted of attempted assassination was invited to an official dinner with the Prime Minister. There are two possible explanations for this. A Liberal MP says he invited the felon, but the Prime Minister himself says it was an Indian conspiracy.

How can it be an Indian government plot against a Canadian trade mission if a Liberal MP says he is the one who invited that person, that terrorist?

If the Prime Minister has evidence, let him present it to the House and answer questions to bring transparency—

[English]

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Public Safety.

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have two points very specifically.

First, the invitation should never have been issued. When it was discovered, it was rescinded.

Second, whenever senior government officials with long experience issue opinions, advice, and recommendations, they do so impartially and always acting in the best interests of Canada to defend the Canadian national interest. They have done that at all times.

[Translation]

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is serious. The Prime Minister's national security adviser said there was a conspiracy theory, and the Prime Minister publicly supported the allegation. The Indian government categorically denied it. Now the Minister of Foreign Affairs is calling it a simple

mistake. A simple mistake? Some 19 MPs and ministers take a trip to India, a terrorist gets an invitation, the PM does a half day's work in eight days in India, all on the taxpayers' dime, and this is being called a simple mistake.

Will the Prime Minister apologize to the Indian government and to all Canadians?

[English]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman overlooks the fact that during the course of that mission there were about one billion dollars' worth of trade and investment identified, about 6,000 Canadian jobs created, and a number of different initiatives that went forward, including an agreement resolving a fumigation dispute with respect to Canadian pulse crop exports to India.

At the end of the mission, the Prime Minister of India expressed his satisfaction with the success of what had been accomplished.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, there are 300 workers at the Catalyst Paper mill in Powell River, who make the products that were recently slapped with a 22% punitive tariff by the U.S. government. Those tariffs directly threaten the mill, meaning that 300 good-paying Canadian jobs in a small community that needs the mill's payroll, taxes, and investment are at risk. These workers know that the government's words on the unfair tariffs are not worth the paper they are written on.

Where is the leadership, the real action that our workers need from the government to protect their jobs?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are deeply disappointed with the unjustified preliminary rates announced by the U.S. Department of Commerce.

Canada's forestry industry sustains good, middle-class jobs and provides economic opportunities for rural and indigenous communities across our country.

We will continue to work with all our partners across Canada to defend this vital sector against unfair and unwarranted U.S. trade measures and practices.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Three hundred workers, Mr. Speaker, and those talking points help none of them.

The federal government has failed so far to come to the defence of workers in British Columbia whose jobs are at risk with U.S. tariffs on groundwood paper. These are good-paying, family-supporting jobs in my riding, and the industry also supports thousands of indirect jobs throughout British Columbia.

What is the government going to do to stand up to this unfair U.S. trade action? When will the Liberals finally show some strength in international trade talks and protect Canadian jobs?

Oral Questions

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the preliminary rates announced by the U.S. Department of Commerce are unjustified, and they are unacceptable to Canada. We stand with our forestry industry, and we are taking every possible action, including in international arenas, to support and defend our forestry industry.

We stand with Canadian workers. We are fighting for them, and we will succeed.

• (1445)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Linda Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a round of negotiations for a possible agreement with Mercosur will take place here in Ottawa tomorrow, March 20. This is a free trade agreement between Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay, and Bolivia. Canada hopes to enter into a free trade agreement with this economic community, Mercosur. The primary objective is to diversify our international trade markets with countries that have similar goals and growing economies.

I wonder if the Minister of International Trade could give us an update.

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Rivière-des-Mille-Îles for her excellent work.

Two weeks ago, I was in Asunción, Paraguay, to launch the Mercosur negotiations. Through our ambitious trade diversification program, Canada is positioning itself for success for decades to come.

With Mercosur, our government is pursuing the most progressive trade negotiations our country has ever undertaken. For the first time ever, the negotiations will include a gender-based analysis and comprehensive assessments of the impact on labour, human rights, and indigenous peoples. I look forward to welcoming stakeholders this evening to get started.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

Hon. Steven Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this morning, we began our parliamentary day by acknowledging the freedom that we enjoy in Canada. The Prime Minister and the Liberals are attacking that freedom: freedom of conscience and freedom of religion. Through their ideological and dogmatic approach, the Liberals are attacking the least fortunate and depriving our young people of good jobs.

Will the Prime Minister and the Liberals use today's vote to support our motion to ensure that the Canada summer jobs program remains a program for creating jobs and not an attack on the freedoms that our soldiers fight for?

[*English*]

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Canada summer jobs program has always provided young people with good-quality job experiences, where they can gain valuable experience, and helped prepare them for school.

Unlike the Conservatives, who have funded groups that promote anti-abortion, distribute graphic images, or discriminate against the LGBTQ community, we are going to ensure that we do not support groups that actively undermine Canadian rights.

We predict a successful year ahead. We know the number of applications is on par with last year, and we look forward to doubling the Canada summer jobs opportunities for young people in the country again this year.

Mrs. Karen Vecchio (Elgin—Middlesex—London, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last week, the approval list for Canada summer jobs came out to the MPs. Compared to last year, 36 fewer organizations in my riding even applied. At least 15 of these organizations told me they did not because of the Liberals' values test.

Instead of funding groups that provide housing and child care, the Liberals have dumped money into for-profit organizations and retailers. Will the Liberals admit this is wrong, vote in favour of our motion, and support Canadians who are trying to help their communities?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada's prosperity relies on ensuring that young people get the experience they need for the jobs of today and tomorrow. That is why the Canada summer jobs program has been so critical in ensuring that young people get that oftentimes first well-paying job that will help them identify their career path and gain the skills they need.

We predict a very successful year ahead. The number of applications received, and currently under review, is on par with 2017. We know that we are going to continue to help young people get that experience and thrive going into the future.

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the minister referred earlier to an organization that I know received tens of thousands of dollars from the Liberal member for Mississauga—Erin Mills. However, that choice by the member does not have anything to do with our motion today, which speaks to non-political, non-activist groups that for reasons of conscience, and their conscience rights in section 2 of the charter, do not want to check this box.

Will the minister support our motion, which would allow these charitable organizations to continue to provide this vital work? Will she look at the motion and support it on the basis of its support for non-political, non-activist organizations?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Canada summer jobs program serves a critical purpose in the country, and that is to make sure that young people get quality job experiences, oftentimes for the first time in their young careers. That is why we are going to make sure that funds do not go, in any way, to groups that actively work to undermine Canadians' rights.

Young people are counting on us to stand up for their rights, to deliver this program in a way that is fair and equitable and respects all Canadians, and that is exactly what we will do.

Oral Questions

● (1450)

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the minister, she is just not answering a very direct question. We have a motion before the House today that says that non-political, non-activist groups should be able to access the Canada summer jobs program regardless of their private convictions.

We believe that it is a violation of fundamental charter rights to force an organization to disclose its private convictions if that has absolutely nothing to do with the activities it is involved in. If the government is sincere about not targeting faith-based charities, it could take one very simple step to reassure those organizations and support our motion today. Will it?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the process this year asked organizations to commit to the fact that their core activities, their core mandate, and the job description for which they are applying would not in any way actively undermine the rights of young Canadians. In fact, we have had resounding applications, the same as last year. We anticipate that over 70,000 young people will have excellent job experiences across the country in a variety of different sectors that will help them gain the skills they need, determine their career paths, and earn a little extra money.

We are incredibly proud of the fact that the government puts youth success at the forefront and knows that it is critically connected to our economic success.

* * *

[Translation]

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Christine Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, NDP): Mr. Speaker, many main roads in rural regions are not even covered by a cellular network. Although investing in 5G may be a good thing, in the meantime, nothing is happening in rural areas. The Liberals are so out of touch that the word “cellular” is not even in their last budget. If the minister is ready to pull his head out of the sand, I would invite him to go on a little road trip with me. He would realize that there is a cellular dead zone just two hours from here.

How much longer before people living in rural areas are not treated like second-class citizens by this minister?

Mr. David Lametti (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in this day and age, mobile communications and high-speed Internet are no longer luxuries, they are necessities. Our government recognizes that innovation is occurring everywhere in the regions, just as it is in major cities. That is why we want to ensure that all Canadians have access to the same technologies, no matter their postal code. It comes down to equal opportunity. Our connect to innovate program is addressing the digital divide and will enable our communities and businesses to seize opportunities provided by the global digital economy.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Ms. Brigitte Sansoucy (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in his most recent report, the parliamentary budget officer called on the Liberals to deliver a detailed plan for how they intend to dole out billions in infrastructure dollars to prevent further delays. He said that some funding would likely not be allocated or spent on time. He went so far as to say that the Liberals do not have a plan for spending the billions of dollars earmarked for infrastructure over the next 12 years. Municipalities have been waiting for too long and cannot wait any longer.

On their behalf, I am asking the government, where is the plan to prevent delays?

[English]

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi (Minister of Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we worked very closely with the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and with provinces and territories to develop a historic plan that is investing more than \$180 billion to build the necessary infrastructure that has been neglected by the Harper government for a decade. We have approved 4,100 projects, with a combined investment of \$35 billion. Last week, we signed three bilateral agreements with the Province of Ontario, New Brunswick, and Northwest Territories to deliver historic investments so communities get the infrastructure they need and deserve.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Hon. Candice Bergen (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, serious concerns are being raised about China-owned telecom company Huawei having access to 5G technology. Recently, a U.S. Senate committee heard compelling testimony from four U.S. agencies, including the FBI and the CIA, which says that Huawei poses a serious cybersecurity threat.

Does the Prime Minister recognize that there may be a threat to Canadian cybersecurity? What is he doing to stop China-owned Huawei from spying on Canadians?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, cybersecurity is an extraordinarily important priority for the country and for the government. As the hon. member will have noticed in the last budget, the Minister of Finance has set aside something in excess of \$700 million for investments over the next number of years, including the creation of a new cybersecurity centre, one that will pay particular attention to the critical infrastructure of this country, which we must indeed protect and defend by every means possible.

● (1455)

Hon. Candice Bergen (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is not just our allies sounding the alarm but national security experts in Canada as well. Ward Elcock, a former CSIS director, told *The Globe and Mail*, “I would not want to see Huawei equipment being incorporated into a 5G network in Canada”. Dick Fadden, former national security adviser, is saying that we do not want Canadian infrastructure to be available to Huawei.

Oral Questions

With what these Canadian experts are saying, will the public safety minister commit to a re-evaluation of Canada's ties with China-owned Huawei?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have just completed a national security review of our cybersecurity systems. That has included every dimension of those systems, including how best to protect critical infrastructure. We will take every step necessary to make sure that this critical infrastructure, which is vital to Canada and to our relations with countries around the world, is properly protected and defended. There is nothing more important than that.

* * *

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mrs. Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, amid a busy schedule of family vacations, the Prime Minister squeezed in some visits to Canadian steel plants. In Saskatchewan he visited Evraz where they manufacture pipelines. The Liberals' abdication of federal leadership on the Trans Mountain pipeline is hurting Evraz, the prairie oil and gas sector, as well as the Canadian steel industry.

Can the Prime Minister reassure Canadian steelworkers that construction on Trans Mountain will start this spring?

Ms. Kim Rudd (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we continue to say, the environment and the economy go hand in hand. We continue to support the energy sector in a variety of ways, including the approval of the Trans Mountain pipeline. I would like to add a number of other pipelines as well: the expanded export capacity for the Alberta Clipper, the Nova Gas pipeline, the Line 3 replacement project, and our support of the Keystone XL pipeline. I could go on and on.

Our government has approved the Trans Mountain expansion and we stand by that approval.

* * *

POVERTY

Ms. Julie Dabrusin (Toronto—Danforth, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last month, the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development released the results of our government's poverty reduction strategy consultations in a "What We Heard" report. I hosted one of those consultations in my riding where I heard from Canadians living in poverty and front-line workers about what it is like to live in poverty in our country.

Can the minister please tell the House how budget 2018 will help low-income Canadians get the support that they need?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would first like to congratulate the member for Toronto—Danforth for her strong commitment to reducing poverty.

Budget 2018 introduces the new Canada workers benefit, which is going to lift tens of thousands of lower-wage Canadians out of poverty and also benefit more than two million vulnerable Canadians. Budget 2018 also introduced automatic enrolment, which will ensure that eligible Canadians actually receive the benefit. Starting in 2019, the new Canada workers benefit will help

more vulnerable Canadians who work hard succeed in joining the middle class.

* * *

[Translation]

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister believes that the budget will balance itself. As a result, Canada has a deficit of billions of dollars.

Western grain farmers are facing a second crisis. They are unable to deliver their products. Like his Prime Minister, the Minister of Agriculture thinks that the crisis will resolve itself and is refusing to take action.

The Liberals' record is one of deficits for everyone and millions of dollars in losses for all farmers. The farmers are here in town.

Will the minister personally commit to taking action, rather than believing in fairy tales like his Prime Minister and waiting for the crisis to resolve itself?

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we all want our western farmers to be able to get their grain to the global marketplace as quickly as possible. That is why the Minister of Agriculture and I spoke with CN and CP. We told them clearly that they were not doing an acceptable job right now, and we asked them to show us how they planned to address the current problems. Over the past two weeks, the situation has improved considerably, and we will continue to monitor their progress in the coming weeks.

* * *

● (1500)

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, Marielle Franco, a city councillor in Rio de Janeiro, was brutally murdered.

Marielle was 38 years old. She was a black woman, a lesbian, a socialist, and a human rights advocate. For years, she had been speaking out against police brutality in the *favelas*. It is for all of these reasons that she was murdered by multiple gunshots to the head. We cannot stay silent in the face of this attempt to kill hope.

Will Canada show leadership and demand that Brazil order an independent investigation into this politically motivated killing?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as you are well aware, human rights, including lesbian and gay rights, are a very important component of our foreign policy. They are important here in Canada, and we are working with our foreign partners to defend LGBT people around the world. We are going to continue with this vital work.

*Oral Questions***AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD**

Mr. Francis Drouin (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government knows that Canadian farmers are key economic drivers in this country and that they play a major role in combatting climate change.

[*English*]

Could the Minister of Agriculture update the House on the important announcement we made to improve clean technology in Canadian agriculture, this morning at Terryland Farms in my riding?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell for all his hard work for Canadian agriculture. Our government is committed to supporting clean technology in Canadian agriculture.

Today, I was proud to join the member to announce an investment of \$25 million to develop and adapt clean technology in Canadian agriculture. This would help our farmers stay on the cutting edge, grow our economy, and help more people join the middle class.

* * *

RAIL TRANSPORTATION

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, western Canadian grain farmers have asked the Liberals for one thing: help them move their grain. We have given the Liberals the concrete actions they could take now to get grain moving. Instead they stand up and defend the rail duopoly. They have tarnished our reputation as a reliable trading partner. Time is of the essence and the crisis farmers are facing is critical. Railcars are not being delivered. Grain is not moving. Farmers are not getting paid.

Does the agriculture minister not grasp the seriousness of this crisis? Why will the Liberals not take action now to move our grain?

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we want to get our western farmers' grain to market as quickly as possible, unlike the previous government, which for 10 years did not do a darn thing to move grain and other commodities more efficiently. By the way, they voted against Bill C-49 and I would ask them to speak to their colleagues in the other House to speed up the process with Bill C-49.

In the meantime, the Minister of Agriculture and I have spoken to CN and CP, and told them that they have to do better. They are doing better, but we will watch them very carefully.

* * *

[*Translation*]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Mr. Speaker, André Dionne, a federal public service manager from Montreal, will be in Federal Court tomorrow as part of his lawsuit to uphold his right to work in French, a right that has been trampled throughout his career. This is a violation of Bill 101 and is also a violation of Canadian law, as the Commissioner of Official Languages found eight years ago. This is the price Quebec has to pay for being subject to the Canadian system.

Will the minister enforce employees' right to work in French at Canadian institutions in Quebec?

[*English*]

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our official languages are at the core of our Canadian values. We will ensure that public servants across Canada continue to have the right to speak in both official languages. This is something that is absolutely fundamental. We will continue to ensure that from coast to coast to coast Canadian public servants are respected, including their right to speak in both official languages.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC SERVICES AND PROCUREMENT

Mrs. Marilène Gill (Manicouagan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, two months ago, the Prime Minister was acting like the Davie shipyard's saviour, promising contracts would be forthcoming. The government has yet to sign a single contract with Davie, even after direct appeals by representatives of the service providers' association. This is an urgent matter for all of Quebec, but obviously not for the Prime Minister of Canada.

When will the Prime Minister honour his commitment? Is he waiting for permission from Seaspan and Irving?

● (1505)

Hon. Carla Qualtrough (Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Davie is a major shipyard and we are still in talks with its representatives. We are exercising due diligence, and we will inform the House once we have made a decision.

* * *

HEALTH

Mr. Luc Thériault (Montcalm, GPQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health will be holding consultations to stop sugary, high-alcohol drinks from being sold in their current format, and that is a good thing. However, we also have a duty to be diligent and above all thorough in our actions, to prevent another tragedy from occurring.

As part of these consultations, will the Minister of Health also consider banning the addition of guarana to these alcoholic drinks?

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his question. I also want to extend my deepest condolences to the Gervais family. This was a real tragedy.

Protecting the health and safety of Canadians is a top priority for our government, and we are going to continue our work to do so. I have instructed Health Canada to immediately take action with regard to the proposal to restrict the amount of alcohol in single-serve highly sweetened, high-alcohol beverages.

We are also going to meet with our provincial and territorial partners, as well as other partners, to ensure that we address this problem.

* * *

[English]

CHEMICAL ATTACK IN SALISBURY

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among the parties and if you seek it, I think you will find unanimous consent for the following motion.

I move:

That the House (a) acknowledge the strength of the ties and values that Canadians and the British people share; (b) condemn in the strongest terms the despicable use of a nerve agent on the sovereign territory of the United Kingdom in the March 4, 2018, chemical attack in Salisbury; (c) recognize that the Russian state bears responsibility for this act and has shown a total disregard for the rules-based international order; (d) call on Russia to co-operate fully with British investigators; and (e) stand in solidarity with the British people and the United Kingdom, a key NATO ally and G7 partner.

The Speaker: Does the hon. minister have the unanimous consent of the House to propose the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motions agreed to)

Hon. Erin O'Toole: Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of co-operation, following the brutal chemical attack on British soil, there have been some basic discussions among the parties with respect to a motion involving the death of a Canadian citizen. If you seek it, I believe you will find unanimous consent for the following motion: that the House (a) condemn the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran and its Revolutionary Guard for the brutal oppression of its own citizens, which included the imprisonment and killing of a Canadian citizen, Kavous Seyed Emami, who was killed in Iranian custody; (b) call upon the government to immediately cease any and all negotiations or discussions with the Islamic Republic of Iran until they accept responsibility for the death of Mr. Seyed Emami; and (c) stand with the people of Iran and recognize that they, like all people, have a fundamental right to freedom of conscience and religion, freedom of thought, belief, opinion, and expression, including freedom of the press, and other forms of communication, freedom of peaceful assembly, and freedom of association.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[Translation]

Mr. Gérard Deltell: Mr. Speaker, as parliamentarians, the solemn acts we perform, like voting or signing a document, are very important. When we put our signature to a document, we are putting our honour on the line.

Routine Proceedings

Consequently, I am seeking unanimous consent to table a document signed by the Prime Minister's own hand. It is his mandate letter to the Minister of Finance, dated November 12, 2015, in which he refers to "balancing the budget in 2019/20".

● (1510)

The Speaker: Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the House to table this document?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Speaker, I believe that if you seek it, you will find unanimous consent for the following motion: that this House call on Health Canada to suspend the sale of high-sugar, high-alcohol drinks and alcoholic energy drinks containing guaranine for the duration of the consultations on this matter and until such time that new rules come into effect.

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]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister of Small Business and Tourism, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House that Thursday, March 22 shall be an allotted day.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

PARLIAMENTARY BUDGET OFFICER

The Speaker: Pursuant to subsection 79.2(2) of the Parliament of Canada Act, it is my duty to present to the House a report from the parliamentary budget officer entitled "Income sprinkling using private corporations".

[English]

Pursuant to subsection 79.2(2) of the Parliament of Canada Act it is my duty to present to the House a report from the Parliamentary Budget Officer, entitled "Budget 2018: Issues for Parliamentarians".

* * *

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 65 petitions.

*Routine Proceedings***COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE**

INDIGENOUS AND NORTHERN AFFAIRS

Hon. MaryAnn Mihychuk (Kildonan—St. Paul, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 12th report of the Standing Committee on Indigenous and Northern Affairs, entitled “Indigenous Land Rights Towards Respect and Implementation”. Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this report.

We know that no relationship is more important than our relationship with indigenous peoples. This report identifies clear measures that must be taken to work toward reconciliation.

I would like to personally thank the 89 witnesses who shared their stories with the committee, both during our travels across the country and in Ottawa.

[*Translation*]

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Hon. Larry Bagnell (Yukon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the 55th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs entitled “Creation of an Independent Commissioner Responsible for Leaders’ Debates”. Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this report.

[*English*]

This report makes some significant suggested changes to debates during elections. When members of the public see this, I think they will be interested in seeing the suggested changes with respect to future debates in federal elections.

[*Translation*]

I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the 56th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs. Pursuant to Standing Order 92(3)(a), the committee reports that it has concurred in the report of the Subcommittee on Private Members’ Business advising that Bill C-385, an act to amend the Navigation Protection Act regarding certain lakes and rivers in British Columbia, should be designated non-votable.

[*English*]

The Speaker: My apologies to the hon. member for Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo. I should have gone to her following of the tabling of the 12th report of the Standing Committee on Indigenous and Northern Affairs.

The hon. member for Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo.

INDIGENOUS AND NORTHERN AFFAIRS

Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to note that the official opposition did attach a dissenting report. We recognize that Canada’s processes for comprehensive and specific claims are in need of revision. However, we felt this report contained many lofty words and very few practical suggestions. Witnesses specifically said that they did not want another report that sat on the shelf. They asked for an action

plan. We do not believe this report lives up to the standards of an action plan.

Therefore, we have included a number of actionable items that we believe will make things better with respect to the resolution of these important issues.

• (1515)

The Speaker: Now, in relation to the 55th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, the hon. member for Banff—Airdrie.

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Blake Richards (Banff—Airdrie, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative members of the procedure and House affairs committee had a number of issues with the report surrounding the creation of a debate commission. Therefore, we have put forward a dissenting report, which I would encourage all members to read, outlining those things, not the least of which is the fact that the committee had undertaken this while consultations were being done by the minister separately, which were not taken into consideration. We believe this is something the minister should be taking into consideration.

Therefore, we certainly hope that those comments, suggestions, and differing opinions will be taken into consideration when the report is looked at.

[*Translation*]

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Mr. Robert Oliphant (Don Valley West, Lib.): I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the following two reports of the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration:

[*English*]

the 16th report, entitled “Supplementary Estimates (C), 2017-18”; and the 17th report, entitled “Interim Estimates 2018-19”.

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC SAFETY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Hon. John McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the following two reports of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security: the 17th report entitled “Supplementary Estimates (C), 2017-18”, and the 18th report entitled “Interim Estimates 2018-19”.

[*English*]

Mr. Serge Cormier: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I ask for leave to return to tabling of documents so I can table a document.

The Speaker: Does the member have unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Routine Proceedings

[Translation]

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Mr. Serge Cormier (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Pursuant to Standing Order 109 of the House of Commons, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the government response to the 14th report of the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration entitled “Immigration to Atlantic Canada: Moving to the Future”.

* * *

[English]

PETITIONS

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Mr. Dean Allison (Niagara West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the petitioners state that Widlene Alexis Earle has been in the care of legal guardianship of a Canadian citizen for more than eight years; that the legislation of Dominican Republic, her country of birth, has stripped Widlene of her rightful citizenship; that Haiti, the country of ancestry, has denied citizenship for Widlene for being born out of country; that as a state child of Haitian descent, Widlene is subject to violent immigration sweeps by Dominican government; and as an unwelcome stateless child in the Dominican Republic, Widlene has access to none of the basic human rights outlined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The petitioners therefore call upon the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship to grant Widlene Alexis Earle immediate access to Canada via a temporary residence permit.

GATINEAU PARK

Hon. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I rise today to table a petition regarding the beautiful Gatineau Park.

The petition was organized by CPAWS, the Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society, and is signed by dozens of local residents. I am pleased to table a petition and I look forward to the government's response.

KINDER MORGAN PIPELINE

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise to table a petition.

The petitioners are calling for the government to oppose the Kinder Morgan pipeline expansion project. They note that the Kinder Morgan pipeline expansion project would triple the capacity of the Trans Mountain pipeline system to 890,000 barrels per day and that it would bring massive environmental and economic risk to British Columbia; that some 40,000 barrels of oil have already leaked from existing Kinder Morgan pipelines; and that it would create only 50 permanent jobs, many of which would be filled by temporary foreign workers. They further note that none of the oil would be refined in British Columbia, but instead would be shipped by tanker to foreign markets and that it would increase the number of tankers coming into the Burrard Inlet from eight to 34 per month. Finally, the pipeline would go through densely populated urban

areas, residential neighbourhoods, and the traditional territories of 15 first nations.

The petitioners therefore are strongly urging the government to say no to Kinder Morgan.

● (1520)

CANADA SUMMER JOBS PROGRAM

Mrs. Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to rise to table this petition, containing hundreds of signatures from residents of Carleton Trail—Eagle Creek, calling on the Prime Minister to withdraw the attestation values test on applications to the Canada summer jobs program.

These petitioners add their names to the thousands of Canadians who have signed this petition already.

SOMALILAND

Hon. John McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to present two petitions on behalf of constituents in my riding of Scarborough—Guildwood. This is from the Somaliland expatriate community. It wishes to have Canada recognize Somaliland as an independent country, as well as contribute to international disaster and relief efforts in Somaliland.

Somaliland was a former British protectorate. After an unsuccessful union with Somalia, the people declared their independence in 1991. Over the last 25 years, Somaliland has established a new constitution and its own currency and bank. The people have overseen the restoration of peace and an independent judiciary. In 2015 and 2017, Somaliland suffered from a drought. The local population has suffered from malnutrition, lack of water, and thousands of deaths.

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise today to table a petition on behalf of petitioners from Courtenay—Alberni who are on the front line of ocean plastics and are leading the charge.

The petitioners call on the government to work with municipalities, the provinces, and indigenous communities to develop a national strategy to combat plastic pollution. They call on the government to regulate single-use plastics, stormwater outfalls, micro-plastic pollution; a national strategy to clean up derelict fishing gear; extend producer responsibility and address the root problem; and redesign the plastic economy through education, outreach, and funding for beach cleanups.

PALLIATIVE CARE

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of a number of people in my riding who are very concerned about hospice palliative care. They believe it improves the quality of life of patients and their families facing the problems associated with life-threatening illness. Palliative care provides relief from pain and other distressing symptoms, and affirms life regarding dying as a normal process that intends to neither hasten nor postpone death.

Routine Proceedings

Unfortunately, it is not specifically mentioned in the Canada Health Act, and it is not accessible and available to all Canadians. Therefore, petitioners are calling on the government to specifically identify hospice palliative care as a defined medical service covered by the Canada Health Act, so that provincial and territorial governments would be entitled to funds under the Canada health transfer system to be used to provide accessible and available hospice palliative care for all residents of Canada in their respective provinces and territories.

CANADA SUMMER JOBS PROGRAM

Mr. Mel Arnold (North Okanagan—Shuswap, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to present three separate petitions, all on the same topic. The first petition with 110 signatures is from people of Salmon Arm in my riding, another petition with 40 signatures is from Vernon, and another petition with 60 signatures is from Vernon and Coldstream.

They call on the Prime Minister to defend the freedoms of conscience, thought, and belief, and withdraw the attestation requirement for applicants for the Canada summer jobs program.

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I stand to bring voices from coastal B.C., and particularly Gabriola Island, where I live. They are opposed to the establishment of five new commercial bulk anchorages. Each are to house 300-metre long freighters. The petitioners cite that the waters of the Salish Sea are already more jammed up with freighters than we have ever seen before. Establishing five new anchorages in this sensitive area to export Wyoming coal to China is a poor decision. They again urge the transport minister to reject the application in order to prevent oil spills and support local communities.

CANADA SUMMER JOBS PROGRAM

Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to present a petition with hundreds of signatures from Calvary Baptist, St. Hedwig's, Harmony Road Baptist, and St. Joseph the Worker Parish in my riding of Oshawa.

These constituents are calling on the Prime Minister and the government to reduce their short-sighted decision and remove the values attestation from the Canada summer jobs application. These organizations and many others have been providing quality summer programming in Oshawa for decades. They do not deserve to have their funding stripped because they disagree with the social values of the Liberal Party.

I strongly urge the Liberals to listen to Canadians and remove this unfair values test.

•(1525)

VOLUNTEER SERVICE MEDAL

Ms. Irene Mathysen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition asking the Government of Canada to reinstate the Canadian volunteer service medal, which was given to recognize Canadians who serve voluntarily in the Canadian Forces, and to acknowledge the volunteerism of our veterans and troops.

You may or may not recall this, Mr. Speaker, but it was abruptly stopped in March of 1947. These petitioners ask the government to

bring it back so we can once again recognize those who serve so generously, bravely, and selflessly.

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise today with a petition from residents throughout the southern Gulf islands within my riding. The preamble of the petition states the deep concern of residents about the proposal of Kinder Morgan to expand and increase its tankers through the Salish Sea, loaded with bitumen and diluent.

The petitioners ask the House of Commons to extend what is being proposed now, a tanker ban on the north coast of British Columbia, to a permanent ban on crude oil tankers for the whole west coast of Canada in order to protect British Columbia's other industries in fishing, tourism, and our coastal ecosystem.

CANADA SUMMER JOBS PROGRAM

Mr. Randy Hoback (Prince Albert, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present 14 petitions with over 1,100 signatures from persons residing in and around my constituency, as well as in the Ontario communities of Corkstown, Scarborough, Oshawa, Whitby, and Ajax.

The petitioners call upon the Prime Minister to defend the freedoms of conscience, thought, and belief. They want the Prime Minister to withdraw his attestation requirements for applications in the Canada jobs program.

Mr. Jamie Schmale (Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present two separate petitions on the same topic. Many of these constituents are upset with the Prime Minister's decision to take away federal funding for people and organizations who disagree with them through the implementation of the Liberal values test. As we know, many of these groups have nothing to do with advocacy on social issues, but now must violate their beliefs in order to receive government funding through the Canada summer jobs program.

These constituents believe that governments must enhance our freedoms, not try to control them. As such, they are asking that the government remove the requirement for applicants to make an attestation to qualify for Canada summer jobs funding.

Mr. Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition signed by just over 90 residents of Manitoba. These Canadians represent only a handful of the thousands from every corner of the country who have been shocked by the Liberals' assertion that only those who agree with Liberal Party values will have their Canada summer jobs funding applications considered.

The affected organizations are pillars of Canadian communities, groups that do work like helping newcomers to Canada, running soup kitchens, youth drop-in centres, and summer camps.

Routine Proceedings

The discriminatory values test hits at the heart of our communities in a very practical way. As a result of this decision, many community organizations will not be able to serve our communities as effectively as they have in years past. This is also an affront to the rights guaranteed in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

That is why these petitioners are calling on the Liberal government to defend the freedom of conscience, freedom of thought, and freedom of belief, and to withdraw the attestation requirement for applicants to the Canada summer jobs program.

I hope that the Liberals respect these voices and do exactly that.

* * *

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if Questions Nos. 1430 to 1471 could be made orders for returns, these returns would be tabled immediately.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Text]

Question No. 1430—**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie:**

With regard to the national shipbuilding procurement strategy: (a) what is the profit margin allocated by the government to the Irving shipyards in Halifax and the Seaspan shipyards in Vancouver; (b) is there a delivery schedule that the Seaspan shipyards in Vancouver must respect; (c) if the answer to (b) is affirmative, what is the schedule, broken down by ship being built; and (d) what correspondence, including emails, was sent by the Assistant Deputy Minister of Defence and Marine Procurement at Public Services and Procurement Canada and by the Assistant Deputy Minister of Materiel at National Defence regarding the Davie shipyard and Federal Fleet Services between June 1, 2017, and December 12, 2017?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1431—**Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach:**

With regard to the Kathryn Spirit: (a) did Groupe St-Pierre seek rent for the land, the barge, or anything else, from the Mexican company that it sold the wreck to and, if so, how much was the rent for each; (b) did Groupe St-Pierre warn the government, when it bid with Englobe, that it had been fined for violating Quebec environmental legislation; (c) was the government aware that Groupe St-Pierre, either René St-Pierre Excavation or its affiliates, did not comply with Quebec environmental legislation and had a class action suit brought against it during discussions on the dismantling contract; (d) if the answer to (c) is affirmative, what action was taken in light of this information to the selection process during the call for tenders, particularly in terms of the points awarded to the Kathryn Spirit DJV consortium (the consortium); (e) what are the environmental and safety standards and rules that the consortium must abide by under the wreck dismantling contract; (f) what are the actions, reports, analyses, etc., that the Groupe St-Pierre must undertake for each department concerned in order to abide by the environmental and safety standards set out in the contract; (g) what are all the actions, reports, analyses, etc., that the departments must undertake to ensure public safety and compliance with environmental standards and to check that the consortium abides by them; and (h) since the contract was awarded, has the consortium violated any rules or standards of the contract and, if so, on which occasions, broken down by (i) date, (ii) rule or standard that was violated, (iii) description of the infraction encountered, (iv) end date of infraction, (v) the departments' actions to ensure it does not reoccur?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1432—**Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach:**

With regard to federal spending in the constituency of Salaberry—Suroit, for each fiscal year since 2010–11, inclusively: what are the details of all grants and contributions and all loans to every organization, group, business or municipality,

broken down by the (i) name of the recipient, (ii) municipality of the recipient, (iii) date on which the funding was received, (iv) amount received, (v) department or agency that provided the funding, (vi) program under which the grant, contribution or loan was made, (vii) nature or purpose?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1433—**Ms. Elizabeth May:**

With regard to government expenditures related to the National Energy Board Modernization Expert Panel, what were: (a) the costs associated with the Panel; and (b) the costs associated with the Panel to review the federal environmental assessment processes?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1434—**Mr. Ted Falk:**

With regard to Health Canada's decisions taken with respect to Mifegymiso: (a) what were the conditions imposed by Health Canada during the initial review and approval of the drug on the (i) manufacturer, (ii) distributor, (iii) retailers, (iv) prescribers, doctors and medical professionals, (v) consumers; and (b) for each of the conditions listed in (a), (i) what rationale was given by Health Canada, (ii) what studies did Health Canada cite to justify the conditions, (iii) which stakeholders were consulted by Health Canada?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1435—**Mr. Alistair MacGregor:**

With regard to federal funding investments in infrastructure, programs, and services in the Cowichan—Malahat—Langford riding: what is the total of the monetary investments for the riding across all government departments for the (i) 2015-16, (ii) 2016-17, (iii) 2017-18, fiscal years, thus far?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1436—**Mr. Ziad Aboultaif:**

With regard to the government paying for the expenses of stakeholders to attend government news conferences or announcements, since November 4, 2015: (a) what are the details of each expenditure including, (i) stakeholder, (ii) organization represented, (iii) date of announcement, (iv) total expenditure; and (b) what is the itemized breakdown of each travel expense referenced in (a), including (i) airfare, (ii) other transportation, (iii) accommodation, (iv) per diems, (v) other?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1437—**Mr. Ziad Aboultaif:**

With regard to staffing levels at the Royal Canadian Mounted Police's Operational Communications Centres, since January 1, 2017: what were the vacancy rates broken down by province and by month?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1438—**Mr. Ziad Aboultaif:**

With regard to concerns raised by veterans and other individuals regarding the Vimy 100 anniversary: (a) how many pieces of correspondence were received by the government; (b) what were the most common concerns raised in the correspondence; and (c) what specific measures is the government taking to address the concerns raised?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1439—**Mr. Arnold Viersen:**

With regard to the World Economic Forum in Davos in January 2018: (a) how many government employees travelled to Switzerland in relation to the Forum, excluding any members of the Prime Minister Protection Detail; (b) what are the titles of all employees in (a); (c) what is the complete list of Ministerial Exempt Staff who have travelled to Switzerland in relation to the Forum; (d) are there any other individuals for whom the government paid their travel to Switzerland in relation to the Forum and, if so, who are they; and (e) what is the list of individuals who flew to or from Davos on the government's Airbus which transported the Prime Minister?

Routine Proceedings

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1440—Mr. Arnold Viersen:

With regard to the December 12, 2017, report from the Parliamentary Budget Officer which states that “the total amount of GST collected on carbon pricing in the four provinces is anticipated to be between \$236 million and \$267 million in 2017-18, and between \$265 million and \$313 million in 2018-19”: in light of the report, does the government concede that its carbon tax is not revenue neutral?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1441—Mr. Steven Blaney:

With regard to projections made by the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation regarding mortgage default rates and interest rates: (a) what is the projected increase in the number of mortgage defaults if interest rates increase by (i) 0.5 percent, (ii) one percent, (iii) two percent; and (b) for each of the projections in (a), what is the projected value of the defaulted mortgages?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1442— Mr. Steven Blaney:

With regard to outstanding tax money recovered by the Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) and with regard to individuals named in the Panama Papers: (a) how many CRA employees or full-time equivalents are currently assigned to investigate information contained in the Panama Papers; and (b) what is the total amount recovered to date as a result of information contained in the Panama Papers?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1443—Mr. Bob Saroya:

With regard to federal spending to address addiction to items listed under the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act: (a) what is the total federal government spending on programming and transfers specifically related to this issue, broken down by each specific funding envelope and each program funded; and (b) what portion of this funding is committed to (i) prevention and education, (ii) treatment and recovery, (iii) supporting police and justice system efforts to deal with the distributors, (iv) research, (v) harm reduction, (vi) other commitments, broken down by type of commitment?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1444— Mr. Bob Saroya:

With regard to the pending legalization of marijuana and any resulting change in policy at Global Affairs Canada: (a) what is the anticipated policy regarding the possession and use of marijuana at Canadian missions abroad; and (b) what is the anticipated policy regarding the use of diplomatic mail in relation to marijuana?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1445—Mr. Bob Saroya:

With regard to flights taken on government aircraft by the Minister of National Defence since November 4, 2015: what are the details of each flight, including (i) date, (ii) origin, (iii) destination, (iv) names of Parliamentarians and exempt staff on each flight, (v) type of aircraft?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1446—Mr. Jamie Schmale:

With regard to Health Canada’s Cannabis Legalization and Regulation Branch: (a) what is the annual budget for the Branch; (b) how many employees or full-time equivalents have been assigned to the Branch; (c) what is Treasury Board’s employment classifications and associated salary ranges for the employees assigned to the Branch and how many employees are associated with each classification; and (d) what resources have been moved to the Branch from other branches within Health Canada?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1447—Mr. Jamie Schmale:

With regard to the Prime Minister’s meeting with Joshua Boyle: on what date did the Prime Minister’s Office or the Privy Council Office become informed that Mr. Boyle was under investigation for possible violations of the Criminal Code?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1448—Mr. Jamie Schmale:

With regard to obligations under the Red Tape Reduction Act, since November 4, 2015: (a) what is the complete list of regulations which have been implemented; and (b) for each of the regulations in (a), what regulation was removed in accordance with the Red Tape Reduction Act?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1449—Mr. Matt Jeneroux:

With regard to vitamin D, taking into consideration that the tolerable upper level of intake set by Health Canada is 4,000 IU per day and that the limit for a dose allowed by Health Canada is 1,000 IU per dose: (a) why has the amount allowed in one dose not been modified to reflect what is considered a safe intake; and (b) what is the rationale for the 1,000 IU per dose limit?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1450— Mr. Matt Jeneroux:

With regard to Rickets and the fact that Statistics Canada has reported that 32% of Canadians are vitamin D deficient: (a) what is being done to ensure that all Canadians, especially pregnant women, are educated about the importance of vitamin D; and (b) is there a program to specifically address prenatal health for First Nations, Métis and Inuit?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1451—Mr. Guy Lauzon:

With regard to grants and contributions from the Communities at Risk: Security Infrastructure Program: what are the details of all funding recipients since November 4, 2015, including (i) name of recipient, (ii) location, (iii) amount, (iv) project description, (v) date funding was received by the organization?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1452—Mr. Guy Lauzon:

With regard to government priorities: what are the government’s top four priorities?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1453— Mr. Guy Lauzon:

With regard to the maintenance and posting to Twitter accounts: (a) how many employees or full time equivalents are assigned to manage or make postings to Twitter accounts; (b) what is Treasury Board’s classification and associated salary ranges for each employee assigned to Twitter accounts; and (c) what are the Twitter handles or usernames maintained by government employees and how many employees are assigned to each account?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1454— Mr. Robert Kitchen:

With regard to the carbon tax and the statement by the Minister of Environment and Climate Change on CTV News on January 15, 2018, that “All the revenues go back to the provinces”: what is the projected amount which will be returned to each province as a result of the additional GST revenue collected from the carbon tax?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 1455—Mr. Guy Caron:**

With regard to the Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) and each CRA program that handles suspected cases of tax evasion, aggressive tax avoidance, fraud and other tax offences: (a) what is, since 2010, the number of employees dedicated to each program or unit, broken down by (i) number of contract employees per year, (ii) employee position; (b) what is the total budget allocated to each program; (c) what is the number of investigations launched since 2010, broken down by (i) year, (ii) number of employees who worked on the investigation, (iii) type of offence investigated; (d) since 2010, what share of the CRA's total annual budget has been allocated to the committee responsible for assessing problem cases in order to recommend whether or not to apply the general anti-avoidance rule as set out in the Income Tax Act, broken down by year; and (e) since 2010, what budget amount has been available to the committee in (d), broken down by year?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1456—Mr. Guy Caron:

With regard to the Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) committee responsible for assessing problem cases in order to recommend whether or not to apply the general anti-avoidance rule as set out in the Income Tax Act: (a) how many problem cases has this committee received from CRA auditors since 2010, broken down by (i) year, (ii) reason for the committee's involvement, (iii) number of employees having worked on the case; (b) how many investigations have been launched following the committee's involvement since 2010, broken down by (i) year, (ii) reason why the investigation was warranted, (iii) number of employees having worked on the investigation; (c) how many employees are working or have worked on this committee, broken down by (i) number of contract employees per year, (ii) number of contract administrators per year, (iii) number of contract technicians per year; and (d) what is the number of investigations resolved since 2010, broken down by (i) year, (ii) number of employees who worked on the investigation, (iii) type of offence warranting investigation?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1457—Ms. Candice Bergen:

With regard to the destruction of the Golden Lampstand Church and the Zhifang Catholic Church by the Chinese government: (a) does the government condemn the Chinese government's actions and, if not, why not; (b) did the government raise any objection to these actions with the Chinese government and, if so, what are the details, including (i) who raised the objection, (ii) what is the title of the Chinese government official who received the objection, (iii) date of objection; and (c) since November 4, 2015, has the government raised the issue of the persecution of Christians by the Chinese government with anyone from the Chinese government and, if so, what are the details?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1458—Mr. Dave MacKenzie:

With regard to individuals being denied entry into Canada since November 4, 2015: how many suspected war criminals have been denied entry into Canada under the War Crimes Program, broken down by year?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1459—Mr. Dave MacKenzie:

Does the government consider the Iranian government to be elected?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1460—Mr. Dave MacKenzie:

With regard to expenditures related to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change's social media accounts, since November 4, 2015, what are the details, including: (a) number of employees assigned to each (i) account, (ii) handle or username, (iii) platform; (b) the details of all expenditures made by Environment and Climate Change Canada in relation to social media, including (i) date, (ii) vendor, (iii) amount, (iv) description of product or service, (v) file number?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1461—Mr. Dave MacKenzie:

With regard to the Canada 2020 event scheduled for February 8, 2018, at the Canadian Science and Technology Museum: (a) is Canada 2020 being given a preferential rate by the government for the event; and (b) what rate is Canada 2020 being charged for renting out this government space?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1462—Mr. Michael D. Chong:

With regard to the Gordie Howe International Bridge: (a) what was the original estimated date of completion of the bridge when the project was announced; (b) what is the current estimated date of completion; and (c) if there is a delay, as per (b), why does this delay exist?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1463—Mr. Michael D. Chong:

With regard to the Ambassador Bridge Enhancement Project: (a) did the Minister of Transport, the Minister of Infrastructure and Communities, or the Prime Minister hold any meetings or interactions concerning this project with (i) Manuel ("Matty") Moroun, (ii) Matthew Moroun, (iii) representatives of the Detroit International Bridge Company, (iv) representatives of the Canadian Transit Company; (b) did officials or exempt staff from the offices of the Minister of Transport, the Minister of Infrastructure and Communities, or the Prime Minister's Office hold any meetings or interactions concerning this project with (i) Manuel ("Matty") Moroun, (ii) Matthew Moroun, (iii) representatives of the Detroit International Bridge Company, (iv) representatives of the Canadian Transit Company; and (c) did officials from the Embassy of Canada to the United States or Canadian consulates in the United States hold any meetings or interactions concerning this project with (i) Manuel ("Matty") Moroun, (ii) Matthew Moroun, (iii) representatives of the Detroit International Bridge Company, (iv) representatives of the Canadian Transit Company?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1464—Mr. Charlie Angus:

With regard to federal tax expenditures, federal economic development agency programming, and the Business Development Bank of Canada (BDC) over the 2010-17 period: (a) what is the government's estimate of the annual forgone revenue through tax expenditures claimed by companies with operations in multiple countries and over 250 employees, broken down by sector, year, and tax credit and expenditure claimed; (b) what is the number of companies with operations in multiple countries and over 250 employees claiming tax expenditures, broken down by sector, year and tax credit and expenditure claimed; (c) how much has been spent on federal economic development programming to companies with operations in multiple countries and over 250 employees, broken down by sector, year, federal economic development agency and program; (d) what is the number of companies with operations in multiple countries and over 250 employees receiving funds from federal economic development agencies, broken down by sector, year, agency, and program; (e) how much was spent and invested by the BDC in loans, loan guarantees, or other funds in companies with operations in multiple countries and over 250 employees, broken down by sector, year, and category of service; and (f) how many companies with operations in multiple countries and over 250 employees received loans, loan guarantees or other funds from BDC, broken down by sector, year and category of service?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1465—Mr. Charlie Angus:

With respect to data, information, or privacy breaches in government departments, institutions, and agencies for 2017 and 2018 to date: (a) how many breaches have occurred in total, broken down by (i) department, institution, or agency, (ii) number of individuals affected by the breach; (b) of those breaches identified in (a), how many have been reported to the Office of the Privacy Commissioner, broken down by (i) department, institution, or agency, (ii) number of individuals affected by the breach; and (c) how many breaches are known to have led to criminal activity such as fraud or identity theft, broken down by department, institution, or agency?

(Return tabled)

*Speaker's Ruling*Question No. 1466—**Mrs. Cathay Wagantall:**

With regard to the various departments, divisions, or units in the Office of the Prime Minister: (a) what are the various departments, divisions, or units; (b) how many employees are in each referred to in (a); (c) what are the mandates of each department, division, or unit; and (d) what are the budgets of each department, division, or unit?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1467—**Mrs. Cathay Wagantall:**

With regard to expenditures on investigations by the government since January 1, 2016: what are the details of all such contracts, including for each the (i) date, (ii) duration, (iii) vendor, (iv) value, (v) summary or description of investigation, (vi) findings?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1468—**Mrs. Cathay Wagantall:**

With regard to the 2017 Canada Summer Jobs Program: (a) how many organizations were approved in each riding; (b) how many organizations applied, but were not approved for funding in each riding; (c) how many jobs were funded; and (d) how much money was awarded to each riding to support the jobs?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1469—**Mr. Pat Kelly:**

With regard to the recent changes announced by the Canada Revenue Agency: (a) how many paper income tax packages does the government expect to mail out this year; (b) what is the projected cost for the mailing referred to in (a), including (i) printing, (ii) postage, (iii) other expenses; (c) how many individuals does the government anticipate will be using the new "File my Return" telephone filing system; (d) what is the projected cost of the new "File my Return" system; (e) what criteria will be used to assess whether or not someone is eligible for the new system; and (f) what are the costs associated with setting up the new system?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1470—**Mr. Larry Miller:**

With regard to the government's delegation to the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland, in January 2018: (a) what was the delegation's estimated carbon footprint; (b) what is the breakdown of the estimated carbon footprint by type of activity, including (i) air transportation, (ii) ground transportation, (iii) accommodation, (iv) other; and (c) what are the details of any carbon offsets purchased by the government in relation to the trip to Switzerland, including (i) date of purchase, (ii) vendor, (iii) amount (dollar value), (iv) amount of offsets purchased (carbon dioxide equivalents)?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1471—**Mr. Gord Johns:**

With regard to the Department of Veterans Affairs: what was the amount and percentage of all lapsed spending in the Department, broken down by year from 2013-14 to the current fiscal year?

(Return tabled)

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that all remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

REQUEST FOR EMERGENCY DEBATE

CANADIAN STEEL AND ALUMINUM EXPORTS

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Standing Order 52(2), I am proposing an emergency debate on the urgent situation of the possible future levy of duties on Canadian steel and aluminum exports to the United States.

It was to my great relief that Canada was exempted from this recent action. However, as this is only a temporary exemption, any future tariffs, if implemented, would have disastrous repercussions on the Canadian steel and aluminium industries and the thousands of workers in those sectors.

Since his election, President Donald Trump has ordered billions of dollars of tariffs on Canadian industries. Almost every major sector has been targeted by the current U.S. administration. In fact, I posed two questions to the Prime Minister today on this very subject.

The steel industry in Canada employs 22,000 workers directly and over 100,000 workers indirectly. Our aluminum industry employs 8,300 workers directly and over 20,000 indirectly. These are good-paying, family-supporting and community-supporting jobs across the country that we cannot afford to lose.

It is necessary for members of the House of Commons to have the time and opportunity to fully discuss not only the implications of future tariffs, but also to propose and debate remedies and solutions to this growing problem. We must have the opportunity to address the increasing amount of Canadian jobs and livelihoods that would be negatively impacted in all of our communities.

I would also like to note that there is no opposition day in the foreseeable future for the NDP. It should be taken into consideration that the next opposition day for the NDP will not be designated until March 28 at the very earliest, but in all likelihood it will not fall until after the Easter break. This situation is far too critical to wait for that date.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that you would find strong support from all parties in the House for a full debate on this issue that will greatly impact our future.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for considering this request and, if granted, I respectfully ask that the debate take place this evening.

● (1530)

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: I thank the hon. member for Essex for raising her request. However, I do not find that it meets the exigencies of the Standing Order at this time.

*The Budget***GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[English]

THE BUDGET

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF MINISTER OF FINANCE

The House resumed consideration of the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government, of the amendment, and of the amendment to the amendment

The Speaker: The hon. member for Durham has three minutes remaining in his comments that were interrupted by question period.

The hon. member for Durham.

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I was in full flight, responding to some of the heckles from my friends in the Liberal Party on my comparison of this budget to the Liberal double-double. I said that it is the Liberal double-double, deficit and debt, and there is no roll up the rim to win for Canadian families. Studies have shown that 80% to 90% of middle-class families, the families they claim to be helping, are paying more under the Liberal government.

High deficits and high debt are connected with taxes. Taxes are already going up, and in many ways large deficits are deferring taxes to the future. The Liberal government seems to forget that it is going to continue to make our economy less and less competitive. The budget contained five mentions of NAFTA, with no funding attached to any of the industries that could be at risk. That includes those industries that the Prime Minister did his speedy little steel town tour to because they almost blew the market access for steel and aluminum for Canadian workers.

I am going to spend my final few minutes on the Canada summer jobs, which dovetails nicely to the thousands of Canadians who have written condemning the Liberal government's approach to politicizing a summer jobs programs. It is in the budget at page 56, and states, "A summer job helps students pay for their education, and gives them the work experience they need to find and keep a full-time job after they graduate."

All members of Parliament know how impactful these programs are. They do great service-related events for communities and help students defer costs of their university or college education at the same time. It is a win. Service clubs are involved, as are seniors homes and faith organizations. All sides of this House have seen the great work that is done with this program. Never in the decades of operation of this program has there been a thought-police approach, where they are putting in a values screen. The Liberals did that because they wanted to exclude faith organizations from playing roles in their communities, even though the Prime Minister's sunshine photo ops with the Syrian refugees who first came to Canada were all coming through private sponsorship roots from faith organizations.

Excluding people in this way violates the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and violates the spirit of what the Canada summer jobs program is supposed to be about. We have heard from thousands of people who have written petitions. We have a vote tonight. For the Liberals who are listening, I would like them to use their conscience. Do they have freedom of thought in the Liberal government? It is

time for them to stand up for all charter rights, and that includes freedom of conscience and religion, and recognizing that faith communities play important roles across Canada.

• (1535)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, for years I sat in the opposition benches, and former prime minister Stephen Harper ignored the importance of the Canada summer jobs programs. In fact, one of the first things this government did in recognizing how important our young people are to our country was to virtually double the amount of money going into the summer student program. I would hope that members opposite would not be discouraging individuals from participating and applying for these important student jobs. I would suggest that if they read the supplementary information, much of the information that the member is getting across is wrong.

My question is a little off that particular topic. Why does my friend and colleague believe that the Liberal government should take advice from the Conservatives when they ran nothing but deficits and accumulated well over \$150 billion? Why does he not see the irony in terms of the Conservatives giving advice on deficits?

Hon. Erin O'Toole: Madam Speaker, I saw my friend, Joe Oliver, over the break from Parliament, and he commented that as Conservative finance minister, he would be the only G7 minister to have a balanced budget in this decade. That is unbelievable. That party's own projections suggest that with the way the Liberals are spending, there will not be a balanced budget in Canada again until the 2030s.

Weathering the largest financial global crisis since the recession better than all our G7 allies and competitors, having a balanced budget, and running a deficit when there was a global recession with a plan to get out of it, is far different from running massive deficits with no plan at a time when the global economy is rocking. This is a failure of the highest order.

With his attacks on job creators and deficit financing, my friends in the Toronto business community wonder if the finance minister is the same person who used to work in the private sector. He seems to have forgotten how to read a balance sheet.

On the summer jobs, the member knows that church organizations and immigration support groups in his riding have involved people from faith communities. That was consistent, from the Trudeau government through Chrétien, Harper, and Mulroney. Why is there a values test now? It is to exclude Canadians of faith.

Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Durham. He is a great representative of his community, and he has really taken this issue of Canada's summer jobs to heart. He knows that the Prime Minister has made statements such as that he admires the basic dictatorship of China and he admires Cuba.

The Budget

In his speech he spoke about this precedent of requiring an attestation. I was wondering if he could respond to this as being a precedent. There are people in my community who are worried that if the Liberal government will go this far, it will now require Canadians to sign more attestations that agree with the government of the day's policies to receive CPP benefits or EI benefits or to apply for a government job. Could he please comment on how important it is as a precedent?

Hon. Erin O'Toole: Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend and neighbour, the MP for Oshawa, whom I have learned a lot from as a member of Parliament, for his strong defence of families, the role of faith communities, and balanced budgets.

There is a precedent for this type of thought police and this type of values screening. The precedent is found in the book *1984*, by George Orwell, in which one does not just oppose one's opponents, one tries to exclude them or defeat them entirely.

Gerald Butts and the Prime Minister's Office do not like people to hold faith convictions. They moved away from private sponsors of the Syrian refugee program to "government knows best", even though it is condemning a lot of those families to poorer outcomes, which their own department has realized.

Faith organizations, of all faiths, including Christian, Jewish, and Muslim, have a tremendous track record. There are those people who might have faith organizations but do their work as Rotarians or as members of the Lions club. These organizations are the foundation of communities. We should be encouraging that, not excluding them.

The precedent being set here not only contravenes the Charter of Rights and Freedoms but runs contrary to what parliamentarians should be doing, which is supporting Canadians to help grow their communities and support the less fortunate before "Ottawa knows best" gets into the act.

● (1540)

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am very pleased today to share my time with the hon. member for Scarborough—Guildwood.

This is an opportunity I am very pleased to have to share my perspective on behalf of the good people of Lac-Saint-Louis on what I consider to be a pivotal budget, not in dollar amounts spent but in terms of some of the long-term structural changes the budget will gradually engender, changes that will benefit both economic growth and social justice. Liberals approach governing with these two dual objectives in mind. Growth without justice is something that would be incomplete, and to have social justice, we need growth.

As I mentioned at the beginning, this is not a budget that is focused on describing large investments. Previous budgets and the economic update talked about our investment of \$180 billion to renew Canada's infrastructure over the next 12 years. If I may take a moment to refer to that economic statement and those budgets, that is spending that is laying the foundation for productivity growth and economic growth, spending to encourage the creation of networks and clusters that are at the very core of innovation.

I am thinking more specifically in terms of my region of the country. I am thinking in terms of the investments the federal government will be making to make a new train system in Montreal

a reality. The Réseau express métropolitain will link the south shore of Montreal with the West Island through the airport and the Saint-Laurent Technoparc. These are the kinds of investments that create opportunities for growth in the long term and the medium term.

Budget 2018 targets important objectives. As I mentioned, I believe it would create structural change, but I am pleased to say that it would do so against the backdrop of declining deficit and debt ratios. For example, if one looks at the projections for the budget deficit in terms of percentage of GDP, we see that it will be going down from 0.9% to 0.6% and then to 0.5%. The federal debt as a percentage of GDP will be going down from 31% to 28.4%. That is important, because many of my constituents have told me that it is very important that deficits remain under control and that we pay back some of the debt that has been accumulated over the years, including by the previous government.

There is a very important investment being made in the budget that I would like to mention, and that is the decision to invest over \$900 million over five years in fundamental science. In other words, the budget is responding to the recommendations of the Naylor report and to the scientific community, which recognize the importance of investing in fundamental science, the kind of science that does not tell us what will drop out of the process down the road, because we just do not know. We could find out that the research has led to a completely unexpected result, an unexpected result that creates jobs and economic growth and new companies that hire new employees, many of them young, in the sciences, the cutting-edge sciences, who will now, as a result, have good-paying jobs.

● (1545)

[Translation]

Speaking of the investments we are going to make in fundamental science, I would like to thank one of my constituents, Mr. Terry Hébert, a researcher at McGill University. He is a professor in the department of pharmacology and therapeutics at McGill and an advisor of sorts. For the past few years, he has been telling me about the importance of fundamental science, and I would like to quote an article that he and two of his associates wrote, which was published in *Le Devoir* on August 2, 2017, entitled "Tomorrow's innovation requires funding today".

The title could have been, "Tomorrow's innovation and economic growth require funding today".

The article says, and I quote:

Thanks to basic research on membrane protein biology, funded by the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), we have implemented new strategies that have led to treatments for cystic fibrosis...

At the time this research was being carried out, nobody could predict that it would lead to the discovery of therapeutic molecules and promising therapeutic approaches, and to the creation of local biotechnology enterprises or to collaborations with pharmaceutical companies internationally.

[English]

By investing in fundamental science, this budget is laying the groundwork for economic growth and scientific discoveries that will help in the treatment of diseases, for example.

The Budget

This budget does something else that is structural and is very important for the future of the economy. It is working to increase the supply of labour. I would like to quote the Governor of the Bank of Canada, who was giving a speech at Queen's University, I believe about a week or two ago. He talked about the labour market. The theme of his speech was the labour market and how we need to increase the supply of labour.

I will quote from Mr. Poloz's speech. He said, "economic growth can[not] happen unless there are people available to fill the newly created jobs. Accordingly, a healthy, well-functioning labour market is critical". He goes on to say, "After looking at a much wider range of labour market indicators, the Bank has concluded that there remains a degree of untapped supply potential in the economy."

This budget is aimed at unlocking some of that untapped potential. It does so by focusing on some groups whose labour force participation rate is, unfortunately, too low for us to maximize economic growth. One group is young people. Young people are one source of untapped potential.

Governor Poloz said:

The key point is that youth represent an important untapped source of potential economic growth. If the youth participation rate were to return close to its level before the [financial] crisis, more than 100,000 additional young Canadians would have jobs.

How is the budget helping with youth employment? It is investing an additional \$448.5 million over five years, starting in 2018-19, to continue increases in the number of summer jobs. The member opposite mentioned the Canada summer jobs program. The government is investing in the Canada summer jobs program, which will be good for increasing the supply of labour from that particular demographic group.

The budget also aims to facilitate greater labour force participation on the part of women. To quote Governor Poloz, again from the same speech at Queen's University:

An even more significant source of economic potential is higher labour force participation by women. While about 91 per cent of prime-age men participate in the labour force, the rate for women is only about 83 per cent.

He goes on to say:

History suggests that this gap can narrow. Consider Quebec, where, 20 years ago, the prime-age female participation rate was about 74 per cent. The provincial government identified barriers keeping women out of the workforce and acted to reduce them, particularly by lowering the cost of child care and extending parental leave provisions. Within a few years, proportionately more prime-age Quebec women had jobs than women in the rest of Canada. Today, Quebec's prime-age female participation rate is about 87 per cent.

Members will recall the Minister of Finance saying in his speech that if men and women in this country had equal labour participation rates, the GDP would be boosted by 4% and we could compensate for the drag on the economy caused by the aging of the population, which, of course, takes people out of the workforce. Therefore, this budget, to facilitate the participation of women, has introduced shared parental leave, which will provide an incentive for members of a couple to share the leave so that they can manage their careers while they are growing their families.

All in all, I conclude that this is a good structural budget that will lead to positive results in the long term.

• (1550)

[Translation]

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am very glad to have heard from my hon. colleague from Lac-Saint-Louis, a man I really respect. Working with him on sensitive issues has been a pleasant, positive, and constructive experience. I am sure he can see me coming a mile away, but I have a very straightforward question for him.

The member was elected because he promised a balanced budget by 2019. The government has now tabled three budgets that offer no prospect of balancing the budget. Worse yet, the parliamentary budget officer says that if nothing changes, we will not see a balanced budget until 2045.

With all due respect for my hon. colleague, who is about to vote for a budget that offers no hope of a balanced budget in the foreseeable future, can he give us a frank and honest explanation for why he told his constituents that his government would balance the budget in 2019?

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia: Madam Speaker, it has been some time since we have worked together, but we had the pleasure of travelling across the country to talk about electoral reform.

Of course we need to work toward balancing the budget in the long term and we need to manage our finances in such a way as to keep spending on track. There is good news though. For example, never before have so many Canadians been employed. The unemployment rate is at its lowest level in 40 years.

We need to work toward balancing the budget in the long term, but we must not forget that the economy is working because of the government's infrastructure investments, among other things. If the price of oil goes up, we should be able to balance the budget sooner than if things stay as they are now.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, I always enjoy the speeches given by my colleague from Quebec. He spoke at length about gender equality and pay equity, but this budget does not allocate one red cent to pay equity. The members know as well as I do that, in Quebec, investments are what led to the elimination of the wage gap between men and women in the public service, although at the federal level, a significant gap still exists.

The question is very simple. How can the government raise the issue of pay equity without investing any money to achieve it at the federal level?

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia: Madam Speaker, indeed, only 16% of business owners in Canada are women. In that regard, the budget includes a \$105-million investment over five years. Those funds will be allocated to the regional development agencies to support women-owned businesses.

The budget also allocates \$1.4 billion over three years to the Business Development Bank of Canada for women entrepreneurs as well as \$250 million over three years to Export Development Canada. This will encourage women-owned businesses and create wealth for women and for the Canadian economy.

The Budget

•(1555)

[English]

Hon. John McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood, Lib.): Madam Speaker, my hon. colleague for Lac-Saint-Louis gave an excellent speech and I thank him for sharing his time with me. It is very generous of him.

This is actually a very good budget. I realize that may not be a universally held position and possibly is really bad for the opposition parties and for the Conservative Party's propaganda machine, but it is a very good budget. It is a very good budget in terms of economic fundamentals.

I would encourage members to go to page 26 of the budget where it talks about our debt-to-GDP ratio and the progress we have made literally over a great period of time. I am looking down at the end of the chamber and I see the hon. member for Kenora who arrived here in the bad old days when our debt to GDP was at its highest, which is 69% of debt to GDP. It climbed steadily from around 30% back in the 1980s through the Mulroney years until the election of 1993 and the Chrétien-Martin period. *The New York Times* had described Canada as an honorary member of the third world because our debt was out of control. While our Conservative colleagues might wish us to believe that at this point, unfortunately this chart and these facts do not support that contention. It is unfortunate for them but very fortunate for us and our nation.

Since 1993 when both Chrétien and Martin worked on reducing the debt and actually paid down something in the order of about \$100 billion of debt, we, meaning the nation, had worked this down around 2006 when it actually dipped under 30% of GDP. After that, we kind of limped along a little above. Certainly, in the 2008 financial crisis, there was a bit of a bump. The Conservatives at that point ran a deficit of \$56 billion claiming it was entirely due to financial turmoil. In fact, in part, it was also due to mismanagement with respect to fiscal instability and reduction of revenues coming into the government. Thereafter, economic conditions settled down and when the Conservatives left office, it was in and around 30% of GDP.

If members think this is simply luck or that we are just a blessed nation, which we are, I would invite members to think again. If we compare, again in the same chart, our fiscal performance to any other G7 nation, members will notice that, for instance, Italy and Japan run debt to GDP well over 120%. Even the United States, which loves to lecture everyone about debt and fiscal responsibility, is running its debt to GDP around 90%. We are around 30%. There is a broad consensus among Canadians of all political stripes that we do need to maintain fiscal discipline in order to be able to provide the services and programs that Canadians rightly are concerned about.

I have heard previous speakers say that we are out of control with respect to the deficit. It is true that there was a promise, a commitment made in the election to run a modest deficit. At the time, that was quite radical because the opposition parties, the Conservatives and the NDP, were promising a balanced budget. At this point the leader of the day decided that Canada's economy needed a stimulus. The stimulus, as it turned out to be, went from \$10 billion, as was set out in the election, to an estimate of \$30 billion. However, if we look at the charts, it actually comes in at less

than \$20 billion. The interesting part is that we ended up with a growth in the Canadian economy.

•(1600)

What my Conservative colleagues fail to mention when they talk in those numbers, namely, 10 becomes 30 which actually ends up as 20 and is projected to decline over the next two or three years, is that at the same time, our unemployment rate went from a high of 7.1% in 2015 to a historic low of 5.9% in 2017. It poses the interesting and nice question as to what it is that we want. Do we want to have a balanced budget at all costs and run the unemployment rate at 7.9% or do we want to provide a stimulus, possibly a larger stimulus than was originally promised but still a stimulus, and run the unemployment rate down to 5.9%?

I know that all governments say the same thing, that it is because of their fiscal management and brilliance that the economy is just humming. The problem for the opposition is that the economy is humming. My hon. colleague from Lac-Saint-Louis referenced the speech of the Governor of the Bank of Canada at Queen's University. The governor said there is still some space in the economy to improve without inflation, which is the dream of every central bank governor. Right now, the Canadian central bank governor has the most envious job in the world. He is running an economy without inflation, with low unemployment, with a debt to GDP that is well within a manageable range.

Again, looking at the charts on page 22, the average real GDP growth since 2016 Q2 is 3.2% in Canada, 2.4% in Germany, 2.4% in the United States. Apparently making America great again has not quite worked. In fact, if one wants to live the American dream, one should move to Canada.

All of these numbers probably in some respects make some people's eyes glaze over, and probably my wife is one of them, but they have to be for some purpose. One of the purposes has been the redistribution of income, or of wealth, if you will, across the income spectrum.

Probably the most significant income redistribution that has happened under this government has been the re-profiling of the Canada child benefit. In the budget at page 38, there is a commitment to raise the amount that is available for an income of \$35,000 from \$7,500 or \$7,600 to almost \$11,000. That is enormous. For a family income of \$70,000, it is raised from \$4,000 up to \$6,700.

In a riding like mine, Scarborough—Guildwood, where there are a lot of children and a low level of income among a lot of people, that is a significant and huge impact. In Scarborough—Guildwood, that means something in the order of \$100 million comes into the riding each and every year.

The Budget

We can talk about tax cuts. For those of us who have a good income, tax cuts are very attractive, but the beauty of putting \$100 million into a riding like Scarborough—Guildwood is that the money gets spent. It gets spent on transportation. It gets spent on food. It gets spent on clothing. It gets spent on education. It is money that goes into the bank accounts of the constituents of Scarborough—Guildwood and immediately, because the incomes are low, gets turned around and ends up in the economy.

• (1605)

The government has initiated, literally, a fiscal revolution under the Canada child benefit. Unfortunately, I am not going to get a chance to talk about the other revolution, which is the ability to redistribute, under the working benefit.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I am sure the member will have a chance to speak about that during his questions and answers.

Hon. Peter Kent (Thornhill, CPC): Madam Speaker, I always enjoy following the hon. member's wanderings through historical revisionism. I would agree that the Canadian economy is humming, but it is not humming because of what the Liberal government is doing. It is humming because the world economy is humming, and the U.S. economy is humming.

The most remarkable thing about this budget, as many economists have pointed out, is that it is notable for its lack of economic analysis, something that the Parliamentary Budget Officer fully agrees with, when he talks about the lack of detail on direct program expenses, the lack of detail on infrastructure spending, and here he pauses to remind the government that roughly a quarter of the planned infrastructure spending will lapse because the government has not figured out how to get those billions of dollars out the door, and the lack of detail in national defence, with no explanation of how Canada's new defence policy is going to be funded over the coming years.

My friend likes to talk about the GDP. The Parliamentary Budget Officer has noted, and this is where I will come to my question, that budget 2018 bases its estimates on U.S. potential real GDP, in other words, the potential for the American economy to continue to grow sustainably. The budget officer suggests and requests—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): We have to allow for other questions. I have allowed the member almost two minutes to ask the question. I am going to allow the member for Scarborough—Guildwood to give an answer, so that we can get at least one more question in.

Hon. John McKay: Madam Speaker, I love the way the hon. member seems to be able to extract bad news out of good.

After his wanderings all over the fiscal map, I will say that growth in the United States is an issue. There has not been a government in Canada since the time of Confederation that did not base its projections upon growth relative to our main trading partner. After all, 70% of our trade is with the United States. We wish it was less.

I do not think we can underestimate the risk that the White House is to NAFTA. If the hon. member reads the back annexes of the budget, he will realize that there is an itemization of risk to GDP. The

first risk is the NAFTA negotiations. I hope they go well, but if they do not go well, we will all suffer.

Ms. Irene Mathysen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Madam Speaker, if the economy is doing so well, why did the government delay action on affordable housing and significant infrastructure until well after the next election? It is kind of like a prize way out there that maybe someday we will see in our own backyards.

Why is there no action on tax havens, pension protection, pay equity, real child care, or pharmacare?

Hon. John McKay: Madam Speaker, one of the things that I learned from former finance minister Paul Martin, and subsequently Prime Minister Martin, is to get the economic fundamentals right.

For the first two years, the government has been readdressing the economic fundamentals of the previous government. The previous government was “a balanced-budget at all costs”. The mere fact that it only achieved this once in its mandate seems to be lost in the mists of time.

Until the economics are right, we cannot address the issues that the hon. member raised, all of which are quite legitimate. The issue of pharmacare, for instance, is a live issue, and all of us on this side are hoping that it moves forward.

• (1610)

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am going to start off where my Liberal colleague from Scarborough—Guildwood left off, where he talked about economic fundamentals.

What are the economic fundamentals right now of Canada? The economic fundamentals are that we are living through the period of greatest inequality in our nation's history. That is an economic fundamental that both this budget and previous Conservative budgets completely ignored. We now have two Canadian billionaires who have the same wealth as 30% of the Canadian population, or 11 million Canadians.

Another fundamental that this budget does not touch in any way, shape, or form is the fact that Canadian families are now struggling with the worst debt burden, not only in our nation's history but in any industrialized nation's history. The average family debt now is a crushing burden. That, of course, was created by Conservative policies and has been enhanced by Liberal policies. However, these are economic fundamentals that this budget does not take into account in any way, shape, or form.

This budget is a cruel hoax for all those Canadians who actually believed that this government was going to do what it said it wanted to do in the 2015 election. We have seen a whole host of broken promises. My colleague from Skeena—Bulkley Valley certainly could speak to the broken promise around democratic reform, but we have seen a whole host of broken promises. This budget just enhances what has been a drive toward more inequality and an unjust tax system.

The Budget

[Translation]

Madam Speaker, I would like to start with the inequalities and the Liberals' broken promises. Several weeks ago, our leader, Jagmeet Singh, and I held a press conference. We wrote to the Prime Minister and to the Minister of Finance to talk about the ever-increasing inequality across the country and to talk about the major changes needed to help all Canadian families.

We said that the government must go after tax havens. The government must close tax loopholes, including tax havens, instead of continuing to allow major corporations and wealthy Canadians to avoid paying taxes. Instead, the government signed even more treaties with notorious tax havens. I am talking about the Cook Islands, Antigua and Barbuda, and Grenada. Even the Conservatives did not want to sign agreements with those countries. Now these agreements exist and they allow companies to not pay taxes.

We also talked about web giants that do not pay taxes like Netflix and Facebook. These companies are effectively stealing from Canadian businesses, and communities are struggling as a result. These web giants were not addressed at all in this budget. This is yet another failure.

[English]

When we talk about all of these tax havens, when we talk about these special fiscal arrangements that allow some of the world's biggest businesses to not pay one cent of tax in Canada, when we talk about what that actually means, there is a cost to Canadians, a huge cost to Canadians. My colleague, the Liberal member, was talking about fiscal discipline. This government has shown absolutely no fiscal discipline whatsoever, in the same way that the Conservatives did not. With the Conservatives it was a free-for-all. Every month they would sign another special treaty with an overseas tax haven. Now the Liberals are in the process of doing the same thing.

What is the cost to Canadians? The Parliamentary Budget Officer and a whole host of think tanks in Canada, whether we are talking about the CCPA or the Conference Board of Canada, have evaluated what it costs Canadians to have this free-for-all, this most egregious signing of taxation-free agreements, which allow money that is made in Canada to go overseas and not be taxed one cent.

• (1615)

The cost for the web giants alone is over \$1 billion, which could be money that serves collectively for all of us to fight the inequalities that I mentioned earlier, to provide the programs that Canadians desperately need, and yet the government is not willing to touch that.

When we talk about tax havens, depending on the estimates, we are talking about a minimum of \$10 billion a year. We are talking about up to \$40 billion a year. These should be those common resources that all Canadians in solidarity use to make sure that their families are taken care of when there are health care problems, when they need medication, and so that they can actually provide child care for their children. Canadians have said very clearly, certainly in the last election, that they believe in a society where we collectively provide those resources and those supports for families. However, Conservatives and now Liberals have been frittering away tens of

billions of dollars each and every year by refusing to close all of these tax loopholes.

There was a brave paragraph in the budget, and I am going to praise the government for this very brave paragraph. On page 69 in the English text, the finance minister and the Liberal government actually say that they are going combat tax evasion and tax avoidance, and that the government will invest money to address the issues of tax evasion and tax avoidance, which, as I mentioned earlier, are in the realm of tens of billions of dollars each and every year.

This is what the budget says. This is what all Liberal MPs stand behind. "As the CRA has a proven track record of meeting expectations from targeted compliance interventions," which is the combat of tax evasion and tax avoidance, "Budget 2018 accounts for the expected revenue impact of \$354 million over five years."

About \$70 million a year with that enhanced compliance is what the Liberals are expecting to get. Now, each and every question period when we raise the egregious issue of the massive amounts of money going offshore for tax havens, the Liberals have responded by saying that they are going to spend over \$1 billion over 10 years to get some of that money back. Now we know what they are targeting. They are spending \$1 billion, or half a billion over five years, and are expecting to get back \$354 million, and remember, Liberals very rarely meet their targets. They would spend half a billion to get back \$354 million. It is almost laughable. It would be a comedy if it did not have such a profound impact on Canadians.

Here are some of the other things the Liberals refuse to close.

There is the stock option loophole, which was evaluated a few years ago as benefiting, to the tune of half a billion dollars, 75 of Canada's wealthiest corporate CEOs. Those are figures under the Conservatives, but the figures today would be similar. Seventy-five wealthy Canadians, because of the stock option loophole, got an average of \$6 million each. That is half a billion dollars in taxpayers' handouts to some of Canada's wealthiest people on Bay Street, yet the same Liberals who are defending this budget will stand up and say that we cannot afford child care, housing, or pharmacare. They are saying that because they have a complete absence of the fiscal discipline to say to the wealthiest in our country that they have to pay their fair share of taxes, the fiscal discipline that means standing up to the corporate sector, which now has a real effective tax rate of less than 10%. It is 9.8% as evaluated by the CCPA.

Ask a tradesperson, a nurse, or someone who works in a mill if they can get by with a 9.8% effective tax rate. They cannot, of course, but Canada's wealthiest enterprises, courtesy of Conservative and Liberal policies, can get by with that small a rate of taxation.

We have said that we need a fair tax system, and I can tell members that in this corner of the House we are not going to stop until there is a fair tax system in this country that allows us to invest and provide for families when they are in need. Canadians, because of the record level of family debt and because of the record level of inequality, have never been more in need than they are now.

The Budget

●(1620)

It is not just what the Liberals refuse to do, which is establishing any sort of fiscal framework. It is what the results have been. That is why we tabled the subamendment to the budget decrying how undisciplined this fiscal framework has been in giving most of the nation's resources and wealth to a very few Canadians, and virtually nothing to Canadians who are struggling.

[*Translation*]

I will start with housing. On page 78 of the budget, we see that \$31 million has been allocated to build more rental housing for Canadian families.

As we know, this means that only a few dozen apartments across the country would be affordable for Canadians.

All amounts combined, including those elsewhere in the budget, represent less than 10% of what is needed this year to deal with the housing crisis that exists across Canada. Even I am affected by this crisis, and my fellow citizens, who are my bosses, feel it every day in New Westminster—Burnaby. In fact, the cost of housing is increasing and more and more people are finding it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to access affordable housing. Take Héléne, for example, a deaf woman who could not afford an apartment even when she was working. She had to turn to a local organization that provides services to deaf people.

In Canada, half of the people who are currently homeless, and we are talking about tens of thousands of people, are people with disabilities. As we can see, this crisis is profoundly affecting people with disabilities and other poor people.

[*English*]

It is not just disabled Canadians who are impacted. I am talking about John Young, a pensioner who worked all his life. He paid into a pension and has a modest pension. However, because of the increase in rent in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia, in my riding, he struggled to keep his apartment but could not, because he was going further into debt. He then tried to room with a friend, which did not work out, so he ended up in a parkade in downtown New Westminster.

These are the victims of the lack of fiscal discipline of the government, which allows people to be homeless and not have the services they need while it feeds tens of billions of dollars to offshore tax havens. These are extraordinarily poor choices. These are the kinds of choices that should force the government out of office in 2019.

It is not just about housing. Let us talk about first nations. We have a government that committed to ending boil water advisories within a couple of years, yet the funding in this budget is only pennies of what is needed to end boil water advisories in this country. It does not even come close to the \$320 million that is needed this year. It is pennies on the dollar. It is a cruel hoax for all those first nations communities across the north and across this country that expected that the government would care enough to actually make those investments.

As well, the government falls lamentably short of the nearly \$1 billion that is needed this year alone for housing for first nations

communities, to address what has been a chronic absence of funding by the federal government. Since the former Liberal government eliminated the national housing program, Canadians, in so many cases, have been forced to make incredibly difficult choices. In first nations communities, only a fraction of the money that is needed this year is actually being provided in this budget.

Let us talk about universal child care. It is not here.

Any sort of investment to deal with the industries that are facing what is an intense push from the new Trump administration against Canadian industries is not there.

My colleague from Hamilton Mountain has done an extraordinary job of protecting pensions. As he has said many times, there is nothing in this budget, and there will be nothing in the budget implementation act, that actually addresses the theft of pensions that is hurting so many Canadians.

●(1625)

The reply of the government was to introduce Bill C-27, which would of course help the finance minister with Morneau Shepell, but it would not help Canadians who are struggling to keep their pensions. Sears pensioners losing their pensions are only the latest who have seen the money they have invested over a lifetime evaporate because there is no pension protection in this country.

As well, I can mention Phoenix, where the government has to make a phenomenal investment, a significant investment, to address the Phoenix pay system, and it chose not to in this budget. The Parliamentary Budget Officer and even the Australians, who would have warned the Liberals not to implement Phoenix, say that it costs \$1 billion to \$5 billion to fix it. The Liberals have only pennies on the dollar in this budget, not enough to fix it, and not enough to make sure our public servants receive the paycheques they so richly deserve in working so hard for our country.

With regard to pay equity, I mentioned earlier that there is not a cent.

The most cruel hoax is the issue of pharmacare. In the days prior to the budget, the Liberals leaked out that they would be taking real action on pharmacare. We have repeatedly brought to this House motions directing the government to enact pharmacare, and the Liberals have refused to vote for them. However, in the buildup to the budget, they said that this time they really meant it.

The Budget

It made a lot of sense that they would enact pharmacare. Even the Parliamentary Budget Officer has said very clearly that all Canadians would save money if we have a universal pharmacare system. The cost of drugs, over \$30 billion a year, can be reduced remarkably if there is a single-payer system. We saw that in New Zealand, with costs being reduced by 90%. Provincial and territorial governments can save billions of dollars, and so can businesses and individuals. Canadians who cannot afford to pay for their medication now and take the medication they so desperately need would actually have that medication provided.

In the past, I have quoted Jim, who is right outside Parliament Hill begging every day for the \$580 he needs for the medication that will keep him alive. After all that buildup, what the Liberals gave was a cruel hoax to Canadians who are desperate to have a pharmacare system in place. The cruel hoax is that they just decided to study it for another couple of years. They will make another promise in 2019, if they get re-elected.

My point is that the budget is a cruel hoax. The Liberal government has repeatedly broken promises it made back in 2015. On the basis of this budget, the government not only does not deserve the support of the House of Commons for this budget, but it does not deserve the support of Canadians in 2019. The Liberals have kept the same cruel fiscal framework that allows the gross inequalities we see in our country, the tens of billions of dollars that go to offshore tax havens and stock options, the whole range of loopholes. None of those are shut down.

What the government is saying is that for those Canadians who want to see pharmacare, instead of struggling and having to choose between putting food on the table or paying their rent and paying for the medication their doctor has prescribed, there is no hope. The Liberals are just offering a study. For the tens of thousands of Canadians who are out on the streets and parks of our nation tonight, there is not going to be any housing coming. There is a little bit, but not nearly enough to actually address the size and scope of the crisis that has befallen Canadians.

If people are looking for pay equity, for their pensions to be protected, or for support for their industry being attacked by Donald Trump, they should not look in this Liberal budget.

• (1630)

This budget is a cruel hoax. Canadians deserve better. Canadians expected better. In 2019, they will be able to get better.

Mr. Adam Vaughan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development (Housing and Urban Affairs), Lib.): Madam Speaker, the member opposite keeps holding this book up, and he really ought to read it.

Something else the member might want to think about reading is the NDP platform from the last election. I am going to read what the NDP promised in year three of its mandate, if elected, for introduction of incentives for affordable rental housing construction. It was zero dollars. In fact, the New Democrats did it for three straight years, zero, zero, zero, for what they just described as the greatest crisis confronting this country.

On homelessness, we have invested an extra \$100 million on top of the \$100-million base that our government created back in the late

1990s and the Tories never changed. We added \$100 million to that. What did the NDP promise to add, in the third year of its mandate? What was the most pressing response it could come up with? It was \$10 million. That is not even half of what the City of Toronto spends, and that is what the NDP put on the table.

When it comes to aboriginal housing, it was zero dollars. In fact, all the NDP put down was \$25 million for critical indigenous infrastructure in the third year of its mandate.

All I can say is that if Canadians had selected an NDP government, it would have made about as big a difference as selecting a Conservative government. In other words, the NDP promises were next to nothing, which was exactly what the Tories promised. That is why both parties are on the opposite side of the House. Zero, zero, zero.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, it would almost be comical, except that these are very serious issues. I wish the Liberals actually took them seriously.

First, I think the member has just confirmed the point I made, that the funding is far from adequate. As members know, there are a whole range of budgets, including the alternative federal budget, which actually said that the government gave proper direction, as we did, prior to the tabling of the budget, and actually talked about what it would take to address the crisis of housing that we are seeing.

However, we have this hon. member inventing an NDP budget. He invented it out of thin air. Then he says, "Oh, the NDP would not do as much." To that I reply that the B.C. NDP government gave \$1.6 billion to housing in its budget just a few weeks ago, which is many times more than the Liberals are giving right across the country. The NDP understands the housing problem. We understand homelessness. There is \$1.6 billion coming from the B.C. government.

If the Liberal government matched even a quarter of that, that would get more people off the streets and into homes—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. The microphone is closed.

I would just say to the member that he needs to take a breath and allow for other people to ask questions. I do want to remind the parliamentary secretary that he had his opportunity to speak, and he should respect others when they are speaking.

I also want to mention that no props are to be used in the House, and that includes the budget book.

The hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan.

The Budget

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, I know the member for Spadina—Fort York is very excited about this issue. He had to put aside *The Fountainhead* for a couple of weeks so that he could actually get this budget read. I have to say the prose here is almost as well put together as in that other book.

In terms of the budget, it is interesting to hear the member for Spadina—Fort York talk about what was promised in the platforms. There is dramatic dissonance between what the Liberals said in their election platform and what they are doing today. In fairness to the NDP, there might have been that much difference had it formed government as well. Who knows?

However, we have this contest between our two far-left parties about who would tax more, and who would spend more. Thank goodness Canadians can rely on Conservatives to cut their taxes. Does the member agree with me that after 2019, we would be well served by a Conservative government that is going to get rid of the carbon tax, cut taxes for Canadians, and actually allow the private sector to grow and create the conditions that will allow people at all levels to prosper?

• (1635)

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, I was in the House when the Conservatives were in power. I saw the massive deficits and the most egregious misallocation of spending possible.

When we talk about this foundation of offshore tax havens, it was established by the Harper government. The Harper government did not see a tax haven it did not love. It wanted to sign as many tax treaties as it could. Unfortunately the Liberals are continuing that practice. That is my point. When Canadians are losing anywhere from \$10 billion to \$40 billion every year because of the Harper tax havens, supported by the Liberal government now, that is where it falls short for Canadians.

When we talk about a balanced fiscal framework, we have to take into consideration revenues, and we have not had that. We have not had a balanced approach on a fiscal framework now for decades. That is why we need to have a new look.

In my opinion, it is a pox on both Houses. The Conservatives and the Liberals really do not make a difference in the lives of regular Canadian families. That is why we have a record debt load and that is why we have such crushing inequality.

Mr. Adam Vaughan: Madam Speaker, I want to remind the party opposite of this. On affordable rental housing construction incentives, in the third year of its mandate there were zero dollars. That is what those members promised for the crisis they described as the largest crisis confronting the riding of the member opposite.

With respect to homelessness initiatives, those members offered to add an extra \$10 billion. We have added \$100 billion, yet they call our approach timid. Their approach was one-tenth of what we have offered.

On the restoration of funding and reinvesting in affordable housing, which is essentially guaranteeing the operating agreements, those members put forward \$640 million, which we are achieving,

but we have also added in this budget an extra \$1.25 billion over the next three years for housing.

In light of the fact that our expenditure on housing is by a factor of 10 in some situations, three in others, but quadruple the size of what they promised, would the members not agree they should support the housing budget put forth by our government of \$40 billion over the next 10 years?

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, the member just keeps making stuff up. That is sad because we are talking about an extremely important issue. I addressed the \$1.6 billion paid by the B. C. NDP. Therefore, what we have is more investment coming from one provincial NDP government than the Liberals have done since they were elected. That is the difference.

The member has just admitted, and this is very important for Canadians, that he is talking about three years from now. He is talking about after 2019. Unfortunately he is a little mathematically challenged. He throws these figures out without really understanding what the impacts are. He is talking about after the next election. Canadians who are homeless need support now. They need housing now, not three, five, or 10 years from now. Case closed.

Ms. Irene Mathysen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Madam Speaker, today, on my way into Ottawa, I was stopped at the airport. A young single mom told me that her life was not getting any better, that she kept hearing these promises about how they were going to help her and my children, but their lives were no better, that she was constantly scrambling for money. She could not even afford to go to the dentist.

The hon. member has talked about the fact that the gap between those who have and those who have not is growing every day, and we know that. As a result, people are desperate. They are going to payday lenders. These are users. These are predators. People are being forced into that kind of economy. I am curious to hear what he has to say about that.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, the question from the member for London—Fanshawe has been the best question asked so far this afternoon. It really touches the core of what the budget debate should be all about. She has touched on real people. It is not Liberal spin or Conservative spin. It is really about the impacts on real people.

Having no pharmacare, having no access to dental care, and having no access to housing in our country hurts real people. It is all well and good for the Liberals to spin it and say that eventually they will get around to it. In three years, as the parliamentary secretary has said, they will do something about it. People are suffering now. Canadian families are suffering now. The government needs to act now, not in three years.

The Budget

● (1640)

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Edmonton West, Public Services and Procurement; the hon. member for Chilliwack—Hope, Ethics; the hon. member for Nanaimo—Ladysmith, Indigenous Affairs.

[*English*]

Mrs. Bernadette Jordan (South Shore—St. Margarets, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I will be splitting my time with my colleague from Mississauga—Lakeshore.

I rise today to talk about budget 2018. In particular, I want to talk about the great things I found in this budget for my riding of South Shore—St. Margarets in Nova Scotia.

However, before I do, I want to commend the Minister of Finance for bringing forward a budget that recognizes the importance of giving women the tools they need to succeed in the economy. It is clear that when we add women to the economy, the economy does better.

Just like when we add women to politics, politics changes. It gets better. I think we can all agree that it needs to get better. I am one of only nine women who have been elected to represent Nova Scotia in the House of Commons in the last 100 years. Just let that sink in. That is why I am happy today to be speaking to a budget that would put women in the driver's seat, and acknowledges the importance of having women represented in our economy and in our communities.

For communities across my riding, there are a lot of great things to be found in the budget, which I would like to address, things like \$250 million for small craft harbours. This is a huge investment in our coastal communities, especially because the state of small craft harbours in my riding is, an issue about which I have heard so much.

During the election, as I travelled across the riding, constituents raised a lot of concerns with me. One of the issues I heard about the most was that our small craft harbours really needed to be repaired.

Since the election, constituents have sent me videos of wharves crumbling and flooding, messaging me on Facebook and Twitter, sending me emails, writing letters, and calling my office to share their concerns about the state of our harbour infrastructure. I have toured a lot of these harbours and my constituents are right. These wharves need serious repairs.

Small craft harbours are a major economic driver in my coastal communities. I am sure some of my colleagues, like the members for West Nova, Bonavista—Burin—Trinity, St. Catharines, Avalon, and many other members across the country would agree that this infrastructure is heavily relied upon. Forty per cent of lobster exports in Canada comes from southwest Nova Scotia.

Fishers rely on safe small craft harbours for their livelihood. The fishing industry is the backbone of my riding's economy and it relies on access to these harbours. Communities and families up and down the South Shore rely on this infrastructure as well. Having safe and accessible small craft harbours means that fishers in my riding can sell their catch and provide for their families.

By investing in our small craft harbours, we are investing in our fishing industry, allowing it to grow, develop, expand, and attract future investment. This historic \$250 million investment will ensure the sustainability and preservation of a vital industry for generations to come.

It is much like the commitment to protect our forestry industry in Atlantic Canada. By investing almost \$75 million in the forestry sector, we are supporting and protecting important forestry jobs and the communities that rely on them, not only in my riding but across Atlantic Canada.

As I am sure my New Brunswick colleagues can attest that the threat and damage of the spruce budworm is catastrophic and can destroy our valuable forests and natural resources. This funding is great news for our forest-dependent communities. It means they can be protected from the devastation of spruce budworm and ensures the survival of our forests. To be honest, there are communities in my riding that rely entirely on the forestry sector. This industry is the economic backbone of these communities. Therefore, if they experience a spruce budworm outbreak, the impact would be devastating.

The economy and the environment go hand in hand, and it is important to ensure we make the necessary investments to protect our natural resources and the benefits they provide to our country.

That is why our government is committing over \$1.3 billion to support Canada's biodiversity, protect our species at risk, and increase our capacity to manage protected areas, including our national parks, like Kejimikujik National Park in my riding.

This new funding, along with the existing \$1.5 billion oceans protection plan, demonstrates that Canadians can be confident that their government takes environmental protection seriously.

While it is important to invest in the environment, it is also important to invest in the workers themselves. That is why I was thrilled about the introduction of the new and enhanced Canada workers' benefit. The working income tax benefit is a refundable tax credit that would supplement the earnings of low-income workers. It would put more money in the pockets of hard-working people across the country.

● (1645)

The government already committed to enhancing WITB to a combined \$750 million in the 2017 fall economic statement. Now budget 2018 wants to strengthen that commitment by introducing the Canada workers benefit. This new strengthened benefit is more generous and, more important, more accessible. Currently, too many Canadians are unaware of their eligibility for the working income tax benefit, so they are not applying. Our plan would allow the Canada Revenue Agency to automatically apply the Canada workers' benefit, which would ensure Canadians would get the money to which they would be entitled.

The Budget

We need to be clear about what this means and why it is so important. We are talking just shy of \$1 billion in new funding for hard-working people across the country. We are talking about impacting the lives of almost two million working Canadians. We are talking about lifting approximately 70,000 Canadians out of poverty.

I also want to highlight what it means to individual Canadians. This benefit means that a single mom from Queens County, who is living paycheque to paycheque, can buy her children new boots, or young couples living in Lunenburg, who are just breaking even, can afford to pay their power bills and their phone bills at the same time. It means that we are investing in the hard-working people in my riding and in the hard-working people right across the country.

This budget will do that. It invests in Canadians. It recognizes potential. It will help us grow. It invests in low-income earners and gives them more money for necessities like groceries and utilities. Not only that, it sees their potential and invests in their future. It invests in rural Canadians like fishers and foresters in my riding. It understands the importance of our harbours and our forests and recognizes that these industries are a way of life. It invests in women and girls. It recognizes the challenges we face every day and gives solutions to those challenges. We know that getting a seat at the table is not the only problem. We know we cannot get a seat at the table if we cannot make it there to begin with.

That is why I am proud to stand in the House today on behalf of my riding of South Shore—St. Margarets and speak in support of this budget. This budget is an investment in all of us. It is an investment in Canada. I encourage all members of the House to support it.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, when I reflect on this budget, I cannot help but think about how it continues with what this government started just two and a half years ago. We made a commitment to Canada's middle class and those aspiring to be a part of it to work hard for them. We are seeing the results of that effort. We have had budgets that have invested money into things such as tax cuts for the middle class. We have seen larger amounts of money go to guaranteed income supplements, the Canada child benefit, all the money that goes into the disposable income of Canadians from coast to coast to coast. In turn, they are spending that money and we have a healthier economy.

Could my colleague and friend provide her thoughts on the importance of recognizing that this budget is continuing from previous budgets, that it is continuing to help, with Canadians, build our economy?

• (1650)

Mrs. Bernadette Jordan: Madam Speaker, my hon. colleague is right. We have made a commitment to invest in Canadians. We have done it through the Canada child benefit and now with the increase in WITB. We have done it through increases in the GIS for our seniors and our most vulnerable population. I am very committed to that.

I am very excited to see that it is not just about investing in the infrastructure we desperately need, but it is investing in those

families and in the people who need the disposable income. With the tax cuts and the programs we have been able to offer through our past two budgets and now this one, I see great changes for people in South Shore—St. Margarets.

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to make one point of correction. I keep hearing government members say that Canada has the lowest net debt-to-GDP ratio, and it is repeated on page 26 of the budget. Actually, the numbers that go into that are federal debt to GDP. One of the things that makes us different compared to many of the other countries we are being compared to is that far more services in Canada are delivered at provincial and municipal levels relative to the federal level relative to other countries. If we look at net government debt to GDP, we are certainly much higher relative to some of those other countries. We are much closer to the average.

The member talked about some of the gender issues in the budget and the laudable efforts to improve the situation of women and of women in the workforce. In particular, one of the things proposed in the budget is a grant for women who go into non-traditional occupations. Obviously, we want to ensure this money goes to the intended recipients. What measures does the government intend to associate with that provision to verify the gender of the applicant, so it is not a man applying and asking for that money? Could the member comment on that? It seems like an important process question.

Mrs. Bernadette Jordan: Madam Speaker, when my colleague mentioned provincial versus federal, we have made historic transfer payments to the provinces, so that has to be taken into consideration when we look at the debt-to-GDP ratio.

With regard to women in non-traditional female roles, this is something that I am extremely passionate about because it has affected me directly. I have a daughter who studied heritage carpentry and actually left the trade because of the sexism she faced in the workplace. It is important that when we are looking to make sure that women have access to these programs, we do everything we can to support them and to make sure that they not only get the training they need, but they get the respect they deserve in the workplace.

Ms. Cheryl Hardcastle (Windsor—Tecumseh, NDP): Madam Speaker, in terms of how we clarify this messaging, there is some confusion, so I would like the member to pick one of those to clarify. It sounds like she is very interested in pay equity. Why is there no funding allocated for implementation? Is that a concern to her?

What about the issue of pharmacare? That is a broken promise right off the bat. We heard a day later from the finance minister that there is a very specific type of pharmacare being envisioned.

I wonder if the member could clarify either of those for us.

The Budget

Mrs. Bernadette Jordan: Madam Speaker, my colleague is right. Pay equity is extremely important. This is 2018. Women should be paid at the same scale as men no matter what, and I am really proud of the fact that our government has taken the initiative to make sure this happens.

Mr. Sven Spengemann (Mississauga—Lakeshore, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I rise to talk about what budget 2018 means for constituents in my riding of Mississauga—Lakeshore and for Canadians from coast to coast to coast.

Let me start by saying that we are seeing clear signs that our government's plan is working. Nearly 600,000 jobs have been created by Canadians and the unemployment rate is down to near 40-year lows. Middle-class Canadians feel more optimistic about their future, whether their plan is to pay down debts, to save for a first home, or to go back to school to train for a new job. The Government of Canada has been supporting this confidence by investing in Canadians and the things that are important to them.

We raised taxes on the top 1% so that we could lower them for the middle class. Through the Canada child benefit we also increased support for nine out of 10 families, lifting 300,000 children out of poverty in the process. At the end of 2017, child poverty was reduced by 40% from what it was in 2013.

These are important achievements for Canadians, but we also know that some of our greatest challenges present the greatest opportunities.

• (1655)

[Translation]

By creating these opportunities, the government is taking action with budget 2018 to ensure that the advantages of a growing economy are enjoyed by more and more people.

By making an effort to support women and girls, reducing the gender wage gap, and increasing women's participation in the workforce, we are encouraging more economic growth for the benefit of all Canadians.

Here are some important facts to support those statements. The McKinsey Global Institute estimates that by taking steps to advance women's equality, such as employing more women in technology and boosting women's participation in the workforce, Canada could add \$150 billion to its economy by 2025. Furthermore, RBC Economics estimates that if Canada had a completely equal representation of women and men in our workforce today, we could increase the size of Canada's economy by \$85 billion, or 4%.

Giving women equal opportunities to succeed will not just ensure strong economic growth. It will also encourage a more inclusive dialogue on the questions that will shape our future, in addition to improving the quality of life for our families and communities. That is why the government's 2018 budget seeks to help new parents care for their children during the early months of life, which are so critical to a child's development.

To support young families and gender equality at work and at home, the government is introducing a new employment insurance parental sharing benefit that will support the equal distribution of home and professional responsibilities. The benefit will provide an

additional five weeks of EI benefits when both parents agree to share their parental leave or an additional eight weeks when parents opt for extended parental leave.

This "use it or lose it" incentive encourages both parents in two-parent families to share equally in the work of raising their children, which will allow greater flexibility for new mothers to return to work sooner.

More equitable parental leave will also help lead to more equitable hiring practices, reducing conscious and unconscious discrimination against women by employers.

[English]

In addition to this new employment insurance parental sharing benefit, budget 2018 helps those in my riding in a number of other respects.

Last November I met with constituent Ruby Alvi and her two sons, Aadam Ahmed and Yusuf Ahmed, both of whom were falsely flagged through the passenger protect program or no-fly list. Their concerns and dissatisfaction were echoed by many in my community, which is why I am proud that budget 2018 proposes to invest \$81.4 million over five years to improve the passenger protect program by establishing a centralized screening model and a redress mechanism for travellers affected by the program. For those families and children who have been falsely and unfairly named on the no-fly list, this investment is an important step forward to address and fix this problem.

We know that Canadians are working hard to build a better life for themselves and their families, and they deserve to have their hard work rewarded with greater opportunities and a fair chance at success. That is why budget 2018 introduces the new Canada workers benefit, which is a stronger even more accessible version of the working income tax benefit, WITB, as it will allow low-income families to take home more of their hard-earned money. This means that an employee earning \$15,000 could receive up to almost \$500 more in 2019 than she or he would have received under the WITB in 2018. Overall, nearly two million Canadians will receive benefits through this new program and 70,000 Canadians will be lifted out of poverty.

The Budget

Like the Canada workers benefit, the Canada child benefit, CCB, is a cornerstone in the government's plan to strengthen the middle class and to help people working hard to join it. In my riding of Mississauga—Lakeshore, the Canada child benefit has helped families give their children a better start in life. Between July 2016 and June 2017, there were 17,130 children in my constituency who benefited from the CCB. With the extra help provided through this program each month, families in my community are better able to afford things like nutritious food, sports programs, music lessons, and school supplies. To ensure that families can keep up with the rising cost of living, the government is proposing to strengthen the Canada child benefit starting this July. For a single parent with \$35,000 of income and two children, the increase in the CCB will contribute an extra \$560 toward the increasing cost of raising children by the 2019-20 benefit year.

However, it is also important to make sure that everyone who qualifies for the CCB receives it. In particular, indigenous communities in remote and northern regions face distinct barriers to accessing federal benefits such as the CCB. To address this problem, budget 2018 proposes to expand outreach efforts to indigenous communities and to conduct pilot outreach activities for urban indigenous communities. These efforts will ensure that indigenous peoples are better able to access the full range of federal social benefits, including the CCB.

• (1700)

[*Translation*]

Through budget 2018, the government wants to give young people a head start by investing in the youth employment strategy and doubling the work placements for youth through the Canada summer jobs program.

Budget 2018 introduces a new apprenticeship incentive for women, a five-year pilot project to encourage more women to enter male-dominated, well-paying trades. Under-represented groups, including women, indigenous peoples, persons with disabilities, members of visible minorities and newcomers, would also benefit from a new pre-apprenticeship program that would help them explore the trades, gain work experience, make informed career choices and develop the skills needed to succeed.

This is part of our long-term plan to identify the list of skills our economy needs, review the programs and services offered by the government, and help people match their skills with the right opportunities and stay current.

[*English*]

Canadians have always understood it is possible to do better, and time after time we have harnessed our curiosity, courage, creativity, and collaboration to create positive change in Canada and around the world.

Through budget 2018, the government is acting on this understanding to create new opportunities for Canadian innovators, from junior researchers to scientists to corporate leaders. With \$6.6 billion committed to science in budget 2018, I am proud that our government is making the single largest investment in fundamental research in Canadian history. The government will invest \$3 billion in the next generation of Canadian research and researchers, the

people behind the ideas. This means more support and training opportunities for the work of about 21,000 researchers, students, and high-quality personnel every year by 2021-22.

Budget 2018 also proposes over \$1.3 billion over five years to provide researchers with access to the state-of-the-art tools and facilities they need to carry out their work at Canadian universities, polytechnics, colleges, and research hospitals. With all these investments in budget 2018, our government recognizes that new opportunities and equality are at the heart of Canada's future economic success.

Canadian women and men work hard every day. They take care of their families, run businesses, teach in schools and universities, invent new technologies, protect communities, grow food, take care of each other when they are sick, and create the music, books, plays, and art that shape culture and remind everyone of what it means to be Canadian. This is as true for my constituency of Mississauga—Lakeshore as it is for those in every other riding across our great country.

By promoting equality, this budget and government will help to create long-term prosperity and growth for all Canadians.

Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC): Madam Speaker, I listened to my colleague's very thorough speech and have a question about financial literacy. We try to teach our kids that we have to live within our means. We all know that when the Conservatives were in government we faced the worst economic crisis ever. Now that the world economy has picked up, typically people take that time to start paying down debt and becoming financially literate.

I have heard the Liberal government's economy called a credit card economy because it is borrowing and borrowing to stimulate. Has my colleague ever heard of a movement called Generation Screwed? It is a group of young people who are trying to raise awareness about the debt, because ultimately we, as a generation, are leaving them huge amounts of money they are going to have to pay back.

I was wondering if my colleague has any concerns about not being able to balance the budget within the time frame his government and the Prime Minister promised? Could he tell us if there is any plan to balance the budget so that we are not leaving a huge financial debt for generations to come?

• (1705)

Mr. Sven Spengemann: Madam Speaker, the question of fiscal discipline is indeed important, and it is raised frequently by constituents. Equally important is the conclusion Canadians reached in 2018, which is that the Canadian economy, in 2018 in a globally very competitive environment, requires investment. Canadians will always do well without that investment, but we will do better if we invest in our infrastructure, including our digital infrastructure and human resources, all those things that make us globally competitive.

The Budget

Left to our own devices economically over the Harper decade, we did not see the success Canadians believed we could reach. We are starting to see, with the investments we made in 2015, that those results and improvements are possible. We are at the top of the list of the G7, or near the top of the list of the G7, with respect to economic growth.

Investment is required for an economy like Canada's, but equally important is the question of fiscal discipline. The term "spending" is not the right term. The right term is "investment". One constituent I spoke to just a couple of weeks ago likened it to a home improvement loan. She said that as long as we invest in Canada and increase the value of our assets as a nation, we will do better.

Ms. Cheryl Hardcastle (Windsor—Tecumseh, NDP): Madam Speaker, I wanted to ask my hon. colleague about the pressing issues we experienced in the past year with regard to irregular border crossings. The issue of immigration, and indeed of multiculturalism and of accepting refugees, had been a theme we were very vocal about last year. I am extremely perplexed and disappointed in this budget. I wonder if the member has any insights with regard to that?

Mr. Sven Spengemann: Madam Speaker, the member raises the question of immigration, including the question of refugees.

Immigration, of course, is a cornerstone, not just of Canada's social success but our economic success. It will remain a cornerstone for generations to come. Canada was and is being built on immigration. We just celebrated our 150th anniversary. The next 150 years will be equally profoundly marked by immigration, by people joining us from all corners of the globe.

Specifically with respect to refugees, to correct some of the misperceptions that might be out there in terms of refugees receiving unfair handouts, in my own view and in the view shared by many Canadians, nobody is more motivated, socially or economically, than a person who has lost everything to natural disaster or a war-torn social setting in their country of origin. The economic contributions we are starting to see from our community of refugees are nothing short of extraordinary.

We need to continue to make sure that we integrate refugees speedily and successfully into the Canadian experience. I am very optimistic that immigration, including refugee influence over the decades to come, will contribute very strongly to our success as a nation.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan.

I am honoured to represent the people of Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke. I participate in this debate to share their concern about the deteriorating state of the finances of the Canadian government and what that means to average middle-class Canadian families who bear the brunt of bad spending.

Everyone knows that today's deficit budgets are tomorrow's tax increases. Borrowing money to pay for borrowed time only works for so long, as the disgraced Premier of Ontario is about to find out when she faces the Ford nation.

I take this time before I continue to thank the members of the Conservative Party of Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke for their

overwhelming vote of confidence in once again confirming that I will be our party's candidate in the next federal election, an election that cannot come soon enough for the overburdened taxpayers of our country.

The democratic nomination process in my riding of Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, which coincided with the delivery of the disastrous federal budget, attracted individuals who previously had been identified as supporting the Liberal Party. This is a reflection of how badly they want to see the government defeated. It speaks volumes that former prominent Liberals publicly supported my nomination as the Conservative Party candidate for the next election.

That anti-Liberal sentiment includes the Liberal candidate, a veteran, who ran against me in the 2015 election. He condemns the Liberal Party on social media for using him as a party prop in a picture during the election, with no intention of honouring any promises made to veterans for their votes. It looks like the Prime Minister's party will be looking for a new candidate. Here is what the former candidate had to say. "Three years ago, I decided to seek the nomination for the federal Liberal candidacy in Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke. My only goal was to play a role in assuring that no other brave Canadian would be penalized at home due to their service. I was inspired by promises to fix things. I was inspired by the presence of other veterans lining up to win nominations for the Liberals. I legitimately felt hopeful for the first time in a long time. I believed them. I now realize that I was wrong. The Prime Minister recently stated that Canadian veterans want more than Canada can give. I stood on a stage behind the Prime Minister in August of 2015 when he made a promise to veterans, a promise which was obviously, in retrospect, a political bargaining chip. I have first-hand experience as a service member, stakeholder, and party member with respect to the way our military is regarded and treated. At some of the highest levels, I have personally witnessed the way in which our injured and ill are regarded with skepticism, suspicion, and cynicism by members of the governing party. It needs to end now."

The budget is a huge disappointment, not only to veterans but to currently serving members of Canada's armed forces and their families. Canada has returned to the days known as the "decade of darkness" that passed for Canadian defence policy. The policy decision by the last Liberal government to interfere in the equipment procurement process, with the decision to cancel the EH-101 helicopter contract, cost the lives of Canadian soldiers in Afghanistan. This marked the beginning of the decade of darkness for serving members of the Canadian Armed Forces. A similar political decision to buy used junk from the Australians is one that most reasonable Canadians know can only end as badly. That decision marks the return of darkness for our military members.

The Budget

To get an idea of how poorly the budgetary policy of the government treats men and women in uniform, I draw attention to a new tax measure that targets military families. On average, about 15,500 members of the Canadian Armed Forces and 2,200 members of the RCMP, along with their families, have been authorized each year to receive relocation services. To quote the government's own propaganda, it says, military families are "the strength behind the uniform". Family members of Canadian Armed Forces personnel share in the stresses and strains resulting in the deployment of their loved ones into dangerous operational duty, and the prolonged separations that they entail. They also make important sacrifices and face challenges associated with frequent relocation, such as finding new family health care providers, re-establishing day care, moving children between schools and education systems, professional licensing, and dealing with inconveniences such as changing driver's licences and vehicle licences when moving between provinces. They must also deal with the financial instability resulting from frequent moves, whether it be the loss of employment, different tax systems, or changes to the post living differential.

● (1710)

Members in uniform are only now finding out, or they will get a rude surprise in the mail come tax time, that effective December 1, 2017, the posting allowance will now be taxable. Members will no longer be able to roll the posting allowance into RRSPs or buy down their mortgage. This announcement is the Minister of Finance's and the Minister of Defence's idea of a comprehensive military family plan.

The posting allowance was incorporated into the integrated relocation program, or IRP, as a non-taxable posting benefit, as a result of a recommendation from the standing committee on national defence and veterans affairs, which was made in their report, "Moving Forward: a strategic plan for quality of life improvements". I remember when this change was made and came into effect. I was a newly elected member of Parliament and a new member of the defence committee. At that time, there was all-party agreement for this change. I was pleased to support replacing the posting allowance that existed at that time with a non-taxable posting benefit to adequately compensate all personnel for the disruption caused by new postings.

As the member of Parliament whose riding includes Garrison Petawawa, the largest army base in Canada, I am too familiar with the financial stress on military families when a soldier is posted. When members of the Canadian Armed Forces have found out about this new liberal policy to tax posting allowances, the reaction goes from disbelief to outrage.

The Auditor General has clearly outlined the growing gap between the total number of regular force members who are needed, including the under-representation of women, and the inability of this government to recruit, train, and keep Canadians in uniform to fill that gap. Why is the Prime Minister so insensitive to military families? Why has the Prime Minister refused to consider this anti-family policy as a barrier to recruitment, retention, and gender equality? Most importantly, why has the Minister of Defence done nothing to protect those he has served alongside?

It is hard to believe that the Minister of Defence would support taxing soldiers this way. However, for this Liberal spending government, taxing Canadians is a higher priority than protecting Canadians. Only in a Liberal spending government is the revenue minister more powerful than the defence minister.

It is clear that the Minister of Defence cannot defend the women and men who defend Canada from being the Prime Minister's next tax target. We need a Minister of Defence who will fight for the Canadian Forces. That is why I will be inviting all Canadians to go to cheryl-gallant.com/postingtax. From that web page, they will be able to send a letter to the Minister of Defence and their local MPs to express opposition to the posting allowance tax. If members on the opposite side of this House hear from enough of their own constituents, they may find the courage to fight the posting allowance tax. That is my hope, that Liberal MPs will start listening to what is going on out there.

There is a rising level of anger and frustration with a federal government that is out of touch with regular Canadians. The pre-budget decision to target people of faith for their personal beliefs has angered people of all religions. Many small business owners and doctors have told me that they will never vote for the Liberal party. Canadian veterans feel particularly betrayed by an aloof Prime Minister when he tells veterans that he does not recognize their sacrifices. There are millions of dollars to give to a convicted terrorist. However, there is no money for the victims of roadside bombs.

The posting allowance tax is the latest example of how the Liberals will continue to sneak in new taxes on regular Canadians. All of this anger, and the Liberal spendthrift government only offers more of the same. The 2018 borrowing binge budget is filled with bad spending and higher taxes.

Canadians deserve a balanced budget, smarter spending, and lower taxes. Canadians deserve a Conservative government.

● (1715)

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend, the member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke for her excellent speech, for standing up for our brave men and women in the Canadian Armed Forces, and for pointing out the folly of the government in taxing our troops and taking away special benefits and allowances from those who are injured in the line of service and are unable to return to duty within six months.

I know my colleague, with her long service on the national defence committee, is well aware that this budget was mute on the entire Department of National Defence. There is less than a paragraph dedicated to national defence. There is no plan for how taxpayers' money will be used to fund procurement and activities of our Canadian Armed Forces.

The Budget

Could the member comment on what that represents and the shameful nature of the Liberals in not standing up for our troops? The Liberals are failing Canadians on transparency, failing in providing the strategy and the plan for how we are actually going to implement “Strong, Secure, Engaged”, the Liberals' defence policy.

● (1720)

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Madam Speaker, the promise of transparency we received during the last election certainly has not materialized. The government does not know the difference between transparency and being invisible.

That there is barely a word in the budget on national defence reflects the low regard the government has for our Canadian Armed Forces. There has to be a plan somewhere. Somebody has to have the fiscal framework. There has to be a budget somewhere.

What we are looking for is an actual document showing what the spending is for the military, and we have not yet seen that. That is an insult to all Canadians.

Mr. Steven MacKinnon (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Madam Speaker, we do not need lessons from the Conservatives on defence and defence procurement and respect for our troops. They had a former minister chased down the hall by a veteran's widow.

Now, today, there is a defence white paper, “Strong, Secure, Engaged: Canada's Defence Policy”, with a fully costed \$62-billion plan to put planes in the sky, to put boats in the water, and to equip our men and women in uniform with the materiel, the very equipment that was denied to them for 10 long, lonely, dark years of the Harper administration.

It is ironic to watch members over there twist themselves in knots, saying that we are spending too much, and then waking up and suggesting that we should spend the billions of dollars that they did not spend on defence procurement during their 10 long, sad years in office.

What we have now is a plan to put planes in the air, a plan to christen and send boats out to sea, and a plan to maintain and upgrade the equipment of our men and women in uniform. How could the member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke have missed that this is the biggest-spending defence budget in the history of Canada?

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Madam Speaker, the member opposite has plans, plans, plans to buy this and buy that, but we actually bought a fleet of C-130s. We bought the C-17s, which are so used now it is difficult to keep enough pilots in the program to keep them flying.

We bought new LAVs, new Coyotes, and just a couple of weeks ago we launched a new supply ship, one that was uniquely procured through a combination of civilian and military participants working together. It was a unique situation. We needed that supply ship and we have it in the water now. It will be on its way shortly to continue with exercises in the Pacific.

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am going to focus my remarks today on responding to the budget's main rhetorical thrust: issues around gender equality and the participation of women in the workforce.

For context, it is important to begin by defining what the objectives are when we talk about gender equality. I do not think that many, if any, of the leading advocates of women's empowerment and gender equality undertook their efforts principally in pursuit of a higher gross domestic product. GDP growth and government revenue growth may be nice ancillary benefits, but they ought not to be the principal objective. This is for three main reasons.

First, GDP is not a measure of well-being: it is a measure of the economic value of the final goods and services produced in a society. To point this out is not to undercut the importance of measuring GDP or seeking GDP growth, since higher GDP means greater capacity at the individual and collective level to invest in things that do contribute to well-being, but GDP is not a direct measure of well-being, and the pursuit of a higher GDP may run at odds with the advancement of well-being in certain cases. The advancement of gender equality seems to me to be about well-being, not GDP—that is, it is about making the lives of women better, not about making society richer.

Parenthetically, this is why it is important for societies to consider alternative measures of well-being instead of using GDP growth as a proxy for well-being. Many proposed alternative measures are problematic for their own reasons, because they weigh different aspects of life in ways that reflect the relative priorities of those designing the indices instead of the relative priorities of those whose well-being is aimed at. As such, I personally favour the greater use of a simplified metric that asks individuals to self-assess their well-being on a scale. Such a metric has limitations, but it provides a much better basis for assessing well-being than either arbitrarily constructed well-being indices or metrics like GDP.

Also parenthetically, it is striking how women's self-reported well-being in the industrialized world has actually declined in recent decades. According to an article published by the econometrics laboratory at Berkeley:

By many objective measures the lives of women in the United States have improved over the past 35 years, yet we show that measures of subjective well-being indicate that women's happiness has declined both absolutely and relative to men. The paradox of women's declining relative well-being is found across various datasets, measures of subjective well-being, and is pervasive across demographic groups and industrialized countries. Relative declines in female happiness have eroded a gender gap in happiness in which women in the 1970s typically reported higher subjective well-being than did men.

Therefore, clearly there is still much work to do.

The Budget

I will go back to the main point: GDP growth should not be considered the objective of gender equality not just because GDP is not a measure of well-being but also because it is paternalistic to assign an objective to gender equality other than the empowerment of women to pursue their own chosen projects and objectives. It is not for us as parliamentarians to decide whether women ought to use greater empowerment to pursue increased paid work, to pursue more leisure time, or to involve themselves in other worthwhile projects that do not involve the economic production of goods and services, such as community involvement, personal enrichment, or family-related activities. Surely a commitment to women's empowerment should leave us to be enthusiastic about whatever choices a person makes, provided those choices represent authentic self-expression and due consideration for the common good.

Third and most importantly, we ought to regard the affirmation of equal dignity and value of all people as an end in itself, not merely as a means to achieve some other end. To justify the advancement of equality purely or primarily in economic terms is to imply that economic growth is the thing of primary importance. I would prefer that we justify economic growth in terms of its implications for human dignity, rather than justifying the affirmation of equal and universal human dignity on the basis of its impact on economic growth.

How we frame the basis of gender equality has practical policy implications in terms of the kinds of policy that we will pursue to advance it. If we believe that gender equality is an end, not merely a means, and that it is best understood in terms of empowerment and well-being, then we will seek policies that empower women and we will be generally agnostic as to how they use their increased agency. If empowered women make different choices, on average, than men in terms of their time and resources, that is not a problem for the state to solve; it is, rather, the result of free and empowered people making free decisions in a free society. Seeking equality is not the same as seeking sameness.

If, however, we believe that the objective of gender equality is GDP growth, then we will pursue policies that push certain kinds of choices over others—in particular, choices that involve more paid work.

It is clear that budget 2018 delivers a GDP-centric vision of equality as opposed to a well-being-, choice-, or simply equality-centric vision. The introduction to the budget tells us that “In January 2018, only 61 per cent of women were participating in the economy, compared to 70 per cent of men.” Again, we might wonder if the principal thing of value in life is “participating in the economy”. Why is this the metric of equality? Many women and men who are not in the paid workforce are choosing to undertake activities that they consider, and which could objectively be, more important.

Further, the assignment of certain tasks to be part of the economy or not part of the economy can be quite arbitrary. If I am the caregiver for my children and my neighbour mows his own lawn, neither of those activities is considered part of the economy, but if I hire him to watch my children and he hires me to mow his lawn, then all of a sudden those activities are both part of the economy and contribute to GDP. That is in spite of the fact that nothing actually separates the former situation from the latter, other than that the

government is better off in the latter situation since it can now collect taxes on this new “economic activity”.

• (1725)

The budget bemoans “uneven sharing of caregiver responsibilities”. Every marriage is characterized by uneven sharing of certain responsibilities based on the desires, priorities, and aptitudes of each partner. In my family, I do most of the gross jobs, like cleaning bathrooms. If we are both at home, I am more likely to change diapers. My wife, on the other hand, does most of the cooking. If we each did the opposite, then she would lose her appetite twice.

It is unlikely that we will find any marriage in this country in which both partners do exactly 50% of each activity. Each partnership should involve recognition of the equal value and dignity of each individual, which is not incompatible with mutually agreeable complementarity in which different people agree to do different things.

I am not naive enough to think that there are not troubled situations in which the division of activities does not arise from mutual agreement, cases in which tasks are taken on because one partner is unwilling to participate or one person is pressured into doing things he or she would rather not do, but in those cases, surely it would make more sense to attend to a lack of agency and empowerment, as opposed to introducing a blanket policy that would seek to reorder how all couples divide their responsibilities.

This budget bemoans the “unequal sharing of caregiver responsibilities”. Page 45 of the budget notes that 92% of EI parental leave is paid to women, while 8% is paid to men. Parenthetically, the graphs do presume a gender binary, but we will leave that for another day.

This is quite a historic gap, 92% to 8%, but it is not at all obvious that all or even most of that gap is the result of sexism or disempowerment. Most women claiming EI parental leave benefits tend to be relatively young, between 25 and 34 years old. These women grew up in a relatively different world from that in which many members of the House grew up, especially in terms of opportunities for women.

They also have an experience that is not yet fully reflected in overall pay equity numbers. About 34% of these young women have a university degree, for example, as compared to 26% of men the same age. Young women, the ones most likely to have children today, have a dramatic educational advantage over men, yet they are also much more likely to take parental leave.

Why is that? Maybe it is because they want to. Maybe that was their personal choice, and that is all there is to it. Maybe in the privacy of the discussions that happen between couples, women are statistically more likely to express a preference for having that extra time with an infant child. Some ideologues might see this as a problem, that it is the result of patriarchal social programming and a false consciousness, but I would argue that as long as women are freely making this choice, there is no problem.

The Budget

I would note as well that parental leave is for those caring for newborns. It may be that the division of caregiving responsibilities is somewhat different for older children. Perhaps women are more likely to take on caregiving responsibilities for infants because some women choose to breastfeed. Reliable statistics show that 100% of breastfeeding done in this country is done by women. Perhaps the finance minister aspires to change that in the next budget.

At a very practical level, if a mother wishes to breastfeed, it is difficult for her to forgo parental leave. I am sure that there is more that we and those in private sector workplaces could do to make it easier for women to breastfeed on the go, but that will not change the fact that it is not always practical for the non-breastfeeding partner to provide the ongoing care and then also to cart the baby back and forth to an external workplace every time the child needs to eat. It is in these practical details that most families live their lives and make decisions about the division of caregiving responsibilities.

On the issue of men taking parental leave, I hope that if the Prime Minister's family is blessed with another child, he will consider leading by example and take parental leave himself. Many of my constituents would appreciate having the Prime Minister thus occupied.

In pursuit of higher GDP, this budget limits women's choices by setting aside a portion of parental leave for each partner. It prefers a system of more limited choice to one in which parents have full freedom to divide up their leave as they see fit. Our approach is to seek more choice, not less, because we believe that the objective of equality is well-being, empowerment, and equality itself, not ideology and not GDP. Our leader has proposed a private member's bill to eliminate the tax on EI parental leave, regardless of who takes it, when, or why.

In addition to tax reductions, many parents I have talked to are looking for policies that will give them more choice and flexibility. Many want to spend more time with their children through flexible work arrangements that allow them to set their own hours, work from home, and receive some parental leave benefits along the way.

If a woman wants to breastfeed while working from home, which is often more practical than bringing a baby to work, policy approaches such as simplifying the work-from-home tax deductions and reducing the clawbacks for those who work while on parental leave would go a long way. Incidentally, that would likely also lead to more women doing paid work, the finance minister's apparent principal objective, though it would not lead to a reduction in the proportion of leave claimed by women. Most critically, it would increase the empowerment and range of choice for women, not constrain them. In our view, that is both the right approach and the truly feminist approach.

I do want to note that I agree with the budget's desire to collect disaggregated data to help us understand the experience of visible-minority Canadians. A first step to addressing inequality is gathering data.

Further, I recently had a constituent highlight to me how efforts by the government to get cheaper prices on drugs can inadvertently lead to delayed drug approval. I do hope that this issue is considered in the context of the upcoming pharmacare discussion.

● (1730)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his intervention today. He was moving a little quickly, but I think I got the gist of it.

The problem with the member's argument about males versus females choosing who is going to be in the workplace, and that it seems that more men are choosing it, is the fact that it is systemic, in the sense that the system favours the man going to work. The fact that males make more than women do statistically is part of the decision-making process.

My wife is pregnant right now. If we had to make the decision as to who is going to return to the workforce, we would probably include in the assessment who is likely to make more money. That is the problem, and that is what this budget is about. It is about setting the stage so that men and women have equal opportunity by being paid for the same work they do.

Does the member opposite not think there is value in making sure that those equal opportunities exist for both parents, regardless of which one wants to enter the labour force?

● (1735)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for the question, but I think we disagree less than maybe he thinks we disagree.

My speech was about a very specific aspect of the budget's approach on this. It was that the budget takes a GDP-centred view and holds up GDP as the objective. It specifically tries to engineer the choices people make with respect to parental leave.

Do I agree that there is a problem of sexism women face? Absolutely. It continues to be a problem women face in certain situations in this country, and it is a problem we need to address. However, I do not think that limiting their choices, limiting their flexibility, is the answer. I said quite specifically that I think we can attend to issues of disempowerment, where they exist, to see greater empowerment and greater opportunity for women, without the kinds of policies, like the parental leave policy the government brought in, that are designed to constrain the choices people make.

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this is a curious debate. We are talking about parental leave and opportunities for women and men in the current economic context. A Liberal points out that they need to bring in this program to allow women to stay at work, and perhaps the father could take paternity leave, because of pay equity realities and the lack of pay equity in this country. The Conservatives argue against that philosophy, and the Liberals argue that philosophy.

The Budget

One would maybe look to the budget to see what the Liberals have done about pay equity, if that is the problem, which they admit and identify. There is nothing in the budget to address pay equity in Canada, where women do not receive equal pay for equal work. There is not even money to study the issue, which was the most basic request from the Canadian Labour Congress.

The Liberals identify the problem but do not want to do anything about it. The Conservatives do not identify the problem at all and say it is all about choice. Canadian women are wondering where they are actually going to get someone to put legislation forward to make it illegal to pay women less than they pay men for equal work of equal value.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, I think a substantial portion of that was directed to the government, but I will correct the record for the benefit of the member. I hope he will listen to this.

The Conservatives strongly support equal pay for equal work. We have been clear about that, and I will be clear about that again.

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am going to go down a different rabbit hole right now.

The Liberal member who spoke prior to both of my colleagues claimed that this Liberal budget was not spending tax dollars; it was investing in Canadians' futures. However, we know that they are rescinding over \$2 billion in infrastructure investment, while spending Canadian tax dollars on substantially growing government bureaucracy and spending on overseas ideological colonialism, such as tying foreign aid to abortion access in Africa, where even in cases of rape, which is used as a weapon of war, women do not blame the conceived children for the horrific crimes they faced and have no desire to abort the children they conceive.

Can the member please speak to how inappropriate it is that the Liberals are funding their own political ideology with this budget, with hard-earned Canadian taxpayers' money, rather than improving the lives, and the freedom to self-directed prosperity, of Canadians and their families?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, the approach we took as Conservatives when we were in government was that our foreign aid should be something that brings Canadians together, something all Canadians could agree was a good idea and that was not divisive for Canadians. I think we were successful in promoting programs, like the maternal and child health program, which provided basic access to medicines and health support for people who needed it around the world.

Let us focus on those things that bring Canadians together, that bring the world together. That should be our priority, and that should be where we invest our resources, because there is so much need in that area in terms of basic medicine and basic nutrition. Why would we not focus on those kinds of things?

Mr. Peter Fonseca (Mississauga East—Cooksville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to rise today to speak to Canadians regarding this budget.

I will be sharing my time with the member for Louis-Hébert.

Since forming government just over two years ago, we have made a commitment to put the needs of Canadians first by increasing

equality, fairness, and competitiveness. We did this by making investments that strengthen the middle class and investments that grow our economy. Thanks to the hard work done by Canadians, those investment decisions are paying off.

My riding of Mississauga East—Cooksville is a riding made up of hard-working Canadians. It is diverse and multicultural. I would like to touch on how our government is taking the next steps in its plan to grow and strengthen the middle-class by promoting equality and investing in the economy of the future. We are doing this by building on our successful innovation and skills plan, launched in 2017 through budget 2018. This plan, which was introduced in last year's budget, was an ambitious effort by our government to place Canada as the place for innovation. It is a plan to help create more good, well-paying jobs that will help strengthen and grow the middle class. It is a plan that builds toward making Canada home to the most skilled workforce in the world, a nation of innovators, and a world leader in the innovation economy.

At its core, the innovation and skills plan is about improving and sustaining an economy that works for everyone to ensure that Canadians have access to high-quality jobs. It is also a plan to ensure that Canadian businesses are well placed to compete in a rapidly evolving and competitive global world.

In budget 2017, our government announced a review of all business-facing innovation programs, with the aim of making them more simple and client-centred, leading to better support for Canadian businesses and entrepreneurs. The review took place across 20 federal departments and agencies, making this the first review effort to date of the entire Canadian business innovation program suite. As a result, in budget 2018, our government is proposing a historic reform of business innovation programs, as well as \$2.6 billion over five years in additional support to help create competitive advantages for our Canadian businesses. That means that our government will be increasing total funding while reducing the number of business innovation programs by up to two-thirds. Specifically, the reforms will streamline business support programs, in part by designing four flagship platforms that will bring together multiple programs.

The Budget

First, to help Canadian entrepreneurs and small business owners develop innovative technologies and successfully commercialize them in a global marketplace, our government will provide \$700 million over five years, and \$150 million ongoing, to the industrial research assistance program, IRAP. IRAP has proven to be an effective resource for growing Canadian companies and innovative entrepreneurs. It is well positioned to support funding for larger projects, above the current contribution threshold of \$1 million. That is why our government will also raise the project contribution threshold to \$10 million. This will enable IRAP to support business research and development for these larger projects. Widening the range of financial support would allow entrepreneurs and small business owners who live in my riding to access support more easily as their businesses grow, alongside assistance to help develop and get products to market.

Second, to allow more focused support for business research and development projects over the \$10-million mark, the strategic innovation fund will move away from supporting smaller projects in favour of larger projects that can lead to significant job creation and shared prosperity for Canadians. The fund's role in facilitating the growth and expansion of firms and attracting large-scale, job-creating inventions will remain unchanged. At the same time, the fund's role in advancing research and development through collaboration among academia, not-for-profits, and the private sector will be expanded.

Third, to help Canadian firms unlock growth opportunities through exports, the Trade Commissioner Service will undergo transformative enhancements to simplify the client experience, modernize tools, and offer innovative services. With the recent decision to sign on to the CPTPP and CETA and to explore other opportunities for trade, it is providing new markets for our businesses to join and succeed in.

● (1740)

There is a lot for business owners and entrepreneurs to do, know, and navigate to reach their full potential. It will help businesses in my riding, such as Borges Food Store and Tavora Foods and others, to succeed in a marketplace that is tilted towards the bigger companies.

The fourth and final flagship platform is the regional development agencies. Our government recognizes that all regions of the country do not always have the same needs. Canada's six regional development agencies support economic and community development by leveraging local networks and abilities. To foster economic growth in communities across Canada, the government proposes to provide an additional \$511 million, on a cash basis, over five years, to the regional development agencies to support the innovation and skills plan across all regions in Canada.

This initiative will also provide nationally coordinated, regionally tailored support for women entrepreneurs and will help workers and communities in the west and the Atlantic region adapt to Canada's transition to a low-carbon economy.

In addition, as part of the broader review of innovative programs, over the next year the government will explore ways to simplify the existing suite of 22 programs offered by the regional development agencies. Our government's proposed reforms to streamline business

support programs will benefit Canadian workers, entrepreneurs, and small business owners, as well as Canadians employed by large companies, over the long term through stronger growth and less paperwork.

Providing Canadians with the opportunity to realize their full potential is not just the right thing to do, it is the smart thing to do for our economy.

We know that women entrepreneurs face unique barriers, such as limited access to capital, supply chains, and export programs, compared to their male counterparts. Women entrepreneurs may also have a harder time receiving training and finding mentorship. To address these ongoing barriers, the government is announcing a new women's entrepreneurship strategy. It is a comprehensive and coordinated approach to supporting women-owned businesses across the country.

To improve skills, mentorship, and networking opportunities, important factors for all growing businesses, the government proposes to provide \$105 million over five years to the regional development agencies in support of women-led businesses. In addition, for women-owned companies, our government will make available \$1.65 billion in new financing over three years through the Business Development Bank of Canada and Export Development Canada to improve access to capital.

Finally, to give businesses the confidence they need to grow and take risks, budget 2018 proposes measures in support of a new intellectual property strategy to help Canadian entrepreneurs better understand and protect intellectual property and get better access to useful and relevant intellectual property. This includes increasing the intellectual property literacy of Canadian entrepreneurs, reducing costs, and creating incentives for Canadian businesses to leverage their intellectual property.

This all builds on our plan. Over the last two years, we have seen our economy grow. We are leading the G7, with 3.7% growth and 600,000 jobs. However, we cannot rest on our laurels. What we need to do is double down. With that success, we need to work harder.

The measures proposed in this budget will secure a more prosperous future for all Canadians. I therefore urge all members to give their full support, because this budget will not only ensure prosperity today but for future generations to come. I wholeheartedly support this budget, knowing full well that it will grow our economy and bring more women into the labour force. We need everyone at their best, and this budget is here to do that.

The Budget

• (1745)

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I looked forward to the budget to find out where the Liberal Party stood. One of the questions was around the general sense of integrity, a promise made. It seemed we had to drag the Liberals to their promise of lowering the small business tax. For those who know their parliamentary history in debates over this issue, it was first proposed by Jack Layton and resoundingly rejected, until it was accepted by the Liberals as a good policy. We are always happy to lend good ideas to the Liberals to see if they will actually implement them.

Another promise was to close the stock option loophole. This was something the NDP proposed. We brought a motion forward in Parliament. The Liberals supported it and then campaigned on it. Canadians may not be familiar with this, because the vast majority of Canadians do not use stock option loopholes to avoid paying taxes, most of the people in the middle class or those working hard to join it, as the Prime Minister used to be fond of saying, have never encountered or enjoyed the privilege of stock options as their source of income, where they then pay a much lower tax threshold.

We proposed, in the last campaign, the idea of closing that loophole, and the Liberals eventually supported it. It is between \$800 million and a billion dollars a year as forgone revenue from the government and shows very little economic benefit. My friend talked about opportunities and economic benefit. The Liberals promised to do this. The Liberals have said, as the Prime Minister did just recently, that we cannot fully support veterans because we simply do not have the means to do it. We cannot support more seniors, to lift them out of poverty, because the government says we do not have the means.

If the Liberals thought this was such a good idea that they campaigned on it, all as individual MPs in their ridings, and the finance minister said he was into it, where is it in the budget and why did they not do it?

• (1750)

Mr. Peter Fonseca: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for putting forward his endorsement of our promise to lower the small business tax. They really are the engine of our economy. We are very proud that we have been able to lower the small business tax this year. We will be lowering it again next year, down to 9%. We will have the lowest small business tax in the G7, making us very competitive.

When the member talks about promises, I will talk about promises kept, such as driving our economy through the Canada child benefit. We can talk about a middle-class tax cut, which was in our first budget. Our budgets have been about equality, fairness, competitiveness, having all Canadians at their best, and providing those opportunities.

Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member has hit on the part of the budget that I get really fired up on, and that is innovation. Page 100, my favourite page in the budget, looks at filling in some deficits. The members opposite talk about a financial deficit. They mention it over and over. We have a deficit in infrastructure, in social programs, and in innovation, which we are now addressing through our previous budget as well as budget 2018.

I wonder if the hon. member could talk about the deficit we have in the equality between male and female, or other people in Canada who choose to identify themselves in other ways.

Mr. Peter Fonseca: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for Guelph for his passion and his experience when it comes to innovation and when he talks about equality. He knows full well how that can drive our economy. I have heard the member speak eloquently here about equality and fairness and what that means.

I will give a couple of examples. RBC did a report and looked at our labour gap. If we were able to close that labour gap, that would mean 4% added to our GDP. That is huge. Internationally, this is what Christine Lagarde, the director of the International Monetary Fund had to say. "Equal pay and better economic opportunities for women boost economic growth...for everyone.... It is an economic no-brainer".

The member is bang on. I thank him for the work he does for his community and our country.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Joël Lightbound (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will pick up where my colleague left off. I will also be speaking about gender equality, one of the themes that makes budget 2018 a historic budget.

By focusing on equality and growth, the budget will ensure that Canada's economy grows and that it benefits all the men and women of Canada's middle class.

Canada's economy is doing well. In fact, it is booming. Now that it is on a solid footing, we need to ensure that it truly reflects who we are as a country. Everyone must have the opportunity to work, to contribute to our collective wealth, and to reap the benefits of that wealth. The economy must work for everyone. Every individual must have access to a good job.

As I mentioned, in the next few minutes I will talk about fairness and equality between Canadian men and women. I am convinced that all members of the House believe in this principle, which is deeply ingrained in the Canadian identity and is not negotiable. Nevertheless, we must look at the reality and accept the facts. Unfortunately, it is clear that there is still much work to be done.

Canadian women are among the most educated in the world, yet they are less likely than Canadian men to be in the labour force.

We also note that Canadian women earn 31% less on average than men annually. They are also under-represented in leadership positions, and fewer women than men own small and medium-sized businesses.

The Budget

We believe that this situation must change and evolve, not just because it is morally right, but also because studies have proven that it makes economic sense.

The McKinsey Global Institute reports that accelerating progress toward gender equality, such as increasing women's participation in the technology sector and in the workforce in general, could boost Canada's GDP by \$150 billion by 2026.

My colleague also mentioned the RBC study finding that if women and men participated in the economy equally, our GDP would grow by 4%, which is huge. As the Minister of Finance said in his speech two weeks ago, we fight for every decimal point of growth.

As I said, increasing women's participation in the economy is not just morally right, it is the best way to support economic growth.

The 2018 budget takes practical steps toward closing those gaps, supporting women and girls, and increasing their labour force participation. This will stimulate economic growth and benefit everyone. Having more women in leadership positions strengthens the economy, creates jobs, improves our communities, and fosters innovation.

First and foremost, we need to make sure that salaries respect the principle of equality. We need to reduce the gender wage gap in Canada. I am proud that, with budget 2018, our government is proposing to enact legislation on the principle of equal pay for equal work. This legislation will ensure that women and men working in federally regulated industries receive, on average, equal pay for work of equal value. It was about time, and the fact that our government is going ahead with this legislation is excellent news.

We are also going to provide Canadians with more information on the compensation practices of federally regulated employers. This will ensure that employers with equitable compensation practices get the recognition they deserve, while ensuring that the others are called out and held accountable for any wage gaps.

As the Prime Minister indicated earlier this year in Davos, pay equity is only the first step. Equal pay does not necessarily mean equal opportunities or sacrifices, which leads me to talk about parental leave. When we look at family life, we see that women often take maternity leave after a child is born, which is a good thing. However, we also see that they often shoulder a larger share of family responsibilities. That is why budget 2018 proposes the creation of a new parental leave that will grant an additional five weeks of benefits to parents who agree to share their parental leave. This measure is directly modelled on what is being done in Quebec, where 80% of new fathers claim their parental leave, compared to only 12% in the rest of Canada.

Going by Sweden's example and according to what we have been told by Quebec's Conseil du statut de la femme, this approach will not only promote a better distribution of family responsibilities from the start, but it will also make it possible for women to return to the labour market more quickly or on their own terms.

● (1755)

This is a key measure of budget 2018 for which we have high hopes. It is inspired by measures that Quebec has taken and that we think will also be successful in the rest of Canada.

In closing, with this budget, our government is showing leadership on equity issues, but we cannot do it alone. We must work in partnership with the provinces and territories, and the private and community sectors. This budget is a first step in the right direction. It contains measures that will help boost women's participation in the workforce and give women entrepreneurs greater access to capital. Ultimately, this will promote greater economic growth in Canada. The equal participation of men and women in the workforce will help put our economy on an even more solid footing.

● (1800)

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to hear from my esteemed colleague, the member for Louis-Hébert and Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance. He started his speech by saying this was a historic budget. He is technically correct, because this marks the first time in Canadian history that a government has tabled a deficit budget, for the third time in a row, at a time of economic prosperity.

Let us not forget that these people got elected by promising to post small deficits of \$10 billion at most and to balance the budget by 2019. I must have asked about 258 questions about this. Not once have we gotten the faintest trace of anything remotely resembling an answer as to why they have not kept their promise or when we can expect a balanced budget.

During question period earlier, I asked a very clear question, which I will now raise again. The parliamentary budget officer has also had enough of this improvisation, and he wants to know when Canada will get back to a balanced budget.

If he does not respect us, the members of Parliament, could the parliamentary secretary give a clear answer to the parliamentary budget officer and tell him when we will return to a balanced budget?

Mr. Joël Lightbound: Mr. Speaker, I thank my esteemed colleague from Louis-Saint-Laurent for his question.

I would love to talk about what is historic in this budget. I talked about how our government took a historic step towards achieving true gender equality in Canada. We are also making historic investments in fundamental research, which will promote our country's long-term growth. Since my colleague is from the Quebec City area, I would love to invite him to Université Laval to see just how important fundamental research is. He could hear people talk about how this sector was neglected and undermined for a decade. We know that research begets innovation, and the Québec Metro High Tech Park is evidence of that. This is one thing that the Conservatives did not understand during the decade they were in power.

The Budget

As for my colleague's question, another historic fact is that during this decade under the previous government, Canada saw its worst economic growth since the Second World War and its worst growth in exports. On this side of the House, we have taken a different approach. We decided to make investments and at the same time continue to lower the debt-to-GDP ratio.

We have the best fiscal situation and the strongest growth in the G7, and this is due to the measures we have taken.

[English]

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, if the member opposite had been sitting through the testimony we have been hearing at the status of women committee, which has been studying federal barriers to women's economic justice in Canada, over the past year he would have heard some devastating stories about how women right now in this country have fallen so far behind, women who have worked their whole lives who end up at homeless shelters when they are evicted because they are not able to find affordable housing, or women who retire in poverty because they have never been able to put aside a pension because they have always worked in part-time, precarious work with no access to EI or benefits.

I really would have thought, if this were truly a feminist budget, that the government would have funded the implementation of pay equity and that, at a minimum, it would have taken up the call of the Canadian Labour Congress to establish an office of a pay equity commissioner to start to put the works in place so that we can get action for women and get more money in their pockets right away. It is not just and I want to hear from the member why there was no funding for pay equity in this budget.

[Translation]

Mr. Joël Lightbound: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for raising these issues.

We have integrated a gender-based analysis into Canada's budget process. This allows us to compare the impact that some measures may have on women, men, and intersectional groups, as each department is making its budget requests, so we can ensure that there are no unintended consequences. This will enable us to eventually achieve greater gender equality.

Taking a gender-based analysis into account in every budget decision makes this a historic budget in this area, and we want to ensure that this analysis will be part of future budgets.

•(1805)

[English]

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, you will forgive me if I cross the line. I have been away for a little while, in case you have not heard. However, I am back and I am a little frustrated.

It is an honour to stand in the House. It is always an honour, and I have a greater appreciation for the work done on all sides of the House. However, it has been frustrating for me to sit at home recuperating, and to watch and listen to the debate. Our colleagues across the way, the Liberals, stand up with their hand on their hearts and tell Canadians time and time again how they are seized with the

issues of the day and they are the most important issues for them. Then they table budget 2018.

As always, I bring it back to my riding of Cariboo—Prince George and what this budget would mean to my riding. I will go back to July 31 when the Prime Minister and some of his cabinet ministers stood in my riding, in Williams Lake, before the cameras and said, “We will be there for the rebuild. We will be there for the challenges to come in the months to come, and this is a time for us to stand together and for the federal government to once again say we will be there for Canadians in times of difficulty.”

Well, it is months past that date. As I toured my team through our riding last week, we met with family after family, business owner after business owner, logger, forester, farmer, tour operator, municipal councillors, and they are still waiting for that support.

Over the last year, we have seen flooding that happened just kilometres away from here and the unbelievable wildfires that happened in British Columbia. We are seeing some unprecedented natural disasters. However, when our leaders of the day stand up and say they will be there for us, I do not know about other members, but I take them at their word that they are going to do it.

The government has failed Canadians. It has failed rural Canadians. This budget 2018 does nothing for rural communities such as those in my riding of Cariboo—Prince George.

We have some trying times ahead of us with the increasing protectionist agenda of our closest trading partner to the south that we do most of our trade with. It is getting harder and harder for Canadian producers and businesses to plan ahead. It is getting harder for companies to invest in Canada, because we are sending the wrong messages. We are sending mixed signals. As a matter of fact, a CEO of Suncor recently said that things are too uncertain within Canada for them to further invest.

The government's job is not to necessarily weigh into our private lives, to tell us how we are going to do this or that, how the government can do it better for us, or what we should be doing better. Its job is to create an environment where all can be successful, where industry wants to invest in our country, where other countries look to us in high regard because of the way we set policy for our countrymen.

I have stood before this House time and again and said that it seems when the cameras are on, the Prime Minister and his ministers stand there with their hand on their hearts and pledge all the support in the world, that this is what they are going to do, that they are with us, and maybe even a little tear comes out. However, when the cameras are off, they are nowhere to be seen.

The Budget

• (1810)

Forgive me, as this has nothing to do with budget 2018. However, while I was gone, I was tagged in a social media post. It has been two years since the Prime Minister stood in this House and pledged to the chief of Attawapiskat, Bruce Shisheesh, that he would be there for them, with them, and would visit that community when they were having a terrible suicide epidemic. Guess what? As soon as the media left, did the Prime Minister go there or attend? Has he gone there to this point? No, he has not. If it does not garner a lot of attention, why should he be there?

That is like budget 2018. There is a lot of fluff in there, not a lot of meat. As a matter of fact, the Prime Minister is spending today like we are in a crisis. There is no thought about what happens “if”. When the Liberals were campaigning, they said they would post a deficit of about \$10 billion. When they tabled budget 2018 a couple of weeks ago, it was \$18 billion, with no plan to get us back to a balanced budget. I do not even know how many times we have asked. Our critics on this side, shadow ministers in the opposition, have asked time and time again, and there is no plan.

For somebody who campaigned and said they were ready to lead, all we see is pointing fingers and assigning blame to everyone else. Do not get me started on the international faux pas we have seen on the international stage. I promised myself I would not bring that up. It has been hard, as one can imagine. It has been hard sitting at home and yelling at the TV. As I told my physician, if I can yell at the TV, I can yell across the way. However, it has been difficult.

I visited the riding last week, and there was a lot of despair. Whether it is that there is no softwood lumber agreement or the new tariffs that have come in, there is a lot of concern. We have lost much of our fibre in terms of our annual allowable cut and the harvestable fibre in our neck of the woods. Our farmers are having a difficult time. We hear our colleagues talk about there being no rail cars to move grain to market. Well, there are no cars available for our forestry producers to get their product to market.

In this budget 2018, if the Liberals wanted to do something transformative, why did they not invest in something like our rail system? Why do they not make investments that can have meaningful change and set Canada up to realize some huge potential, whether it is policy or investments? It is disappointing, but, again, this is what we have seen as par for the course. It is disappointing.

There are some great people on the other side, some really good people. I am looking, and I can see a few of them there today. However, I have said this before, and I think the Prime Minister is not only failing Canadians as a whole but failing the back four rows of this House on that side. They have to go back to their ridings and explain the things that this person in the front bench is doing. It is disappointing, it really is.

Mr. Speaker, I know my time is getting short, but I want to end with this. It truly is an honour to stand before you in this House. Once again, and I will probably say this time and time again, I want to thank you and all our colleagues for the support along the way. However, our Prime Minister is failing Canadians, and it is disappointing and unacceptable.

The Deputy Speaker: It being 6:15 p.m., it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the subamendment now before the House.

[*Translation*]

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 Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the subamendment will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

• (1815)

• (1840)

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

(*Division No. 458*)

YEAS

Members

| | |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Angus | Ashton |
| Barsalou-Duval | Beaulieu |
| Benson | Blaikie |
| Blaney (North Island—Powell River) | Boudrias |
| Boulerice | Boutin-Sweet |
| Brosseau | Cannings |
| Caron | Choquette |
| Christopherson | Davies |
| Donnelly | Dubé |
| Dusseau | Duvall |
| Fortin | Garrison |
| Gill | Hardcastle |
| Hughes | Johns |
| Jolibois | Julian |
| Kwan | Laverdière |
| MacGregor | Malcolmson |
| Marcil | Masse (Windsor West) |
| Mathysen | May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) |
| Moore | Nantel |
| Pauzé | Plamondon |
| Quach | Ramsey |
| Saganash | Ste-Marie |
| Stetski | Stewart |
| Thériault | Trudel |
| Weir— 49 | |

NAYS

Members

| | |
|------------|----------|
| Aboultatif | Albas |
| Albrecht | Aldag |
| Alghabra | Alleslev |
| Allison | Amos |

The Budget

Anandasangaree
 Arnold
 Arya
 Badawey
 Bains
 Baylis
 Bennett
 Bergen
 Berthold
 Bibeau
 Blair
 Block
 Bossio
 Bratina
 Brison
 Calkins
 Carrie
 Casey (Charlottetown)
 Champagne
 Chong
 Clement
 Cuzner
 Damoff
 Deltell
 Dhillon
 Diotte
 Dreeshen
 Dubourg
 Duguid
 Easter
 El-Khoury
 Erskine-Smith
 Eyolfson
 Falk (Provencher)
 Ferguson
 Finley
 Fisher
 Fortier
 Fraser (Central Nova)
 Fuhr
 Garneau
 Genuis
 Gladu
 Goldsmith-Jones
 Gourde
 Grewal
 Harder
 Harvey
 Hoback
 Hussen
 Iacono
 Joly
 Jordan
 Kent
 Kitchen
 Lake
 Lametti
 Lapointe
 Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
 Lebouthillier
 Leslie
 Liepert
 Lloyd
 Lockhart
 Longfield
 MacAulay (Cardigan)
 MacKinnon (Gatineau)
 Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
 May (Cambridge)
 McCauley (Edmonton West)
 McCrimmon
 McGuinty
 McKenna
 McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
 Mihychuk
 Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)
 Monsef
 Morrissey
 Murray
 Nater
 Ng
 O'Connell
 Oliver
 O'Toole

Anderson
 Arseneault
 Ayoub
 Bagnell
 Barlow
 Beech
 Benzen
 Bernier
 Bezan
 Bittle
 Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
 Boissonnault
 Brassard
 Breton
 Caesar-Chavannes
 Carr
 Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
 Chagger
 Chen
 Clarke
 Cormier
 Dabrusin
 DeCoursey
 Dhaliwal
 Di Iorio
 Doherty
 Drouin
 Duclos
 Dzerowicz
 Eglinski
 Ellis
 Eyking
 Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
 Fast
 Fillmore
 Finnigan
 Fonseca
 Fragiskatos
 Freeland
 Gallant
 Généreux
 Gerretsen
 Godin
 Goodale
 Graham
 Hajdu
 Hardie
 Hébert
 Hogg
 Hutchings
 Jeneroux
 Jones
 Jowhari
 Khera
 Kmiec
 Lambropoulos
 Lamoureux
 Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
 LeBlanc
 Leitch
 Levitt
 Lightbound
 Lobb
 Long
 Ludwig
 MacKenzie
 Maloney
 McColeman
 McDonald
 McKay
 McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
 Mendicino
 Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
 Motz
 Nassif
 Nault
 Nuttall
 Oliphant
 O'Regan
 Ouellette

Paradis
 Peschisolido
 Petipas Taylor
 Poilievre
 Qualtrough
 Ratansi
 Reid
 Rioux
 Rodriguez
 Romanado
 Rudd
 Rusnak
 Saini
 Samson
 Sarai
 Scarpaleggia
 Schiefke
 Schulte
 Sgro
 Sheehan
 Shipley
 Sidhu (Brampton South)
 Simms
 Sopuck
 Sorenson
 Stanton
 Stubbs
 Tabbara
 Tassi
 Trost
 Van Kesteren
 Vandal
 Vaughan
 Viersen
 Wagantall
 Warkentin
 Webber
 Wilkinson
 Wong
 Yip
 Yurdiga

Paul-Hus
 Peterson
 Picard
 Poissant
 Raitt
 Rayes
 Richards
 Robillard
 Rogers
 Rota
 Ruimy
 Sahota
 Sajjan
 Sangha
 Saroya
 Scheer
 Schmale
 Serré
 Shanahan
 Shields
 Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
 Sikand
 Sohi
 Sorbara
 Spengemann
 Strahl
 Sweet
 Tan
 Tilson
 Trudeau
 Van Loan
 Vandenbeld
 Vecchio
 Virani
 Warawa
 Waugh
 Whalen
 Wilson-Raybould
 Wrzesnewskyj
 Young
 Zimmer — 254

PAIRED

Nil

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

* * *

[English]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—CANADA SUMMER JOBS PROGRAM

The House resumed from March 1 consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion of the member for Elgin—Middlesex—London, relating to business of supply.

● (1850)

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

(Division No. 459)

YEAS

Members

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Abouttaif | Albas |
| Albrecht | Allison |
| Anderson | Arnold |
| Barlow | Barsalou-Duval |
| Beaulieu | Benzen |
| Bergen | Bernier |
| Berthold | Bezan |
| Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis) | Block |

The Budget

Brassard
Carrie
Christopherson
Clement
Diotte
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Gallant
Genius
Gladu
Gourde
Hoback
Kent
Kniéc
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengary)
Liepert
Lobb
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McColeman
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Nater
O'Toole
Poilievre
Rayes
Richards
Scheer
Shields
Simms
Sorenson
Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Van Loan
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Wong
Zimmer— 93

Calkins
Chong
Clarke
Deltell
Doherty
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Généreux
Gill
Godin
Harder
Jeneroux
Kitchen
Lake
Leitch
Lloyd
MacKenzie
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Motz
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Raitt
Reid
Saroya
Schmale
Shipley
Sopuck
Stanton
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga

Goodale
Grewal
Hardcastle
Harvey
Hogg
Hussen
Iacono
Jolibois
Jones
Jowhari
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
LeBlanc
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Marcil
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Mathysen
May (Cambridge)
McDonald
McKenna
Mendicino
Soeurs)
Monsef
Morrissey
Nantel
Nault
O'Connell
Oliver
Ouellette
Pauzé
Peterson
Picard
Poissant
Qualtrough
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Rusnak
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sohi
Spengemann
Stetski
Tabbara
Tassi
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Weir
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewszky
Young— 207

Graham
Hajdu
Hardie
Hébert
Hughes
Hutchings
Johns
Joly
Jordan
Julian
Kwan
Lametti
Lapointe
Laverdière
Lebouthillier
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-
Moore
Murray
Nassif
Ng
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Petipas Taylor
Plamondon
Quach
Ramsey
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Ruimy
Saganash
Saini
Samson
Sarai
Schieffe
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Stewart
Tan
Thériault
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Virani
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Badawey
Bains
Beech
Benson
Bittle
Blair
Boissonnault
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Brosseau
Cannings
Carr
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Choquette
Cuzner
Damoff
DeCoursey
Dhillon
Donnelly
Dubé
Duclos
Dusseault
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Garneau
Gerretsen

Alghabra
Amos
Angus
Arya
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Bennett
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boulerice
Bratina
Brisson
Caesar-Chavannes
Caron
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhaliwal
Di Iorio
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duvall
Easter
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Goldsmith-Jones

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

[Translation]

IMPACT ASSESSMENT ACT

The House resumed from March 2 consideration of the motion that Bill C-69, An Act to enact the Impact Assessment Act and the Canadian Energy Regulator Act, to amend the Navigation Protection Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division at second reading of Bill C-69.

Pursuant to Standing Order 69.1, the first question is on part 1 regarding the impact assessment act, part 2 regarding the Canadian energy regulator act, the title, the preamble, the schedule, and all clauses in part 4, except clauses 85, 186, 187, and 195.

Before the Clerk announced the results of the vote:

● (1900)

[English]

Mr. Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, I noticed that the member for Kildonan—St. Paul was not in the House for the previous vote on the Canada summer jobs, and came into the House well after the vote on the motion on Bill C-69 had started. I believe if you check with the member, she would indicate her vote should not count for this vote.

The Speaker: Could the member for Kildonan—St. Paul confirm she was not here at the beginning of the vote when the question was read?

Hon. MaryAnn Mihychuk: Mr. Speaker, I believe I re-entered from a short absence, but if I was not here for the reading, I will excuse myself from the vote.

[Translation]

(The House divided on the elements of the bill, which were agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 460)

YEAS

Members

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Aldag | Alghabra |
| Alleslev | Amos |
| Anandasangaree | Angus |
| Arseneault | Arya |
| Ashton | Ayoub |
| Badawey | Bagnell |
| Bains | Baylis |
| Beech | Bennett |
| Benson | Bibeau |
| Bittle | Blaikie |
| Blair | Blaney (North Island—Powell River) |
| Boissonnault | Bossio |
| Boulerice | Boutin-Sweet |
| Bratina | Breton |
| Brison | Brosseau |
| Caesar-Chavannes | Cannings |
| Caron | Carr |
| Casey (Cumberland—Colchester) | Casey (Charlottetown) |
| Chagger | Champagne |
| Chen | Choquette |
| Christopherson | Cormier |
| Cullen | Cuzner |
| Dabrusin | Damoff |
| Davies | DeCoursey |
| Dhaliwal | Dhillon |
| Di Iorio | Donnelly |

| |
|--------------------------------------|
| Drouin |
| Dubourg |
| Duguid |
| Duvall |
| Easter |
| Ellis |
| Eyking |
| Fergus |
| Finnigan |
| Fonseca |
| Fragiskatos |
| Freeland |
| Garneau |
| Gerretsen |
| Goodale |
| Grewal |
| Hardcastle |
| Harvey |
| Hogg |
| Hussen |
| Iacono |
| Jolibois |
| Jones |
| Jowhari |
| Khera |
| Lambropoulos |
| Lamoureux |
| Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation) |
| LeBlanc |
| Leslie |
| Lightbound |
| Long |
| Ludwig |
| MacGregor |
| Malcolmson |
| Masse (Windsor West) |
| Mathysen |
| May (Saarich—Gulf Islands) |
| McDonald |
| McKenna |
| Medicino |
| Soeurs |
| Monsef |
| Morrissey |
| Nantel |
| Nault |
| O'Connell |
| Oliver |
| Ouellette |
| Peschisolido |
| Petitpas Taylor |
| Poissant |
| Qualtrough |
| Ratansi |
| Robillard |
| Rogers |
| Rudd |
| Rusnak |
| Sahota |
| Sajjan |
| Sangha |
| Scarpaleggia |
| Schulte |
| Sgro |
| Sheehan |
| Sidhu (Brampton South) |
| Simms |
| Sorbara |
| Stetski |
| Tabbara |
| Tassi |
| Trudel |
| Vandenbeld |
| Virani |
| Whalen |
| Wilson-Raybould |
| Yip |

| |
|-----------|
| Abouttaif |
| Albrecht |

The Budget

| |
|---|
| Dubé |
| Duclos |
| Dusseault |
| Dzerowicz |
| El-Khoury |
| Erskine-Smith |
| Eyolfson |
| Fillmore |
| Fisher |
| Fortier |
| Fraser (Central Nova) |
| Fuhr |
| Garrison |
| Goldsmith-Jones |
| Graham |
| Hajdu |
| Hardie |
| Hébert |
| Hughes |
| Hutchings |
| Johns |
| Joly |
| Jordan |
| Julian |
| Kwan |
| Lametti |
| Lapointe |
| Laverdière |
| Lebouthillier |
| Levitt |
| Lockhart |
| Longfield |
| MacAulay (Cardigan) |
| MacKinnon (Gatineau) |
| Maloney |
| Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia) |
| May (Cambridge) |
| McCrimmon |
| McGuinty |
| McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam) |
| Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Érables) |
| Moore |
| Murray |
| Nassif |
| Ng |
| Oliphant |
| O'Regan |
| Paradis |
| Peterson |
| Picard |
| Quach |
| Ramsey |
| Rioux |
| Rodriguez |
| Romanado |
| Ruimy |
| Saganash |
| Saini |
| Samson |
| Sarai |
| Schiefke |
| Serré |
| Shanahan |
| Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon) |
| Sikand |
| Sohi |
| Spengemann |
| Stewart |
| Tan |
| Trudeau |
| Vandal |
| Vaughan |
| Weir |
| Wilkinson |
| Wrzesniewski |
| Young— 204 |

NAYS

Members

| |
|---------|
| Albas |
| Allison |

The Budget

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| Anderson | Arnold | Brisson | Brosseau |
| Barlow | Barsalou-Duval | Caesar-Chavannes | Cannings |
| Beaulieu | Benzen | Caron | Carr |
| Bergen | Bernier | Casey (Cumberland—Colchester) | Casey (Charlottetown) |
| Berthold | Bezan | Chagger | Champagne |
| Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis) | Block | Chen | Choquette |
| Boudrias | Brassard | Christopherson | Cormier |
| Calkins | Carrie | Cullen | Cuzner |
| Chong | Clarke | Dabrusin | Damoff |
| Clement | Deltell | Davies | DeCoursey |
| Diotte | Doherty | Dhaliwal | Dhillon |
| Dreeshen | Egliniski | Di Iorio | Donnelly |
| Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster) | Falk (Provencher) | Drouin | Dubé |
| Fast | Finley | Dubourg | Duclos |
| Fortin | Gallant | Duguid | Dusseault |
| Généreux | Genuis | Duvall | Dzerowicz |
| Gill | Gladu | Easter | El-Khoury |
| Godin | Gourde | Ellis | Erskine-Smith |
| Harder | Hoback | Eyking | Eyolfson |
| Jeneroux | Kent | Fergus | Fillmore |
| Kitchen | Kniec | Finnigan | Fisher |
| Lake | Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry) | Fonseca | Fortier |
| Leitch | Liepert | Fragiskatos | Fraser (Central Nova) |
| Lloyd | Lobb | Freeland | Fuhr |
| MacKenzie | Marcil | Garneau | Garrison |
| McCauley (Edmonton West) | McColeman | Gerretsen | Goldsmith-Jones |
| McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo) | Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound) | Goodale | Graham |
| Motz | Nater | Grewal | Hajdu |
| Nuttall | O'Toole | Hardcastle | Hardie |
| Paul-Hus | Pauzé | Harvey | Hébert |
| Plamondon | Poillievre | Hogg | Hughes |
| Raitt | Raves | Hussen | Hutchings |
| Reid | Richards | Iacono | Johns |
| Saroya | Scheer | Jolibois | Joly |
| Schmale | Shields | Jones | Jordan |
| Shipley | Sopuck | Jowhari | Julian |
| Sorenson | Stanton | Khera | Kwan |
| Ste-Marie | Strahl | Lambropoulos | Lametti |
| Stubbs | Sweet | Lamoureux | Lapointe |
| Thériault | Tilson | Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation) | Laverdière |
| Trost | Van Kesteren | LeBlanc | Lebouthillier |
| Van Loan | Vecchio | Leslie | Levitt |
| Viersen | Wagantall | Lightbound | Lockhart |
| Warawa | Warkentin | Long | Longfield |
| Waugh | Webber | Ludwig | MacAulay (Cardigan) |
| Wong | Yurdiga | MacGregor | MacKinnon (Gatineau) |
| Zimmer — 97 | | Malcolmson | Maloney |
| | | Masse (Windsor West) | Masé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia) |
| | | Mathysen | May (Cambridge) |
| | | May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) | McCrimmon |
| | | McDonald | McGuinty |
| | | McKenna | McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam) |
| | | Menicino | Mihychuk |
| | | Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs) | |
| | | Monsef | |
| | | Moore | Morrissey |
| | | Murray | Nantel |
| | | Nassif | Nault |
| | | Ng | O'Connell |
| | | Oliphant | Oliver |
| | | O'Regan | Ouellette |
| | | Paradis | Peschisolido |
| | | Peterson | Petitpas Taylor |
| | | Picard | Poissant |
| | | Quach | Qualtrough |
| | | Ramsey | Ratansi |
| | | Rioux | Robillard |
| | | Rodriguez | Rogers |
| | | Romanado | Rudd |
| | | Ruimy | Rusnak |
| | | Saganash | Sahota |
| | | Saimi | Sajjan |
| | | Samson | Sangha |
| | | Sarai | Scarpaleggia |
| | | Schiefke | Schulte |
| | | Serré | Sgro |
| | | Shanahan | Sheehan |
| | | Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon) | Sidhu (Brampton South) |
| | | Sikand | Simms |
| | | Sohi | Sorbara |
| | | Spengemann | Stetski |
| | | Stewart | Tabbara |
| | | Tan | Tassi |
| | | Trudeau | Trudel |

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare these elements carried.*[English]*

The next question is on part 3, regarding the Navigation Protection Act, and clauses 85, 186, 187, and 195 of part 4.

● (1910)

(The House divided on the elements of the bill, which were agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 461)

YEAS

Members

| | |
|----------------|------------------------------------|
| Aldag | Alghabra |
| Alleslev | Amos |
| Anandasangaree | Angus |
| Arseneault | Arya |
| Ashton | Ayoub |
| Badawey | Bagnell |
| Bains | Baylis |
| Beech | Bennett |
| Benson | Bibeau |
| Bittle | Blaikie |
| Blair | Blaney (North Island—Powell River) |
| Boissonnault | Bossio |
| Boulerice | Boutin-Sweet |
| Bratina | Breton |

Adjournment Proceedings

Vandal
Vaughan
Weir
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young— 205

Vandenbeld
Virani
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

[English]

PUBLIC SERVICES AND PROCUREMENT

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, about a month ago, I had the opportunity to stand in this House and ask the Minister of Public Services and Procurement about the Phoenix issue, and I took the opportunity to congratulate her on her nomination for the Teddy award. The Teddy award, of course, is an award given by the Taxpayers Federation for government waste. Now, I made a big error in that comment. I overlooked mentioning that this is the second year in a row that the department and the minister have received a nomination for waste regarding the Phoenix system, the Liberal Phoenix fiasco.

I also overlooked some of the other Teddy awards, including the \$8.2 million that Heritage Canada wasted on a parliamentary skating rink and the \$100,000 for the health minister's Twitter account, to do two tweets a day. I also overlooked commenting on Finance Canada spending \$192,000 to receive a Teddy award nomination for the money wasted on its budget 2017 book.

I apologize to the Liberal government for overlooking the nominations received from the Taxpayers Federation.

Getting back to the public services and procurement minister, we have been at this for over two years with Phoenix. We have asked again and again how the Liberals are going to fix it and what the plan is. All we have received is empty platitudes and talking points.

Again, I ask the minister, when will they deliver a plan to this House? When will they end the empty talking points, the platitudes, and deliver a plan to fix the Liberal Phoenix fiasco?

● (1915)

Mr. Steven MacKinnon (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a bit rich coming from the member across to get up and give empty lectures on a pay system. Let us go through a little of the chronology. The member across has conveniently omitted several facts.

The first fact he admits is that the Phoenix pay system began to be planned in 2008. It was his own friend, the member for Parry Sound—Muskoka, and his colleagues in cabinet, who ordered, dictated, ordained that this system must save money. We learned later that this system had to save \$70 million annually. They bragged about that. Where did that \$70 million come from? It came from firing summarily some of the most experienced and dedicated people in the public service of Canada, those who served as compensation advisers. Between 2008 and 2015, the member's party cynically, wrongly, and, as has been identified in countless reports, systematically at every turn in the planning process, broke every single rule in the enterprise information technology book.

The minute the member stands up and says we do not have a plan to fix the Phoenix pay system, he should look in the mirror and all around those Tory benches. There are 700 people out there this evening who could be helping us, and the Conservatives fired them.

NAYS

Members

Aboultatif
Albrecht
Anderson
Barlow
Beaulieu
Bergen
Berthold
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boudrias
Calkins
Chong
Clement
Diotte
Dreeschen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Fortin
Généreux
Gill
Godin
Harder
Jeneroux
Kitchen
Lake
Leitch
Lloyd
MacKenzie
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Motz
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Plamondon
Raitt
Reid
Saroya
Schmale
Shipley
Sorenson
Ste-Marie
Stubbs
Thériault
Trost
Van Loan
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Wong
Zimmer— 97

Albas
Allison
Arnold
Barsalou-Duval
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Block
Brassard
Carrie
Clarke
Deltell
Doherty
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Gallant
Genuis
Gladu
Gourde
Hoback
Kent
Kniec
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Liepert
Lobb
Marcil
McColeman
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Nater
O'Toole
Pauzé
Poilievre
Rayes
Richards
Scheer
Shields
Sopuck
Stanton
Strahl
Sweet
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare these elements carried.

Accordingly, the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development.

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

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

Adjournment Proceedings

My riding in Gatineau, like many ridings across the country, is full of dedicated public servants. We owe them our best efforts, our dedication. We owe, as the minister says so often, leaving no stone unturned.

The member talks about a Teddy award from some weird right-wing interest group, talks about the fact that we are spending too much to fix the mess that reeks, as I have said many times, of the arsonists complaining when the fire department shows up. That is what reeks. It is almost comedic for the member to stand in his place and say on the one hand that we are spending too much to fix the problem that they caused and, on the other hand, we do not have a plan to fix the system.

We have both. We have identified the resources to fix the problem, and we have a plan to fix this very sordid public administration debacle that the party across left us with and they ought to apologize for.

Mr. Kelly McCauley: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Gatineau for the enjoyable rant. I want to go back in time to 2008 when the Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates came up with the suggestion to solidify the department in one group. Let us see who was on that. It was made up by a majority of Liberals who came up with the plan to make the Phoenix changes. That is one thing that the government refuses to acknowledge.

The very origins of this error go back to a Liberal-dominated committee, including the member for Mississauga—Malton, the member for Ajax, and the member for Mississauga Centre who are still here. He maybe needs to look at them for blame. He maybe needs to take a look at the Auditor General's report that clearly places the blame for the Phoenix fiasco at the government's feet. If the member spent more time fixing the issue instead of blaming others, we would not be in this situation.

• (1920)

Mr. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, if the Conservatives quit making sad platitudes, standing here with their false outrage, and took responsibility for the disgrace they left the Public Service of Canada in, the disgrace of a ticking time bomb of a disaster, and if they would stand and take a modicum of responsibility, maybe we would take them a little more seriously. Until then, they are just a sad joke every time they open their mouths about the Phoenix pay system.

ETHICS

Mr. Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC): Mr. Speaker, about four months ago I asked the government why it seemed like the Liberals are always taking care of themselves. They are always able to get free, taxpayer-funded nannies, for instance, free trips to private islands, or free helicopter rides on private islands.

The finance minister and the Prime Minister set up complex accounting schemes to protect their family fortunes, but were going after ordinary Canadians who worked hard to create a small business and employ other Canadians so they could put food on the table.

I asked why Canadians always have to foot the bill to pay for the lifestyles of the rich and famous Liberals.

Since I asked that question, the former ethics commissioner came back with a report confirming that the Prime Minister of Canada was

guilty of breaking the law in four separate places because of that trip to the Aga Khan's island, a billionaire's island. He was found guilty by the former ethics commissioner of improperly arranging his personal affairs. He was found guilty of accepting illegal gifts. He was found guilty of illegally accepting a ride on a private aircraft and he was found guilty of engaging illegally in discussions about government business.

When I raised that question at another time, the government House leader said the Prime Minister was found not guilty of three other charges that had been brought forward. She was actually proud of the fact that he was only found guilty of four of the seven possible violations of the ethics code and the members' code of conduct. It is really unbelievable that the government is proud of the fact that the Prime Minister was found guilty of breaching those sections four times. The Liberals are proud that he accepted the report. The only thing the report did was to find him guilty of breaching those sections.

Since asking that question, the finance minister has been found guilty of failing to disclose the corporation structure around his French villa. None of us on this side of the House have a French villa, but if we did we certainly would know that the right things had to be filed with the Ethics Commissioner to properly adhere to the code of conduct. The minister violated that as well.

Since my question originally was about why Canadians always have to pay when the Liberals get the free ride, I am wondering whether in the recent budget there is a single change to the tax structure that would cause the finance minister or the Prime Minister to pay one additional cent of tax because of their trust funds or their complex numbered companies.

Is there anything in the budget that would raise taxes on those Liberals or were the tax hikes just reserved for average Canadian families and small business owners?

Ms. Kamal Khera (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to speak to the question posed by the hon. member about our commitment to combat offshore tax evasion and aggressive tax avoidance.

In budgets 2016, 2017, and now 2018, our government is investing nearly a billion dollars to crack down on tax evasion and aggressive tax avoidance. Budget 2018 alone would bring close to \$130 million in new investments over five years to combat aggressive tax avoidance while improving our domestic and international rules to close tax loopholes used by certain large multinationals. Thanks to these investments, the CRA is now able to expand its tools and have tools at its disposal to help close in on any individual or corporation that tries to avoid paying its share of taxes.

Adjournment Proceedings

Our plan is working. In particular, I commend the actions by our Minister of National Revenue for getting us where we are today. Canadians can be proud of our government's international leadership on these matters. Collaboration with international partners is crucial to identifying and taking action against those who are evading and avoiding paying their fair share. In fact, because of our government's action, in 2018 Canada will be able to automatically exchange information with other countries to identify taxpayers with offshore accounts through the OECD's common reporting standard. Compliance actions will be taken according to the information available in each case, including referrals to CRA's criminal investigation program and, where appropriate, to the Public Prosecution Service of Canada for possible criminal prosecution.

However, I want to emphasize that CRA does not depend on leaked lists such as the paradise papers and the Panama papers to tackle the issue of tax evasion and aggressive tax avoidance. Thanks to our government's investments in the CRA, by the time such leaks occur, the agency is already well advanced in carrying out its work in identifying and pursuing those who are not paying their fair share. For offshore-related files alone, as of December 2017, the CRA has been conducting audits on nearly 1,100 taxpayers and is conducting criminal investigations in more than 42 cases of tax evasion. It will continue to apply penalties to all cases of serious tax non-compliance.

We are delivering on what we promised to Canadians, and that is exactly what we will continue to do, now and in the future.

• (1925)

Mr. Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the parliamentary secretary for that answer; unfortunately, it was not to the question that I asked.

What I asked was this: was there anything in budget 2018 that caused the Prime Minister or the finance minister to pay one additional dollar in federal taxes, or were the tax increases reserved solely for people who own small businesses and for Canadian families?

Ms. Kamal Khera: Mr. Speaker, as I stated, our government is firmly committed to combatting tax evasion and aggressive tax avoidance. We want a fair tax system for all Canadians, and our actions are producing results.

We will close the net on any wealthy individuals or corporations that try to avoid paying their fair share of taxes and drain resources away from the services that improve the quality of life of all Canadians. We will continue the work needed to combat offshore tax evasion and aggressive tax avoidance. Our government stands on solid ground in this regard. We are on track and we are meeting our targets, and we will continue to deliver the results.

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the last time I was in conversation on this topic, the inquiry into murdered and missing indigenous women had just filed its report. That was at the beginning of November. We had identified that eight out of the 10 challenges raised by the commissioners of the inquiry, those things that were making it difficult for them to get their work done, to get to the root of the terrible problem of murdered and missing indigenous women, were related to govern-

ment interference. When I questioned the minister for indigenous affairs and reconciliation in question period, she said that we would get a quick answer and that the government was committed to removing barriers.

Here we are all these months later and we have not yet seen a change.

One of the top and most compelling recommendations of the commissioners in their November report was that the government work collaboratively with the provinces and territories to create a national police task force to which the national inquiry could refer families and survivors to assess or reopen cases, or review investigations. This is extremely important. We have heard repeatedly from families that, where police found their report of a missing or murdered family member to be unfounded or something had just not been investigated or pursued to its very end, it left families in limbo and with no closure.

My colleague from Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River, the New Democrat deputy critic for indigenous services, stated:

I am hearing the desire for law enforcement to be involved and given the necessary resources to solve cold cases of missing Indigenous women from all over Saskatchewan; cases like that of my friend, Myrna Laprise, and her family, who want to know what happened to her aunt who disappeared years ago.

The summer before last, the Native Women's Association of Canada said, again, that it is a missed opportunity that the terms of reference did not specifically invite the investigation of cold cases. It stated:

There does not appear to be an opportunity for families to pursue or reopen cases through the justice system. In fact, for families who want to pursue cases or re-open ones that have been part of the justice system, the Terms of Reference direct that the support the Commissioners can offer is to redirect them to the appropriate provincial or territorial victim services. Families are not looking for mainstream counseling services through victim services but justice. This is a missed opportunity.

To our disappointment, there still has been no government response to this very pressing interim recommendation from the inquiry commissioners, and there is nothing in the budget released last month to address other vital recommendations from the inquiry. There is no response to any of the requests in the report. There is no money to establish a commemoration fund in collaboration with families, survivors, and national and regional indigenous organizations as asked.

Therefore, these are my questions to the government. What is it doing with the recommendations? What assurances is it giving to families and survivors that their asks have been heard, and why was there no money in the budget to specifically address the inquiry's appeals for us to resolve this situation once and for all?

Adjournment Proceedings

•(1930)

Ms. Yvonne Jones (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the traditional territory of the Algonquin people to answer the question posed by my hon. colleague.

Our government remains committed to ending the ongoing national tragedy of missing and murdered indigenous women and girls in Canada. This is why, when previous governments failed to do so, we immediately moved to establish an independent inquiry into missing and murdered indigenous women and girls.

As we have announced and have indicated many times, the federal government has provided nearly \$54 million over the past two years to ensure the success of this national inquiry.

The inquiry released its interim report on November 1, 2017. The commissioners stated in their interim report that they were striving to make stronger connections with families, survivors, and women's and indigenous organizations that are their key partners on the front line.

The government will respond shortly to the recommendations of the inquiry's interim report and we will outline further actions at that time. The Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs has met with these commissioners on several occasions, including since the interim report was released.

On the broader recommendations, the commission is right to raise these important issues because they are all connected. The government took immediate action on these points. They produce better results for communities, lead to stronger and healthier families, and support self-determination.

A working group has also been created and is meeting regularly with the commission to help resolve the administrative issues faced by the commission. The working group is providing solutions to ensure the commission can complete its work.

We are also discussing the commission's recent request for an extension to the work that it is doing, so it may deal further with families, indigenous partners, and provincial and territorial counterparts.

We have said along, and we continue to say, that families must be at the centre of the independent commission's work. The families of missing and murdered indigenous women and girls remain at the heart of this inquiry. We know we need to bring healing for the families, justice for the victims, and put an end to this national tragedy once and for all.

We are determined to do this right for the survivors and for their families, to honour the spirits and memories of those who have been lost, and to protect future generations.

•(1935)

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson: Mr. Speaker, my difficulty with what the member opposite is saying is that nothing has changed since the inquiry's interim report was released the beginning of November.

We do not see evidence that the Liberals are keeping their promise to the families to help the inquiry succeed at every level. The Prime Minister said that he would review the report and pay attention to its recommendations, but nothing has changed.

Witnesses from the department said at committee that they were preparing options, and this was just in January, and that we were going to have a response very soon. It is now the middle of March and still nothing. We do not have time.

Again, when will we hear the government's response to the inquiry's interim recommendations? We need to act quickly.

Ms. Yvonne Jones: Mr. Speaker, I know the member opposite would like to have this happen within her time frame. The reality is that we are truly committed to real reconciliation with indigenous people. The independent national inquiry into missing and murdered indigenous women and girls is vital to that process. We are determined to get this right. We remain committed to working with indigenous governments and with communities, provinces, and territories, and other key partners to end the unacceptable rates of violence against indigenous women and girls.

We have received the interim report. The Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs is undertaking that review. She has also met with the independent commissioners. We will be responding to the interim report.

At the end of the day, this government is determined to end the violence that has been perpetrated against indigenous women and girls in our country. This is the reason we have committed to this process, and have committed nearly \$54 million to support this process over the past two years.

[*Translation*]

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

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

CONTENTS

Monday, March 19, 2018

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Latin American Heritage Month Act

| | |
|----------------------------------|-------|
| Mr. Kent | 17623 |
| Bill S-218. Second reading | 17623 |
| Mrs. Caesar-Chavannes | 17625 |
| Ms. Kwan | 17625 |
| Mr. Virani | 17625 |
| Ms. Kwan | 17627 |
| Mr. Genuis | 17628 |
| Mr. Lamoureux | 17629 |
| Mrs. Caesar-Chavannes | 17630 |

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

The Budget

Financial Statement of Minister of Finance

| | |
|----------------------|-------|
| Motion | 17631 |
| Mr. Easter | 17631 |
| Mr. Genuis | 17632 |
| Ms. Malcolmson | 17632 |
| Ms. Lapointe | 17632 |
| Mr. Genuis | 17634 |
| Mr. Cullen | 17634 |
| Mr. MacKinnon | 17635 |
| Ms. Harder | 17635 |
| Mr. Samson | 17636 |
| Mr. Cullen | 17637 |
| Mr. Saroya | 17637 |
| Mr. Arya | 17638 |
| Mr. Cullen | 17639 |
| Mr. Breton | 17639 |
| Mr. Deltell | 17640 |
| Ms. Malcolmson | 17640 |
| Mr. Arya | 17641 |
| Ms. Ratansi | 17641 |
| Mr. Arya | 17642 |
| Mr. Schmale | 17642 |
| Mrs. Wagantall | 17643 |
| Mr. Deltell | 17643 |
| Mr. Lamoureux | 17644 |
| Mr. Sopuck | 17644 |
| Mr. Arya | 17645 |
| Mr. O'Toole | 17645 |

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Mike MacDonald

| | |
|----------------------|-------|
| Ms. Vandenbeld | 17646 |
|----------------------|-------|

Naw-Ruz

| | |
|------------------|-------|
| Mr. Carrie | 17646 |
|------------------|-------|

St. Patrick's Day

| | |
|-------------------|-------|
| Mr. Lametti | 17647 |
|-------------------|-------|

Bev Desjarlais

| | |
|--------------------------------|-------|
| Mr. Masse (Windsor West) | 17647 |
|--------------------------------|-------|

International Women's Day

| | |
|-------------------|-------|
| Mr. Dubourg | 17647 |
|-------------------|-------|

Conservation Trust Fund

| | |
|------------------|-------|
| Mr. Sopuck | 17647 |
|------------------|-------|

Pay Equity

| | |
|------------------|-------|
| Mr. Cuzner | 17647 |
|------------------|-------|

International Women's Day

| | |
|--------------------|-------|
| Mr. Di Iorio | 17648 |
|--------------------|-------|

Yannick Dumont

| | |
|------------------|-------|
| Mr. Clarke | 17648 |
|------------------|-------|

Worldwide Quilting Day

| | |
|--------------------|-------|
| Ms. Mihychuk | 17648 |
|--------------------|-------|

Athéna Gervais

| | |
|---------------------|-------|
| Mr. Robillard | 17648 |
|---------------------|-------|

Canada Summer Jobs Program

| | |
|------------------|-------|
| Mr. Genuis | 17648 |
|------------------|-------|

Quebec Intellectual Disability Week

| | |
|---------------------|-------|
| Mr. MacKinnon | 17649 |
|---------------------|-------|

International Day of La Francophonie

| | |
|-----------------|-------|
| Mr. Caron | 17649 |
|-----------------|-------|

Member for Cariboo—Prince George

| | |
|-------------------|-------|
| Mr. Doherty | 17649 |
|-------------------|-------|

2018 Winter Paralympic Games

| | |
|--|-------|
| Mr. Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation) | 17649 |
|--|-------|

ORAL QUESTIONS

National Defence

| | |
|--------------------|-------|
| Ms. Raitt | 17650 |
| Mr. Trudeau | 17650 |
| Ms. Raitt | 17650 |
| Mr. Trudeau | 17650 |
| Ms. Raitt | 17650 |
| Mr. Trudeau | 17650 |
| Mr. Paul-Hus | 17650 |
| Mr. Trudeau | 17650 |
| Mr. Paul-Hus | 17651 |
| Mr. Trudeau | 17651 |
| Mr. Caron | 17651 |
| Mr. Trudeau | 17651 |
| Mr. Caron | 17651 |
| Mr. Trudeau | 17651 |

International Trade

| | |
|-------------------|-------|
| Ms. Ramsey | 17651 |
| Mr. Trudeau | 17651 |
| Ms. Ramsey | 17651 |
| Mr. Trudeau | 17652 |

| | | | |
|--|-------|---|-------|
| Finance | | | |
| Mr. Deltell | 17652 | Mr. Goodale | 17657 |
| Mr. Lightbound | 17652 | Natural Resources | |
| Mr. Deltell | 17652 | Mrs. Block | 17657 |
| Mr. Lightbound | 17652 | Ms. Rudd | 17657 |
| Mr. Poilievre | 17652 | Poverty | |
| Mr. Brison | 17652 | Ms. Dabrusin | 17657 |
| Mr. Poilievre | 17652 | Mr. Duclos | 17657 |
| Mr. Sohi | 17652 | Agriculture and Agri-food | |
| Mr. Poilievre | 17653 | Mr. Berthold | 17657 |
| Mr. Lightbound | 17653 | Mr. Garneau | 17657 |
| Mr. Poilievre | 17653 | Foreign Affairs | |
| Mr. Lightbound | 17653 | Mr. Boulerice | 17657 |
| Regional Economic Development | | Ms. Freeland | 17657 |
| Ms. Trudel | 17653 | Agriculture and Agri-food | |
| Ms. Freeland | 17653 | Mr. Drouin | 17658 |
| Pensions | | Mr. MacAulay | 17658 |
| Mr. Duvall | 17653 | Rail Transportation | |
| Mr. Lametti | 17653 | Mr. Barlow | 17658 |
| Canada-India Relations | | Mr. Garneau | 17658 |
| Mr. O'Toole | 17653 | Official Languages | |
| Mr. Goodale | 17654 | Mr. Beaulieu | 17658 |
| Mr. O'Toole | 17654 | Mr. Brison | 17658 |
| Mr. Goodale | 17654 | Public Services and Procurement | |
| Mr. Rayes | 17654 | Mrs. Gill | 17658 |
| Mr. Goodale | 17654 | Ms. Qualtrough | 17658 |
| Mr. Rayes | 17654 | Health | |
| Mr. Goodale | 17654 | Mr. Thériault | 17658 |
| International Trade | | Ms. Petitpas Taylor | 17658 |
| Ms. Blaney (North Island—Powell River) | 17654 | Chemical Attack in Salisbury | |
| Ms. Freeland | 17654 | Ms. Freeland | 17659 |
| Mr. MacGregor | 17654 | Motion | 17659 |
| Ms. Freeland | 17655 | (Motions agreed to) | 17659 |
| Ms. Lapointe | 17655 | Business of Supply | |
| Mr. Champagne | 17655 | Ms. Chagger | 17659 |
| Employment | | ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS | |
| Mr. Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis) | 17655 | Parliamentary Budget Officer | |
| Ms. Hajdu | 17655 | The Speaker | 17659 |
| Mrs. Vecchio | 17655 | Government Response to Petitions | |
| Ms. Hajdu | 17655 | Mr. Lamoureux | 17659 |
| Mr. Genuis | 17655 | Committees of the House | |
| Ms. Hajdu | 17655 | Indigenous and Northern Affairs | |
| Mr. Genuis | 17656 | Ms. Mihychuk | 17660 |
| Ms. Hajdu | 17656 | Procedure and House Affairs | |
| Telecommunications | | Mr. Bagnell | 17660 |
| Ms. Moore | 17656 | Indigenous and Northern Affairs | |
| Mr. Lametti | 17656 | Mrs. McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo) | 17660 |
| Infrastructure | | Procedure and House Affairs | |
| Ms. Sansoucy | 17656 | Mr. Richards | 17660 |
| Mr. Sohi | 17656 | Citizenship and Immigration | |
| Public Safety | | Mr. Oliphant | 17660 |
| Ms. Bergen | 17656 | | |
| Mr. Goodale | 17656 | | |
| Ms. Bergen | 17656 | | |

| | |
|---|-------|
| Public Safety and National Security | |
| Mr. McKay | 17660 |
| Citizenship and Immigration | |
| Mr. Cormier | 17661 |
| Petitions | |
| Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship | |
| Mr. Allison | 17661 |
| Gatineau Park | |
| Mr. McGuinty | 17661 |
| Kinder Morgan Pipeline | |
| Ms. Kwan | 17661 |
| Canada Summer Jobs Program | |
| Mrs. Block | 17661 |
| Somaliland | |
| Mr. McKay | 17661 |
| The Environment | |
| Mr. Johns | 17661 |
| Palliative Care | |
| Mrs. Wagantall | 17661 |
| Canada Summer Jobs Program | |
| Mr. Arnold | 17662 |
| The Environment | |
| Ms. Malcolmson | 17662 |
| Canada Summer Jobs Program | |
| Mr. Carrie | 17662 |
| Volunteer Service Medal | |
| Ms. Mathysen | 17662 |
| The Environment | |
| Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) | 17662 |
| Canada Summer Jobs Program | |
| Mr. Hoback | 17662 |
| Mr. Schmale | 17662 |
| Mr. Falk (Provencher) | 17662 |
| Questions Passed as Orders for Returns | |
| Mr. Lamoureux | 17663 |
| Request for Emergency Debate | |
| Canadian Steel and Aluminum Exports | |
| Ms. Ramsey | 17666 |
| Speaker's Ruling | |
| The Speaker | 17666 |

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

| | |
|---|-------|
| The Budget | |
| Financial Statement of Minister of Finance | |
| Motion | 17667 |
| Mr. O'Toole | 17667 |
| Mr. Lamoureux | 17667 |
| Mr. Carrie | 17667 |
| Mr. Scarpaleggia | 17668 |
| Mr. Deltell | 17669 |

| | |
|--|-------|
| Mr. Julian | 17669 |
| Mr. McKay | 17670 |
| Mr. Kent | 17671 |
| Ms. Mathysen | 17671 |
| Mr. Julian | 17671 |
| Mr. Vaughan | 17674 |
| Mr. Genuis | 17675 |
| Ms. Mathysen | 17675 |
| Mrs. Jordan | 17676 |
| Mr. Lamoureux | 17677 |
| Mr. Genuis | 17677 |
| Ms. Hardcastle | 17677 |
| Mr. Spengemann | 17678 |
| Mr. Carrie | 17679 |
| Ms. Hardcastle | 17680 |
| Mrs. Gallant | 17680 |
| Mr. Bezan | 17681 |
| Mr. MacKinnon | 17682 |
| Mr. Genuis | 17682 |
| Mr. Gerretsen | 17684 |
| Mr. Cullen | 17684 |
| Mrs. Wagantall | 17685 |
| Mr. Fonseca | 17685 |
| Mr. Cullen | 17687 |
| Mr. Longfield | 17687 |
| Mr. Lightbound | 17687 |
| Mr. Deltell | 17688 |
| Ms. Malcolmson | 17689 |
| Mr. Doherty | 17689 |
| Amendment to the amendment negated | 17691 |

Business of Supply

| | |
|---|-------|
| Opposition Motion—Canada Summer Jobs Program | |
| Motion | 17691 |
| Motion negated | 17692 |

Impact Assessment Act

| | |
|--|-------|
| Bill C-69. Second reading | 17693 |
| Elements of the bill agreed to | 17694 |
| Elements of the bill agreed to | 17695 |
| (Bill read the second time and referred to a committee) .. | 17695 |

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Public Services and Procurement

| | |
|---------------------|-------|
| Mr. McCauley | 17695 |
| Mr. MacKinnon | 17695 |

Ethics

| | |
|------------------|-------|
| Mr. Strahl | 17696 |
| Ms. Khera | 17696 |

Indigenous Affairs

| | |
|----------------------|-------|
| Ms. Malcolmson | 17697 |
| Ms. Jones | 17698 |

Published under the authority of the Speaker of
the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: <http://www.ourcommons.ca>

Publié en conformité de l'autorité
du Président de la Chambre des communes

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante : <http://www.noscommunes.ca>